JUN 8 - 1944

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 89—PART 8

NOVEMBER 23, 1943, TO DECEMBER 21, 1943
(PAGES 9843 TO 11005)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1943

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

NOV 8 1994

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 1943

(Legislative day of Thursday, November 18, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of all grace and mercy, who art the Author and Disposer of human life and from whom our spirits have come and unto whom they return, with bowed heads and uncovered hearts we come into Thy presence.

We thank Thee for the life and character of Thy servant whom Thou hast called unto Thyself. We rejoice that whatever was noble and beautiful in Thy sight and in our sight abides forever.

We bless Thee that he was numbered among those who seek to do justly, who love mercy and walk humbly with their God, ever striving to serve his generation according to Thy holy will. His sun went down while it was yet day only to rise again in glory and majesty. We are not saying "farewell" but "good night," hoping to meet again with all with whom we were privileged to walk and labor for a little while upon this earth and who now dwell in heavenly blessedness, having received the end of their faith, the salvation of their souls.

Thou who art the Consolation of the sorrowing and the Support of the weary, we pray that Thou wilt look down in love and pity upon the members of the bereaved family. Grant that they may avail themselves of the eternal companionship of the Christ, that Friend who sticketh closer than a brother and who will fill their lonely and desolate hearts with that peace which passeth all our understanding.

We pray that Thou wilt also so teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom. Grant that we may live out those days in faith and in faithfulness and at last give us all an abundant entrance into Thine eternal kingdom.

Hear us in the name of the risen Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, November 22, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

DEATH OF SENATOR BARBOUR, OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, it is with the deepest sorrow that I am called upon to announce to the Senate the death of my beloved colleague, the Honorable W. WARREN BARBOUR, senior Senator from the State of New Jersey.

Senator BARBOUR was close to the people of New Jersey. He was loved very much by them, and his passing is a great loss not only to the people of the State but to New Jersey itself. He will be much missed by all his colleagues in the Senate. I shall never forget his friendly attitude and willingness to cooperate with me after I became a Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, I shall take a few moments of the time of the Senate to read my favorite little poem, entitled "A Comrade Rides Ahead," which was written by my personal friend Douglas Malloch to the memory of Emerson Hough, and which applies equally when any of our comrades ride ahead, as my beloved friend Senator BARBOUR has been called upon to do:

Time brings not death, it brings but changes;
  I know he rides, but rides afar,
Today some other planet ranges
  And camps tonight upon a star
  Where all his other comrades are.

For there were those who rode before him,
  As there are those he leaves behind;
Although from us time's changes bore him,
  Out there our comrade still will find
  The kinship of the comrade mind.

Time brings us change and leaves us fretting;
  We weep when every comrade goes—
Perhaps too much, perhaps forgetting
  That over yonder there are those
  To whom he comes and whom he knows.

I would not hold our loss too lightly;
  God knows, and he, how deep the pain;
But, friends, I see still shining brightly
  The brightest link in all our chain
  That links us with a new domain.

Time breaks no circle such as this.
  For this I swear, because believing;
However hurt, however grieving,
  However much a friend we miss
  Between the world is no abyss.

For friendship binds the worlds together—
  World over there, world over here.
From earth to heaven is the tether
  That brings the earth and heaven near
  And makes them both a bit more dear.

Not weaker now our chain, but stronger;
  In all our loss and all our ill
We now shall look a little longer
  At ev'ry star above the hill
  And think of him, and have him still.

Whatever vales we yet may wander,
  What sorrow come, what tempest blow,
We have a friend, a friend out yonder,
  To greet us when we have to go—
  Out yonder someone that we know.

To all eternity he binds us;
  He links the planet and the star;
He rides ahead, the trail he finds us
  And where he is and where we are
  Will never seem again so far.

Mr. President, I submit a resolution, which I ask to have read and considered by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 211), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. W. WARREN BARBOUR, late a Senator from the State of New Jersey.

Resolved, That a committee of 12 Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, whenever a Member of the Senate of the United States passes on there is a breach in the harmony of this great deliberative body; there is a sense of disappointment for what we regard as the unfulfillment of great promise, and there is deep sadness. Indeed, in the face of such visitations, I feel a sorrow which I am sure affects my life. But with the death of W. WARREN BARBOUR there has gone out of my life something more than a colleague in the United States Senate.

The great benevolence of that colleague's character was revealed to me most intimately. We entered this august body on the same day, having the same misgivings which we expressed to each other. We sat side by side until he lost an election and there came an interim when he was not here in the Senate. My association with him socially has happened to be very intimate, and through light and through dark of our experiences I have regarded him a gallant Christian gentleman and friend.

Mr. President, on this occasion I want to leave some of the evidence—not all of it, I could not do that, but some of the evidence—of his concern for the underprivileged, his anxiety to improve or ameliorate the conditions of those who were physically handicapped, and his regard for the oppressed, particularly for minority groups, for the blind, for

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

veterans, for all who need the benevolence of such men as WARREN BARBOUR and of such men as constitute the United States Senate.

Let me say, in order that history may speak with some cold facts, that he was born in 1888 in Monmouth Beach, Monmouth County, N. J., and was a lifelong resident of New Jersey. His father and his grandfather were both residents of New Jersey. His roots ran deep into the soil of that great State, and he faithfully endeavored to represent it in the Congress of the United States.

An interesting side light on this man, who was powerful physically, is that in 1910, when he was only 22 years of age, he won the national amateur heavyweight boxing championship in two bouts in Boston on the same night. Of course, he participated in other amateur contests in which he won titles.

Foregoing a college education, he entered business, associating himself with other members of his family in the linen thread company the name of which was a household name in my family when I was a small boy. Barbour Thread is a memory of my childhood, and when I met this gentleman here on the floor of the United States Senate for the first time, there came to my mind a picture of my boyhood, and a memory that ran back to the advertisements and spools carrying his name and that of his family.

WARREN BARBOUR was a member of the National Guard for 10 years, accompanying the guard to the Mexican border in 1916 as a first lieutenant and later advanced to the rank of captain.

He had been president of the American Tariff League for 10 years while he was in active business and before he began his public career. He first entered public life as a member of the borough council of Rumson, and that was followed by his election as mayor of Rumson. He served as mayor from 1923 to 1928. He was elected to public office 27 times.

I always remarked that he had a very keen political sense, which, I regret to say, I lack; and he was of great help to me as I sat beside him in this body and was able to ask him when an issue arose what its political aspect was. He had almost an intuition of where the shades ran, whether into the field of public approval or disapproval as votes at the polls might be affected. I would not leave the impression that that was the dominating element in his consideration, and I am sure my colleagues know it is not in my consideration of what to do when a disputed question arises for our decision here. I have sometimes regretted that I have not been able to give more weight than I have given, and as much as Senator BARBOUR gave, to political considerations, because I regard the preservation of our party system as an important bulwark of American liberty.

WARREN BARBOUR was delegate to State and National Republican conventions. He was chairman of the finance committee of the Republican State committee.

He came to the Senate by appointment of the Governor on December 1, 1931, to succeed Dwight W. Morrow upon the latter's death. As a candidate for reelection in 1936, Senator BARBOUR ran 185,000 votes ahead of his ticket, although the ticket was defeated in the Roosevelt landslide.

In January 1937 he was appointed a member of the New Jersey Unemployment Compensation Commission, became its chairman, and resigned later in the year to campaign for State Senator Lester H. Clee, of Essex County, when he was nominated as the Republican candidate for Governor.

Senator BARBOUR was reelected to the United States Senate in 1938 to fill the unexpired term vacated by the resignation of Senator A. Harry Moore when the latter became Governor of New Jersey. Our colleague was again elected in 1940 for the full term ending in January 1947.

Mr. President, I have here a rather graphic statement of the principles which Senator BARBOUR has advocated in public, on the platform, and in the Senate of the United States, affecting American institutions, affecting national defense, concerning labor and liberalism, social security, home ownership, business and economics, agriculture, veterans, and other subjects. I shall not read the statement, but ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS

Senator BARBOUR is one of the country's foremost spokesmen for constitutional government, speaking and writing frequently to urge preservation of American democracy and human liberties guaranteed by the Constitution, including free speech, a free press, freedom of religion, and freedom of assembly.

Vigorously and constantly throughout his career has opposed communism, nazi-ism, or totalitarianism in any form.

He was author of a resolution (S. J. Res. 264), introduced in the Senate May 27, 1940, to limit to 1 year the power of the President and other executive officers to suspend civil liberties of citizens or existing restrictions of law on wages and hours of labor.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

As a member of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, Senator BARBOUR is best known as a "big navy" Senator. Always an advocate of a strong national defense.

With the spread and intensification of the European war he demanded—

1. Quick expansion of American aircraft industry to provide for a minimum production of 100,000 fighting planes annually.

2. Training of a minimum of 50,000 military pilots and 100,000 civilian pilots.

3. A streamlined and mechanized regular army of 500,000 men equipped with latest military weapons.

4. An army reserve of 1,000,000 men.

5. Accumulation of a 3-year supply of rubber, tin, and other essential war materials not produced in the United States.

He introduced bills to—

(a) Provide new and enlarged naval bases for emergency use. (The provisions of this measure were incorporated in the 1940 naval authorization bill.)

(b) Increase the number of National Guard aviation units.

(c) Provide for a survey of the Hackensack Meadows and Conaschonck Point to determine their value for defense purposes and to enlarge Cape May Naval Air Station.

Senator BARBOUR was author of the new Espionage Act signed by President Roosevelt in March, which greatly strengthens the national defense by increasing the penalties for peacetime espionage and sabotage, the first of its kind to become a law.

LABOR AND LIBERALISM

Wage-and-hour legislation, both State and National, have had Senator BARBOUR's special interest and support.

Measures voted for:

1. Railroad Retirement Act.

2. Federal wage-and-hour law.

3. Act creating the National Labor Relations Board.

4. Bills for the benefit of postal employees and other Federal workers.

5. Norris anti-injunction bill, outlawing "yellow dog" contracts and limiting the power of Federal courts to issue injunctions in labor disputes.

6. Various measures guaranteeing and reinforcing the right of workers to organize without interference from employers, bargain collectively, and strike, in the furtherance of their aims.

7. Legislation requiring payment of the prevailing rate of wages for all work on Government contracts or financed with Federal funds.

8. Civil Liberties bill.

Urged New Jersey Legislature to enact minimum wage law for women and wage-and-hour legislation for all workers.

Voted for W. P. A. appropriations, Wagner Housing Act, and subsequent appropriations for Federal housing projects.

Classified as liberal in attitude on all progressive and social legislation.

Author of resolution (S. J. Res. 264) to protect labor's gains in Government employment and while working on Government contracts, in cases where Federal executives are empowered in emergencies to set them aside.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Voted for present Social Security Act and amendments to provide for:

1. Old age and survivors' insurance.

2. Old age pensions, and pensions for the blind and mothers with dependent children.

3. Relief appropriations and reorganization of the relief system, to give the States greater autonomy in administration.

Believes Social Security System should be expanded to include groups not now covered by retirement benefits and that old age pensions should be liberalized.

Author of a bill to give free mailing privileges to blind applicants for admission to college.

HOME OWNER

Author of bills to:

1. Reduce interest rate on Home Owners' Loan Corporation mortgages from 5 percent to 3 percent.

2. Provide for 2-year moratorium on unpaid balance on H. O. L. C. mortgages.

3. Reduce lending rate of Federal Home Loan Bank system to building and loan associations, to permit lower interest charges to home owners dealing with these institutions.

4. Reduce the interest rate on federally insured mortgages financed through Federal Housing Administration from 5 percent to 4 percent.

BUSINESS AND ECONOMIC POLICY

For sound money, curtailed Federal spending, balanced budget, adoption of governmental policies designed to encourage rather than punish business, and to stimulate private initiative and investment.

Favors taxation in proportion to ability to pay, including income and inheritance taxes.

Advocates coordination of tax systems of Federal and State Governments and reimbursement of States, counties, and cities by Federal Government for loss of taxes on revenue-producing Federal property.

Critic of bungling bureaucracy, excessive Federal regulation, and absorption of investment funds by Federal Government.

Author of bill to deny Federal Communications Commission power to stifle development of television.

AGRICULTURE

Has spoken and voted for:

1. Increased appropriations for research in basic agricultural problems and for Federal scientific services functioning for the general good of American agriculture.

2. Greater emphasis on marketing studies and reports, insect and disease control, and weather services.

3. Reduction of agricultural cash subsidies to one-crop farmers of the South and West, to permit a fairer distribution of Federal aids to farmers in New Jersey.

4. Various measures for benefit of dairy and poultry industries.

5. Numerous amendments to agricultural appropriation bills to give greater recognition to needs of "forgotten farmers" of New Jersey and other Northeastern States.

Author of bills to:

(a) Create a Poultry Division in the Department of Agriculture.

(b) Provide for an excise tax on eggs and egg products.

(c) Provide for a National Farm Conference to study conflicts in present "Alice in Wonderland" farm program of Federal Government.

VETERANS

Voted for bonus bill, both on original passage and when passed over President's veto.

Opposed proposals to cut compensation of veterans for service-connected disability, or restrict hospitalization privileges.

Author of bill to exempt widows and wives of veterans from provision of law requiring automatic dismissal of all W. P. A. workers except veterans continually on rolls for 18 months.

Leader in fight for impregnable national defense.

NEGRO

Author of antilynching bill, pledged to vote for cloture rule when considered.

Author of bill to establish a Negro battalion in New Jersey National Guard and secure War Department recognition.

Author of legislation to assure Negroes equality in hospital service and other facilities in development of national health program in the South as well as in the North.

Senator BARBOUR has received many communications from Negro organizations and leaders throughout the whole country thanking him for his efforts in behalf of their race and commending his aggressive fight for constitutional rights and social justice.

TOLERANCE

An outstanding spokesman for tolerance in public and private life, and vice chairman of the Council Against Intolerance, Senator BARBOUR has become widely known for his public utterances on this subject.

He was author of a bill to prohibit transmission through the mails of forgeries or any scurrilous or inflammatory matter tending to arouse racial or religious hatreds.

NEW JERSEY'S OWN SENATOR

As a native and lifelong resident of New Jersey, Senator BARBOUR possesses a more intimate knowledge of the make-up, industries, interests, and needs of the State than most men who could be sent to Washington to represent it, making him in a unique sense "New Jersey's own Senator."

CLEAN POLITICS

Voted for the Hatch Act and amendments to end political coercion and abuses resulting from efforts to force W. P. A. and Federal employees to vote and work for candidates favored by party bosses.

Opposed to political bossism, gangsterism, and use of public office for private ends.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, there are some matters which I cannot pass over because they seemed to be so important in considering the public service of Senator BARBOUR.

In his efforts to ameliorate the condition of classes who are often regarded as minorities, we find him offering an antilynching bill in Congress. We hear him announcing that he would vote for cloture of any debate when that seemed necessary in order to secure action on such legislation. He was the author of a bill to establish a Negro battalion in the New Jersey National Guard, and to secure War Department recognition.

He introduced legislation to assure Negroes equality in hospital service and other facilities in the development of national health programs in the South, as well as in the North. In his lifetime he had received many communications from Negro organizations and leaders throughout the whole country thanking him for his efforts in behalf of their race and commending his aggressive fight for constitutional rights and social justice.

I well remember that when we were considering the Selective Training and Service Act an amendment upon this subject, which was adopted, introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], provoked from Senator BARBOUR remarks that revealed his attitude toward this particular minority. The remarks are to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 26, 1940, and I wish to read them into this RECORD. Speaking of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New York, which was agreed to, Senator BARBOUR said:

I do not know whether or not his amendment and my own are exactly alike, but certainly our aims are exactly similar. In other words, results are what I want, and by the same token I do not want to press my amendment, Mr. President, simply because of any pride of authorship. I will be glad to join the distinguished Senator from New York in his amendment, or he can join me in mine. Anyway it cannot be doubted—I know it of my own personal knowledge—that there is and has been and will continue to be this tragic, unfair discrimination of which the Senator from New York speaks, which I seek to check and end by my amendment.

Senator BARBOUR spoke further upon the subject, and offered his amendment, and I ask leave to have it inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

In the administration of the foregoing provision and all other enlistments for service in the Military and Naval Establishments of the United States applicants for enlistment, if otherwise acceptable, shall be accepted for service without discrimination on account of color or race, and men so enlisted or inducted into the land or naval forces of the United States shall be permitted to serve in any branch of these services without discrimination because of color or race.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, one of the efforts which Senator BARBOUR initiated most recently is evidenced by a joint resolution introduced by him last month. It bears the date of October 14, 1943, and is Senate Joint Resolution 85, to provide for the admission to the United States of aliens who are religious or racial refugees. That measure was so benevolent in its purposes that it commanded the support of organizations of both the great political parties. A statement made jointly on September 9, 1943, by the National Democratic Club and the National Republican Club of New York City relative to that subject, will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, October 14, 1943. I shall not read the entire statement, but only its concluding sentence:

We specifically and urgently request the introduction of legislation of the character which we have indicated and also specifically request immediate hearings before the appropriate committees, at which hearings we respectfully request to be heard.

For National Democratic Club:
WILLIAM F. FULLEN.
For National Republican Club:
THOMAS J. CURRAN.

That proposed legislation, if it should be enacted—and it perhaps could be—would denounce the Hitler mass murders, and would undertake to uphold religious freedom, and to afford a sanctuary for the oppressed.

Mr. President, Senator BARBOUR has left a monument here which I regard to be of benefit to all who wish to have access to definite information on subjects about which Senators are daily asked by their constituents. A letter to me from him best reveals his attitude toward the subject, and what he accomplished. The letter is dated November 11:

DEAR WARREN A.: The many, many letters that we have gotten—and still are getting, as a matter of fact—from schools, colleges, educators, and parents asking questions about how to go about getting into the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and the difficulty I have had and my office has had in trying to answer all these different questions gave me the idea that the Naval Affairs Committee could well prepare, in a committee print, a comprehensive review of all these matters which it seemed at first might be covered by a fairly short statement. This, however, proved impossible, and, by the same token, I really feel that the copy I am sending you of this committee print, while making for a larger pamphlet than I had hoped, really is about the most concise way to put the whole story—and, of course, it should cover the whole story.

Then follows something more personal, and the letter is signed "WARREN B."

Mr. President, that euphemism is dear to my heart. As I have said, we came into the Senate on the same day, and sat side by side for a long time. We were both WARRENS, and my salutation to him was "WARREN B.," and his to me "WARREN A." I shall always cherish very highly that personal relationship.

Senator BARBOUR was an important and influential member of several important committees, including the Committee on Naval Affairs. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of the Senate committees of which he was a member at the time of his demise.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The list is as follows:

Commerce, Manufactures, Naval Affairs, Public Buildings and Grounds, Rules, Special Committee to Investigate Gasoline and Fuel Oil Shortages.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of the clubs of which Senator BARBOUR was a member at the time of his demise.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The list is as follows:

Union League, Rumson Club, Racquet and Tennis Club, Chevy Chase Club, Society of the Cincinnati, Society of Mayflower Descendants, Society of Colonial Wars, Metropolitan Club, Sons of the American Revolution.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I have done less than I could do, and less than I should like to do to glorify the wonderful relationship which existed between this United States Senator and me, between this friend and me, and to try to express what I believe to be true, that 95 Senators of the United States are saddened by his passing, and would like to extoll his virtues and honor his memory.

I cannot say farewell to this good man without tendering to the members of his bereaved family my own heartfelt sympathy and that, I am sure, of all his colleagues in the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it had been my purpose at the conclusion of the deliberations of the Senate tomorrow to read a brief paragraph from the Thanksgiving proclamations of President Washington in 1789, of Abraham Lincoln in 1863, of Woodrow Wilson in 1918, and of President Roosevelt a few days ago, and to ask the Senate to do the unaccustomed thing of joining with me in a brief prayer of thanksgiving to Almighty God for the land in which we live and for the people who live within it. Our purpose to recess over until Friday frustrates that little diversion in our Senatorial program.

I wish to say for the information of the Senate that a recess will be taken until Friday, and then until Monday. Consideration of the pending bill will not be resumed until Monday. It may be possible that on Friday there will be consideration given to another bill which is on the calendar, but that will be determined between now and then. I refer to the measure dealing with the Chinese Exclusion Act.

Mr. President, I cannot allow the occasion to pass without expressing my profound regret and sorrow over the death of Senator W. WARREN BARBOUR. We have relationships here in the Senate of which the public knows little and which have no political connection. As a matter of fact, they cross political lines, geographical boundaries, and religious delineations, to create an intimate friendship and respect which we ourselves know and appreciate, but of which the public knows little or nothing. It is one of the glorious traditions and privileges of service in the Senate to cultivate and enjoy these personal relationships which are not terminated either by retirement from the Senate or by death itself. I never knew why just such a relationship existed between Senator BARBOUR and me, but it did. From the time when he entered the Senate until today I flattered myself that I enjoyed his personal friendship and confidence and affection, and I am happy to say that that feeling was mutual. I recall on one occasion when he confided in me a matter of great intimacy affecting his personal life. I accepted that as a compliment. I now regard it as such, and I cherish it as such.

Senator BARBOUR was in every respect a courtly gentleman. In all the controversies that have taken place here since he came to the Senate, some of them personal, some of them partisan, I do not recall ever having heard him express bitterness or animosity or envy toward anybody, either in the Senate or out of the Senate. He was a man of great kindness and generosity. Though he was a man who had engaged, most of his life, in the manufacturing industry, as had his ancestors before him, he was in a deep sense a kind of philosopher. His philosophy was homely and practical. It was the sort that anybody, whether scholar or unlettered, could understand. That type of man is valuable in the Senate. That type of character impresses itself upon us, and makes a definite contribution to the sum total of our legislative and political and intellectual history.

I am sure I express the feeling of all the Members of the Senate in the majority as well as in the minority whose minds and hearts converge in the same path on such an occasion as this, when I say that we deeply respected Senator BARBOUR. We entertained for him a personal affection and a high regard, and we join with all his friends here and elsewhere in expressions of profound sorrow upon the occasion of his death. All that we can say in our feebleness of language to them and to him and his spirit is, "Hail and farewell."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, Senator BARBOUR was a faithful, devoted, and industrious member of the Committee on Naval Affairs. He was very much beloved by all its members. He was loved because he was the type of public servant who invariably commands respect and affection for his kindly, sympathetic, tolerant, and charitable attributes. He had more qualities than these. He was industrious. He faithfully attended the committee meetings. He had a special affection for the Navy. He took pride in his membership on that committee. He cooperated in every way possible to help promote and advance our Navy and to make it the powerful military force that it is today. We shall all miss him; but we shall have for our inspiration in the future the memory of a man who served his country faithfully, who did his duty bravely and courageously, who recognized and respected the rights of his colleagues and who exemplified those unselfish and robust qualities that make cooperation with one's associates an effective force in lessening the burdens of public service.

It is fitting, therefore, Mr. President, that the Secretary of the Navy should be prompted this morning to send a letter to me in connection with the passing of Senator BARBOUR. I send the letter to the desk and ask to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letter will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, November 23, 1943.

MY DEAR SENATOR WALSH: The tragic and untimely death of Senator W. WARREN BARBOUR is a heavy blow to the entire Nation. I wish to convey to you and the other Members of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee my personal sense of loss and that of the entire naval service. Senator BARBOUR'S valued efforts will be keenly missed.

Most sincerely,

FRANK KNOX.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

Under the second resolving clause the Vice President appointed Mr. HAWKES, Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. WHITE, Mr. AUSTIN, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TUNNELL, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. REVERCOMB, and Mr. ROBERTSON the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator from New Jersey I move that the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, November 26, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who art the Rose of Sharon and the bright and morning star, in these sacred moments we are reminded of our most solemn duties. As we have inherited vast benefits from those who have gone before, forbid that we should make mock of their sacrificial toil. By brotherly love the discouraged are made restful, the heavy laden, light, and those who are weighted down receive strength.

Empty all hearts of ingratitude, pride, and covetousness and let our eyes see the world and our hands touch it, that

Thy kingdom may come, stainless and unrestrained. In the calendar of our memory inspire us to live and labor for our Republic with all knowledge and wisdom. Heavenly Father, these days are heavy with historic issues; be Thou the inspiration of all our duties and let the decisions be in accord with the best traditions of our Government. We pray for all who are waiting and longing for those whose memory is most precious. Let our prayer for them be prompted by that love which labors, pleads, and comforts by its own divinely inspired power. Give them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, and the garment of praise for heaviness. O glorious eclipse, O grand obscurity, O shadow that tells of the Light, we shall not ask earth's broken ones to find a place of rest, but we pass from things temporal to things eternal and our souls vibrate in Thy holy name, and Thy grace and peace shall minister to all. Grant us this prayer, our blessed Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 209):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. HENRY B. STEAGALL, late a Representative from the State of Alabama.

Resolved, That a committee of four Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of the above resolution the Presiding Officer had appointed Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. HILL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, and Mr. AIKEN members of said committee on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 210):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. J. WILLIAM DITTER, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of five Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of the above resolution the Presiding Officer had appointed Mr. DAVIS, Mr. GUFFEY, Mr. SCRUGHAM, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. BUSHFIELD members of said committee on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 763) entitled "An act amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

Department of Agriculture.
Department of Agriculture (War Food Administration).
Department of Labor.
Department of the Navy.
Department of War.
Civil Service Commission.
Federal Security Agency.
Securities and Exchange Commission.
War Manpower Commission.

COMMITTEE TO ATTEND THE FUNERAL OF THE LATE HENRY B. STEAGALL

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following Members to attend the funeral of Mr. STEAGALL: Mr. RAYBURN, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. RAMSPECK, Mr. VINSON of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. STARNES of Alabama, Mr. HOBBS, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. DEWEY.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and in one to include an editorial concerning paper mill expansion and in the other a letter from the Honorable Marvin Jones.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Washington Post by Walter Lippman entitled "The A, B, and C of Subsidies."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Mr. Ernest Lindley in the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to section 3 of the resolution to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation. I feel that if section 3 is left in the bill inflation will follow.

Ever since I have been a Member of this House, I have supported farm legislation. However, if section 3 remains in the present bill, I will have to vote against it. In the event Congress fails to continue the subsidy it means higher prices, especially on the necessities of life which are so essential to the workers of this country.

At the present time there are fifteen or twenty million workers in this country who have not received any increase in their salary for several years. It is hard enough for these people to make ends meet with the present prices on commodities having, in some instances, increased 100 percent. If section 3 is adopted it will mean an even greater increase of prices and a terrible hardship on these workers and their families throughout the country.

For that reason I trust the House will see its way clear to eliminate section 3 from the bill.

Mr. MCLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a memorandum I have prepared on the Treasury's new tax program and the home owner.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an address by the President of the Philippine Commonwealth, and in the other some statistics regarding crops.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an editorial from a paper in my district and in the other an article on competitive bidding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on petition No. 14 calling for the discharge of the bill H. R. 2887.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

(Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a poem by William Cullen Bryant.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the American Merchant Marine Institute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE GLORY OF THE TIMES

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont.

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, upon many occasions during my years of service in the Congress I have been severely and caustically critical of the Roosevelt administration. I have belabored it on account of its sins of omission and commission. I have not spared President Roosevelt in so doing.

Although I have supported the Commander in Chief in his program, military and naval, to win the war, and shall continue to do so as long as I am satisfied with the progress which is made, I shall also continue, as aggressively as I know how, to oppose the programs of the New Deal.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I recall and have been often reminded of the fact that I was somewhat critical, practically and constructively, of some of the activities of a very fine lady, Mrs. Roosevelt, the wife of the President.

Few, if any, of the words I have spoken would I recant. My feelings have been given forthright expression whenever I have felt the situation deserved my attention and that of Congress and the people. Frankly, I see many evidences which indicate that there will be other and more occasions for further critical comment by me, with, I hope, constructive suggestions anent the failures of this administration and of those who comprise it.

AN HONOR TO THEIR TITLES

Today, Mr. Speaker, as always, I wish to praise where praise at any time is due. I say this with enthusiasm, sincerity, and a fervor equal to that which has at any time motivated me to be critical in days gone by or shall influence me in the future.

The service record of the Roosevelt boys—of James, of Elliott, of Franklin, Jr., and of John—deserves the approbation and the commendation of all of us. Asking for hard jobs, unpleasant tasks, dangerous missions, these boys who come from the first family of the land have typified the strength, the resourcefulness, the daring, and the democracy of the youth of America.

No supermen, as they would be the first to testify and the last to claim, nevertheless they have performed the tasks which have been assigned to them without fear and asking no favor, and they have made the grade and have completed the mission and have done the task so well as to deserve the highest accolade.

Theirs was not and is not the easiest spot—in fact, it is one of the most embarrassing spots to be in, as sons of the President. They have met the challenge—together with thousands of other young Americans who have distinguished themselves under the fire of the enemy. They really deserve and I, as one, make so bold as to offer them the commendation of the American public for the genuine service they have rendered their country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a magazine article by the Governor of Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement relative to the candidacy of a man whose character and ability are needed at the helm of our National Government during these critical times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix an address made by Mr. W. D. Farr, secretary of the Colorado-Nebraska Lamb Feeders Association.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday after the conclusion of the Legislative Calendar and any other special orders I may address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Sunday Telegram-News of Lynn, Mass.; and also to include an address I made before the Lions Club.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WEISS was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include the quarterly report of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON THE BILL S. 981

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to file a supplementary report from the Committee on Insular Affairs on the bill S. 981.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a sermon delivered by Rev. Paul Little, rector of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, San Francisco, delivered at a memorial service of the American Legion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I have four unanimous-consent requests. First, to revise and extend my remarks; second, to extend my remarks and include two radio broadcasts by Rupert Hughes; and to extend my remarks and include an article on reconversion.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter received from C. W. Swonger, research economist, New England Milk Producers' Association, November 19, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement of legislative policy by the manufacturers' division of the Lafayette Chamber of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of Ohio and Mr. LEONARD W. HALL were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and a second request that I be permitted to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks an address by the dean of the law school of the University of North Carolina. The latter extension may exceed the usual space allowed, but I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a brief article from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to set forth therein the position of the Farmers' Union of North Dakota on the tax bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein a telegram and a short poem commemorating the birth of the Honorable James E. Watson, former Senator from Indiana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by Dr. F. J. Underwood, of Mississippi, president-elect of the American Public Health Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein some excerpts from an address by Edgar S. Gorrell, president of the Air Transport Association, delivered in Oklahoma City on November 11, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an excerpt from an article from the current issue of Flying written by my colleague the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including a patriotic telegram from eight patriotic societies of East Chicago, Ind.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Missoulian, of Missoula County; also to extend in my remarks comments of the press of Montana in regard to the silver policy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in three separate instances, one my own remarks, and the other two separate editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make this afternoon on the subsidy bill and to include therein a certain newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including a letter I received from Chester Bowles, Administrator of the O. P. A.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Dallas News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection?

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—POST-WAR BENEFITS TO VETERANS OF THE ARMED FORCES (H. DOC. NO. 361)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

All of us are concentrating now on the one primary objective of winning this war. But even as we devote our energy and resources to that purpose, we cannot neglect to plan for things to come after victory is won.

The problem of reconverting wartime America to a peacetime basis is one for which we are now laying plans to be submitted to the Congress for action. As I said last July:

> The returning soldier and sailor and marine are a part of the problem of demobilizing the rest of the millions of Americans who have been working and living in a war economy since 1941. * * * But the members of the armed forces have been compelled to make greater economic sacrifice and every other kind of sacrifice than the rest of us, and are entitled to definite action to help take care of their special problems.

At that time I outlined what seemed to me to be a minimum of action to which the members of our armed forces are entitled over and above that taken for other citizens.

What our service men and women want, more than anything else, is the assurance of satisfactory employment upon their return to civil life. The first task after the war is to provide employment for them and for our demobilized war workers.

There were skeptics who said that our wartime production goals would never be attained. There will also be skeptics who will question our ability to make the necessary plans to meet the problems of unemployment and want after the war. But, I am confident that if industry and labor and Government tackle the problems of economic readjustment after the war with the same unity of purpose and with the same ingenuity, resourcefulness and boldness that they have employed to such advantage in wartime production, they can solve them.

We must not lower our sights to prewar levels. The goal after the war should be the maximum utilization of our human and material resources. This is the way to rout the forces of insecurity and unemployment at home, as completely as we shall have defeated the forces of tyranny and oppression on the fields of battle.

There are, however, certain measures which merit the immediate attention of the Congress to round out the program

already commenced for the special protection of the members of the armed forces.

The Congress has already enacted a generous program of benefits for servicemen and for the widows and dependents of those killed in action.

For example:

1. Under the National Service Life Insurance Act, life insurance at low premium rates is now available to members of the armed forces in amounts not less than $1,000 and not more than $10,000 per person. A total of nearly $90,000,000,000 of insurance has already been applied for.

2. In addition, provision has been made, under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act, for the guaranty by the Government of the payment of premiums on commercial policies held by members of the armed forces while in service. Premiums on insurance totaling $135,582,000 have been guaranteed, as a result of 56,276 applications by servicemen for such relief.

3. The Congress has also enacted legislation making provision for the hospitalization and medical care of all veterans of the present war, and for the vocational rehabilitation and training of those suffering from disability incurred in, or aggravated by, military service, when such disability results in a vocational handicap preventing reemployment. Similar provision has been made for the rehabilitation of disabled persons in civil life, who, with proper training, can be equipped to play a useful part in the war effort at home. Men who are rejected for military service because of physical or mental defects, or who are discharged from the armed forces because of a disability existing at the time of induction, are thus eligible for such rehabilitation services and training as may be necessary and feasible in order to fit them for useful and gainful employment.

4. By recent legislation, our present service men and women have been assured the same pension benefits for death or disability incurred in the line of duty while in active military service as are provided for the veterans of prior wars. The pension rates for the family of those killed in this war were recently increased by the Congress.

The Veterans' Administration will, from time to time, request the consideration by the Congress of various amendments of existing laws which will facilitate administration, and which will correct any defects in our present statutory scheme which experience may disclose. I am confident that the Congress, in line with the historic policy of this Government toward its ill, injured, and disabled service men and women, will provide generous appropriations to the Veterans' Administration with which to carry out these laws.

5. Numerous other measures have been adopted for the protection of our servicemen such as the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against members of the armed forces, the creation of reemployment rights under the Selective Service Act, and the provision for emergency maternity care to the wives and infants of enlisted men.

However, I believe that we must go much further.

We must make provision now to help our returning service men and women bridge the gap from war to peace activity. When the war is over, our men and women in the armed forces will be eager to rejoin their families, get a job, or continue their education, and to pick up the threads of their former lives. They will return at a time when industry will be in the throes of reconversion. Our plans for demobilization of soldiers and sailors must be consistent with our plans for the reconversion of industry and for the creation of employment opportunities for both servicemen and war workers. Already the armed forces have returned many thousands of service men and women to civil life.

The following further steps seem desirable now:

1. To help service men and women tide over the difficult period of readjustment from military to civilian life, mustering-out pay will be needed. It will relieve them of anxiety while they seek private employment or make their personal plans for the future. I therefore recommend to the Congress that it enact legislation and provide funds for the payment of a uniform, reasonable mustering-out pay to all members of the armed forces upon their honorable discharge or transfer to inactive duty. This pay should not be in a lump sum but on a monthly installment basis.

2. We must anticipate, however, that some members of the armed forces may not be able to obtain employment within a reasonable time after their return to civil life. For them, unemployment allowances should be provided until they can reasonably be absorbed by private industry.

Members of the armed services are not now adequately covered by existing unemployment insurance laws of the States. It is estimated that approximately one-half of them will have no unemployment insurance protection at all when they leave military service. Benefits payable to those who are covered by State law are unequal, and will vary greatly among the States because of the wide differences in the provisions of the State laws. The protection in many cases will be inadequate. It is plainly a Federal responsibility to provide for the payment of adequate and equitable allowances to those service men and women who are unable to find employment after their demobilization.

For these reasons, I recommend to the Congress that a uniform system of allowances for unemployed service men and women be established.

I believe that there should be a fixed and uniform rate of benefit for a fixed period of time for all members of the armed forces who, after leaving the service, are unable to find suitable work. In order to qualify for an unemployment allowance each person should be obliged to register with the United States Employment Service, and, following the usual practice in unemployment insurance, must be willing to accept available and suitable employment, or to engage in a training course to prepare him for such employment. The protection under this system should be continued for an adequate length of time following the period for which mustering-out payment is made.

At present persons serving in the merchant marine are not insured under State unemployment insurance laws, primarily because the very nature of their employment carries them beyond the confines of any particular State. I believe that the most effective way of protecting maritime workers against post-war unemployment is to enact without delay a Federal maritime unemployment insurance act. There has been in effect since 1938 a Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act and a similar act for maritime workers is long overdue. Marine workers are, however, insured under the existing Federal old-age and survivors' insurance law.

3. Members of the armed forces are not receiving credit under the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance law for their period of military service. Credit under the law can be obtained only while a person is engaged in certain specific types of employment. Service in the armed forces is not included in these types. Since the size of the insurance benefits depends upon the total number of years in which credits are obtained, the exclusion of military service will operate to decrease the old-age retirement benefits which will eventually be payable to service men and women. Furthermore, a large number of persons whose dependents were protected by the survivors' insurance benefits at the time they entered the armed forces, are losing entirely those insurance rights while they are in service.

I therefore recommend that the Congress enact legislation to make it possible for members of the armed forces to obtain credit under the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance law during their period of military service. The burden of this extension of old-age and survivors' insurance to members of the armed forces should be carried by the Federal Government, and the Federal contributions should be uniform for all members of the armed forces irrespective of their rank.

I have already communicated with the Congress requesting the enactment of legislation to provide educational and training opportunities for the members of the armed forces who desire to pursue their studies after their discharge.

The Congress will agree, I am sure, that this time we must have plans and legislation ready for our returning veterans instead of waiting until the last moment. It will give notice to our armed forces that the people back home do not propose to let them down.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 23, 1943.*

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the

state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3477) to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the bill was under consideration last Friday the Clerk had read section 1. Section 1 is now open to amendment.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the bill presently before the House today, if adopted with section 3 remaining, will, in my opinion, return to plague those responsible. It is a most dangerous experiment. On both sides of the aisle we have heard pleas for unity since Pearl Harbor. Where are those pleas today?

Speaking of subsidies, have we not been dealing in subsidies for the past 30 years? You and I are responsible for these subsidies and taking the House as a whole no serious attempt has been made to even reduce them let alone abolish them. Only a few days ago I placed in the RECORD a list of Federal grants, each and every one a subsidy, if you please, that totaled nearly $1,000,000,000, not including the food subsidy. Yes, we have been paying in part for other people's grub, as one Member said, and if we are to believe another Member, we have been engaging in blackmail every time we voted these Federal grants. Do we not in part pay for other people's grub when we vote benefits to the veterans, old-age assistance, help for the blind, the widows, and dependent children, and so forth. Have we voted those funds in the expectation of benefiting politically? If so, all are guilty, Republicans as well as Democrats, because we all supported them regardless of what political party was in power. Were we guilty of blackmail when we extended dozens of benefits to the farmers over a long period of years? I wonder if my friend who spoke of blackmail remembers when he offered an amendment to an agricultural appropriation bill to increase, not decrease, an appropriation to eliminate some disease or pest that was injurious to cattle. Was that not a subsidy? Was that blackmail?

Every appropriation bill that will come before us, with the exception of one, after the first of the year will contain subsidies in the form of Federal grants. Watch and see how many will be eliminated. If the food subsidy is so obnoxious as some would make us believe now will these other subsidies be equally so?

The present program has been successful. As I said, we are warned by those who should know, you are making a mistake. The white-collar workers and the housewives, as well as all whose incomes are in the low brackets, will be the ones to suffer the most if this program is destroyed and you do not advance a substitute. What have you to offer as a substitute? Nothing.

You are willing to destroy this plan but have nothing constructive to offer to take its place. Just recently we passed legislation increasing veterans' compensations, and raising the allowance to dependents of those now in the armed forces. All arguments in support of those bills were the same. The veterans and dependents could not live on what they were receiving. Not a single Member of this House voted against either bill. Now you would pass legislation that ultimately will increase the cost of living and the veterans and dependents of those in the service will be back to where they were before you voted to raise the Government's compensation. No one complained then nor advocated to "let them buy their own grub" nor did any one advance the argument we were engaging in blackmail.

Those who will suffer most if you destroy the food-subsidy program are not represented by organizations such as the farm organizations. Only a small portion of them are members of labor organizations. I raise my voice in behalf of this group and appeal to you not to destroy the food-subsidy program unless you advocate a substitute that will bring equal results. I have listened to the Army and Navy with reference to the conduct of this war and I have supported their recommendations. We have brought to Washington some of the most outstanding businessmen in the country, Republicans as well as Democrats, more Republicans, if you please, to keep up the fight on the home front. Some of those men have made great financial sacrifices and they say that this subsidy is a necessity. I am going to follow them the same way I followed the men in the Army and Navy who are fighting on the battle fronts.

I hope we will not place ourselves in the position where we will increase the cost of living to the people of this country. The O. P. A. tells you that is exactly what you are going to do. It is best, in my opinion, to let good enough alone. Let us have unity on the home front, and one way to do that is to allow the administration to continue this food subsidy.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. What use is there in increasing the allotments to the dependents of soldiers and increasing the pensions to veterans if we are going to nullify that action by passing a bill that will increase the cost of living?

Mr. COCHRAN. No use whatever. If the cost of living does increase, a bill to further increase the compensation of veterans and others recognized just last week will be in order.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I am not an economist, and by the same token, judging by the arguments presented in this debate, I do not believe there are many in this House. However, one does not need to be an economist to understand the purpose of the opposition to this food subsidy. It is easily understood when you examine the reactionary lobby behind the opposition—the farm bloc in Congress, the farm lobbies, and the various trade interests, such as meat canners and packers. Members seem to think consumers do not count or that the issue has become so involved they will not understand its relation to their food bills. Well, if you saw the flood of protests from consumers, particularly women, received at my office during the past few days you would understand how very important this matter is to the housewives of the Nation. The consumers are only now beginning to realize how they are being "sold down the river." If you vote against this subsidy to the consumer—for that is what it really is—you will have a lot of explaining to do when the price of food goes up, which, without subsidies, it surely will. You cannot be so naive as to expect the millions of citizens—I believe it is estimated that there are over 30,000,000 whose wages have not been increased—in offices, schools, Government, and industries not connected with the war and not organized to take it "lying down."

You will hear from them, make no mistake about that, and you will not like what they will have to say. For regardless of how you dress up your argument, the housewives of the Nation who provide the food for their families will understand that by your vote you have prevented the President from using funds appropriated in this bill to hold down the food bills and prevent inflation. That is something you will not be able to sidestep with any argument and do not forget that 75 percent of our food products are consumed by our civilian population.

It has been said that women hold the balance of power in America. This is undoubtedly true at this time with so many men absent, fighting and dying all over the world so that we may continue our American way of living. How do you think women will react when they find themselves paying excessive prices for the necessities of life and they realize we have made a political football of a device which would insure against inflation? I think I can tell you how they will react. Judging from my mail this morning they seem to have, at long last, awakened to the fact that they have power and intend to use it. If this bill is passed without the subsidy provision, it will do more to arouse women to their potential political strength than all the arguments advanced by either the Republican or Democratic Party since 1920. The surest way I know of to get women interested

in any issue is to bring that issue into their homes, for then it becomes peculiarly individual. When they find how little an inflated dollar will buy, we shall have a made-to-order issue for the women of America. Many of us older housewives have no difficulty in recalling World War No. 1 and the prices we paid for essential foods to feed our families—substitutes for flour; fresh eggs a dollar and a quarter a dozen and hard to get at any price; butter, sugar, almost impossible to buy. With all the complaints against O. P. A., I insist it has done a great job and should be given credit for holding the line under very difficult conditions. I have had a great many inquiries about the bill before us and the puzzling question seems to be, What is inflation, and how can a subsidy control the prices of food and prevent inflation?

It is my understanding that when prices go up to the point where your money is not worth much of anything, that is inflation. Inflation can reach the point—and has in other countries—where your whole week's salary will not buy enough food for 1 day.

The very first commodity to be affected by too swiftly rising prices which bring on inflation is food, because food is an absolute necessity to everyone. The price of food, therefore, is of first importance in our fight against inflation in this country. That is probably why the President devoted one of the longest messages he has ever sent to Congress to food. In his message, the President asked for a continuation of what he and other responsible leaders believe to be the only method for controlling the price of this most important commodity—food—the use of subsidies. Up to now, we have managed to control fairly well the rise in the cost of food. Prices on a number of food items have been held and even forced down. For instance, butter, about 10 percent since June. We have maintained this control by the much discussed and misunderstood method called subsidy.

Bear in mind that a subsidy is not, as so many people seem to think, a general hand-out to farmers and food processors to bribe them to produce food which we must have for our armed forces, for our allies, and for ourselves. What it really is is a payment by the Government to the farmer to protect him from the loss he would otherwise sustain as the cost of production goes up, while prices are held down, and that is all it is. The part of the farmer's cost which the housewife does not pay, the Government does. To farmers and, in some cases, to processors of certain basic and absolutely essential foods, such as butter, for instance, subsidies have been paid by the Government—not as a bribe or hand-out but to protect them from losses in their expanded production.

The only other way beside subsidies that the farmer could have been protected was to allow the price of food items he was producing to go up, thereby encouraging inflation. The subsidy program has not applied to all farm products. It has not been necessary. It has been used only to protect producers of essential foods from loss under an expanded program. The alternative offered by opponents of the subsidy program is to permit farm prices to rise in accordance with demand, as they would under normal conditions. The administration points out that such a rise in food prices would bring about a demand for wage increases, which in turn would lead to a further rise in food prices, and then another rise in wages, leading certainly to inflation.

The President, in his message, stated that the subsidy program, already tried out, is necessary to prevent inflation and that while subsidies are paid out of the taxpayer's money, the taxpayer saves many times the subsidy and higher costs of everything the Government is buying these days for the war effort. He points out that we must produce food we need and, to get this food, we must assure the farmer a fair return for his work. To provide all the food we need at this time, every farmer in the United States has been asked to produce to the utmost limit and beyond, of the capacity of his land and his equipment. Our farmers are doing this. Food production in 1943 in the United States exceeded anything we have ever done before, or anything we had ever dreamed of doing before. The Government is asking American farmers to go even beyond this in 1944. How can they do this and why should they do it if they are not protected by the Government?

I think I can say that I have voted, during my long service here, for every bill that would benefit the farmer. Some of them apparently benefited the farm organizations, not the small dirt farmers, who never have been considered to the extent they should be. They are not organized, but they are doing a fine patriotic job for America. Somewhere along the line, between the man who digs and plants the food and the woman who buys it for her table, there is much to be explained. It would be a great service if an honest investigation could be had on this subject.

Now, the record on food production in 1943 was a great one, but even greater production is planned for 1944. Again in his message President Roosevelt outlined some of the extraordinary demands on our food supply. Incidentally, three-fourths of the food produced in this country is being consumed, not by our soldiers and sailors or by our allies but by ourselves—the civilian population of the United States.

In planning and legislating for the future we must realize that as the war continues, the demand for increased supplies of food will be much greater. If we do not hold the line now, through the subsidy system, which provides a flexible and fair method of controlling prices, we will commit an unforgivable sin, not only against the men who are suffering and dying all over the world but against their children and grandchildren of the future.

Surely we will not dare to tell our soldiers when they demand an explanation on their return to the America they defended that we were too busy making a political issue of food to realize what they were fighting for. I want again to call your attention to the fact that rising food prices bring severest hardship to the more than 30,000,000 white-collar workers—clergymen, school teachers, police and firemen, city, county, State, and Federal workers—and to those living on insurance policies and the dependents of soldiers at the front. All of this the President pointed out so well as he traced the steps in the fight against inflation in his recent message to Congress. If there were a better way to fight inflation, it stands to reason that all of those charged with the responsibility, from the President down, would have found it. That nobody has leads me to believe there is no better way at this time. I believe that food subsidies are really war subsidies and should be regarded as part of the necessary war costs, just as munitions, ships, planes, tanks, and all the other matériel of war. Feeling very strongly on this issue, I shall vote to retain the subsidy provision in this bill, and, if that is defeated, I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, we have been met with all sorts of pleas to hold the line against inflation. We have been told that this subsidy business will keep the cost of living down.

I want to give you a picture of how this situation has been dealt with. From the 1st of January 1941 to the 15th of September 1943 the cost of living has risen 22.9 percent. The average hourly rate of pay has risen in the period from the 15th of January 1941 to the 15th of August 1943 41.2 percent. In that same period the size of the weekly pay envelope has risen 63 percent. These are Bureau of Labor Statistics figures.

We ought to have some of these things in mind and realize just what the picture is. At the present time the Government is advertising for common labor right in the Washington newspapers and offering pay of $71.05 a week and their expenses paid to Vancouver. I do not know whether you call that holding the line or not.

I want to call attention to the way this subsidy business works and what it amounts to in connection with the cost of living. As you put a subsidy and a rollback into effect you reduce the price of those goods which are in most demand and in greatest scarcity. You drive those goods off the shelf and create a greater scarcity and a black market at the very time that we ought by a fair price to be keeping those goods so that they will carry through until some more come on. We should not be encouraging the consumption of meat, butter, milk, and other things that the subsidy has been placed upon at a time when the scarcity is such that it is absolutely necessary to ration most of them. In other words, the creation of scarcity is the thing that promotes uncontrolled inflation, it is the thing that creates black markets and does those other things which will destroy our economic picture.

The trouble with our food picture today is the mistakes that the War Food Administration and the O. P. A. have made with reference to the prices of different things. The price of milk, for instance, varies from 25 cents to 50 cents a hundred within a distance of 5 miles. The price of other things, including the price of grain for feed, the price that it can be bought in the market, are the things that have muddled our whole food picture.

At the present time we are facing a situation where as a result of that we are in great danger of losing a large part of our dairy cattle in the East. What is that going to do to you with reference to scarcity?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. How much would some of these things mean? Suppose we had a cent a quart increase in the price of milk. The average consumption of milk runs something like a pint a day through the East. That would mean $1.83 a year. Suppose we had an increase of 10 cents a pound in butter. The individual is not getting a pound a month. That would be $1.20 a year. Suppose we had an increase of 10 cents a pound on meat. The individual gets no more than a pound a week. That would be $5.20. The entire cost of those things would be $8.23 a year.

How is that going to create inflation when you have the kind of a picture presented to us of the rates of wages and the increases and the hourly increases and the size of the pay envelope at the end of the week?

The only fair thing is for us in this flush period of high wages to pay for what we get and not charge it up to posterity, to pay now for what we get at a time when we need to prevent the creation of scarcity, and not do those things that will create more and more a greater and more dangerous inflation.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. That is what the gentleman should have explained in his own time, but he did not. I am sorry, I cannot yield at this time because I do not have enough time.

I hope that when the Members of this House come to vote upon this question they will use their heads and not be run off their feet by telegrams. I had a telegram from a fellow here in Washington saying that he was a voting resident of New York. A name was signed to that telegram. I checked up on that telegram and found that he had given a telephone number as his address in case of no delivery, and that he had used the first two parts of his name. He had not given his own surname. That is the kind of propaganda that has been coming in here to Washington to a lot of Members here on the floor, from people who knew nothing about it and did not dare sign their own names. I hope the Members of the House are not going to be run off their feet to do something unsound because of telegrams.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, we expected an outburst from the loyal administration leaders. They have been very busy. We should not be surprised at the bombardment of postal cards and telegrams. Heretofore it has been the custom, has it not, for key employees of the Government to be instructed to urge the people to write or telegraph their Congressmen. It is not difficult to imagine the cause of these messages. I have received very few, indeed, but others report that they have received many.

How these bureaucrats love to see the Congressman forced into submission. However, in this instance we are not much frightened by the bombardment. We are acting rightly and are not to be deterred. I am disturbed over Walter Lippmann's article appearing this morning. Walter Lippmann has administered to you a "primer lesson," if you please. Read it in the Washington Post. Lippmann carries a great deal of weight with his public. He knows a great deal about everything. If you read his article, and I hope you will not be too much influenced by his arithmetic. You may decide that he himself is not competent to teach beyond the primer class.

He says when it costs one producer $1 to make an article, and when it costs another $2, and when it costs a third one $3, we should fix the price at $2. The first one will still make the profit of one extra dollar, but the public must pay the high-cost producer the extra dollar. The price therefore should be $2.

Such conditions seldom prevail as the high-cost producers must have vanished. Cost conditions had already wiped out such illustrations. You would think that those three manufacturers might even be from the same community. If so, two would not have been in business at all. If one man could make an article at $1 and it cost the other $3, he would not be in business.

Citrus fruit in Florida ought to sell, and does sell, more cheaply there than in New England. But when you raise the ceiling price above that which prevails, you freeze that price everywhere at what was the price before, which was different in the various localities. Supply and demand and distribution expenses play their full part in such matters.

I do not like his reasoning. I do not want his illustration to poison the minds of my people, who so often follow him, as I have done, on many questions. It weakens my respect for his teachings. He claims to have read the debates and to be well informed. He cannot dismiss this most complicated matter so simply.

I read this morning an article by a former Democratic Member of this House. He ought to be persuasive. He says, "Of course, when you roll back prices, this is a hidden wage increase." Our friend the gentleman from Texas, Mr. PATMAN, seemingly agrees. He seems to acknowledge it, but advocates taking it away by more taxation. It is, indeed, a hidden wage increase; there is no question about it. They have induced some of my white-collar workers to write me letters. Labor today is getting higher wages than it probably ever had before.

Even the domestics—let us see you hire one at almost any price. I have seen this sort of advertisement in the paper: "We will give you, an ordinary domestic, $22 per week, furnish you a private bath, a radio, nearly anything you want." No applications received. In many localities this prevails, and the War Manpower Commission says you cannot take one from one locality to another.

When they are getting these high wages, why should we pay their grocery bill, as is often stated? When this war is over, those white-collar workers will find they are the only ones getting a steady salary, be it insufficient. Those high wages paid to laborers will have disappeared.

The tax bill to pay for those subsidies will then be presented to those white-collar workers for payment. I do not claim to be an economist, but after many years of service here I have learned the methods of the administration in power to secure votes for themselves by high pressure. I do not want to be disagreeable, but your Democratic Congressmen of former days, to whom I referred, said, "This is a bill to win the next election." Many have advanced that opinion.

An old adage: "He who would sacrifice a little liberty for a little temporary safety deserves neither liberty nor safety."

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. FORD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, we have had two very eloquent speeches on this subject, one of them reporting a lot of statistics that are perfectly all right, except they are not correct.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Those statistics are the exact figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. FORD. I do not care whose figures they are; they are not correct.

Mr. KNUTSON. Coming from some bureau downtown, of course, they would not be correct.

Mr. FORD. I do not know what you did or where you took them from or what your basis was; they are incorrect because of the base date, so it is all right with me for you to quote them. They are in line with all other statistics which the opposition to subsidies have offered.

My good friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] who is always lovable and charming and witty and delightful, makes a rather broad statement too. He always does. He means well, but? But that being as it is, I just

want to make this one observation, if you gentlemen want to pass this section 3 in this bill, all I have got to say is you are going to face one of the worst inflation spirals that this Nation has ever been called upon to meet. If you think that when butter goes to a dollar and eggs to a dollar and wheat to two or three dollars and corn to $1.50 or $2, and all the other spiraling prices, if you want to meet that in 1944 with the country in a wild flurry of inflation, why, it is O. K. by me. But I want to tell you there are more consumers in this country than there are farmers. We gave the farmers of this country in the last 10 years about $6,000,000,000 or $7,000,000,000. They have always had their hands out to the Treasury when they were in trouble. Now, when we are trying to meet the stabilization situation the farmers come in and they want the lid taken off and they want to have the old law of supply and demand apply. Well, let us have that if you want it, and boys, you are going to be sorry for what you did when the voters get a chance to tell you how they feel about it.

The opponents of subsidies are only opposed to consumer subsidies, but they are in full accord with the idea of producer subsidies.

You say consumer subsidies are paid out of the Treasury; well, the producer subsidies also come out of the Treasury.

You say consumers' subsidies will be a charge on the next generation; well, so will producer subsidies. The point seems to be that subsidies for farmers are of great virtue, but subsidies for consumers are of evil and bad report. If that is good Americanism, then my education has been sadly neglected.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, not having had an opportunity to discuss this important subject of subsidies when it was considered under general debate last week, I am taking this time today to express my views for the RECORD on a subject which is of vital importance to the country so that my colleagues and my people may know the reasons why I have concluded to support this measure to prohibit payment of roll-back, or consumer subsidies.

Measured by the volume of communications received from my constituency, it is unquestioned that the people of my district do not approve the principle of consumer subsidy. However, this has not been controlling of my decision nor my reason, for I have assumed that it is the responsibility of any representative of the people to study all phases and implications of any given question and eventually come to a conclusion based upon the sole consideration of what is best for the common good. While I confess that my conclusion does not square with the judgment of many persons at home whom I respect and that my judgment is not infallible, at the same time, it must be admitted that at least I have probably given the matter more thought and detailed study than they.

Many protestations have come to me from the farming interests in my district, typifying the thought of agriculture generally throughout the country in opposition to roll-back subsidies. It is claimed by them that subsidies inevitably lead to regimentation and control by the Government. Quite true. Every time a group or class receive some governmental preferment, they are circumscribed and regulated. It is inescapable. However, much as I deplore regimentation of our people, especially the farming class, this particular argument against subsidies does not impress me greatly. I recognize that when one's nation is at war drastic and severe regulation is inevitable and I am confident that the farmer is as ready to make sacrifices when his nation's life is at stake, whether it be by way of out-of-pocket losses or of regimentation, as any other segment of our population, and a great deal more ready to comply with governmental strictures than some groups within us.

First, Mr. Chairman, we should have a clear understanding of the meaning of the terms used in a discussion of the subject of subsidies. Generally speaking, subsidies, which is the application of public funds for the promotion or maintenance of any activity or function affected with a public interest, is rather common in our history. We have had subsidies to encourage the development of a merchant marine, the promotion of commercial air lines through air-mail contracts, maintenance of transoceanic shipping by Government support of insurance, the transportation of petroleum products to the Atlantic seaboard, the production of crops and commodities for which there is either an inordinate demand or a shortage. Even now, the Government is offering subsidies to promote the production of certain agricultural products by means of a support price or guaranteed minimum. With these kinds of subsidies there is little, if any, disagreement; we recognize that they are essential in a war economy and some in times of peace.

The type of subsidy with which there is violent disagreement is the consumer or roll-back subsidy by which the Government undertakes to cushion the public against payment of the ceiling prices on commodities, the ceilings having been previously fixed by the Government itself. Essentially, this means that the Government is paying a part of the food bill of the people. In reality, the consumer roll-back is not a subsidy at all—but a dole, a hand-out from the Public Treasury, not based upon individual need but, rather, because of individual affluence. It does not promote or encourage or maintain production of anything, unless it can be charged that it is designed to encourage the highly paid wage earner not to ask for higher wages—a mild form of bribery.

One month after Pearl Harbor the Congress gave to the President authority to stabilize prices of commodities and to encourage their production. It did not give him power to restrict the advance of wages at the same time for the simple reason that he announced a refusal to accept that authority. Then, in the summer of 1942, the President demanded that the Congress give him complete authority over both prices and wages, asserting that in the event of congressional failure, he would accomplish it, anyway. Having been ready to clothe him with this authority previously, in October 1942 it conferred upon the Executive not only the authority but the obligation to stabilize prices and wages as of September of that year. In the exercise of that authority, either through deliberate intent or the ineptitude and inefficiency of the administrators, this was not done, and prices on certain articles were allowed to go to a point which now is thought by them to be too high.

To remedy the situation, they have resorted to their characteristic panacea of dipping into the Public Treasury. Bold, courageous, competent dealing with the problem at the time would have averted the present difficulties. Certainly this failure cannot be credited to the Congress. Rather, the Congress is to be complimented for its apparent refusal to throw open the gates of the Treasury for this absurd and demoralizing raid. Any government which undertakes to buy bread and meat for the people in times of prosperity is doomed in times of adversity.

The principal argument advanced by the administration in its request for legal authority to continue an operation which it has insisted is essential in the program to stabilize prices is that to do otherwise and allow a price advance for those articles on which there is a proper showing of justification for the increase, would result in "ruinous inflation." If I were convinced that their contention is sound, or even if there were a reasonable chance that their position is correct, I would not oppose consumer subsidies. There is not a Member of this body who does not recognize the threat of inflation and seek by all possible means to avoid it. The truth of the matter is that the plan they espouse would result in a saving to the consumer public of 1½ cents a day per person. It is inconceivable that this slight increase in the cost of living would form any reasonable basis on which to place a demand for higher wages—at least this would be true if the administration of the problem were in the hands of a government committed to the treatment of all classes and groups in the country with fearlessness, impartiality, and on a nonpolitical basis.

Rather, it can be safely argued that to pay consumer subsidies would encourage inflation and higher prices. It is commonly agreed that the real threat of inflation stems from the fact that a tremendous idle purchasing power now lies in the hands of the public. By just so much as the Government undertakes to spare the public from paying its own grocery bills, to that extent the volume of purchasing power held by the public is enhanced and the danger of inflation augmented to the same degree.

Now, is it true that the cost of living has already advanced beyond the in-

crease of wages so as to justify either this method of relief or a demand for a wage increase? According to the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, the cost of living in February 1943 was 21.5 percent higher than the average for the year 1939. The National Industrial Conference Board shows a 19.5 percent advance for the same period. But what has happened to the average weekly earnings of factory workers during that interval? The Bureau of Labor Statistics states that these earnings rose from $24.59 to $41.12, or a gain of 67.4 percent. The National Industrial Conference Board reports that the advance was from $27.02 to $43.91, an increase of 62.6 percent. Both these figures refer solely to those actually employed, taking no account of the large additional gains in income brought about by rising employment. The best available evidence indicates that in the last 4 years the contents of the pay envelope of the average factory worker have expanded at least three times as much as the rise in the cost of living. This being so, how can anyone with any degree of honesty claim a still higher wage because the average family must pay about 5 cents more per day than they would have to pay if this program were to be adopted? It is ridiculous.

For every dollar of consumer subsidy paid out now, the taxpayers of tomorrow will have to remit two or three dollars to the Treasury. In effect, we are asked to place upon the shoulders of future generations the obligation for payment of a part of our grocery bills of today. This I am unwilling to do. The reaction of the soldiers returning to their homes at the end of the war will be great and they will be resentful of certain conditions and practices that were allowed to continue during the war. The strikes, work stoppages, demands for higher and ever higher wages made by the leaders of labor already are sufficiently grave to cause the returning veteran to be indignant. It is unthinkable that he should not only be asked to fight in the foxholes, the air, and on the water and now, in addition, obligated along with his children to pay the food bill of those of us who stay at home.

Mr. Chairman, it is asserted by the proponents of the roll-back principle that without this authority the Government will lose control of the stabilization program. With this contention, I take positive exception. If price control were the only mechanism through which stabilization is sought to be effected, there might be some room for the argument. However, since price control is also coupled with control through rationing, it is difficult to understand why the situation cannot be handled effectively and properly by a fearless exercise of the rationing power. If the price of any article is too high, increase the point value of the commodity and thereby curtail its consumption. Proof of the strength of this as a weapon in control is the present exercise of it by the Government in the case of pork products. It was found that our program has brought about too great a quantity of pork, to an extent where the Government is called upon to make good its commitment for a minimum price for producers. To relieve this surplus congestion the Government only recently announced the lowering of point values for pork which will result in a gradual increase in consumption until the situation is brought into balance. Those who claim that consumer subsidies are essential if inflation is to be averted lose sight of the power of rationing which, if properly exercised, to my mind, can deal with any abnormal conditions in a way which will bring prompt and orderly relief.

There is but one group of our citizens to which the consumer subsidy would supply a much-needed relief in their present plight. I speak of the thousands of persons whose income remains fixed or constant in the midst of surrounding price and wage increases. The white-collared worker, the teacher, pensioner, minister, office worker, and person living on an annuity or fixed income from invested savings are forced to meet not only ever-mounting tax requirements but the higher cost of living as well with no increase in their income whatever. There might be some justification for the Government coming to the aid of this class of persons to relieve the squeeze in which they are caught, but I venture the assertion that the idea of a dole or public subsistence is abhorrent to them and that they would far prefer some assurance that their Government is dealing with public funds in a careful, prudent, and as conservative a manner as the demands of a war economy will allow.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a partisan issue. Although roll-backs are sought by the administration, those in the Congress who feel the program to be unsound and unwise, come from both the Democratic and Republican Parties. It is true that all Republican members of the Banking and Currency Committee, which has reported this bill, took a stand against roll-backs, but they were supported by a majority of the Democratic members of that committee. In considering the problem, I have tried to avoid partisan political considerations. Even in peacetime when considering problems facing the country, I have been guided by what seemed to me best for the country, irrespective of political considerations. This is and should be especially so in time of war. Although my deliberations have not been dominated by political implications, a careful consideration of the problem and the type of remedy recommended by the Government, leads me to the inescapable conclusion that the roll-back program is advanced by the Government leaders for the purpose of political preferment. Through it they see a chance for political advantage with a large segment of our voting population. Stripped of all its high words and nice-sounding phrases, when the Government undertakes to pay a part of the consumer's food bill, it is in reality an advance in wage or an increase in the consumer's income. The Government is getting set for the elections of 1944. The fact that a very substantial number of Democratic Members have joined with the Republicans to stop this practice indicates that the people of the country will not countenance this cheap form of demagoguery sought to be done at the expense of future generations.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman and Members of Congress, I have been listening intently to the discussions on this bill for the last few weeks. Thus far, none of the opponents of subsidies has been able to propose anything more effective than subsidies to keep prices down and to protect us against the danger of inflation. I know in my city of 7,000,000 people we have no war industries.

One of the principal problems facing this Nation at the present time is the problem of how to avoid inflation.

Our Government very wisely tried to prevent inflation from hitting the average man, woman, and child in the United States, and sought to make the lot of the average family so much easier.

It is true that in some sections of this country increased production and the ability to find war jobs helped a good many of our people, and in those places where there is an abundance of war work the rise in the cost of living is not felt very badly.

My constituency, however, is in the city of New York, where there has been no appreciable amount of war work, and where the real wages of the average workingman and woman have really fallen down and were not increased to meet the increased cost of living. That is also true of most other sections of my State.

That the cost of living has increased, however, in most of the urban areas of the United States, and particularly in the city of New York, has been recognized by all students of economics.

The mayor of the city of New York in a broadcast last week, called attention to the fact that unless some congressional or Executive action is taken by January 1 to lighten the burden of wage earners in nonwar industries, by increasing wages to face the constantly rising cost of food, clothing, and other items which make up the average household budget, these workers will be unable to stand the increased cost of living.

In addition to that, the average wage earner today must pay an enormous income tax, which is deducted at the source, and which it is proposed to increase in amount in the new tax bill.

You can, therefore, see how difficult it will be for a person whose wages were not increased, to meet the increased burden of living costs, the withholding tax, and all other charges which will be made upon his diminished returns.

It is also worth while to observe that while we have a very good amount of statistics about the cost of living, taxation, and average increases, and other figures showing how much the average

employee receives in wages, these figures are very misleading, since they deal with an average throughout the United States and do not specify an average as it applies to the ordinary city worker, or an employee in a nonwar industry, whose cost of living goes up just the same, but whose wages, as I pointed out, have not only not been increased but have been lowered, comparatively speaking.

An official table, prepared by the Office of Price Administration, shows the rise in food prices of many ordinary commodities which will occur if subsidies are removed. The table is as follows:

[From the New York Times of November 18, 1943]

	Unit	August retail price	Price increase from removal of subsidy
Round steak	Pound	41.6	5.2
Rib roasts	Pound	33.7	4.6
Chuck roast	Pound	29.1	3.5
Hamburger	Pound	28.3	3.8
Veal cutlets	Pound	45.5	6.0
Pork chops	Pound	38.0	4.6
Sliced bacon	Pound	42.2	5.2
Sliced ham	Pound	52.6	6.5
Whole ham	Pound	36.1	4.5
Salt pork	Pound	23.0	2.8
Leg of lamb	Pound	40.0	1.7
Lamb rib chops	Pound	46.0	3.2
Butter	Pound	50.5	[1]9.9
Cheese	Pound	37.4	[1]7.8
Milk	Quart	[2]15.1	1.0
Dried prunes	Pound	16.7	3.2
Canned vegetables	No. 2 can	13.5	1.4
Sugar	Pound	6.8	1.0
Dry edible beans	Pound	10.3	1.0
Apples	Pound	11.3	[3]1.0
Bread	Pound	9.0	1.0
Flour	10 pounds	61.7	7.0

[1] In addition to the effect of abolishing the subsidy on the commodity itself, this figure includes the indirect effect of abolishing the feed subsidy on milk.
[2] Average of delivered and grocery prices.
[3] Represents the price reduction that will be made impossible by prohibition of the subsidy rather than an actual increase. The percentage changes express this absolute price reduction as a percentage of the August retail price.

The only way, therefore, in which some stabilization could be obtained in the various items constituting the daily food budget of the average American family would be by way of some sort of a subsidy, which the Government would create in order to maintain the present scale of prices. The word "subsidies," of course, has a sort of ominous and unpleasant sound, and there are many Members of this House who are strongly opposed to subsidies, calling them un-American and a host of other names. Nevertheless, subsidies are nothing new and have been practiced for some time solely for the benefit of the American public and the average householder. The Commodity Credit Corporation, for example, has bought various commodities, including tomatoes, sweet corn, peas, carrots, cabbage, lima beans, snap beans and beans from processors at 1943 prices and then re-sold them at 1942 prices to the public. This has saved all of us some $30,000,000. If it were not for this single subsidy, each can of food would cost the housewife a cent and a half more, which is a lot when you count all the cans a family uses.

It is true that there have been some instances where subsidy price control has been abused and it is up to Congress to be on the alert and correct any of the abuses which might be found, but it is not true that subsidies are un-American, since this was the method used for many years in order to correct inequities and bring about a better cooperation between producers and consumers. I am sure that with the proper control, an intelligent program of subsidies is in the best interests of the American people.

Sometime this year the proper steps were taken to adjust the compensation, especially of war workers, to the mounting and rising cost of living. It was then that a formula was devised, which came to be known as the Little Steel formula, and which provided, in effect, a 15-percent raise in the pay of most workers in the war industries. This Little Steel formula, however, was only a partial solution, and it was not applied to the millions of so-called white collar workers in industries which were not considered war industries, or over which the various national wage-adjustment boards had no jurisdiction.

The proposed bill, by which there would be a continued roll-back of prices, is now provided for in the Commodity Credit Corporation Act, and is a partial answer and a partial solution to this vexing question. It is not a complete solution because it covers only certain items of expense which the ordinary person incurs, and does not cover all the items which make up the cost of living.

If wages and prices had been stabilized at the same time there would have been no necessity for any roll-back or subsidies to maintain the present prices of commodities. But, unfortunately, there was no such stabilization, since as I said before, only a portion of the wage earners received the benefit of a 15-percent increase in wages. Those who did not receive any increase had no recourse to any legal action which might be taken in their behalf and all they could do was to either go out and get another job or ask their employer to give them a voluntary increase, which, of course, was a very hard and up-hill process, and in most cases resulted in no action.

The Director of the Office of Price Administration estimates that there are 15,000,000 persons in the United States whose pay envelopes had not increased and who live on a very close budget so that each increase in the cost of living brings a lowered standard of living.

These persons, not being organized, and having nobody to plead for them, depend upon us in Congress to take up the cudgels in their behalf and do everything in our power to alleviate their plight. There is only one way in which this group can be helped, and that is by price ceilings. These price ceilings must be kept if we do not wish these 15,000,000 wage earners to find themselves with a highly reduced standard of living at a time when we are all fighting to keep the morale of our Nation by maintaining a high standard of living.

I feel that the aid which has heretofore been given by way of roll back of prices is still not adequate enough to take care of the many whose wages have dwindled so much in this era of high prices. But it is a step in the right direction, even though only a step. I can very well see that if such roll-backs are not created the average man, woman, and child in this country will have to live on a starvation diet, and, instead of a people unified and armed to fight for their country, we shall find a disgruntled people who will be forever critical of the Government and forever unhappy in whatever might be done for them. We must not allow dissatisfaction to reach the point where our war effort will suffer and where through lack of action on our part we shall be compelled to revise the daily routine of living for those who are least able to afford to maintain themselves.

For instance, the Commodity Credit Corporation buys up cheese at 27 cents a pound, then resells the cheese at 23¼ cents a pound. Without the cheese subsidy, retail cheese prices would increase about 4 cents a pound. This subsidy has saved the consumer about $3,000,000 over the grocery counter.

The milk subsidy which averages 38 cents a hundredweight has thus far saved consumers about $3,000,000. A peanut-butter subsidy of 4.5 cents a pound has made it possible to reduce the retail price from 33.1 cents to 26.5 cents a pound. This operation will save us about $20,000,000. The sugar-beet subsidy of $1.50 a ton has saved us about $112,000,000 and in the case of canned vegetables, the C. C. C. has absorbed the increase over the last year in the price of vegetables and has thus saved the American people about $30,000,000.

The butter subsidy, which went into effect June 4, rolled the butter price back from 46 to 41 cents a pound and will save consumers about $97,000,000. The meat subsidy will save us at least $400,000,000 and if it is canceled, we must get ready to pay 6 cents a pound more for bacon and 8 cents more for ham.

Not only have subsidies kept prices down, and pyramided profits also, but they have given producers enough incentive to increase their production. The production of subsidized crops increased 35 percent after the program went into effect. Nonsubsidized crops increased only 6 percent in the same time. So subsidies mean: First, lower prices; second, more food.

Again referring to current wages paid to American labor, even the 15-percent raise which was granted to some workers, was entirely inadequate, since the latest figures show that the over-all increase in the cost of living is some 23 percent. So you can see how difficult it is to keep up with this constant increase in the cost of living, and how the poor worker who has no protection is sliding down the scale of living from day to day and from hour to hour.

We must not allow the situation to get out of hand. I know that the creating of the roll-back is not a permanent solution of this problem, and I expect that both the administration and Congress will take more effective means in the long run to control both prices and wages. But until such is done, and until a definite formula is adopted, and a

thorough study made of the situation, let us not bring the unorganized worker and the person who has not been able to obtain an increase in wages, into a position where his plight will become desperate.

We must do first things first, and settle each problem as it arises. The immediate problem before us is how to save from starvation the consumer of goods who has no protection, and the poor wage earner whose little pay envelope has been reduced from time to time, until it can hardly buy him the necessities for his daily life. Let us at least keep the price of his daily necessities at the present level, and let Congress and the administration make a thorough study of the situation and offer a complete solution, which will once and for all stop any inflation.

Chester Bowles, who has just been appointed Administrator, I think, is a man of ability and high character. I feel he understands his business, and if we will only give him a chance to do something, by giving the Commodity Credit Corporation money to be used for subsidies, so that Mr. Bowles, through O. P. A. can keep the prices down and hold the line, I am sure, gentlemen, we would be doing a great service to the American people. During my long service in this House I remember voting for more money expenditures—subsidies in one form or another—than I have hairs on my head. I remember we had flood control for farmers of every section of the country. We men representing large cities have always supported the farmers in their requests for some form of subsidies to help them. When they needed Government aid, they and their friends never thought of calling subsidies un-American. I am amazed, therefore, to hear today that the farmers do not want subsidies. Why? There has not yet been presented a proper answer to that question.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the gentleman's attention should be called to the fact that, although I know he did not intend to make a misstatement, the Office of Price Administration is not paying any subsidies today, although they have the power to do so.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is true. I thank the gentleman. But the fact is, we have an Administrator that is trying to do a fine job. But authority to keep down prices is not sufficient unless it is backed up by financial ability to subsidize certain industries to keep consumers' prices at a certain level.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I might say, gentlemen of the committee, that this bill in no manner repeals or modifies or in any manner affects the authority of the Price Administrator to pay subsidies for the purpose of maintaining maximum prices of any goods or food.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes; but under section 3, you practically destroy the very program upon which hinges the question of price control.

Mr. WOLCOTT. No. You do not destroy it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is what your argument was last Wednesday.

Mr. WOLCOTT. No, no. That is Mr. Bowles' argument and Bowles has not recently read subsection (e) of section 2 of his own bill, which we do not disturb.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Has it been changed?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No. It has been that way for a year. We settled this question of prices a year and a half ago.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Let me ask the gentleman this: If you vote for this bill, if you leave section 3 in the bill, that means that you remove subsidies for the roll-back, which in turn means an immediate increase in food prices. Am I correct?

Mr. WOLCOTT. You remove the roll-back. That is, you remove the financing of the roll-back, but you do not remove the authority which the Price Administrator has to roll back.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. What good is the authorty to do something if all the tools with which the job can be done are taken away?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Where we directed he should do it last October.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. When you vote for section 3, which is the real crux of the whole bill, you are practically killing the roll-back program, are you not?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No. Stripping purely and simply the financing of the roll-back.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Which is in my opinion the same as killing it. If the Commodity Credit Corporation does not get the money to subsidize the roll-back, then there is no way for the Office of Price Administration to keep down prices—even though theoretically they may have the authority to do so.

Judging by the public reaction to subsidies, I would say that the people of this country are overwhelmingly in favor of continuing this program for the protection of the consumers and as a check against the dangers of inflation. While our armies are fighting for the preservation of our way of life let us do all we can to protect their families and to keep the standard of living that is necessary for a free and decent people to have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] referred to various blocs that were in support of this legislation, but the gentlewoman did not mention any particular blocs which favored subsidies. I want to spend a few minutes' time discussing one of the main sponsors of the consumer subsidy program, that is, the C. I. O. A few days ago, the president of the C. I. O. Automobile Workers Union, R. J. Thomas, appeared before a Senate committee, and said that the radio broadcasting companies were gagging him so that he could not get any time to speak on the air.

Mr. Chairman, every citizen who believes in the "four freedoms" for the American people, should be seriously concerned at an incident which took place on Sunday last, to threaten the freedom of the air waves—in the radio broadcasting field. The incident is a clear demonstration of how far a dictatorial group will go to dominate and arbitrarily take over popular means of communication for the sole purpose of spreading erroneous propaganda on important issues before the Congress.

I refer to the unexplained action of the National Broadcasting Co. in canceling the paid radio time of the Sunday program known as the Voice of the Dairy Farmer, and the turning over of this 15 minute broadcast period to C. I. O. Vice President R. J. Thomas, who is also president of the C. I. O. Automobile Workers Union, for a political speech in favor of consumers' subsidies. The radio stage was a perfect set for the C. I. O. official. Millions of farmers sat around their radios on Sunday afternoon to listen to the noncontroversial voice of the dairy farmer. This program was listed and advertised in the newspapers and radio programs of the country. When the time came for the farmers' program, the N. B. C. announcer proclaimed, "The program previously scheduled for this period has been canceled, and the time turned over to R. J. Thomas, C. I. O. president of the United Automobile Workers Union, who will speak on subsidies." Mr. Thomas minced no words with his farm audience on his strong stand for consumer subsidies. He threatened his listeners and said the C. I. O. would break the Little Steel formula if subsidies were not approved to help pay on the grocery bill of the membership of his organization, out of taxpayers' money from the United States Treasury. In fact, he said the C. I. O. would break the Little Steel formula wage scale, irrespective of congressional action on consumer subsidies, because he said the formula was not fair to his fellow workers. Incidentally, C. I. O. war workers, are the highest paid men in American labor today. Mr. Thomas, Mr. Murray, and other leaders in the C. I. O. are among the main sponsors of the administration consumer subsidy program.

I tried to find out who was responsible for the cancelation of the radio time paid for by 5,000,000 American farmers. Officers of the National Broadcasting Co. are silent and refuse to explain. I would like to learn if labor leaders in the C. I. O. have some mysterious control over the N. B. C., or if the cancelation was ordered by some official of the Government at the demand of the C. I. O. I feel that Congress and the people have a right to learn who exercises this dictatorial control over the N. B. C. Freedom of the air waves is at stake. I will ask the Cox special committee and other committees in Congress to conduct a full investigation to find out who is responsible for the arbitrary action in

canceling the farmers' program last Sunday.

Mr. Thomas, of the C. I. O., claims that his organization has been gagged by the broadcasting companies. The records show that in addition to the 15 minutes he stole from the farmers, members of his organization were on the air Sunday afternoon for another 30 minutes. Yes, I think it about time for Congress to make a full investigation and find out who is gagging who.

DAIRY GROUP CHARGES GAG TO AID SUBSIDY

The American Dairy Association said yesterday it had begun an inquiry in Washington, D. C., as to why its regular Sunday radio program was summarily barred from the air and the time given to a speech by R. J. Thomas, president of the United Automobile Workers of America (C. I. O.). Thomas spoke in favor of Federal subsidies to hold down the cost of food.

Owen M. Richards, manager of the dairy organization, said at its Chicago headquarters that the association was shocked when notified Friday night by the National Broadcasting Co. that the 15-minute "Voice of the Dairy Farmer" program would not be broadcast as usual at noon on Sunday. He said the association immediately protested and refused to release its radio time, but was told Saturday by N. B. C. that there would be no program from the Chicago studios and Thomas' talk would be broadcast from Detroit, Mich., instead.

ASSOCIATION AVOIDS CONTROVERSY

"The program sponsored by 5,000,000 dairy farmers was choked off the air at the eleventh hour when the controversial subject of food subsidies, affecting the Nation at large, was approaching a congressional decision," Richards asserted.

"The American Dairy Association has been careful not to involve its members in this controversy. We have always presented both sides of the question, and on the Sunday radio program based our views on economics and not politics.

DICTATORIAL METHODS CHARGED

"To have our radio time taken away in this fashion and given to the C. I. O., which is not in harmony with the farmer's viewpoint, is shocking. The method used borders on dictator-nation methods, and is not to be expected in a free America."

Richards charged that Thomas in his radio talk made a political issue of the subsidy question and failed to state facts when he told consumers that the cost of food subsidies would be small, whereas inflation would double their annual grocery bill. The dairy association official further accused Thomas of attempting to frighten farmers by reminding them of the agricultural depression following the last war.

EXPLANATION IS DEMANDED

Richards said the dairy association had not taken a stand on food subsidies, but had asked only for a fair price for agricultural products both to meet rising production costs and to stimulate output.

He explained the association had not learned who ordered the program off the air. He said an explanation had been demanded "in the interests not only of the program sponsors, but of all free Americans." The inquiry under way is expected to be taken up in the House of Representatives, he said.

The dairy official called attention to the fact that a C. I. O.-sponsored program follows the Voice of the Dairy Farmer at 12:15 p. m. on Sundays and is broadcast by N. B. C., but Thomas did not use this time for his subsidy speech. The dairy program is broadcast over a network of 60 stations and began about a year ago.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FORD. Does not the gentleman think that labor has just as much right to present its views to the country as the farmers?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Exactly. And I will say to the gentleman from California [Mr. FORD] that the C. I. O. leader took this time away from the farmers, and it was time that was paid for by them for a noncontroversial program.

Mr. FORD. Oh, they have been there for weeks and months.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] has expired.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I listened very attentively to the address of my colleague from California [Mr. FORD]. I felt impelled to say a few words with reference to his remarks. The gentleman from California may have had some reason to give us the figures to which he felt the prices of foodstuffs would rise if this bill is passed, or some basis on which to base those figures. But to my mind that is what is wrong with the fight for or against this Commodity Credit Corporation bill right now. Men who know better know that prices of foodstuffs, if this bill is passed, could not go to those heights unless we abolished the Office of Price Administration. They try to arouse public opinion in this country among the consuming public, who do not have the figures or any way to understand what this subsidy program means, and cause them to feel that if the provisions of this bill are carried it will cost them a huge amount of money in their grocery bills and in their food bills every week.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. In just a minute. Anyone familiar with the present subsidy program realizes and knows that it is only an insignificant part of the monthly bill for any family's food in this country.

Mr. FORD. Will the gentleman yield, having mentioned my name?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I will yield after I have finished. The reason that they have had a demand for these subsidies is because of the apprehension of my good friend from California that the O. P. A. does not know how to handle the fixing of prices of food commodities. When the Congress created the O. P. A. law it gave that agency ample authority to hold the line. It was not the intention of this Congress, as I understand it, that they should set ceiling prices on any commodity below the cost of production and then come to the United States Treasury and take money out of it to pay the difference. It was given authority to set ceiling prices which will return a fair profit, but it was also given authority to hold the line against inflationary and unwarranted profits. I say to the gentleman from California if the O. P. A. exercised that authority we would have no fear of an upward spiral in prices and the inflation to which he refers.

Mr. FORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman makes my point exactly when he says that the subsidies to be paid are only an insignificant amount in comparison with what we would have otherwise.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. The gentleman contradicts himself because he said in his speech that if the subsidy program were abandoned butter would go to $1.10 and wheat to $2.50 a bushel. That is not insignificant; that is something that should be stopped by the O. P. A. Nobody in this Congress wants to see prices get out of hand like that, but if O. P. A. exercises the authority given it by this Congress it cannot happen regardless of subsidies or no subsidies.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman has made the statement that if we pass this bill nevertheless the O. P. A. will have the power to fix prices and hold the line. Am I correct in my statement?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Absolutely, in my opinion.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Without these subsidies you are going to drive every little businessman out of his little store. As a matter of fact they have been doing it for the last year.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. That is because of the way O. P. A. has handled the price-ceiling situation. It was not the intention of Congress that the O. P. A. drive the little man out of business.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. In just a moment.

Mr. Chairman, I say we are embarking on a program of subsidies in this country. I wonder what the men who founded this great democracy of ours would say could they come back here to find America in her present prosperous situation, in the middle of a war, but also find its Government selling Victory bonds to pay the food bill of the people? Would they think we were living in a democracy?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, if Congress today has not the courage and the backbone to say to the administration that in time of the greatest income in the history of our country we are not going to issue bonds to pay the food bill of the consumers of the country, how in the name of God are we going to have the courage to say "No" when there may be some just reason in

the years immediately ahead of us when the consumers and the laboring people will not have the income they have today to pay their food bills? If and when that time comes and Congress has established this precedent, has not had the courage to say "No" to organized labor today, we are not going to have the courage, in my humble opinion, to say "No" in the days to come. Once it is started it will never be eliminated.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

ROLL-BACK AND CONSUMER SUBSIDIES

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation and to discontinue the payment of roll-back and consumer subsidies. I favor the bill.

Price control is one of the methods to combat inflation. From the beginning I have insisted that there must be a control not only of prices but of wages. The President and the administration opposed including wages in the Price Control Act finally approved January 30, 1942. The situation went from bad to worse. There were continued demands for increased wages. In the act of October 2, 1942, the President was directed to control prices as of the level that they were on September 15, 1942, and he was directed to fix wages and salaries based upon the levels existing on the same date.

What is the record? What are the facts? Total manufacturing pay rolls have increased 15 percent in the past year. The cost of living has advanced only 4 or 5 percent. Roll-back subsidies have been paid on butter and beef. Consumer subsidies are now being paid at the rate of $800,000,000 a year. They are costly. They are not required. Between September 15, 1942, and September 15, 1943, there was a decline in many food prices. Practically all food prices went down except fruits and vegetables, but wages increased.

INFLATION

As I have indicated, price control was adopted to prevent inflation. It is only one factor. There are many other factors. The 40-hour week with time and one-half for overtime, the 48-hour week with time and one-half for all time over 40 hours, the unprecedented wages and salaries paid in war plants, the increase in wages, are far more inflationary than the increase in prices. Increased production will prevent inflation. Producer subsidies are intended to increase production. They do prevent inflation. But consumer subsidies increase inflation. Increased wages are largely responsible for the $40,000,000,000 of excess purchasing power. Consumer subsidies will further increase the inflationary tendency. It will add to the excess money. Consumer subsidies operate for the poor man and for the rich man. They are demanded by the labor leaders. They are demanded for the groups that have largely received an additional $40,000,000,000 in wages.

I am utterly unable to understand how an increase in wages will not cause inflation when it is urged that an increase of a few cents in butter, a penny in milk, will cause inflation. I cannot follow such reasoning.

PRODUCER SUBSIDIES

The labor leaders who insist upon consumer subsidies and roll-backs urge that they are analogous to parities and to conservation subsidies in agriculture. For many years the commodity loans on agriculture were only 50 to 60 percent of the parity price. When soil-conservation payments were made to improve the soils and to build them up to promote production, at the same time, to aid the workers, public works were provided. The Works Progress Administration was authorized; the Civilian Conservation Corps was established; the National Youth Administration was inaugurated. They were primarily for the municipal and industrial areas.

Parities are now no longer being generally paid. Conservation payments have been reduced. They will probably be eliminated. For the year 1943 the profits of the cotton growers will be far less than in the two preceding years. The costs of labor, the cost of production have vastly increased in agriculture, including cotton, while prices are substantially the same as they have been for the past 2 years.

LOOSE TALK

There has been a lot of loose talk about the prosperity of agriculture and the increased income of agriculture. The standard, however, is to compare agricultural increases with labor and industrial increases. Between September 1942 and August 1943 the average weekly earnings of factory workers in manufacturing industries increased, as I have indicated, about 15 percent, or, more accurately, 14.9 percent. During this same period the cost of living increased only 4.6 percent.

The Little Steel formula allowed for an increase in wages of 15 percent in order to take care of the rise in the cost of living between January 1, 1941, and September 15, 1942. Actually, however, during this period the average weekly earnings of industrial workers increased nearly 37 percent, compared with an increase of about 17 percent in the cost of living. In July 1943 the weekly earnings of industrial workers were 51 percent above the January 1941 level, compared with the 23-percent increase in the cost of living.

PRODUCTION

I have indicated that there is a vast difference between production and consumer subsidies. Consumer subsidies mean increased cost of administration, increased taxes, increased control, increased regimentation. They do not benefit those entitled to an increase in price. They go to the processor. Food is essential in the prosecution of the war. There should be an incentive to food production. It should not be deterred. Increased labor costs should be provided for. If subsidies are to be effective they should be made available to the producers so that producers would get the benefit of subsidies and thus increase the production that is essential to win the war.

LABOR LEADERS NOT SATISFIED

It is urged that roll-back and consumer subsidies are essential to prevent increase in the price of wages. Roll-backs are being paid. Consumer subsidies are being paid, and yet John L. Lewis, Philip Murray, and William Green are demanding, and obtaining, increased wages. The argument, therefore, that roll-backs and subsidies are imperative to prevent inflation and to prevent increased wages and increased salaries falls of its own weight.

THE ISSUE

The issue involved is the cost of food. The question is whether the Federal Government will subsidize consumers at the expense of the taxpayers when consumers are able to pay adequate prices for foods. America should pay for what it eats today instead of leaving to the citizens of tomorrow to pay their grocery bills. The roll-back is to place prices at a certain level, but the consumer, who is also a taxpayer, must pay for the subsidy. Consumers who pay no direct taxes will probably pay indirect taxes. Wages have been increased. The roll-back is an additional wage increase. If increased wages promote inflation, so will roll-backs. Money in the hands of consumers, as the economists maintain, is inflationary. More money will be more inflationary.

It is said that we cannot hold the line without subsidies. We thus admit that the labor leaders are the masters of the United States. They are dictators. I do not believe it is necessary to surrender to labor dictators to "hold the line."

Farm prices are today 10 percent lower than in 1918. Factory wages are more than twice as high. Another comparison is in order. Factory wages per worker are 65 percent higher than in 1929, but the cost of living is about the same.

There is no saving in consumer subsidies. The consumer really loses. The average consumer may save 83 cents on his grocery bill, but the saving is deceptive. The amount so saved will be increased and charged back to him and to our returning soldiers in the form of taxes. I repeat that the consumer today is better able to pay the 83 cents than at any time in the past and probably at any time in the future.

Since 1939 farm income has increased only one-seventh as much as wages and salaries and only one-eighth as much as nonfarm income. If the surplus income is the index of inflation, then those who do not farm are seven or eight times more responsible. They are not only more responsible but they are better able to pay. The real issue is whether consumers will pay for their food out of their income or whether a part of their bill will be paid for by the Government with borrowed money and be added to the public debt to be paid for by those in the armed services and their children.

Consumer subsidies are unlike the tariff. Moneys are collected under tariff. They are appropriated under subsidies. They are unlike the subsidies on copper. The Government is the chief consumer of copper today. The Government is subsidizing itself.

Again, as I have said, there is a difference between consumer subsidies and parity payments. Parity payments were used during the depression to enable farmers to receive increased prices resulting from the ruinously low levels. They were for the benefit of the consumer. The consumer then did not have the money, due to unemployment. While they benefited the consumers, they promoted the production of food and feed.

Farmers at all times prefer fair prices on the markets to subsidies.

The pending bill prohibits the use of funds to roll back prices or to maintain price ceiling adjustments or to maintain a ceiling price below a support price. It does not stop subsidies to encourage the production of strategic war materials. It will not interfere with price supports as required by existing law. The bill forbids the placing or maintenance of a price ceiling below a support price. The War Food Administrator fixes the support price at the levels necessary to get production. The Office of Price Administration is then required to adjust its ceilings to the support price to avoid losses. An exception is made in the case of oilseeds and vegetable oils in order to get the necessary production.

FIXED INCOMES

I am not unaware that those with fixed incomes are adversely affected by increased prices of food. They are affected by increased taxes. Who would say, therefore, that taxes should not be increased? All legislation results in some discrimination. Those with fixed incomes have sons and daughters to educate, but their sons and daughters are now being called into the armed services. Parents who formerly sent sons to college are now being supported by contributions from the Government because of the service of their sons. I repeat, however, that there will be hardships. War always dislocates. Some suffer more than others. Consumer subsidies will not prevent inflation. They will not promote production. They only increase wages and salaries. They will promote inflation.

While in war all classes may be called upon to pay more for food, while there may be some discriminations, while there are some injustices, the sacrifices at home are not to be compared to the sacrifices of our armed forces in muddy and bloody Italy or in the malarial jungles of the Pacific.

Let us cease controversy over higher wages and higher profits. Let us be worthy of the men who are sacrificing in this great and tragic hour to save America for American institutions.

Daily messages, "Missing in action," are being sent to almost all States and communities. There will be many more of such messages in the hard days ahead. The flower of American young manhood is making the supreme sacrifice. Our bravest and best are determined to keep America free. They are determined that the Government shall be the servant and not the master of the people.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] asked why no one had taken this floor and answered the question: Why the farmers do not want subsidies. They do not want subsidies because they have good memories and have not forgotten the rules, regulations, red tape, and regimentation they experienced on previous occasions that accompanied payments to them, whether they were incentive payments, whether they were adjustment payments, or whether they were parity payments. They have gone through that experience and the reason that the farmers generally throughout the country do not now want these subsidy payments is because they have good memories. All they ask is a fair price in the market place for their products without depending on a check from Washington. No one up to this time has offered any reason why they should not have it.

Mr. Chairman, many months ago the Congress of the United States, anticipating the necessity for legislation to keep living costs in line with wages, passed the Price Control Act, and I voted for it, setting up an agency with power to establish price ceilings which would effectively regulate living costs.

The Office of Price Administration, with Leon Henderson as its first head, was charged with administration of the Price Control Act. The O. P. A., which acted in a manner which indicated that it was more determined to regiment the American people than it was to enforce the Price Control Act along the lines intended by Congress, soon came into general public disfavor. Despite widespread condemnation of the administrative heads of the O. P. A. and their methods, the Price Control Act was not then, and is not now, in jeopardy. Congress was, and still is, overwhelmingly in favor of adequate price controls and against inflation.

For some time the O. P. A., with the approval of President Roosevelt, has been resorting to a program of food subsidies. This scheme has its root in the failure of the O. P. A. to hold the line as intended under the Price Control Act. Little cracks were permitted in the price-control dam and as time elapsed the little cracks became so numerous that now the entire dam is threatened with destruction. In desperation O. P. A. officials then turned to food subsidies in an attempt to turn the tide. At first, only a few subsidies were established. Since then the subsidy program has been expanded to cover new commodities and only this last week still more subsidy controls were announced. The end is nowhere in sight. Based upon past experience, it is entirely logical to expect that more and more commodities will be brought into the subsidy fold. What started out to be a limited program now promises to become unlimited in scope and involve the expenditure of millions upon millions of borrowed dollars, which in itself, is a major inflation factor.

No domestic policy of the present administration has been more misrepresented to the public than that of food subsidies. The O. P. A., confronted with a complete break-down because of its administrative shortcomings, now wants to jump from the frying pan into the fire. The food subsidy program is being advanced as a bulwark against inflation when, in reality, it contains within itself a powerful stimulus to inflation. Not only will the food subsidy program cost the taxpayers of this Nation untold millions of dollars, adding substantially to our already towering national debt, but it will result in diversion of manpower from essential war production to the administrative personnel needs of an ever-expanding O. P. A. bureaucracy.

Reduced to a few short words, the food subsidy plan is simply robbing Peter to pay Paul—a monetary raid upon the substance of future generations. Future generations not only must repay the millions of borrowed money used for the payment of subsidies, but they also must pay interest upon those millions. Administrative costs, also, will have to be paid. It has been computed by reliable analysts that every dollar paid out in subsidies will cost the people of the United States at least $3.

If we permit a continuation of food subsidies there is no telling what the ultimate cost of the program will be, but there is the certainty of disastrous inflation at the end of the subsidy rainbow. The advocate of food subsidies, in effect, says: "Although I am working in a period of relatively high wages, I do not wish to pay my grocery bill in full, so why not fix it so that my children and my children's children will pay the bill." Is that the honest and decent thing to do? It is certainly a dangerous thing to do because inflation will be the inevitable reward for such a scheme.

Are we being fair to our fighting men and women when we indulge in such a scheme? Is it honest and decent to ask them to pay the bill for food subsidies when they return from the battle fronts? They are prepared to make the supreme sacrifice, if necessary, and are giving their all that this country may live. Let us do the right thing and face this situation as it should be faced. We ought not be less patriotic than our fighting sons and daughters.

There is one additional point which I wish to emphasize, one that advocates of food subsidies seem to ignore entirely, and that is that the termination of the inflation-laden subsidy program does not nullify the Price Control Act passed by Congress. The Price Control Act, if properly administered in the manner intended by Congress, can be an effective brake against inflation. The advocacy of food subsidies by officials charged with the responsibility of administering the Price Control Act is an unqualified confession that these officials have failed in their obligation to the people.

Let us really fight inflation by a courageous administration of our Price Control Act and by the elimination of every dollar of nonessential Government spending. Let us be honest with our children and be worthy of our gallant fighting forces.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I have been endeavoring since last June to have the O. P. A. either remove or substantially raise the ceiling price on corn in order to get it moving from its production source in the Middle Western States to the Northeastern States to feed our poultry flocks and dairy herds.

The milk and egg supply in the Eastern States is being jeopardized by the crackpot O. P. A. and farm regimentation which has resulted in causing a critical shortage of corn for our eastern dairymen and farmers who are being forced to curb production or go out of business.

In my district Franklin D. Roosevelt, of Hyde Park, had to abandon his claim of being a dirt farmer, due to the exactions of New Deal and O. P. A. regimentation, and assume a new title as forester or distributor of Christmas trees. Fifteen miles away another constituent, Henry Morgenthau, Jr., unable to cope with New Deal milk regulations and the O. P. A. ceiling price on corn, sold his large dairy herd, relinquished his title as a dirt farmer, and became a horticulturist.

The following letter from the Dutchess County Poultry Association, which held its recent meeting at Hyde Park, N. Y., expresses clearly the critical situation of the Dutchess County poultrymen, which is the same in Orange, Rockland, Sullivan, and Delaware Counties. What a tragedy it is, in view of the administration's urging the American people to raise poultry, and when they have complied, corn is not available to feed them, through New Deal blundering.

The letter follows:

DUTCHESS COUNTY POULTRY ASSOCIATION,
Hyde Park, N. Y., November 18, 1943.

Hon. HAMILTON FISH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the D. C. P. A., held the evening of November 17, at the Vanderbilt Inn., Hyde Park, N. Y., it was moved and carried that the secretary write Senators MEAD and WAGNER, and Congressman FISH, informing them of the critical situation now existing in the poultry industry of Dutchess County, because of the shortage of feed, particularly corn.

Many poultrymen, members of our association, are on the verge of being forced to liquidate because of the increasing difficulty in securing adequate feed supplies. These men are aggressive, competent, hardworking farmers, who ask only that something be done to break the bottlenecks in the movement of feedstuffs to the Northeast.

We feel confident that we may rely on you to use your power and influence to the end that we will not be forced to curtail our production of the poultry and eggs our country so urgently needs.

Sincerely yours,
HAROLD W. RABIDON.

Mr. Chairman, I also include the following typical letter from another constituent, along the same lines:

SALT POINT, N. Y., *November 12, 1943.*
Hon. HAMILTON FISH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: I am writing you about the feed situation for poultry. I have 300 laying hens. I can't get scratch feed or wheat for my hens. The Government is holding it back. We farmers are asked to produce and the Government ties our hands so we can't produce. Hens have got to have corn to produce body heat. If I don't get some scratch feed soon, I can't keep my hens. Hope you will be able to help me.

Sincerely yours,
TRISTRAM C. VAN DEWATER.

The production of milk, butter, and eggs is rapidly falling off for lack of corn. The American people are facing a food shortage which is becoming more acute every day, yet the O. P. A. does nothing about raising or removing the ceiling price on corn. Unless eastern poultrymen get corn by the first of the year many of them will be forced out of business and ruined. The same situation confronts eastern dairymen. It is becoming more critical and dangerous every week. The responsibility rests squarely on the arrogant New Deal bureaucratic O. P. A. and its program of farm regimentation.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Is it correct that Dutchess County is the home county of the President of the United States?

Mr. FISH. He has claimed for many years to be a dirt farmer of Dutchess County but I have yet to learn of anything he has done to help them. He knows as well as I do the plight of the dairymen and poultry producers of the Hudson River Valley. I know of nothing he has done to make corn available to the farmers of Dutchess County to enable them to stay on their farms and continue to produce milk, eggs, and poultry for the war effort. What applies to Dutchess County applies equally to Orange, Rockland, Sullivan, and Delaware Counties in my new district.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if the debate that has been going on in this Chamber for the past 3 days had been held in any other place except the Chamber of the most deliberative body in the world, I would pronounce it the longest and greatest comedy ever staged. My respect for the House, however, prevents me from indulging in such a characterization.

Never since my membership in the House commenced some 13 years ago have the Members of the House indulged in such reckless, flamboyant, and extravagant language, resorted to such absurd, demagogic, and, at times, in my opinion, highly questionable arguments, or exhibited such political venom. And the membership of this House have not been the only offenders. It looks like the Republican Party, certain hate-Roosevelt Democrats, hate-Roosevelt papers, and hate-Roosevelt pressure groups have ganged up on our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States. The whole performance reminds me of the neighborhood dogs ganging up on some stray dog that happens to show up in the neighborhood. You know the stray dog is tackled by the first neighborhood dog that happens to spy him. The first yelp that goes up seems to be the tocsin of war that brings the other neighborhood dogs out of the alleys and yards; and, without first finding out what the trouble is all about, yes, without rhyme or reason, they join in the assault against the stray dog with all the ferocity their animal instincts can muster. And, I have observed after the fray most of the dogs return to their respective alleys and yards, their tails between their hind legs, and with a dejected look that would indicate they are ashamed of the ridiculous performance into which mob psychology led them.

The question before the House for our determination is an important one. It is worthy of our best and most careful consideration. Outside of our vote declaring war, I doubt seriously if we have had for consideration a question fraught with greater consequences. And yet, instead of the great consequences involved sobering us up, they seem to have fired us up. Instead of the enormity of the problem filling us with a sense of responsibility and prompting us to proceed with caution, the very opposite appears to be true, and to such an extent that may seem to be filled with such a spirit of rebellion that they either cry out "to hell with the consequences, I am against subsidies," or "to hell with the consequences, I am against Roosevelt."

Why, to such a low level has the consideration of the question descended that I received a special-delivery letter from the Committee for Constitutional Government enclosing a release by a former Member of this House, one Pettengill by name, who still refers to himself as "The Gentleman from Indiana," in which he charges:

> The purchase of next year's election is under way. That is what the President's food subsidy program amounts to. We might as well call things by their right name.

Yes, this man Pettengill makes the charge that the President of the United States is advocating the subsidy program, not in an effort to hold the line and keep down inflation, but for the purpose of purchasing the election next year. My colleagues, can you imagine a loyal patriotic citizen of our country, much less a former Member of this House, making such a false and dastardly charge against the President? Yes, Mr. Pettengill, "we might as well call things by their right name," and I here and now brand you and your ilk as dispensers of aid and comfort to the

enemy and saboteurs of the morale of our people.

And let me caution those who have set out to destroy Mr. Roosevelt that they had better proceed cautiously lest by their vengeful acts the comedy they now stage turns into a Samson tragedy. Remember it is written:

> And Samson took hold of the two middle pillars upon which the house stood, and on which it was borne up, of the one with his right hand, and of the other with his left.
>
> And he bowed himself with all his might and the house fell upon the lords, and upon all the people that were therein.

And all poor old Samson got out of the whole vengeful affair was a pretty decent burial somewhere between Zorah and Eshtaol.

No doubt these self-constituted guardians of constitutional government forget that Mr. Chester Bowles, a sincere, loyal and patriotic hard-headed businessman who has been connected with O. P. A. for years, and who now heads the organization, is one of the chief advocates of the consumer subsidy program. And a sufficient answer to the slimy charge made by Mr. Pettengill is the fact that Mr. Bowles is a Republican, and it hardly stands to reason that he would be in "cahoots" with Mr. Roosevelt to buy the 1944 election for the Democrats.

Having gotten rid of some of the filth, may I for just a few minutes calmly and dispassionately present the issue? Shall we hold the line and thus prevent inflation, or shall we with an abandon born of hate and ill-will break the line and thus open the way to inflation, is the issue, and unless we settle down and face that issue honestly and fearlessly, I shudder at the consequences. Now, as to whether the passage of this bill will break the line, may, in my opinion, be honestly questioned. There is argument, I admit, without indulging in vituperation and abuse, that it will not. But when my Commander in Chief tells me that in his opinion it will, I believe I should accept his statement as being honest and sincere, and that I should, at least, pause and give consideration to his views. And when the statement of the Commander in Chief is followed by a statement from Mr. Chester Bowles that if we do not carry forward the food subsidy program that the cost of living will advance $8,000,000,000 per year, which, if true, will force an advance in wages, prices, and rents and thus break the line from one end to the other and bring about inflation, the time has about arrived, it seems to me, for us to forget our prejudices against subsidies which, I have a sneaking idea in some quarters is just a cloak to hide behind in giving vent to ill-will against the Commander in Chief, and vote to hold the line.

There are times, my colleagues, when we are called upon to do distasteful things—things that personally we not only dislike but hate and detest. None of us like war, yet we all voted for it. Why? Because the safety, security, and well-being of our country demanded that we marshal our forces and send our boys forth to battle to save our country from the ravage of the dictators. When the war resolution was before us it was not a question of likes or dislikes; it was a question of country. Many of us, I dare say, honestly dislike subsidies. I know that I do; and yet, when I calmly survey the situation, when I contemplate the ravages of inflation upon my country, I am driven to the conclusion that there is nothing left for me to do but let my dislike for subsidies become submerged by my love of country, pick up the bitter cup and swallow it, and stand up like a true American and vote in the interest of my country. To me this question, like the war resolution, is not a question of likes or dislikes. It is a question of country—and, my colleagues, feeling as I do, I shall vote against the antisubsidy bill.

Yes; I remember the bitter things I have said against the Hendersons and Ginsbergs and other strange-thinking individuals who have been connected with the O. P. A. Yes; I remember the harsh criticisms I have directed against certain of the rules and regulations promulgated by the O. P. A., and be it understood that by my vote I am not retracting a single statement I have made. I was directing my fight not against the law but against the way the law was being administered, and by my vote be it further understood that I am not yet satisfied with the way the law is being administered, and shall continue my fight until it is, in my opinion, administered in the right way and in accordance with the intent of the Congress. In my criticism I have not tried to destroy; I have only tried to improve.

Yet, my colleagues, remembering all I have said and done, I cannot permit the ill-will and prejudice the administration of the law has placed in my mind and heart to sway me when it comes to the safety, security, and welfare of my country, and the safety, security, and welfare of our country depends not only upon winning the war but also in winning the battle against inflation.

Now let us honestly look the situation right in the face. Back on October 2, 1942, by act of Congress we directed the President to stabilize prices, wages, and salaries, and other things that go into the cost of living as of September 15, 1942. Whether we made a mistake in not taking a different approach to the problem is beyond the question. The President's directive is contained in the act of October 2, 1942, and in that directive we established the line and we directed the President to hold that line. While I know the line has not been held 100 percent I also know that it is humanly impossible to administer the law in such a way as to make a 100-percent record. And I also know, by and large, the President has done a mighty good job in holding the line. Yes; it is true, that in carrying out our directive of October 2, 1942, the President, in order to hold down the cost of living and at the same time encourage production without increasing prices, has been forced to resort to subsidies. Do you know of a better way? The President many months ago challenged us to point out a better way, and assured us if a better way could be pointed out he would follow it. I personally heard him make that challenge, first to a delegation of House Members and Senators and later to a delegation of House Members, and no one on either occasion accepted the challenge, and to this good day, so far as I know, no one has ever attempted to point out a better way. And, so I say to those who are mouthing around, to put up or shut up. Point out a better way or forever hereafter hold your peace.

We are now told by those in position to know that if we will invest around $1,000,000,000 per year in food subsidies that in all probability the line can be held and inflation averted. Of course, there are those who ridicule the idea that we can invest so little and accomplish so much. In spite of this criticism, I am persuaded that there is something to the plan. You know a small leak in the dam, if looked after in time, can be quickly repaired at small expense. However, if the leak is not looked after in time, but neglected and left to the ravages of the water, it soon becomes a hole that gradually grows larger and larger, until the dam gives way and the waters, no longer under control, rush forth to devastate and destroy. Now, if we permit the cost of living to go up—and I am convinced it will go up if we do not resort to food subsidies—we are permitting a leak to come in our stabilization dam, which I am afraid will grow into a salary hole, a price hole, a rent hole, a wage hole, that will destroy the dam and permit the waters of inflation to descend upon our country. Would it not be better to stop the cost-of-living leak by a reasonable subsidy rather than run the risk of the leak developing into an increase-in-salary hole, an increase-in-price hole, an increase-in-rent hole, and increase-in-wage hole, because we know if these holes develop the stabilization dam will collapse? Think it over, my colleagues.

If, as proposed, we can spend $1,000,000,000 per year in food subsidies and hold the line—yes, if we can spend $2,000,000,000 per year in food subsidies and hold the line, we have, in my opinion, rendered an outstanding service to our country. Prudence and common sense dictate that we, at least, give the plan a trial. Oh, I know we will be charged by the demagog with asking our soldier boys to not only do the fighting but the paying as well; that if we pay food subsidies, the argument will be made that we are forcing our soldier boys to pay a part of our food bill. That argument is not worrying me. Let me tell you what is worrying me. It is this: Having held the battle line and won a great victory, having saved our country from the ravages of the dictator, I am wondering what our soldier boys will say if they return home and find that while they were over there doing the fighting we who stayed at home became so involved in factional fights, so embittered by political considerations, that we forgot all about the security and welfare of our country, turned against our Commander in Chief, and under the excuse of saving a few billion dollars to the

Federal Treasury, failed to hold the home line, let down the flood gates, and permitted inflation to ravage the land they were fighting to protect. And think that over, my colleagues.

And, my colleagues, we established a line that was supposed to cover our whole economy. One point in the line is known as the cost-of-living point, another the salary point, another the wage point, and still another the price point. These different points were links in the line chain, and the line chain is no stronger than its weakest link. If we permit the link in the line chain known as the cost-of-living link to snap in two, just ordinary common sense tells us that it is then just a question of time until every link in the line chain will snap in two. It is about time, do not you think, for us to calm down, forget our likes and dislikes, our hates and prejudices, and use just a little ordinary common sense. And think that over, my colleagues.

My colleagues, Congress established the line. It directed the President to hold the line. Now, will the same Congress that established the line and directed the President to hold the line, refuse to give the President the tools he finds necessary to use in carrying out the job Congress imposed upon him? And think that over, too, my colleagues.

As for me I am not going to be a party to employing a workman to do a job and then refuse to supply him with the necessary tools. I am going to vote to give the President the tools he has asked for.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last seven words.

Mr. Chairman, subsidies are a very perplexing problem little understood by the American people. Most of us know it has something to do with grants. Subsidies are nothing new to our American economy, and by subsidies we have been able to stabilize our home economy in times of peace, and certainly they are more worthy of consideration in time of war to stabilize the cost of living on the home front.

After listening to the arguments here, I note that some of these same arguments were made in the British Parliament, and it would behoove every Member here to refer to the British Price Control Act and the fourth report of their select committee on national expenditures. I want to quote from that publication.

In those debates it was said that the cost of subsidies for home-killed meat would run $1,600,000 a week—that is, £320,000 a week. The actual cost the first year of operation was $80,000,000. The very same arguments have been advanced regarding the cost of subsidies in the well of this House.

Referring to some of the statements made by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], that many of the telegrams in support of subsidies are from irresponsible people, may I state that I also have received many telegrams, including one from M. W. Sparr, one of the finest citizens of the city of Pittsburgh, and a Republican, by the way, who is president of the Allegheny Federation for the Blind. He represents about 100 blind folks, and he pleads with me to support subsidies. Another telegram I received is from Dr. Harold C. Clausen, of the city of Pittsburgh, one of our outstanding Presbyterian ministers, who is also a Republican. I always respect his judgment, as do all of the people of our great county. He wants me to support subsidies. That is the kind of telegrams I have been getting.

While we do not always agree with the President of the United States, his courageous fight against inflation has won the support of the masses of American people. His first major step in holding the line was his veto of the Bankhead bill. Let us peruse his vigorous anti-inflation statement made at that time, called a "hold the line" order:

> To hold the line we cannot tolerate further increases in prices affecting the cost of living, or further increases in general wage or salary rates except where clearly necessary to correct substandard living conditions. The only way to hold the line is to stop trying to find justifications for not holding it here or not holding it there.
>
> No one straw may break a camel's back, but there is always a last straw. We cannot afford to take further chances in relaxing the line. We already have taken too many.

The word "subsidies" is an ugly one. In normal peacetimes, I would be unalterably opposed to having subsidies applied to our economy. However, we are now engaged in war, fighting for our own preservation. The demands of war are heavy and the drain on our food supply is a serious problem. We must not only supply the food for our armed forces, but we must aid our allied comrades in arms. In addition to supplying the necessary foods for our own consumption, we must also aid in furnishing food for our stricken allied civilians. To satiate the demands of war with respect to food we must grant our farmers all of the necessary inducements to produce the desired crops, distribute the produce fairly through the established channels of distribution, and bring the produce to the retail shops at the rationed price and in the promised amount. The order of the President recognizes that the farmer may be given "support prices, subsidies, or other inducements as may be authorized by law and deemed necessary to maintain or increase production provided that such action does not increase the cost of living."

LET GOVERNMENT PURCHASE ENTIRE CROP

There is no reason in the world why a higher price, if it is necessary, should not be paid to the farmer and the difference covered out of Government funds. The chief objection, by the farm bloc, to accepting subsidies, as has been evident in recent debates on this vital measure, is that the new dealers have a tendency to attach meddlesome conditions. This objection can be met—just as easily as Canada and England have met this vital issue. "Instead of paying subsidies to farmers, let the Government buy the whole crop at the economic price, and then let it resell to the private distributors at the O. P. A. price that part of the crop which is for civilians. The difference between the two prices should then be written off as part of the costs of the war."

This would seem in the minds of our leading economists to be a constructive solution to the problem. The Government is already buying for the Army, the Navy, and lend-lease a sizable proportion of the same products which are being rationed to the civilians. It cannot be much more difficult administratively, and, in fact, it may be more simple in the long run, to buy the entire crop. This does not mean that the Government would go into the food business. The civilian supply it should at once resell on an equitable basis—on the principle that each existing business firm should be allowed to buy at the O. P. A. price its pre-war proportion of the whole supply.

This method does more than solve the problem of how to keep consumer prices down while paying farmers proper inducement. It is the most effective method of making rationing work in that instead of relying on ceilings announced by fiat and backed by jail sentences and fines, the Government which allots to the distributors can, by threatening to withhold the allotment, compel them to maintain the ceilings. When the Government is supplying distributors with food at fair prices, the Government has the right and the power to compel the distributors to sell at fair prices. This removes the main cause for the black market. England has been highly successful in holding the line on the cost of living and in preventing black markets. There is no reason why we cannot adopt the same system.

RAYMOND CLAPPER, WALTER LIPPMANN, ERNEST LINDLEY, DOROTHY THOMPSON SUPPORT SUBSIDIES

Fulton Lewis, Jr., radio commentator with a great following—and men like him—in continually telling the American people that subsidies—nothing new to American life—are hand-outs and that the administration is attempting to buy its way into the 1944 elections is doing a great disservice to his country. His type of propaganda is just as dangerous as that of Herr Goebbels.

Yet, on the other hand, we have Raymond Clapper, Walter Lippmann, Ernest Lindley, and Dorothy Thompson, world renowned columnists who have frequently criticized this administration's domestic policy and who cannot be said to be proadministration, all in favor of subsidies as the only approach in this war to the solution of the inflation issue. For my part, I fully subscribe to the clear-cut logic advocated by these impartial columnists rather than follow the illogical propaganda of Herr Fulton Lewis, Jr. It appears to me that Herr Lewis is a hatchet man for some group or political party. Who?

CONGRESS FAILED

The dignity of Congress must be preserved. To date Congress has miserably failed in its responsibility to roll back prices and to hold down the cost of living with the result that administrative agencies have bypassed Congress. In

its dealing with this vital problem of inflation, at best Congress has proved a cumbersome and ineffectual body. It has been hostile, either deliberately or through the inability of a great many of its Members, to understand what the control of living costs require. Indeed Congress has become on its own account a dangerous inflationary force, partly by its failure or inability to act, partly because of the direction of the few actions it has taken. Do Members of Congress value the return of World War No. 1 prices that will skyrocket the cost of living? Are we willing to sit by and let the prices of sugar run up to 36 cents per pound, onions 19 cents per pound, potatoes $1.17, eggs $1.25 per dozen, butter $1.02 per pound, and from 50 percent to 100 percent increases on the cost of meats and other foodstuffs?

I plead with the House to rise to the same degree of nonpartisanship and statesmanship it has exemplified on many other important war measures. Let us continue the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation and provide for wisely administrated subsidies to help stabilize our economic front and to hold the line on the cost of living.

Mr. BARRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEISS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. I want to point out to the gentleman that many of the Members opposing this bill are not opposed to subsidies during peacetimes because on October 2, 1942, they passed a bill to guarantee the farmers 90 percent of parity through subsidies for 2 years following the war.

Mr. WEISS. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

If we can authorize the expenditure of two hundred and fifty or three hundred billion dollars to kill people and destroy property, we certainly can authorize the appropriation of eight or nine hundred million dollars to stabilize our economy on the home front.

Mr. Chairman, for my part I am going to support the President and the administration's policy on subsidies and I shall vote in favor of the minority report filed by the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, we have consumed 1 hour on section 1, which is not controversial. Section 3 is the controversial section and we should have ample time to discuss it.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on section 1, and all amendments thereto, do now close.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] asks unanimous consent that all debate on section 1 and all amendments thereto do now close. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN]?

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate do now close on section 1 and all amendments thereto.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby amended by changing the designation thereof to section 7 (a); by striking out in the first sentence of such section "December 31, 1943" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1945"; and by striking out the period at the end of such section and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided, however,* That the Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account and shall determine the procedures to be followed in the transaction of the corporate business.

"(b) The financial transactions of the Corporation beginning with the period from July 1, 1944, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States: *Provided,* That the Corporation shall continue to have the authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers: *Provided further,* That a report of such audit shall be made to the Congress, together with such recommendations as the Comptroller General may deem advisable, and that each such report shall cover a period of 1 fiscal year: *Provided further,* That a copy of each such report shall be furnished the Secretary of the Treasury and that the findings contained therein shall be considered by the Secretary in appraising the assets and liabilities and determining the net worth of the Corporation under sections 1 and 2 of the act of March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this section shall be construed as modifying legislation authorizing the use of funds of the Corporation for administrative expenses and requiring accountability therefor.

"(c) The expenses of the audit as provided in this section may be paid up to and including June 30, 1946, from moneys advanced therefor by the Corporation, or from any appropriation or appropriations for the General Accounting Office, and appropriations so used shall be reimbursed promptly by the Corporation as billed by the Comptroller General: *Provided,* That any such advances or reimbursements shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses of the Corporation. For the purpose of such audit the representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all papers, books, files, accounts, financial records, warehouses, and all other things, property, and places belonging to or under the control of or used or employed by the Corporation and shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances in depositaries and with fiscal agents: *Provided further,* That the certified financial reports and schedules of the fiscal agents of the Corporation based on commercial audits in the usual course of business may be accepted by the General Accounting Office in its audit of the financial transactions of the Corporation as final and not subject to further audit verification.

"(d) Any examination of the corporate records shall be made at the place or places where such records are normally kept in the transaction of the corporate business, and the Corporation shall retain custody of contracts, vouchers, schedules, or other financial or accounting documents, either original or duplicate, relating to its nonadministrative transactions."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, in order to facilitate the consideration of this bill, I hope my colleagues will refrain from offering pro forma amendments to this section and will wait until section 3 is read to offer their amendments, when ample time will be available for debate.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask our acting chairman if it is his plan to allow a considerable length of time under section 3 for both formal and pro forma amendments to be debated?

Mr. SPENCE. That is subject to the will of the Committee of the Whole. The only reason I make this suggestion is that we have not yet come to the meat of the subject.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is my understanding that a number of Members are concerned about whether or not they are going to have a chance to speak on the bill. They are afraid that a motion may be made to close debate.

Mr. SPENCE. As far as I am concerned, I should like to see ample time allowed for debate, if the Members will let us go on to section 3.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us a bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation. There has been little if any argument made against the Corporation on this floor. Agreement as to its value is general. It seems particularly unfortunate, therefore, that there should have been intruded into it the very controversial issue of subsidy payments. It is also to be regretted that no compromise measures were made possible at this point.

The situation facing many of our people whose incomes are fixed, who have not benefitted by the high wage scales of war, begins to be serious. Their need is very real—typically it is one that is being used to becloud the vital issues. Difficult as our position may be, we must not permit ourselves to look at the immediate present only, as they would have us do.

The country is being told that there must be these subsidy payments if food prices are to be held, that Congress will be wholly responsible if the grim spiral of inflation starts its devil's dance. We have heard that argument even here on this floor. The country is not being told that subsidies are as truly an inflation measure as anything that could be done to us as a Nation. Once begun there is no end. Free corn to the Romans and free circuses was the death knell to Rome. We have also been told that something called politics is behind the opposition to the only method the administration sees fit to use in its inadequate efforts to control living costs. Is there no politics behind the all too successful efforts being made so consistently to hang upon Congress all the bad results of mismanagement, of vacillating policy, of inadequacy and theoretical ineptitude? Faced with what appears to be the inevitableness of inflation it can be readily understood that the administration looks for a scapegoat lest the people awaken to a realistic attitude toward its failure to take a strong posi-

tion 2 and even 3 years ago. That scapegoat is to be the Congress.

The situation in which we now find ourselves is the direct result of weakness, of temporizing with reality. No amount of camouflage will hide the cold facts from the people permanently. Rather will it prove to be a clear trail back to the real source of inflation and the breakdown of our national economic structure, a boomerang such as we have never yet seen.

But that is small comfort for those who will go hungry as prices rise, as they inevitably will whether we vote this subsidy up or down unless we have strong controls courageously applied. That they have been misled into believing our officials able to cope with the results of 3 years of mismanagement is readily understandable, because it still masquerades in pretty clothes. That they may turn upon Capitol Hill in their anger is probably just as inevitable. Blinded by present need, they will not see that the results of this subsidy plan will be more and more subsidy that will be as mad a spiral of inflation as any other that could be devised.

What reason is there to suppose that the methods of this subsidy plan would differ from the methods of the N. R. A. and the A. A. A.? Control of one commodity must inevitably lead step by step to the control of all. A controlled economy may be the ultimate goal in the minds of those wanting subsidies, but such an economy is not to be tolerated by true Americans.

Proponents of the subsidy plan have been able to focus the general attention upon it and it alone. But the real picture is a far broader one. Price control—the control of living costs—involves a very much larger field beginning with the planting of seed in the ground, continuing through harvest, reaching out through distribution to final consumption. The philosophy of scarcity forced upon us earlier by the New Deal plays its realistic part in the cost spirals of today. Waste of taxpayers' money, overpurchasing of foods by the Government and the consequent tight markets, and spoiled food, and above all the complete lack of over-all planning both in military and civilian fields all play their part in the creation of the tragic situation in which a large part of our people are now caught.

That help should be given those who are caught between the upper millstone of taxes and increasing costs and the nether millstone of fixed low incomes, we are surely agreed upon. There are several excellent plans suggested already placed in the RECORD during this debate. Several of these attack the problem with clarity and directness and have much to commend them. Subsidy is not the only answer to the immediate crisis. The refusal of those responsible to consider other methods should not go unnoticed. Nor should we permit ourselves to fail to point out to the people again and again the fact that subsidy of the grocer's bill must be paid for in taxes that actually exceed the amount remitted on food costs. Starting the spiral of subsidy inevitably starts the tax spiral which will overshadow our children's children.

Never in the long history of mankind have two wrongs made a right. Tragic as the situation is which has grown from the failure of one economic experiment after another, I cannot justify a vote for this subsidy plan believing as I do that it would accelerate the ultimate pyramiding of costs.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, the Committee has no desire to prevent anybody from having ample opportunity to debate this bill, but we feel that debate on pro forma amendments to section 2 should now close. Members will have ample opportunity to discuss the question after section 3 is read. I hope they will agree to close debate on section 2 at this time, and I ask unanimous consent that debate on section 2 and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. It might be appropriate for the Chair to advise the gentleman that he is informed by the Clerk that there is one amendment on the desk to section 2 of the bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Of course, we have no objection to a bona fide amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment seeks to insert a new section following section 2 of the bill.

Mr. SPENCE. We ask that that amendment be now considered.

The CHAIRMAN. That would not close debate on the pending section. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that all debate on section 2 and all amendments thereto do now close. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Do I correctly understand that there is at least one amendment to section 2 in respect to the subject matter of section 2?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair upon examining the amendment more closely finds that it is an amendment to insert a new section following section 2. Of course, the pending request would not affect that.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. PACE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, some of us who have not had an opportunity to speak generally on the bill will, when we reach section 3, under the rules of the House, be confined to addressing the Committee of the Whole only one time on a particular pending amendment. Would there be an opportunity for Members to make general remarks on the bill and later address the Committee on any amendment that might be pending to section 3?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman can obtain recognition, he can speak to every amendment offered to section 3, if he so desires.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I had intended presenting a motion to strike out the enacting clause of this bill because in my considered judgment, after carefully weighing both the benefits and the evils in this program, it is in the Nation's interest to put an end to the Commodity Credit Corporation. I will not now present that motion because a survey of the situation makes it clear that such an effort would be futile at this time.

The Commodity Credit Corporation in the course of its life has done some good things, but its virtues do not outweigh its vices. It stands as a dictator over every farm and farmer. Benevolent despots may do some good things, but I want no despot nor despotism in America, benevolent or not.

The Government Corporation is in the no man's land of Federal finance. The theory that gives it life justifies careful scrutiny in the sense of fundamentals.

In the first place, this Corporation is a State corporation. It is incorporated in a State and under State laws and is not a Federal corporation at all. There are a multitude of things that could be pointed out objectionable about the Corporation, but I choose to devote my remarks to two points.

First, my own opinion of subsidies is that the very thought of subsidy is fit only to subside. It is, in my studied judgment, an absolute fallacy to substitute debt inflation for price inflation.

What possible logic could there be in saying that this subsidy will keep butter from being raised 5 cents a pound, but it will add 5 cents to your taxes? It will keep canned vegetables from being raised 1 cent per can, but it will add 1 cent for every can of vegetables to your taxes. It will keep the price of sugar from being raised 1 cent a pound, but it will add that 1 cent to everybody's taxes.

This program says to the purchaser, "Now, everybody that buys a can of peas will pay 1 cent a can less, but everybody in the Nation will be taxed to pay that cent whether they buy canned peas or not." They will be taxed to pay that 5 cents on the pound of butter whether they buy butter or not. If you buy 4 pounds of butter, you will save 20 cents on the purchase. If I buy 1 pound of butter, I will save 5 cents on the purchase, but then you and I will be taxed equally to pay that 20 cents for you and that 5 cents for me.

Mr. Chairman, I have before me the letter of the president of the C. I. O. in which he charges that an unsubsidized market will operate for the personal profit of special interests. The American farmer is that special interest he is talking about. Of course, the American farmer will not himself get this subsidy money. This is not a subsidy to the farmer. It is a subsidy to the consumer. The processor gets the check. The consumer gets the reduced purchase price

and the farmer gets what he has generally received—nothing in a big empty sack.

No, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to vote another bond issue in order that John L. Lewis' pound of butter will cost him a nickel less. Let John L. and his crowd pay their own grocery bills. Uncle Sam has enough to pay when Uncle Sam pays for the war. Let us not call on Uncle Sam to pay everybody's personal grocery bills. I do not want to vote another bond issue to maintain a vast army of hirelings to busy themselves with regimenting and regulating the American farmer.

Let me read to you what a farmer down in Lincoln County, Okla., has written to Mr. Wickard on this subject. He says:

On November 4, I received a letter from the Oklahoma, Lincoln County, A. A. A. that it will pay me 6 cents per pound for butterfat. Looks well timed. Is it an effort to appease the farmer and the consumer just now? Is it an effort to work both ends against the middle? Is it a political movement to whip Congress in line? Is it an effort to keep alive the A. A. A. and burden us with scores of pap-suckers?

Evidently, according to your local A. A. A., I'm entitled to 6 cents more for my butterfat. If so, why not let me receive my money over the counter where I sell it, rather than wait a month, and be paid through the United States Treasury, through a State organization, and through a local A. A. A.? Why all the red tape? Why all the extra expense? Why all the waste of manpower? Isn't your plan hidden inflation? Isn't it an effort to hoodwink the public? Doesn't it add expense to expense and interest on top of all that? If you permit the operators to pay the miners without a bureau for intervention, why should we farmers need an intermediary to act for us? We are 21 years of age and need no political hand-outs.

* * * * *

I'm a poor farmer, and God knows that I need the money, but, brother, I'm not going to sell my freedom, have my lips closed, and be made a cringing slave. I positively refuse to have a part in what appears to be a movement to establish socialism in our country. I'll fight Hitler, and I'll fight those who try to overthrow our constitutional form of government.

Now, that farmer is a man of sense. What he has said is truth.

Mr. Chairman, the question of subsidy has been much debated here. The arguments for it have limped in on their crutches and, under the light of the sound reasoning against subsidy, have been wheeled away to the funeral of proposals that cannot live in the light of reason. Suffice it to say that, in my opinion, the man who advocates the subsidy on the grounds that this general tax on everybody to keep down the living costs of a few by removing a pound of price and substituting for it a pound and a half of tax—the man who advocates that program, in my judgment, is a Judas betrayer of reason.

Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied with the perpetuation of this Corporation even without subsidies. I know that those who have gained privilege and benefit from its existence will not look with favor upon my stand. I know that it takes a hard-headed brand of courage for any Member on this floor to stand up when my motion is voted on, but if ever our Nation needed a courageous Congress, it is now. We have seen on every hand the American way of life being abandoned and a system of regimentation and bureaucracy supplanting the old American system of freedom, free enterprise, and governmental institutions controlled by the people. I am a freedom-loving, tyranny-hating man. I cannot submit to the chains of bureaucratic control, nor see the irons of regimentation and autocratic and even capricious regulation be manacled on the citizens of this great country.

My particular charge against the Commodity Credit Corporation is that this Corporation has defied the law. This is the second point of major consequence that I want to present for your consideration. On July 31, 1943, the Commodity Credit Corporation sent the following wire:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 31, 1943.*

ARDMORE COTTON OIL MILL,
Ardmore, Okla.:

War Food Administrator issued C. C. C. Order 5, effective August 1, 1943, requiring every processor to set aside for sale and delivery to the Corporation, without regard to the rights of creditors, existing contracts, or payments made, all soybean, cottonseed, and peanut cake, meal, and pellets which he owns or has under contract August 1, 1943, and all soybean cake, meal, and pellets which is produced by him on or after August 1, 1943, from soybeans grown in the calendar year 1942 and cottonseed and peanut cake, meal, and pellets produced by him from cottonseed and peanuts grown in the calendar year 1942 which he owns or has under contract August 1, 1943. This Corporation will accordingly issue an offer to purchase from you at the ceiling prices applicable under the 1942 program all cake, meal, and pellets covered by C. C. C. Order 5. By this offer you will be authorized to make sales and deliveries for the account of the Corporation at the new ceiling prices and differentials established by the O. P. A. effective July 31, 1943, which on cottonseed meal prime 41 percent protein in bulk is $47 per ton, lower grades 75 cents per unit of protein lower. Price 43 percent protein bulk meal $49 per ton f. o. b. cars at all mills in Oklahoma. Loose slab cake 75 cents per ton lower than bulk meal of same grade and on peanut meal 45 percent or more protein in bulk $50 per ton f. o. b. cars at all mills, loose slab cake 75 cents per ton lower. Sacked differential above bulk meal on both cottonseed and peanut meal is market value of bags used and all less than carload prices $1 per ton higher than carloads.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION,
C. C. FARRINGTON, *Vice President.*

This wire is a violation of the law. Read the law and you will find a specific prohibition on what this wire did—paragraph E–2, exception and proviso, page 4, Public Law 421. A vote to continue this Corporation sanctions their actions. We cannot afford to let bureaus operate above or outside the law. Many bureaus have usurped the law-making powers of Congress, and some have usurped also the Executive's powers and the judicial powers which the Constitution delegates to the courts. The bureau is the usurper, the despot, the dictator that must be dethroned or constitutional Government is lost to America.

Let us examine further what this wire means. This wire means that the Commodity Credit Corporation does not have to come to Congress for appropriations. It means that they set themselves up as a law unto themselves with the power to corner the market on any commodity and to buy and sell for profit. Notice that the wire said every processor must set aside for sale and delivery to the Corporation without regard to the rights of creditors, existing contracts, and so forth. Under the Commodity Credit's order, for example, cottonseed cake that had been selling for $41 a ton was raised in price to $54 a ton and the dealer was ordered to remit the balance to Commodity Credit Corporation. What did Commodity Credit do with the swag? The thing they did is the same as what Al Capone did. They said, "On every ton of cake you charge so much and give so much to me." It was racketeering pure and simple. Mr. Hutson himself says that they purchased and sold for profit.

	Tons purchased and sold	Gains
Soybean cake and meal	253, 564	$2, 613, 540
Cottonseed cake and meal	18, 370	175, 049
Peanut cake and meal	6, 133	84, 688
Total (profit)	278, 067	2, 873, 277

I am advised by the Texas peanut producers that the farmers are being paid $140 a ton for their peanuts by Commodity Credit and Commodity Credit was charging the shelling plants $170 a ton. What did they do with that $35-a-ton profit? What is more fundamental—under what possible logic had the Commodity Credit any right to become a profiteer on the farmer?

All of this program of holding down the prices that the farmer gets from his production is supposed to provide him with an incentive to produce more.

When I look at the performance of the Commodity Credit Corporation, I would appraise it as a comedy if I did not realize that the paying public has this Corporation on its back as a burden and so the performance is a tragic farce.

Mr. Chairman, the theory that holds that a bureaucrat downtown can, on his own unrestrained and unguided judgment through the power of an edict from his own hand, seize control of the entirety of a product, and, subject to the whims of his own capricious will, manipulate the prices of that product to the extent of raping the public pocket of millions of dollars, is a theory intolerable in a democracy and inconsistent with the principles of the American Government.

We have heard a lot about "four freedoms." The motion I have just made provides an opportunity for you to vote for a "fifth freedom"—freedom from bureaucracy. In that freedom is lodged a whole library of titles to liberty. Let us give intelligent thought to the encroachment of bureaucracy on our rights and freedom. Let us face the

challenging fact that this is our problem and we must solve it with action.

Bureaucracy is no longer an overgrown departmentalism. It has become a new concept of government. A concept that rests on the pernicious doctrine of implied powers. A concept that envisions a government of men to supplant our government of law. A concept that holds that government should be master, not servant, of the people; that holds that the government should control the people instead of the American philosophy that the people should control the government. A concept that holds that men should have the power to regiment and regulate us. To control our every enterprise and activity at the behest of their own unguided judgment and unrestrained and capricious whim or will.

Bureaucracy is a maze of amazement, a jungle of jumbles. Tons of pamphlets from Government presses grind out the unsolvable puzzles from umpteen thousands of pee-wee minds of bureaucrats in the vast caboodle of bureaus.

We cannot afford to let government regiment agricultural endeavor, and bind and chain the farmer.

Bureaucracy is jeopardizing both our prosperity and our liberty. The bureaucrat has us all in a strait jacket. If his edict were law, he would have succeeded in making criminals of us all.

All the money in the world would not make a decent down payment on what bureaucracy has cost us.

You know what the farmer ought to plow up? He ought to plow up the Department of Agriculture. He ought to plow up the Commodity Credit Corporation, plow them up and plow them under. A vote against subsidy is a vote against bureaucracy in its malicious form. A vote against subsidy is a vote to stop racketeering. It is a vote for free enterprise. It is a vote to protect the people from a great new weight of debt.

Since the parliamentary situation makes it clear that we cannot now abolish this bureau we can at least restrain it from spending impossibly huge sums of public money through subsidies. We can forbid subsidies and save the American people from another great weight of debt.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, the organized farmers in their opposition to the consumer subsidies have had many advocates in the last several days. The organized industrial workers, along with unorganized farmers and other wage earners—postal employees and white collar workers—numbering more than half of our population, have had few advocates up to the present time.

Are these people to be forgotten by this Congress in their extreme desire to suffer no advance in living costs? Are they to be so forgotten by the Congress that they will become the victims of inflation similar to what took place during the First World War?

I am irrevocably committed to supporting their interests and striving my utmost to prevent their becoming the unjust and unwilling victims of such economic disturbance. The prevention of inflation is a secondary war measure. It is the duty of the Congress to put into the hands of the administration all of the measures and instruments that are necessary to keep our economy stabilized for the interest of the people and for the financial advantage of the Government. There is no one in Congress, or out of Congress, who can say that the passage of this bill will not prevent inflation. The most that they can say is that it is doubtful. And now is not a time to pass doubtful legislation.

To permit the rise in the cost of living as is sure to take place if this bill is passed in its present form seriously will affect the morale of a large number of our people, and that will be reflected in the morale of the members of the armed forces, which is directly affected by the morale back home.

To me there is no excuse for anyone's taking any other viewpoint than that the passage of the present measure will loom up as a specter to confront its supporters when inflation takes place.

I will support the administration in its efforts to control prices, and attempt to put into its hands all of the instruments and weapons that are necessary to stabilize the cost of living.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: On page 4, after line 21, insert:

"SEC. 2A. Whenever the board of directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation determines that there exists in any area of the United States a shortage of feed for dairy cows, beef cattle, and poultry, the Corporation is authorized and directed to acquire, or to release from its stocks, corn and other feed for distribution for feed for dairy cows, beef cattle, and poultry in such area. Such distribution shall be made in such manner, at such prices, and subject to such terms and conditions as the board of directors of the Corporation shall prescribe."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to the bill.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, may I have an opportunity to speak on the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Kentucky willing to reserve the point of order?

Mr. SPENCE. I reserve the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I regret that a point of order has been made against this amendment, because it is the one opportunity this House has to solve the most serious food shortage the country will ever see or ever know. Five thousand years ago the Egyptians, starving after 7 lean years, called for Joseph to open up the storehouses and the granaries and feed the starving people. Today, Mr. Chairman, we have had ample warning of the failure of the Office of Price Administration to release corn and other feeds, not only to the dairymen of upstate New York and to the poultrymen, but to the beef-cattle feeders and feeders of livestock over the whole country.

Unless some solution is brought forth, the metropolitan districts throughout the country, the consumers, the members of the armed forces, and all those other nations we are pledged to feed, will be faced with the most serious and critical situation that can possibly be imagined.

I am appealing not necessarily in behalf of the farmers of my district but also for the consumers, for the people throughout the metropolitan sections of this country, and I am appealing to this House to consider the feasibility and the wisdom of selling corn and other feeds in the areas that must have it.

As I have stated, I am sorry that a point of order was made against this amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield briefly.

Mr. COOLEY. May I suggest to my friend that he address the Chair on the point of order, because I hold to the opinion that the amendment is not subject to a point of order. I believe the gentleman should insist that his amendment is in order, because if the Commodity Credit Corporation is not going to be permitted to do the thing the gentleman wants to authorize it to do, then I submit the members of the committee do not understand the bill they brought in here.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, unless the House adopts some sort of amendment like this, the people throughout the country in the metropolitan districts, regardless of the prices they are called upon to pay for food, are not going to have any food at all, because the Administration has refused to allow corn and other feed to flow and to be distributed into sections where dairy cattle, poultry, and beef cattle are being raised and being fed. It is one of the most disastrous, one of the most disheartening, and one of the most deplorable situations this country has ever come upon or ever been presented with. I hope that some measure can be designed to save the situation, and I serve notice on this House now that unless we solve it today people in the gentleman's district, the people throughout New York City and the people throughout every other metropolitan district in this land are going to face starvation. The men in our armed forces are not going to be able to carry on this greatest of all struggles if the food is not forthcoming. The only way we can raise this food is to supply the dairy cattle, beef cattle, and poultry and other livestock of this country with the proper feed in order to produce the food that must go into the gentleman's district

and must go everywhere throughout the country to feed our patriotic American population, no matter how high the prices for food go. No matter how much the people are called upon to pay for food, what good is it going to do, what good is it going to do, I say to you, if there is not any food to buy? You can talk all you want to, but that is the one issue we face in this House today. Let us get the corn and the feed into the areas where it should be placed and save America from famine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky withdraws his point of order.

Mr. SPENCE. However, we consider this amendment a dangerous amendment to adopt without full consideration.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] knows with what reluctance I rise in opposition to his amendment because I know he has a very noble and worthwhile purpose in mind, and we all wish that what he desires could be brought about.

However, we are confronted with this situation: This is a bill designed primarily to stop the payment of consumer subsidies. The committee has had to be very meticulous in the use of its words, in order that we would in no manner interfere with the producer-subsidy program, the support-price program, or any other program which has been set up, including any program under the Price Control Act for the purpose of obtaining the maximum amount of production. I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman would direct the Commodity Credit Corporation, if it finds a shortage of feed, to acquire stocks of feeds and distribute them to the feeders of livestock and poultry. They already have, under existing law, not only the right to buy but the administration obligation, if necessary, to obtain the maximum amount of production. There is nothing whatsoever in this bill—and I hope there will be nothing written into this bill—to amend or modify or in any other manner affect the operation of subsection (e) of section 2 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942.

I wish the Committee would have in mind that the President is authorized to designate any other agency of the Government that he sees fit to administer the provisions of the price-control bill. Under subsection (e) of section 2 of the Price Control Act, the President could, if he saw fit, notwithstanding any provisions in this bill, designate the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy all the feed which was necessary and distribute it virtually for nothing, if, in his judgment, it was necessary to obtain the maximum amount of production.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No. Not at this time. There is nothing in this bill which would prevent the operation of any existing law to obtain the maximum amount of production. I do not think we should start writing directives into this law to further tell these bureaus that they must administer laws which are already on the statute books. That is my objection to it. If we write in here a directive that the Commodity Credit Corporation, or the administration shall obey the law, then, of course, we have a right to expect that the dairymen will be here, the meat men will be here, the corn-hog men will be here, the bean growers and the sugar-beet growers will be here, asking for specific directives to enforce the Sugar Beet Act, the Bean Act, and other provisions in the Commodity Credit Corporation law, section 32 of the A. A. A., and all other provisions of law, which we have set up in order to authorize the payment of subsidies, the purchase of commodities at a high price and sale at a less price, if it is necessary to obtain the maximum amount of production. For that reason I have to appose this amendment and hope it will not be adopted and that no similar amendment will be adopted to defeat the purpose of section 3.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my purpose in rising is not to oppose what the gentleman has in mind in offering this amendment, but to advise him and the membership of the House that I have prepared an amendment to section 3, which I think is more appropriate, legislatively, and which will accomplish his purpose.

I am very much in favor of what the gentleman has in mind. I hope if his amendment is defeated that you will support the amendment which I will offer in the appropriate place, providing that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall have the power under the exception in section 3 regarding vegetable oils, to move feed of this kind into areas where it is needed.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. CRAVENS. Does the gentleman propose to read his amendment at this time, so that we may understand it?

Mr. HAYS. My amendment is very simple. It simply adds on page 6, line 2, the words "or livestock feed" after the last word in that line.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York and your amendment, merely adds "feed" as a commodity, to vegetable fats and oils, on which a subsidy can be paid? Is that true?

Mr. HAYS. Yes. I should say in order to be entirely fair about it, it would amount to a subsidy. It is directed to the reduction of transportation expense. That is what it amounts to. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], its purpose is not related to production. It is to get feed that is produced in an area where there is a surplus, into an area where there is a scarcity. If that transportation expense cannot be met by the Government by subsidy, if you please, then the producers in drought or scarcity areas, cannot get that feed at a price at which it would have to be offered. It is for that reason we believe some aid ought to be offered.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Where in the bill would the gentleman's amendment be offered?

Mr. HAYS. At the end of section 3, in the last line; and it would as I have indicated accomplish just what the gentleman from New York had in mind, with which I am in thorough sympathy, and I believe a number of the members of our committee are.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman understand that this bill will prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from carrying on its normal functions in the future as it has in the past with regard to the buying and selling of farm commodities?

Mr. HAYS. Yes; I am quite sure of it. There is no doubt in my mind that so far as livestock feed is concerned the bill if passed in its present form will prevent that kind of operation. We have that on the word of the President of the Commodity Credit Corporation himself. It was stated in committee and as I recall without contradiction that if the bill stood in its present form such operations as they outlined would have to stop.

Mr. COOLEY. In other words, on two or three former occasions this Congress has authorized the release of Commodity Credit wheat which relieved a very distressing situation in America. If I understand the gentleman correctly, if this bill passes in its present form unless some exception is hereafter provided, that operation will be prevented in the future.

Mr. HAYS. I do not think there is any doubt about it.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from New York by his amendment leaves it in the discretion of the directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation who must find that a shortage of feed exists before they can go out and acquire this feed and release it to livestock raisers. Why would not the gentleman accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York if it accomplishes the same purpose which the gentleman has in mind? It does not hurt to have it in twice.

Mr. HAYS. Because I believe it lifts livestock feed out of the category where I think it belongs and sets up a special limitation on the power of the Corporation. I think they should have general powers on those items.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I believe the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York would be inconsistent with the provisions of section 3 whereas if the gentleman's amendment were adopted it would be consistent with section 3.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman; I believe that is the case.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Under the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York the Corporation could dispose of feed at any price it wanted to; is that right?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] to answer.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. They would have the power, but it would get food to the population of the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. They could sell it at a less price than they paid for it.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I do not deny that; but I think the primary consideration is the feeding of the country. That should be the primary motive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. The fact is they could sell at a less price than they paid for it; is not that right?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words the gentleman is opposed to a subsidy on milk but he wants the Government to pay a subsidy on feed.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. But it would mean we were going to feed the country under this plan; and they are not going to feed the people any other way.

Mr. McCORMACK. But the gentleman does agree that he wants all producers to get a subsidy except the dairy farmers.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. This does not apply to dairy farmers.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman know of anything that would be more demoralizing to market conditions, meaning to the producer, than for this Congress to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to do the very thing the majority leader just pointed out? I cannot imagine doing such a thing.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is not one of the very purposes for which the Commodity Credit Corporation was created that of going into a sinking market to buy commodities with the idea of stabilizing prices and thereafter to sell those commodities in the market place?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I have just a moment, and the thing I want to say is this: The real issue is whether or not we want to aid the producers in the drought areas. We can reach that issue when my amendment is offered to section 3 where it belongs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE: After the words "beef cattle", wherever they appear in the Hall amendment, insert "sheep, other livestock."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to use the 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment as proposed relates to dairy cattle, beef cattle, and poultry; but the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] calls attention to the fact that the same problem that exists as to beef cattle exists also as to sheep and in the range country of the West; and it seemed to me that this amendment is a perfecting amendment and that there should be no objection to it if the Hall amendment is to be adopted.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I readily accept the gentleman's amendment to my amendment. I merely want to say to the majority side that I do not want it on my conscience when these other people start blaming somebody for what will go on in the future, the famine that will go on throughout the country due to the lack of feed for these cattle that should form the basis of our food program.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the gentleman could also say that the same thing applies to turkeys, poultry, pet dogs, goats, to every living animal of man that uses protein feed. I want to ask this further question again: Does the gentleman know anything that would further demoralize the market and further demoralize production than to authorize a Government agency to dispose of hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of feedstuff at any price and on any terms that the Government agency may desire to do so?

Mr. CASE. I do not propose to enter into a general discussion of the subsidy question or of the gentleman's amendment in the few minutes I have, but it seems to me as a practical matter if you offer this opportunity for feed for beef cattle you should do it also for sheep in the same general range area.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. With regard to a subsidy being involved in this amendment, may I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that it certainly is not directed to that because the amendment expressly provides that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall charge such price as it sees fit.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman understand the language and the original purpose for which the Commodity Credit Corporation was created was to stabilize the farm prices at a time when we were in a depression?

Mr. CASE. Yes; that is my impression. I hope there will be no objection to the amendment to the amendment, if you intend to vote for the original amendment.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, may I point out this is a subsidy amendment whether you like it or not, because the whole plan by which the Commodity Credit Corporation has given subsidies up to this time is by a buying-and-selling arrangement. They buy at a high price and sell at a lower price and there is your subsidy. This amendment authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy at such prices and conditions as it may desire, and by so doing you simply give them the legal privilege of doing what you have in section 3 prevented their doing—that is, giving a subsidy to different feed grains.

Mr. DEWEY. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DEWEY. May I say that under the subsidy they buy at a high price and sell at a lower price.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. That is right.

Mr. DEWEY. Who pays the difference?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The Government pays the difference.

Mr. DEWEY. Where does the Government get its money?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. From the Commodity Credit Corporation. The gentleman knows that very well.

Mr. DEWEY. I know; but do not the taxpayers have to provide that money in the long run?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Oh, yes, there is no question about that. The Commodity Credit Corporation gets its money from the taxpayers.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I wish the gentlewoman would explain to the House that it is because of the support prices of pork

that they have used all the corn to raise hogs and we cannot get any for our poultrymen. This is a serious matter to me. My poultrymen demand this legislation. We cannot get feed because you have a support price for hogs. This ought to be named, "To provide for taking the feed away from the hogs."

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentlewoman states that this is a subsidy amendment. May I also point out that because the consumer gets the ultimate benefit from it, it is also a consumer subsidy.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Right.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentlewoman yield further?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Was not the same situation true when we authorized the release of Commodity Credit Corporation wheat? That was also a consumer subsidy?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I did not vote for that.

Mr. COOLEY. Well, I did.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I was going to say that it may be that there are some limitations in that act. I do not recall the amendment enough to say, but I do know in this there is absolutely no limitation except the kinds of grains involved. You can buy and sell feed and all these particular grains in the whole of the United States with any amount of subsidy desired. The amount is not limited.

Mr. COOLEY. Has that not been the normal operation of the Commodity Credit Corporation, buying at one price and selling at another?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. There are limitations to parity. We made loans there on the grain and then when the loan was taken over they sold, but if you will remember, there was a limitation on the amount. On cotton it was 300,000 bales a year. Those were all loan operations, but since they have gotten into these war subsidy programs, the milk program and other programs, they have all been buying and selling operations. I might add that the buying and selling operation such as described in this amendment is a typical operation in the subsidy programs of foreign countries.

Mr. COOLEY. Is that not what we authorized when we authorized disposition of the Commodity Credit Corporation wheat at a price less than the price fixed by law?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. If the gentleman is going to rake up all the bad laws of this Congress and say because we passed those we should start to operate under a system of subsidies and give any amount of subsidy, that is another matter.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentlewoman say that that Commodity Corporation wheat was a bad proposition?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I told the gentleman I voted against it. I do not care to enter into that discussion, but I do wish to point out to the gentleman from New York, who has a very sincere purpose in offering his amendment, that so far as the farmers are concerned the way not to get corn is to start this kind of subsidy proposition. You will get more corn if you raise the price of corn to, say 20 cents, because our farmers will produce fewer other nonessential commodities.

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Apropos of what the gentleman from North Carolina has just said, I call the attention of the gentlewoman to the fact that the Congress has not authorized the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of any of its stock except under certain limitations as to price contained in that legislation, whereas this amendment affords absolutely no limitation or directions at all as to prices and conditions.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I thank the gentleman. I felt sure there were limitations in every subsidy Congress has so far authorized, but I was not sure until the gentleman, who is a distinguished member of the Agricultural Committee, stated the proposition.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I have heard a lot of discussion here with respect to this bill being a political measure. Let us assume that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is adopted and it is admitted here that they can pay any price they want to and sell at any price they want to. What is to keep the Commodity Credit Corporation, if it wants to play politics, from paying $2 a bushel for corn in the Corn Belt of this country, covering 8 or 10 States, and selling it at 50 cents a bushel to the people who need it in other sections, and thereby controlling both sections of the country?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I can tell the gentleman something else that is at least equally serious. Our fight in the Middle West has been to try to get more meat by preventing the O. P. A. from driving our feeder industry out of existence.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER]?

There was no objection.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. We found during the first subsidy hearings that there was a deliberate intention not to have the cattle brought to the Middle West and the range cattle fattened there so as to get more meat. Since then we found what appears to be confirmation of that in the Gaumnitz committee report, a committee appointed by Secretary Wickard, only the conclusions of which report were released to the public, and the report suppressed. There they offer a program for food and say that according to their program it would contain less meat, fruits, oils, and sugar, but more cereals, beans, peas, and potatoes. They want Americans to eat a great deal more dried peas and beans, and few animal foods.

Under this amendment you give them a chance to monopolize the corn, if they go in conformity with this program as enunciated in this lengthy report, to wipe out our feeder industry so we will have even less meat than they are giving us today.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I have tried to follow the gentlewoman's remarks very carefully, but I cannot understand why in case this amendment is agreed to it changes the picture from what they are doing at the present time with feed that they are obtaining in Canada. They buy it at any price they want to buy it, and they sell it at any price that they want to sell it; do they not? That gives them a chance to carry on their bucket-shop operations with the domestic market the same as with the import market.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentlewoman has raised the objection to this amendment that it may possibly be a subsidy. Would the gentlewoman accept the amendment with this addition in the last sentence:

> Such distribution shall be made in such manner at no less than parity where sold and subject to such other terms and conditions as the board of directors of the Corporation shall prescribe.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. What the House wants to do is its own privilege, but I would object to it.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentlewoman would object to it anyway?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Yes, I would object to it for another reason. The price of corn might still be above parity, but still you would not have it high enough to get the kind of production you want. The reason you should insist on $1.20 for corn now, or around that, is that then we would not be producing things we do not need to give to the people to increase the food supply, but we would be producing more corn. As I pointed out the other day, according to this same report 7,000,000 more bushels of corn might be made available. A price increase in corn would increase supply.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I am, of course, anxious to get dairy feed into the East.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Yes; I know that.

Mr. REED of New York. That will benefit the whole country.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. We are eager to sell you the corn, too.

Mr. REED of New York. I cannot get excited over this so-called inflation as far as farm prices are concerned. From 1933, when we devalued gold, down to the present time every kind of a crackpot scheme has been dragged out of the corner that has failed elsewhere and it has been dusted off and put into operation to raise the prices of farm products, yet the minute they start to move up everybody goes into hysterics that that is going to cause inflation. They are making the farmer the goat, when all of the inflationary powers now possessed by anybody are in the hands of the President of the United States.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. That is what I tried to point out the other day. The very same pressure that has kept them on a cheap food program ever since they came to power is going to keep them from raising prices much if this bill passes.

Mr. REED of New York. It is doing it now. They just want to reduce the farmers to a degree of servitude, that is all.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. You will never get the chance, probably, because they will have the votes to support the veto, but if you do get this law you will see that O. P. A. does not raise the price of corn much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset may I say that I do not believe any agency of the Government which has been created in recent years has rendered a more valuable service to American agriculture than the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Some things that have been said in the course of the debate on this amendment clearly impugn the motives, the patriotism, the honor, and the integrity of those in charge of the Commodity Credit Corporation program. It does not stop there. The implications of some of the remarks made here on the floor of the House with regard to politics are such as even impugn the motives of the President himself.

I have some misgivings about subsidies but I am conscious of the fact that the release of Commodity Credit wheat was nothing more nor less than a direct consumer subsidy. I appreciate the fact that the release of that wheat relieved a very distressing situation throughout the length and breadth of this country, however.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York only authorizes the directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make available to dairy farmers, hog farmers, cattlemen, and poultrymen, necessary feed wherever there is an actual shortage of feed. Can it be said that Members of Congress want to tie up the feed resources of this Nation and prevent the movement of necessary feed into areas where there is a shortage? That is a clear-cut proposition. If this bill passes in its present form, I wonder just what will be the remaining powers of the Commodity Credit Corporation. We all know that it has saved the farmers on many markets.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman knows I do not oppose the Commodity Credit Corporation, but I do oppose the way they have taken an organization that is one of the most popular with Congress and used it to do things that were not intended by the farmers or the Congress originally.

Mr. COOLEY. Regardless of what they have done, I still believe that in good faith they were trying to serve those engaged in agriculture and at the same time prevent inflation in keeping with the present program of the present administration. I could very well vote for this committee bill and perhaps be somewhat consistent. Those of you who voted for O. P. A. said it would work well, but I was not convinced that it would work. I voted against O. P. A. and I voted against O. P. A. appropriations. I did not vote against it because the agency was accused of housing a lot of crackpots and screwballs. I voted against it for very fundamental reasons. I did not believe it would work and it has not worked, and the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives now, by this bill, confesses plainly and frankly that it has not worked. I dare say they would not vote for a repeal of the O. P. A. Frankly, I must confess that it has accomplished much more than I ever thought it would accomplish and it has done a much better job than I thought it would do. Now, let us look into this thing. What is evil and unholy about subsidies to farmers? We have subsidized practically everything else in America and I, for one, am reluctant to say to the President of the United States, to the Commander in Chief, and the War Food Administrator and the Commodity Credit Corporation, that they shall not have a free hand in the field of food production and distribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. I ask for 3 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the genteman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. I have voted for every defense measure that has been before this House, for every bill that has been recommended by the Military Affairs Committee and the Naval Affairs Committee. I voted for all the defense appropriation bills. I voted for one in excess of $70,000,000,000, more money than the human mind can even understand or comprehend. I do not want to put myself in the position today of saying I am unwilling for the Commander in Chief who has in the palm of his hand almost the life and the destiny of the fighting men of America and the very life of our own Nation, that he shall not have a free hand in the matter of food and food products.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The committee spent 3 months on this bill. Do you suppose the President spent that much time studying these things?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not know, but judging from the expressions on the floor I doubt very much if the Banking and Currency Committee fully understands the far-reaching ramifications of the bill they have presented to the House.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. For the gentleman's information, no public hearings were held on this bill. It was introduced after the hearing was over.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. If the House votes down the amendment to strike section 3 out of this bill, what would be your advice to a friend of the Commodity Credit Corporation, to vote with this section 3 left in it? I am going to vote against it. I am going to vote to take it out, but I am afraid I am going to get beaten. Now, after we are beaten, what are the friends of this great agency that has done so much for the farmers, going to do? Is it better to vote for it with section 3 left in it; or against it?

Mr. COOLEY. May I admonish my friend not to be faint of heart and pessimistic about the outcome?

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am in sympathy with the spirit that prompted the amendment by the gentleman from New York, and also by my friend the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS], but I do not see why we should be so restricted in our application of subsidies. Is it not a peculiar philosophy that will give a lot of subsidies to feed a cow and deny subsidies to feed a baby?

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman, but I do not consider either the Hall amendment or the Hays amendment a restriction or limitation upon the use of subsidies but rather a definite authorization to use subsidies for very definite and specific purposes.

Frankly, I do not look with much favor upon the use of subsidies but I hesitate to vote to prevent the use of subsidies. I shall, therefore, vote to strike out Section 3 which prevents the use of subsidies by the administration in its efforts

to prevent inflation. While I would much prefer for agricultural commodities to be sold for a fair price in the market place, if a further increase in commodity prices will have the effect of starting us down the primrose path which leads to devastating inflation, I certainly prefer the use of subsidies.

Congress directed the President to fix prices as of a past date, to wit, September 1942. In many instances prices have advanced since that date and it appears that it is impossible for him to carry out the mandate of Congress without inflicting punishment upon those who will suffer by a roll-back of prices unless subsidies are paid. If Congress does not want the President to carry out the mandate which it has given him, then Congress should say so in definite and specific language. If, on the other hand, Congress insists that prices be rolled back, then certainly it should permit the President to use subsidies in an amount sufficient to enable him to carry out the true intent and meaning of the law without inflicting unusual and harsh punishment upon innocent individuals who would be made to suffer if subsidies are not paid. If Congress does not want prices stabilized in this way, then it is the duty of Congress to offer a better method. Up until this time apparently no better method has been offered. If the bill passes in the form submitted by the committee and meets with a Presidential veto, it is my present intention to vote to sustain the veto. The pending amendment is a liberalizing amendment but, in my opinion, it does not go far enough.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have a dangerous scarcity of feed for poultry and dairy interests. On yesterday I received strong protests as to this condition. What should they expect me to do about it? I agree with my chairman that the Commodity Credit Corporation has the power, but do not have the courage to act. Because of the feed shortage and the support prices for pork, this condition obtains. Farmers are holding their corn to raise pork. The Commodity Credit Corporation does not have the courage to change the ceiling prices on corn, although there will be superfluous supply of pork. Courageous and sensible action is due on this matter.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman say that the Commodity Credit Corporation ought to change the prices or that the O. P. A. should change the prices?

Mr. GIFFORD. The O. P. A. and other advisory departments. We may hesitate to speak of the success of the O. P. A. in many of their activities. Fish sold at $4.50 a pound in my district a couple of days ago. Four dollars and fifty cents a pound. Those on which they had put ceiling prices brought probably 6 or 8 cents a pound, but those that did not have a ceiling price went up to $4.50 a pound. I do not have time at this moment to explain what has led up to that extraordinary condition, but there has been dismal failures on many other fronts. There has been a lack of courage to act on this feed question. I want to support the chairman of this committee, and his counsel that this is not the proper place to attempt to remedy the situation should be followed. This is not the place for such an amendment. However those who are worried about this feed question for poultry must see to it that something is done and done quickly. They are receiving, if you please, a subsidy in the matter of feed now. But they are not getting the feed. It takes more than this subsidy to move the corn. We should understand that this is a great surplus of pork and the desire to turn the corn into pork is causing this trouble. Do we not have a courageous department in Washington in charge of the matter who will take the bull by the horns and change the corn ceiling prices? We appeal to O. P. A. or the War Food Administration. Shall not those to whom we have delegated power not come to our rescue? I fear the time may come when we must legislate, simply to force action by the appointees of the Executive. We are in a very tough position, and wish to make more than a gesture. We must demand relief from the O. P. A.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Did I understand the gentleman to say that fish were selling for $4.50 a pound?

Mr. GIFFORD. $4.50 a pound.

Mr. COOLEY. For one pound?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes, and ordinary fish. That is the result of O. P. A. action.

Mr. COOLEY. They must have been goldfish or caviar.

Mr. GIFFORD. Well I am reminding you how successful your administration is with your activities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the monkey wrench in the machinery. It is a subsidy, pure and simple. We cannot pass upon the motive with which it is offered, but we do know that—whether by design or not—it will completely disrupt the plan and purpose for which this bill is drawn.

It is possible, of course, that there may be those who will vote for such amendments through conviction. But we may rest assured that, on the other hand, every man opposed to section 3 of this bill will approve the amendment. It will have the hearty and unanimous support of every enemy of farm parity.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we must protect this bill from amendments of every character—but we must especially protect the bill against this amendment. We earnestly ask all those who favor fair prices to farmers in the open market to vote against this amendment and all others similarly intended to hamstring and emasculate the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in sympathy with the purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALL]. The dairy and poultry producers on both coasts, particularly the northeast section of this country, face a very desperate situation. But I do not believe this is the proper method to approach this problem. I do not see, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has just said, how anyone can consistently vote for section 3 of this bill, and also vote for this amendment, because this is a subsidy. It is not only a subsidy, but it is a blind subsidy. There is nothing said as to what shall be paid for the feed that is purchased or the rate at which it shall be sold. We have in the past authorized the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell feed, but we have always imposed some limitation upon the price at which it might be sold.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. Not right now.

Now, the fundamental difficulty that has brought about this trouble is the O. P. A. ceiling on corn. That is at the bottom of the entire feed shortage in the United States today. We have a ceiling price on corn of $1.07 in Chicago, which means less than a dollar on the farm. While some corn is getting into commerce through black-market channels, on the whole, corn is being disposed of by being fed to hogs, because you can feed it to hogs and get $1.35 or $1.40 a bushel for it. No farmer is going to sell corn for less than a dollar, if he has hogs on his farm that he can feed it to and get $1.35 or $1.40 per bushel.

This ceiling on corn, contrary to the idea of the O. P. A., has not in any way kept down the price of feed. What has happened is that the price of other feeds such as wheat, rye, barley, and oats, has gone up to a point which is comparable to corn at $1.40 and $1.45 per bushel; so that the dairyman and the poultry producer who is now buying feed is paying for it at the rate of $1.40 or $1.45 a bushel. But he cannot get the feed that he needs the most and desires the most because it is all locked up in the corn bins out in the corn belt awaiting the time when it will be fed to hogs. That is the situation.

At the same time the War Food Administration states that from a food standpoint we need to increase the production of milk and eggs and to decrease the production of pork.

The remedy is to take the ceiling off of corn or at least to raise the ceiling on corn to a point where it will result in corn going on the market at a price that is comparable with other feeds; and until the O. P. A. recognizes that as the problem you are not going to solve this feed situation.

Miss SUMNERS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Is it not also true that if they do not make an arrangement within the next 2 or 3 months they will be past the season

where they can get what additional supplies would come from changing your crops and raising corn instead of a less essential crop?

Mr. HOPE. Yes. I think what the gentlewoman says is very true. The time that action should be taken is now. If it is not taken now we are going to have a very, very serious feed situation not only this winter but in the next crop season, as the gentlewoman from Illinois has pointed out; so until we can meet that fundamental situation, until the O. P. A. will see this thing in a realistic light there is not any way that we can solve this problem.

Corn is to the feed industry what steel is to the metal industry, and until we turn loose this great supply of corn and make it available we are going to have this tight feed situation of which we have heard so much today.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I hope the gentleman will make the time long enough to give 5 minutes to each Member who is on his feet.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I have done so.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I rise to ask if the request is to close debate on this particular amendment only or to all sections of the bill? I did not hear the request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, it has been well stated by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] that if this amendment is adopted, it destroys the purport and effect of section 3; you might as well have no section 3 in this bill if this amendment is adopted in its present form.

It has been well pointed out by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] that this amendment will destroy the price of many grains and commodities, such, for example, as corn. We have had this question up many times in our Agricultural Committee and on the floor. We are not impugning the motives of the Commodity Credit people, as has been suggested. But this agency in times past has gone into the wheat country and bought wheat at a high price and then they have taken it out into the corn country and sold it at a low price, way below the price of corn, the Government paying the difference. That tends to break the corn market. It is exactly like a laborer going over to a factory and cutting under the wage scale and agreeing to work for much less than the factory has been paying other workmen. The labor people have a name for this sort of conduct. They call this cheaper man a "damned scab." I never heard it called by the simple word "scab"; it is always "a damned scab." I would not use that naughty word myself, but I am just telling you how the labor people talk about scabs and scabbing. The Government should not buy wheat for a high price in the wheat areas and then bring it over to the corn areas and sell it at a price so as to break the corn market. The Government loses this money, and the corn farmer himself is taxed to help pay this loss.

If these Commodity Credit people under the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York can buy wheat for a high price and then sell it at such price as they desire, then the wheat—or whatever they buy—will go into the market as against other grains, such as corn, barley, rye, and soybeans, and thus destroy the market for such other grains.

In other words, in that state of affairs, the grain which they buy at whatever price they want to pay, and then take over into other areas and sell it at whatever price they want to sell, will be exactly like I have described before as scabbing, and such wheat—or other grain—will be like a scab in labor circles. All of us know that that is not a fair way for competition. If these Commodity Credit people would consent to sell the grain that they buy at no less than parity, it would be another proposition, but here the proposed amendment provides for sales, "at such price as the Commodity Credit Corporation may desire." They frequently have sold their purchases away down below parity. They buy wheat at $1.25 and take it over and sell it at 15 and 20 cents below the price of corn in my county and below the parity price for corn. They buy it for $1.25 and take it over there and sell it for 80 or 85 cents and break the price of corn. Corn was above the price that they were selling the wheat for. And the taxpayers and corn farmers pay the loss.

That is not fair, it is not honest, it is not even respectable; and unless this amendment is changed there is no person who should support it. It is not a fair amendment, it is a scab amendment by which they will do away with the whole purport and effect of paragraph 3 of this bill.

Mr. FORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman says they buy it at one price and sell it at another. Then the gentleman is for subsidies?

Mr. GILCHRIST. No, I am not. They could sell for practically nothing, but that would not be fair to the other competitive grain, such as corn. It would not be consumer or a producer subsidy anyway. It would not be any kind of a subsidy. It would be wrong.

Mr. FORD. Does the gentleman believe in subsidies?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I am not for that kind of a subsidy. It is not fair or even honorable. Nobody should be for such subsidies. The amendment would break the whole purport and intent of section 3 of this bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. They could also buy corn for $1.30 and sell it in New York or some other State for $1?

Mr. GILCHRIST. Yes, they could, under the amendment.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. In other words, as far as your particular district and State is concerned, they might pay $1.30 or $1.40 for corn?

Mr. GILCHRIST. Yes; they could come out to my district and give every lady enough for her corn to enable her to buy a diamond ring. The best we can do is to get substantially parity for corn and other grain under the legislation we have now. We do not get it. We are away below parity, notwithstanding the attempts that we made to cause the purchase of these commodities to be as high as parity. The proposed amendment is bad.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, stabilization should mean keeping prices on a level, and especially keeping them in the same relation to one another. The heart of it is to keep the cost of living prices on a level with wages. But what have we? Just the contrary, with too many agencies dealing with the subject of stabilization, with no teamwork and not geared together.

The American people are in the throes of the bureaucrats, with too much confusion and a lack of interrelated decisions, with too many bugs in it for those in control to know what it is all about, and impossible for the citizenship to understand.

I am almost overwhelmed when I realize whenever a farmer and a cattleman have a problem they suffer from confusion and indecision, with many additional expenses in disposing of their commodities, such as having to pay up to four to five times the average commission the average businessman charges for like services, a very rigid classification as to grade, with lots of rejects, and with delay, especially when perishable commodities are ready to be put on the market. I cannot with a clear conscience support a subsidy that will make the farmer and cattleman wards of the Government, with the packers and bureaucrats and labor leaders as their guardians. One will only have to look at a sales slip from your commission merchant now and 1 year ago to know who is getting the benefit of the subsidy on livestock to see that the producer is paying far more than his just share.

After all, I have not had one constituent to ask me to vote for a subsidy. On the other hand, I have had many on the opposition side of the issue.

We were told that parity prices to the farmers were very inflationary, notwithstanding it cost only a billion dollars. Yet an increase to one group of organized union strikers which got their demands will cost a like figure. That is not all. Many more organized groups are asking for an increase in wages, and in all probability they will get what they ask for, while the average unorganized citizen will have to suffer the directives which sentence American citizens to starvation if they fail to abide by the orders of certain bureaucrats, while daily strikes are occurring, while our brave soldiers are fighting for our liberty. Those of our fighting forces who are fighting for our liberty will have to continue their fight with the ballot to fully realize our American way of life. The C. I. O., A. F. of L., and other labor groups say we will have the worst inflation spiral known to civilization if the Congress does not vote a continuation of the subsidy program. Subsidies is just simply a hidden wage increase for the highest-paid organized union workers in the history of the world, with all the disadvantage to the average citizen.

If the cost of living has not been held down, what is wrong? Someone has not done their duty. When eggs are selling at 37 cents in Antlers, Okla., and for 75 cents at Washington something is wrong. The line against inflation has not been held. And by the same token the farmer has had his products held down and has not received just consideration.

In my opinion, the present law is ample to hold the line of stabilization of prices, which include wages as well as commodities, if you please.

Twice before I have voiced my views at length in opposition to subsidies, and will not here rehash what was then said.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri with reference to this particular amendment. There is no Member of Congress in either House who has more varied livestock problems confronting him than does the present speaker—poultry, hogs, beef and dairy cattle, goats, sheep, and all other kinds.

There is an old Spanish proverb: "De noche todos los gatos son pardos"—at night all cats are gray.

The truth is that the night of obscurity which confronts this House and this country has been brought over it by the tremendous confusion wrought by administrative agencies which have taken charge in truth and in fact of ways and means under and by which Americans in the past have been accustomed to doing business. It is with great difficulty that one can bring the mind to focus on the facts in a situation such as that which confronts us. Everybody knows simply and frankly that the bill we have before us is a bill which proposes to do one thing, stop the payment of subsidies, recognizing that all legislation deals with human beings and the things human beings produce, and with particular reference to the future of the human beings.

I am going to read something that happens to be St. John's translation of Plato, and it has a definite bearing on this situation. I hope I have time to explain it because I do not want to leave any wrong impressions here. I am not accusing anyone in this or in any other country of a desire to fix tyranny upon us on account of confusing the issues, however, with the possibility that if we continue to permit not only compounded confusion but the financing thereof, in spite of the best men this Nation affords, tyranny is inevitable.

This is from Plato, a fellow who once dealt in theories:

> Tyranny is not so much a form of government as political death, or sleep during which all conscious exertion of power is extinguished. The people, like a vast mass of brute matter, are fashioned by their tyrant into whatever form he pleases: he sends jugglers among them under the name of priests, who fill them with dreams favorable to tyranny: by the instrumentality of these men he darkens their minds, stupefies them with intellectual mandragora, and gradually plucks up by the root every free and manly and noble sentiment: ultimately, with more than Circean art, he transforms them into hogs, rings their noses, and turns them to grunt, feed, and fatten for his use in the sty of slavery.

Mr. Chairman, the confusion that is wrought in this great deliberative body which is the heart of your country and mine, which we love, is the thing that I condemn. There can be no compromise with principle. The situations involved here and to be decided here are simply this: This Nation is not for sale by subsidy or otherwise quite so cheap.

What I mean to convey is that regardless of how we may strive to save this great enterprise, we will fail unless we stop this proposal which will sap the very virtue of the people. Continued dependence on government for alms or support forges the very tools to serve the designs of ambition misdirected.

May I call back Thomas Jefferson to testify: "If we have a doubt relative to any power we ought not to exercise it."

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: On page 4, after line 21, insert:
>
> "SEC. 2A. Whenever the board of directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation determines that there exists in any area of the United States a shortage of feed for dairy cows, beef cattle, and poultry the Corporation is authorized and directed to acquire, or to release from its stocks, corn and other feed for distribution for feed for dairy cows, beef cattle, and poultry in such area. Such distribution shall be made in such manner, at such prices, and subject to such terms and conditions as the board of directors of the Corporation shall prescribe."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota to the pending amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. CASE to the Hall amendment: After the words "beef cattle" wherever they appear in the Hall amendment, insert "sheep, other livestock."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FORD) there were—ayes 22, noes 164.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 3. No funds appropriated to, borrowed by, or in the custody or control of any governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) shall be directly or indirectly used by or made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) to make any subsidy or other payment, or to pay or absorb losses, on any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part therefrom, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, either to reduce or maintain, or in lieu of increasing, maximum prices established on such commodities, except as provided in section 4 hereof: *Provided*, That with respect to any such commodities for which subsidy programs or support prices have been announced on or before October 13, 1943, such programs may be carried out and such support prices may continue to be maintained to the extent only that funds are available for such purpose under existing law, but not beyond December 31, 1943: *Provided further*, That support prices shall continue to be announced for any such commodities pursuant to section 4 of Public Law No. 147, approved July 1, 1941, as amended, and loans shall continue to be made pursuant to section 8 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, but any maximum prices heretofore or hereafter established for such commodities shall not be below the support prices therefor or below the prices specified in section 3 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942: *Provided further*, That none of the foregoing provisions shall apply to any payments or losses incurred in transactions with respect to competitive domestic vegetables oils and fats and oilseed.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, during the 10 long years of the present administration, the American economic system has persistently been injected with doses of inflation, through the reckless, wasteful squandering of the American taxpayers' hard-earned money.

With increasing billions of dollars, distributed in ever-increasing wages and salaries, it is no wonder the supply of money and the supply of goods available for purchase get out of balance. An unbalanced condition as between purchasing power in the hands of the people, and the purchasable amount of goods and services arises. The result—further inflation.

The Government can put ceilings on prices of labor and commodities, and maintain them if it likes. The President long ago was given the authority and the power by the Congress to do exactly that and to stop the rapidly growing inflation. Why has he not kept prices where they were when Congress gave him the right to do so? It would then have been comparatively easy to stop this thing. It is not too late even now. It can be done—and will be done—if he will summon the courage to meet his responsibility.

In the meantime, the Government goes on with its inflationary policy. Instead of going to the roots of the disease and curtailing unnecessary expenditures, the administration resorts to all kinds of subterfuges in order to postpone the day of reckoning until after the next general election. One of these devices is represented by governmental subsidies under a wide variety of forms. To conceal the fact that costs rise if they are not controlled, and that prices consequently must rise if production is to continue, the administration proposes to pay subsidies to producers and processors. The administration prefers to fool the public by suggesting that prices shall be rolled back on agricultural products and that the Government will pay the difference between rising costs and the sales price, and this at a time when our people—or most of them—have more money to spend for their needs than they heretofore have ever had. Now just who is the Government? It is you and I and everybody, isn't it? The President proposes to bribe us with our own money, doesn't he?

The Treasury Department, all along, has been trying to devise ways and means of siphoning off the surplus purchasing power in the hands of our people in order to stop inflation, so we are informed. The President's proposal to pay subsidies is a move in exactly the opposite direction. Again we find the New Deal moving in two different and conflicting directions at the same time.

Those who think this problem through will not be fooled by such a proposal. They will know that the subsidies, through the necessity of borrowing the money with which to pay them, will be added to the staggering national debt and to their tax bill, together with the costs of interest on the debt until that debt is paid. The cost of administering the subsidies will be substantial and will further increase our taxes and our debt. If this is done, the subsidies must be increased continuously in line with the growth of inflation. Subsidies do not prevent inflation. Subsidies add to inflation by pouring more purchasing power into the economic stream and by forcing the Government deeper and deeper into debt. Adopting the President's policy will be about as effective in reducing or stopping inflation as throwing gasoline on a fire in order to extinguish the same. It is high time that we all sober up and reject economic policies which have brought this rich and prosperous Nation to the very verge of bankruptcy and uncontrolled inflation.

Mr. Chairman, I have again reviewed the two measures known as the anti-inflation bills enacted by the Congress. Both these measures contain the exact provisions insisted upon by the President of the United States when they were before us. He assured the Congress and the country that if given these laws he could and would prevent inflation. No one questions his authority under the law to do exactly as he then promised to do. It must be perfectly apparent to everyone, however, that a rather large measure of inflation has developed since these powers were given to him. His failure to control the situation was not through lack of powers to do so but rather his neglect to exercise those powers. I think anyone familiar with all the facts will agree that if inflation has occurred—and it has—the responsibility therefor can be placed directly in the lap of the President of the United States. If further inflation takes place, the responsibility therefor will rest directly upon the President and not upon the Congress, as he would have the people of the country believe.

Mr. Chairman, the administration program of rolling back prices, of paying subsidies on the processing of farm products, of still further increasing our national indebtedness, and still further expanding the bureaucracy which at every hand stifles and irritates the people of the country, will, for the reasons I have set forth, induce inflation rather than prevent it. The President can stop inflation exactly where it now is. He needs no further legislation or power. Every day almost prices are changed by order of the W. P. A.

This represents the will of the President working through the agency which he himself set up for this purpose under the law. If he can fix the rent you pay—and he does—he can change prices, he can fix the prices of foods and keep them fixed exactly where they now are and thus stop the threat of run-a-way inflation.

Certainly he cannot do so through the medium of a policy which in itself is dangerously and inevitably inflationary.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONRONEY: On page 4, line 22, strike out the words "No funds" and insert "Until October 1, 1944, not more than $750,000,000 in the aggregate, and after that date no funds."

On page 5, line 10, after the colon strike out the balance of line 10 and all of lines 11 to 25, inclusive.

On page 6, strike out lines 1 and 2, inclusive, and insert *"Provided further*, That the authority to make any such subsidy or other payment, or to pay or absorb any such losses, except as provided in section 4, shall in no event extend beyond the date on which any general increase in wage rates is granted or approved by any agency or officer of the United States acting under authority of Public Law 729, approved October 2, 1942, in the amount greater than 15 percent of the rate of such wages in effect on January 1, 1941."

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Oklahoma be extended 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered in the hope of finding some middle ground in which Congress can play a part in helping to prevent the tide of inflation from swamping us.

I think we have heard enough debate in the past several days to realize that this is a very complex and dangerous question. I feel that Congress must take part in the prevention of inflation and that we dare not fail to do just that.

This amendment is drawn by the Legislative Drafting Service. It did not come up from downtown and I do not yet know whether it pleases anybody in any of the administrative offices downtown. It is the result of two long hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency that have stretched out for almost 6 months, in which the subject of subsidies has been thoroughly examined and studied by the members of that committee.

FEAR MISUSE

When you resolve most of the difficulties over opposition to the subsidy, you find that they are based on fear and on the feeling that these subsidies will be abused. It is to prevent those abuses that I have tried to restrict this amendment and give this mandate by Congress for limited and judicious use of the subsidies.

As to the amount, I have tried to tie that up to the limitation so that it would extend the present rate of subsidies, plus enough barely to cover the flour and bread subsidy, because I feel that if we allow bread to go up a penny or 2 cents a loaf, with the dangerous situation we have on the labor front today, we are then putting the match under the powder keg of inflation.

And so I think any consideration of subsidies should make allowance for that one, because bread and flour are now in a terrific squeeze. The second proposition is, I think we should limit it as to time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. What situation would make it necessary to increase the price of bread?

Mr. MONRONEY. Because wheat has gone up far beyond the amount on which the level price of bread is now based.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman will permit the observation we sold wheat in 1920 at $2.40 a bushel and bread was 10 cents a loaf. A few years later wheat was 30 cents a bushel and bread was 10 cents a loaf. Today wheat is at $1.35 a bushel on the farm and bread is still 10 cents a loaf. What is the effect of giving a man a few more cents a bushel on wheat?

Mr. MONRONEY. I will say to the gentleman the figures by the millers indicate—and are convincing—they must raise the price of flour to bakers and the bakers are at the breaking point now on their present price of bread. And so if you do not include money for bread subsidies you are going to have to see that price go up.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There were no subsidies when wheat went from 30 cents to $2.40 and bread was still 10 cents a loaf.

LIMIT AS TO TIME

Mr. MONRONEY. As to the time, I believe Congress wants to take control and keep control of the use of subsidies and for that reason we ought to bring the agency back at the earliest possible time it is practicable to examine and find out just how these programs are being used within the limits we provide.

So I provide authority to use subsidies which expire on September 30, 1944. I would have them expire earlier, but we dare not split the crop-growing season in the middle because in that way it would do great damage to the war food production. So the date of September 30 is about the earliest date we can reasonably make it expire.

Do not overlook the fact their use will be examined with a fine-tooth comb, gentlemen, because the Price Control Act expires the 30th of June next year. Hearings will probably start in March of this coming year, so the congressional committees will be busy studying and examining and watching the operations of the subsidy program and other operations of the O. P. A. during that period.

TIES TO WAGE FORMULA

Now I would like to come, if I might, to what I think is the most important point of my amendment, and that is a sincere conscientious effort to tie into permission to use subsidies a mandate that the Little Steel formula must be sustained. I will agree with anyone it is a very difficult proposition to write this into law. I will agree my language must be general.

But it incorporates the basic components of the Little Steel formula and provides that with any general increase in wage and salary rates above the January 1, 1941, level, that is in excess of 15 percent, when that line is crossed then the authority to use subsidies ends.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. I am in hearty accord; if we could tie this to some wage level that would be fine. Has there ever been a general wage level increase in the United States?

Mr. MONRONEY. Definitely.

Mr. POAGE. When?

Mr. MONRONEY. The whole Little Steel formula was a general wage increase.

Mr. POAGE. It was not a general increase. There were lots of people in this Nation who did not get an increase. If we were to pass a piece of legislation of this kind, and if these departments do not then interpret that to mean you have got to give every human in the United States from German war prisoners to President Roosevelt, some increase before they will agree that there has been a general wage increase, I will be greatly surprised.

Mr. MONRONEY. I cannot agree with the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. We are not going to have a general wage increase for all groups in the Nation at any one time. You have got to tie your formula down to a certain number of people. The coal-mine increase was not a general wage increase. Although it involved 600,000 people it was not general. It did not apply to the men on the railroads because they are now threatening to strike for higher wages, so you did not get a general increase when you got the wages of 600,000 workers increased.

Mr. MONRONEY. In answer to the gentleman I would like to say that 2 or 3 more fractures of the wage line, such as have already taken place, will bring about a general wage increase. You might as well try to say you cannot see a Mack truck going down the street, because when they fracture the line on 1 or 2 more occasions there will be 1,000,000 labor cases in the lap of the War Labor Board and to surmount this terrific pressure and threat to strike there will have to be a general declaration and moving up of the wage line.

I feel that the language, in view of the practical situation that we face, is as tight as it can possibly be made.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman is the author of the amendment in question. When he states on the floor what he means by "a general increase" is not an increase all over the United States, but an increase for one industry or for one union. I believe that those words are what the gentleman intends when he said, "general wage increase," are they not?

Mr. MONRONEY. A general breaking of the Little Steel formula. It will be impossible to move that line without it being soon determined by every Member of the House, and by the Comptroller General, who will have to pass on this. So the matter is self-enforcing, because the situation is in such condition that you cannot make many specific adjustments without notice when you are in a wartime economy.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. Does the gentleman consider that the wage increase granted the coal miners was a general increase?

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe it will bring about demands for a general wage increase.

Mr. POAGE. But the gentleman evidently does not consider that a general wage increase as does the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Now would the gentleman tell us just how many people would have to be involved before there would be a general wage increase? The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] gave his idea of what would constitute a general wage increase, and he was putting words into your mouth to the effect that if one union got a wage increase that was general. But you say that is not what you mean. How many people would have to be involved before there would be a general wage increase?

Mr. MONRONEY. I hate to disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. You are not disagreeing with me. Just answer my question.

Mr. MONRONEY. In a practical situation you cannot violate the Little Steel line on occasions and not find yourself in a position that will make you move forward the whole wage line. I feel for that reason you should not try to tie it in to specific, individual wage increases, because there are constant minor adjustments going on.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman say how many people he would figure must be affected before we would have a general wage increase under the terms of his amendment? I want to see what his amendment means.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am saying to the gentleman that the matter is self-enforcing, because any wage advance has an effect on the Little Steel formula that brings such repercussions to force forward that entire line.

Mr. POAGE. It cannot be self-enforcing, because the men down in the Commodity Credit Corporation have got the power to use this money until they agree that there has been a general wage increase.

Mr. MONRONEY. The War Labor Board is concerned with the wages of 45,000,000 men. If you think you can raise 600,000 men here, 300,000 men there, and 400,000 in another place, and have them still hold the wage-formula line, you are mistaken, because they will have to move that line forward. There is no other way, from a practical standpoint, that you can handle this difficult wage freeze that you have got.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Over a year ago wages went up 16 percent.

Mr. MONRONEY. You mean from January 1 to May 1?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. From May to May 1943. Would you consider that a general wage increase?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am driving at the Little Steel formula. My friend from Illinois knows that on many occasions whole industries raised 25 percent from January 1 to that date, but I am talking about the Little Steel formula. I think this amendment answers the chief criticism.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. But you do not answer me and you did not answer the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MONRONEY. I have answered to the best of my ability.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Reserving the right to object, I understand there is an attempt being made to finish this bill this afternoon. The gentleman has spoken under general debate, as we have all spoken. It is not my thought to cut off any debate, but the gentleman has already had 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Well, I do not want to be in the position of objecting.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I object, Mr. Chairman. In support of my colleague, I object.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Do not think you are supporting me, because I am not going to object.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, on my own account, then, I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment is peculiarly objectionable because it would put the stamp of approval by Congress on the payment of consumer subsidies in the first place. It would then limit the program to $750,000,000.

I have said repeatedly that if the time ever came when this Congress adopted a consumer-subsidy program, then we should have the courage to give the administration sufficient money with which to carry it out. Do not think you are going to hide behind any political bogeyman by voting for this amendment, because if you think you are, let me tell you something. You will put the stamp of approval on the payment of consumer subsidies. Then you have said to the administration "All you can use is $750,000,000." So it puts the administration politically in the position of telling you that although you put the stamp of approval on consumer subsidies they could not prevent inflation because you did not give them money enough; so that disposes of that question.

The amendment destroys the support program; it destroys the loan program. The language on page 5 between lines 10 and 24 is stricken from the bill. The sponsor of this bill has been opposing the prohibition against consumer subsidies from the very moment that the bill was introduced; so I do not think he is sympathetic with our philosophy of price control and price fixation. He destroys the support program, and everyone who would vote for the Monroney amendment would vote to destroy the program by which agricultural prices are supported which results in obtaining the maximum amount of production.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I cannot yield at the moment.

Mr. MONRONEY. But the gentleman mentioned my name.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am going to mention it again sometime perhaps but I will never do it in vain, I can assure the gentleman. I have deep respect for him.

It destroys the program whereby a floor of 90 percent may be placed under agricultural prices. This is the so-called Steagall amendment to the Commodity Credit Corporation Act assuring farmers that if they are encouraged to expand production of nonbasic as well as basic commodities that they would be assured of at least 90 percent of parity. He destroys that program.

The gentleman from Oklahoma has been telling you that you should vote in favor of subsidies because of a large fixed-income group which would suffer if you did not. All right; he predicates the suffering of this fixed-income group upon some deficiency of administration in the Price Control Act and when the so-called Little Steel formula is punctured then he makes no provision for the little fellow, he makes no provision for the white-collar worker, the fixed-income worker, or anyone else whom he says would be peculiarly affected if we do not pay subsidies. How does he reconcile these two theories? He reconciles his amendment with his endeavor to defeat this bill and for no other reason.

When is the Little Steel formula punctured? I listened with a great deal of interest to the colloquy which has just taken place as to what the Little Steel formula is. Does it apply generally? Does it apply to specific industries? Do subsidies stop when it is punctured through in any particular place? Or must all wages on the average increase more than 10 or 15 percent, or whatever he says in his amendment, before the subsidies will be stopped? These are things which are so nebulous, so cloudy, so uncertain that we just cannot afford to adopt this language and leave it to the administrators to interpret it in any manner they see fit.

We provided last October 2 a stabilization program. We said that wages and salaries should be stabilized on the highest which was paid between January 1 and September 15, 1942.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not; I should like to answer the gentleman and also expect to ask for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I will not object to anyone's having 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We told the O. P. A., the administration, to stabilize wages and salaries at the highest amount paid between January 1 and September 15 1942; but we said, "You cannot set them below that; you can go above that if they make a showing of necessity." In an Executive order the administration provided that in hardship cases they could discuss whether wages were high enough in any particular case before the War Labor Board, and salaries I believe before the Treasury Department. We stabilized on that basis all salaries and wages paid between January 1 and September 15, 1942. On the other hand we said to the agriculturists, "We are going to stabilize your prices upon this comparable level; we are going to give you the same benefits." We said to the President, "You may stabilize agricultural prices, but you cannot put a maximum price below parity." The formula was parity to the farmers, the highest price paid to the workingman. There was stability. If the President, if the Administrator of the price-control law had held to that line then as you directed him to there would not be this chaos today. If they had held the wages and salaries except in cases of gross inequities to the highest paid between January 1 and September 15, 1942, and if they had kept agricultural prices at parity, then no one could have objected; the wage earner could not have objected, the salary earner could not have objected, the farmer could not have objected. We gave him the authority to make adjustments to correct gross inequities, to increase war production; and we said that if it was necessary to make adjustments upward to obtain a maximum amount of production then he should raise the prices.

Mr. Chairman, this question of whether we should raise the prices to absorb these increased costs of production or not was settled by this Congress in the October 2, O. P. A. Act. This whole question has once been before this Congress and settled. If there are deficiencies in the price scheme today, if there are deficiencies which result in our not getting sufficient food or sufficient of any commodity, it surely is not in the fact that Congress has not given the authority to the administration to do the job. The deficiency lies in the fact that the Price Administrator, the War Food Administration, and several others perhaps have not been judiciously and courageously administered. Do you want to know what the alternative program is? The alternative program to consumer subsidies is a courageous and judicious enforcement of the Price Control Act. We are all for price control, everyone of us. Any Member of this House who is not in favor of some price-control authority does not know what he is talking about. They have kept down prices, they have done a fairly good job, but I do not intend to allow them, if I can help it, to pay consumers' subsidies for the purpose of covering up the mistakes which they have made in the administration of this law.

This amendment should be defeated.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

NO MEMBER CAN ANSWER THE CHALLENGE THAT IT IS EITHER SUBSIDIES OR HIGHER COST OF LIVING

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, day after day on the floor of this House I have asked any Member, the minority leader, or the distinguished gentleman who just addressed you, or any other Member of this body, to offer an alternative for the use of subsidies. I would like to hear it and the country would

like to know it. Up to this good day no such alternative has been offered. I want to say that there is no alternative. You must either increase the cost of living or not encourage the production of food or pay a subsidy. After 2 weeks, if no one can answer, we must presume there is no answer.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I shall not be able to yield to anyone for the present.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman is definite.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, there is a question before us and the country today that is as serious as our No. 1 problem. Our No. 1 problem is the winning of the war. Our No. 2 problem is the prevention of ruinous inflation. It is possible for us to take a step here today that will carry us into the type of runaway inflation that will destroy the value of our money, that will make it not only possible but probable for us to absolutely lose the war not only on the domestic front against inflation but on the foreign fronts as well. People will not work and will not produce if they are only offered money that will not buy anything—worthless money. So along with inflation you have worthless money.

What is the alternative for worthless money? A dictatorship, something we say we all fear and dread. There is no other way on earth for a country to come out of inflation except through a dictatorship. So today it is possible for us to start on the road not only toward ruinous inflation and the possible loss of the war but also to take a step, a long step, in the direction of a severe dictatorship in order to bring us out of that ruinous inflation.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] mentioned that the President has been given the power and the authority to stabilize prices and wages and enforce the law. If he does not do it, of course the blame for the lack of use of that power is upon him. May I say that it is true we did a very unusual thing. We passed a law here which issued a directive to the President of the United States and stated that the President is directed to stabilize wages and prices and the cost-of-living items and salaries. We directed him to do that. Yet we turn right around and take away from him the weapons and tools that he could use for that purpose.

When the O. P. A. appropriation bill came up the same people who are fighting subsidies today voted to decrease that appropriation bill by almost $30,000,000, a sufficient amount to take away from the President the weapons and the tools with which he could enforce the very law that we had directed him to enforce. How can you blame one for not enforcing a law when you take away from him the weapons? You might as well tell our boys down in the South Pacific, "You are authorized to whip the Japs, but we are taking all the guns and ammunition away from you. We are not giving you anything." That would be an analogous situation.

When the O. W. I. bill came up here, that agency was doing a marvelous job teaching the people the evils of inflation and how to keep it down. They were flooding the country with good information and the people were observing it. But when that appropriation bill came before this body, the same people who are now denouncing subsidies and who are trying to cut them out of the present law were successful in passing an amendment that destroyed entirely, 100 percent, that part of O. W. I. which was doing a marvelous job teaching the people the benefits of combating inflation.

So while we have given the President the power, we have taken away from him the weapons and the tools he could use with which to get the job done which we assigned to him to do. Therefore, the criticism comes with very poor grace from the Congress after passing a law directing the President to do something, then passing appropriation bills here so low and with no appropriation in some cases, thereby making it impossible for him to enforce that law.

What about these subsidies? Let me invite your attention to how inconsistent this very bill is. The present bill, if passed by the solid Republican minority vote, and they will pass it because they have the united strength of their party and they also have some strength on the Democratic side, will it mean you are passing a bill against all consumer subsidies? No. We will still pay hundreds of millions of dollars of the fuel bill of the New England people. There is nothing in here against that. The same people who are voting to help pay the fuel bill of New England, the same people who have endorsed helping pay the rent bill for people all over the country, the same people who endorsed helping pay the food bill, if you please, in this very bill if they will eat certain foods, are here trying to cut subsidies out of this bill. Read the last provision of this bill and you will find that it has a big exemption in there. It will include probably $100,000,000 worth of products. You will be voting to help pay their food bill if they eat oleomargarine or if they eat Crisco or if they eat anything that is made from vegetable oils, fats, or oilseeds. That is perfectly all right, you say, so far as consumer subsidies are concerned. Is that not inconsistency for you? You get up here and say if it is made of lard or any other product of an animal, it is extremely wrong, it is bribery; it should be denounced, it should not be tolerated, but in the same bill you say if it is made out of certain products it is perfectly all right and it is not a consumer subsidy.

May I warn you, Mr. Chairman, this bill is far reaching. It goes beyond just the immediate few subsidies involved here. I cannot feature these people from the dairy sections, for instance, voting to subsidize oleomargarine and saying that it may be sold for 1 cent a pound. It is possible under this bill to subsidize Crisco and it may be sold for 1 cent a pound. It is possible to do that under this bill, but you are not willing for your dairy farmers to have the benefits of this same money and the same theory and principle of government that you are willing for the others to have. If it is fair for one it is fair for the other. I say it is fair for both.

SUPPLY AND DEMAND IS INFLATION

I know that many people say that the alternative for this is supply and demand. Any person who says that deliberately either is misinformed or he is for inflation. There are no ifs, ands, or buts about that. Are you going to have supply and demand in a country like we are in now at war when a large part of everything is being bought up by our Government and a large part of the rest is bought up for lend-lease? There is no competitive market now. It is a seller's market, it is not a buyer's market, therefore the law of supply and demand would only work to ruinous, runaway inflation. It is my hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] will be adopted, but if it is not adopted I hope to have the privilege of offering an amendment striking out all of section 3 later on after all of the perfecting amendments have been passed on.

For the present I sincerely hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] will be adopted, which will make subsidies ineffective if the Little Steel formula is broken. There is protection there for everybody. That line must be held. If it is not, under the Monroney amendment this will be null and void and subsidies will be taken off. So I believe the Monroney amendment should be adopted.

I am inserting herewith five letters from very prominent officials of our Government who support my views on this subject. They are as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., November 23, 1943.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: I would have answered your letter sooner except for the fact that I have had to be out of town.

There is no question in my mind that it is of paramount importance to all of us that the cost of living be kept within some control. It is particularly important to those in the lower income brackets with fixed incomes. Within this group I would include the dependents of many of the men in the armed forces. Accordingly, I am in favor of such reasonable steps as may be necessary to accomplish stability in our cost of living though I fear that this will become more and more difficult if we fail to hold the line in wages as well.

Whether subsidies are the soundest or most effective steps to accomplish this, I frankly do not know. I understand, however, that within limits subsidies have proved successful in both England and Canada, where there is a controlled relationship between the cost of living and wages. To the extent that subsidies are in force in this country I am told that they have been effective in checking the rise in some food costs and at the same time in encouraging maintenance of production.

In these circumstances, having applied the principle of limited subsidies for some time, I think it would not be advisable at this time completely to prohibit them as is contemplated in the proposed amendment to the bill extending the Commodity Credit Corporation. But an effective use of sub-

sidies on the one side, presupposes an effective wage control on the other. If the present spread between ceiling prices of certain foods and the cost of production is to be no longer subsidized, or if we are unsuccessful in holding the line in wages, then either production will have to suffer or else ceiling prices will have to be lifted. It seems to me that neither alternative would be acceptable at this time.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, November 17, 1943.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: I am glad to have the opportunity to express my opinion that the expenditure of Federal funds to stabilize the cost of living is not only wise and proper, but the failure to permit the continued use of this device may have serious consequences to the country.

There is nothing novel in the use of subsidies to achieve some desired objective of national policy. Certainly the stability of living costs is a matter of deep concern not only to the families of our fighting men, but to war workers in the shipyards and on the production lines. We are spending unprecedented sums for naval and military purposes. If the cost of living can be maintained at present levels, the necessity for wage adjustments is thus minimized. If living costs are permitted to increase and wages adjusted to meet that increase, the cost of the war will likewise increase. I therefore consider appropriate substantial payments to stabilize food costs a sound investment.

Congress has recently increased the allotments for the dependents of servicemen. I am advised that the pending proposal to extinguish subsidy program would result in immediate increases in the cost of living. Therefore it would not seem desirable to nullify the effects of this increased allotment by permitting food costs to go up. I am hopeful that Congress will sanction the use of every tool to achieve stability in wartime. Subsidies are an important tool that have been used by every belligerent nation to attain maximum production and preserve stability in the price structure. We cannot afford to take the risks which would flow from further increases in the cost of living. I am glad to add my voice in support of the policy which you are seeking to protect.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK KNOX.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., November 18, 1943.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Committee on Banking and Currency,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: This is in reply to your letter to me of November 11, asking for an expression of my views with respect to the bill H. R. 3477 extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation with particular reference to section 3 which would prohibit, with certain exceptions, after December 31, 1943, any agency of the Government from using public funds for subsidies for agricultural commodities or commodities processed in whole or in part therefrom.

The war production program at this time would be seriously imperiled if existing price and wage stabilization machinery is removed. An increase in food costs would affect the morale of those war workers who would find food increasingly difficult to obtain. It will be extremely difficult to hold the wage control line if food prices go up to any marked degree. Any dislocation in the labor situation at this time will severely impede the maintenance of existing production rates.

On industrial fronts, subsidies have been successfully used to obtain increased production at minimum prices in a wide variety of fields. After reviewing this matter, I have come to the conclusion that a continuation of the payment of public funds to producers or intermediate processors will have a substantial effect in preventing a widespread increase of food costs that might otherwise result. For these reasons, I feel that the continuance of the subsidy program is essential to the national well-being. If it is not continued, unrest in war plants may result from uncontrolled food prices and gravely retard war production. For these reasons, I disapprove the proposed section 3 of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill.

Sincerely,

DONALD M. NELSON, *Chairman.*

NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD,
Washington, D. C., November 22, 1943.

The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PATMAN: I am glad to reply to your request for my views on the proposed amendment to the bill extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which would prohibit the use of public funds for subsidies on agricultural commodities.

In my opinion the Congress is on the threshold of making a decision which will affect the daily life of every American. Rises in the price of food since the Congress acted in October 1942 to maintain prices and wages at September 15, 1942, levels have already reduced the standard of living of many of our citizens and increased the privations of those on low, fixed incomes.

Since May 1943 careful use of Federal funds has enabled the Government to guarantee fair prices to the farmer and at the same time reduce the cost of certain foods for the consumer. The amendment to which you refer would end this program. Food prices at the grocery store would once again resume their upward march and the privations which I have mentioned would increase. The immediate effect, I am informed, would be a 7-percent rise in the price of food and a 3-percent rise in the over-all cost of living.

Bu this would only be the first act of a national tragedy. Such increase in the cost of living would inevitably renew the tragic race between wages and prices.

The cost of the war will shoot higher as the value of the dollar drops and takes down with it the savings of our people and the allotment checks for the families of men in the armed forces. The letting and performance of war contracts will be bedeviled by the uncertainty of future prices. In short we shall suffer all the evils of a rising spiral of inflation.

In passing the act of October 2, 1942, the Congress showed great wisdom in protecting our citizens from such a calamity. I find it difficult to believe that the Congress at this date would undermine its own good work and subject our people to the suffering which would follow such a blow to the national economy.

In closing may I call your attention to the following paragraph from a resolution unanimously passed by the War Labor Board on June 29, 1943:

"This increasing cost of food gravely affects the wage stabilization program of the National War Labor Board. The Board believes that its established wage stabilization policy is effective. It believes that policy should be carried forward in full cooperation with the other agencies of government responsible for the other factors of the over-all economic stabilization program. But the Board states with all the emphasis at its command that its wage-stabilization program calls for a prompt carrying forward of announced policies of the administration affecting the cost of food. In the considered opinion of the Board, this is essential to the success of national economic stabilization.

"Subsidies are among the instruments which have proved effective to control food prices. The War Labor Board unanimously supports the administration's intention to use those and all appropriate measures in its food price policy."

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. DAVIS, *Chairman.*

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION,
Washington, D. C., November 22, 1943.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: This is in response to your request for an explanation of the effect section 3 of the bill, H. R. 3477, would have upon the sugar programs administered by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

In order to assist growers in maintaining sugar production in the continental United States in the face of increased production costs, provision was made for increasing growers' returns from the 1943 crop sugar beets by about $1.50 per ton over returns from the 1942 crop. This program is implemented by contracts between the Commodity Credit Corporation and sugar beet processors under which, in order to avoid an increase in the price of sugar to consumers, the Corporation will absorb the increase in producers' returns. A similar program has been adopted for Louisiana sugarcane. In addition, the Commodity Credit Corporation is absorbing increased costs of marine and war-risk insurance, ocean freight, handling charges, and internal rail transportation in order to permit sugar from offshore, domestic, and foreign areas to be sold to consumers at existing ceiling prices. The estimated cost of this program for the 1943 crop season is $50,000,000.

The increase of about $1.50 per ton in producers' returns for sugar beets is equivalent to about one-half cent per pound of sugar produced from the beets. In order to provide this increased return to the producers through a rise in the price of sugar, it would be necessary to permit an increase of approximately 1 cent per pound of sugar at retail. The reason for this difference is that producers have sold their crop to sugar beet processors under contracts which provide that the processor will receive on the average about 40 percent of the proceeds from the sugar produced and, further, that the margins of retailers and other distributors are computed on a percentage basis.

An increase of 1 cent per pound on the quantity of sugar which is expected to be available for use by domestic civilian consumption in 1944 would amount to about $105,000,000. The price increase on the quantity of sugar which would be used for governmental purposes would equal about one-half the cost of the sugar subsidy payments. Because of the increase of about $105,000,000 in expenditures by domestic consumers for sugar and products in which sugar is used, more than the remaining one-half of the present loss woud be represented by increases to the Government in purchases of other products. Thus, the elimination of the subsidy payment on sugar would mean a net increase in the public debt as well as increased costs to consumers.

For 1944 the net governmental cost of eliminating the subsidy would be even greater than indicated above because of slightly higher prices to beet producers and

slightly lower transportation costs for imported sugar. While there is nothing in section 3 that would require higher prices to beet producers, slightly higher prices probably will be necessary in order to get the needed increased production. For reasons obvious from the above, higher prices for beets or even the present prices would be difficult to justify if the subsidy payment is eliminated.

I understand it has been suggested that the present program for sugar beets and continental sugarcane could be continued or a similar program inaugurated under the authority of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, which authorizes buying and selling commodities or making subsidy payments to domestic producers as may be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production. This suggestion appears to overlook the fact that section 3 of the bill now under consideration would prohibit the use of any funds by any agency to carry out activities of this character with respect to any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or in substantial part therefrom. If the bill were enacted the effect, I believe, would be to require either that the price of sugar be advanced, with the consequences outlined above, or that support prices to producers be reduced to the level reflected by existing ceilings.

Sincerely yours,

J. B. HUTSON, *President.*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], who has spoken, I realize the probable result of the vote that will be taken today, but the fight that is being made has far-reaching consequences and the final results will probably be decided on another day. The debates on this occasion will probably play an important part on the final conclusion at a later date on this legislation.

This bill is more far-reaching in its drasticness than the bill the President vetoed 4 or 5 months ago. While I have no knowledge as to what action will take place if the bill in its present form or in substantially its present form is presented to the President, it is a reasonable inference to draw that if he vetoed a bill less drastic 4 or 5 months ago similar action awaits this bill.

I have here an interesting letter dated November 20, signed by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, which reads as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington 1, D. C., November 20, 1943.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCCORMACK: I am appealing through you to the Members of Congress to support the President's recommendation that the serious threat of inflation be met in a constructive way and that authority be given him to control it through the payment of subsidies. It seems inconceivable that Congress should fail to enact necessary legislation providing for the payment of subsidies. One may well ask the question, "What other or better plan can be offered?"

The mounting price of food has already reached the point where it constitutes a serious menace. At the same time the need for increasing production of farm commodities and food items is obvious. That need can be met through the payment of subsidies and by doing so the serious threat of inflation can be successfully met. The farmers of the country are willing to accept subsidies from the Government during peacetime periods when conditions are normal. That fact is reflected through the payment of the Government for the limitation of acreage in crop production and through payments to farmers under the administration of the A. A. A. If they were willing to accept subsidies no matter in what form they were paid during normal peacetime periods, why should they object to the payment of subsidies now when conditions are abnormal and the shadow of destructive inflation hangs heavily over the Nation.

The six and a half million members of the American Federation of Labor support the President in his recommendation and appeal to Congress for the enactment of legislation authorizing the payment of subsidies. In behalf of this great production force, these millions of working men and women, I appeal to Congress to support and vote for the enactment of subsidy-payment legislation.

Very sincerely yours,

WM. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

In connection with the dangers of inflation, I am going to present some facts that appeal to me. We must bear in mind, first, the consumer goods available; and, second, the national purchasing power.

Individual incomes for 1943 will total $142,000,000,000, of which $18,000,000,000 will be siphoned off by taxes. This leaves $124,000,000,000 or $125,000,000,000 to compete for a maximum of $90,000,000,000 in goods and services for people to buy. We can see that about $35,000,000,000 is left in dangerous money, which unless checked, may bid against one another and lead to the spiral of rising prices and wages until everybody's dollar is hopelessly devalued. We must keep in mind that everybody's dollar is in danger of being hopelessly devalued. This means farmer, worker, businessman, industry, and Government.

What about the millions of the poor and those in the fixed-income class who have not benefited by any increase of wages as a result of the war? While national income will be about $142,000,000,000, that does not mean that the income of every individual has increased. There are millions of persons who receive no benefit and yet who will suffer as a result of a sharp rise in prices, if such should take place, as I consider inevitable if this bill passes barring subsidies.

Statistics also tell us that 81 percent of this national income goes to those receiving $5,000 a year or less.

We must also keep in mind that in the last war there were 4,000,000 men under arms, and in this war there are 11,000,000 men under arms. The total war expenditure in the last war was $32,000,000,000, and in this war it is estimated to be $250,000,000,000.

The peak fraction of national production devoted to war in the last war was 30 percent, and in this war it is 50 percent. The peak fraction of industrial output devoted to war in the last war was 40 percent, and in this war it is 70 percent.

The growth of excess purchasing power is shown by the following figures—and these are interesting facts:

In 1939 the consumers' disposable income was $67,700,000,000; consumers' expenditures, $61,700,000,000; excess purchasing power, $6,000,000,000.

In 1940 the consumers' disposable income was $73,200,000,000; consumers' expenditures, $65,700,000,000; excess purchasing power, $7,500,000,000.

In 1941 the consumers' disposable income was $88,200,000,000; consumers' expenditures, $74,600,000,000; excess purchasing power, $13,700,000,000.

In 1942 the consumers' disposable income was $108,800,000,000; consumers' expenditures, $81,900,000,000; excess purchasing power, $26,900,000,000.

The preliminary estimate for 1943 is that the consumers' disposable income will be $125,000,000,000; consumers' expenditures, $90,000,000,000; excess purchasing power $35,000,000,000.

We can see from these figures the danger of excess purchasing power of dangerous money toward inflation unless checked.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman—and I shall not object—may I ask the majority leader if some of us who have been waiting around for 3 legislative days can, before the debate is over, have an opportunity to get 5 minutes, I mean insofar as the gentleman is concerned? I was sure of that, anyway.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think I have always tried to be generous.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I know the gentleman has been. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. The net income of farm operators, after all expenses, in 1919, the post-war peak, was $8,800,000,000; in 1939, $4,500,000,000; in 1940, $4,700,000,000, in 1941, $6,600,000,000; in 1942, $10,200,000,000; and in 1943, according to the official Bureau of Agricultural Economics estimate, $12,800,000,000.

Let us see what happened in the last war under the conditions that existed then. A comparison of index numbers of wholesale prices in the United States, using as the base of 100 the period July 1, 1913, to June 30, 1914, showed that on all commodities the prices remained pretty stationary in the United States until around the middle of 1915, and at the end of 1915 the index had gone up to 108. At the end of 1916 it was 148; at the end of 1917, 202; at the end of 1918, 208.

Let us see what happened to food during the World War. The index remained pretty stationary on food until the end of 1915. In the fourth quarter of 1915 the index was still 100. Then in January of 1916 it was 108. It rose rapidly, and the average for the year was 117, the month of December being 127.

In January 1917 it was 137, and it ended at 187 in December, or an average for the year of 163.

It started in January 1918 at 182 and ended in December at 208. The average for the year was 196.

That shows what happens. It shows what happened during the last war. That is only 25 years ago. That shows what happens unless we have real price control. During the last war we employed the licensing system, and had about five hundred-and-some-odd specific commodities under the licensing system. Prices kept spiraling upward. The farmer was excluded from the license system. The licensing system was applied to the wholesaler. The greatest efforts possible were made, but rising prices could not be stopped. The history of the last war shows that in a period of less than 2 years, approximately 18 months, the index of food, being at 100, rose rapidly until it was close to 200. That was in a period of less than 18 months. That is the best argument I can think of in support of subsidies during this war. If no strong price control is exercised in this war, under existing conditions, prices will go much higher than they did during the last war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, now that the battleships, the blockbusters, and the big guns of the House have been heard, it may not be out of order to let a small, very small firecracker make a noise, hence these remarks: I have been in some doubt as to whether the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] was opposed to inflation or whether he just wanted subsidies. Whether he was opposed to inflation temporarily or at all times. I say that because I recall very distinctly when we were about to pass bonus legislation the gentleman wanted to pay the bonus in printing-press money. Because of his insistence upon the adoption of his plan for the payment of the bonus, the payments to the veterans were held up for months. Now it may be that the gentleman is in favor of subsidies and that if the House defeats subsidies it would be required of him to go about the country, without remuneration, of course, and educate the people along the line of the necessity for subsidies. The gentleman from Texas makes me think of my boyhood days. Back in the old home town, just a little, small town, the beautiful homey town of Constantine on the banks of the old St. Joseph River, every year along in the early part of the year, with the arrival of spring fever, would come a well-dressed fellow with a banjo, a mouth organ, a gasoline torch, and a wagon with a square platform on the rear.

Along one side of the platform which was enclosed on the sides to a height of a foot or two and 2 or 3 feet above the sideboard ran a rod and over this rod were draped a lot of snakeskins—snakeskins long, snakeskins short, snakeskins black, blue, and mottled. Over on the other side of the platform on a similar rod were strung a row of copper rings, perhaps a few necklaces made of teeth, human or from animals. Then to complete the display and to give it tone and a medicinal atmosphere, on the back of the platform at the top of the endgate there was a flat shelf where all could get a good view, even the small boys, by standing on their toes, could see the row of quart cans filled with tapeworms preserved in alcohol.

The snakeskins were awe-inspiring. The copper rings and the necklaces with human teeth created apprehension. But the tapeworms—boy, oh boy, how they would make the cold chills run up and down my boyhood back, yes, and older and stiffer backs as well, as the orator described the ills from which I, in common with the other children and adults of the community, suffered.

Those tapeworms were horrid looking things. They were a gruesome sight. On more than one night when the spieler held forth on the town square I suffered all the tortures of a vivid nightmare; in fact, so potent was the spell the dispenser of universal remedies cast over me that to this day when I grow bold and venture to master a piece of mince pie, I still awaken in the still, small hours certain that the crawling, wiggling feeling in my middle is due to a tapeworm uneasy and not at peace with his surroundings.

This advocate and dispenser of a panacea was not only a most excellent banjo player but he was a sweet singer of old songs. His voice and banjo made sweet music, though sometimes he ran away with a good-looking but feeble-minded village girl. He had an inexhaustible flow of language, he was master of four-, five-, even six-syllable words. He would give to us in great detail a description of all the ills that afflicted humans. He described the symptoms of lumbago, of insomnia, of ordinary rheumatism, of a headache, of a toothache, of a stomach ache, of indigestion, of constipation of thought as well as of words, kidney disease, heart failure, lung fever, jaundice, and even mange, ring bone, and spavins. He dwelt so vividly, so powerfully upon the symptoms of various ills that afflict humans and animals that those of us who until his advent had been in the best of health, began to believe that we were in the last stages of some one or more—usually more—of the diseases mentioned.

He sold his remedies in pints, quarts, and even gallons. Sometimes it was labeled "swamp root," sometimes just "tonic," sometimes it was "wahoo." It had many names. It had one feature in common, it would cure whatever "ailed" you, as he put it, and also whatever you thought might ail you and it was 80 percent poor whisky.

If you were fat and too heavy, wahoo would make you slim and beautiful. If you were thin and hungry, if as a growing boy or girl you were troubled with a constant appetite, beyond question you had at least one tapeworm and the gentleman would proceed to describe the activities of a tapeworm, a tapeworm more often than not 15 or 20 feet in length, like the one in the jar which he held in his hand, whose cousin or brother you were convinced after hearing him, was very much alive and was the cause of the noises, of the squirming and the twistings which were taking place in your "innerds" as you stood goggled-eyed, open-mouthed listening to his advice and plea—just as those not familiar with the frosting on the arguments of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] listen to his, shall I say, oratorical arguments.

For rheumatism he would sell you a copper ring, at a good price, and it was guaranteed to cure.

If you had a toothache, an ulcered tooth, he would sell you a necklace of teeth which if worn faithfully for a dozen nights would ease all your pains. If you had a lame back, he would sell you a snake skin. And the directions were to soak it in a mixture of vinegar and wormwood and then rub on the oil and lo and behold, in a couple of days your back would be all right; in fact, stronger than ever. A moment ago, following the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], who likewise has a remedy for everything, provided you let him mix it and administer it, along came the majority leader and he, too, frightened me. He threatened us, not directly—I will withdraw that, because he did not really threaten; he just hinted or in a very delicate way intimated that perhaps if we took certain action there might be a Presidential veto—something all of us fear, or do we? Then he told us, too, that the American Federation of Labor wanted subsidies. We were told if we did not follow, not in so many words, but by inference, but quite plainly, if we did not follow what the A. F. of L. wanted we would be wiped out come election time. You all remember how, when two-thirds of the House and Senate passed certain legislation—the Smith-Connally bill—over the President's veto, we were all told by the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. that we would never, no, never, no how, no matter how long we lived, as long as we lived—we were never going to be able to come here again as representatives of our people. We, one and all, yes, each one of us, were to be executed politically. You remember the results of the last election. The union politicians did not get any of us, did they? Why? Because union employees know that we have their interests in mind, know that this House will always give the actual employees just a little better than an even break. Now, what is the use of listening to all that patent medicine talk put out at such great length during the last 4 legislative days by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]? There has been something like 5 hours of it, all devoted to selling a quack remedy. The gentleman has us into every conceivable disastrous situation that his imagination can conceive or his words picture, and he always has a remedy. It may have many labels on the bottle, but it is the same old "wahoo"—spend and spend the other fellow's money. And the spending has been for the purpose of convincing the people that were confronted with an emergency, with a crisis. I will concede that we are confronted with a great danger—inflation—but it is one created by the New Dealers, and neither the gentleman's oratory,

spellbinding, or unfounded charges, nor yet his quack remedies, will aid us.

Two years ago next Sunday, on the 28th day of November 1941, after 4 days of debate, this House, by a vote of 224 to 161, passed the administration bill which was designed to, and which it was said would, stabilize the cost of living, prevent inflation.

On January 30, 1942, having passed the Senate and been signed by the President, that act became the law of the land—Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, title 50, supplement 2, United States Code, 1940 edition.

The administration had told the Congress that the Nation was threatened with inflation which would bring disaster. It presented a bill the enactment and administration of which it said would prevent the threatened disaster—inflation. The Congress adopted that act. The President signed it, and the administration from that day to this for its enforcement has had all of the authority and all of the money for which it asked.

Some of us did not believe that the act would accomplish the desired purpose. Subsequent experience has demonstrated the correctness of that conclusion and, as well, one of two things—either that the act was not properly designed for the purpose for which it was proposed or that its administration has been faulty. In my judgment, it is subject to both criticisms.

The President has gone beyond the terms of the act to force his policies upon the American people. The Congress expressly provided that the prices of certain agricultural products should not be fixed without the consent of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Nevertheless, the President, by Executive order, nullified the act of Congress which gave the Secretary the veto power by providing, in section 3 of Order No. 9250, that the Economic Stabilization Director should settle any difference of opinion between the Secretary of Agriculture and the Price Administrator growing out of the fixing of the price of agricultural commodities, thus destroying the power Congress gave the Secretary of Agriculture.

Having been granted all the authority and all the money for which he asked and having failed in the task of preventing inflation, as the present request for subsidies demonstrates, it is not fair for the President, through Under Secretary of War Patterson, through Chester Bowles, or through other administrative agencies or political allies, to now tell the public that the refusal of Congress to grant him millions—yes, billions—of dollars to be paid out to special interests in subsidies, will bring about inflation. He cannot shift the responsibility for his failures to Congress.

The President is seeking a fourth term, and the political strategy on the part of the fourth-termers is to use the Public Treasury, the taxpayer's dollar, once more, as before it has been used, as has been shown by reports of Senate committees controlled by his own party, to influence a Presidential election.

We know from experience that money granted for the triple A was used to influence voters. We know by the report of Senate committees that other funds appropriated to relieve distress were used to influence elections in Kentucky and elsewhere and I, for one, do not propose to let this charge of the President—that the Congress by refusing to give him subsidies will be responsible for any inflation which may follow—go unchallenged. That charge is not true. It is an attempt to save face by "buck passing."

When price control and inflation were being debated here 2 years ago, we knew and this administration knew, that inflation could not be prevented by the fixing of prices, unless wages were also stabilized.

The Congress was asked to order the stabilization of prices of commodities but it was asked to leave the question of wage stabilization in Presidential hands, with his promise that he would stabilize wages. That promise he has failed to keep and as a result today we are on the verge of run-away inflation. We have forced the people to take the New Deal wahoo, its pain killer, its swamp root, its lullaby drops, its snake oil, and to wear the copper rings—most of them hooked through the noses of Members of Congress. But the patient has steadily grown worse.

The President realizes the danger and now, to avoid the consequences of his own political bargain with the C. I. O. and other organizations, he is asking us to tax all of the people to pay special benefits to his political allies. Stabilization cannot be accomplished in that way.

The Congress should once more resume its constitutional duties and responsibilities and enact legislation, which will actually bring about stabilization, prevent inflation, as a former Member of this body who has since entered the armed forces by enlistment—I refer to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]—begged us to do 2 years ago.

If disastrous inflation follows in the ensuing months, the responsibility rests squarely upon the shoulders of the President and his economic advisers who are seeking, not stabilization, but votes for a fourth term.

The administration has the power to prevent inflation. If it does not take effective steps without further delay, Congress should do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the farm-baiting bloc is opposed to section 3 of this bill. Every predatory interest seeking to exploit the farmer is opposed to section 3 of this bill. Every group trying to reduce its cost of living at the expense of the farmer is opposed to section 3 of this bill.

All of them follow the same formula. The robbing, grabbing, profiteering farmer is rolling in unearned wealth filched from the down-trodden consumer—the consumer who is getting the largest income he has ever earned in his life.

The greedy farmer is starving the defenseless city dweller who, as a matter of fact, is living in the greatest luxury today ever enjoyed by the average family in the history of the world.

The taxpayers of the country are lifting their hands in supplication, begging and pleading to have this extra burden—estimated to eventually reach $5,000,000,000—taken out of the United States Treasury and placed on their shoulders.

That is the universal song and dance staged by all these advocates of Government subsidies, free groceries, and high taxes. All three go together, subsidies, free groceries, and high taxes. You cannot have one without the other. The only alternative is to dispense with all three. And that is what section 3 of this bill proposes to do.

The farm-baiting bloc would have us believe that the taxpayers and bond buyers are eager to have this money taken out of the Treasury and spent for free food for the city consumer who is today, according to actual statistics, paying the smallest part of his income for food in the economic annals of the Nation—16 cents out of every dollar. Only paying 16 cents out of the dollar for the bountiful table you find in every city home—and yet the farm-baiting bloc wants to save the poor fellow the 16 cents, and charge it to the returning soldiers. The soldier will have 6 months' pay while he looks for a job and his wife will have saved something from her $50 a month while he has been crossing bayonets and exchanging hand grenades with the Japs and Jerries and the soldier and his wife will be glad to pay the grocery bills of the dear boys who stayed at home and made big money during the war while the servicemen fought it out in the putrid fox holes of the Pacific and on the bloody beaches of the Mediterranean.

The soldiers are not here to speak for themselves. But the bond buyers and taxpayers are here and this is what they are saying about it. They are saying "We are willing to pay taxes and buy bonds to feed the servicemen fighting for their country, and we are willing to pay to feed the unemployed. But we'll be damned if we pay taxes and buy bonds to feed the employed who are all munition workers and white-collared workers, drawing down the biggest pay they have received since they left their father's roof."

In this connection, a great many tears have been shed over the deplorable condition of the white-collared worker when farm prices go up. But they always conveniently overlook their condition all those years from 1920 to 1932 when farm prices were going down. Every year farm prices went down until the farmer's clothes were patched, his harness tied with binder twine, and his machinery held together with baling wire. And every year the buying power of the white-collared worker increased and pyramided. But no one had anything to say about buying power in those days. It is only when the farmer, slowly, painfully struggles back toward normal that the white-collared consumer, who has been drawing the same salary all these years

and living at the farmer's expense all these years, begins to talk about the buying power of his stationary salary.

The opponents of fair farm prices in the open markets know they cannot defeat this bill and cannot take out section 3. So they endeavor to practice a little legerdemain. They try to amend and do indirectly what they cannot do directly. They offer an amendment asking us to compromise with evil. But if it is evil after September 30, it is evil after January 1. You cannot compromise with a thing like that. Either it is right or it is wrong. And subsidies are wrong both in January and September. The amendment is offered by one of the ablest and one of the most sincere Members of the House. I think a great deal of him, but wittingly or unwittingly, his amendment plays into the hands of the farm-baiting bloc.

And tying in with the Little Steel formula is handcuffing it to a corpse. The Little Steel formula has already been broken. It is moribund. And if raising income above the formula—and I am not objecting to it—fails to start inflation, then failure to roll back farm income will not start inflation.

My good friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] challenged you to produce an alternative. Why, alternatives are on every side. Nobody has to produce an alternative. They are as numerous as the stars in the firmament—as numerous as the commodities and services entering into the farmer's cost of living and costs of production. All the farmer asks is to have the same alternative that everybody else has.

The alternative is for the consumer to buy his products like he buys the products of the farm-machinery manufacturer, to buy food like he buys fertilizer—a fair price in the open market. The alternative is a wage for his labor in the open market, along with the wages of every other laborer in the open market, and he is entitled to it. He works longer hours than any other group in America. He is the only laborer whose wife and children work with him, without pay, and he receives less per hour than any other laborer—and yet he is the one man they want to roll back. Others are increasing, but the farmer is to be subsidized and rolled back. Only the farmer is to receive a part of his price in the market and the rest from the Treasury taxpayers—a part of his wages in the open market and the rest from the bond buyers. And after the war, when the inevitable depression comes and the bond buyers and taxpayers wipe out subsidies, he will be left just like he was after the last war—his banks breaking, his farm under the sheriff's hammer, and his family destitute.

All these people who are asking to live at the farmer's table without paying board, are against section 3. Now, let us see who is for section 3.

The farmers are for it. Farm organizations all over the country are for it. Farm leaders are for it, and are urging adoption of section 3.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Both Houses of the Congress of the United States are for it. Let us go back and look over the record made in this and preceding Congresses on subsidies. In every instance in which the question of subsidies has been presented as an issue in this House, the proposition for subsidies has been overwhelmingly defeated. On the first yea-and-nay vote on subsidies taken in the House in the Sixty-eighth Congress, the vote was 90 for subsides and 229 against. There has never been a vote on the sole question of subsidies in either House or Senate in which subsidies were not overwhelmingly defeated and that indicates convincingly and conclusively the attitude of the people back home.

The farmers are opposed to subsidies. The people are opposed to subsidies. The Congress is opposed to subsidies. The taxpayers and bond buyers are opposed to subsidies. Mr. Chairman, I do not even believe the rank and file of the consumers are for subsidies. The American consumer, for all his personal interest in cheap food, believes in fair play and fair dealing and has a warm sympathy in his heart for the underdog. They do not want alms or Government hand-outs when they are self-supporting and self-sustaining, and they especially object to taking advantage of the farm producer whose prices are less than their own and the farm laborer whose hours are longer and whose wages are lower than their own. In keeping with the wishes of the farmers, the Congress, the taxpayer, and the fair-minded American consumer, this amendment, and every other amendment to section 3, should be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto be limited to 40 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN and Mr. MILLER of Connecticut objected.

Mr. PATMAN. Reserving the right to object, there are four amendments at the desk which I intend to offer. I do not care to take up much time, but I would like to have 5 minutes on each amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order. Objection has been made.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to state he is advised that there are four other amendments to this section on the Clerk's desk. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] has an amendment pending to line 2, page 5.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] has an amendment pending to line 6, page 5; the gentleman from California [Mr. FORD] has an amendment pending to line 24 on page 5. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has an amendment pending to line 2 on page 6. These four amendments are now on the Clerk's desk.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL], a member of the committee, now seeking recognition?

Mr. KUNKEL. I wish to speak on my amendment if it is in order at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment now pending, but the gentleman may ask unanimous consent to have his amendment read for information if he so desires.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, I prefer to wait until my amendment is in order.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the situation is that a delegation of important Members of this House, appointed to attend the funeral of one of our late Members of many years' service, is leaving at 6:25 p. m. I am just explaining the situation to the Members of the House. Certainly we want an official delegation to be present at that funeral; on the other hand it seems only right that if this bill is not disposed of before the train leaves that those Members who attend the funeral representing this body should be protected in their voting. If the bill can be disposed of by 6 o'clock then I assume the delegation can make arrangements to go. I have briefly explained the situation in such way that I hope every Member will thoroughly understand.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I may say that a good many Members are here today and had planned to come today and expect this vote to be had sometime tonight.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the train leaves at 6:25 p. m.; that is my understanding.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, why does not the distinguished majority leader move to close debate?

Mr. McCORMACK. We do not like to cut off debate peremptorily.

Mr. KNUTSON. But this is an unusual situation and calls for it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close at 5:15.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if we do not reach a roll call on this bill before 5:15 then the delegation cannot catch their train.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think they can.

Mr. RANKIN. If it is desired that this delegation catch this 6:25 p. m.

train the gentleman might as well begin to shut off debate now, allowing 5 minutes for and against each amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am merely explaining the situation to see if we can meet it.

Mr. RANKIN. Move to close debate; that is the way to do it.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I presume that the gentleman means that the amendments will come first and that there will be 5 minutes on each side.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure the Committee would not have to give any direction to the Chair. The Chair is sufficiently acquainted with the situation and the membership to be able to recognize the author of each amendment and one Member to speak against it. I am sure we will all be satisfied with what the Chair does in recognizing those in opposition to the amendment. Those who have legitimate amendments to offer should be recognized.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have a very minor amendment to offer to line 8 on page 5, section 3. Will I have an opportunity under this arrangement to offer that amendment?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not want to interrupt the program, but I have an amendment to propose at the end of the reading of this bill which I regard as very important.

Mr. McCORMACK. This relates only to this particular section.

Mr. O'CONNOR. What I am trying to get at is whether I shall have at least 5 minutes in which to discuss it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does my friend from Montana want a delegation at the funeral of this distinguished late Member of this body?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I represent 360,000 people in my State who are concerned with this bill and I have an amendment affecting their interests.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. O'CONNOR. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. McCORMACK. Does not the gentleman want a delegation from this House to attend this funeral?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do not want to interfere with what any delegation does or wants to do. I want to do my duty as I see it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let us see if we cannot be practical.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment do now close.

I move that, Mr. Chairman, and ask for a vote on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has the floor.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent—we have got to protect Members with legitimate amendments. If we close debate they are not protected.

Mr. RANKIN. Move to close debate.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania and Mr. BARRY) there were—ayes 123, noes 157.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. BROWN of Georgia and Mr. MONRONEY to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 120, noes 154.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say it is proposed to recognize gentlemen to offer these amendments in he order that the amendments would appear in this section of the bill. The amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas is to line 2, the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, line 6, and so forth. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAYS: On page 6, line 2, amend section 3 by striking the period, inserting a comma, and adding the following words: "for livestock feed."

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the debate on this section and all amendments thereto close at 5 minutes after 5, and that each speaker be limited to 3 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] is recognized.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I undertook in my discussion of the amendment presented by the gentleman from New York to explain the purpose of this amendment and I do not wish to impose upon the House by elaborating greatly on that statement. The purpose of my amendment is merely to authorize a continuation of those operations in which the Commodity Credit Corporation is now engaged by which livestock feed is moved from one part of this country into another where because of drought or some other disaster livestock feed is not available. The bill would stop the importation of hay at a loss to the Commodity Credit Corporation, a loss occasioned largely because of transportation expense to the eastern part of the United States, Maryland, Virginia, and adjoining States, and it would also affect the shipment of feed into my part of the country, the great Southwest, where we had, as you know, not only a drought this year but a flood in the earlier part of the season.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Would it permit the shipment of feed into areas where they have not grown feed but need it very badly and customarily import it?

Mr. HAYS. It would.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Unless the gentleman's amendment is adopted, the Commodity Credit Corporation cannot carry on in the future as it has in the past and provide feed where it is necessary in distressed areas of the country?

Mr. HAYS. That is correct. I hope the committee will adopt this amendment and enable this worth-while activity to continue. I am sure you have seen in your own States in many seasons conditions such as those that I have described, a drought or a disaster, that deprived growers of livestock the feed that they desperately need.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think the gentleman's amendment is mighty important to a lot of people in my district, and I am for it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does it cover all classes of livestock?

Mr. HAYS. It covers everything that the expression "livestock feed" would embrace.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am for the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. CRAVENS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CRAVENS. Your amendment leaves all controls and limitations that are applicable to this bill, applicable to this additional item that you add to it?

Mr. HAYS. Yes. It leaves unchanged the present operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation involving feed and wheat as a substitute for corn in certain areas and the shipment of hay which I have described.

I trust the committee will help out to that extent and not work a discrimination against the farmers who have suffered misfortune.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, from the many able speeches concerning subsidies I believe two fairly clear conclusions may be drawn. First, it seems to me that as a theoretical proposition on paper the payment of subsidies can be justified. In certain limited fields, such as copper, subsidies have been successful and have saved the Nation many millions. Likewise, we know that on a relatively small scale and under very

different conditions subsidies have been successful in Canada and in Britain.

Nevertheless, and in spite of these examples, and in spite of the theoretical soundness of subsidies, I think the second conclusion is that this Nation does not want these consumer subsidies and that this Congress is not going to approve them. The fundamental reason for this is simply that neither the people nor this Congress believes that the subsidy program can be or will be efficiently or properly administered.

The reason for this distrust of the administering agencies is not found in a single instance of maladministration. It is found in a long series of relatively insignificant instances of unwise, but more especially arbitrary, actions of the various administrators. Perhaps of even greater importance is the fact that the bureaus have been unable to administer the laws without practically suffocating everyone with mountains of regulations and questionnaires that few people can understand.

In short, I think the basic objection to subsidies on a large scale, touching millions of small producers, is the distrust that the Congress and the people feel toward the administering agencies. It is true that we like to say that this is a government of law and not of men, yet we know in our hearts that laws are not self-executing and that no system of government can be any better than the men who make it function. The only rea' solution to this very difficult condition is that wiser and more experienced men be induced to undertake the administrative task—men especially who recognize that this House of Representatives has a responsibility in these matters, and men who are willing to cooperate with the Members of this House.

In this connection, I should like to say one word concerning the Kefauver resolution now before the Rules Committee. That resolution has for its purpose the solution of this difficulty that confronts us now. We all know that there is a lack of confidence and cooperation between the executive agencies of the Government and the Congress. The best way I can think of to restore that mutual confidence so essential to a government of checks and balances, such as we have, is for the heads of the administrative agencies to come before the whole House and explain and justify their administration. That is the objective of the Kefauver resolution. I do not believe that the possibility of intemperate squabbles is sufficiently grave to outweigh the great benefit that will certainly be derived from a better understanding of each other that will certainly result. One has only to recall the recent meeting of this House with the representatives of the military and also the address of Secretary Hull.

Under present conditions, our system of checks and balances is all checks and no balance. It is dangerous not only to the prosecution of the war, but also to the preservation of peace in the world and prosperity here at home. I believe it is our duty to take the first step toward breaking up this impasse and the Kefauver resolution is a good first step. In the meantime, I think the real reason why we in this House object to subsidies is that we have little confidence in the wisdom and efficiency of those agencies that must administer the program. I recognize that this is a dangerous step we are proposing to take, but I hope that it may result in a greater degree of cooperation between the executive agencies and the Congress than has hitherto existed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. Chairman, about the only difference between this amendment and the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALL] is the location of the problem. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HALL] and the eastern seaboard have a problem in respect to feed for poultry. The gentleman from Arkansas has a problem in respect to feed for livestock. There is no reason so far as this bill is concerned why an equitable, just program should not be worked out to get all of the essential feed, all of the necessary feed, to both the poultry growers of the East and to the livestock growers of the West if the acts which have already been set up are judiciously administered.

Of course, this amendment should not be added in this particular place. We have at the suggestion or request of the administration exempted competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oilseed because of the program of the administration to raise all of the fats that they can. This was first put in the bill which was passed by this House last June or July. I refer to the one which the President vetoed, at the suggestion of the Commodity Credit Corporation, they having already laid out a program for loans to encourage the production of competitive vegetable oils and fats. It was not put in here because anybody in particular in the Congress insisted upon it. It was put in here at the insistence or at the request of the Commodity Credit Corporation to get the maximum production of vegetable oils and fats. I never contended it had to be in here, but it is in there and, so far as I am concerned, it might go out, because I think that domestic vegetable fats and oils are adequately protected in other provisions of the bill, just as I think that livestock feeds and the adequacy of that program is protected in other provisions of this act.

This amendment should be defeated, for the same reason the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALL] was defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAYS) there were—ayes 72, noes 141.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KUNKLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KUNKLE: On page 5, line 16, after "December 31", strike out "1943" and insert "1944."

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment makes only one change in the bill; in fact, it changes only one figure. In line 16 on page 5 it changes the date from "1943" to "1944", thus giving one more year for the Commodity Credit Corporation to end those subsidies which are now being administered and which were started before October 13, 1943. It does not approve consumer subsidies in any way, because every prohibition against them that is contained in this original bill is continued. It does not destroy the support program or the loan program because those provisos are also continued in it.

If you shut off within a period of 20, 30, or 40 days all the present subsidies being paid you are apt to cause a dangerously sharp rise in the cost of living index which might easily be interpreted as one of the many milestones on the road to inflation, so the idea of this amendment is to ease that reduction off over a period of 1 year.

You have seen in this House today that there are probably enough votes to sustain a veto, which is what we can expect on this bill as now presented.

If the veto is sustained, the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House will probably have to act again on interim legislation that will have no prohibition on subsidies and not refer to them at all. The effect of that is that you will have a high, wide, and handsome subsidy program, including everything the O. P. A. and the administration here in Washington want to subsidize.

For that reason, I think this amendment should appeal to those who are opposed to subsidies, as well as those who do not wish to have any sharp jump in the cost of living index which might be interpreted as one milestone on the road to inflation.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUNKEL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Does not the gentleman's amendment say in effect that we believe that opium is a bad thing and that consumer subsidies are opium; but that when a man has so mismanaged his life that he has developed an addiction to it we do not dare shut it off all at once, no matter how much we would like to? If we vote for the gentleman's amendment, it does not mean we are approving subsidies, but that we are stopping them gradually so as not to create sudden economic dislocation or alarm in the minds of many people who have been led to believe that stopping subsidies means inevitable uncontrolled inflation. Is that what the gentleman's amendment is designed to do?

Mr. KUNKEL. That is correct. These subsidies have been built up over a period of a year and a half, added to one by one. Now you say in the space of 30 days we are going to cut them all out irretrievably and at once.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUNKEL. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Does it not prove, then, that subsidies are an opiate and a soothing sirup?

Mr. KUNKEL. I am against subsidies. The bill is against subsidies. The amendment keeps every disapproval of subsidies right in it just as stated.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, there are two main factors, economic and psychological, which we must take into account in considering the provision in section 3 forbidding the use of any moneys for the payment of consumer subsidies after December 31, 1943, and the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] to extend that deadline to the end of next year, 1944.

If there were only the economic standpoint to consider, I should favor the bill as it stands. I am opposed to the principle of paying consumer subsidies out of the Federal Treasury, except under one main condition—namely, when prices have risen or are threatening to rise more rapidly than wages. Under those circumstances, judicious use of consumer subsidies would probably be the best way to keep up adequate income to the producer without increasing the cost to the consumer thereby leading to a need and a demand by him for a raise in his income.

But that situation does not prevail in our country. Wages have risen more rapidly than prices. As has been shown here repeatedly the cost of living has increased 23 percent since 1940, wage rates 37 percent, and total wages received per week by industrial workers almost 70 percent. As the beloved chairman of the committee, Mr. Steagall, whose untimely death we mourn, showed in his last speech on this floor, price increases all these years have followed, not preceded, wage increases.

To maintain that holding down prices alone can prevent inflation is illusory. Rising prices are not the cause of inflation; they are the inevitable, ultimate result of inflation. The cause is too much purchasing power for the amount of commodities available.

We already have such an excess of purchasing power. To pump more Government money into the Nation's economy by increasing the consumer subsidy program can produce only one result—still greater purchasing power and greater pressure on the price ceilings; therefore such subsidies are definitely and inevitably inflationary. They are like a hypodermic of morphine in a case of acute appendicitis; they mask the symptoms temporarily, lull the patient to sleep, give him a false sense of security, but the disease process continues without his recognizing it. And he may die for lack of the more drastic operation he no longer realizes he needs.

When as in this case purchasing power has risen more rapidly than price levels, consumer subsidies tend not to hold the line, but to break it.

There are only two ways we can prevent inflation in the long run—either increase production so there is enough to go round, or else reduce purchasing power. To do the latter would require either reduction of those wages which have increased relatively too rapidly, and I doubt that any of us believes that would be possible; or increased taxes, enforced savings, and bond purchases from those groups where the greatest increases of income have occurred. Unfortunately it does not appear our tax experts are willing to make a real assault on this problem.

In the second place, I agree that it is wrong and unsound policy to be paying part of today's board bill with subsidies borrowed from tomorrow's income, to ask returning soldiers and even unborn generations to pay for their own food and part of ours, too.

Furthermore, for every dollar we get in subsidies now they will have to pay back two to three ultimately.

The administration's propaganda on this question has caused a widespread misconception, rather than true understanding of the economics of subsidies. Otherwise we would not get letters demanding in one paragraph that we vote subsidies to help pay the writer's living expenses, and in the next paragraph that we do not increase taxes—at least not for him. From what source can subsidies come ultimately except taxes? We can have our cake, or we can eat it, but not both. What surer way is there to lead to devaluation of our currency than by continuing our headlong rush toward national insolvency by borrowing?

Third, I agree that the plight of many white-collar workers with fixed income is so bad as to be approaching desperation. I believe they should be allowed by the authorities to get wage increases where their employers are willing, as is so frequently the case. Or the squeeze on them should be eased by the use of food stamps. If that is considered by some to be governmental charity, just what makes it less a charity for the Government to be making gifts by subsidies to everybody, to the Fords and Rockefellers as well as to the family with fixed income?

Great as is our concern for the white-collar worker, our very first responsibility is for the solvency of the United States Treasury. If that goes, no one's income will be worth more than a plugged nickel.

Fourth, I agree that if we do not prevent now further extensions of the consumer subsidy program it will be all but impossible to stop later. Now they demand Government money to help pay their food bill, or else. Next month they can say that clothing prices are rising and the Government must help buy the next new suit, or else. When and where can it be checked if not now? And especially with a national election approaching.

Fifth, I agree that demands by organized labor for wage increases have come, are coming, and will come no matter whether we grant subsidies or not. Some groups would use prohibition of subsidies as a pretext for further demands. But if we do not give them the pretext, the demands are coming just the same. I warn that subsidies will not hold them off.

Sixth, I agree that the administration asks for these new subsidies in part to try to cover up its mistakes, to escape the inevitable results of its failure to enforce the Price Control Act according to the plain intent of Congress. To imagine it could get economic stabilization, could hold the line against inflation by freezing prices while allowing increases in actual income to huge sections of our people was like trying to keep a ship from sinking by closing the portholes on only one side.

Thomas Jefferson described exactly the sort of a situation we face today better than any one else has expressed it, when he said:

> Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap we should soon want bread. I am for a government rigorously frugal and simple—and not a multiplication of offices and salaries merely to make partisans and for increasing by every device the public debt on the principle of its being a public blessing.

And yet, despite all the economic factors which I submit are overwhelmingly against consumer subsidies in the situation which exists in our country today, there is a psychological factor which we dare not ignore. For months there has been persistent and insistent propaganda from Washington that forbidding all consumer subsidies will automatically lead to inflation. I am convinced such a view is not sound or justified, but that does not change the fact that millions have come to believe it implicitly.

Mr. Chairman, the psychological situation has been skillfully built up to the point where passage of this bill as it is might, I fear, precipitate a general belief that inflation is inevitable, a loss of confidence in our War bonds, even our currency. There does not actually have to be a fire to start a panic. For some to cry it repeatedly and make the people believe there is a fire can lead to just as disastrous results. If the general public became convinced that our money is bound to depreciate through inflation, and savings deposits began to drop because people were withdrawing them to put into real or personal possessions, a downward trend would be started whose course perhaps could not be controlled or whose end predicted. Therefore, I hoped both sides could agree on a compromise amendment such as the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] introduced, which would, for the first time, tie wages to prices and prices to wages. The administration's failure to do this heretofore is, I believe, the single biggest cause of our whole economy being so badly out of balance.

Since that failed, I hope we can accept this amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] which will permit a continuation through next year of the subsidy programs announced prior to October 13, 1943, but will prevent extension to other commodities.

Consumer subsidies, when income has risen more than prices, are opium, and all opium is bad if used regularly. Yet there are conditions where, except for opium, the patient could not endure long enough for the healing processes to get under way. The thing we are against is not opium; it is the misuse of it, the developing of the opium habit, demanding ever more and more.

However bad a patient's addiction may be we must be judicious in withdrawing the drug lest the remedy induce an earlier catastrophe than the disease. If that is called compromise, then may I say that doctors have to carry out that sort of compromise daily. We do not want the operation to be successful but the patient dead, when by doing gradually all the patient can stand, rather than all he needs, we have a better chance of getting both a successful operation and a living and more healthy patient.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment to continue the present program for a year and forbid any extension will be adopted. I believe the risks it holds for our country's whole economy are less than those involved in sudden complete prohibition of all consumer subsidies, because that could conceivably set off an uncontrolled inflation which would be the very worst thing that could happen to the country, second only to military defeat.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend by own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, in consideration of the limitations of time, and having spoken on the subject of the present subsidy program, and its fallacies, several times during the past few weeks, I did not request time during the general debate. The sudden deaths of two of the most distinguished Members of the House have now made it necessary to crowd 2 days further debate into 1 day.

I feel, however, that several brief comments should be recorded at this point in the RECORD. The first is an admonition to beware of statistics in the hands of inexperienced and uninformed people. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] spoke of columnists and their figures. Now we have the wife of the President of the United States, offering some figures which might be interesting if they had any foundation in fact.

Let us see how these figures are obtained. The statistics of the Bureau of Labor Statistics are available to everyone. The majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] used some of them this afternoon. I rose to commend him and to say that his figures were accurate and that I hoped he would continue and use comparable figures for this war. Such comparison would then show that food prices, under the most rigorous control in our history, are actually rising more than in the last war, under the sort of control I want to see applied to this crisis.

The base for the figures used by the majority leader, and by the columnist whose article has been referred to, and by the radio commentator who so irritates the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and others, is the year 1913. That was 4 years before we entered the last war. By 1917 the index had risen to 151.

These figure users then jump hastily to another base, the average of 1935 to 1939, and use that for the present increases. Would it not be fairer to take some comparable base, or to tell the folks who are supposed to be frightened by these figures, that prices had more than doubled in the meantime?

If the price of all meats was 18 cents in 1913, and 24 cents in 1917, and about 30 cents in the year before the end of the last war, would it not be fairer to tell the folks that the price was about 36½ cents when we entered this war, and now only about 43 cents, not recognizing, of course, the black market, with which the administration simply does not seem able to cope, and which is flourishing like the proverbial green bay tree?

So if we take a 5-cent or a 6-cent rise in either period and figure it against a doubled base in the present war, it is very easy to fool the people by saying that the percentage of increase is less now. Actually I hold the percentage, against comparable bases and over comparable periods, to be greater now than in World War No. 1.

But I am not overcome with figures. I think the wife of the President should understand that statistics in the hands of the uninformed are as dangerous as a gun in the hands of the inexperienced. When one reads that butter will advance 9.9 cents, one wonders what ignorance or lack of statistical integrity produced that figure. Mr. Marvin Jones says butter should advance about one-half cent. The War Food Administration has allowed a 5-cent advance, by subsidy. Where is any basis for a 9.9-cent figure, except in an always fertile imagination?

So let us understand these things: The bill before us does not destroy price control nor price ceilings. It does not follow that consumer prices will rise if the bill is passed. The recent announcement of the O. P. A. that forty millions of dollars will be saved to the consumers of citrus in the coming year, because that is the amount the handlers got, by O. P. A. regulations, more than they deserved, or expected, is at least a suggestion as to where savings to the consumer may be made. Meat, potatoes, other commodities, have been listed in these debates as not requiring consumer increases.

Finally, why not tell the whole truth about the situations in England, Canada, Germany? Each country is doing exactly what the supporters of this bill want the administration to do. I do not know anyone on this side of the House who is opposed to production subsidies. Certainly we are as much concerned over inflation as anyone; more so, I think, after hearing the arguments of the bill's opponents. We want centralized management and control; we want production encouraged. If we have subsidies, as we will have them, we want production support, and I call the attention of the Members to the fact that so thoroughly does Canada follow this wiser program that when subsidies are allowed in a few commodities, the subsidy is later "renegotiated" if the one receiving it is discovered to have made enough without it, in that harvest, or even in a later harvest. It is not too late for good administration, and over-all control; the alternative is inflation.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, while I am among those who believe that the Commodity Credit Corporation should be continued in operation, I am not in accord with the measure under consideration. I am opposed to the move to stop subsidy payments to farmers as is provided in section 3 of the bill.

Section 3 should be eliminated. I feel that its effect will be to further hamper and restrict the production of food. It would end subsidy payments on January 1, 1944, thus reducing the farmer's income at a season of the year when his costs are greatest. Subsidy payments now are being made for dairy products, but they are not sufficient to meet the increased cost of feedstuffs for farm animals which are not only higher in price, but difficult to obtain.

The subsidy allowances for dairy products are discriminatory. The payments for production of butter, cheese, and other manufactured dairy products are less than half the subsidies for whole milk. In consequence, production of butter and cheese is declining at an alarming rate. Also, larger subsidies are granted to the farmers of some States than those in other sections of the country, in which production is greatest, tending further to reducing rather than increasing the supply of milk and milk products for our armed forces and our civilian population as well.

With all this injustice and discrimination, I believe that it would be unwise to further interfere with production by stopping subsidy payments at this time. Small and unfair as the payments may be to the farmers of the Northwest, to stop them now would be likely to further unsettle and disturb the situation as to the Nation's food supply.

The bill offers no substitute for the subsidy program. Whether or not one may agree with that program, nothing else is proposed in this measure. The situation of the dairy farmer probably is much the same as those in other lines of agriculture. The importance of obtaining cost of production plus a reasonable profit for agriculture becomes greater daily as the food supply of the Nation lessens, but there is nothing in this measure bearing on that point. The spread of costs between what the farmer receives and what the consumer pays is as great as ever. Subsidies as now allotted are far too limited to affect that

angle. But, to the extent that subsidies are paid they must serve to at least aid in upholding production. With their ceiling prices arbitrarily fixed by a Government bureau and ration points by departmental edict, the dairy farmers need every encouragement which can be offered them. A program which may serve only in part is better than none at all.

Another feature provision of section 3 is that exception in lines 9, 10, 11, and 12 on page 6 of the bill which is almost peculiar. It would continue subsidy payments on domestic vegetable oils and fats and oilseeds. Some such vegetable oils are used in commodities directly competing with dairy products, and still section 3 would continue such subsidies while eliminating those for dairy products, a form of subsidized competition not conducive to increasing production of butter and cheese. The bill as it now is before us, if enacted, will stop all subsidy payments on dairy products, which now amount to approximately $3,000,000 per month for Wisconsin dairymen, and at the same time continue subsidies to oleomargarine makers who now are using millions of pounds of vegetable oils monthly. Not only does section 3 strike at the production of milk used for butter, cheese, evaporated milk, and whole milk, but it would pour additional millions into the coffers of the 18 large corporations who even now are piling up great profits in the sale of oleomargarine.

There are many other features of the bill and the subsidy program which I should be pleased to discuss were the time allowed to me, but I want to register my opposition to the provisions which will prove to be highly detrimental to the people of my own State, and which I feel will serve to lessen farm production at a time when our country and the world are suffering a seriously acute situation as to food supplies.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I did not have to oppose this amendment offered by my very esteemed friend and colleague, but I think it goes right to the heart of this situation. If we adopt his amendment we say in substance, "Well, it is all right to continue your subsidies for a year, just a year, but we do not want you to continue them after that."

A year is 12 months, it is a long time, and it will cost the Government at least as much as it has cost the Treasury during the last 12-month period, or in the neighborhood of $800,000,000. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and I are in hearty accord on one thing in respect to consumers' subsidies—they must be paid out of the Treasury. The Treasury can get this money only by issuing bonds. For every dollar which is paid out of the Treasury for consumers' subsidies $3 must be raised in taxation to pay for them. Therefore this program of $800,000,000, which will be going on during the pendency of the subsidy period if the gentleman's amendment is adopted, becomes $2,400,000,000 which must be raised by the taxpayers to pay for the original so-called saving of $800,000,000.

If it is all right to pay consumers' subsidies for another year, who are we to say it is not all right to pay consumers' subsidies for the year following and the year following that? And if it is all right to pay consumers' subsidies on the very limited number of articles on which they are paying them now—butter, meat, and a few others—then, of course, it is only logical to give them the authority to pay consumers' subsidies on many other articles.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KUNKEL) there were—ayes 90, noes 143.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBERTSON: On page 5, line 8, strike out "or maintain."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, in announcing my intention to vigorously oppose any broad program of consumer subsidies I do not intend to permit any Member of this distinguished body to pin on me the inflationist label. No Member of the House has been more alert than I to the dangers of inflation inherent in our war situation; no Member is more opposed to price inflation, which may subsequently be followed by currency inflation; no Member has been more active in his efforts to ward off this serious threat to the economic soundness of the Nation during its war effort, and even more serious threat to the period of post-war readjustments.

Before explaining why I opposed a broad program of consumer subsidies may I briefly mention two changes in the pending bill which I think should be made, and the making of which would, in my opinion, be anti-inflationary. I think we should eliminate from section 3 of the bill the language relating to the use of subsidies to maintain maximum prices. And I think we should eliminate from section 3 the provision that any maximum price heretofore or hereafter established shall not be below the support price announced by the War Food Administrator. We are now engaged in maintaining the present maximum price on sugar through the payment of subsidies to the producers of domestic sugar, which is about one-fifth of the total consumed. That is a subsidy that goes directly to the producer, stimulates a necessary wartime increase in production, and is a program far cheaper to the ultimate consumer than permitting the price on all sugar to increase to the point where the domestic producer could meet his cost of production. Some subsidies that go directly to the producer, such as oil, copper, and sugar, stimulate production and justify themselves. Subsidies paid to processors and distributors do not stimulate production and are difficult under any circumstances to justify. My objection to fixing a maximum price on a level with the support price is based upon the fact it will inevitably result in pressure upon the War Food Administrator to lower his support price, which in certain instances at the present time exceed the maximum price. We authorize support prices for the purpose of encouraging producers and stimulating increased production. The mentioned prohibitions in section 3, in my opinion, go beyond the general proposal of consumer subsidies, are unnecessary in this bill, and may react adversely upon the producer who needs our help.

As to a general program of consumer subsidies, it is my deliberate opinion that they are economically unsound and are calculated to establish a dangerous political precedent. While throughout the years we have had many different forms of Government subsidies, never until the President ordered the roll-back in prices of beef, butter, and coffee, which did not involve at the time congressional action, have we ever undertaken a program to furnish to the citizens of this Nation food below the cost of production. The only excuse for such a radical departure from our established policies would be the threat of inflation and the need to control it.

In view of the fact there has been considerable loose thinking and loose talking on the subject of inflation and the means of controlling inflation it becomes important for us to define our terms. With respect to prices, a lay definition of inflation is an "undue expansion or increase." A more technical definition is "An abnormal increase in the quantity of purchasing power." In connection with the latter definition, frequent reference in recent months has been made to what is termed the "inflationary gap" between purchasing power and available consumer goods. In 1926 we had the closest balance between farm prices and industrial wages that has ever existed in the past quarter of a century. As a consequence, many governmental tables use the year 1926 as a normal year when neither farm prices nor wages were unduly expanded or increased and, therefore, not inflated. Food prices have not yet reached the level of 1926 and the percentage of total consumer income required to purchase the same quantity of food as consumed in the prewar period of 1935 to 1939 is 8 percent less than it was in 1926. Real wages have not only advanced out of all proportion to the cost of food over the prewar average of 1935–39, but over the entire cost of living, the total of such increase during the intervening war years being 31.7 percent.

A good illustration of the fact that food costs have not been unduly expanded or increased, and therefore have not been inflated, is flour. American millers have been required to sell flour on the basis of wheat at 89 percent of parity. What is the base period for the parity on wheat? 1909 to 1914. Does parity for wheat include increased labor costs incurred during the present war period? It does not, although on

September 7, 1942, the President told the Congress:

Parity is a fair relationship between the prices of things farmers sell and the things they buy. Calculations of parity must include all costs of production, including the cost of labor. As a result, parity prices may shift every time wage rates shift.

What is the new O. P. A. price regulation for flour? It is to be sold on the basis of 100 percent of wheat parity. Can any Member of this House truthfully and consistently say that parity for wheat, which after 2 years of war spending was not reached on the average American farm, is an inflated price for wheat? If not, on what basis shall we justify the current action to subsidize millers in order that they may continue to give to the American people in a period of the greatest national income in history their bread on the basis of wheat at 89 percent of parity? I answer, on no basis whatever, unless it be an unwillingness on the home front to make a war sacrifice comparable to that being made by our American boys on the fighting fronts.

In my opinion, the flour program is on all fours with the drive to furnish to the American people during this war period their food for less than it costs to produce it, adding the difference to the national debt and calling upon returning soldiers to help pay it when the war is over.

If it be true, as I have claimed, that farm prices are not yet above the 1926 level, what has created the inflation threat? It has been an undue expansion and increase in the weekly wages of war workers on the one hand and the creation of new money through deficit financing on the other, the two together creating an abnormal increase in the quantity of purchasing power. I think the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] correctly presented the administration's viewpoint in behalf of the broad consumer-subsidy program when he last Thursday said in effect that if we do not give the American war worker his food for less than it costs to produce it he will demand and be granted further wage increases, which in turn will further increase the cost of his food, which in turn will require still further wage increases, and that in a word is the inflation spiral that leads first to uncontrolled price inflation and ultimately to uncontrolled currency inflation. And those presenting such an argument to us in this emergency have blandly assumed that if we stabilize the cost of food through subsidies at the level of September 15, 1942, wages will be automatically stabilized and there will be no further inflation threat. But we know that, notwithstanding the President's promise of a general consumer-subsidy program, John L. Lewis proceeded to break the Little Steel formula and that Mr. Phil Murray has publicly announced he will now be forced to make a drive for increased wages for all steel workers. We also know that the wage relationship existing as of September 15, 1942, has not been stabilized, notwithstanding the minor increase in the cost of living since that date and there is no reason to believe that further wage demands will not be made or that they will be firmly denied when made.

I therefore submit it would be unjust and inherently unfair when we already have inflated wages, in some instances inflated prices, and the prospect of more of both, for anyone to attempt to hold the refusal of this House to authorize a general consumer-subsidy program responsible for the price inflation that may subsequently result.

We had an opportunity in November 1941 to control price inflation but administration leaders in this House vigorously opposed any steps at that time looking to the control of the most dangerous equation—namely, war wages. It will be recalled that I offered at that time the following amendment:

(f) In order to prevent inflationary wage increases that will interfere with or prevent the effectuation of the purposes of this act, no agency or official of the United States shall approve or recommend any wage increase which the Administrator determines to be inflationary nor shall any allowance be made for any wage increase which the Administrator determines to be inflationary, in any ceiling under this act. For the purposes of this act, a wage increase shall be deemed to be inflationary, if the Administrator determines that such increases will require an increase in any ceiling under this act, except where he determines that such increases in such ceiling are justified due to an increase in the workers' cost of living or due to subnormal wage rates that may exist in a particular industry or part thereof.

Opposing that amendment, our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] stated:

In my opinion it is one of the most drastic amendments that could be offered on this particular subject. * * * The amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia is unworkable. It is a very drastic amendment. We are going to have labor legislation next week. I share the views expressed by the gentleman from Texas that in a price-control bill relating to property there should not be included control of human beings.

We naturally are concerned about strikes and their control. If the legislation we pass next week does not meet the situation Congress can legislate again. We are going to have labor legislation.

Incidentally, we did have strike control legislation passed by the House by a 2 to 1 vote just before the Pearl Harbor attack and then killed by administration leaders in the Senate. In the summer of the following year we had another chance to curb inflation in the bill pending before the House Naval Affairs Committee to suspend for the duration the operation of the 40-hour week and its inflationary overtime payments. Administration leaders caused that bill to be killed in committee. Last year and again this year we had an opportunity to frame tax laws calculated to drain off a portion of the "abnormal increase in the quantity of purchasing power" but again administration leaders killed all sales tax proposals—the only feasible and practical method of closing the inflationary gap between purchasing power and purchasable goods.

As I have indicated in my opening statement, I have been deeply concerned over the inflation threat and I have vigorously advocated a comprehensive anti-inflationary program that included taxes, price and wage control, economy in Government spending, and a general thrift program including liberal investment by the people in War bonds. But I regard a general food subsidy program, which temporarily conceals the increased cost of living and which would not be any incentive to production because paid to processors and distributors, as being neither a necessary nor proper part of an effective anti-inflation program.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, of course we do not want to admit by the statements made by the gentleman, much as I should like to go along with him, that this section in any manner interferes with the operation of any producer subsidy program. I am fearful that if we strike out the word "maintain" we shall create a situation whereby the administration can continue the present subsidy programs. For that reason, I am opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORD: On page 5, line 24, after the semicolon, strike out "*Provided further*, That none of the foregoing provisions shall apply to any payments or losses incurred in transactions with respect to competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oilseed."

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, all this amendment does is give these antisubsidy boys a chance to vote for or against subsidies amounting to some $60,000,000 a year for soybeans, peanuts, and cottonseed oil. If you want to vote for a subsidy for those and vote against subsidies for the consumer, go to it, but you are going to be in the position of voting for subsidies on the one hand and against them on the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FORD and Miss SUMNER of Illinois) there were—ayes 34, noes 147.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is there anyone on the majority side that is advocating the passage of this bill who has charge of the debate and the time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky, the acting chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In favor of the passage of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. He is in charge of the time for the debate on the bill on the majority side.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: On page 4, commencing with line 22, strike out all of section 3 down to and including line 2, on page 6.

TO STRIKE OUT SECTION 3

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a question of support prices or not having support prices. This is really what I believe everyone will agree is the meat in the coconut. If you are against subsidies of all kinds, a vote should be cast against this amendment. But if you are in favor of certain subsidies your vote should be cast for the amendment. In other words, if you are willing to carry on the program as it has been in the past and save $28 in some cases for every $1 you put out on copper, and several dollars on sugar and many other items, a vote should be cast for this amendment. I hope it is. I hope it is adopted, because we cannot afford to run the risk of run-away inflation in this country. The question of subsidies is an old one. The tariff was the first subsidy, and the first general law ever passed by the American Congress 154 years ago was the tariff bill. The railroads have been subsidized and the merchant marine and the inland waterways and newspapers and magazines to the extent of $100,000,000 a year, which is a consumers' subsidy, because the subscribers get the benefit of most of it and is therefore a desirable subsidy and should be continued.

We have subsidized aluminum, copper, brass, lead, zinc, and all kinds of farm products to help the farmer as well as the consumers.

I hope you vote for this amendment.

If this amendment fails, I will be in the position of having to vote for the bill or vote against the continuance of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I very much favor the continuance of that Corporation, so if forced to, I will vote for the bill with section 3 in it. We cannot legislate unless we send something to the other body to consider. If the Senate fails to strike out the subsidy prohibition and it is not stricken out in conference between the two Houses, the President will veto the bill, and I will vote to sustain the veto. Then we can pass a bill continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation without the amendments that will put us on a paved highway to inflation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the howling propaganda for consumer subsidies is a result of an administrative strategy that is fundamentally dishonest and cowardly.

The administration says the choice is between subsidies and uncontrolled inflation. Whose choice? Not the choice of Congress, for Congress has enacted the price-control law. Not the choice of consumers, or labor, or the public, for they want the price control law fairly and efficiently enforced. The threatened choice between control and surrender on prices is being made by the administration. What they really mean by this dire threat is that they are going to lie down on the job, and desert the wartime post assigned them by the people, not because they will no longer have the power to hold down prices and wages, but because they will no longer have the will. They say, "Pressure will become too great." Pressure on whom? Pressure on the administration. They mean that there is no nice, easy way to play politics with prices and wages any more, and they are unwilling to hold prices and wages in line the hard way, even though they have the power to do it under law.

In this fight, no one is opposing any and all subsidies, although everyone is deploring subsidies in theory. Our Government has resorted to subsidies many times. The fight here is against just one form of subsidy, the plan of having the Government pay part of everybody's grocery bill. The insidious, progressive, universal demoralization that follows from this practice has been proven time and again in the history of mankind. The Roman Empire subsidized wheat progressively, more and more, and in a few years free bread, "panem et circenses," was one direct cause of the fall of the Roman Empire.

Our country has already taken the first, insidious, pleasant step in demoralization. Only eight hundred million added to the debt and yet how pleasant it is to feel the Government, somebody else, is giving us part of our food. The proponents admit this is dangerous business, but the administration, although they have failed so far, say that by continuing the doses, increasing them just a little, we can achieve painless price control. Up to date, their other methods have been painful and have not controlled prices. Their very attempts to achieve painless price control, to tinker a little here and there, have caused excruciating pains to break out in some new place. Nevertheless, they threaten to abandon all attempts to control prices, unless they are allowed to play with this deadly narcotic of consumer subsidies. The tippler, whose attempts at progressive pleasantness have failed, threatens to get drunk if he is not allowed morphine.

Once we start to subsidize consumers, there is no end to our problem. What makes you think that the crowd, who have failed to satisfy anyone, because they have tried to satisfy everyone, will suddenly turn over a new leaf and be firm and achieve price control through self-control? Their despairing cries now show that they intend to get off the hot lid of prices, and permit them to rise, but to use this new device of consumer subsidies to paralyze the public against the shock of inflation to allay the pain temporarily.

There is only one way to meet this issue. We must keep consumers' prices real. The Government must hold them down the hard way, by controlling wages and the costs that enter into consumers' prices. Failure and favoritism must be kept in the open. The pressure from pressure groups, including the consumers, the greatest pressure group of all, is almost but not quite unbearable. We owe it to ourselves, to our country, to our children's children, to stand firm and to force this wobbling administration to stand firm, to stop being dishonest and cowardly, to buckle down to the task of controlling prices under law.

The amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on this amendment and on this section.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PATMAN) there were—ayes 102, noes 173.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PACE. I offer the following amendment, which I have sent to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

Mr. PACE. I understood that all time had expired.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

Mr. PACE. I would not want to offer it unless I had time to discuss it. I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, Congress is not responsible for food and commodity price rises, though it cannot reject responsibility for trying to curb them. Present exorbitant prices, with consequent threat of an ever-increasing spiral of inflation, are due principally to the failure of administrative agencies of the Government to deal effectually with the black market. The main and principal cause of current high prices lies in the continuance and even the aggravation of black-market conditions in practically every community in this country.

Who can deny it? Who is prepared to state that the black market does not exist, and that if you are willing to pay the price you cannot buy practically whatever you want in almost every community in this country?

Why should this condition be permitted? Why should we allow wealthy groups and temporarily enriched war workers to have all they want and need while our low-income group families are forced to hew close to the line of ration stamps, curtailed supplies, greatly increased prices, and generally prevalent scarcities?

How can we defend the spectacle of meat rotting in the markets of America while millions of our people are unable to procure it at their regular meat markets? How can we justify the destruction or export to nonmilitary foreign peoples of basic foodstuffs, while our own people feel the pinch of restricted quantities of these vital necessities and skyrocketed prices?

Price subsidies will not cure this condition. By putting more money in the pockets of consumers they may well aggravate it. We are not faced with the same conditions as England, which is a great importing country and where the Government can control imports and, therefore, deal with the whole supply of commodities, subject to price control. Moreover, this country is not in the same favored position which enables it to roll back prices of basic commodities through the use of lend-lease goods.

But let us sweep aside all these technical arguments. Let us admit that subsidies in some form are desirable, if the need is compelling enough, to help consumer groups by keeping down prices and thus lessening the pressure of wage increase demands. If it is justifiable and logical and reasonable to roll back the prices of meat or butter 5 cents, it is justifiable to roll back the prices of every commodity by the same proportionate amount, and it is also justifiable for the Government to pay half, or even all of the cost of such roll-backs.

Thus you establish the principle that the Government of the United States is under an obligation to pay part, or indeed all, of the grocery, meat, and food bills of all its people. To my mind, this will lead to economic chaos, inflation, confusion, and the ultimate destruction of our basic mercantile and economic institutions. It is dangerous folly for the Government to undertake to pay the food bills of the Nation. Such a course will not only make our citizens minions of the State but will soften their moral fiber and render them dependent upon the State for their existence.

I am not disturbed about the abandonment of the Little Steel formula. In fact, it has already been abandoned. I am disturbed about securing for our wage earners sufficient money to purchase food for themselves and families, and it does not matter substantially, excluding extremes, what the levels of prices and wages are. The important thing is the maintenance of a proper relationship between prices and wages which will not penalize wage earners or persons with fixed incomes. As I pointed out, the balance can be maintained by checking black markets, by establishing a fixed relationship between wages and cost-of-living price indexes based on established scientific principles and not on the ukase of some starry-eyed bureaucrat.

Neither am I disturbed by the bogie of inflation and the much abused spiral of rising prices that is prophesied if these subsidies are not permitted. The very same people who now tell us that inflation is an imminent danger were telling us a few short years ago that it would be a blessing.

In 1941 Congress passed a price-control bill which the administration demanded as necessary to prevent a runaway inflation during the war. Now let it be enforced. Let the O. P. A. enforce the criminal law against the perpetrators of the black market. Let Government agencies themselves unravel the tangled skein of production, distribution, price, and wage problems that has been rolled up through bureaucratic incompetence, radical experimentation, and lack of courage to face and grapple with current realities. The Government has the power to control prices and wages without subsidies. Let it invoke that power in a forthright, intelligent manner. If black markets are smashed and price ceilings enforced, prices will be brought into balance with wages, the people will have necessary food and we can turn all our attention to the most important question ever to face us—the sure, speedy winning of the war.

If this form of government which has permitted us to live as freemen, and this economic system which has brought us such unparalleled prosperity and happiness are to be thrown to the dogs of socialism or communism, then it will not be with my vote. If this Congress proposes to yield to the same demands that the leadership of Rome and Greece and every other great democracy in history yielded to and thus destroy the substance, strength, and vigor of American freedom, then it will not be with my vote.

This Government exists for the people. It must be supported and upheld by the people. It can be taxed out of existence just as surely, if less speedily, than it can be overthrown. When the Congress of the United States starts to pass out doles to pay the grocery and commodity bills of the people, it is time to throw in the towel. Not only will our form of government be transmuted into a totalitarian dictatorship of superpolitical and superradical bureaucratic groups, but the system and spirit of free enterprise which has been responsible for all our progress and upon which the future security and prosperity of the country depends will be liquidated and discarded.

Free enterprise is not an attribute of great wealth alone. It does not exist solely for the talented and the favored. It is the valued possession of every person who seeks to advance himself. It is the boon of the professional man, the small businessman, the farmer, the artisan—the safeguard of the ambitious and the industrious, for it gives to the humblest, most inarticulate citizen the chance to improve his lot and join the populous ranks of those who have won their substance by the use of their own talents and the fruits of their own toil. It is the special prize of high paid, high standard, free American labor, out of which it permits opportunities for advancement and leadership to develop. Indeed, it is more important to the working man of frugal means than it is to anyone else. Wealth may be wasted through profligacy and extravagance, as it is certainly being confiscated through taxation. But when you take away from the man who toils hard for a living the assurance that by his industry, his thrift, his devotion to duty, his sacrifice, he can have for himself and give to his sons and daughters the chance to rise to the topmost rung of the ladder of success, you will have stifled and killed one of the greatest prizes and heritages of American citizenship.

To me, there is something palpably illogical about rolling back prices at a time when, according to Government figures, wages and the national income are higher than ever before in the history of the Nation in order to save consumers money they will promptly use to bid up prices on other commodities.

Some of those behind these subsidies operate on the theory that the American people have become soft and have to be given the harsh, bitter sacrifices of war in sugar-coated pellets. Subsidies will not lighten the load. They will simply put off the day of reckoning and like a shot in the arm result in demands for greater and impossible concessions.

Cut down the inflationary gap with heavy and heavier taxes if you must, but do not meddle further with our basic economic patterns.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. The Commodity Credit Corporation may sell at a loss perishable fruits or vegetables, owned or controlled by it, the increased production of which has been requested by the War Food Administrator, if there is danger of substantial loss through deterioration by spoilage.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment following section 4.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'CONNOR: On page 6, line 8, after section 4, insert:

"SEC. 5. The War Food Administrator is hereby directed to establish support prices for cattle and sheep sold for slaughter and, pursuant to title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, to issue such orders as may be necessary requiring all persons purchasing cattle and sheep for slaughter to pay such support prices."

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section close in 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the motion of the gentleman from Georgia is not in order.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I move that debate on this section close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is made that the motion is not in order. The motion is not in order until some debate has been had on the section.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, this proposed amendment to this bill would require the Food Administrator to promulgate support prices supporting the prices of cattle and sheep just the same as he has done with reference to hogs. The best argument, Mr. Chairman, that I can make in support of this amendment is an account sales of sheep sold in South St. Paul on the 6th day of October 1943; and sheep have gone down since then. They sold from 5 to 4 cents per pound, not much more than enough to pay the freight, yardage, feed, and general expenses of shipment. The packer who bought those sheep, after he got the subsidy payment of 95 cents, made in the neighborhood of $8.48 clear on that

sheep, considering the carcass that he sold to the Government at 16½ cents per pound, as the carcass would process about 65 pounds. He sells the wool—sometimes the entire pelt, and the offal for fertilizer purposes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Arizona livestock men say they do not want subsidies, but I believe they do favor support prices. Do I understand that there are support prices now made for some animals and meats but not for cattle and sheep?

Mr. O'CONNOR. There are support prices for hogs, but not for cattle and sheep. The market today for sheep is practically demoralized and for cattle it is going down every day.

Mr. MURDOCK. I can see great difficulty in setting ceilings on livestock but under present conditions there does not seem to be even a tissue-paper floor under them. A support price would be better for our livestock people than any kind of subsidy that I can think of. I hope it can be provided for this necessary food supply.

Mr. O'CONNOR. It makes no difference whether you have subsidies or not. You have got to have a floor price for sheep and cattle, or else the market is going to be demoralized and those people are going to have to take very little for their sheep and for their cattle.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. How does one synchronize this idea of supply and demand in the pork market when you have to put support prices under hogs at the present time, because there are so many in the market?

Mr. O'CONNOR. There is the biggest supply of meat on hand today than we have had in many years in the past. There are over 600,000,000 pounds of meat today in storage in the United States, yet we have points practically prohibiting the people from purchasing that meat, though there it is in unprecedented quantities.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I agree with the gentleman and want to compliment him on his unfailing interest in the livestock industry, but under this amendment will you subsidize the producers rather than the big packers?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Absolutely. The producer will get the benefit of the subsidy and today he is not getting it.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. The big packer will not get it?

Mr. O'CONNOR. No. I want to say this to my colleagues: Under the present system the packers are making more money today than they ever have in their business. Subsidies will be of no consequence to the producer of live animals unless you fix a floor price, then the subsidy may be included in the price that is paid to the stockman.

The packers standing in together, as we know they do, depress the price so the subsidy does not inure to the benefit of the shipper. My amendment provides for support prices for cattle and sheep sold for slaughter pursuant to title III of the Second War Powers Act of 1942. Under that power and this amendment the Price Administrator can fix the floor price for cattle and sheep and enforce such floor price or prices by refusing to allocate cattle and sheep to those processors or slaughterers who refuse to pay the floor price. In that manner the provisions of this amendment could be enforced. The directive issued by Mr. Vinson October 26 attempting to fix a support price for cattle provides that the packer who fails to pay the support price would forfeit his subsidy only to the extent by which he pays less than the support price. When he fixed the support price for hogs the penalty was a forfeiture of the entire subsidy paid regardless of how little the packer paid under the support price. Now under present conditions it can be seen that the producer of both cattle and sheep has no guaranty of a support price backed up by a Government order as is the case with the hog support price. Nor are there any formal penalties if the processors buy below the support price.

I think that those in the O. P. A. who have given the subject of floor prices thought, agree with me that the only means by which we can insure the passing on of subsidies to producers, if we are going to use subsidies, is by establishing minimum prices for the live animals. This floor price is an essential part of the program to stabilize the price of livestock regardless of whether or not subsidies are paid to the packers. If the subsidy is paid to the packer this minimum price may be raised to the extent of the subsidy as compared to its level if no subsidy is paid.

The decline in prices of live animals such as sheep and cattle has discouraged feeders from maintaining the high level of production that was reached in 1943 and also the uncertainty and confusion of the price for both cattle and sheep have caused these feeders of both cattle and lambs to bypass feeding this year and we are going to feel this condition next year when we keenly need lamb, mutton, and beef. I want to again point out that we have in storage today, or as of November 1 this year, 630,000,000 pounds of meat, beef, pork, lamb, and mutton, being almost one-third higher than what it was for the average of 5 years between 1938 and 1942. The average during those years was 414,535,000 pounds.

When you consider this huge and unprecedented storage of these meats and then consider the value of the meat points which in effect denies the civilian population the privilege of buying this meat, such a program does not make sense. In order to give any relief we should have a floor price under these animals and the value of the points for meat should be reduced at least 50 percent or entirely discontinue their use for a period of at least 2 months, giving an opportunity to dispose in the usual channels this tremendous supply of meat that is so sorely needed by the workingman and the people of the country generally.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'CONNOR) there were—ayes 41, noes 132.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HERTER. I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HERTER: After section 4 add:

"SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the limitations provided by section 3 the War Food Administrator is authorized to plan a food-stamp program and to provide for the issuance of food stamps under such plan in order to increase the food purchasing power of individuals and institutions under subsection (b) to be eligible persons. The funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be available to and be utilized by the War Food Administrator in carrying out any food-stamp program under this section in such amounts and in such manner as may be determined by him.

"Subsection (a). Any plan under this act for the issuance of food stamps shall include provisions (1) limiting the use of food stamps to use in connection with the purchase of articles of food designated from time to time jointly by the War Food Administrator and the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service; (2) authorizing retailers and other distributors of food to accept food stamps in payment for purchases of articles of food designated under clause (1); and (3) limiting the value of food which may be purchased with food stamps by an eligible person to such percentage (not to exceed 25 percent) of the value of the total purchases of food by such person as is fixed by the War Food Administrator.

"Subsection (b) (1). The State welfare agency of each State designated by the Governor of the State shall determine and certify to the War Food Administrator in such form as may be prescribed by him the institutions and individuals that are eligible persons under this act.

"(2) The War Food Administrator shall reimburse each State for all actual and necessary expenses incurred in carrying out the provisions of subsection (1).

"Subsection (c). As used in this act the term 'eligible person' means—

"(1) Any individual whose rate of family income is not more than 20 percent greater than his rate of family income on January 1, 1939, and whose rate of family income is not greater than $1,000 per year in the case of a single person, or $1,200 per year in the case of a married person and his spouse, plus $100 for each dependent.

"(2) Any individual 50 percent or more of whose family income is used for the purchase of articles of food.

"(3) Any private institution or any individual who maintains a foster home for children or provides food and shelter for any individual described in paragraph (1) or (2).

"As used in this section the term 'family income' means the income of an individual and the income of his spouse and his dependents, if any."

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I understand a point of order will be made against the amendment in order to save the time of the Members. I ask unani-

mous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment and that it may be included in the RECORD at this point, and that my remarks may be included in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the House failed to adopt the amendment offered by the able gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], for which I voted, and which would have placed a definite limit on so-called consumer subsidies and would have strengthened the hand of those who are endeavoring to hold down the cost of living, by tying in subsidies with the Little Steel formula. However, even his amendment made no differentiation between persons of small means and low fixed income and those more fortunately situated.

The amendment which I have offered is the substance of a bill which I introduced last June and which at present is in the hands of the Committee on Banking and Currency. It is a plan, through the medium of food stamps, for extending direct assistance to persons in the lower income brackets in meeting the increased cost of food. My proposal is an out-and-out subsidy to consumers, but it is confined to those groups of our people upon whom the higher wartime cost of living falls with special severity.

It defines as eligible for assistance persons whose annual income, if single, does not exceed $1,000, or, if married, does not exceed $1,200, plus $100 for each dependent. But there is the further important condition, namely, that the family's income has not increased as much as 20 percent since January 1, 1939. Also eligible for assistance by the terms of the plan are all persons, regardless of status or income, who are so situated that 50 percent or more of the family income is applied to the purchase of food.

With respect to these groups of persons, and it is estimated that approximately 12,000,000 individuals would be eligible for this assistance, the plan contemplates issuance to them of food-purchase currency in coupon form, in amounts not exceeding 25 percent of their total monthly food budget.

By the terms of the amendment which I have offered, the War Food Administrator is charged with the responsibility of the issuance and the distribution of these food-stamp coupons, but, in order to guard against political favoritism, the token currency may be given only to such persons and institutions within the eligible classifications as may be certified by such public welfare agencies as the Governors of the States may designate. Thus, local, nonpolitical agencies, rather than a new Federal bureaucracy, have the privilege and duty of determining the recipients of this consumer subsidy.

These provisions whereby the yardstick of eligibility is a precise measure laid down by Congress and whereby the maximum amount of the Government's contribution is a fixed and uniform percentage and whereby local agencies, wholly disassociated from Washington political connections, sift the applications and certify the recipients, differentiates this food-stamp program from the food-stamp arrangement to which the Government resorted prior to the war as a mechanism for distributing to needy individuals Government stocks of so-called surplus commodities.

This token currency, under the plan which I have proposed, which is to be given to certified eligibles in an amount equal to 25 percent of their total food bills, is not to be exchangeable for any kind of food. The War Food Administrator is empowered to designate the particular food commodities for which the coupon stamps will be valid. He makes these designations after consultation with and approval by the United States Surgeon General.

The stamp coupons, after they have passed from the consumer to the retail storekeepers shall be redeemed by the Government out of funds by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Estimates as to the over-all cost of this plan to the Federal Treasury are necessarily only an approximation. The exact cost cannot be predetermined. But on the assumption that about 12,000,000 persons would be eligible for this assistance by the terms and specifications set forth in the amendment, and computing on the basis of present retail price levels of foods, it is figured that the annual cost would not exceed $700,000,000.

If it be contended that this food-stamp plan involves as large an expenditure as is in contemplation under the consumer food-subsidy program upon which the administration is now embarked and which Congress is now proposing to prohibit, my answer is that under a subsidy plan confined to the needy and of specific dimensions there is a fixed ceiling with respect to the cost, whereas under any program of general subsidies the cost will rise sky high. It seems to me fairly obvious that if we are going to undertake to pay out of the Federal Treasury a portion of the food bills of every person in the country in an honest effort to hold down or to roll back the cost of living for everyone and if the contribution is to be of any really appreciable amount in dollars and cents, it is bound to cost the Treasury a great deal more than the amounts which have been mentioned in the course of today's debate, a vastly greater sum than the seven hundred or eight hundred million dollars which is said to be the limit of cost on the subsidies now in operation. It is obvious that any program of general consumer subsidies, granted irrespective of individual needs, will have the same propensities to expand as would a snowball rolling down hill.

One of the professed objectives of the administration's program is to ease the strain of advancing food costs on the pocketbooks of the poor. The coupon stamp plan which I have proposed attains this objective without disrupting the ordinary processes of food distribution and without tapping the Treasury and charging up to the cost of the war and adding to the public debt a portion of the food bills of the well to do and the food bills of the now highly paid war workers in industry.

I trust that the House will be willing to accept this amendment as an alternative for the subsidy program which the administration has initiated and which, by the terms of the pending bill, Congress is now proposing to prohibit.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order, but I would like to say one word.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the point of order for the time being.

Mr. HERTER. In this entire debate, Mr. Chairman, the question as to what is going to be done for the white-collar class and the small pensioner who today has already taken a pretty severe beating from the increase in prices, is an extremely important matter. The committee was kind enough to hear me on the subject of the stamp-tax plan, and I am hoping that the committee will continue its hearings on that matter and will report a bill favorably to take care of that type of person.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I am interested in your plan because you have at heart, as I do, the interests of the people who are unorganized and whom a great many of us would like to help. Consideration of some sort or a food-stamp plan of some kind will have to be used to get help to these people who are dependent upon allotments from their folks in the service or on pensions, or on salaries which have not been raised over the past 3 to 4 years. I have spent a great deal of time since last spring when this matter of subsidies was discussed for the first time on the floor of this House trying to understand this question. I am opposed to the idea of great and ever-increasing subsidies because I fear the effects on our population if allowed to go too far. I have listened attentively, though, to all the debates on this floor, read everything I possibly could on the subject, discussed the matter with my constituents at home and, in general, have done everything possible to arrive at an answer to this vexing question. There has been no alternative plan offered except this plan of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and while I do not know its details, the idea seems sound because it proposes to reach the people who need help the most in combating the high cost of living but who are unorganized and whose voice cannot compete with either the organized farmer or laborer. They are the people who need help the most because their salaries have remained stationary over a long period, their pensions and annuities have not been increased, and their allotments from their kin in

the service have not been raised. I want to compliment the gentleman for advancing an idea of merit and in considering the welfare of this forgotten group.

Mr. HERTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the gentleman's plan is a very humane one and I am hoping that the committee will give him a hearing at an early date.

Mr. HERTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. Is it not true that a great number, if not a majority of the white-collar class, are working for private industry, and that private industry would be perfectly willing to increase their wages without any obligation upon the part of the Government, if the Government would permit private industry to increase those wages and thus relieve the temporary burden on the white-collar worker?

Mr. HERTER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, but my particular bill would cover a much larger group than the white-collar class.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There are about 30,000,000 people in this country who would be the beneficiaries of your plan, and who do not now receive any benefit out of war expenditures, and that is the class you want to take care of?

Mr. HERTER. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] make a point of order against the amendment?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I make the point of order against the amendment, Mr. Chairman, that it is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] and the point of order is sustained.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. VOORHIS of California was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts has been declared out of order. His amendment is similar to a bill for a national food allotment program which I have had before the House for a long time.

If we had provided protection for the fixed-income and low-income families of this Nation so that through the issuance of food stamps or food-purchase certificates to them they could be assured of the ability to buy the food they need, then Congress could, with some justice, ban the use of subsidies and require increased prices as this bill in present form does.

I should like to see us able to determine price policy wholly from the standpoint of securing maximum production. As long, however, as some 15,000,000 families in this Nation receive less than $1,000 per year of income action by Congress which would result in increased living costs is unfair to this very large group of our people, and bears very heavily on them.

The answer to inflation lies in a far more courageous tax program than this Congress is apparently going to pass. And that is the only basic answer. For it is the only way to lessen the pressure upon prices. In its absence we are forced back on unsatisfactory and second-best methods, such as price control, subsidies, and all the rest.

Because of this group of our people who have by and large unorganized political power I have voted for amendments to modify the prohibition against subsidies contained in this bill. I believe those prohibitions are too sweeping. I wanted to be able to vote for this bill because the Commodity Credit Corporation is an absolutely necessary agency to the operation of the food-production program for war. I know the bill will pass anyway. Therefore my vote against this bill is simply a protest vote against the failure of Congress to show regard for the problems of those really low-income families I referred to a moment ago. I hope the Senate may do a better job with the bill than the House has done, and I further hope that prompt action may be taken by the Congress on a program such as the gentleman from Massachusetts presents in his amendment. Were that action taken I would personally feel very different about legislation to ban consumer subsidies. For I do not like such subsidies any better than those who have supported this bill.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PASSAGE OF ANTISUBSIDY BILL WILL MEAN INFLATION—HIGHER CONSUMER FOOD PRICES—SHORT-SIGHTED AND POLITICALLY MINDED REPUBLICANS WILL BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, the statement of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that only labor leaders and those of predatory wealth are in favor of striking out section 3 for the continuation of subsidies, is indeed ridiculous.

I am convinced and have positive proof that the vast majority of the American people who recognize the present-day conditions and are fearful of the ever-mounting increase in the cost of food products are in favor of the subsidy program. I pause to suggest that the term subsidy as we are using it here is a misnomer and can more properly be designated as a practical form of price adjustment, a sensible plant to hold down the ever-increasing cost of food products and to ward off the imminent danger of inflation. I need not remind you that this is a most critical period and that under the present conditions inflation can easily be precipitated.

It has been stated here that the subsidy payments might amount to $800,000,000. I cannot dispute that, nor can I dispute the assertion that the American people may be obliged to pay from twelve to eighteen billion dollars above the present cost of living. But I warn you that this would be only a drop in the bucket compared to inflation. The gentlemen who represent the big farmers, the richest of the farmers, and the insurance companies and the banks, who own huge acreages and who, like most farmers, have obtained greater returns, returns far beyond their expectations, the past few years, are opposing subsidies because by elimination of subsidies they feel they will be in a position to force the prices of farm products sky high.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the real dirt farmers, those owning 40-, 60-, 80-, or even 160-acre farms and representative of the honest-to-God type of farmer, are not advocating or "pressuring" the passage of this antisubsidy bill. The real pressure for the passage of this bill comes from the commercial growers, the coterie of gentlemen who, during the dark days of the Republican Hoover administration in 1930, 1931, and 1932 were holders of farm mortgages, foreclosed those mortgages with pocket money and are now the owners of farm acreage comprising many farms, the possessors of 500, 1,000, 2,000, 5,000, and 10,000 acres. They are not concerned with inflation or the effect of rising prices on the livelihood of the consumers of the white-collar class, 22,000,000 workers whose wages or salaries are less than $1,000 a year, or approximately $20 a week, or the additional 11,000,000 white-collar workers whose earnings are less than $2,000 a year, with a wage range of $20 to $38 a week, a total of 33,000,000 wage earners whose shoulders are already bending under the burden of increased taxes.

Further, this farm group and the Members advocating the ban of farm products subsidy payments have not considered the effect of increased food prices upon the dependents of 9,000,000 soldiers, sailors, marines, coast guardsmen, and members of the auxiliary branches of our armed forces. The allowances and allotments of these dependents are fixed and inflexible. How can this deserving group exist if they are compelled to pay an additional 5 to 20 percent for their food? I ask those Members who advocate the ban on subsidy payments whether they considered or gave thought to what increased food prices would mean to the nearly 2,000,000 aged persons on State and public-assistance rolls; to the 1,000,000 disabled veterans of the first World War and their dependents; to the 158,000 retired and disabled firemen, police officers, county and municipal employees; to the 53,000 blind persons receiving pensions; to the 700,000 retired workers, widows, and young children receiving social insurance payments under the Old Age and Survivors Insurance program of the United States Social Security Board; the more than 400,000 persons who are drawing fixed annuities for which they had put away their sav-

ings for many years, and the thousands of retired school teachers in every State of the Union?

COST OF LIVING IN CITIES

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the advocates of the antisubsidy payments are aware that even in the smallest of towns it costs a family of 4 over $1,200 a year to live. I have here the cost of living in 33 of our larger cities, and it shows the lowest cost of living is in Mobile, Ala., which is $1,424, and for the other 32 cities the range is upward to $1,758 for San Francisco and New York City, followed by Washington, D. C., Detroit, and Chicago. I insert the cost-of-living figures for a family of 4 in 33 cities, as follows:

Cost of living for family of 4 in 33 cities of the United States, Dec. 14, 1942

Atlanta, Ga	$1,580
Baltimore, Md	1,594
Birmingham, Ala	1,542
Boston, Mass	1,691
Buffalo, N. Y	1,598
Chicago, Ill	1,718
Cincinnati, Ohio	1,612
Cleveland, Ohio	1,690
Denver, Colo	1,549
Detroit, Mich	1,723
Houston, Tex	1,540
Indianapolis, Ind	1,554
Jacksonville, Fla	1,594
Kansas City, Mo	1,506
Los Angeles, Calif	1,602
Manchester, N. H	1,634
Memphis, Tenn	1,598
Milwaukee, Wis	1,651
Minneapolis, Minn	1,660
Mobile, Ala	1,454
New Orleans, La	1,546
New York, N. Y	1,758
Norfolk, Va	1,652
Philadelphia, Pa	1,601
Pittsburgh, Pa	1,642
Portland, Maine	1,636
Portland, Oreg	1,641
Richmond, Va	1,589
St. Louis, Mo	1,655
San Francisco, Calif	1,758
Scranton, Pa	1,640
Seattle, Wash	1,670
Washington, D. C	1,757

INCREASE IN FOOD PRICES

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the high cost of living in cities, I insert some official figures on food prices which have continuously risen since 1939, which accounts for 40 percent of the increased cost of living to the city dweller. They are as follows:

Percent of increase in food prices

Commodity	Quantity	Jan. 1, 1941	Sept. 15, 1942	Today	Percentage
Chicken	Pound	0.21	0.29	0.44	104
Cabbage	Pound	.02	.03	.05	150
Apples	Pound	.04	.04	.12	200
Tomatoes (canned)	Can	.04	.05	.10	150
Oranges	Dozen	.15	.19	.45	200
Butter	Pound	.30	.49	.56	86
Pork chops	Pound	.23	.31	.52	120
Eggs	Dozen	.27	.33	.60	122
Coffee	1-pound bag	.13	.20	.26	100
Spaghetti	Pound	.07	.08	.15	114
Tomatoes (fresh)	Pound	.03	.04	.10	233
Beans	Pound	.05	.09	.11	120
Potatoes	Pound	.04	.04	.06	50

Mr. Chairman, I have given the wages of 22,000,000 workers who earn less than $1,000 a year, of an additional 11,000,000 whose compensation is less than $2,000 a year, and the millions who are disabled, retired and receiving dependents' allowances, annuities and pensions. I ask those Members who advocate the discontinuance of subsidy payments how they can conceivably justify their vote which will inflict an increase in the cost of living to the extent of 5 to 20 percent upon this class of citizens of the white-collar and fixed-income class.

The advocates of this bill, I repeat, seem to have little or no concern for the welfare of the most deserving of our citizens and refuse to consider their impoverished condition in this critical period. I think it would be a great and serious mistake to vote for the retention of section 3 that provides for the elimination of the price adjustment plan misnamed "subsidy."

I have in my possession hundreds of telegrams and letters, not only from the labor organizations of this land, but from merchants, businessmen, manufacturers, and even sane financiers, who fear and dread the consequences if we act so unwisely as to fail to eliminate section 3 of this bill at this time.

Indeed, I am amazed that nearly all of you Republicans, who proclaim to your constituents while at home among the people of your districts that you are the friends of the people and the farmers, should now force this legislation which definitely tends to precipitate inflation. And I am wondering what possible excuses you may give your constituents when campaigning as candidates for reelection, because by that time the people of the country generally will understand and realize how faithless you have been to their interests. Of course, I realize that you are just playing politics, catering to the big business that comes across with campaign contributions, while at the same time relying upon the President to veto your action, as he will be compelled to do in the interest of saving the country from inflation that would be bound to reduce the value of our money, your money.

The least informed persons must recognize and realize that if the prices of food products are not to come down but instead are to be still further increased the workers of the country will demand, and will be justified in demanding, increases in wages and salaries. And especially will this be true of those underpaid millions that I have called attention to.

It is to be regretted that these millions of white-collar workers are unorganized. You short-sighted Republicans who are generally opposed to organized labor and are advocating and forcing this legislation are encouraging organization of the white-collar millions to organize so that they, too, like the farm bloc, will have someone to advocate their cause.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, judging from the way the vote has gone on the several amendments proposed to this bill today, I suppose the measure will pass with the prohibition against subsidies in it. Now, I fear it will be a mistake to deprive the Government of one of the means to holding the line against inflation. I hold no brief for the mistake made by agencies of Government charged with the administration of the price-control laws we have already passed. Mistakes have been made, but the cost of living has been held down somewhat, and I would much rather strengthen the hands of the Government to hold back the flood of inflation than to weaken them.

Several times I have pointed out instances in American political history when Congress took back the powers which it had delegated to the administrative branch of our Government during a great emergency, but heretofore it has usually been done after the emergency had safely passed. We are still in the midst of this most terrible of all emergencies, and I think now is the wrong time to teach the bureaucrats a lesson, even if it is admitted they have one coming to them. There is such a thing as jumping out of the frying pan into the fire.

I did not get the full import of the amendment which was last offered and which was ruled out on a point of order as not germane. Apparently it was an effort to recall the food-stamp plan to save the poorer class from the ravages of hunger when the cost of living has gone sky high. I certainly am very much concerned about the white-collared class and all the millions who have not had war increases in their incomes. However, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. For my part I would rather put forth effort to minimize the rising cost of living than encourage it and then try to relieve the suffering caused by it. Both may be necessary to a degree, and I would provide for both, but emphasize partial prevention more than partial cure.

I have never been unfair enough to want the primary producers who bring forth our necessities from the earth to work for nothing, or for the sole advantage of all the rest of us. I want substantial justice done those primary producers, but I think it can be done without pyramiding costs through a host of secondary producers to the crushing burden of all consumers and the exaggerated enlargement of the national debt. We are told the wise use of subsidies will best accomplish the purpose. All who would forbid such subsidies are under obligation to suggest and provide a better way to do it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have followed the legislation of the Banking and Currency Committee very closely in regard to the Price Control Act and the present legislation. The provision in the Price Control Act of 1941, whereby producers of war foods are given an 85–90 percent parity floor, has done much to encourage food production.

The two schools of that are still at odds, it seems. One school believes in a maximum food production program as a means of combatting inflation and of preventing starvation; the other school still clings to the price philosophy and

the feeling if they can only plan it that way, it will come out aplenty for all.

If milk producers are furnished feed at a lower price, it would prevent an advance in the milk price. No agency, including the C. C. C., has made a sensible and constructive effort to furnish this feed.

The big question involved in this present legislation is not subsidy or no subsidy. The real question involved is whether you believe in private enterprise or whether you believe that a governmental agency knows more about business than the businessmen of this country.

Since it seems agreed that producer subsidies are not effected by the bill, the only point that is made an issue is the consumer-subsidy angle. Even the so-called producer subsidies are not being carried on in a very efficient, fair, or common-sense manner. The Christian Herter bill to revive the stamp plan, to provide food for the lower-income groups does not get approval. No effort is really being made to provide food at a reasonable price to the low-income group.

The problems involved boil down to these:

First. Do you wish to tell your feed dealers and other businessmen in your district that you believe in private enterprise, but that you did vote to appropriate $800,000,000 to a "super-duper" federally financed agency to carry on its bucket-shop operations with millions of unnecessary waste and overhead, and finance the Federal agency to run their business for them?

Second. This C. C. C. agency has and is fathering and fostering programs that harm the war food program. It is and has been engaged in activities that are not helpful to the war effort.

The first reason certain groups and individuals are trying to make this legislation an issue, is because they are so fond of putting the Government into business. They are evidently more anxious to put the Government into business than they are to see that this agency follows a procedure that would furnish food. When the time comes that any Government agency is put in business it would be well to select someone whose service record shows has had at least one day's business experience. The second reason certain groups are vociferous in their opposition to this bill is because of the cheap politics involved. Anyone can visualize the politics involved. However, I doubt if anyone is going to be deceived into thinking that he can play cheap politics and receive the approval of the American people.

As long as the man with the price can buy cream by the gallon without points, though the housewife is required to pay 5 points for a pound of cottage cheese made from skim milk, there isn't much indication that the O. P. A. is even interested in first, distributing food equally, nor second, in distributing food fairly.

It appears to me that any agency that really knew how or wanted to produce maximum amounts of food would get some common sense in their programs, and would not spend so much time selling the wonders of the New Deal and take credit for planning it that way.

Please keep in mind that we have an Agriculture Committee in this House that is rather active and close to these food-production problems. We have an Appropriation Committee very close to food-production problems.

Let us not be misled by any untruthful propaganda, by people not familiar with food production. Let us support this if we really want to bring order out of chaos and confusion. Let us remember that the hold-the-line advocates should find out that wheat and corn have not reached the line and that cotton is not even at the line much of the time. The inflation line was badly bent way back last April 20 when the Congress gave Federal employees receiving $2,900 to $1,200 per year a $628 increase in salary to meet the increase in cost of living—and this without the protest of the O. P. A., Jimmy Byrnes, or any administration spokesman. That was the time we put the President in an embarrassing position. You gave the members of the War Labor Board $628 to meet the increased cost of living. These men are getting $10,000 a year. They were asked to sit across the table and tell Mr. John Lewis that his miners could not have any increase in salary because it would cause inflation.

It seems to me that the only time anyone seems to get excited about inflation is when the low-income groups are involved or when the American farmer is in the picture.

Mr. FAY. Mr. Chairman, today I shall vote in favor of food subsidies. I shall do it because the financial health of my country and its people is more important to me than the financial greediness of a few blocs. I shall vote for food subsidies because I am heart and soul for winning the battle abroad—without our having to engage in another battle here at home among ourselves, of such magnitude as to endanger the battle we are fighting abroad. I am convinced that once we permit this inflationary spiral to unwind—there will be no end to it. I do not want it on my conscience that a year from now Americans will have to pay 16 cents a loaf for bread and 28 cents a quart for milk. I do not want to saddle the people with an additional $8,000,000,000 food bill. That money will just be scooped out of the war effort in order to go into the pockets of a few, while making the poor sucker poorer. That is the way to sickness—not health. I am sometimes led to believe that we in the Congress of the United States have a congenital blind spot when it comes to the lessons in history. We have had inflation. We know what it did for us, and here we are, just calling for it to happen again. I saw it when I got back from World War No. 1. I do not want to see it again.

I would like to take time out and tell the real story about this measure. It is straight political, the sort of thing that should not happen in wartime, ever. Those who want to kill subsidies think they will get a pat on the back from the farm lobby. They think that the President will then veto the bill, thus actually saving their constituents from getting it in the neck. And they feel they will be saved when the bill comes up again, because there will be enough votes to uphold the veto.

It is a bad spectacle. I am sorry to see it happen because what we are doing today is going down in the history books—with your name and mine.

I do not want my name connected with the awful word inflation. I do not want Americans to point at me and say, "See, see, he made us poor."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, it has been correctly stated that food will win the war and write the peace. But, we ask, what is being done by the administration to secure maximum production of all necessary foods? The Department of Agriculture and the War Food Administration would get results if given a free hand and full control over production, rationing, and distribution. But these agencies are not free. They are tied down by bureaucratic supermen from other agencies who have conceived schemes that decrease production and disrupt distribution. I refer in particular to the economic planners in the O. P. A. and other intellectual schemers in the executive department who are bent on changing our entire free economy into some kind of a socialistic state.

No sane person wants a disastrous inflation. I am convinced that existing price-control laws, if legally and honestly administered by the O. P. A., will stop a spiral of inflation without the need for consumer subsidies. Considering the activities of the New Deal and remembering that every threat to cause inflation was instituted by an administration policy, I am not so sure about the desire of the planners to stop inflation. The administration has refused to carry out the price-control law as enacted by Congress and now demands consumer subsidies as a political gesture for 1944—all in the name of stopping inflation.

Consumer subsidies are not paid to the producers of food. In my opinion, such subsidies will decrease food production, cause additional shortages, encourage black-market operations, and bring increasing threats for an inflationary spiral.

It seems to be popular to blame the high cost of living on the farmers and the farm bloc. But what are the facts? Recent figures from the Departments of Agriculture and Labor disclose that people today are paying a less percentage of their income for food than in the prewar period. The estimates show that from 16 cents to 20 cents out of the consumer's dollar is used to buy food. The balance of the consumer's dollar is used to purchase everything from a nightshirt to a permanent wave. If we want to rely on figures supplied by these

governmental agencies it must be noted that wages have increased 41.3 percent since January 1941. During the same period the average increase in all retail prices was 22.4 percent.

With the exception of a sharp increase in the retail cost of fresh fruits and vegetables, the advance in the past year for other staple foods has been very slight. In many instances, food prices are under last year's figure. The primary cause for the increase in fresh fruits and vegetable prices over a year ago, is due to the excessive mark-ups authorized by the O. P. A. for wholesale and retail distributors. But these mark-ups have not been reflected back to the farmer or producer. Take the case of a carload of oranges—the customary pre-war profit for the wholesaler amounted to between $200 and $300 a car. Today, under O. P. A. directives, the wholesaler can take as much as $1,000 profit per carload of oranges and other citrus fruits. This excessive profit is passed on to the consumer and raises the cost of living 32½ percent over last year on the price of oranges, and the grower of oranges does not receive any more than he did in 1942. But the grower receives the blame for the high cost of oranges, when as a matter of fact, he is having a tough time to keep going and to pay the increased wage and other operating costs.

I also know of many cases where wholesale and retail margins are so small under O. P. A. directives, that these merchants and processors are rapidly being forced out of business.

I want to make it clear that the farmers are not responsible for the high cost of living about which some complain. There are several hundred items in the index prepared by the Department of Labor to determine the cost of living. This statistical tabulation shows a relatively small increase in food cost, with the exception of fresh fruits and vegetables, between September 15, 1942, and September 15, 1943. But during the same period the index discloses that motion-picture admissions have increased by 10.4 percent; daily and Sunday newspapers increased 9.7 percent; haircuts, plus 16.7; wave sets for women, plus 32.4 percent; permanent waves, plus 22.0; domestic services, plus 41.0; railroad fares, plus 9.5 percent; cigars, plus 25.4 percent; overcoats, plus 9.8 percent; pajamas, plus 12.2 percent; shorts, plus 12 to 15 percent; women's coats, dresses, slips, nightgowns and girdles, from 3 to 30.4 percent; all of these and many more are included in the cost of living. Does the administration intend to pay a consumer subsidy on these and similar items and services to keep the cost of living down. If it does, it will cost the taxpayers and the Treasury over $10,000,000,000 a year. Instead of reading all of the items in the cost-of-living index, I will include the tabulation as prepared by the Department of Labor at the end of these remarks. These facts are significant when you consider the reasons for increased cost of living, and I believe it demonstrates that farmers are being erroneously blamed for all of the increases which have taken place.

Farmers everywhere, business and professional men, and the rank and file of consumers are opposed to food subsidies to be paid out of the United States Treasury. They are willing to pay their own grocery bill. They recognize that for every dollar taken out of the Treasury to help pay on grocery bills they will be called upon to pay approximately $3 in taxes and much more interest on Government bonds.

The trouble with the gentleman from Texas and his New Deal associates is the fact that during the past 10 years they have become so accustomed to paying out billions of dollars from the Treasury in their effort to retain political support that they now feel it necessary to make a political offer for 1944 to pay a few dollars on everyone's grocery bill, which includes Rockefeller and Henry Ford, out of the United States Treasury and at the expense of the taxpayers—and that means all of the people. Do not forget that we have had a new tax bill, with increased rates, every year for the past 10 years.

Let us examine the merits of the subsidy proposal and see how it works. Thus far, the subsidy scheme contemplates paying a part of your milk, butter, and meat bill. If the average individual uses 5 quarts of milk a week the Government will pay 1 cent a quart subsidy or $2.60 for the year. According to the War Food Administration, the milk subsidy to save you $2.60 a year on your milk bill will cost the taxpayers $90,000,000 for 3 months or $360,000,000 for a year. The roll-back and subsidy on butter is 5 cents a pound, if you can get it. Under the rationing system of 16 points per pound you may be able to get 12 pounds of butter a year, which figures up to a saving of 60 cents on butter for 12 months. This small item will cost the taxpayers $90,000,000 a year. Under the roll-back and subsidy scheme you are supposed to save 3 cents per pound on meat, if you have points enough to get it after buying butter. We will assume that you can buy 2 pounds of meat a week, which means, under the subsidy plan, that the Government will pay 6 cents a week on your meat bill or $3.12 a year. The total cost of the meat subsidy for a year is estimated to be $350,000,000.

Now, let us do a little simple arithmetic. The sponsors of the subsidy scheme propose to save you $2.60 a year on your milk bill, 60 cents a year on your butter bill, and $3.12 a year on your meat bill, making a total saving on this part of your grocery bill for 1944 of $6.32. And it will cost the taxpayers, and that means all of you, the staggering sum of $800,000,000, to say nothing of the additional cost for hiring thousands of New Deal administrators to police and administer the scheme. This is to save you $6.32 on your 1944 election year grocery bill.

Let us do a little more figuring. Of course, the Treasury does not have the $800,000,000, and therefore, more taxes must be raised and more bonds sold to each of you. If this sum is to be raised by taxation, the normal tax rate must be increased from 10 percent as fixed by the new tax bill, to 11.6 percent. Everyone realizes that money raised by taxation must first be used to finance and win the war, and therefore, it will be necessary for the Treasury to sell you 2.9 percent War Savings bonds to make up this subsidy fund for 1944.

When we consider that our national debt may be over $300,000,000,000 before the end of the war, no one expects that the $800,000,000 in bonds sold to raise the money to save you $6.32 on your 1944 grocery bill will be paid within 50 years. The interest alone on the $800,000,000 at the rate allowed for War Savings bonds will be $1,160,000,000 and the total amount paid out in interest and principal to redeem the bonds will be $1,960,000,000 or more than two and one-third times the amount of the original subsidy. This means that in the end every consumer will pay out $19 in taxes to save $6.32 on your 1944 election year grocery bill. Some argue, why worry about what is going to take place 50 years from 1944. Well, if we do not pay our grocery bill today, your children and grandchildren will be called upon to do it. I am inclined to believe that the coming generations will have enough of a burden on their shoulders to help pay for the cost of this tragic war.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has said that the Government was buying one-half of all commodities upon which a subsidy was paid. If this statement were correct, you would not be able to get enough meat, milk, and butter to give yourself a diet for the average hottentot. If the statement is accurate, we have the answer for raising the points on butter from 8 to 16, and the reason for the scarcity of milk. Time will not permit to analyze all commodities, but in the case of butter, the Government bought 456,000,000 pounds, or 35 percent, of the production of butter between February and October 1 of this year, to be used by the armed forces, lend-lease for our allies, and for other purposes. That is the reason for the shortage of butter to take care of civilian needs.

Let me add here that certain subsidies were authorized by Congress to increase the production of critical materials. Food subsidies to consumers, as I have outlined are inflationary and will retard production of the subsidized foods instead of increasing them. Producers of food need man and machine power to produce in abundance, and they must be placed in a proper competitive position with reference to price levels, if we are to keep our armed forces and civilians with adequate supplies of food.

I believe that we had better think twice before we authorize a consumers' subsidy which, if embarked on, will cost the taxpayers and future generations billions of dollars a year. Inflation can be stopped under existing law if the administration will honestly and legally perform its function and hold the line without fear or favor, recognizing American methods of production, distribution, and costs, and forgetting, at least for the period of the war, the attempt now being made to permanently socialize our social, political, and domestic economy.

Percent of change in the cost of miscellaneous goods and services purchased by wage earners and lower-salaried workers in the large cities combined between Sept. 15, 1942, and Sept. 15, 1943

	Percent
Auto operators' license	0
Auto insurance:	
Liability, bodily injury	−15.6
Property damage	−18.8
Collision, $50 deductible:	
Ford	−15.1
Chevrolet	−15.5
Plymouth	−14.3
Fire, theft, and comprehensive:	
Ford	−9.4
Chevrolet	−9.4
Plymouth	−20.0
Prescriptions:	
Nonnarcotic:	
Liquid	+.6
Capsules	0
Narcotic, liquid	+2.5
Aspirin tablets:	
Widely advertised	0
Not advertised	0
Quinine, 5-grain capsule	+3.8
Cold remedy, ointment	+.7
Antiseptic, mild tincture of iodine	0
Castor oil	0
Milk of magnesia	0
Laxative	0
Toilet soap	+3.5
Shaving cream	+1.5
Tooth paste	+.8
Face powder:	
$1-$1.25 level	0
50-75 cent level	+1.4
Cleansing cream:	
Widely advertised	+1.0
Not advertised	+1.0
Sanitary napkins	−1.6
Razor blades:	
Widely advertised	0
Not advertised	+1.2
Telephone rates	+3.8
Streetcar fares	−.2
Bus fares	0
Motion-picture admissions:	
Adults	+10.4
Children	+8.4
Newspapers:	
On street:	
Daily	+3.4
Sunday	+3.7
Carrier, daily and Sunday	+9.7
Physicians:	
Office visits	+7.1
House visits	+5.6
Obstetrical	+11.2
Surgeons, appendectomy	+6.6
Specialists, tonsillectomy, child:	
Hospital	+6.2
Office	+8.5
Dentists:	
Filling	+2.4
Extraction	+5.3
Cleaning	+6.0
Hospitals:	
Men's pay ward	+8.1
Women's pay ward	+8.9
Semiprivate room	+6.9
Private room	+7.8
Private nurse	+4.0
Optometrists:	
Glasses, complete	+4.4
Lens, bifocal	0
Barber services, men's haircuts	+16.7
Beauty shop services:	
Women's haircuts	+14.0
Wave sets	+32.4
Permanent waves	+22.0
Laundry services:	
Damp wash	+5.5
Thrifty	+2.9
Fluffed dry	0
Rough dry	0
Economy	+2.8
Family finish	+4.0
Auto repairs:	
Adjust brakes	−4.1
Reline brakes	+1.2
Overhaul and repair clutch	+1.6
Chassis lubrication	+.7
Domestic services:	
Day workers	+41.4
Weekly workers	+23.2
Railroad fares	+9.5
Water rents	0
Postage	0
Gasoline, regular	+1.5
Motor oil, regular	+2.3
Soap, toilet, floating	+4.8
Soap:	
Toilet, floating	+.6
Laundry:	
Bar, white, wrapped	+2.5
Bar, yellow, wrapped	+3.9
Flake and chip, fine	+1.9
Flake and chip, general purpose	+2.9
Granulated	+2.3
Cleanser	+6.7
Matches, kitchen	+3.2
Starch, laundry	+.7
Toilet paper	+2.1
Tobacco:	
Cigar	+25.4
Cigarettes	+5.0
Pipe tobacco	+1.1
Taxes, registration:	
Ford	0
Chevrolet	0
Plymouth	0

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Cost of Living Division, Nov. 18, 1943.

Percent of change in the cost of food purchased by wage earners and lower-salaried workers in the large cities combined between Sept. 15, 1942, and Sept. 15, 1943

		Percent
Cereals and bakery products:		
Cereals:		
Flour, wheat	10 pounds	+14.4
Macaroni	pound	+11.3
Wheat, cereal	28 ounces	−2.9
Corn flakes	8 ounces	−5.7
Corn meal	pound	+18.0
Rice	do	+1.6
Rolled oats	do	0
Flour, pancake	20 ounces	(1)
Bakery products:		
Bread:		
White	pound	+2.3
Whole wheat	do	+2.1
Rye	do	+4.1
Vanilla cookies	do	+6.7
Soda crackers	do	+11.4
Meats:		
Beef:		
Round steak	do	−6.1
Rib roast	do	−2.6
Chuck roast	do	−3.3
Stew meat	do	(1)
Liver	do	(1)
Hamburger	do	(1)
Veal:		
Cutlets	do	−16.6
Roast, boned and rolled	do	(1)
Pork:		
Chops	do	−12.1
Bacon, sliced	do	+2.7
Ham:		
Sliced	do	−12.4
Whole	do	−6.0
Salt pork	do	−4.6
Liver	do	(1)
Sausage	do	(1)
Bologna, big	do	(1)
Lamb:		
Leg	do	+6.1
Rib chops	do	−2.3
Poultry: Roasting chickens [2]	do	+10.3
Fish:		
Fish (fresh, frozen) [2]	do	+26.8
Salmon:		
Pink	16-ounce can	+8.3
Red [3]	do	+2.7
Dairy products:		
Butter	pound	−.2
Cheese	do	+7.9
Milk:		
Fresh (delivered)	quart	+3.3
Fresh (grocery)	do	+6.7
Fresh (average)	do	+4.1
Evaporated	14½-ounce can	+13.5
Eggs: Eggs, fresh [2]	dozen	+14.4
Fruits and vegetables:		
Fresh fruits and vegetables:		
Fresh fruits:		
Apples	pound	+72.6
Bananas	do	+19.4
Oranges	dozen	+32.5
Grapefruit [3]	each	+7.4
Fresh vegetables:		
Beans, green	pound	+31.9
Cabbage	do	+25.6
Carrots	bunch	+30.4
Lettuce	head	+4.8
Onions	pound	+62.2
Potatoes	15 pounds	+25.5
Spinach	pound	+16.8
Sweetpotatoes	do	+59.4
Beets [3]	bunch	(1)
Canned fruits and vegetables:		
Canned fruits:		
Peaches	No. 2½ can	+11.2
Pineapple	do	−1.1
Grapefruit juice	No. 2 can	+16.1
Canned vegetables:		
Beans, green	do	+6.6
Corn	do	+5.3
Peas	do	−1.4
Tomatoes	do	+7.8
Soup, vegetable, [3] 11 ounce	do	(1)
Dried fruits and vegetables:		
Dried fruits: Prunes	pound	+11.5
Dried vegetables: Navy beans	do	+12.1
Dried fruits and vegetables, dried vegetables:		
Soup, dehydrated chicken noodle [3]	ounce	(1)
Beverages:		
Coffee	pound	+4.5
Tea	¼ pound	+4.9
Cocoa [3]	½ pound	−10.8
Fats and oils:		
Lard	pound	+9.2
Shortening other than lard:		
In cartons	do	+2.6
In other containers	do	+1.6
Salad dressing	pint	+.4
Oleomargarine	pound	+7.1
Peanut butter	do	+20.1
Oil, cooking or salad	pint	(1)
Sugar and sweets:		
Sugar	pound	−1.4
Corn sirup	24 ounces	+5.3
Molasses [3]	18 ounces	+6.7
Apple butter [3]	16 ounces	(1)

[1] Priced for first time in February 1943.
[2] Percentage change computed on the index.
[3] Not included in the index.

NOTE.—Data are based on 51 cities combined prior to 1943 and on 56 cities combined from January 1943 to date.

Percent of change in the cost of clothing purchased by wage earners and lower-salaried workers in the large cities combined between Sept. 15, 1942, and Sept. 15, 1943

	Percent
Men's clothing:	
Overcoats:	
Medium quality	+5.5
Inexpensive quality	+9.8
Topcoats	+1.8
Suits, wool	+2.4
Trousers, dress, wool:	
Medium quality	+5.4
Inexpensive quality	+5.5
Jackets, wool	+5.2
Trousers, work:	
Khaki	+3.3
Covert	+4.1
Overalls, cotton	+4.2
Shirts:	
Work, cotton	+5.6
Business, cotton	+6.1
Pajamas, cotton:	
Broadcloth	+12.2
Printed percale	+9.8
Shorts, cotton:	
Broadcloth	+12.0
Printed percale	+15.3
Undershirts, cotton, knit	+5.8
Union suits, cotton:	
Medium quality	+3.0
Inexpensive quality	+1.4
Sweaters, wool:	
Medium quality	+3.2
Inexpensive quality	+3.7
Socks, cotton and rayon	+3.0
Hats, felt	+4.3
Neckties	+1.0
Women's clothing:	
Coats:	
Dress, fur-trim	+8.2
Sport	+17.1
Fur, seal-dyed rabbit	+4.9
Skirts, wool:	
Medium quality	+10.0
Inexpensive quality	+6.3
Dresses: Wool	+9.7
Rayon:	
Satin crepe, medium	+3.
Crepe, inexpensive	+4.2
Prints:	
Inexpensive	+3.3
Very inexpensive	+4.0
Extremely inexpensive	+5.8
Wash frocks:	
Percale	+20.1
Voile, batiste, or dimity	+8.5
Slips	+16.8
Nightgowns, cotton	+14.9
Panties, rayon	+1.6
Girdles:	
Woven, medium quality	+8.4
Knit, inexpensive quality	+30.4
Hose, rayon	−4.3
Hose, cotton	+1.1
Hats, felt	+7.8
Gloves, leather	+.5
Girls' clothing:	
Coats, wool, no fur:	
Medium quality	+11.1
Inexpensive quality	+23.2
Shoes:	
Men's:	
Street	+3.1
Work	+8.5
Women's, street	+4.6
Children's	+5.2
Men's rubbers	+5.3
Miscellaneous:	
Yard goods:	
Silk	0
Rayon	+1.1
Percale	+.4
Dry cleaning	+1.9
Shoe repairs	+15.1

Percent of change in the cost of house furnishings purchased by wage earners and lower-salaried workers in the large cities combined between Sept. 15, 1942, and Sept. 15, 1943

	Percent
Mattresses, innerspring, medium quality	+4.7
Sewing machines	+1.1
Electric light bulbs, 40-watt	−6.8
Vacuum cleaners, electric	+2.6
Stoves, cook, gas range	+2.5
Dinnerware:	
Plate	+1.6
Teacup and saucer	0
Glassware tumbler	0
Brooms:	
Medium quality	+13.9
Inexpensive quality	+13.0
Towels, cotton	+8.9
Sheets, muslin:	
64 x 64 construction	+.9
68 x 72 construction	+1.4
Curtains, marquisette:	
54 x 34 construction	+2.2
52 x 30 construction	+.9
44 x 18 construction	+2.9
Blankets:	
Medium quality, wool	+5.8
Inexpensive	+1.6
Part	+5.3
Rugs, Axminster	+.6
Carpets	+.7
Rugs, felt-base	0
Felt-base floor coverings	0
Linoleum, inlaid	0
Living-room suites:	
Medium quality	+2.9
Inexpensive quality	+1.8
Dining-room suites	+1.2
Bedroom suites	+1.6
Studio couches, medium quality	+2.3
Bed springs, coil, medium quality	0

Percent of change in the cost of fuel, electricity and ice purchased by wage earners and lower-salaried workers in the large cities combined between Sept. 15, 1942, and Sept. 15, 1943

	Percent
Fuel oil:	
No. 1	+7.2
No. 2	+3.6
Electricity	0
Gas	−1.4
Ice	+1.5
Coal:	
Anthracite:	
Pennsylvania	+5.0
Other than Pennsylvania	+4.4
Bituminous:	
Low and medium voaltile	+4.0
Eastern high volatile	+5.8
Western high volatile	+3.1
Coke, egg	+.5
Briquets	+9.1
Kerosene	+3.3
Wood	+4.2
Lignite:	
Lump	+3.3
Nut	0
Sawdust	0

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, it has been announced that very shortly a subsidy on flour will be put into effect in order to prevent an increase in the price of bread. This shows to what a ridiculous extent the subsidy program can be carried and indicates that if Congress permits the administration to go ahead with the subsidy program it will be a constantly expanding program and the amount of subsidies paid will be running into the billions before many months have passed.

What is the situation with regard to bread prices? How much have they increased in recent months? How do these prices compare with those during normal times?

I am submitting herewith figures showing the total national income each year for the past 30 years, as compared with bread prices for the same period:

Year	Average retail price per pound (baked weight) white bread in leading cities of United States	Total national income in United States
	Cents	*Billion dollars*
1913	5.6	
1914	6.3	36.4
1915	7.0	38.3
1916	7.3	44.9
1917	9.2	53.4
1918	9.8	58.1
1919	10.0	67.3
1920	11.5	69.3
1921	9.9	52.3
1922	8.7	60.1
1923	8.8	69.7
1924	8.9	69.6
1925	9.3	74.4
1926	9.3	76.5
1927	9.2	75.8
1928	8.9	79.6
1929	8.8	83.3
1930	8.6	68.9
1931	7.7	54.5
1932	7.0	40.0
1933	7.1	42.3
1934	8.3	49.5
1935	8.3	55.7
1936	8.2	64.9
1937	8.6	71.5
1938	8.6	64.2
1939	7.9	70.8
1940	8.0	77.8
1941	8.1	95.6
1942	8.7	119.8
1943	[1] 8.8 [2] 8.9	142.0

[1] January to April.
[2] May to September.

These figures indicate that the price of bread today, 8.9 cents per pound, is less than the average price during the last 25 years. They show that during the past year the price of bread has advanced only two-tenths of a cent per pound, and that the price is less today than it was in 1917, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921, 1925, 1926, and 1927, and that the price is the same as it was in 1924 and 1928. In all of the years mentioned the national income was far below that for 1943. For instance, in 1924, when bread sold for exactly the same price that it does today, our national income was $69,600,000,000. Today it is more than twice that. Even in 1932, with a national income of only $40,000,000,000, the price of bread per pound was less than 2 cents below what it is today. Bread today is three-tenths of a cent per pound more than it was in 1938, but our national income in 1943 is $142,000,000,000, as compared with $64,200,000,000 in 1938.

If a ceiling on wheat prices were fixed at parity today, it could not possibly result in more than an increase of one-half a cent per pound in the price of bread. If such an increase occurred, bread would still be by far our cheapest food and would be selling for about the average price at which it sold during the period from 1920 to 1930. Did we have inflation then? Is not the consumer today, with a national income twice as large as the average during the period from 1920 to 1930, able to pay as much for bread as he paid during that time? There can be but one answer to that question. Is there, then, any justification whatever for passing on to the taxpayers of this and future generations a part of the bread bill of every household in America today?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, during the debate upon this bill many persons have expressed concern for the white-collar workers and those with fixed income, such as pensioners.

Their plight has been considered by many Members, among them the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER], who has prepared a measure for their aid.

Mr. Chairman, I hope his bill will be called for discussion and consideration without delay.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, would it be in order to make a general request to extend remarks?

The CHAIRMAN. That would have to be done in the House, not in the Committee of the Whole.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 356, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. WRIGHT and Mr. CARTER rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from California rise?

Mr. CARTER. To offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CARTER. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CARTER moves to recommit the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I also have a motion to recommit. I am opposed to the bill and have been opposed to it from the beginning.

The SPEAKER. The Chair always recognizes a Member on the minority to move to recommit if the Member qualifies as being opposed to the bill.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman demand the yeas and nays on this vote?

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the motion.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 278, nays 117, answered "present" 3, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 163]

YEAS—278

Abernethy	Dworshak	Johnson,
Allen, Ill.	Eaton	Luther A.
Andersen,	Elliott	Johnson, Okla.
H. Carl	Ellis	Johnson, Ward
Anderson, Calif.	Ellsworth	Jonkman
Anderson,	Elmer	Kean
N. Mex.	Elston, Ohio	Kerr
Andresen,	Engel, Mich.	Kilburn
August H.	Engle, Calif.	Kilday
Andrews	Fellows	Kinzer
Angell	Fenton	Kleberg
Arends	Fish	Knutson
Arnold	Fisher	Kunkel
Auchincloss	Fulbright	Lambertson
Barden	Fuller	Landis
Barrett	Gamble	Lanham
Bates, Mass.	Gathings	Lea
Beall	Gavin	LeCompte
Beckworth	Gearhart	LeFevre
Bell	Gerlach	Lemke
Bender	Gibson	Lewis, Ohio
Bennett, Mich.	Gifford	Luce
Bennett, Mo.	Gilchrist	McCord
Bishop	Gillette	McCowen
Blackney	Gillie	McGehee
Bolton	Goodwin	McGregor
Bonner	Gore	McKenzie
Boren	Gossett	McLean
Boykin	Graham	McMillan
Bradley, Mich.	Grant, Ala.	McWilliams
Brehm	Grant, Ind.	Maas
Brooks	Gregory	Mahon
Brown, Ga.	Griffiths	Manasco
Brown, Ohio	Gross	Mansfield, Tex.
Bryson	Gwynne	Martin, Iowa
Buffett	Hagen	Martin, Mass.
Burch, Va.	Hale	May
Burgin	Hall,	Merrow
Busbey	Edwin Arthur	Michener
Butler	Hall,	Miller, Conn.
Camp	Leonard W.	Miller, Mo.
Connon, Fla.	Halleck	Miller, Nebr.
Cannon, Mo.	Hancock	Miller, Pa.
Carlson, Kans.	Hare	Mills
Carson, Ohio	Harless, Ariz.	Monkiewicz
Case	Harris, Ark.	Morrison, N. C.
Chenoweth	Harris, Va.	Mott
Chiperfield	Hays	Mundt
Church	Heidinger	Murray, Tenn.
Clark	Herter	Murray, Wis.
Clason	Hess	Newsome
Clevenger	Hill	Norman
Cole, Mo.	Hinshaw	Norrell
Cole, N. Y.	Hobbs	O'Brien, N. Y.
Colmer	Hoeven	O'Hara
Cooley	Hoffman	Pace
Cooper	Holmes, Mass.	Patman
Costello	Holmes, Wash.	Patton
Courtney	Hope	Peterson, Fla.
Cox	Horan	Peterson, Ga.
Cravens	Howell	Philbin
Crawford	Jarman	Phillips
Cunningham	Jeffrey	Pittenger
Curley	Jenkins	Ploeser
Curtis	Jennings	Plumley
Davis	Jensen	Poage
Day	Johnson,	Pracht
Disney	Anton J.	Ramey
Domengeaux	Johnson,	Rankin
Dondero	Calvin D.	Reece, Tenn.
Doughton	Johnson, Ind	Reed, Ill.
Drewry	Johnson,	Reed, N. Y.
Durham	J. Leroy	Rees, Kans.
Richards	Smith, Ohio	Troutman
Rivers	Smith, Wis.	Vinson, Ga.
Rizley	Sparkman	Vorys, Ohio
Robertson	Springer	Vursell
Rockwell	Stanley	Wadsworth
Rodgers, Pa.	Starnes, Ala.	Ward
Rogers, Mass.	Stearns, N. H.	Weichel, Ohio
Rohrbough	Stefan	West
Rolph	Stevenson	Wheat
Rowe	Stewart	Whelchel, Ga.
Russell	Stockman	Whittington
Sauthoff	Sumner, Ill.	Wickersham
Schiffler	Sumners, Tex.	Wigglesworth
Schwabe	Sundstrom	Wilson
Scott	Taber	Winstead
Scrivner	Talbot	Winter
Shafer	Talle	Wolcott
Short	Tarver	Wolfenden, Pa.
Sikes	Taylor	Woodruff, Mich.
Simpson, Ill.	Thomas, N. J.	Woodrum, Va.
Simpson, Pa.	Thomason	Worley
Slaughter	Tibbott	Zimmerman
Smith, Maine	Treadway	

NAYS—117

Baldwin, N. Y.	Hartley	O'Connor
Barry	Hébert	O'Neal
Bates, Ky.	Heffernan	O'Toole
Bloom	Hoch	Outland
Bradley, Pa.	Holifield	Pfeifer
Buckley	Hull	Poulson
Bulwinkle	Izac	Powers
Burchill, N. Y.	Johnson,	Price
Burdick	Lyndon B.	Priest
Byrne	Judd	Rabaut
Canfield	Kearney	Randolph
Capozzoli	Kefauver	Robinson, Utah
Carter	Kelley	Rowan
Chapman	Kennedy	Sabath
Cochran	Keogh	Sadowski
Coffee	King	Sasscer
Crosser	Kirwan	Satterfield
D'Alesandro	Klein	Scanlon
Dawson	Lane	Schuetz
Delaney	Larcade	Sheridan
Dickstein	Lesinski	Smith, Va.
Dilweg	Ludlow	Smith, W. Va.
Dingell	Lynch	Somers, N. Y.
Eberharter	McCormack	Spence
Ellison, Md.	McMurray	Sullivan
Fay	Madden	Thomas, Tex.
Feighan	Magnuson	Tolan
Fernandez	Maloney	Towe
Fitzpatrick	Mansfield,	Vincent, Ky.
Flannagan	Mont.	Voorhis, Calif.
Fogarty	Marcantonio	Walter
Forand	Merritt	Wasielewski
Ford	Monroney	Weaver
Furlong	Mruk	Weiss
Gale	Murdock	Welch
Gavagan	Murphy	Wene
Gordon	Myers	White
Gorski	Norton	Wolverton, N. J.
Granger	O'Brien, Ill.	Wright
Hart	O'Brien, Mich.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Folger	LaFollette	O'Konski

NOT VOTING—30

Allen, La.	Fulmer	Mason
Baldwin, Md.	Gallagher	Morrison, La.
Bland	Green	O'Leary
Celler	Harness, Ind.	Ramspeck
Compton	Hendricks	Robsion, Ky.
Cullen	Jackson	Rogers, Calif.
Dewey	Jones	Sheppard
Dies	Kee	Snyder
Dirksen	Keefe	Whitten
Douglas	Lewis, Colo.	Willey

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dirksen for, with Mr. Ramspeck against.

Mr. Jones for, with Mr. O'Leary against.

Mr. Compton for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Robsion of Kentucky for, with Mr. Jackson against.

Mr. Harness of Indiana for, with Mr. Morrison of Louisiana against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Kee against.

Mr. Keefe for, with Mr. LaFollette against.

Mr. Douglas for, with Mr. Cullen against.

Mr. Baldwin of Maryland for, with Mr. Rogers of California against.

General pairs:

Mr. Bland with Mr. Willey.

Mr. Whitten with Mr. Dewey.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Gallagher.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. KEEFE. If he were present, he would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote of "nay" and vote "present."

Mr. BOREN changed his vote of "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to mention the tax program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]?

There was no objection.

THE TAX BILL

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, a number of our colleagues must leave tonight on a sad mission. Tomorrow the House will take up the tax bill. Out of courtesy to those who cannot be here, and in view of the fact that none of us on the floor can give any better presentation of what is in that bill than what the committee has put in its report and sent to each Member of the House, I hope it will be possible to take that bill up tomorrow, adopt the rule, have brief debate and pass the bill before adjournment tomorrow evening without any roll call.

Each Member of the House will then be given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD within 5 legislative days in case he wishes to discuss some phase of the tax bill. We all know that the bill will come up under a closed rule which prohibits the offering of amendments, we all know we have to pass the bill, so, in my opinion, it will be a proper courtesy to those who cannot be here tomorrow to dispose of this matter without a roll call.

HOUSE TO MEET AT 11 O'CLOCK TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar on Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include therein a letter I received from William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from the American Trucking Association and a resolution from the American Trucking Association in favor of the Lea bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Walter Lippmann on subsidies, and in two instances I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article written by Blair Moody, appearing in the Detroit News, on price control and to include also several tables on price inflation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that if the article above referred to exceeds the space allowed, it may be included in the RECORD notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a petition signed by 9,000 women of the State of New Jersey with reference to the bill passed today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a list of names with the business classifications of the administrators of O. P. A.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and to include therein a short excerpt from the New York Times in reference to the O. P. A.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short letter and a set of resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill and include therein a letter from a farm woman, and further to extend my own remarks on the rubber question and include therein a newspaper article by William Jeffers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD on two occasions and include therein some newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a magazine article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD with regard to the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech by Henry J. Kaiser at St. Louis, Mo.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous censent that on Monday, November 29, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a poem entitled "Keep America American."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRACHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Prof. H. G. Brown, of the University of Missouri.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include in one a letter and in another a short article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short committee report and newspaper articles pertaining thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

NOVEMBER 23, 1943.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,

SIR: The certificate of election in due form of law of Hon. D. EMMERT BRUMBAUGH as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-eighth Congress from the Twenty-third Congressional District of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to fill a vacancy in that district, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,
SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of aviation and include therein an editorial from the September issue of the McGraw-Hill publications.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 630. An act to amend section 107 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the district court for the middle district of Tennessee;

S. 759. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of W. I. Dooly;

S. 763. An act amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 770. An act for the relief of Eddie Percle;

S. 862. An act for the relief of the Grafton Boat Works;

S. 950. An act for the relief of the Milford Trust Co. and Blanche R. Bennett, as administrators of the estate of Charles E. Reed, deceased;

S. 1008. An act for the relief of Gerald G. Woods;

S. 1246. An act for the relief of Ervin S. Finley;

S. 1309. An act for the relief of Pan American Airways, Inc.

S. 1382. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the foreign service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; and

S. J. Res. 47. Resolution to provide for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation.

THE LATE SENATOR W. WARREN BARBOUR

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, three times within the brief space of 24 hours this week the Angel of Death has cast his dark shadow over this Congress. The first to go was our beloved and brilliant friend, Mr. DITTER; the second call came to the distinguished gentleman, Mr. STEAGALL. It now becomes my sorrowful duty to announce the death last evening of my beloved friend, the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey, Mr. BARBOUR. He passed away gently in his sleep, in the prime of his manhood.

This is no time to take the opportunity of expressing our feeling as a body for the great loss that has fallen upon the Congress and upon the great State of New Jersey and upon our Nation in the passing of our friend. Personally, I am unable to speak without deep emotion because we were practically blood brothers for many long years. We were happy in our own successes together, and we comforted each other in the many failures and frustrations that come to men in public life.

He is gone. God rest his spirit.

I wish to announce that the funeral will be held tomorrow afternoon in the Episcopal Church at East Eighteenth Street, Paterson, N. J., at 3 o'clock. The funeral train will leave on the Pennsylvania Railroad from Union Station here tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their own remarks at this point with reference to our departed friend.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to express my regret on the untimely passing of my very good friend, Senator BARBOUR, and my deepest sympathy to the members of his family.

In our many years of association in the Congress I always found him most cooperative, sympathetic, and friendly. Although not of my political faith, I can say with all sincerity that whenever questions or bills concerning the welfare of New Jersey came before Congress, he could be counted on for support and most cordial cooperation.

New Jersey has lost one of her able and most outstanding representatives. His great loss will be felt not only by his friends, but also by those who came to know and respect him in his public relations, and in his faithful service to the State he was elected to serve.

May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I feel the deepest sense of personal loss in the passing of Senator BARBOUR who had always been most kind to me and my predecessor, the late Congressman Seger. He had lived for years in our district and he was keenly interested in its progress and problems. He loved to meet people from Passaic County and to reminisce about his early days in Paterson.

Our New Jersey delegation in the House, Republican and Democrat, always hailed the Senator for his readiness to cooperate in any congressional matter and Congress as a whole today remembers him for his stalwart Americanism. He was big mentally and physically. He was big in heart. He had time for the little things in life, friendly courtesies, and he was noted for his spirit of tolerance.

The Senator's business background and his interest in making America aggressor-proof made him a most valuable Member of the Congress in these trying days of global war. His last public address, delivered before a Washington American Legion post last Wednesday, was a stirring plea for our country to be as great a maritime nation as any in the world, also that the peace-loving countries of the world maintain a superiority of seapower.

Senator BARBOUR belonged to a number of groups seeking to promote tolerance and understanding among the peoples of the earth. He indulged in many charities of a private nature. He aimed to add to the sum of human happiness and he did.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have been shocked to learn of the sudden passing away of the senior Senator from New Jersey, Hon. W. WARREN BARBOUR.

It has been my privilege to know Senator BARBOUR for many years. I have always found him the same, kind and considerate, ever willing to help whenever he was able to do so. He never failed to respond to any call that came to him, even from the most humble of his constituency. He served faithfully and well. It seemed a pleasure to him to be of service. He was alert to the needs of the State he so ably represented. He was courageous and forceful in presenting his views in matters that affected the welfare of State and Nation. He was a true patriot. He loved his country and appreciated the opportunity he had to serve it. His memory will linger long and pleasantly with all who knew him.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to pay a brief tribute to my good friend, WARREN BARBOUR, of New Jersey.

Senator BARBOUR had a distinguished record of public service. In whatever capacity he served he gave to the State and Nation loyal, honest, and effective service. It was my privilege and pleasure to have known WARREN BARBOUR for a number of years. He was an inspiration to me as a new Member of Congress, and I always found him kind, courteous, and willing to lend a helping hand.

Mr. Speaker, by the death of Mr. BARBOUR the State of New Jersey has lost an able representative and the Nation loses a man who can ill be spared during such a critical period as now faces our country. I join in sharing the grief of his family and extend to them my deepest sympathy.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, it was a severe shock to learn of the death of my friend, W. WARREN BARBOUR, the senior Senator from New Jersey. I can always call on my memory to bring back the friendliness and sound advice which he extended to me upon my entrance into the Halls of Congress. He was always ready to extend a helping hand.

He was a great humanitarian who sought to protect the minority groups. A review of his record will reveal that he championed many liberal social reforms for the good of the people regardless of race, color, or creed. Honesty, strength, and courage always possessed him. His character, ability, and patriotism were readily recognized by his colleagues of the Naval Affairs, Commerce, and other committees and by all others who were in association with him. The loss of this valuable statesman and outstanding man

of New Jersey and the Nation will be keenly felt.

To the members of his family and those dear to him, I express my deepest sympathy upon their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, sudden death is always a shock and the shock is doubly severe when it comes to a close and dear friend. The unexpectedness of it leaves you speechless and overcome with awe at the realization of the mortality of man. The Honorable W. WARREN BARBOUR was one of my closest friends for many years. He and I were boys together and our paths crossed many times as we traveled the road of life.

He was an intensely human man. He loved life and people and he had the peculiar gift of being able to get on with people. There was nothing of sham or pretense about him. He would not have been such a natural character if there were. He was generous to a fault and had a heart as big as his frame. He was successful in business and in his public life he showed a shrewd political appreciation which few men have. Members of Congress often turned to him for advice, recognizing his ability, and with implicit trust in his integrity.

WARREN BARBOUR leaves a host of friends who, although saddened by his passing, are cheered in their spirits by having enjoyed his companionable friendship and his warm and sincere personality. The people of New Jersey have lost one of their great leaders and true statesmen, and they will long remember him for his many personal acts of kindness and for his devotion to their best interests.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 363), which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. W. WARREN BARBOUR, a Senator of the United States from the State of New Jersey.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That a committee of 12 members be appointed on the part of the House to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral.

The resolution was agreed to; and the Speaker appointed as members of the committee to attend the funeral, Mr. EATON, Mr. CANFIELD, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. HART, Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey, Mr. POWERS, Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey, Mr. TOWE, Mr. HARTLEY, Mr. SUNDSTROM, Mr. WENE, and Mrs. NORTON.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the balance of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its order heretofore entered, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 24, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE

OCTOBER 4, 1943.

TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

Pursuant to clause 4 of rule XXVII, I, WESLEY E. DISNEY, move to discharge the Committee on Banking and Currency from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2887) entitled "A bill transferring certain functions of the Price Administrator, with respect to petroleum and petroleum products, to the Petroleum Administrator for War," which was referred to said committee June 7, 1943, in support of which motion the undersigned Members of the House of Representatives affix their signatures, to wit:

1. Wesley E. Disney.
2. Oren Harris.
3. Edward H. Rees.
4. L. H. Gavin.
5. Charles M. LaFollette.
6. Overton Brooks.
7. A. Leonard Allen.
8. James H. Morrison.
9. A. J. Elliott.
10. C. W. Vursell.
11. Wm. S. Hill.
12. James V. Heidinger.
13. Henderson H. Carson.
14. J. Harry McGregor.
15. Ranulf Compton.
16. Robert F. Rockwell.
17. Lyle H. Boren.
18. Sam M. Russell.
19. James M. Curley.
20. Gerald W. Landis.
21. A. M. Fernandez.
22. Earl R. Lewis.
23. Wat Arnold.
24. Frank A. Barrett.
25. Norris Poulson.
26. Fred E. Busbey.
27. Jennings Randolph.
28. Ross Rizley.
29. Henry D. Larcade.
30. C. W. Bishop.
31. A. C. Schiffler.
32. Fred Norman.
33. Bertrand W. Gearhart.
34. R. E. Thomason.
35. Wm. Lemke.
36. Reid F. Murray.
37. Earl Wilson.
38. Chester H. Gross.
39. Paul Stewart.
40. Harold C. Hagen.
41. Stephen A. Day.
42. Karl E. Mundt.
43. Robert Hale.
44. Charles S. Dewey.
45. William C. Cole.
46. John Phillips.
47. Frank Carlson.
48. Clinton P. Anderson.
49. H. Carl Andersen.
50. Emory H. Price.
51. Ben F. Jensen.
52. Calvin D. Johnson.
53. Anton J. Johnson.
54. Fred C. Gilchrist.
55. Paul W. Shafer.
56. Hubert S. Ellis.
57. E. G. Rohrbough.
58. Chauncey W. Reed.
59. Joseph R. Bryson.
60. Raymond S. Springer.
61. L. Mendel Rivers.
62. Fred Bradley.
63. Usher L. Burdick.
64. Edward O. McCowen.
65. Lawrence H. Smith.
66. Evan Howell.
67. Roy O. Woodruff.
68. Bartel J. Jonkman.
69. Howard H. Buffett.
70. Joseph P. O'Hara.
71. Fritz G. Lanham.
72. Noble J. Johnson.
73. John Kee.
74. Grant Furlong.
75. O. C. Fisher.
76. James Domengeaux.
77. Albert Thomas.
78. Errett P. Scrivner.
79. Frank W. Boykin.
80. Ralph E. Church.
81. Thomas D. Winter.
82. Victor Wickersham.
83. Luther A. Johnson.
84. Harris Ellsworth.
85. Carl T. Curtis.
86. Daniel A. Reed.
87. Samuel A. Weiss.
88. Walter E. Brehm.
89. Edwin Arthur Hall.
90. Robert L. Rodgers.
91. Robert B. Chiperfield.
92. Walt Horan.
93. Walter A. Lynch.
94. Mike Mansfield.
95. B. W. Kearney.
96. Dean P. Taylor.
97. W. Sterling Cole.
98. Joseph Mruk.
99. P. W. Griffiths.
100. A. L. Miller.
101. Chester E. Merrow.
102. Homer A. Ramey.
103. Alvin F. Weichel.
104. Henry C. Dworshak.
105. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
106. Leo E. Allen.
107. John H. Tolan.
108. John Z. Anderson.
109. William P. Elmer.
110. Max Schwabe.
111. B. Carroll Reece.
112. Alvin E. O'Konski.
113. Charles B. Hoeven.
114. Karl Stefan.
115. Joseph J. O'Brien.
116. George Mahon.
117. Joseph E. Talbot.
118. J. P. Richards.
119. Frank B. Keefe.
120. Ward Johnson.
121. L. W. Hall.
122. John S. Gibson.
123. Jay LeFevre.
124. Marion T. Bennett.
125. Francis Case.
126. C. E. McKenzie.
127. Jed Johnson.
128. Henry O. Talle.
129. Louis E. Miller.
130. Thomas S. Gordon.
131. W. A. Rowan.
132. Clare E. Hoffman.
133. William I. Troutman.
134. B. J. Monkiewicz.
135. Cliff Clevenger.
136. L. C. Arends.
137. Pehr G. Holmes.
138. W. D. Mills.

139. James F. O'Connor.
140. Charles R. Clason.
141. John C. Butler.
142. John D. McWilliams.
143. Harold Knutson.
144. Winifred C. Stanley.
145. Dan R. McGehee.
146. F. Edward Hébert.
147. N. M. Mason.
148. Chet Holifield.
149. Melvin J. Maas.
150. Harve Tibbott.
151. J. W. Ditter.
152. James Gallagher.
153. George E. Outland.
154. Richard J. Welch.
155. Carl Hinshaw.
156. C. Frederick Pracht.
157. Frances P. Bolton.
158. W. P. Lambertson.
159. Paul H. Maloney.
160. Richard P. Gale.
161. Thomas A. Jenkins.
162. E. C. Gathings.
163. Pat Cannon.
164. Fred A. Hartley, Jr.
165. Hamilton Fish.
166. Earle D. Willey.
167. J. Glenn Beall.
168. Sid Simpson.
169. Chas. H. Elston.
170. Foster Stearns.
171. George H. Bender.
172. Lindley Beckworth.
173. Hadwen C. Fuller.
174. J. E. Rankin.
175. Wm. W. Blackney.
176. D. Lane Powers.
177. Harry L. Towe.
178. Harry R. Sheppard.
179. J. W. Fulbright.
180. Aug. H. Andresen.
181. Eugene Worley.
182. Cecil R. King.
183. Philip J. Philbin.
184. Albert E. Carter.
185. John Jennings.
186. J. Roland Kinzer.
187. Ed Rowe.
188. Martin J. Kennedy.
189. H. Wm. Wheat.
190 Frank Fellows.
191. Walter H. Judd.
192. Clarence F. Lea.
193. Frederick C. Smith.
194. Everett M. Dirksen.
195. Angier L. Goodwin.
196. R. M. Kleberg.
197. Milton H. West.
198. A. Sidney Camp.
199. Joe L. Smith.
200. W. K. Granger.
201. W. A. Pittenger.
202. Margaret Chase Smith.
203. J. Edgar Chenoweth.
204. B. M. Vincent.
205. Thomas J. Lane.
206. John W. Gwynne.
207. Leonard W. Schuetz.
208. Martin Gorski.
209. Fadjo Cravens.
210. W. F. Norrell.
211. Tom Murray.
212. R. L. Sikes.
213. J. Leroy Johnson.
214. Ivor D. Fenton.
215. Robert A. Grant.
216. Jessie Sumner.
217. Wm. E. Hess.
218. Charles A. Plumley.

This motion was entered upon the Journal, entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with signatures thereto, and referred to the Calender of Motions to Discharge Committees, November 23, 1943.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

927. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Navy transmitting a draft of a proposed bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels, landing craft, and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BELL: Committee on Insular Affairs. Supplemental report to part 2 to accompany S. 981. An act assisting in relieving economic distress in Puerto Rico; without amendment (Rept. No. 810). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 3712. A bill to provide for the termination by the taxpayer of the period for amortization of emergency facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 3713. A bill to amend section 3475 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to the tax on the transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 3714. A bill excluding the retirement pay of retired enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard from gross income for the purposes of the individual income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3715. A bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels, landing craft, and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 3716. A bill to establish a United States Maritime Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROLPH:

H. R. 3717. A bill to amend section 3 (a) of the joint resolution entitled "joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943," approved April 29, 1943, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 3718. A bill to grant military rank to certain members of the Army Nurse Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEWART:

H. R. 3719. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma," approved January 27, 1933; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3720. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint notaries public; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 3721. A bill to grant free postage to veterans, soldiers, sailors, or marines while being furnished hospital treatment, institutional, or domiciliary care in institutions operated by or under contract with the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 3722. A bill to amend section 342 of the Nationality Act of 1940 in respect to fees for the issuance of certificates of arrival; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KING:

H. Con. Res. 58. Concurrent resolution to declare a governmental policy in relation to industrial readjustments during and after the present war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 3723. A bill for the relief of Murray B. Latimer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 3724. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Howard C. Bantin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3725. A bill granting an increase of pension to Minerva Rexicker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 3726. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amanda Townsend; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 3727. A bill for the relief of Miss Violet De Groot; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 3728. A bill for the relief of Claude Edwards; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 3729. A bill for the relief of Anna Mattil and others; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3707. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Rev. Lawrence Duncan and 21 petitioners of Sabetha, Kans., requesting the passage of House bill 231; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3708. By Mr. KING: Letter received from Rev. H. B. O. Phillpotts, pastor of the Community Baptist Church of Hermosa Beach, Calif., and petition signed by members of that church, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082), which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3709. By Mr. VOORHIS of California: Petition of Clara E. Balmat, of Pomona, Calif., and 21 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3710. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition signed by employees of the Brown Shoe Co., St. Louis, Mo., asking support of sufficient subsidies to assure the roll-back of prices, and also urg-

ing opposition to section 3 of House bill 3477, a bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3711. Also, petition of Fred Walters and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3712. Also, petition of William G. Maulkardt and other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3713. Also, petition of W. B. Moloney and other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3714. Also, petition of John F. Spangler and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3715. Also, petition of R. Fife and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3716. By Mr. SADOWSKI: Petition of the common council of the city of Hamtramck, Mich., at its regular meeting held in the city council chambers on November 9, 1943; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3717. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Society of Insurance Brokers, San Francisco, Calif., endorsing House bills 3269 and 3270 and Senate bill 1362 and urging enactment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1943

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, by whose Spirit we have guidance and understanding, help us during this day to give ourselves unreservedly to Thy leading, holding our own wishes in suspense until Thou dost declare Thy will.

We pray that Thou wilt create within the hearts of these Thy servants those desires which Thou dost delight to satisfy. Grant that their minds may be veritable sanctuaries of those revelations and visions of the wisdom of God which shall enable them to find a happy solution to the many difficult problems confronting our generation.

As Thou hast opened Thy hand in blessing upon our beloved country, so wilt Thou enlarge our souls with a sincere desire to bring in that blessed time when every need of struggling humanity shall be supplied and righteousness and peace shall flow as a mighty stream.

To Thy name we shall give all the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 211):

Resolved, That the Senate had heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. W. WARREN BARBOUR, late a Senator from the State of New Jersey.

Resolved, That a committee of 12 Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions of the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of the above resolution the Vice President had appointed Mr. HAWKES, Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. WHITE, Mr. AUSTIN, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. TUNNELL, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. REVERCOMB, and Mr. ROBERTSON members of said committee on the part of the Senate.

COMMEMORATING THE FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST AIRPLANE FLIGHT BY WILBUR AND ORVILLE WRIGHT

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 175 commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the first airplane flight by Wilbur and Orville Wright.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman state what the resolution is and whether it comes with a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was referred to the House Committee on the Library. It received their unanimous approval and was reported out.

The resolution simply commemorates the fortieth anniversary of the first flight of the Wright brothers, which anniversary will occur on December 17, 1943. The resolution asks no appropriation of money but expresses the gratitude and respect of the Nation through its elected representatives and orders that an engrossed copy of the joint resolution be presented to Orville Wright, the surviving brother.

Mr. MICHENER. In other words, the resolution is simply one of gratitude and respect and orders only that an engrossed copy of the joint resolution be transmitted to the person designated.

Mr. JEFFREY. Exactly.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas on December 17, 1903, the first flight of a heavier-than-air machine was made by Wilbur and Orville Wright at Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, N. C.; and

Whereas this flight fulfilled man's dream to conquer the air; and

Whereas this achievement of the Wright brothers has been of incalculable value to mankind; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States heretofore has recognized this epochal event by authorizing the erection of a memorial at the place of the flight; and

Whereas the fortieth anniversary of the first flight of a heavier-than-air machine will be commemorated on December 17, 1943: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the Nation express its gratitude and respect for this signal and astounding contribution to the progress of the world on the fortieth anniversary thereof.

That an engrossed copy of this joint resolution be transmitted to Orville Wright, the surviving brother.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, this Nation is justly proud of its famous sons. Two of these are the Wright brothers of Dayton, Ohio.

On December 17, 1903, Orville and Wilbur Wright flew the first airplane on the sands of Kill Devil Hills at Kitty Hawk, N. C. That flight signalized man's conquest of the air. For years it had been a dream, the subject of poetry and prose. For years man had vainly striven to conquer space. Now dream and effort had become reality.

That achievement is unsurpassed in the annals of mankind. Heretofore the Congress has properly recognized the anniversary of this epochal event. It is fitting that the fortieth anniversary of this first flight should be commemorated.

In keeping with the life and character of the surviving brother, Orville Wright, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 175. This simple resolution expresses the gratitude and respect of the Nation through its chosen representatives to two great Americans. It voices the pride of a people in a genius whose contribution is ageless.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include certain clippings.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GEN. GEORGE S. PATTON, JR.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received a telegram from a representative of one of the largest American Legion posts in the State of Iowa, as follows:

Respectfully request that you demand a full investigation of the General Patton incident with A. E. F. These are American soldiers and not Germans. If our boys are to be mistreated, let's import Hitler and do it up right.

The Patton incident is most unfortunate. The fathers and mothers of America having boys in the service, already weighed down by concern for the welfare of their sons, now will have the added anxiety of wondering whether or not their boys are being abused by hard-boiled officers. Perhaps we have too much "blood and guts" now. I feel that the entire matter should be investigated by our Committee on Military Affairs. Apparently General Patton is getting by with an apology. If the soldier had struck the general, we would have had a different story.

WAR RELOCATION AUTHORITY

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to again publicly proclaim in behalf of 95 percent of the people of California our dissatisfaction with the appeasement program of Mr. Dillon Myer, of the War Relocation Authority. We in California realize that Mr. Myer has not made the segregation of loyal and disloyal Japanese, and if he continues in office, his policy of pampering the Japanese who admit their disloyalty will create situations far more serious than the Tule Lake incident.

Inasmuch as this is another agency set up by Executive order and not subject to congressional control, there remains only one avenue through which Congress can exercise its influence. That is through appropriations. The Committee on Appropriations will soon receive a request for many millions of dollars for the continuation of this appeasement and coddling program so I petition the members of the Committee on Appropriations to exercise their most judicious consideration in the granting of further appropriations for this organization.

THE TAX BILL

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, a number of Members have spoken to me with reference to the tax bill which is to follow shortly, and I am therefore taking the floor for the purpose of announcing that we are willing to do everything we can to secure a final vote on the bill today so that Members who desire to leave town over the week end may do so. Here it is almost quarter past eleven. Judging by the number of Members who were on their feet a few moments ago seeking recognition, I am afraid the final vote on the bill will have to go over until tomorrow unless we can have cooperation.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to say a word of commendation for the excellent work which has been, is, and I hope shall continue to be done by the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission.

Several excellent publications have been heretofore issued by the Jefferson Commission through its capable secretary, Hon. Edward Boykin, the latest of which I now hold in my hand, treating of religious freedom. This valuable document is now available from the Commission by Members of Congress upon their individual requests and, no doubt, the supply will be quickly exhausted.

Those of us who are being supplied with documents about the life, character, and work of the Sage of Monticello for distribution among our schools, libraries, colleges, and the public generally, are most fortunate. The availability of desirable, authentic publications about Thomas Jefferson has been scant. I take this occasion to commend the gentlemen comprising the Jefferson Commission upon the fine work they are doing and feel that I voice the sentiment of the vast majority of our colleagues.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article appearing in the Lawrence Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., November 19, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a peace program proposed by the Knights of Columbus and adopted by the Supreme Council on August 19, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Gary Post-Tribune, written by H. B. Snyder.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a tribute to an old friend of mine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Alabama [Mr. NEWSOME] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SLAUGHTER]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include separately two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VURSELL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter sent to me by one of my distinguished constituents with reference to subsidies, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech given by the national commander of the American Legion in Chicago on November 10 before the American Petroleum Institute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN]?

There was no objection.

FISH BRING $4.55 A POUND

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I made a statement yesterday that fish were bringing $4.55 per pound. Perhaps you disbelieve that, but I want to put in the RECORD a full explanation of why that situation exists in the attempt to fix prices. In order to secure the catch the processor will pay enormous prices for fish on which there are no ceilings. It is a peculiar situation. Read this article. It is illuminating.

FISH BRING $4.55 A POUND

New Bedford's fluke market on the fish exchange repeated itself Sunday, when the non-price-controlled fish sold for the unprecedented prices of $4.55 and $4.50 a pound.

The bidding skyrocketed as dealers resumed their feud over control of the yellowtail market. Last week end similar attempts to obtain yellowtails, in spite of the much-disputed voluntary allocation plan which restricts catches to five dealers, resulted in prices of $2.36 for fluke and $1.51 for butterfish.

Records of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service showed that 13,000 pounds of yellowtails on the *Sankaty Head* went along with 90 pounds of fluke selling at $4.50, while 16,000 pounds of yellowtails aboard the *Gay Head* accompanied about 150 pounds of fluke at $4.55. The fish normally sells for about 25 cents.

Buyers were reported to be the Dartmouth Fillet Co. and L. S. Eldridge & Son.

Certain of New Bedford's established dealers reported last week that they were "teaching a lesson" to dealers failing to abide by the allocation plan. Under the noncompetitive system of ceiling prices for yellowtails, bidding for non-price-controlled fish on the side appeared to be a way of determining who should get the catch.

Fishermen who brought in the fish on both occasions were reported to be bewildered by the turn of events which made dealers attach such a price to the hitherto neglected fluke.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on three subjects and to include certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

ANTISUBSIDY GROUP WILL LOSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the vote yesterday on the subsidy question indicates that the antisubsidy proponents do not have a two-thirds vote. On my amendment to strike out section 3 they lacked 10 votes of having enough for a two-thirds majority, and on the Monroney amendment they lacked 29 votes of having two-thirds. So instead of the antisubsidy group being encouraged over yesterday's vote, in view of the undisputed facts they should be discouraged because the outlook for them is gloomier than ever, and I predict they will lose.

ANSWERING MR. FULTON LEWIS, JR.

Although I did not hear him, I understand that the radio spokesman for the Republican Party, Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr., last night on his radio broadcast left the impression that I had changed my views on the subsidy question because I voted to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. If such an inference were left, it was an erroneous one, since I am just as much opposed to prohibiting subsidies as ever and will continue my efforts to eliminate the provision in the bill that will prohibit them. If the Senate does not strike out this provision and the conference committee does not strike it out, the President will veto the bill and I will vote to sustain his veto.

THE TAX BILL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 360 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3687) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 days, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but such amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this rule would of course make in order the immediate consideration of the tax measure. The Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in requesting the Committee on Rules to report out this particular type of rule. It is of course a closed rule, which permits of no amendments except those approved by the Committee on Ways and Means. This is the usual type of rule under which tax measures have to be considered.

I wish to congratulate the Committee on Ways and Means, whether it has fully met the views of everyone in the country or not, for having returned to Washington before the recess was over and gone to work on this tax measure. The members of this committee have worked on it for many, many weeks, long, hard hours, both day and night. I feel that they have undertaken seriously to do that which in their judgment is best for the country under the present circumstances, and that we may rely with a great deal of confidence on what they have done.

I know the House wants to get down to the consideration of the measure and I see no particular reason why we should consume much time in debating this rule. I shall cooperate with the gentleman on the minority side and conclude the debate on the rule as speedily as possible.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK] has so ably stated, this rule comes to the House upon the recommendation of the Committee on Ways and Means, who were unanimous in asking for this type of rule. The Committee on Rules reported it out also by a unanimous vote to the House, who, of course, in the last analysis, are the masters of their own rules. However, for this particular type and character of bill, this is the customary rule, in order to avoid confusion and delay.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my function as a member of the Committee on Rules to discuss the intricacies of this revenue legislation. That is the duty of the committee members under the very distinguished leadership of the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman ROBERT DOUGHTON, the greatest Roman of them all. But, Mr. Speaker, I do propose to take some time to refresh the memories of the Members of the House on both sides as to the original proposal emanating from the Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau, Jr., which, in my humble opinion, if it had been carried out, instead of being repudiated by the Committee on Ways and Means, would have put us on a level with the Communists, and might have even outcommunized the Communists. So I propose to take time, not to talk about the details of the tax bill which is before you but to speak about the original proposal as submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury.

I take this occasion to congratulate the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means for refusing to further increase income taxes and place oppressive burdens upon the American people, particularly the middle class, who are already groggy and staggering along under the tax load as best they can. Those sound and wise Democrats who joined with them under the able leadership of the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman BOB DOUGHTON, are likewise to be highly commended for opposing the preposterous and communistic proposal of Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau to virtually limit net incomes to $10,000.

The public was never fully informed of the abomination of desolation recommended by Secretary Morgenthau. Previously the attempt to limit salaries to $25,000 was squelched by Congress and by the American press as an attempt to interfere with private initiative and free enterprise. However, the original tax proposal of Secretary Morgenthau at the hearings on the present bill was incomparably more drastic and revolutionary and actually limited net salaries and incomes to $10,000. A taxpayer with $150,000 net would have only $6,600 remaining after taxes, whereas another taxpayer with $15,000 net would have $7,600, or $1,000 more, left after payment of taxes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I shall be delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague from Minnesota, who some day will be the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. KNUTSON. I thank the gentleman. We accept the nomination with due humility.

Mr. FISH. It is inevitable.

Mr. KNUTSON. I should like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that an individual with an income of $750,000 in 1944 and again in 1945 will pay the full $750,000 plus $3,250.

Mr. FISH. In other words, pay 101 percent.

Mr. KNUTSON. On a $1,000,000 income the individual will pay $5,750 in addition to the full million dollars in 1944 and again in 1945, and so on. The more his income the more he will owe. The man with a $5,000,000 income will owe $45,750 plus the $5,000,000.

Mr. FISH. Then, as I take it, I have underestimated the situation. I stated the original Morgenthau proposal would limit incomes and salaries to $10,000 a year. Now, according to my friend from Minnesota, some of the taxpayers in the higher brackets will be owing money. They will be called upon to pay over 100 percent of their income and will not have $10,000 left after taxes. I thought the man who had a million-dollar income was to at least retain $10,000. Evidently I have made a mistake, and he will be owing more than that to the Government. But as a general proposition, what I stated was to the effect that it was an attempt to limit all salaries and incomes to $10,000.

You gentlemen of the House on both sides, because this is not a political issue, remember the furor and the uproar when President Roosevelt and the Treasury Department suggested limiting not income but salaries to $25,000 annually. That was squelched by an overwhelming vote of the House. Now the Secretary of the Treasury in his original proposal on this tax bill which he and his Treasury subordinates advocated before the Committee on Ways and Means sought to limit salaries and incomes—all income—to $10,000 a year. I submit this Socialist plan is not known to the American public. The details were never really told to the American people. I have talked to literally hundreds of businessmen, large and small, and not one of them had heard of this radical attempt to limit salaries and income to $10,000. They all knew about what they called the outrage to limit salaries to $25,000, but when it came to limiting both to $10,000, they had never heard of it. That is why I am taking the floor today, to refresh the memories of at least the Members of the House of Representatives on both sides as to this outrageous proposal emanating in the first instance from the Treasury Department.

The largest taxpayers, already squeezed white, would be mulcted of virtually all their income by the Government. As my friend from Minnesota suggests, they will be mulcted of all of it and more, too. The recommendations of the Secretary of the Treasury would also have tended to liquidate the middle class, the farmers, the home owners, and the small-business and professional men and women, and also would have added greatly to the burden of the wage earners, which would have caused severe hardship in every American home.

The proposal to virtually limit income to $10,000 and to heap additional taxes on the already overburdened middle class was an attempt by tax legislation to socialize and revolutionize America and to out-communize the Communists.

The existing income taxes are already oppressive and further burdens would be destructive of free enterprise and the American standard of living. The way to stop crushing and excessive taxes is to economize and reduce governmental expenditures all along the line by abolishing useless bureaucratic agencies, eliminating at least 300,000 Federal employees as a beginning, and supervising war expenditures. The Congress made a good start yesterday in stopping the vicious subsidy program, which if it ever got underway would have cost the taxpayers $2,000,000,000 annually. Even the Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means threw the socialistic-communistic Morgenthau proposal to confiscate large incomes and liquidate the middle class out of the window. The brazen attempt of the New Deal administration, drunk with power and long tenure of office, to use the tax system to limit all incomes to $10,000 and to undermine thereby the American system of free enterprise was repudiated not only by the Republican members, but by Jeffersonian Democrats on the Committee on Ways and Means, much to their credit.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the whole House, Republicans and Democrats, owe a vote of gratitude to the members of the Committee on Ways and Means for throwing this outrageous proposal into the New Deal ashcan.

Mr. Speaker, the following table illustrates what the total tax burden would be under the original Treasury plan for individual taxpayers:

Comparison of total tax burden under existing law and under Treasury plan (no post-war credit allowed)—Married person, no dependents

Net income before personal exemption	Net tax plus ½ unforgiven tax			Effective rates (net tax plus ½ unforgiven tax)			Net income after tax (net tax plus ½ unforgiven tax)	
	Present law	Treasury plan	Increase or reduction	Present law	Treasury plan	Increase or reduction	Present law	Treasury plan
				Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*		
$600	$1.28		−$1.28	0.213		−0.213	$598.72	$600.00
$750	6.28		−6.28	.837		−.837	743.72	750.00
$800	7.94		7.94	.992		−.992	792.06	800.00
$1,000	14.62		−14.62	1.462		−1.462	985.38	1,000.00
$1,200	21.28	$27.00	5.72	1.773	2.250	.477	1,178.72	1,173.00
$1,500	79.28	108.00	28.72	5.285	7.200	1.915	1,420.72	1,392.00
$1,800	157.38	207.90	50.52	8.743	11.550	2.807	1,642.62	1,592.10
$2,000	205.45	272.50	67.05	10.272	13.625	3.353	1,794.55	1,727.50
$2,500	325.61	446.00	120.39	13.024	17.840	4.816	2,174.39	2,054.00
$3,000	445.78	634.50	188.72	14.859	21.150	6.291	2,554.22	2,365.50
$4,000	713.11	1,065.50	352.39	17.827	26.637	8.810	3,286.89	2,934.50
$5,000	987.20	1,502.25	515.05	19.744	30.045	10.301	4,012.80	3,497.75
$6,000	1,297.28	1,988.00	690.72	21.621	33.133	11.512	4,702.72	4,012.00
$7,000	1,616.36	2,479.75	863.39	23.090	35.425	12.333	5,383.64	4,520.25
$8,000	1,971.44	3,020.50	1,049.06	24.643	37.756	13.113	6,028.56	4,979.50
$9,000	2,335.53	3,567.25	1,231.72	25.950	39.636	13.686	6,664.87	5,432.75
$10,000	2,735.62	4,154.00	1,418.38	27.356	41.540	14.184	7,264.38	5,846.00
$15,000	5,039.78	7,373.50	2,333.72	33.598	49.156	15.558	9,960.22	7,626.50
$20,000	7,906.45	11,162.50	3,256.05	39.532	55.812	16.280	12,093.55	8,837.50
$25,000	11,187.11	15,382.50	4,195.39	44.748	61.530	16.782	13,812.89	9,617.50
$30,000	14,710.78	19,842.50	5,131.72	49.035	66.141	17.106	15,289.22	10,157.50
$40,000	22,163.11	29,089.50	6,926.39	55.407	72.723	17.316	17,836.89	10,910.50
$50,000	30,240.58	38,737.00	8,496.42	60.481	77.474	16.993	19,759.42	11,263.00
$60,000	38,855.63	48,710.50	9,854.87	64.759	81.184	16.425	21,144.37	11,289.50
$70,000	47,808.19	58,832.50	11,024.31	68.297	84.046	15.749	22,191.81	11,167.50
$80,000	57,098.24	69,092.00	11,993.76	71.372	86.365	14.993	22,901.76	10,908.00
$90,000	66,725.80	79,489.00	12,763.20	74.139	88.321	14.182	23,274.20	10,511.00
$100,000	76,591.86	90,012.50	13,420.64	76.591	90.012	13.421	23,408.14	9,987.50
$150,000	127,155.13	143,311.00	16,155.87	84.770	95.540	10.770	22,844.87	6,689.00
$200,000	178,843.41	196,745.50	17,902.09	89.421	98.372	8.951	21,156.59	3,254.50
$250,000	231,107.69	250,244.00	19,136.31	92.443	100.097	7.654	18,892.31	−244.00
$500,000	492,496.58	517,744.00	25,247.42	98.499	103.548	5.049	7,503.42	−17,744.00
$750,000	753,250.00	785,244.00	31,994.00	100.433	104.699	4.266	−3,250.00	−35,244.00
$1,000,000	1,005,750.00	1,052,744.00	46,994.00	100.575	105.274	4.699	−5,750.00	−52,744.00
$2,000,000	2,015,750.00	2,122,744.00	106,994.00	100.787	106.137	5.350	−15,750.00	−122,744.00
$5,000,000	5,045,750.00	5,332,744.00	286,994.00	100.915	106.654	5.739	−45,750.00	−332,744.00

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is always interesting to listen to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] speak. We are always bound to hear people called a lot of new names. We hear Secretary Morgenthau called a Socialist and a Communist for submitting some proposal, and a lot of other pet names. Whenever I hear a man call other persons names in argument, the thought always exists in my mind that it is evidence of inability to make a fair and effective argument on the merits of the proposition. To me, name-calling is an indication of defeatism and inability to have an argument available to discuss the merits of a proposition.

However, that is not my purpose in rising here. My purpose is to make one terse observation. President Roosevelt said at the outset of the war there would be no blood millionaires made out of this war. It means a lot to the fellow in uniform, it means a lot to the fellow who is fighting abroad, whether or not blood millionaires are being made out of his sacrifices and out of this war. After this war is over, brushing aside all these high-sounding phrases that may temporarily mislead or deceive some of our people, after this war is over, I reiterate, there will be no blood millionaires.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. FISH. I should just like to ask my distinguished colleague if he was in favor of limiting net salaries and incomes to $10,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. Did the gentleman say the Secretary of the Treasury proposed that?

Mr. FISH. That was the general proposal in the bill, as anyone can see if he studies and analyzes it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am advised by members of the Committee on Ways and Means that the Secretary of the Treasury never proposed it.

Mr. FISH. It is in the bill, if the gentleman will study the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I want the RECORD to show I am opposed to the closed rule on this bill. I am opposed to it for two reasons: In the first place, I do not think it is customary to grant a closed rule on a legislative bill—and this is not only a tax bill; this bill contains a provision about renegotiation of contracts which may or may not be desirable. I have some concern about these provisions and believe they should at least be open to amendment. The bill should, in my opinion, have been considered under an open rule. The second reason I have for being against the closed rule is because I should like to have been able to offer, and I want the people of my district to know I would have offered, amendments to make this tax bill raise more revenue than it provides. I do not think there is any other answer to inflation except a courageous program of taxation so we could stop the creation of new money by sale of bonds to commercial banks. The distinguished chairman of the committee has been kind enough to say that he would grant me a little time later on in the debate. At this point I should only like to say that it is important that the Members on the Republican side of the aisle make up their minds whether they were right yesterday or whether they are right today; were they right yesterday when they told us there is an abundance of surplus buying power in the hands of the people, so it did not matter whether there are means or machinery for keeping down prices to consumers, or are they right today when they tell us a great and terrible government is, in order to try to finance the greatest war in history, taking more money out of the pockets of the taxpayers than can be justified? For my part, I will say whereas I do not agree to a flat limitation by Executive order of the amount of income or salary that a person can receive, I do believe, in all justice, that in time of war the Congress should levy such tax rates on income of ourselves as citizens as will be commensurate with the needs of that war. I do not think those rates should ever be confiscatory, but I do believe in the higher brackets they should be sufficiently steep so that in practical effect there will be some limit on the amount of money a person can save or keep or spend on himself while people are fighting and dying on the battlefields of the world.

Mr. FISH. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. We all have the highest respect for the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] and for his opinions. I have had many a protest too from folks who did not wish to be taxed. I would like to write a tax bill that would not hit anybody in my district or any of the people who vote for me. Theater owners are kicking about the amusement tax. The C. I. O. is kicking about the sales tax. The people who operate factories and businesses are all kicking about the income tax. I would like to be able to get up here on the floor and offer amendments, amendments covering every one of my constituents and exempting every last one of them from taxation and then I would be able to write a nice letter back home and say, "I did all I could but that House of Representatives would not go along with me, so you are stuck; it is all their fault." But a tax bill cannot be written that way. It is a technical subject. This committee is a nonpartisan committee if there ever was such a committee in the House. They have knowledge that we have not, or I will say they have knowledge that I have not; I will not say anything about any one else. I could not write a tax bill if I tried. In all frankness I say I do not believe, with all due respect, that two-thirds of the Members of the House could write a tax bill if they had a chance. I am willing to leave it to the committee. Just as long as we continue to spend and spend we must tax and tax. My remedy would be to spend less.

Mr. FISH. I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am rather reluctant to take the floor again at this time, because I shall have to do so later on. But I want to say to the minority Members that the minority of the Ways and Means Committee were a unit in favoring the issuance of the rule now under consideration. The older Members of the House will recall that back in 1932, when the present majority had just secured control of the House, they brought in a tax bill, as I recall, without a rule and by the time the House got through with it, its authors could not recognize it. Closed rules are necessary in the consideration of tax measures on the floor, otherwise everyone with a pet theory of taxation would offer amendments and perhaps have them adopted and by the time we got through the bill would be neither fish nor fowl. As a general proposition I am not in favor of these so-called special or gag rules, but I realize we must have one whenever a tax bill is before the House. I want at this time to express my appreciation to the members of the Rules Committee for the very fine and well attended hearing they gave us one day last week. It is very encouraging to go before a body of industrious and intelligent men such as make up that committee, because we know we will always get a fair deal. I hope we can expedite matters now and shortly take the rule up for passage so that those who have plans to leave the city for over Thanksgiving may be permitted to leave late this afternoon. And as I said a while ago, if we do not dispose of the bill today I am afraid we will have to be in session tomorrow, and that would be regrettable. It is up to the House as to whether or not we will be in session tomorrow and I ask the cooperation of every Member of this body in expediting the consideration and final passage of this bill so that we may dispose of this matter in a reasonable time this afternoon.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the majority leader apparently was a little annoyed that I should term the original tax proposal of Secretary Morgenthau as socialistic and practically communistic. I am reminded of the old Latin proverb "Magna est veritas, et praevalebit"—Truth is mighty and will prevail.

There is no question, and I propose to prove it by asking unanimous consent to insert in my previous remarks tables showing that no taxpayer would have more than $10,000 left under the original Treasury plan. In view of what the majority leader said, I ask unanimous consent to insert in my previous remarks a table showing the effect of the proposed Treasury tax plan on incomes of various sizes. This table shows that under the Treasury plan no one would have more than $11,000 after taxes. I made a slight error of $1,000 and I am willing to admit that, but I want the RECORD to show that $11,000 is the maximum that would be left any taxpayer in the proposed Morgenthau-Roosevelt plan.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. You say the Treasury tax bill. Is that the bill we are now considering?

Mr. FISH. Oh, no. I mean the original Morgenthau-Roosevelt program limiting salaries and incomes to $11,000, which was the recommendation of the Treasury Department. Nobody back home apparently has ever heard of it. They have heard of $25,000 salary limitation, but this was an $11,000 income-and-salary limitation and that, in my opinion, was revolutionary and socialistic and would have placed us on a par with the communistic program.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert these tax tables in the RECORD at the end of my previous remarks showing that my contention is correct in spite of the statement of the majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, at the very beginning of the printed report of the Committee on Ways and Means with reference to this tax bill, the statement is made that in preparing this bill the committee has given consideration to five different factors. The fifth factor is enumerated as the possibility for economy in governmental expenditures.

Inasmuch as governmental revenue and governmental economy are properly

closely allied subjects, I think it very pertinent to call attention again to the fact that on February 24, 1942, in the Seventy-seventh Congress, I introduced a bill, H. R. 6667, to establish an office of fiscal investigation, as an agency of the House of Representatives, to follow up appropriations that we make and to see how the money is expended and be able to give us the necessary information to eliminate waste and duplication and extravagance. I reintroduced that measure in this Congress as H. R. 83, on January 6, 1943. In order that the matter might be considered by the House alone, in view of the fact that it pertains to a proposed agency of the House of Representatives, I have recently introduced it as House Resolution 358.

I believe that the adoption of the policy suggested in this measure will save the taxpayers of this country untold millions of dollars. Through the courtesy of the Chairman of the Committee on Accounts, our beloved colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], hearings were held a week ago today on this measure before the Committee on Accounts. I trust that committee will soon report this measure to the House for consideration.

It would place at the disposal of the standing committees of this House an agency akin in its particular line of work to that of our office of Legislative Counsel, and such an agency would be able to get accurate and definite information for each committee with reference to authorizations of appropriations that might be requested of that committee, and then, in conjunction with the special agency which heretofore has been approved for the Appropriations Committee, and concerning which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has a pertinent bill pending before the same Committee on Accounts, we would be able to know the amount of the authorizations we should make, and then we would be able to follow up the appropriations and know how the money was spent. I think also if there are Federal agencies which are performing State rather than Federal functions, we will be able to eliminate them through the information we can get.

In the interest of economy, which is recited as one of the considerations of the Committee on Ways and Means in the preparation of this measure, I want to urge very early consideration of this House Resolution 358. The responses I have had with reference to it from various parts of the country confirm my belief that its adoption will result in governmental economy that will save the people of this country great sums of money, and will save us the embarrassment of being accused of responsibility for the acts of bureaucratic agents which, if we ever authorized them, were authorized in ignorance of the amounts of money that were necessary to be expended and of how those amounts were expended after they were appropriated.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, this 1 minute is all I care to take on the tax bill today.

On page 3 of the report I received enlightenment. I could not understand why a man receiving a little more than $300,000 a year salary should want the job of a Congressman. Look up that table and you will find that what he will retain after he pays taxes will be less than $8,000 next year. That seems to be the answer.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD with reference to the price of oil in Montana.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein the bill (S. 1285) on absentee ballots for our men in the armed forces.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 164]

Allen, La.	Goodwin	O'Brien, Mich.
Auchincloss	Graham	O'Leary
Baldwin, Md.	Grant, Ala.	Philbin
Bland	Green	Plumley
Boykin	Hale	Powers
Bradley, Mich.	Halleck	Pracht
Bradley, Pa.	Harness, Ind.	Ramspeck
Buckley	Harris, Va.	Robsion, Ky.
Byrne	Hart	Rodgers, Pa.
Canfield	Hendricks	Rogers, Calif.
Cannon, Mo.	Herter	Scott
Celler	Hobbs	Sheridan
Chenoweth	Holmes, Wash.	Short
Coffee	Jackson	Simpson, Pa.
Compton	Jarman	Smith, Ohio
Cravens	Johnson, Ind.	Snyder
Crawford	Jones	Sparkman
Cullen	Kee	Starnes, Ala.
Dawson	Keefe	Sumner, Ill.
Dewey	Kennedy	Sundstrom
Dickstein	Kinzer	Taber
Dies	Kleberg	Taylor
Dirksen	Lambertson	Thomas, N. J.
Douglas	Lewis, Colo.	Thomas, Tex.
Eaton	Martin, Mass.	Tibbott
Elmer	Mason	Troutman
Fay	Merritt	Walter
Fisher	Miller, Pa.	Wene
Fogarty	Monroney	Whelchel, Ga.
Ford	Morrison, La.	Whitten
Fulmer	Mott	Wigglesworth
Gale	Murphy	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gallagher	Myers	Wolverton, N. J.
Gavagan	Newsome	Woodrum, Va.
Gillette	Norton	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and twenty-six Members have answered, a quorum.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

THE REVENUE ACT OF 1943

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, before so many Members were on the floor I stated that this rule was reported by the Committee on Rules upon the unanimous request of the Ways and Means Committee. It is the rule customarily used in the consideration of a tax bill. I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VOORHIS of California) there were—ayes 208, noes 7.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3687) to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3687, the Revenue Act of 1943, with Mr. GORE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, may we have some understanding in regard to time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say that, under the rule, the time is equally divided.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, it is understood that the time will be equally divided between the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] and myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration represents another effort on the part of the Committee on Ways and Means to raise additional revenue to help meet the enormous expenditures made necessary by the war, and also along with other tax bills of recent years to make a substantial contribution toward controlling inflation.

While considering this legislation and before preparing the bill, our committee heard witnesses representative of almost every segment of our economic life. For 26 days, beginning with the Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., we also heard the views of the public, of governmental departments, our joint staff, the Treasury staff, and of labor and industry. These hearings covered about 2,800 pages of printed testimony. No two of those appearing before us seemed to agree as to the amount of revenue we should raise or the best means of providing it, nor as to the problem of inflation or the best method of dealing with it. Neither did they agree on how any of the other difficult problems confronting us should be solved. Almost all the witnesses said they realized the difficulty of our task, the necessity for additional revenue, and proclaimed their willingness to do their full part, at the same time saying that they could not reasonably carry any additional burdens, but any additional or increased taxes should be placed upon the

shoulders of other taxpayers. For more than 2½ months, in public hearings and in executive session, sometimes working at night, our committee engaged in an earnest effort to prepare the best tax bill possible. We endeavored to be guided by factual conditions rather than by theoretical opinions or philosophies. While we listened to the various witnesses appearing before our committee and heard the comments of all elements and factions, receiving many helpful suggestions, in the final analysis the bill is the result of the thought and arduous labors of our committee. It is not a Treasury bill, a joint staff bill, a C. I. O. bill, a chamber of commerce bill, or a National Association of Manufacturers' bill. It is a Ways and Means Committee bill, and for it we assume full and sole responsibility.

I am happy to say that during the entire proceedings and consideration of this legislation there was not the slightest evidence of partisanship in our committee. The minority members cooperated wholeheartedly in the preparation and formulation of the bill and worked as faithfully, as earnestly, as conscientiously, and as helpfully as the majority members. The minority, therefore, has equal responsibility and is entitled to equal commendation for this legislation.

We were thoroughly cognizant of the enormous deficits which our war expenditures are creating in our governmental finances. We were also fully aware of the margin between the available supply of consumer goods and the present purchasing power of our people under increased wartime income. We were fully aware also of the great need of additional revenue to meet as far as possible the necessary heavy expenditures of our Government. There has been no inclination to avoid any of the facts and factors that were to be considered, but, on the contrary, we endeavored to meet them squarely and realistically.

The primary purpose in any tax legislation is and always should be to procure, as far as reasonable, revenue necessary to meet the financial obligations of the Government, and also to see that the tax burden is spread as fairly and equitably as is consistently possible.

That revenue measures have secondary and incidental aspects cannot be doubted, as we are all conscious of the economic and social implications of every tax bill, and these considerations were given full attention by our committee. However, such considerations should not overshadow the revenue aspect of a tax bill.

If our purpose is to meet the financial needs of our Government, let us impose taxes and increase taxes for this purpose. Of course, this policy necessarily helps control inflation. The place to attack inflation effectively, however, in my opinion, is to courageously attack it directly and at its source—attack the cause—prices, wages, and retrenchment in governmental expenditures.

In testing to see whether our bill is adequate as a revenue-raising measure, we cannot confine ourselves to this bill alone but must examine also the entire tax structure and burden as amended by this bill. In 1939 our total Federal receipts amounted to approximately $5,700,000,000. Since that time we have enacted the First and Second Revenue Acts of 1940, the Revenue Act of 1941 and the Revenue Act of 1942.

Under the pay-as-you-go legislation which was passed the first part of this year, the revenues were also increased for the fiscal year 1944 by advancing the date of payment of individual income tax on rising incomes and requiring partial payment of the uncanceled portion of the 1942 tax in 1944 and 1945. These acts for a full year of operation will produce approximately $41,340,000,000. With the $2,140,000,000, this bill will produce total revenues for a full year of approximately $43,000,000,000. Thus, in 4 years it is estimated that the Federal tax burden of the American people will have been raised by about 700 percent, while the national income payments have increased from about $71,000,000,000 in 1939 to about $143,000,000,000 in 1943, or approximately 100 percent. The revenue collected by our Government since July 1 of this year—that is, for little over one-third of the current fiscal year—exceeds that of the entire year of highest receipts during the period of World War No. 1 by $9,000,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Minnesota. He is a very able member of our committee.

Mr. KNUTSON. I extend my congratulations to the residents of North Carolina.

At this point it might be pertinent to call to the attention of the House that the per capita taxes in the United States now exceed those levied in any other country.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I am just coming to that point, if the gentleman will pardon me.

As our revenue needs have increased, we have increased our tax burden accordingly. We certainly have not lagged behind other nations in this respect. On the contrary, our per capita tax burden now exceeds that of other countries as is shown by the following figures prepared by the Treasury Department:

1943–44

(Total includes State and local taxes)

United States	$357
United Kingdom	291
Canada	261

Our expenditures are also greatly in excess of those of other nations, not only in total amounts but also per capita. The estimate of British expenditures for the present year totals about $23,000,000,000, whereas our year's expenditures are expected to reach ninety to ninety-five billion dollars. A comparison of American and British expenditures up to the end of the current financial year indicates that we will have spent $200,000,000,000 for war purposes as against Britain's $69,000,000,000.

The American people bear the heaviest tax load of any country in the world. It is more than 3 times the tax bill of Great Britain, which is around $11,000,000,000 and 14 times the tax bill of Canada. In spite of this enormous burden under which our people are already groaning, the Treasury in its appearances before our committee requested additional revenue of $11,500,000,000, principally upon the assumption that such a drain on the pocketbooks of the American people would control inflation. In my opinion, the dire effects of such an additional tax load would more than offset any good which could be accomplished toward stopping inflation. If such a program were put into effect, it would immediately create demands for higher wages and greater profits to pay the tax bill, the natural consequences of which would be to stimulate rather than to retard inflation. It would also lay a crushing, and I believe unbearable, burden on the fixed income or white-collar group whose incomes not only have not been increased, but have actually been reduced by the rise in the cost of living. In my opinion, such a crushing burden of taxation would be far worse than any real or fancied danger of inflation now facing our country.

Mr. KNUTSON. In connection with what the able chairman of the committee has stated, it may be well at this point to call attention to the fact that at the beginning of the next fiscal year, at the rate we are now spending, the national debt of the American people will be several times the total debt of all the other countries in the world.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GILCHRIST. May I ask the gentleman if the figures he gave include State and municipal taxation.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes; they are included in the $357 per capita tax burden, but in addition to the $43,500,000,000 Federal tax we have State and local taxes of $10,000,000,000. It makes a total tax load to the American people, a load they are carrying today, of more than $53,000,000,000 per annum.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. The figures the gentleman is giving are very interesting and instructive and I am sure the members of the committee are very glad to receive them. I was wondering whether the gentleman has among the figures the per capita national bonded indebtedness as compared with Great Britain?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I am sorry, I cannot give the gentleman that figure, but I will include it in my remarks and insert it in the RECORD.

Mr. CARTER. I will be very happy to receive it.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The information requested is as follows:

Per capita gross debit of central governments, Mar. 31, 1943

United States	[1] $884
Great Britain	1,411

[1] By Sept. 30, 1943, this figure had risen to nearly $1,200; more recent figures for Great Britain are not available.

By now it should be abundantly clear to everyone that taxation alone is not

adequate to control inflation. The place where inflation can be most effectively dealt with is at the source where it arises. Dip as you may into the flowing stream through taxation, you cannot overcome the flood caused by excessive income flowing into the stream. Taxation can and must perform its portion of the anti-inflation program, but once the money has been paid out in excessive wages or excessive prices, or both, taxation simply cannot completely rectify the damage.

While the Treasury attempted to justify its program as a check on inflation, the program itself was patently ineffectual in this respect. In the record of the hearings, on page 21, you will find a table prepared by the Treasury Department which indicates that of the $157,000,000,000 of income payments estimated for the calendar year of 1944, individuals having net incomes of under $3,000 annually will receive $96,000,000,000, or 61 percent of the total. Yet of the $6,600,000,000 additional revenue to be derived from the individual income tax under the Treasury's plan, only $1,700,000,000, or one-quarter of the total, would come from these individuals with incomes of less than $3,000 annually. If the primary purpose of this revenue legislation had been to combat inflation, it would have been necessary to levy heavy additional income taxes on those persons having incomes of $3,000 per year or less, because it is in this group that 61 percent of the increased national income lies. But that was not our primary purpose. The Treasury program would have eliminated 9,000,000 income taxpayers and would have secured a very small part of the proposed increased revenue from those who have by far the greater part of the increased income. Thus it seems perfectly clear that the Treasury program would not have curbed inflation to any substantial degree, but on the contrary would have increased very substantially the inflationary dangers insofar as they relate to persons in the lower income tax brackets.

There has been much discussion of the so-called inflationary gap, which is generally defined to mean the difference between the sums of money available for expenditure for consumer goods and the amounts of consumer goods available to supply the demand. I wish to comment briefly on this inflationary gap. No two experts seem to agree either on the amount of this gap or the best way to close it. The Treasury has estimated the excess purchasing power to be $25,000,000,000 after taking into account $21,000,000,000 in individual taxes and $17,000,000,000 used to purchased War bonds. Others claim it is still greater, and there are still others who contend that there is no substantial gap at all. As I said before, our considerations of this bill were in the light of factual and practical conditions confronting us and not controlled by theories or abstractions. We tried to be realistic rather than theoretical.

This inflationary gap seems to me to be a statistical abstraction and not capable of any reasonable ascertainment. In any case, we have through taxation gone as far as I believe feasible in the light of all of the circumstances. Certainly, the tax portion of the anti-inflation program is far ahead of the wage and price portion of this program. Moreover, those who express the greatest alarm at the inflation bugaboo or danger do not, in my opinion, fully take into account the public psychology. While there are undoubtedly many cases of reckless spending by persons with substantially increased incomes, on the whole our people are putting a very substantial portion of their earnings into War bonds and savings stamps, into the payment of debts, the retirement of mortgages and the making of installment payments on the purchase of homes, insurance, and other savings or purchase programs. The great mass of our people remember all too vividly the lean years following the collapse in 1929 and the privation they were forced to endure during the depression years. These recollections, at least up to the present time, have brought about a considerable degree of caution with respect to reckless spendings.

Certainly, it must be recognized that we cannot absorb all of these "dangerous dollars" by taxation, especially under a program such as that proposed which either exempted completely or drastically reduced the existing taxes upon millions of our citizens having substantially increased amounts of such "dangerous dollars."

In an effort to produce every dollar of revenue which our economy can bear and to avoid passing on to future taxpayers, many of whom will be our returning soldiers, our committee in the last 4 years has raised taxes to an unprecedented height. In this connection, we have been fully conscious of our obligation to help combat inflation and have done so through taxation to the top limit we now deem advisable.

The more important and direct checks in dealing with inflation, however, prices and wages, have not been correspondingly held in line. Until greater effort to remedy this situation is made, the only effect of levying additional taxes will be to place further hardships and unbearable burdens upon the fixed income group, the so-called white-collar group and others who not only have not received increased income out of the war but who have actually had their income reduced and their expenditures increased. Confronted with this very real and practical situation, our committee did not deem it wise or safe to make any considerable increases in individual income taxes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. At this point I think it is fair to point out we are rapidly approaching the point of diminishing returns on the number of tax sources.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is the judgment of a great many people and a great many economists. You cannot impose too heavy a tax burden. When you destroy the initiative and break the morale of the taxpayers it is like overloading a good team and, being a farmer, I have seen many good teams ruined by being overloaded. You can place an unreasonable tax burden on the American people which would have the same effect so far as the morale of the American people is concerned, as overloading a good team. You discourage them. How? You remove initiative and break their morale. Nothing could be worse, especially in time of war than breaking their morale, because the American people are willing, they are patriotic, and they are anxious to pay now, rather than pass on to future generations and future taxpayers, every dollar they can reasonably pay on an economically sound basis.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I just want to make this observation in support of what the gentleman has said, whom I wish to compliment for his splendid statement. In my country people are getting very much discouraged over the high levies on incomes and we are approaching the time now when we had better be pretty careful or we will be destroying business and the incentive to produce an income. We should get taxes for a basis of ability to pay and encourage the people who will pay these taxes, as far as we can. We should proceed pretty cautiously, as we are in a precarious position.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The slight increases which have been made are a result of the effort to integrate the Victory tax with the individual income tax. There has been much just complaint about the complications of our income-tax laws, particularly the individual income tax. Under the existing law, a taxpayer is required to compute his tax on three different bases, namely, the normal tax base, the surtax base, and the Victory tax base. A different set of exemptions is required in the case of the Victory tax from that required in the case of the normal and surtax. The earned-income credit further complicated our tax law by requiring a different base for normal tax than for surtax. Since prior laws have extended our individual tax to a great many more taxpayers, it is very important that every effort be made to make the tax simple and easy for the taxpayer to understand and be able to prepare his return. We have made every effort to simplify the computation of the individual income tax. In a bill, which recently passed the House, we simplified the return forms for 1943, and by requiring the Victory tax credits to be taken currently, we succeeded in eliminating several items from the return form. In this bill we have further simplified the return through the elimination of the Victory tax and the repeal of the earned income credit. We hope to accomplish still further simplification in the administrative and loophole bill of next year.

In the interest of simplification, the committee adopted the following plan for the purposes of the individual income tax:

First. The Victory tax was repealed.

Second. The normal tax was increased from 6 to 10 percent to replace the Victory tax.

Third. The present personal exemptions and credit for dependents were retained.

Fourth. The surtax schedule of existing law was adopted with certain adjustments to bring the surtax in line with the elimination of the Victory tax.

Fifth. The earned income credit was repealed.

Sixth. Married persons filing separate returns are each required to take a single person's exemption.

Seventh. A minimum tax of 3 percent of the net income in excess of a special personal exemption of $500 for a single person, $700 for married persons, and $100 as a credit for each dependent is provided.

The effect of the above changes will be to permit the average taxpayer to compute his tax both for normal and surtax purposes on one net income base and pay that tax to the Government. The troublesome base of the Victory tax and the complications resulting from the earned income credit are eliminated.

Taxpayers whose income tax is less than the minimum tax will be required to pay the minimum tax. The minimum tax was necessary to continue in the tax-paying class approximately 11,000,000 taxpayers who are now subject to the Victory tax but not to the regular income tax. The present 20 percent withholding rate is retained.

The bill also made two other changes in the income-tax law. First, it denied the taxpayer deductions for Federal excise taxes paid in computing net income. In general, this will apply to the admissions tax, the transportation tax, and the telephone tax. Most individual taxpayers do not keep records of these taxes and our committee was of the opinion that the advantage of making administration much easier and of securing additional revenue from this source would more than offset any increased burden on the taxpayers.

A special deduction of $500 was allowed in computing the gross income of a blind person. It was pointed out that blind persons have additional expenses that are not incurred by ordinary persons, such as for the employment of attendants, and that some relief should be granted in the form of an additional exemption to take care of this added burden.

With respect to the corporate taxes, the bill makes several important changes. The bill does not contain any increase in the corporate normal and surtax rate. It was thought that an excessively high tax on the normal earnings of corporations would have a serious effect in retarding normal dividends and seriously endanger many corporations faced with declining incomes caused by the war. Over 30 percent of the dividends of corporations are received by individuals with incomes of less than $5,000 and, in many cases, these dividends represent the sole income upon which the individual supports himself and his family. In addition, many of our religious, charitable, or educational institutions would not be able to survive if their dividend income were greatly reduced through an increased corporate income tax. Therefore, the bill provides that the excess profits tax be increased and not the normal and surtax. The excess profits tax rate was increased from 90 to 95 percent. Information was developed before our committee that many corporations using the invested capital credit were not paying excess profits taxes. This is due to the high return on their invested capital which the present law allows and to the rather liberal carry-over and carry-back provisions of existing law.

One of the main difficulties of the excess profits tax has been its burden on small companies. In order to remedy this situation, the bill provides that the specific exemption of $5,000 now allowed for excess profits tax purposes be increased to $10,000.

There was an obvious loophole called to the attention of the committee which we felt should not wait until the next revenue bill for action. That is, the avoidance of income and excess profits tax through the purchase of defunct corporations. The committee believed that this loophole should be plugged immediately and that the provisions plugging such loophole should be made retroactive to all taxable years beginning after December 31, 1939.

Our committee also received considerable complaint about many organizations which are now exempt from income taxes. It is very difficult to secure information as to these exempt organizations. The bill provides that exempt organizations must file annual returns of income unless they are religious corporations or certain types of educational or charitable corporations. It is believed by this means we will be able to secure information to determine whether or not such organizations are escaping their fair share of the tax burden.

With respect to excises, the revenue was increased by $1,202,000,000. The rate on distilled spirits was increased from $6 a gallon to $9 a gallon; on beer, from $7 to $8 a barrel; and there were also slight increases in the wine tax. Other articles subject to increased taxes were electric light bulbs, jewelry, furs, luggage, toilet preparations, telephones, transportation taxes, admission taxes, cabarets, club dues, bowling alleys, and billiard and pool tables.

A tax on pari-mutuel betting at the rate of 5 percent was also adopted by your committee and the 3-percent tax on the transportation of property was retained and extended to parcel post. The increases on present excises, and the new taxes, are temporary and will expire after the war.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to interrupt the gentleman because he is making an excellent presentation, and I congratulate him upon it, but this question has been asked by a number of Members and I assume it is of some importance to know the answer in replying to the letters of inquiry. The question has been asked as to when the provisions of the tax bill will take effect. The gentleman will note that the different provisions take effect at different times. I have here a little memorandum which shows the effective date of each provision.

Mr. DOUGHTON. In general, this bill, if enacted into law, will become effective December 31, 1943.

Mr. REED of New York. But the different provisions in the bill become effective on different dates. I have the dates here if the gentleman cares to insert them in his remarks.

Mr. DOUGHTON. If there is any question about it I will insert that at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, the question has been asked as to when the provisions of the tax bill will take effect.

In general, the provisions relating to the individual income tax and to corporation taxes become effective January 1, 1944. In other words, they are not to be retroactive.

The excise tax increases will become effective on the first day of the first month which begins more than 10 days after the date of enactment of the bill. Thus, if the bill becomes law by December 15, the excise taxes would be effective January 1. If, however, the bill is not signed until December 26, the excises would not become effective until February 1.

The postal increases will take effect on the 30th day after the date of enactment.

The changes in the renegotiation law will be effective in the main as to fiscal years ending after June 30, 1943, except that the court-review provisions are made retroactive to cover all past renegotiations.

One of the most troublesome features with which our committee had to deal was that relating to renegotiation of contracts. A subcommittee was appointed to prepare a report on this matter and I may say that they performed an excellent job, working with tireless energy.

It was disclosed in our hearings that many contractors had just grounds for complaining about the way in which the present renegotiation law is administered. We have gone a long way in this bill toward removing many of the grounds for the complaints which were directed against the present procedure, by placing the Government and the war contractor upon a more nearly equal footing. The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] will discuss in detail the renegotiation provisions of the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to my distinguished friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Due to the fact that my distinguished friend the chairman of the committee has yielded now, I may say that I talked with the gentleman a few days ago about a committee amendment. I realized the situation and difficulty of considering too many committee amendments, so I agreed not to have the matter pressed at this time but

I should like to get my friend's reaction to it.

Under the present law members of the armed forces are allowed a special deduction from gross income of so much of their compensation for active service in the present war as does not exceed $1,500 in any year. My suggestion is—and I hope that the Senate puts it in the bill and that the House conferees will accept it—that similar relief be granted with respect to so much of the earned income received by them during the period of 1 year after their discharge from the service as does not exceed $1,-500. Such an amendment would afford substantial relief to the servicemen and I understand there would be no immediate loss of revenue for any loss would be offset by the economic advantages resulting from such a policy of post-war rehabilitation. I wonder if my distinguished friend would care to make an observation at this time on such an amendment if it is adopted by the Senate?

Mr. DOUGHTON. In response to the statement of the distinguished majority leader I may say that on the face of the proposition and what study I have had time to give it, it is my judgment that it would be a very worthy change to make in our present law. I would, of course, want to take the matter to our committee for its consideration. I will say to the distinguished majority leader that while the bill is in the Senate and before it goes to conference I will attempt to call the committee together and take up this amendment and if it is favorably considered by the committee we will ask the Finance Committee of the Senate to incorporate it as an amendment to our bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. I want to refer to title IV, the postal rates.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I will come to that a little later.

Mr. WHITE. I am waiting patiently for that.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I am going to take that up later.

Mr. WHITE. Before the gentleman concludes, I want to ask a question for information.

Mr. DOUGHTON. All right.

Mr. WHITE. My question goes to the exemptions on the increase in postage on religious publications. I note that you have made an increase, doubled the third-class rate, but you have not touched the second-class rate. I am wondering if it would not be good policy to exempt religious publications under the third-class rate from the increase. There is no provision in the law now covering that.

Mr. DOUGHTON. If they are not so exempted, I see no reason why the third-class increase should apply to religious publications.

Mr. WHITE. We cannot amend this bill, but the provisions of the bill we are now considering will double the postage rate on religious publications.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It is too late to think about that now. We cannot now consider it thoroughly enough to offer it as a committee amendment, but such an amendment may be offered in the Senate and if it appeals to our conferees we can adopt it then.

Mr. WHITE. The distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee would be in favor of exempting religious publications?

Mr. DOUGHTON. As far as I understand it now, yes. Of course, there may be technical reasons why such an exemption is not feasible.

Mr. WHITE. This is just a matter of postal rates. You have extended it to second-class rates and I cannot see any reason for not extending it to third-class rates.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Perhaps the gentleman is correct.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman did not go into the stamp tax at all, the putting of a tax on money orders for instance?

Mr. DOUGHTON. We talked about everything.

Mr. WHITE. That was done in the last war when we had much less expenditure than we have now.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Almost everything in the tax bill that could be considered—that had any relation or bearing on tax matters—was considered and discussed in our committee. Of course, this bill is not a bill that any one person would have written. It is not like the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] would have written it, or my distinguished friend the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], or the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], or the distinguished gentlemen from Minnesota and New York [Mr. KNUTSON and Mr. REED]. It is not exactly like any of us would have written it, but it is a bill we can go along with, it is the only bill that could command the majority of the votes of the committee and it takes a majority of the committee to report any bill. If I were writing the bill, perhaps I would have written it a little differently, but there is nothing in this bill that I cannot consistently and willingly support.

We come now to the postage rates. Of course, we did not have time to study the entire postal schedule and we would not have changed any rates in the postal schedule had it not been for the need for additional revenue. Everybody knows that the rates on postage—first-, second-, and third-class mail matter, and all classes of mail matter—have been out of adjustment for a long time. Back in 1917, my distinguished predecessor, Hon. Claude Kitchin—no abler or greater man ever served in this body or ever stood in the well of this House—had something to say on this matter. I have also heard the Honorable Joe Cannon, who was a great debater also. On one occasion he said as far as he knew Claude Kitchin had no equal as a debater. He called the attention of the country to the fact at that time, over 20 years ago, these postal rates ought to be adjusted. How much was it he said we were losing at that time?

Mr. COOPER. It was 26 years ago. That was in 1917.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes; 26 years ago.

Mr. COOPER. His speech gave comprehensive statements as to the amount that was lost. It showed that some of the large magazines and periodicals of the country were receiving subsidies ranging from a quarter of a million to a half-million dollars, some of them up as high as four or five million dollars a year.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Now about this third-class mail matter, there seems to be some disturbance about that. The third-class mail matter has not paid its way, neither has the second-class, for years, but there is a difference between second- and third-class mail matter. The second-class mail matter is mostly all news and material of educational value, while the third-class matter is more of an advertising nature, books and catalogs. In the last 15 years third-class mail matter has enjoyed a subsidy at the expense of the taxpayers of the United States of at least $250,000,000. For 1942 it was about $24,000,000.

We have increased the taxes on transportation of persons, on telephones and telegraph messages, on freight shipments of food and farm materials, and of the necessities of life, and why should not those enjoying the third-class mailing privilege be called on to pay a little additional for revenue purposes? They should not complain during this war emergency.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. I approve the raising of the third-class mail rate, but the only thing I want exempted is religious publications. I approve of what the committee has done.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That matter will undoubtedly be given consideration before the bill becomes law.

Mr. WHITE. If they have an exemption under second-class it is fair that they should have an exemption under third-class.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Taxes are not very popular and we always get into trouble whenever we increase a tax or impose a new tax. There is always somebody saying they cannot stand an increase or cannot pay the additional tax. You cannot win a war, you cannot finance the Government, you cannot carry on the economy of the country and let every taxpayer write his own tax bill. That cannot be done. But we do give as careful consideration as we can to all the witnesses that come before us with respect to increased or new taxes.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HARTLEY. In view of the fact that the gentleman's committee has taken over the writing of postal rates——

Mr. DOUGHTON. We have not done that; I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. HARTLEY. In view of the fact that you have gone into third-class rates, which pay 75 percent of their freight, why did you not go into the question of revising the second-class rates, which pay only 25 percent?

Mr. DOUGHTON. The committee did not consider that third-class mail matter was of equal importance, of equal value to the American people, and of equal dignity with second-class mail matter. It is mostly advertisements. You get a publication that pays third-class postage and nine-tenths of it is pure advertising. I think that class of mail matter can at this time pay something.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I think it might be appropriate for the chairman to point out in reply to the inquiry that has just been presented as to why the committee saw fit to make at least some adjustment in these postage rate matters that there is not any desire to invade the prerogatives of the great Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, but the fact remains that for 26 years this situation has existed and nothing has been done about it by that great and distinguished committee. It was thought that a start should be made by somebody and not let the thing run indefinitely in the future.

Mr. DOUGHTON. In the consideration of the tax bill of 1942 the question came up as to why we should not do something about adjusting these postage rates to secure additional revenue. The Post Office Department stated they were studying the matter, but no report has been rendered up to the present time.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I will yield after I get through with my speech. I am trying to complete it now and must decline to yield.

I am sorry I have not been able to go more into detail in the explanation of this bill. Quite a number of the members of the committee will follow me, and I am sure that what I lack they will gladly make up, and answer questions. I have taken enough time.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman said that much of the third-class mail is not necessary and important.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman says it is?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes. I have a number of nurseries in my district who sell seed and nursery goods.

Mr. DOUGHTON. If I could not yield for a question, I cannot yield for a speech. We have taken action. If the gentleman will go before the Senate Finance Committee and convince that body that we have made a mistake, as we often do—for we are not infallible—the gentleman will have his opportunity there. If the Senate decides we have made a mistake, our conferees will at least be open-minded and fair-minded. If we have made a mistake, we will be as eager as can be to rectify it.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DOUGHTON. In conclusion I wish to state while your committee recognizes the desirability of keeping the public debt at a minimum and paying as much of the cost of the war as is consistently possible out of current revenues, it is also keenly aware of the fact that too heavy a tax burden is as great a danger to the Nation's economy as is too large a public debt. Certainly we should not pass on to future taxpayers, many of whom will be our returning soldiers, taxes that we ourselves should pay, but neither should we pass on to them a business structure so weakened by heavy taxes that it will be unable to carry on in the post-war period.

When this war has been won, and God grant it be at an early date, we want the business and industry of the Nation in a condition which will enable it to offer the greatest measure of opportunity and employment to those who are now offering life's fullest measure of devotion to our country on the far-away battlefields of the world.

I am inserting at this point a table of excise taxes and postage rates:

Excises and postage rates

Article or service	Present tax base and rate	Proposed tax base and rate	Estimated additional revenue under proposed tax base and rate [1]
1. Distilled spirits	$6 per gallon (draw-back of $3.75 per gallon on nonbeverage alcohol).	$9 per gallon (draw-back of $5 per gallon on nonbeverage alcohol).	$370,000,000
2. Beer	$7 per barrel	$8 per barrel	70,000,000
3. Wine:			
Still:			
Under 14 percent	10 cents per gallon	15 cents per gallon	
14 to 21 percent	40 cents per gallon	60 cents per gallon	
Over 21 percent	$1 per gallon	$2 per gallon	18,000,000
Sparkling	10 cents per half pint	15 cents per half pint	
Other	5 cents per half pint	10 cents per half pint	
4. Electric light bulbs and tubes	5 percent of manufacturers' sales price	25 percent of manufacturers' sales price	20,000,000
5. Jewelry	10 percent of retail price	20 percent of retail price	72,500,000
6. Fur and fur-trimmed articles	do	25 percent of retail price	54,800,000
7. Luggage, handbags, wallets, etc	10 percent of manufacturers' sales price on luggage only.	do	53,400,000
8. Toilet preparations	10 percent of retail price	do	51,400,000
9. Telephone, telegraph, radio, etc.:			
Local telephone	10 percent of charge	15 percent of charge	48,900,000
Long-distance telephone	20 percent of charge	25 percent of charge	
Telegraph, radio, and cable	15 percent of charge (domestic) 10 percent of charge (international)	do 15 percent of charge	48,800,000
Leased wires, etc	15 percent of charge	20 percent of charge	
Wire and equipment service	5 percent of charge for service	7 percent of charge for service	
10. Transportation of persons	10 percent of charge	15 percent of charge	75,000,000
11. Transportation of property	3 percent of amount paid; coal, 4 cents per short ton.	Apply tax to fourth-class mail also	4,500,000
12. Admissions:			
General admissions	1 cent for each 10 cents or fraction thereof	2 cents for each 10 cents or fraction thereof	163,500,000
Leased boxes, etc	11 percent of charge	20 percent of charge	
13. Cabarets	5 percent of charge	30 percent of charge	91,300,000
14. Club dues and initiation fees	11 percent of charge	20 percent of charge	5,100,000
15. Bowling alleys, billiard and pool tables	$10 per alley $10 per table	do $20 per table	27,000,000
16. Pari-mutuel wagers	None	5 percent of total wagers	27,500,000
Total, excluding postage			1,201,700,000
17. Postage: [2]			
First class	2 cents per ounce, local delivery	3 cents per ounce	44,000,000
Air mail	6 cents per ounce	8 cents per ounce	11,000,000
Third class	1 and 1½ cents for each 2 ounces	2 and 3 cents for each 2 ounces	74,400,000
Money orders	6 to 22 cents per order, depending upon amount	10 to 37 cents	21,000,000
Registered mail	15 cents to $1 per article	20 cents to $1.35 per article	4,500,000
Insured mail	5 to 35 cents per article	10 to 70 cents per article	6,500,000
C. o. d. mail	12 cents to $1.20 per article	24 cents to $2.40 per article	5,400,000
Total postage			166,800,000
Grand total			1,368,500,000

[1] Estimates of additional revenue are for a full year of operation at levels of business estimated for calendar year 1944.
[2] Estimates are based upon the revenue figures cited in the cost ascertainment report for 1942, released by the Post Office Department.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the pending tax bill is but one of an endless procession of major revenue measures since 1933.

In this period the tax burden of the American people has been increased twentyfold—from two billions annually to a present total of more than forty billions.

The time has come when we have about reached the bottom of the barrel so far as the possibility of securing additional revenues is concerned. There is a limit to the people's ability to pay taxes, even in time of war. During the past 4 years they have had to absorb particularly drastic increases to meet the staggering war costs, and they have not had time to adjust themselves to one increase before another even greater one has been piled on. Now the administration wants to add ten and one-half billions more, mostly by sharp increases in the already burdensome personal income tax.

When the administration's tax program was proposed early in October, the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee took a strong stand in opposition and assured the people that, so far as we were concerned, there would be no increase in the personal income tax or in the tax on the normal earnings of business. Having unanimously joined in defeating the administration's program in committee, we have lived up to that promise. The bill which has been reported by the committee raises but one-fifth of the amount requested by the administration, and most of this sum will come from increased excise levies on luxury and semiluxury items.

From now on the motto promulgated by the great spender, Harry Hopkins, "tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect," is out. The people very decisively came to this decision in November 1942 and again on November 2 of this year. We of the Republican minority will do all in our power to erase it completely from the Nation's escutcheon. We have already given notice that, so far as we are concerned, we will not give consideration to the imposition of additional taxes upon the people until the administration has first eliminated all waste and extravagance in Government spending and then only if it be absolutely necessary.

There is an old saying that "chickens come home to roost," and that is surely true so far as it applies to the administration's wasteful spending. For years the average man has been told that he need have no worry about what amount was being spent by the Government in Washington since the other fellow would be taxed to pay the bill. Now he knows that this was but one of many deceptions on the part of the administration, and in this connection, Mr. Taxpayer, who is the forgotten man under the present administration, is recalling the dulcet words of a certain candidate for President in 1932, who said:

Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors.

Even Santa Claus will in time pall on the people if he has nothing but cream puffs and marshmallows to offer.

The people, straining under the present heavy tax burden, are beginning more and more to realize that there is no such thing as something for nothing. Somebody must pay, and it is always the consumer. He pays both in visible taxes and through "hidden" levies.

In the consideration of the pending bill the committee gave careful study not only to the probable effect of increased taxes upon the Nation's present economy but upon the future as well.

Chief Justice Marshall's dictum that "the power to tax is the power to destroy" is no less true today than when uttered during the early days of the Republic. The Republican minority on the Ways and Means Committee believe that to increase taxes by ten and one-half billions as proposed by the administration would be a destructive act. In our opinion, this additional burden would liquidate the great middle class, which is the bulwark of the Nation. It would threaten the future solvency of all business, imperil savings, and jeopardize the post-war continuance of private enterprise. Moreover, it would destroy the essence of the American way of life, which our armed forces are now heroically battling to maintain and preserve.

We Republicans are determined to preserve and encourage free enterprise and opportunity in America, not destroy them by excessive taxation. When the millions of men in the armed forces come back from the far-flung battle fronts we want them to find:

First. That jobs at good wages are open to them.

Second. That the door of opportunity has not been closed in their absence.

Third. That wasteful spending has been stamped out.

Fourth. That the American way of life has been preserved.

If America is to remain a land of opportunity, we must put a stop to the loose fiscal policies of the present administration. Its extravagant and wasteful peacetime spendings have been succeeded by equally reckless expenditures for war. Our Nation is today spending more for military purposes than the United Kingdom, Russia, Germany, and Japan combined. Various congressional inquiries into war spendings have disclosed that money is being squandered on every hand, not only for military supplies far in excess of needs, but for items having no direct connection with the war effort. The action of the War Department in turning back to the Treasury some thirteen billions of its appropriations shows that the present $357,000,000,000 war program is far in excess of needs. No doubt other service departments could make similar refunds without in any way impairing the war effort. There is no doubt in my mind but what an investigation of lend-lease allotments to many nonbelligerent foreign countries, particularly in South and Central America, would disclose that many billions are being poured out for such nonmilitary purposes as the construction of an agricultural college in Costa Rica, for example, road building, sanitation, and other unrelated projects. Our people want this sort of spending stopped, and stopped now.

Time has shown that we can no longer safely delegate, without supervision, the spending of the taxpayer's hard-earned money to individuals in the executive branch who labor under the delusion that the money the Government pays out is the product of printing presses, when any schoolboy knows that every cent the Government expends must at one time or another, in one form or another, be wrung from the people in taxes.

I shall not spend any time in justifying the committee's action in rejecting the Treasury's proposal for drastic increases in the personal income tax, other than to refer to the following table, which discloses that despite all the loose talk we have heard about the need for putting a limit on incomes in wartime, our existing tax laws have already brought about such a limitation. This table shows that no matter how much a man earns in 1944 and 1945, he cannot have more than $24,000 left after taxes, and in fact he may wind up owing the Treasury even more than his total income for these 2 years. The table follows:

Existing income-tax burden for 1944 and 1945, including net Victory tax and one-half of unforgiven 1942 tax (assuming no change in net income)—Married person, no dependents

Net income before personal exemption	Income, net Victory, and one-half unforgiven tax[1]	Effective rate	Income remaining after tax
		Percent	
$1,200	$21.28	1.773	$1,178.72
$1,500	79.28	5.285	1,420.72
$1,800	157.38	8.743	1,642.62
$2,000	205.45	10.272	1,794.55
$2,500	325.61	13.024	2,174.39
$3,000	445.78	14.859	2,554.22
$4,000	713.11	17.827	3,286.89
$5,000	987.20	19.744	4,012.80
$10,000	2,735.62	27.356	7,264.38
$15,000	5,039.78	33.598	9,960.22
$20,000	7,906.45	39.532	12,093.55
$25,000	11,187.11	44.748	13,812.89
$50,000	30,240.58	60.481	19,759.42
$100,000	76,591.86	76.591	23,408.14
$150,000	127,155.13	84.770	22,844.87
$200,000	178,843.41	89.421	21,156.59
$250,000	231,107.69	92.443	18,892.31
$500,000	492,496.58	98.499	7,503.42
$750,000	753,250.00	100.433	−3,250.00
$1,000,000	1,005,750.00	100.575	−5,750.00
$2,000,000	2,015,750.00	100.787	−15,750.00
$5,000,000	5,045,750.00	100.915	−45,750.00

[1] Net Victory tax computed on a gross income equal to ten-ninths of net income.

I call attention to incomes of $750,000 and more. It will be noted that in these instances the tax collector takes all and then some. How is that for distributing the wealth?

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to my good friend.

Mr. REED of New York. As a matter of fact, there are several brackets where he will owe the Government more than he earns.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; I thank the gentleman. I am coming to that.

The poor chap who has an income of $2,000,000—and I never expected to live to see the day I would commiserate with a man having an income of one or two million dollars, but, of course, I could not foresee the New Deal.

Getting back to the poor devil who has an income of $2,000,000 in 1944 or 1945, he will not only have to pay in $2,000,000, but he will have to pay $15,750 on top of that.

Then we come to the hopeless bankrupt who has an income of $5,000,000 in 1944 and 1945. He is going to pay $45,750 in addition to the $5,000,000. So what Roosevelt ought to do is pray for more millionaires to run through the wringer.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That comes about, does it not, because of the fact that taxpayers are required to pay 12½ percent of their 1942 income at the same time as they are paying current taxes?

Mr. KNUTSON. That is right. But I will say to the gentleman from California it hurts just as much.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No doubt; but I think that ought to be made clear to the Committee.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; I was coming to that, too, as we say in committee.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Is this tax that is in excess of income considered an income tax? By what authority can your committee impose an income tax beyond income?

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, as the gentleman from California called attention to, in 1944 and 1945 we pay the full tax, plus 12½ percent, which is one-half of the 25 percent unabated portion of the 1942 tax.

Mr. CURTIS. Regardless of what you call it, it is all a tax imposed by this Government.

Mr. KNUTSON. Regardless of what you call it, it comes out of the taxpayer's pocket.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Has the gentleman determined what would be assessed against a million or two-million-dollar income in the absence of the 12½ percent? I think that, too, should be part of the record.

Mr. KNUTSON. The regular tax is $900,000 on an income of $1,000,000 and $1,800,000 on an income of $2,000,000.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Do the figures you have set forth include State taxes and municipal taxes?

Mr. KNUTSON. No; they just include what you owe your Uncle Samuel.

Mr. GILCHRIST. On top of all you have said, they will have to pay additional State and municipal taxes?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes. It would be much cheaper for a millionaire to take the bankruptcy cure.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Will you insert in the RECORD the amount of income tax an individual with $150,000 income for the coming year will be compelled to pay?

Mr. KNUTSON. He will have to pay $127,155.13 if he is a married man with no dependents. I suppose the 13 cents is to show that he is out of luck.

Mr. MICHENER. Some newspaper in my district stated that a man with an income of $150,000 would be compelled to pay about 90 percent, and that he would have but $15,000 left on which to live.

Mr. KNUTSON. On $150,000?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. No. That might occur under the Treasury plan, which the committee rejected. It is all a part of the elaborate plan to distribute the wealth. They stole Huey Long's formula. They took that over as a part of his estate.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to my friend. He is always so gracious to me when I appear before his committee, I want to keep my credit good.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman for those remarks. It is very interesting to me to note that the $5,000,000 income earner is going to pay more in the future than what his income amounts to. I am wondering how much the man whose income is $5,000,000 will pay in the next year, and also how much of that $5,000,000 he was forgiven by the Ruml plan when the Ruml plan was adopted.

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, I thought we had laid that old ghost away long ago.

Mr. O'CONNOR. But it will not stay hidden. It is like Banquo's ghost, it constantly springs up.

Mr. KNUTSON. I suppose it will keep bobbing up as long as it can be used as a political football.

Mr. O'CONNOR. No; I am not talking politics.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course I would not accuse my good friend of playing politics.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Now, would the gentleman answer my question?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; I will answer the gentleman's question by asking one. Will the gentleman please tell the House what year we escaped paying any taxes?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Of course we never escape paying any taxes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, what is the difference whether the tax you pay this year is called the 1942 tax or the 1943 tax? As far as the Government is concerned, the Treasury will continue to collect on your salary, also on your successor's salary, year after year after year, just as long as the Republic endures.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I will tell you when the Government loses is when I do not earn anything. Then I am forgiven the tax which should have been paid when I was earning something, and that is when the Government loses under the Ruml plan.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why, you pay every year that you earn something. That is the beauty of the pay-as-we-earn plan, that when you do not earn, when the people in their wisdom say, "Jim, we love you so much we want to keep you at home," then you do not have to pay any more. Or if you should die, Mrs. O'Connor will not have to sell the old family homestead in order to pay Uncle Sam last year's taxes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Now, will you go back and answer the question I asked you?

Mr. KNUTSON. I have answered it, but if the gentleman does not understand it, I cannot help that.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman has described to the House what happens to a man with a salary of $150,000. Will you return to what the average American receives, about three or four or five thousand and tell the House what his tax will be this coming year?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes. I can do that. A married man with an income of $2,500 will pay $325.61 in 1944. A man with a $5,000 income will pay $987.20. On $10,000 the tax will be $2,735.62. Now, we are getting up into the affluent class.

Mr. DONDERO. Are those percentages an increase or decrease over what they were in 1942?

Mr. KNUTSON. They are an increase, since they include one-half the carry-over from the unabated 1942 liability.

Mr. DONDERO. About how much in percentage?

Mr. KNUTSON. This is the total tax burden.

Mr. CURTIS. Does that include the 12½ percent?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; that includes the 12½ percent. Do you want a comparison?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes; in percentage. The average taxpayer is interested to know how much more he is going to pay this year over 1942; that is, what percent more.

Mr. KNUTSON. On an income of $2,000 he pays $187.95 for 1943. That is for a married man. Under the committee bill he will pay only $184 for 1944, a saving of $3.95. This does not include the 12½ percent carry-over. Now we will take $5,000. Under present law he pays $893.95. Under the committee bill he pays $928, plus the 12½ percent carry-over for 1944 and 1945.

Mr. DONDERO. What does he pay under present law?

Mr. KNUTSON. Eight hundred and ninety-three dollars and ninety-five cents on $5,000; but all these details are in the majority report. While I had no part in preparing the majority report, it is a very useful document, and I suggest to the membership that they provide themselves with a copy and preserve it, because it is really a compendium of tax information that could very well be used as a textbook in the higher institutions of learning.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Certainly I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. GORE. I did not quite get the gentleman's answer to the question propounded by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]. This taxpayer who is paying $45,000 a year more than he earns had to earn how much this year in order to be obliged to pay $45,000 more?

Mr. KNUTSON. $5,000,000.

Mr. GORE. What part of that $5,045,000 is taxes on the $5,000,000 he earned last year?

Mr. KNUTSON. Last year he would have paid $4,499,000.

Mr. GORE. I know, but what part of this $5,045,000 is payment on his income of last year?

Mr. KNUTSON. $546,000 is the carryover, being one-half of the unabated $1,093,500 liability.

Mr. GORE. Then he has earned $10,000,000 and is paying $5,045,000 taxes?

Mr. KNUTSON. No, out of the $5,000,000 he earned last year he had to pay the tax for the previous year. If there is any windfall it is taxed in full and, of course, the estate and inheritance taxes will also prevent any tax avoidance.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. I think one thing should go in the RECORD at this point. Whatever the forgiveness was under the Ruml plan it did not differentiate between individuals regardless of their station of earning.

Mr. KNUTSON. How is that?

Mr. ROWE. I say whatever forgiveness there may have been under the tax bill we passed to forgive part of the income tax it applied to every station regardless of what it was, did it not?

Mr. KNUTSON. It treats all taxpayers fairly. The pay-as-you-go plan did not forgive anything, it simply abated 75 percent of an assessment, which we transferred from the past year to the current year. Forgiving is when one is absolved from his sins and indiscretions as well as his debts. I hope to stay in Congress long enough so that the facts regarding the pay-as-you-go plan may percolate into the minds of all who are willing to see.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. What I want to get at, following through the clarification question of the distinguished gentleman now in the chair—I feel that he sort of clarified the gentleman's answer to my question which was rather confused. What I want to get at is to clear up this point and who pays the $5,045,000 in taxes is still to the good under the system we now have and under the Ruml plan is still to the good in the neighborhood of $5,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. How does the gentleman figure that?

Mr. O'CONNOR. He had $10,000,000 income for the 2 years and pays only $5,045,000 in taxes.

Mr. KNUTSON. What year does he not pay a tax?

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is not the question.

Mr. KNUTSON. It certainly is. The Treasury is only interested in revenue, they are not interested in academic questions.

Mr. O'CONNOR. My question is whether he is not still $5,000,000 to the good.

Mr. KNUTSON. No; of course he is not, because he will have paid just as much this year under the old plan as he would under the pay-as-you-earn plan; consequently the Treasury has not lost anything.

Mr. O'CONNOR. When the Treasury starts to lose is when the depression comes and income ceases; that is when the Treasury starts losing under the Ruml plan.

Mr. KNUTSON. The Treasury will lose nothing, but I suppose it will break the gentleman's heart to find that he is current when his income stops.

Mr. O'CONNOR. No; that still does not answer my question.

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, that is just what the gentleman is talking about. He appears to be resentful because we have fixed it so that when he stops having an income or when he died he would be even with the board.

Mr. O'CONNOR. No; but I was trying to protect the Treasury when we had the bill before us last year. When the depression comes, when we will no longer have income, we will still need taxes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Somebody will step into the gentleman's shoes and carry on, but I hope that will not be for a long, long time.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I think it should be borne in mind that if anyone gains under the so-called Ruml plan it is the small taxpayer. The large taxpayer's earnings will be taken care of by estate and inheritance taxes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course, whatever benefits accrue will accrue proportionately more to the small taxpayer than to the big taxpayer and that is the reason there was so much opposition to it. It was approached purely from a political angle.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. This $45,000 the gentleman has pointed out is the only forgiveness I have found in the Ruml plan. They pay $45,000 more than they earn.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes. I suppose some day they will consider operating on our tear ducts so we will not have anything to weep with.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Under the Ruml plan he would have paid $900,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes. That is a very good point and I thank the gentleman. The gentleman's statement shows he has clear vision and good understanding.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The gentleman from Minnesota should not worry about the fellow earning $5,000,000.

Mr. ROWE. I think at this late day I have learned something about forgiveness.

Mr. KNUTSON. Do not use the word "forgiveness." Use the word "abatement."

Mr. ROWE. I think it is applicable here. The accrual of what we have given is what constitutes the surplus in income that is going to the Treasury.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I realize it is desired to get all the revenue possible, but I figure in one instance they are going to lose some of this new tax. I refer to the little theaters because if one patron out of five fails to go you lose as much as you gain. It seems to me that in the smaller theaters they are not going in for luxuries, they are going in for education, and you will destroy the taxes which you intend to try to get. It seems to me that the theater patrons who pay taxes, if they are excessive, will not go and you will destroy not only the privilege of going to the theater, but you will also destroy the theaters in the smaller towns.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from Oklahoma is absolutely right. His statement shows he is a man of discernment. I expressed similar views before the committee in executive session.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I think the gentleman from Minnesota was correct.

Mr. KNUTSON. Absolutely; but there are those on the committee who could not see it.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The report makes considerable reference to a comparison of the income, or, rather, the expenditures for the war effort by the people in Canada and the United Kingdom and the people in the United States. It is pointed out that for war purposes the United Kingdom will expend about $23,000,000,000 in 1944, and Canada will expend about $5,500,000,000 in 1944.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. A much smaller expenditure relatively speaking than our own expenditure. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not the national income and wages have skyrocketed in Canada and in the United Kingdom in the last few years as they have in the United States?

Mr. KNUTSON. I have no late information, but, as I recall, when we had the 1943 revenue bill before the committee it was testified that they had been able to hold the line, as the phrase is now used, much better in Canada and in the United Kingdom than we have, because

they put a ceiling on wages as well as on all commodities.

Mr. MAHON. Then per dollar expended in Canada and in the United Kingdom they may have gotten more in production?

Mr. KNUTSON. Possibly so.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Briefly.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the bill set a floor to the price of admission to theaters below which there is no tax or the tax increase does not apply?

Mr. KNUTSON. No. The tax is now 1 cent for each 10 cents or fraction thereof. The bill fixes the rate at 2 cents for each 10 cents—just double.

Mr. DONDERO. That applies on all admissions, whether it is 10 cents or 50 cents?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes, that is right.

Mr. DONDERO. There has been some opposition voiced to that provision, the claim being made it punishes the poor man's diversion and some people think it is wrong in principle.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course, as the gentleman from Oklahoma so well pointed out, in the smaller communities that have been injured rather than helped by war spending there has been a big falling off in theater attendance.

I want to close with a little philosophy, then I shall yield the floor.

If the Republican Party maintains its present strength in the Congress, or makes gains in the next election, the country can confidently look forward to reductions of taxes in the future, rather than continual increases. Certainly, as soon as hostilities in the present war cease, immediate attention will be given to the revision of our whole tax structure with a view to the realization of maximum revenues consistent with the least interference with individual and business enterprise. Our tax laws are archaic, cumbersome, and complicated. Sound tax principles have been departed from, and too often the taxing power has been used for other than revenue purposes. We have seen taxes availed of to punish taxpayers, for social experimentation, and for accomplishing ends otherwise prohibited by the Constitution. Any worth-while revision of the tax laws must include a restoration of the principle of taxation for revenue only. The Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee are pledged to support and bring about this long-needed, much-to-be-desired tax revision. In a large measure, the country's ability to maintain a high level of national income in the post-war period will depend as much upon the adoption of wise tax policies as upon any other factor.

In conclusion, let me say that there is no royal road to financial independence, either for the Government or for individuals. It can only be attained by integrity, frugality, industry, and moderation. We must adopt these virtues if we are to avoid national and individual bankruptcy and chaos.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] as much time as he may desire.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I want to make just this preliminary statement. I cannot recall whether it was in a colloquy on the floor or elsewhere, but there was some criticism directed against the members of the Ways and Means Committee in that the members of that committee, some 25 in number, utilize so much time that the younger Members of the House fail to get an opportunity to speak on important measures, and particularly such a one as this tax bill. That, I know, was made in good faith, and I have no objection to it. I think there is much to be said in that respect, at least so far as I am personally concerned. I have undoubtedly taken more time in debate than I should have done on some of these bills in which I have been intensely interested, and to which I have given a great deal of study, so I shall endeavor not to offend on this occasion.

Mr. Chairman, more than 10 years have come and gone since Franklin D. Roosevelt took full charge of the executive branch of the Government, and assumed responsibility for its fiscal affairs. We have before the House today another bill to raise revenue, the seventeenth, I believe, since civilization began to function in 1933.

After a careful examination of the majority report of the Ways and Means Committee, a most excellent report on the bill now before us,

> I accuse the present administration of being the greatest spendthrift administration in all history. It is an administration that has piled bureau on bureau, commission on commission. * * * Bureaus and bureaucrats, commissions and commissioners have been retained at the expense of the taxpayer.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that if Franklin D. Roosevelt as a candidate could with propriety make such an accusation in 1932 against the Republican Party, without facts to support his accusation, I am well within my rights and fully justified by the facts to make the same accusation against the Roosevelt spendthrift administration. I would hesitate to make this charge were it not for the fact that the majority in this committee report does not hesitate to indict the Roosevelt administration for its extravagance and waste as a justification for not yielding to the Executive demand for $10,500,000,000.

It was not until Hon. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury, appeared before the Ways and Means Committee on October 4, 1943, that our committee was made fully and officially aware of the magnitude of the revenue raising task it would have to face. It was then that Secretary Morgenthau suggested that the committee bring out a revenue bill that would produce additional revenue amounting to $10,500,000,000. Furthermore, the Secretary emphasized the fact that his proposal would require an additional tax burden on the individual taxpayers of $6,500,000,000. The fact that the tax burden of individuals has been increased about 2,000 percent since 1940, or from $900,000,000 annually that year to a probable $18,000,000,000 in the current fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, caused the committee great concern as to the effect of adding $6,500,000,000 to the present tax load.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the first page of the majority report where this statement appears:

> In preparing this tax bill, your committee has given consideration to the following factors:
>
> 1. The need for additional revenue.
> 2. The inflationary problem.
> 3. The present tax burden.
> 4. The necessity for simplifying the present tax system.
> 5. The possibility for economy in governmental expenditures.

It may cause some speculation among the Members of the House as to the formula that was used by the committee in formulating the measure now before this body for consideration. There was nothing in recent party publications to which the majority could turn for inspiration and guidance as how best to finance the war, meet the problem of inflation, lessen the tax burden, and above all simplify the present tax system. I am not violating the rules relating to disclosures made in an executive session of the committee when I reveal that among some ancient, musty, and long-neglected New Deal campaign literature this magic formula was found:

> We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, the committee formula not only produced this modest revenue bill but it had the further effect of causing the bureaucrats to disgorge some $13,000,000,000 not required for the prosecution of the war, nor needed to carry on the necessary functions of civil government, much less to squander and waste on useless and, in many instances, dangerous socialistic schemes.

Mr. Chairman, the task of raising revenue is an unpleasant and thankless one, but it is nonetheless an all important one, for without revenues the Government could not long exist.

Especially is this true at the present time, when we are fighting a global war, the total monetary commitments for which already aggregate $330,000,000,000 or roughly the amount of our entire national wealth. And the war is still far from being won, particularly in the Pacific theater of operations. Moreover, we yet have to plan for post-war rehabilitation, which undoubtedly will add untold billions to the over-all cost.

In the current fiscal year, the Federal Government will spend $104,000,000,000, which is at the rate of nearly $9,000,000,000 every 30 days. Of this total, ninety-seven billions will go for war activities, two and seven-tenths billions for interest on the national debt, and the balance, or four and three-tenths billions, for civil functions. I wish to say, however, that there is some dispute as to this breakdown of these figures in view of the unrequired $13,000,000,000.

In the face of this astronomical expenditure during the next 12 months, the Treasury anticipates net revenues from existing taxes of some forty-one billions.

The administration has proposed a program of additional taxes which, had we approved it, would increase revenues to approximately fifty billions, or to roughly one-half the amount of the estimated expenditures.

For many reasons, it is desirable that we meet currently as much of the essential war cost as can be done without destroying our economic system. However there is one circumstance which requires comment, and I refer to the reckless fiscal policy of the pre-war period. The waste and extravagance of the last decade, with the resultant annual deficits and the pyramiding of the national debt, left the Nation ill-prepared for the tremendous financing problem arising out of the war. Let me repeat that despite mounting taxes from 1932 on, the deficits continued to pile up year after year because of the rapid increase in expenditures. When the Japs struck their blow at Pearl Harbor, we had experienced 11 straight years of operating the Government "in the red." Think of it! Eleven years of uninterrupted deficit-financing. Eleven years of annual tax increases, without any approach to a balanced budget during this time.

When we were compelled by dire necessity to borrow astronomical sums for war financing, our Nation's credit had already been stretched to hitherto unprecedented proportions and our potential sources of taxation tapped to the point of virtual exhaustion. We now have reached the stage where the inexorable law of diminishing returns precludes further drastic increases in existing taxes, and where our chief hope for increased revenues must be based not on higher rates but on increased national income, except where the tax burden can be lessened by the elimination of waste.

While you are all deeply conscious of the tremendous increases in taxes in the past few years, I dare say not many citizens realize the actual extent of this increase measured in tax dollars. Let me give you a few interesting facts in this connection:

First, as regards the individual income tax—

In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940—at which time our emergency defense program was being instituted—the Federal Government was collecting less than $900,000,000 annually from personal incomes.

The following year the receipts were $1,300,000,000.

In the fiscal year 1942 they rose to $3,200,000,000.

In the fiscal year 1943, just closed, they jumped to $7,000,000,000.

In the current fiscal year, ending next June 30, they are expected to be in the neighborhood of $18,000,000,000. This represents a 2,000 percent increase in individual income tax receipts in 4 short years.

Let us now look at the corporate picture, in comparison:

In the fiscal year 1940 the corporation income tax produced $950,000,000.

The next year receipts increased to $1,600,000,000.

In the fiscal year 1942 they were $3,000,000,000.

In the fiscal year 1943, just closed, they were $4,000,000,000, which is substantially the amount estimated to be received during the current fiscal year. This represents a little over 400 percent increase in 4 years. However, when we include the excess-profits tax receipts, the percentage of increase is much greater. Collections from the excess-profits tax have grown to $10,000,000,000 annually since the tax was enacted in 1940. This makes the total current corporate tax burden approximately $14,000,000,000.

The individual income tax, along with the corporate income and excess-profits taxes, are by far the largest revenue producers in our entire tax system, making up 32 billions out of the total of 41 billions in taxes which will be collected this year. In terms of percentage, they are responsible for 85 percent of the Treasury's receipts.

Under the revenue laws of the last World War, the most that the Federal Government collected in any one year was $6,700,000,000, and this figure was not reached until 2 years after the war had ended. Today the total volume of our tax collections is six times as great—and the trend is still upward. Up through the fiscal year 1940, Federal receipts never exceeded $6,000,000,000. Since then, they have mounted by leaps and bounds, partly through drastically increased rates and lowered exemptions, and partly as a result of increased national income. From 1940 to 1941, Federal tax collections increased moderately from $5,300,000,000 to $7,600,000,000. In the fiscal year 1942 they rose to $12,800,000,000. In the fiscal year 1943, just closed, they jumped to $22,000,000,000. And in the current fiscal year, we are now informed, they will be over 41 billions—representing a seven-fold increase since 1940.

These figures express more clearly than words the reason why we must go slow in imposing further taxes. Yet each time the administration has recently proposed a new tax bill, it has doubled the amount of its previous request. Thus in 1942, Congress was asked to raise three and one-half billions. Last year the request was for seven and six-tenths billions. This year, the request was raised to twelve billions, then reduced to ten and one-half billions. It would seem that the order should have been reversed, and that as we approach the point of tax exhaustion the additional burdens to be piled on should get less and less, instead of more and more.

If twelve billions had been added to the present Federal tax load, as suggested by the administration, it would then have totaled fifty billions, or slightly less than half the contemplated outlay in the present fiscal year. Including the ten billions being collected by the State and local governments, this would have brought the total annual tax burden in this country to sixty billions.

However desirable it may be to absorb more of the war cost currently, and at the same time combat the threat of ruinous inflation—and I would be the last to quarrel with the desirability of either objective—the fact is that we have about reached the saturation point in taxes, and must therefore be exceedingly careful in piling on additional burdens. To go too far may result not only in the destruction of the great middle class, which is the very backbone of our country, but also in destroying incentive, which is so necessary to the success of our war effort. Moreover, business must be left something to carry through the readjustment period following the termination of hostilities.

The committee thought it inadvisable to increase taxes by any such figure as $12,000,000,000, as requested by the administration. The committee examined the whole situation carefully, and then made provision for such increases as seemed practicable, keeping in mind the cardinal rule of ability to pay as well as the dictum of Chief Justice Marshall that "the power to tax is the power to destroy."

With the corporate excess-profits tax rate raised to 95 percent in the bill before us, it seems clear that there can be no further increase from this source, aside from what may be realized as a result of the acceleration of war production.

Moreover, it would seem that the present upper rate on normal corporate profits—now 40 percent—cannot go much higher. I have not forgotten that during the last World War, when individual rates reached a maximum of 77 percent, the corporate income tax was only 12 percent—the equivalent of the maximum normal rate on individuals. Nor have I forgotten that in those days, and up to the time the New Deal philosophy of taxation was given effect, recognition was given to the fact that a corporation was merely a collection of individuals doing business in corporate form, and that, therefore, allowance should be made for the tax paid by the corporation in assessing the shareholders, which was done by exempting dividends from the normal tax on individuals.

Now, we not only will tax the corporation up to 40 percent on normal profits and up to 95 percent on excess profits under the bill, but we shall tax what is left, when paid out in dividends, at the full normal and surtax rates in the hands of the stockholders. Someday, I hope we may get back to sound and defensible principles in taxing individuals doing business in corporate form. Despite the exigencies of war, England has continued to adhere to the sound practice of treating the corporate income tax as a tax upon the shareholder, collected at the source, for which due allowance is made in assessing the individual income tax.

Last year, the Treasury asked for a 55-percent rate on normal corporate profits, but Congress refused to go above 40 percent. There has, as you know, been considerable agitation for an allowance for

post-war reconversion reserves. Of the desirability of such reserves there can be no doubt. The Congress has already given recognition to the principle of post-war reserves in connection with the excess-profits tax, 10 percent of the tax being set aside for the use of the corporation in the post-war period. While this credit is all right so far as it goes, it is not of such magnitude as to build up any appreciable amount for post-war industrial rehabilitation purposes. Moreover, the credit only applies where the corporation has excess-profits tax liability, whereas thousands of other corporations not benefited by the war will have an equal need for such reserves.

No more important problem confronts the Nation than the necessity of being ready to provide peacetime jobs for the millions who will be thrown out of war work with the cessation of hostilities, not to mention the millions of returning soldiers and sailors who will be looking forward to resuming their normal pursuits. The kind of a corporate tax policy which the Congress adopts I know will have a profound effect upon the ability of business and industry to provide these jobs when the war boom ends.

If we are to succeed in maintaining a high level of employment and national income in the post-war period, I firmly believe it is essential that our Federal tax policy be such as to give some encouragement to venture capital. In my opinion, there are endless possibilities for the development of new industries after the war if a wise tax policy is pursued. These industries can easily pave the way for an era of post-war prosperity instead of a post-war depression, and it is to the interest of the Government to see that these industries are nurtured and developed. The war has opened up new frontiers in science and invention, and if the resource and industry of our people are not unduly hampered by ill-advised Government policies of taxation and restraint we can look forward to the enjoyment of unparalleled prosperity and improved living standards.

Before passing to other phases of the tax problem, I should perhaps briefly mention the matter of renegotiation of war contracts, on which the Ways and Means Committee has been conducting public hearings preparatory to proposing certain revisions in the existing law. Prior to the enactment of the excess-profits tax in 1940, the only restriction on war profits was under the Vinson-Trammell Act, which limited the allowable profit on naval vessels and planes. When Congress passed the excess-profits-tax law, it suspended the provisions of the Vinson-Trammell Act as being unnecessary. Later, there was added as a rider to one of the appropriation bills a measure known as the war contract renegotiation law, providing for the renegotiation of war contracts where excess profits were found. This law, as every Member here knows, has given rise to much controversy and dissatisfaction, particularly because of the lack of any definite standards for the administration of the law. Most war contractors seem to feel that the law is unnecessary because 90 percent of any excess profits will be taken under the excess-profits-tax law in any event, and they further feel that the time spent in going through the renegotiation proceedings has actually held up the war production effort. The war agencies, on the other hand, feel that the renegotiation law is sound in principle, though they admit there is room for improvement in the administrative machinery. They have contended further that the function of keeping war costs at a minimum cannot be accomplished under the excess-profits-tax law, nor, so they assert, can such a law provide effective incentives to war contractors to keep production at a maximum and costs at a minimum. A number of clarifying changes have been made so as to eliminate some of the present uncertainties and improve the administration of the law.

Summing up the corporate-tax picture, this bill does not raise any substantial amount of additional revenue through higher corporate rates. I believe that the inadvisability of doing so was conceded by Mr. Randolph Paul, the Treasury tax adviser.

It is obvious that if any large amount of additional taxes, such as was demanded by the President, had been imposed and realized, the burden would have had to fall largely on the individual taxpayer, whether in the form of income or excise levies.

So far as the individual income tax is concerned, there was no longer any room for increases in the topmost brackets. We can hardly expect to take in taxation more than 90 cents out of every dollar a man earns, which is the present maximum. This means that whatever increases may have to be made in the future will have to be in the middle and lower brackets, principally the latter, and we seem to be rapidly approaching the limit even there.

One difficulty with any general increase in rates in the lower and middle brackets is that it would have fallen with unequal impact on persons who have not benefited from the war boom as against those who have so benefited. I realize, of course, that there is a tremendous reservoir of excess purchasing power in the hands of large segments of the people today, indicating that the point of tax exhaustion has not been reached in all cases. The problem, however, is to reach this so-called inflationary purchasing power without crucifying those who are already struggling under the existing tax load. There are millions of persons who either have not had an increase in income since the war or have actually suffered a decreased income. They do not have the same capacity to pay increased taxes as war workers and others whose incomes have doubled, trebled, and perhaps even quadrupled. For example, the man who has received $5,000 income over a period of years finds today that his actual purchasing power has been considerably reduced through mounting taxes and higher prices for everything he buys. Moreover, he has fixed commitments which must be met, such as insurance premiums, mortgage payments, and so on. By contrast, his neighbor, who as a result of the war has received an increase in income from $2,000 to $5,000, and who does not have these fixed and often long-standing commitments, is enjoying new-found luxury despite the relatively high taxes he has to pay.

In the case of so many of the excise taxes, the products on which they are levied are no longer available, such as passenger cars, electric refrigerators, and radios. In other cases, such as gasoline, consumption is restricted. Thus in a number of instances, receipts have fallen off in the face of increased rates. In the case of practically all of the excise levies, the rates have been increased again and again since they were first imposed.

The Federal estate tax also offers little opportunity for increased revenue, since the rates are already rather high, reaching a maximum of 70 percent. The Treasury urged still higher rates last year, but Congress refused to approve any increase.

Since existing sources of taxation offered little possibility of raising substantial additional revenue, practically the only potential source of new revenue as yet untapped is the sales tax. For years Congress has toyed with the idea of enacting such a levy, but the administration has always been bitterly opposed. Back in 1932 the Ways and Means Committee recommended to the House a manufacturers' sales tax, based on the successful Canadian system, but it was overwhelmingly defeated. Since that time the sales tax has never been able to command the support of a majority of the Ways and Means Committee, and hence has not been included in any of the more recent tax bills, nor in this one. It has, however, been the subject of much discussion.

The arguments which have been most generally used against the sales tax are that it falls heaviest on those with the least income, and is deflationary in character, since it discourages consumption. While it is perhaps true that the sales tax is more burdensome to the poor than to the well-to-do, this argument would be more valid if the sales tax were the only means of raising revenue for the support of the Government. But as long as it is employed in connection with progressive income taxes, the ability-to-pay principle is preserved.

One difficulty about the Federal Government enacting a sales tax at this late date, even if there had been no other objection, is that the State has largely preempted this field. Moreover, they have varying rates and exemptions, and varying methods of collection. For the Federal Government at this time to impose a sales tax with different rates and exemptions, and a different method of collection, probably would have caused a great deal of confusion.

It has been estimated that it would require a retail sales tax of 10 percent, without exemptions, to produce $5,000,000,000 of revenue. If food were exempted, the yield of a 10 percent retail sales tax would be only $3,000,000,000.

Thus even if a sales tax were enacted, the Treasury's first proposal of $12,000,000,000, or even its request for $10,500,000,000, in additional revenue would have come far from realization.

In this connection, I feel I ought to make some reference to the fact that the long-standing differences between the administration and the Congress on tax policy have made the task of the Ways and Means Committee most difficult in these already trying times. In recent years, the Treasury has presented a detailed tax program to Congress, and when Congress has not seen fit to go along the administration has used its vast propaganda machine to try to overcome congressional opposition. Congress has been held up to scorn and ridicule, and has been accused of shifting the tax burden from corporations and the wealthy to the backs of the masses. Of course, we in Congress get used to unfounded criticisms of this kind, but it is not a very wholesome situation, and is wholly unwarranted. In the first place, the Treasury has no business having a fixed tax program. It is the duty of the House of Representatives, under the Constitution, to originate revenue bills. The executive branch is merely supposed to administer the laws that Congress enacts. It is perfectly proper for the Secretary of the Treasury to make recommendations to Congress when requested, but to my mind it is improper for the Treasury to work out a tax program of its own and then insist that Congress enact it into law without regard to the views of those who are to be taxed or the judgment of the taxpaying public as to what is for the best interest of the country.

The founding fathers had a very definite reason for placing the power to initiate revenue bills in the House of Representatives, whose members must give an accounting of their stewardship every two years. This important power over the purse was purposely denied to the executive branch. The attempt of the latter to usurp the functions of Congress in laying down tax policy is simply a part of the general trend during the last decade, and in my opinion it is high time it was stopped.

I recall that in 1941, when the Ways and Means Committee was considering the $3,500,000,000 tax bill, we worked under the apprehension that we were increasing the tax level from $9,500,000,000 to $13,000,000,000. The next year, however, we found that it had actually been raised to $18,000,000,000. Again last year, when we were preparing the $7,000,000,000 bill, we were given to understand that it would raise the tax level to $25,000,000,000. Yet early this year, the President informed us in his budget message that the tax level had actually been increased to $33,000,000,000.

The problem of Government financing is one which will continue to plague the Congress and the executive branch for some time to come. As long as the war lasts, we will doubtless be spending tens of billions more annually than we can possibly raise by taxation. In the meantime, the national debt will continue to pile up. When the national debt reaches $300,000,000,000, as seems likely, the interest burden alone will be as much as it cost to pay the entire expenses of the Government in the extravagant pre-war period, without reference to any provision for the retirement of the principal.

Following the last World War, we retired the debt at the rate of $1,000,000,000 annually for 10 years. Then the depression put a stop to further curtailments. Even if we are able to increase the amortization rate to $3,000,000,000 annually after the present war, it will take a hundred years to pay off the debt.

When we contemplate that our post-war Budget will have to provide a minimum of perhaps ten billion for debt service, it becomes apparent that we will never see a reduction of the cost of government to anything like the pre-war level, even comparable to that in the heyday of New Deal extravagance. Besides providing for debt service, we may have to maintain a huge army, navy, and air force to police the world, which will cost many billions annually. We will have to provide hospitalization and disability compensation for the casualties of the war. We will have to make huge appropriations for post-war rehabilitation. We will undoubtedly be called upon to continue financial aid for post-war recovery in other countries. All these costs will be superimposed upon the regular operating expenditures of the Government, which seem inevitably to increase year by year. I would not venture to predict the exact size of our post-war Budget, but I know it will be staggering when compared to the pre-war level.

At the present time our national income is the highest in all history, yet the most we have been able to raise in Federal taxes has been forty-one billions. If the national income should drop precipitately after the war, the maintenance of our present high taxes would not produce anything like forty-one billions. In other words, we will need to raise by taxation in the post-war period enough to cover not only the high level of expenditures which we may then expect, but the amortization of the national debt as well. This is a problem to put a strain on the ingenuity of our best minds. It can best be solved by endeavoring to maintain national income at a high level in the post-war period; otherwise, the burden of taxation which would be required to keep the post-war Budgets in balance would be absolutely crushing in its severity. Waste, extravagance, and boondoggling must be stopped. The tax outlook for the future is not a very pleasant one to contemplate.

I repeat that in order to minimize the burden as much as possible, it is imperative that every effort be made to eliminate every dollar of wasteful and extravagant spending. Heretofore, congressional efforts at economy have centered around nonmilitary spending. The time has now come to scrutinize more and more carefully the huge appropriations being made for war purposes. Of the more than three hundred billions already authorized by Congress, only one-third has actually been spent. If it should be found that only 10 percent of the total appropriations were unnecessary, a saving of thirty-three billions could be made. After the last World War it was found that a considerable portion of the funds appropriated had actually been wasted, and there is no reason to believe that the present war will be an exception. The congressional economy committee, headed by Senator BYRD, which is largely responsible for the economies in Federal spending already effected, has accomplished much in this respect without in any way interfering with the war effort. To the extent that economies in military spending are possible, the task of financing the war is simplified.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. I notice in today's paper that Under Secretary of War Patterson makes the statement that where military affairs are concerned they do not consider the cost in connection with the Canol project for oil up in Canada. That $17,000,000 is a part of the $13,000,000,000 to which the gentleman referred, that is to be returned or that will not be used?

Mr. REED of New York. As I understand, the $13,000,000,000 up to this time perhaps cannot be construed strictly and legally as a saving, because it is still there to be spent or distributed around to the different departments to spend as they see fit. What the Congress ought to do, if that be true, is to pass a resolution that the $13,000,000,000 and any other money the departments save or fail to spend, or that is unnecessary for the prosecution of the war, should be turned back to the Treasury, and then if they need any of that money later, they should come before the Congress or the proper committee of Congress and make their case, and another appropriation can be made to take care of it.

Mr. ROWE. Do I understand, now, that the $13,000,000,000 of formerly committed dollars is now reserve dollars?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes.

Mr. ROWE. I note further in today's paper that the Secretary of the Treasury proposes a $10,000,000,000 post-war bank. Is there anything in this tax bill being considered today in the way of funds to be contributed in that direction?

Mr. REED of New York. No; there is nothing that has anything to do with that. We will hear all about that later in the session.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. In regard to the $13,000,000,000, the War Department budget officer, General Richards, was prepared to say to us when we had our hearing on this matter that they would set over to the Budget Bureau approximately $10,800,000,000 that would be in a budget reserve, to be drawn only by permission of the Budget Bureau.

In the hearings we conducted last week for some 3 days we went into the total field of expenditures further, and as a result of that they agreed to set over to the budget reserve an additional $2,200,000,000. However, some of us were not satisfied that that should stay exactly in the status of a budget reserve without some control of it by Congress, so we exacted from the budget officer of the War Department and the several heads of the branches of the War Department who appeared before us the explicit statement—and it is a part of the record testimony on the subject—that none of the $13,000,000,000 will be removed from the budget reserve in any amount without coming to the War Department subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and also getting the sanction of that committee.

I may say that that was a concession that was won by the committee on the express statement made in the committee that without some such reservation some of us would feel obligated to introduce the very type of resolution the gentleman from New York suggests. It will be understood, of course, that appropriation expires June 30, 1944, and the unspent funds automatically revert to the Treasury.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not believe the statement made by the gentleman from South Dakota justifies no affirmative action on the part of the Congress. It is possibilities, not probabilities, that should be taken care of by law by Congress.

Mr. REED of New York. I concur 100 percent with the gentleman from Michigan for this reason: I believe that every dollar that is spent by this Government should be first appropriated and approved by this Congress.

Mr. MICHENER. If that money was not used for the purpose for which it was appropriated by the Congress, then it is entirely wrong to have that money transferred to the control of the Budget Bureau or any other bureau to be used if and when some individual in the Department might see fit to use it. If the money has not been expended for the purposes for which it was appropriated then it should revert to the Treasury.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. CASE. I think this is a matter that does concern the Congress and that a frank statement on it should be made. I happened to raise in the committee the same question the gentleman from New York asked, whether or not the committee should not take action to have that money revert to the Treasury. There was some support for it. I felt that way about it myself. However, the pledge to come back to the committee was not made merely as a matter of somebody's opinion, it is a matter of testimony, a matter of record, that before any part of that $13,000,000,000 will be spent the Committee on Appropriations will be consulted. The budget officer of the War Department, General Richards, Secretary Patterson, and General McNarney, the Assistant Chief of Staff, all gave their solemn testimony that that money would not be expended without coming before the Committee on Appropriations and asking for it again.

Mr. MICHENER. If that is true, the proper way to do it would be to have action by Congress rather than to accept the promise of Department representatives to a subcommittee.

Mr. REED of New York. Absolutely, and not only in writing but make it a resolution of Congress.

Mr. CASE. It is in writing as a matter of record before the committee. Although much of the testimony before us was of a military nature and off the record, this matter is a part of the record.

Mr. REED of New York. I do not care anything about the testimony.

Mr. CASE. Further, there are some items in that $13,000,000,000 which it might be important to have available relating to the reduction in certain projects which are related to military strategy. If we had insisted upon getting that resolution, if I and one or two others who supported me in the matter had insisted on getting the resolution, we would not have been able to have impounded as much as $13,000,000,000.

Mr. REED of New York. Congress can impound whatever portion of the $13,000,000,000 it deems wise.

Mr. MICHENER. Would it not be better to impound it and know what we have impounded rather than to transfer to some agency or bureau $13,000,000,000 to be used if, when, and how the bureau might see fit?

Mr. CASE. It is impounded. It is not left to the Budget Bureau alone.

Mr. MICHENER. It is not impounded by law, yet Congress has apparently lost control over it. That is what I am concerned about.

Mr. CASE. The Congress, through the Appropriations Committee, has recaptured control of $13,000,000,000 over which it did not have control.

Mr. MICHENER. The Appropriations Committee has no authority to recapture any of this money. At most it can leave only a promise.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I notice here that the individual income tax increases are going to bring in $154,800,000.

Mr. REED of New York. The reason for the increase is that the normal tax had to be increased to implement what is now known as the Victory tax. It does pick up a little revenue, but it is very slight.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It seems to me you are doing a very serious thing here, for two reasons. First, we passed a bill yesterday with scarcely enough votes to override a veto—and we may not have enough votes to override it when it comes back—a bill to give $1,000,000,000 worth of subsidies chiefly for the purpose of subsidizing the consumer grocery bills of the white-collar class, which is the very class you attack. Here you are in a war situation where you need this managerial and white-collar class. You ought to keep up their salaries. And you bring in this decrease. It seems to me that is entirely inconsistent with our idea of profit and the means of getting things done.

Mr. REED of New York. When you look at the whole picture, in order to get rid of this very objectionable Victory tax it had to be worked out on a mathematical basis. It does bring in a little revenue, but it is not of great consequence to the general run of taxpayers, in view of the $6,500,000,000 which the Treasury sought to put on individuals.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Do you mean to say these increases make no difference to you personally, but will just replace the Victory tax?

Mr. REED of New York. That is true, just to replace the Victory tax.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield for a question.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. We did repeal the earned-income credit, which we did to simplify the tax system, and that does increase taxes somewhat. And also we removed the deductions from taxes and excises from personal income. That is where we picked it up.

Mr. REED of New York. To answer the lady from Illinois a little further, you must recall the President wanted to increase individual income taxes five times that amount. He wanted, as I have said, to put on $6,500,000,000 additional to the tax load of individuals, which would have hit the white-collar people. When Mr. Eccles, of the Federal Reserve, appeared before our committee his proposal was $16,000,000,000 increase in taxes. We are now showing a retrenchment of $13,000,000,000, provided it can be returned to the general fund of the Treasury. How many more billions of dollars the spendthrifts are pouring into rat holes right now is to be ascertained by future investigation.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would like to know from the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] whether or not the Army came in voluntarily and disgorged the $13,000,000,000, or whether it was dragged out of them.

Mr. CASE. The true credit for the savings should go to the boys in Africa and Italy, in Alaska and Australia who have made these savings possible. The credit for the mechanics of the saving should probably be divided between the War Department, the budget officer of the General Staff, Brigadier General Richards, and the committee. The War Department came in in response to a letter which the chairman of the committee wrote for the committee last summer shortly after the recess. The letter was predicated upon the reduction in the armed forces. As the gentleman knows,

at the time the War Department appropriation bill was prepared last May, it was planned to have an army of 8,260,000 men at the end of the fiscal year. Subsequently plans were curtailed so that we currently plan an army of 7,700,000 men. That reduction of 560,000 men automatically suggested to the committee and to the chairman of the committee the possibility of some saving, not merely in the pay of those soldiers, but in the equipment and matériel that would be provided for them. That particular phase was responsible for about $2,000,000,000 in the money that is recaptured. That led, however, to a further investigation of the appropriations made last June on the basis of the changed military situation, the improvement of the situation at sea with the conquering of the submarines or at least a reduction of their effectiveness, with the result that when the War Department made its report to us a week ago they proposed impounding $10,943,000,000. That was increased by $2,200,000,000 to a total of $13,100,000,000 as a result of the hearings the committee conducted last week.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does not the gentleman think the War Department is to be complimented for bringing in that money?

Mr. CASE. Yes; I do.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman from New York is one of the most distinguished and scholarly members on the minority side of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. REED of New York. I will have to plead not guilty, sir.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would like to ask him if when this tax bill, which we are passing without prolonged debate today, comes back from the Senate, should they have a freeze of the social-security tax raised in there; will we be forced to vote for that in a conference report? I would like to see what the sentiment is in the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. REED of New York. I cannot express the sentiment of the Ways and Means Committee as I have not the power of divination to know what the Senate Finance Committee may do. I understand that some of the most distinguished men in the other body are in favor, of course, of freezing the tax where it is, and whether they will attempt to put it in this bill I do not know. I wish I could inform the gentleman. I can speak only for myself, so far as that is concerned, but from all the evidence I have been able to examine as to the amount of reserve that has been built up and the necessity to accomplish that function at this time, there is no reason for building up a larger reserve. All it does is to print bonds and to put those in a box and go out and spend the money. I think it is better to leave the money in the banks.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman does not mean we should be given a question of this great import on a conference report to study, does he?

Mr. REED of New York. As I say, I cannot speak for the majority of the Ways and Means Committee. I do not want to attempt to speak for the minority on that question. Just what the situation might be at the time, whether it is necessary to do it or bring it in, I do not know. I do not like to see a tax bill muddied with a big question of that character. I am not in control of it.

Mr. MONRONEY. It seems to me that would be very bad legislative procedure. That would not give the House a chance to express its true views on this and legislate as we should on a matter of that importance.

Mr. REED of New York. It would not be the first time that another matter is attached to a tax bill.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I would like, before this bill passes, to make inquiry regarding the 3 percent tax on freight transportation. I come from the far West and that tax being on a percentage basis rather than a unit basis acts as a tariff barrier on certain of our products.

Mr. REED of New York. That is perfectly natural. I am not criticizing anybody for it, but I have yet to find anybody who is truly fond of taxes. If you had sat day after day listening to people who appeared before us—fine, splendid, patriotic people, some representing corporations and some partnerships and some individuals—I think if you will examine the testimony you will find, in nearly every instance, each of those who came before us and they said, "We know you must have money and we are in favor of taxes. We feel, however, that we are taxed for all that we can afford to pay." Now, as a matter of fact, considering the demand of one department for $16,000,000,000 and another department for $12,000,000,000 and another one for $10,500,000,000, I think that after all the people must realize that this is a rather modest demand, even with your transportation tax. I would like, of course, to see many items in the tax bill removed.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Possibly I should explain my comment. The objection that I hold, and I think the one that is held by the people out there, is not an objection to paying a tax but it is an objection to the basis on which the tax is levied. Take, for example, lumber; the 3 percent tax on the lumber we ship amounts to an average of about 60 cents per thousand feet. The lumber freight tax from competitive areas is much less. The freight tax should be on a unit basis—not percentage.

Mr. REED of New York. I can see your point and I do not blame you for raising it.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I just wanted to make it clear that it is not the amount of the tax. That is not the point involved.

Mr. REED of New York. I understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the Ways and Means Committee, because of its refusal to provide additional revenue of ten and a half billions of dollars in the bill we have before us, has been editorially castigated by certain editors of the metropolitan press. Ordinarily, editors of such publications are well informed and their opinions are worthy of consideration by the public. However, in this instance, the ones to whom I refer apparently are yielding to the importunities of the Secretary of the Treasury and other members of the administration, and doing so without knowledge of many facts which this administration is concealing from the public, and which cannot be justified upon any grounds whatsoever. I believe it is almost unanimously agreed that when our soldiers and sailors are fighting on battle fronts all over the world, when we also are providing money, food, and all types of military supplies to our allies, that every expenditure of the Government should be closely and critically scanned by the Congress, and that appropriations should be provided only for those things which are directly needed to bring victory to our arms at the earliest possible moment.

We all have been hearing stories coming from Central and South American republics, as well as other parts of the world, to the effect that those countries are being overrun with agents of this Government who are committing our people to expenditures of money to an extent that will shock the people of this country when the facts are known. Confirmation of this statement can be had if the Appropriations Committee will force from the proper officials a detailed account of what these agents of the Government are doing in those countries, and to what they are committing the taxpayers of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress approved the original Lend-Lease Act. It has since renewed the act for an additional 2 years. This law gives to the President of the United States the authority to spend the billions provided under the law in any way he sees fit, if in his opinion, such expenditure will contribute to our national defense. This is the only restriction placed upon the Chief Executive in this regard. I voted against the original Lend-Lease Act and against its extension. I voted against appropriations under the act. I did so because I did not believe the President was careful enough of the taxpayers' money to justify giving him this power. Subsequent events have confirmed my opinion. Certainly when Congress approved the legislation and the more than $70,000,000,000 which have been either directly appropriated for, allocated to the lend-lease fund through Executive order, or expended for ships and arms which have been contributed or made available to our allies and other nations, it naturally expected that the President would make expenditures from this fund only for purposes which would directly and substantially contribute to

the winning of this war. I believe neither the Congress nor the country would have given any measure of approval to this act if it had been known that the money, which we must borrow on the credit of the taxpayers for this purpose, and which the taxpayers must eventually dig down in their pockets to pay, together with the interest thereon, until those debts are finally retired, if they had had the slightest suspicion that this Government would establish W. P. A. projects and other boondoggling activities all over Central and South America, and probably all over other sections of the world also.

How many Members of this House, for instance, know that we are now committed to spending in the next 3 years in Central and South American republics $6,000,000,000 for every imaginable thing, not one of which will in the slightest degree contribute to the early success of our arms and bring peace to this world? Mr. Chairman, one million dollars is a huge sum of money. The human mind just cannot conceive the magnitude of six thousand millions, which is the amount involved in this program in a comparatively small part of the world. What other programs of like character elsewhere there are is yet to be disclosed. How many Members of the House know that the national budgets of the 20 Central and South American republics in 1941 totaled only $1,067,000,000, or approximately one-sixth of the amount we propose to spend there in 3 years? One Latin American editor said, "$6,000,000,000! There are 120,000,000 people in Latin America. That is $50 apiece. If our friendship were actually for sale, $50 would not be enough; but if we would sell it, $50 would be too much." It is known that we have set up in Latin America W. P. A.'s, N. Y. A.'s, and F. S. A.'s, and the spending of this six billions is in the hands of a number of agencies of the United States Government. It is understood there are more than 12,000 projects of different types. For example, this money is being spent to stock the streams and lakes of Venezuela with game fish. Right now there is a fishery mission in Mexico. We paid for a fish survey in the ocean adjacent to Panama. We are financing the preparation of a handbook of South American Indians. Also, a Guide to Official Publications of Latin America, a Law Guide, and Central American Legal Studies. We are paying for a survey of collections of Latin American music. All these and thousands of other projects of various degrees of usefulness.

Mr. Chairman, I am indebted to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, the Honorable HUGH BUTLER, for the information I am discussing.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I think it should be mentioned that the Senator will file a very lengthy and detailed report in the Senate in a day or two, and the entire expense of this trip covering some 20,000 miles did not cost the taxpayers anything, and was undertaken by the Senator individually.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I am very happy to have that information injected into my remarks. I hope every Member of the House, and certainly every Member of the Senate will carefully scrutinize the report that the Senator will file with that body. I am sure we will all find it highly enlightening.

This splendid public official traveled 20,000 miles in the countries to the south of us at his own expense, as the gentleman from Nebraska says, and while there gathered information which should be in the possession of every citizen of the United States. In an article in the December issue of the Reader's Digest, the Senator has disclosed the fantastic lengths to which the Roosevelt administration would go in taxing our people and spending their hard-earned money in the far corners of the world.

To those who criticize the Ways and Means Committee for refusing to pile upon the already overburdened taxpayers of this country an additional $10,500,000,000 tax at this time, while things such as I have disclosed, together with all the other things which Senator BUTLER has described, as well as the probable similar activities the administration is engaging in all over the world, I commend a careful reading of the splendid article by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, something should be done about such fantastic expenditures.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. That article was placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Certainly Congress should promptly amend the Lend-Lease Act and take from the President the power he now has which he is so shamefully abusing, and place that power in the hands of some agency not as profligate in spending the taxpayers' money as the President has proved himself to be. I commend my remarks and Senator BUTLER'S splendid article to the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House, and appeal to that committee to report an amendment to the act which will accomplish this. Further, I commend to the Appropriations Committee that when the next appropriations bill comes from that committee, they recover to the Treasury the billions still available in the lend-lease fund, and that hereafter when additional billions are requested, that the members of the committee secure from the spending authority an itemized account of the things for which the spenders propose to use the fund, eliminate every item that cannot be fully justified, and then hold that authority to strict account for its expenditures. Further, there should be, there must be, some check put upon all reckless, wasteful, fantastic spending of the public moneys. If from the very beginning of the present world emergency we had limited our expenditures to only those things which were absolutely necessary for the civil administration and the prosecution of the war, even then the public debt would have been far greater than could at the time have been conceived. As it is, God alone knows how many additional billions of debt have been heaped upon our people, and how many additional generations will be taxed in order to pay the increased debt engendered by such activities. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, those responsible for this policy must have been afflicted with visions of grandeur or they are determined to wreck this Republic. How else can we account for the utter disregard of the welfare of our tax-paying public?

Mr. Chairman, had our critical editors been informed as they should have been, had proper publicity been given to the crack-brained policy of a world-wide program of boondoggling and W. P. A., they would have directed their shafts of criticism at those responsible and in that way have contributed to some degree to a return of sanity in the expenditure of the tax and borrowed money.

The conditions I have discussed, together with the surrender to the Treasury of the thirteen billions which the War Department turned back the other day, point the way to save other and greater amounts by recovering to the control of the Appropriations Committee the unexpended balance in the lend-lease fund. When this has been done we will find we, by that process, will have reduced our expenditures to the point where no greater taxes upon our people will be necessary, and that the pending bill provides a sufficient amount of money at this time.

Mr. Chairman, in order that the Members may have all the facts presented by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, I suggest they read the article in the current issue of the Reader's Digest heretofore referred to, a reprinting of which appears on page A5073 of the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. I would like to ask the gentleman how we can justify levying additional taxes upon the people of this country at this time in face of the things the gentleman has just related and as contained in Senator BUTLER'S report?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. There would be no possible justification for levying greater taxes upon the people of this country at this time than the taxes incorporated in the present bill, I will say to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. How can we justify the taxes incorporated in the present bill in the face of it?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I am frank to say that in view of the disclosures made by the Senator from Nebraska, which came to my attention only today, I am somewhat in doubt myself as to the advisability of it.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Is it not a fact that the tax bill is to pay the accrual of the debt that has been caused by the very extravagance to which you are referring?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. There is not any question about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY].

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein the individual views I filed in the report on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE WESLEY E. DISNEY

In recent years there has been much discussion of economy in government. Important economies have been accomplished. The present bill provides no legislative means of operation to improve the governmental machinery in the direction of economy. Up to the time of the War between the States, the Ways and Means Committee was the tax-raising and money-spending committee of the House. It levied the taxes and took the appropriation bills to the House. At that time the Appropriations Committee was created, and since then each committee has gone its way. The Ways and Means Committee has been the revenue committee of the House and the Appropriations Committee has presented the appropriations bills to the House. Neither had had power or jurisdiction over the other.

In the legislative branch of the Government there is no committee or organization which deals with the subject matter of the over-all budget or the over-all revenues. The Bureau of the Budget, now in the arm of the executive branch, performs this function that is entirely separate and apart from the Congress. The Comptroller General in the main looks to the legality of expenditures.

It is therefore necessary for a Member of Congress, if he desires to get the over-all picture of expenditures and receipts, to go to the Bureau of the Budget, which has no legislative authority. Under the rules, procedure, and traditions of both Houses, the Ways and Means Committee and the House Appropriations Committee are independent of each other on this subject, as are the Senate Finance Committee (the revenue committee of the Senate) and the Senate Appropriations Committee.

I proposed in the Ways and Means Committee a provision to be inserted in instant H. R. 3687, which would require the President to furnish the Congress an estimate of expenses to be furnished to a newly created Joint Committee on the Budget, composed of five members of the Ways and Means Committee, five from the House Appropriations Committee, five from the Senate Finance Committee, and five from the Senate Appropriations Committee. This committee would be required to make a joint report to the two Houses, which, upon the adoption by each House, would create a statutory ceiling for appropriations for each department or establishment of the Government. This statutory ceiling could not be exceeded except by two-thirds of the votes of each House on a yea-and-nay vote, and any individual Member could raise the question on a point of order.

As a part of these views the provision is offered as follows:

TITLE II—BUDGET AND REVENUE CONTROL

Part 1

1. The President shall transmit to the two Houses of Congress, on or before June 1 of each year, a report showing:

(a) His estimate of the total revenues and receipts of the Government for the calendar year next succeeding.

(b) His estimate of the total of the expenditures by departments and independent establishments of the Government under obligations to be incurred during the fiscal year beginning on the 1st of July of the calendar year next succeeding.

(c) If the total of his estimates of expenditures under (b) exceed the total of his estimates of revenues and receipts under (a), he shall recommend to the Congress in said report the manner in which the revenues and receipts shall be increased so that the total of such revenues and receipts, as estimated, shall equal or exceed the total of the obligations, as estimated.

(d) Upon receipt of said report from the President, it shall be referred forthwith to the Joint Committee on the Budget created by part 2 hereof, and such reference by either body to such joint committee shall confer jurisdiction to consider and report as provided in part 2 hereof.

Part 2

This part is enacted by the Congress, with complete reservation of the constitutional rights of each House thereof, as follows:

(a) There is hereby created a joint committee of Congress to be known as the Joint Committee on the Budget, hereinafter referred to as the Budget Committee. The Budget Committee shall consist of 10 Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate (consisting of 3 members of the majority party and 2 members of the minority party from each of the Committees on Appropriations and Finance); and 10 Members of the House, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House (consisting of 3 members of the majority party and 2 members of the minority party from each of the Committees on Appropriations and Ways and Means). The chairman shall be designated by the Speaker of the House.

(b) On or before June 15 of each year, following the transmission of the President's report as herein provided, the Budget Committee shall report its recommendations thereon to the respective Houses of Congress. Such report shall be accompanied by a joint resolution or bill with the customary resolving or enacting clause and the body thereof in following form:

"That the Budget submitted by the President for the fiscal year beginning July 1 of the calendar year next succeeding, shall not exceed a grand total, for all purposes of $_____. The said total sum shall include all appropriations of every kind whatsoever—regular, annual appropriations, permanent appropriations, reappropriations, indefinite appropriations, and authorizations to contract or commit, the amount for which, if indefinite, shall be estimated."

The total of the estimated appropriations for each department or establishment shall constitute the statutory ceiling of appropriations for such department or establishment.

(c) Consideration of the report of the Budget Committee shall be first on the part of the House.

(d) If the Budget Committee fails to make a report within the time specified herein, it shall be in order for any Member of the House to present the resolution or bill set forth in (b) hereof and to call up the same for consideration at the earliest date; if said resolution or bill has not been considered, it shall after 3 days be considered as unfinished business of the highest privilege.

(e) Consideration of said resolution or bill shall not exceed 10 hours in either House, the control of which shall be equally divided in either House among the chairmen and ranking minority members of the two committees of each of such Houses from which the members of the Budget Committee are chosen. Upon completion of consideration the resolution or bill shall be moved to final passage with no intervening motion, except that amendments may be offered to change, without qualification, the total amount.

(f) Upon passage by the House, the resolution or bill shall be transmitted forthwith to the Senate, where it shall be considered at the earliest date and after 3 calendar days shall be considered unfinished business of the highest privilege.

(g) Consideration by either House of Senate amendments to such bill or resolution, or of conference reports thereon, shall likewise be of the highest privilege.

(h) Whenever any appropriation bill for any department or other establishment, the ceiling for whose total appropriation is fixed pursuant to this act, reaches a final vote in either House, if the total of such bill when moved to final passage is in excess of such ceiling, each such vote shall be by yeas and nays, and shall require a two-thirds vote for passage. If the bill shall have failed to receive a two-thirds vote, it shall be considered as having been recommitted with instructions to report the same back with each item proportionately reduced, to bring the total of the bill within the statutory ceiling.

(i) Whenever any appropriation bill for any department or other establishment, the ceiling for whose total appropriation is fixed pursuant to this act, has passed the Senate with Senate amendments the net total of which will increase or further increase the total of such bill above such statutory ceiling, concurrence in the amendments to the extent which increases the total of the bill above the statutory ceiling, or adoption of any conference report the net effect of which is to increase or further increase the total of such bill above the statutory ceiling, shall require a two-thirds vote.

In my judgment, it is unfortunate that this provision was not adopted as a part of H. R. 3687. It would be a special move in the direction of governmental economy. Our appropriations have risen since 1913 from $700,000,000, when we had a population of 90,000,000, to nearly $8,000,000,000 in 1940, when our population had only increased to 130,000,000. In my judgment, our economy cannot continue to function with such tremendous increases in expenditures and consequent high rates of taxes.

WESLEY E. DISNEY.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, while we are tossing these dollar marks around this afternoon, we must remember that every dollar that is spent goes across these desks and somebody here has to vote for it. There is one certain way to cure the bureaucrat and that is to cut off his money. Nobody can cut off his money but Congress. So, after we get through with our tirades against the bureaucrats, remember that we furnish them the money.

I shall confine my remarks on the bill to the provisions relating to renegotiation of war contracts, but, first, let me talk a little bit on the subject of expense, since the subject matter has been brought up here by so many Members.

At the beginning of the First World War we had a public debt of $1,282,000,000. We ended the First World War with a debt of $26,500,000,000. We began this World War with a public debt of $65,000,000,000; and this Congress has

appropriated since July 1, 1941, $345,000,000,000 of which $285,000,000,000 has been obligated. I made a proposal before the committee, and I am sorry it was not adopted. It was to create an over-all budget committee. Up to the War between the States the Ways and Means Committee acted as appropriations committee and as a revenue-raising committee. Then it was divided and the Appropriations Committee come into existence. There is no committee of Congress whose duty it is to keep the Congress advised of the over-all picture as to revenues and appropriations. The Congressmen must seek that information downtown at the Bureau of the Budget.

My proposal was for the creation of a committee of 20 members composed of members of the Ways and Means Committee and Appropriations Committee of the House, and the Finance Committee and the Appropriations Committtee of the Senate. The duty of this committee would be to prepare an over-all budget and submit it to the two Houses. Upon adoption by the two Houses no appropriation could exceed that ceiling except upon a two-thirds vote of the membership and upon the yeas and nays. To me that would implement economy instead of treating economy like the weather, simply talking about it but doing nothing about it.

Mr. Chairman, the provisions of this bill dealing with renegotiation of war contracts involve many difficult problems. The existing law on renegotiation is somewhat of a legislative botch because of the stress of circumstances.

You will recall that the present law on renegotiation of war contracts had its origin in an amendment proposed by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] to the sixth supplemental national defense appropriation bill of 1942. The amendment provided that funds under the bill should not be available to pay contractors with the Government any profits on their contracts in excess of 6 percent. The amendment was adopted by the House but in the Senate it was stricken from the bill and an amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] substituted for it. The final provisions for the renegotiation of war contracts, which were contained in section 403 of the sixth supplemental national defense appropriation bill of 1942, were those recommended in the conference report on the bill.

Note that at no stage of the legislation up to and including the date of its enactment were any public hearings held. The very fact that it was written in conference indicates that it was done hurriedly. As early as August of 1942, a mere 3 months after its enactment, it became apparent that certain administrative amendments were necessary, and such amendments were recommended by representatives of the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission in connection with the consideration of the revenue bill of 1942 by the Committee on Finance of the Senate. The recommendations were followed by the committee, adopted by the Senate and recommended in the conference report on the revenue bill of 1942. The managers on the part of the House, however, while realizing that the amendments proposed were necessary and desirable, were also convinced that further amendments would not be necessary, for in their statement to the House they said:

> The committee of conference does not feel that the amendments which are made by the bill to the renegotiation law contain all the changes and improvements which it might be desirable to make. No attempt has been made to study and reexamine all the possible methods for dealing with excessive profits realized on war contracts. The bill merely attempts to remove some of the more pressing objections to the present law and to make the law administratively workable. It is anticipated that the Ways and Means Committee will study section 403 in connection with matters now pending before the committtee with an eye to a more general revision than is contained in the 1942 revenue bill.

A more general revision than that contained in the 1942 tax bill should have been approved last year but time and the legislative situation did not admit of it. We hoped to get into it the 1st of last January almost immediately following the 1942 bill but we were not able to.

Last June, as a result of the many complaints and criticisms of the law, hearings on renegotiation were initiated by the Committee on Naval Affairs under its authority to investigate the progress of the war effort insofar as the Navy was concerned, and in the same month a subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means was appointed to go into the whole problem of renegotiation of war contracts and make recommendations to the full committee. In the meantime the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means at the request of the interested departments and agencies introduced a bill to increase the exemption limit from $100,000 to $500,000. This was the only amendment recommended by the departments. Hearings on amendments to the renegotiation law were held by the full committee beginning in September and extending over a period of 2 weeks. Shortly thereafter the Committee on Naval Affairs made certain recommendations in the form of a report which was made available to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Since the First World War everyone has discussed the subject of taking the profits out of war; we are all agreed on that subject, that no inordinate, undue profit should be made out of any war effort, and in this bill by these amendments we adhere to that principle.

I think paramount to that principle, however, should be the making certain that when this war is over men returning from the service may have jobs. We cannot cut into profits too deeply and by doing so prevent the accumulation of the reserves which will make that reemployment possible. Perhaps we are cutting too deeply already with a tax rate as high as 90 percent on corporate and individual incomes.

At the outset of the hearings on renegotiation Mr. Karker, who had charge of renegotiation in the War Department, used this language. He said:

> In my judgment as an individual this Renegotiation Act is a dangerous and un-American statute; but we are in a dangerous and destructive war which justifies unusual precautions and conditions.

The present renegotiation statute can be open to the charge Mr. Karker made. Why? Because it adopts the principle of government by men instead of government by laws.

The definition of "excessive profits" in the existing law illustrates what I mean. It is rather remarkable. It reads like this:

> The term "excessive profits" means any amount of a contract or subcontract price which is found as a result of the renegotiation to represent excessive profits.

Really a work of art by the Congress for which we are all to blame. The absence of any standard in the present law for the determination of excessive profits leaves the American system of free enterprise completely at the mercy of the social views of whoever happens to have the job of determining excessive profits.

We try on pages 101 and 102 of the bill to give a definition of "excessive profits," and I think you will find it a fairly satisfactory definition. Twenty-five men on the Ways and Means Committee, who feel that they are as good as the average man and woman of the House, have worked very assiduously, sometimes very heatedly, over this whole subject. We went to grips with each other without nearly the unanimity that appears on this floor now. But we tried to define "excessive profits" in a legal manner. We prescribe the factors on page 102 which must be taken into consideration in the determination of excessive profits. The standards are necessarily general, for it is obvious that a dollar amount or value cannot be ascribed to any one factor, any more than in the purchase of a horse can so many dollars be ascribed by the purchaser to soundness, so many to wind, and so many to a straight tail. It is impossible to fix exact standards because of varied situations and circumstances under renegotiation. All of the factors prescribed, however, must be taken into consideration. Furthermore, when the Board makes a determination of excessive profits it must, at the request of the contractor or subcontractor, furnish him with a statement of the determination, of the facts used as a basis therefor, and of the reasons for the determination of the particular amount of excessive profits found. Thus the contractor will be apprised not only of the facts used by the Board in making its determination, but also of the reasoning which on the basis of such facts compelled the conclusion which the Board reached.

The departments recommended that when the aggregate of the amounts received or accrued under contracts for a fiscal year did not exceed $500,000 the

contractor be exempted. That is to say, if a man has one contract for $500,000 or less for the fiscal year, he is not renegotiable; if he has half a dozen contracts, the aggregate of which does not exceed $500,000, he is not renegotiable.

On page 125 you will find the exemption of contracts and subcontracts for agricultural products in the first form or stage in which they have an established market; that is to say, using cotton as an example, the first form in which cotton has an established market is in the bale, and hence contracts and subcontracts for cotton in this form will be exempt from renegotiation.

We have rewritten the definition of subcontractor. The definition in the present law makes it necessary for the renegotiators to go clear through the whole gamut of subcontractors down to the man who furnishes the hammer and nails out of the hardware store to make the packing box in which to ship some article which ultimately finds its way into an article contracted for by a department, but we redefine subcontractor so as to establish certain limits. Under the new definition, renegotiation will apply only to subcontractors who make or furnish either an article contracted for by a department or an article which is to be actually incorporated in or as a part of an article contracted for by a department. Thus all incidental operations which are involved in fulfilling a contract, such as the purchase of business machines to keep records, the purchase of machines or hand tools with which to make contract articles, will be excluded from renegotiation.

You will find on page 79 of the report a graph that gives an illustration of the operation of the new definition.

The departments were anxious to save work for themselves and suggested that contractors be required to file statements of costs with the departments. The committee acceded to that as a good suggestion and on page 114 we do make that provision. Under penalty, contractors having contracts with the departments as well as subcontractors are required to file cost statements. We think that will facilitate administration of the law.

On page 112 we provide that when money is saved by the department as a result of renegotiation, that money goes back into the Treasury. Under the present law only amounts that are actually recovered from contractors go into the Treasury. We have extended this to cover amounts withheld from contractors as well.

On page 113 we provide that once renegotiation is started it must be completed in 1 year. We want this business closed up. At the end of a year after renegotiation proceedings have started, if the renegotiation officials have not finished the job, renegotiation ceases. If they have set renegotiation in process they must complete it in 1 year. Of course the present law requires that renegotiation be started within 1 year after the close of the contractor's fiscal period. We have not changed that.

All through the bill you will find that repricing or progressive pricing is provided for. That was suggested by the departments. It has been found to be successful in Great Britain. That is to say, while the performance of the contract is in progress the department may check up with the contractor, see what his costs are, and if he can produce at a less price, or if it is necessary to have a greater price, the statute gives the department the leeway to adjust the price accordingly. We think that is a beneficial provision which will assist the Government in saving money and also do away with the necessity in many cases of recapturing excessive profits after they have been realized.

Coming to standard commercial articles, we had a tremendous argument and debate both in the subcommittee and full committee on this subject.

Mr. NORRELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. In reference to renegotiation, I am wondering what the gentleman's opinion is regarding the ability of business in this country to accumulate a reasonable reserve to tide them over from wartime to peacetime activities. I wish the gentleman would give us some discussion of that.

Mr. DISNEY. Under the 1942 Revenue Act a man who has excess profits gets a post-war reserve of 10 percent of his excess-profits tax, but that cannot operate under renegotiation. It would be impossible to do that because we would have such tremendous discriminations between contractors. In other words, if a contractor has made excessive profits by reason of charging the Government an excessive price you would not want to give him 10 percent for a post-war reserve. You as a contractor might charge the Government reasonable prices, whereas I as another contractor might charge excessive prices and make a tremendous excessive profit. It would not be fair to give me a reserve that I might not need and not give you one which you might need. They do not fit together.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The distinguished gentleman who is speaking was chairman of the subcommittee that held hearings on the renegotiation feature and he did a splendid job.

Mr. DISNEY. I thank the gentleman. He has always been constructively helpful, as a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. KNUTSON. At this point may I suggest it might be in order to tell the House that some concerns after renegotiation had 16 percent left, the big ones, while the little fellows were squeezed down to 3 or 4 percent after renegotiation.

Mr. DISNEY. That comes from government by man instead of government by law. Under the present Renegotiation Act, the situation is governed by men, different groups of men, and their best judgment. Some of the big ones got big returns and some of the little ones got squeezed. It is one of those things you cannot prevent because you do not have a fixed system of rules. On this subject matter it is almost impossible to have an ironclad rule. Otherwise we could do the job by taxes. If a specific formula could be had the job could be done by taxes, but the variations are so great, the amount of business so great, that we could not find an exact formula for a tax statute on excessive profits. I have long contended that a contractor should be entitled to a definite profit on sales, with safeguards against excessive profits. In my opinion, a profit of 3 percent on sales would be fair to nearly every contractor and to the Government. Especially so, if that floor were coupled with a floor of the excess-profits-credit base against excessive profits.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is a vast improvement. As the law is now you have six different formulas.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. We are going to operate under one formula in the event favorable action is taken on this bill.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, we tried to find a definition for standard commercial articles. We were in earnest on this subject and we had many heated arguments, but no expert ever said he could define a standard commercial article. We did our best, and on page 106 there is a definition of standard commercial article. On page 127 we give the Renegotiation Administration discretion to exempt standard commercial articles when normal competitive conditions should return. We gave them a wide range of discretion there. There was a division of opinion amongst us, but a majority of the committee felt it best in the long run, with varied opinions, to permit the Renegotiation Administration to have the discretion to exempt standard commercial articles when in its judgment comparable normal competitive conditions should return, rather than provide for an automatic statutory exemption.

There is a general exemption on page 127, line 22, where the Renegotiation Administration may exempt contractors, big and little, as they see fit, from renegotiation when in its judgment competitive conditions justify so doing. As it is now they are required by the law to renegotiate virtually everybody and it makes a terribly onerous job. We have to give the people downtown credit for doing an honest, forthright, fair job on renegotiation—for in nearly every instance they have done so. Highminded men have left their work and their business at great personal sacrifice, they have engaged in this work and have done a fine job. There have been some exceptions that were annoying to the committee—where advantage was taken of the law as it now exists in the judgment of the committee.

On page 116 you will find that we have created a War Contracts Price Adjustment Board upon which is placed all of the responsibility for renegotiation. Under the present law this responsibility is divided between the War Department, the Navy Department, the Treasury Department, the Maritime Commission, the

War Shipping Administration, and the several subsidiaries of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Each one follows different policies and procedures in renegotiation. Each has different views as to what should be considered a reasonable profit in a particular case. Each has a different method of arriving at its determination of excessive profits. The amendments do away with these difficulties and centralize responsibility in one board. The board will be composed of representatives of the present renegotiating departments and agencies, appointed by the heads of those departments and agencies. In order to provide flexibility of administration and not disturb the close relationship between renegotiation and current pricing and procurement, the board is authorized to delegate its powers to the present renegotiating departments and agencies, with one exception: It is prohibited from delegating its power to finally decide when requested to do so by an aggrieved contractor or subcontractor.

The departments were not anxious for us to create this board, but after the suggestion was made by the subcommittee that we were going to create such a board, the departments themselves set up a central board consisting of men from each of the renegotiating departments, for the purpose of providing uniformity of principle and policy. The committee had the same general purpose in making provision for a board.

Great complaint has been registered by contractors against the present renegotiation proceedings, for they have not been able to find out how they were to be renegotiated, by whom they were to be renegotiated, why they were being renegotiated, or what the facts were upon which they were being renegotiated.

One amusing bit of testimony was that of a contractor from Georgia who was told that that information was secret criteria. Well, we disposed of the secret criteria in a hurry. We have required the board to make a written decision upon the request of the contractor, stating the facts used as a basis for its decision and the reasons why it decided that the contractor should return so much money. Then the contractor who feels aggrieved by the decision of the board may go to the Tax Court of the United States for a decision de novo, a new hearing, based on all the facts.

The Tax Court was chosen to perform this function for four principal reasons. The first is, that the Tax Court deals with very similar problems under the excess profits tax. The second reason for choosing the Tax Court is the fact that in it judges hold court all over the United States and hence the contractors will not have to come to Washington to be heard by the court. The third is that the use of one forum will bring about uniformity in the development and application of principles of decision; and the fourth is that a forum had to be chosen upon which Congress could impose the duty of deciding the nonjudicial question as to the amount of excessive profits, for the committee is aware that the standards it has prescribed for the determination of excessive profits are too general and flexible to be applied judicially. Under the amendments recommended by the committee these standards do not have to be applied judicially since the obligation to refund excessive profits is made in all cases—as under the original Vinson-Trammell Act—a contract obligation of the contractor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DISNEY. In my judgment, and in the judgment of the committee, I think, litigation in the Tax Court will be held down by the fact that The Tax Court may enlarge the amount of excessive profits against the contractor after he appeals. It has the right to make a new determination, and a higher determination than the board made.

When the contractor appeals to the Tax Court, there is no stay of the recapture of the money but, of course, a decision by the Tax Court in his favor would entitle him to a refund of amounts that had been recaptured.

We did not fix any cut-off date except at the termination of hostilities in the war. We discussed that to a great extent, but after all was said and done the composite judgment of the committee was that we should fix the date of the termination of hostilities as the cut-off date. Contracts entered into after that date will not be renegotiable.

Returning just a moment to the procedure before the Tax Court, the existing law requires renegotiation of contracts entered into before April 28, 1942, where final payment was not made before that date. The *Hornet* was renegotiated after it was sunk.

There was another unusual instance. A contractor made a model trailer, and then with that as a design manufactured several thousand trailers, and was paid for them in full prior to April 28, 1942. The present statute says that a contract upon which final payment has not been made prior to April 28, 1942, is renegotiable. The renegotiators renegotiated him because the specification model had not been paid for.

I do not believe there is a lawyer in this House but will agree that this retroactive application of the existing law is unconstitutional. But we were faced with this problem: Should the committee itself decide the constitutional question, recommend the appeal of the retroactive features, and by doing so require refunds to those whose excessive profits had already been recaptured, or should it simply give contractors the right to raise the constitutional question?

There are two methods which Congress might have constitutionally adopted for the recapture of excessive profits. One is the method which Congress chose when it enacted the Vinson-Trammell Act, under which the liability to refund excessive profits was made a contractual liability of the contractor, written into his contract at the time the contract was entered into. The other method is the fixing by legislation of the measure of excessive profits or the prescribing by legislation of definite standards through the application of which by the renegotiation officials excessive profits might be determined in each individual case.

The second method can be used only if it is possible to work out a specific formula for the determination of excessive profits, or to prescribe standards definite enough to constitute a formula in their application to a particular case. As I have stated, this was not possible.

Obviously the first method could be applied only to contracts entered into after the enactment of the original renegotiation law on April 28, 1942. But as has too often been the practice in the last few years, Congress, looking only to the end to be achieved—and they are ends we are all seeking to achieve—cut constitutional corners, and sought to recapture excessive profits on contracts which had been made long before April 28, 1942, contracts which did not contain any agreement by the contractor to refund excessive profits, contracts which were binding obligations of the United States but which Congress, by its enactment of the renegotiation law, has attempted to repudiate. For making the present renegotiation law applicable to contracts entered into prior to April 28, 1942, was nothing but an act of repudiation. There is not a case to be found which even so much as hints that the application of the law to such contracts would be lawful, and there are countless cases which hold otherwise—at least two within the last 10 years.

The first is the case of *Lynch* v. *United States* ((1934) 292 U. S. 571). That case involved a provision of one of the economy acts under which Congress sought to withdraw all rights of veterans of the First World War and their beneficiaries, under yearly renewable term insurance issued by the United States during that war, and also sought to withdraw the consent of the United States to be sued on such policies. In the course of its opinion holding that such action by Congress was unconstitutional, the Court, speaking through Justice Brandeis, said:

> 2. The fifth amendment commands that property be not taken without making just compensation. Valid contracts are property, whether the obligor be a private individual, a municipality, a State, or the United States. Rights against the United States arising out of a contract with it are protected by the fifth amendment (*United States* v. *Central Pacific R. Co.*, 118 U. S. 235, 238; *United States* v. *Northern Pacific Ry. Co.*, 256 U. S. 51, 64, 67). When the United States enters into contract relations, its rights and duties therein are governed generally by the law applicable to contracts between private individuals. That the contracts of war-risk insurance were valid when made is not questioned. As Congress had the power to authorize the Bureau of War Risk Insurance to issue them, the due-process clause prohibits the United States from annulling them, unless, indeed, the action taken falls within the Federal police power or some other paramount power.
>
> The Solicitor General does not suggest, either in brief or argument, that there were supervening conditions which authorized Congress to abrogate these contracts in the exercise of the police or any other power.

The title of the act of March 20, 1933, repels any such suggestion. Although popularly known as the Economy Act, it is entitled "An act to maintain the credit of the United States." Punctilious fulfillment of contractual obligations is essential to the maintenance of the credit of public as well as private debtors. No doubt there was in March 1933 great need of economy. In the administration of all Government business, economy had become urgent because of lessened revenues and the heavy obligations to be issued in the hope of relieving widespread distress. Congress was free to reduce gratuities deemed excessive. But Congress was without power to reduce expenditures by abrogating contractual obligations of the United States. To abrogate contracts, in the attempt to lessen Government expenditure, would be not the practice of economy but an act of repudiation. "The United States are as much bound by their contracts as are individuals. If they repudiate their obligations, it is as much repudiation, with all the wrong and reproach that term implies, as it would be if the repudiator had been a State or a municipality or a citizen" (*Sinking-Fund Cases*, 99 U. S. 700, 719).

The second case is that of *Perry* v. *United States* ((1935) 294 U. S. 330). That case grew out of the attempt on the part of the United States to repudiate its obligation under the gold clause in bonds of the United States. In the course of its opinion, holding such repudiation unconstitutional, the Court, speaking through Chief Justice Hughes, stated:

In attempted justification of the joint resolution in relation to the outstanding bonds of the United States, the Government argues that earlier Congresses could not validly restrict the Seventy-third Congress from exercising its constitutional powers to regulate the value of money, borrow money, or regulate foreign and interstate commerce; and, from this premise, the Government seems to deduce the proposition that when, with adequate authority, the Government borrows money and pledges the credit of the United States, it is free to ignore that pledge and alter the terms of its obligations in case a later Congress finds their fulfillment inconvenient. The Government's contention thus raises a question of far greater importance than the particular claim of the plaintiff. On that reasoning, if the terms of the Government's bond as to the standard of payment can be repudiated, it inevitably follows that the obligation as to the amount to be paid may also be repudiated. The contention necessarily imports that the Congress can disregard the obligations of the Government at its discretion and that, when the Government borrows money, the credit of the United States is an illusory pledge.

We do not so read the Constitution. There is a clear distinction between the power of the Congress to control or interdict the contracts of private parties when they interfere with the exercise of its constitutional authority, and the power of the Congress to alter or repudiate the substance of its own engagements when it has borrowed money under the authority which the Constitution confers. In authorizing the Congress to borrow money, the Constitution empowers the Congress to fix the amount to be borrowed and the terms of payment. By virtue of the power to borrow money on the credit of the United States, the Congress is authorized to pledge that credit as an assurance of payment as stipulated, as the highest assurance the Government can give, its plighted faith. To say that the Congress may withdraw or ignore that pledge, is to assume that the Constitution contemplates a vain promise, a pledge having no other sanction than the pleasure and convenience of the pledgor. This Court has given no sanction to such a conception of the obligations of our Government.

So I am convinced in my own mind, as I believe is every other lawyer in this House, that the retroactive application of the renegotiation law is an act of repudiation and hence unconstitutional. We have been told, however, that if we repeal the retroactive provision, the United States will have to refund to war profiteers almost a billion dollars. In my view this is not a sound argument. It is an argument based solely on expediency. If the Constitution is worth anything at all, it is worthy of the protection of the legislative department of the Government.

The plan worked out by the committee gives every man a right to assert his rights under the Constitution in case he avails himself of its protection.

The committee has provided that any contractor aggrieved by a determination of excessive profits under the old law, whether he was cooperative and signed a closing agreement or not, may have a review of that determination in the Tax Court of the United States and in the review have all issues, constitutional and otherwise, decided by the court. In my opinion, the Supreme Court will hold that Congress cannot constitutionally apply the Renegotiation Act retroactively and thus repudiate its own obligations.

Having arrived at the conclusion that those contractors who had been renegotiated on contracts prior to April 28, 1942, might have an appeal to the Tax Court, fairness compelled us to give this right to all contractors notwithstanding they may have signed closing agreements, so they all have the same right of appeal.

There might be a good deal of political argument on that subject but there is none at all about the legal question and none upon the question of substantial fairness, correctness in dealings, and right between citizen and citizen.

The new amendments are effective as follows: "The repricing provisions are effective from the date of the enactment of the act. The new provisions relating to matters required to be included in contracts and subcontracts are effective 30 days after the enactment of the act."

There are some retroactive features in the amendments. One agricultural exemption is retroactive to April 28, 1942. The departments want to be rid of these agricultural products and did not want to renegotiate those contracts.

The court review of old law cases is retroactive, too, as far as those cases are concerned.

In all other instances the new amendments apply only to the calendar year 1943 and subsequent calendar years, and to fiscal years ending after July 30, 1943, and subsequent fiscal years.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. On the matter of a post-war reconversion reserve, I have discussed that matter with some businessmen and I wonder if there came up in the gentleman's committee the possibility of allowing 5 years in which to pay off an agreed portion of war taxes, just the reverse of the amortization plan in converting to war purposes. In that way the Government would get all of its war money but the taxpayer would be able to finance himself. Is that a workable proposition?

Mr. DISNEY. We did not consider that to the extent of drafting legislation on the subject.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I commend the gentleman on the very excellent work, and hard work, that he did on this very complex problem.

Mr. DISNEY. I thank the gentleman, but the hard work was done by the whole committee as well as the subcommittee.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I concur in that, and add my commendation on the very splendid job the gentleman's committee has completed.

Reverting to renegotiation, as referred to by the gentleman, I have a letter today from a constituent presuming to know the facts, wherein he strenuously complains about the high and excessive profits being allowed war contractors. The gentleman has just held extensive hearings on war profits. What does he say as to the amount of profits being allowed in renegotiation of contracts?

Mr. DISNEY. They have recaptured and repriced several billion dollars in war contracts.

Mr. MICHENER. I am not talking about the amount, but are war contractors being permitted to make excessive profits out of war contracts?

Mr. DISNEY. Not after renegotiation they have not been. I really wonder whether or not enough money has been left to the contractor to employ these boys when they come back. We may be cutting too deep. I am not certain about that. The profits may look big at the time but the contractors must have money to employ these soldiers when they get back.

Mr. MICHENER. But there is nothing unusual, and no war millionaires are being made as far as the hearings show?

Mr. DISNEY. They get the money back, some great amounts of money. I think in one instance $55,000,000 was paid back under renegotiation, and in another instance $157,000,000. Immense amounts of money are paid back.

Mr. MICHENER. In other words, the gentleman's committee, through its taxing power or its power to recommend legislation concerning renegotiation, is seeing to it that formulas are written whereby there will not be war millionaires made out of this war.

Mr. DISNEY. I think so. I think the war millionaires that come out of this war, if they come out, will be people that did not have business with the Government.

Mr. KNUTSON. And there is the excess-profits tax that will take care of that.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes, admittedly the excess-profits tax under the 1942 Revenue Act would take care of from 70 percent to 80 percent of what they do get back by renegotiation.

Mr KNUTSON. And then there is the personal income tax.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes, and the personal income-tax rates have reached enormous heights.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I would just like to state that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] and the members of his committee are entitled to much credit for the great improvement they have made in this Renegotiation Act. I want the RECORD to show while it is not wrtten in the bill we did seriously discuss reconversion problems. As a matter of fact we had the words "potential financial burden to reconvert" as one of the factors. But I do not think we violate any of the agreements or any of the confidences of the executive session if I state that this was stricken out at the insistence of the Department down below and not because the Congress or the committee did not want to consider it.

Mr. DISNEY. That is true.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman of the Naval Affairs Committee who was on a subcommittee that held hearings on this same subject.

Mr GRANT of Indiana. I know something of the deep study that the gentleman has given to the subject and I respect his opinion highly. I would like to ask him a question on a hypothetical case. Take the case of two corporations, corporation A and corporation B, both of them in civilian business, but corporation A converts into the business of making tools for war, and corporation B gobbles up the customers of corporation A, and thus, I contend, profits by the war. I would like to ask the gentleman what justification there can be for renegotiation of the firm that elects to go into the business of producing tools of war and not touching the firm that elects, by choice or otherwise, to stay on the outside?

Mr. DISNEY. Personally, I have not yet abandoned the idea, for some future time, at least, of working out a tax formula which would come more nearly treating every corporation alike.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Certainly, if I may pursue this just a bit further. After 2 or 3 years experience by the procurement officers and agencies of Government they ought to be in a position now, if they ever can do a reasonable and businesslike job in the matter of fixing prices, and they ought to be pretty soon at a point where a tax levy can do the job.

Mr. DISNEY. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield 5 more minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes.

Mr. CASE. I want to join with what the other Members have said as to the work that his committee and the subcommittee have done in working out amendments to the renegotiation statute. It is a baffling and difficult problem. It is not easy to handle this problem of repricing and taking away excess profits. The gentleman mentioned a provision that is made for the expiration of the power to renegotiate within the fiscal year or the end of the year from the time the renegotiation started. Is that protected against any stalling by the contractor in supplying information?

Mr. DISNEY. He is under a criminal penalty if he fails to supply information.

Mr. CASE. So that renegotiation can be completed within the year?

Mr. DISNEY. He can stall, but he will wish he had not.

Mr. NORRELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes.

Mr. NORRELL. Does the period of renegotiation continue until the end of the war has formally been declared or hostilities shall cease?

Mr. DISNEY. The termination of hostilities, and under the amendments Congress, by concurrent resolution, may fix the date when hostilities shall be considered as terminating for this purpose.

Mr. NORRELL. I am very much concerned about manufacturers not being able to retain enough, more than I am about the Government not being able to get a sufficient amount out of them.

Mr. DISNEY. I am not so sure but what you are right. I think these companies need money to hire these men when they get back.

Mr. NORRELL. We are paying these folks now good salaries to look into the contracts and determine what prices shall be paid. There is not a very great emergency that exists any longer, so I think we ought to get to the end of renegotiation pretty soon.

Mr. DISNEY. The committee looked into all phases of it and decided this way was better. There is nothing to prevent taking up the matter later.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Has the gentleman's subcommittee considered the case of a subcontractor, generally a small contractor, who has been prevailed upon to take some war job in which he was not previously experienced and which has resulted in a loss to him rather than in a profit, and to make provisions for renegotiation of the contract upward to prevent such a loss?

Mr. DISNEY. That was considered. Mr. Patterson, Undersecretary of War, told us he had the right under the First War Powers Act to rectify such a condition, and in instances had made such adjustments. We deemed it unnecessary to amend, since they have and are exercising that power.

Mr. BUSBEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. I was greatly interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas. I personally believe this is one of the most vital subjects before the country today—that is, the matter of reserves for the reconversion period—and the businessmen of this country are particularly concerned about that.

I wonder if the gentleman could comment on that?

Mr. DISNEY. There is first a 10 percent post-war credit on your excess-profits tax. If you are a contractor, and on the termination of your contracts the departments are not liberal with reconversion problems, they will make a terrible mistake. We will probably have legislation on that subject of termination of contracts shortly so as to lay down some rules and standards for termination of war contracts.

Mr. BUSBEY. The question was, What can they look forward to at an early date along that line from the committee?

Mr. DISNEY. It no doubt will be the subject matter of legislation.

Mr. GAVIN. The renegotiators, I might say, seem to be cutting quite deep into the profits of the small industry, the small manufacturer, and he is greatly concerned as to whether or not he is going to have enough money left to reconvert his business in the post-war period. What relief or what recourse does he have to get the protection necessary to hold onto his business? From the letters I have received these renegotiators have been taking about everything that they have. Can the gentleman outline any plan of procedure whereby they can appeal their case, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. DISNEY. It is in the bill. Read the report and you will find it.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I have a high regard for the gentleman's ability.

Mr. DISNEY. It is mutual.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Has the gentleman considered or will you consider a provision in the tax bill to allow a reasonable deduction for the payment of insurance premiums to protect a man's family, and to protect his estate tax and his income tax?

Mr. DISNEY. That is another phase of the bill that I want to leave for others to discuss. Personally, I think a man ought to be permitted to secure life insurance, payable to the Government, for the future payment of his estate taxes. But the Treasury Department constantly defeats that proposal before the committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. As one of the most studious members of the Ways and Means Committee, could you advise what will be the attitude of the Democratic

members of the Ways and Means Committee in case the Senate succeeds in freezing the social-security tax?

Mr. DISNEY. I do not know. It is hard to anticipate that. I know some of the personal views of members on the committee, but I do not know what the conference will bring forth.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman realizes it will be a rather irregular parliamentary procedure in which most Members would not have the right to speak on that question.

Mr. DISNEY. That is true, and that is what happens in legislative procedure.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman knows that would result in a loss of revenue of $1,250,000,000 that would go to the social-security fund?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes, I realize that, but it is hard to predict what might transpire as a result of the conference. We do not know what the Senate will do.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. In this particular bill is there any provision made for these contractors who have been subject to renegotiation, and then have to pay the second windfall tax?

Mr. DISNEY. I know what you are talking about. That was the subject of discussion at the end of the hearings, and while the Committee agreed something should be done, it was not mechanically feasible at the moment, and we hope the Senate will act upon that. The Treasury has recommended it, but we could not get to it. The Treasury has recommended what you are talking about and what you want, and I am inclined to think the Senate will pass it.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Taking into consideration the excess-profits tax and the other recapture clauses of the tax structure, does not the policy of renegotiation operate to put a premium on inefficiency, extravagance, and waste by contractors?

Mr. DISNEY. Well, yes and no. It depends. If we could find a tax formula, I would be for putting renegotiation out of the window, but we have not been able to evolve a tax formula, because the country needs these products of our industrial machine in a hurry. Perhaps you could make them at $250. Maybe he could make them at $400, and maybe I could make them at $300. We had to have the guns. The disparity in circumstances (when speed was the first consideration) made it necessary for the procurement officers to get the goods and renegotiate afterward.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the Membership on their attendance this afternoon. With a very important holiday impending, and the discussion of what everybody knows is a very dry subject, I think you do well to give such a fine attendance, and such fine attention. I indulge the hope that although I speak extemporaneously that I may be favored with a continuance of your attention.

Every tax bill is a difficult one. We have come to the place in our plans of taxation that causes us to stop, look and listen. We are now staggering under the most colossal debt that ever afflicted any Nation and we are increasing that debt at the rate of nearly $200,000,000 dollars a day. I am not proud of this tax bill but I shall vote for it because we cannot in these stressful times throw up our hands and refuse to do anything to meet these obligations although we know that there has been gross and almost criminal negligence and waste in connection with these debts and obligations. This tax bill is difficult because we are scratching and scraping in every direction in an effort to get all the taxes we can without impairing and throwing our economic structure out of equilibrium.

This bill divides itself into four very distinctive parts.

First. Tax on personal incomes.
Second. Tax on corporations.
Third. Excise taxes.
Fourth. Renegotiation of contracts.

The tax on personal incomes has been increased and this bill will produce $154,800,000 additional taxes. These taxes will come principally from an increase in the normal tax from 6 percent to 10 percent and from an increase that will result from the cancellation in the future of what is termed as earned income credit.

The tax on corporations will be increased, and it is estimated that an additional $616,000,000 will be collected. This comes principally from the increase of the excess-profits tax from 90 percent to 95 percent.

The increases in the various excise taxes will amount to $1,201,700,000 and an additional amount of $166,800,000 from the increase in postal rates.

The estimated total increase in this tax bill from all sources will be $2,139,300,000. This is not much of an increase in the face of the demands of the Treasury which called for an increase in taxation of $10,500,000,000.

The Ways and Means Committee early in its deliberations decided that it would be impossible to raise the $10,500,000,000 recommended by the Treasury, and the committee proceeded to write its own bill regardless of the demands of the Treasury.

It had been my purpose to take up the question of renegotiation of contracts before I went into some of the new features of the tax bill. I wanted to do this out of respect for the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] for a discussion of the renegotiation features of this bill would be in line with his discussion, which he has just closed.

But the page boys have brought in this blackboard chart which I expected to use in connection with these new features of the tax bill, and from the interest that you appear to be manifesting in this chart, I think that I had better change my planned course and discuss one of these important innovations in this present bill. I hope that I may be able to have a copy of this chart appear in my remarks in the RECORD so that if you are at all impressed with it you may be able to make reference to it in the RECORD. I think there is no better way to understand the complications of a tax bill than by the use of illustrations on a blackboard. We use a blackboard in the discussions in our committee quite frequently, and we find them to be a great advantage in explaining complicated transactions.

Regular income tax (married man, 2 children)

Gross income		$2,000
Assumed deduction of 6 percent	$120	
Married exemption	1,200	
Dependents deduction, 2 children, $350 each	700	
		2,020
No tax		------

Minimum tax (married man, 2 children)

Gross income		$2,000
Assumed deduction of 6 percent	$120	
Married exemption	700	
Dependents deduction, 2 children, $100 each	200	
		1,020
Taxable		980

$980 taxable at 3 percent, $29.40.
Minimum tax under short form, $29.
Victory tax under present law, $38.50.

This tax bill has one very distinctive new feature about it. You will recall that a year or two ago we passed a law providing for the levy of the Victory tax. This Victory tax reached all salary and wage earners who earned more than $15 a week. The Victory tax was found to be very complex and somewhat difficult to administer and it was decided by the taxing authorities and by your committee that it would be best to repeal the Victory tax and to supplant it with a more workable tax which would produce about the same amount of money. The Treasury recommended the abolishing of the Victory tax. If this had been done 9,000,000 taxpayers would have been relieved of any tax responsibility. This bill provides for the repeal of the Victory tax and as I have already suggested a substitution of what we call a minimum tax.

Let me briefly explain this chart. You will see that this chart is applicable to a married man, with two children, who earns $2,000 per year. In the left hand box I compute the taxes that this man would owe under the regular income-tax law as it will apply when this bill is passed. You are all familiar with the fact that recent tax bills have carried what we call a "short form." Millions of taxpayers in the lower brackets pay their taxes on the short form. For those wishing to pay their taxes in that way an assumed deduction of 6 percent is allowed. In the case in point you will notice that the assumed deduction of 6 percent will amount to $120.

The married exemption runs the same in this bill as in the present law, which

is $1,200. The same deduction is allowed for dependents in this new bill as in the present law. In this supposed case, the deduction for two children will be $700. The total of these deductions as you will see amount to $2,020. From this you can see that the deductions amount to more than the income and there would be no tax if the same were computed under the regular income tax computations. In other words, this taxpayer would, if he were to follow what we call the regular income-tax plan, have no income tax to pay. But he is not going to escape a tax under this minimum-tax plan any more than he would under the Victory-tax plan.

Now let us turn to the second box which is captioned "Minimum tax." We use the same earnings illustration as in the first box, which is a gross income of $2,000. We allow the same assumed deduction of 6 percent, which is $120. This is supposed to cover the deductions of the average person for church and charitable contributions, and so forth. Now we come to the marital exemption under the minimum tax. This is only $700. If it were for a single man it would be $500. We must not confuse this exemption with the regular exemption in the regular income tax computation. This $700 exemption is allowed only in the minimum-tax plan. The deduction for dependent children is also different in this minimum-tax plan. In this case the deduction allowed is $100 for each child or a total of $200 in this case. You will see that the total of these exemptions and deductions amount to $1,020. That sum deducted from $2,000 leaves the balance of $980, which is subject to the minimum tax. The minimum tax in this case therefore would be $29.40.

So it can be seen that from this chart under the regular income-tax law this person, whose income has been considered, would be relieved from any taxes but under this bill we come forward with the minimum tax plan which, as stated before supplants and takes the place of the Victory tax.

You will see from the report filed by the committee that there is a short form table which is applicable to this minimum tax just as there was a short form table applicable to the Victory tax, and so forth. Under this short form the minimum tax will not be $29.40 as I have figured it but it will be $29 as you will see at the bottom of the chart. I cite this to show that the figures in the short form charts are not figured out exactly to the penny but they are usually figures that are rounded out and in some cases a taxpayer loses a few cents and in another case he will gain a few cents. In this case, the taxpayer could easily figure out his own taxes according to the short form and you see that he would gain 40 cents thereby and in addition he would also escape the trouble of having to go to a tax expert to make out his tax return.

You will also notice that I have shown by this chart what the Victory tax would be for this same individual under the present law. It would be $38.50.

Summing this whole matter up therefore, you will see that in the case that I have taken for illustration, the man would be required to pay a tax of $29, which is the tax under the short form, because under this bill we are considering today the taxpayer must pay a minimum tax if it exceeds what his tax would be under the regular income-tax computation. In other words, a taxpayer should follow the short-form computation made under the minimum-tax law but if he is not satisfied with that computation he may compute his taxes under the regular income-tax formulas. But he will be required to pay under whichever of these two formulas will produce the larger tax.

You will notice from this chart that the Victory tax computed under the present law in the same kind of a case as that illustrated would pay a tax of $38.50.

Generally speaking the minimum tax will be a little lower than the Victory tax but in some cases it might not work out this way for the minimum tax has been set up to take the place of the Victory tax as nearly as possible but to relieve the taxpayer of many of the complications and inconveniences that have followed with the Victory tax.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it true that an individual with an income of $2,900 would have less personal and family exemptions than an individual in the same family status who had an income of $3,100?

Mr. JENKINS. No. All taxpayers of like marital status with like dependents have the same exemption if they are assessed under the same plan, regardless of how much their taxable income may be. There is a difference if they are assessed under different plans. They are allowed $1,200 under one plan and $700 under another.

Mr. CURTIS. I will state it another way. Is it true that the individual having an income of less than $2,000 gets a smaller personal family exemption?

Mr. JENKINS. Oh, no. These exemptions stay the same to all if they are assessed under the same plan. If, as I have said, a person with $2,000 income and is married with 2 children he will have a married man's exemption of $1,200 and $350 for each child under the regular income-tax plan. But if he comes under the minimum plan he will have a married man's exemption of $700 and $100 for each child. These exemptions will be the same if he has a $3,000 income or a $1,500 income.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. If I caught the gentleman's question correctly, what the gentleman wants to know is whether or not the exemption for the minimum tax and for the income tax are the same. Is that the point?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. They are not the same. The exemptions for income-tax purposes are $500 for a single person and $1,200 for married persons, with $350 for each dependent. The minimum tax, which does not apply to anybody who is subject to an income tax, the exemption for the minimum tax is $500 for a single person and $700 for married persons instead of $1,200, and $100 for dependents instead of $350.

Mr. JENKINS. His question was, as I understood it, whether or not there was any difference between the exemptions as the income went up. There is no difference between the exemptions as the incomes go up. If he decides to pay his tax under the regular income tax his exemption is $350 per child and $1,200 as his marital exemption. This is the same regardless whether his gross income is $2,000 or $3,000.

Mr. CURTIS. No one pays the minimum tax who would be liable for the income tax.

Mr. JENKINS. I forgot to tell you about this further feature. Whenever a man makes this computation, if it develops he is taxable under either plan he must pay under that plan which carries the greater tax. He cannot get out of paying under the minimum plan just because he may not owe a tax under the regular income-tax plan. Whichever one is the greater of the two computations he must accept.

Mr. CURTIS. He pays the greater?

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman is right. He pays the greater.

Mr. Chairman, now I want to talk about renegotiation and I cannot do it adequately in a few minutes. Never before on the floor of this House have we had a complete discussion of renegotiation. Renegotiation is a comparatively new proposition from a legislative standpoint. It first came up for consideration a little more than a year ago. We have never even had a true consideration of it in the Ways and Means Committee until this year. This is a legislative matter that did not originate in the House. The Senate added an amendment onto a House bill. The central idea in the renegotiation law was first furnished by a Member of the House, and the idea was then taken up in the Senate and an amendment was added to House legislation. It was the gentleman representing a Midwestern State who first proposed the idea. I refer to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. He is the real author, he is the man who furnished the first germ of thought out of which this program has grown. Since this matter has never been adequately discussed in this House it is unfortunate that we must crowd it so fast today. What do we mean by renegotiation of contracts? We mean that in 1942 Congress enacted legislation that provides that in cases where the Government has made a contract for the production of materials or food which the Government needed to carry on the war that in case there was excessive profits coming to the contractor or subcontractor the Government could renegotiate such contracts with the purpose of recapturing some of these excessive profits. We are all in favor of

preventing war millionaires, but we must take these profits legally and according to the Constitution.

Here is a provision of the law that has been the base of much confusion and I think much unjust and illegal actions. Give attention as I read:

(6) This subsection (c) shall be applicable to all contracts and subcontracts hereafter made and to all contracts and subcontracts heretofore made, whether or not such contracts or subcontracts contain a renegotiation or recapture clause, unless (i) final payment pursuant to such contract or subcontract was made prior to April 28, 1942.

Those who sought to enforce the renegotiation law proceeded to renegotiate contracts which contained no renegotiation clauses and contracts on which the rights of the parties had all been established before the renegotiation law was passed. They sought to violate contracts duly entered into before the law under which they were set up as a board or group to do renegotiating. I maintain that this was unconstitutional and absolutely unjustifiable.

Why do we need another renegotiation law? We have this law of last year. I will tell you why we need it. Because it has been administered so shamefully. It has been little short of a national disgrace the way the law has been administered. To what do I allude, you ask? What did they do to call for such a castigation from me? For days and days, before our committee, fine American citizens from all over the Nation, contractors and businessmen, came in and poured out before us their complaints against the arrogance and the tyranny of these individuals who sought to carry on these renegotiations. Out of that has come this new proposal. We here propose to amend the law of last year. This bill before you is far from perfect; it is not nearly as good as I would like to have it, but it is the best we can do under the circumstances. In it are some provisions I should like to have seen omitted. And there were some provisions that I thought would have strengthened the bill greatly that I and others who agreed with me were not able to have included.

If anybody should ask you what is the main fault with this bill I think you should say to them that the main fault is that it still gives too much discretionary power to those who are to carry on the renegotiations. We attempted many times to write into the bill strong and unambiguous language that would compel fair dealing on the part of those carrying on these renegotiations but we were thwarted and checkmated by those who had brought down upon their heads the anathemas of so many sorely aggrieved Americans who had been unjustly imposed upon. I am not defending any thieving contractor who might have been defrauding the Government. I think such men should be made to disgorge and should be punished criminally if possible. I am only interested in seeing a man who contracted openly with the Government be governed or treated openly by the renegotiators.

Now let us see what we propose to do by way of amending this law under which so much injustice has been done. In the first place we establish a cut-off date beyond which this renegotiation business cannot run. These fellows cannot run on forever. This bill under consideration provides that no renegotiation shall be had on contracts entered into after the end of the war.

Another provision of this bill tends to curb the activities of these energetic gentlemen. I refer to the provision which raises the limit from $100,000 to $500,000. This will permit some of the little fellows to escape. It will let most of the little contractors out. Although the departments at first indicated their approval of this change I understand that they now see that some will escape their clutches and wish this provision were omitted. Personally I was not strong for this change for I feel that anyone who has been unjustly enriched should pay up regardless of whether the amount of his contract was $100,000 or $500,000. I support this change because I feel it is best to play safe against those who have shown a disposition to be unfair.

One of the most salutary provisions of this new bill is that provision which sets up a fair court review. Bless your life, when these so-called renegotiators went into a contractor's office and said they were going to negotiate, about all they would do would be to find out what the businessman's bankbook showed and then they proceeded to demand about all he had. Evidence before our committee and information that has come to us individually will convince any fair-minded man that threats open and covert were made in many cases and that many men paid out millions of dollars without knowing how the renegotiators based their demands. Under the old law the contractor had no relief. He had no recourse and when he asked for a bill of particulars as to why he was being required to pay a large sum of money, he was told that he had better pay and pay quick else his money would be withheld and he would get no more contracts. And when he asked to be permitted to take his case up with Washington he was admonished that he would be far worse in Washington. And as a fact I think those who came to Washington fared worse than those who quietly submitted to the tactics of would-be officers of the law.

That is about the way they dismissed people. It was a national disgrace. I do not make this statement as a partisan Republican. I know that many, if not all, of the members of the Ways and Means Committee on both sides agree with me. I have heard many of them express themselves. I want to give credit to them and to others who were able to come right out in their own dignity and American citizenship to assert themselves and say, "This thing must stop." Now we are trying to stop it. To this end we provide a court review. Most of those who complained were anxious for a court review of some kind. What we provide in this bill is not perfect but it is a great step in the right direction. We provide that a central board of five members be set up. These men are to be selected from the departments of the Government which enter into these contracts. I preferred that they be civilians from among businessmen and that they be appointed by the President. But it was thought best since this was to be a temporary board that it be constituted much as the board is now set up. I hope that none of those on the present board will be reappointed. They should be cleaned out. This bill provides that this board set up rules of procedure so that the public may know what to expect. The board should do this at once and notify every contractor of his rights under these renegotiation proceedings. If this is done contractors may then know their own rights and will know that they are not bound by the inspectors who come to see them. This board will also be charged under this law with the duty of hearing aggrieved contractors who are not satisfied with the decision of the inspectors. This board is expected to deal justly and is supposed to know that Congress expects that the star-chamber proceedings of the past must not be carried on in the future. This board has a great opportunity to redeem itself. A strong board imbued with a sense of fairness could carry this work on to the satisfaction of the contractors and to the financial benefit of the Government. If they clean house and convince the contractors and the public that they want to be fair most all of these renegotiation matters will be disposed by them and no further appeal will be made by the contractors.

For fear that the Board will not take the fair and conciliatory attitude that the task requires, the committee has provided in this bill that the aggrieved party may carry his case to the Court of Tax Appeals for a review. This court will then hear the matter de novo, as the lawyers would say. That means the tax court would hear it all over from the beginning.

To summarize, the contractor can go to the Board to review the findings of the investigator, and he can go to the tax court if he is not satisfied with the Board's decision. Let me say to you that already the investigators and the Board have awakened to the situation and there has been a decided improvement in their attitude toward the performance of their duties in a courteous and just manner.

There is one feature of this bill that my good friend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] touched lightly. This is a very important matter. I think that he and I agree on it completely. I refer again to the matter of the unconstitutionality of the retroactive features of the present law. As I have heretofore stated the present law went into effect on the 28th of April 1942. The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that contracts create property rights that cannot be violated by retroactive provisions of laws subsequently passed. The fifth amendment of the Constitution provides that property cannot be taken except by due process of law. What is due process of law is not yet in this country properly determined by bureaucrats. That is

strictly a judicial function and it is for the courts to determine and I know that these bureaucrats act as though they own the Supreme Court, but I think this Court will uphold such a long line of illustrious decisions that have been handed down on this question.

Personally, I should like to see this bill cut off with April 28, 1943. But what have these renegotiation authorities done? They have taken millions and millions of dollars out of people illegally and unconstitutionally. Some of those whom I think are among the chief perpetrators sat before us in our committee and acknowledged that they might have done so. They have taken millions and millions of dollars from contractors. Some by renegotiation and some by agreement. This raises a serious question. Shall we speak up boldly and compel restitution because of the question of constitutionality or shall we give to the aggrieved parties the right to appeal. It we would take the course that right and justice would dictate we would encourage all those who have been thus renegotiated to demand refunds. But since many of them have signed agreement settlements probably the best policy would be to side-step the constitutional question and permit all these contractors to appeal their cases if they wish to do so. That would include those who have settled and paid as well as those who have not settled or been renegotiated. Someone might say "That man ought to stick to his agreement." I say "no." He ought not to be compelled to stick to his agreement, because he had no chance to know his rights and because over here is his neighbor with the same kind of a contract who has not yet been renegotiated. That neighbor is going to get the benefit of the provisfons of this new law. The other man should have the same chance. I say to you that that man who was renegotiated, figuratively at the point of a gun, ought to have his day of freedom, his day in court, and he ought to be permitted to take advantage of this law if he wants to do so.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. With reference to the right of appeal de novo to the Court of Tax Appeals, I commend the subcommittee for writing that provision into the bill; but on the further matter of which the gentleman speaks, to me the gravest omission in the bill as presented to the House is the failure to say in no uncertain terms that the bill shall not apply to contracts that were made and the goods delivered under it before April 28, 1942, because the gentleman, who is an able and distinguished lawyer, has just said that it is plainly unconstitutional as to those cases. Some of these days somebody is going into court and this whole thing is going to be declared unconstitutional, without a separation of that part before the effective date of the law, and chaos and confusion will follow.

Mr. JENKINS. I agree absolutely with what the gentleman says. Arrogance and tyranny carried on by bureaucrats under the guise of patriotism is not safe and not for the best interests of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, our beloved friend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], and to every member of that great committee, for their fair and intelligent approach to the important question of renegotiation and the equitable manner in which it has been handled, from the standpoint of both the Government and the contractor.

The great chairman and his able committee are entitled to the thanks of the House for having presented to us a greatly improved statute dealing with renegotiation. Conflicting views were reconciled. They have done a good job under most difficult circumstances, and a careful analysis of the bill will readily cause anyone who studies it to conclude that it protects the Government and at the same time is fair to the contractor.

The Committee on Naval Affairs, as the Ways and Means Committee has generously noted in its report, has been concerned for many years with the problem of controlling profits on war contracts. This concern led to a series of public hearings, which disclosed huge war profits already being made on war contracts only a few months after Pearl Harbor, and finally resulted in Congress enacting the renegotiation law in an effort to control such profits. From the very first there has been much discussion as to the manner in which the renegotiation law was being administered by the departments, and there has been pressure for its repeal.

The interest which the Committee on Naval Affairs has always had in the expanding procurement program of the Navy, and the responsibility which we have necessarily assumed for that program, naturally caused us to be aware of these discussions and this pressure. We concluded that the questions which had arisen were so grave as to require an investigation by us into renegotiation, and its administration by the Navy Department and the other departments which were given responsibility for the operation of the law. We made a careful study of this, and held lengthy hearings, at which representatives of the Navy Department and of the other agencies, as well as a cross section of business, testified. Subsequently, the committee filed a report with the House, in which all of the questions which had been raised were thoroughly explored. The committee print of this report was made available to the members of the Ways and Means Committee prior to the time that that committee's hearings on the same subject began.

The Ways and Means Committee, in the report which is now before the House, came to three general conclusions with respect to renegotiation. It concluded, first, that the law should be continued, with amendments, until the termination of hostilities. With this our committee is in agreement. After a thorough examination of the question, we came to the conclusion that renegotiation plays so important a part in the obtaining of the necessary articles of war at fair prices to the public its repeal would be unthinkable for the duration of the war.

Second, the Ways and Means Committee concluded that there is just ground for complaint about the existing law and its administration, particularly as applied to the small contractor. As one of the amendments designed to relieve the cause of such complaint, the Ways and Means Committee has recommended that an amendment be adopted exempting from renegotiation contractors whose annual renegotiable sales do not exceed $500,000. We, too, felt that some hardship cases had occurred, but we felt that a recurrence of them could be prevented by a more extensive use by the departments of their powers under the law to exempt by administrative action contracts which were not susceptible of excessive contracts, rather than by statutory exemption. While this recommendation of the Ways and Means Committee was disapproved by a majority of the Naval Affairs Committee, I feel that it should be accepted in the interests of harmony. While it is not exactly what we favored, its purpose is good and it should be effective in preventing hardship to smaller contractors.

The minority report of the Ways and Means Committee goes much further, however, in its findings as to the hardships imposed on contractors by renegotiation than do the majority reports of either the Naval Affairs Committee or the Ways and Means Committee, or, in fact, than the minority report of our committee. The minority report of the Ways and Means Committee says:

> The testimony before both committees is replete with instances where those administering the renegotiation law have been arrogant, high-handed, and even tyrannical in dealing with contractors and subcontractors. The powers given them have, in a number of instances, been abused. They have discriminated as between different contractors, allowing one a greater percentage than another under the same or similar circumstances. Also they have used duress, direct and implied, in order to secure the submission of contractors and subcontractors to their findings. No review of their decisions by the courts has been permitted. Countless numbers of contractors have been harassed, and their war work interfered with, by having to go through the renegotiation process only to be given a clearance in the end, though at considerable expense to themselves.

I am not as familiar with the record before the Ways and Means Committee as perhaps I should be. I am familiar, however, with the whole record of the testimony before the Naval Affairs Committee. When the minority report of the Ways and Means Committee says that the record of our committee is replete with testimony of the character indicated, it is entirely contrary to the facts. Members of our committee made

a point of inquiring of witnesses who appeared as to the manner in which they had been treated by the renegotiators. Without exception, the witnesses who came before us testified as to the fair and equitable manner in which the members of the Price Adjustment Boards had dealt with them, and praised them for the competent and fair manner in which they performed a difficult assignment. Our finding of fact as to the fairness and competence of the Boards was unanimous, and our record bears no evidence upon which the statement in the minority report of the Ways and Means Committee can be based.

Nor is there any valid basis for the statement in that minority report that the Boards did not permit review of their decisions by the courts. If there has been any limitation on the right to appeal to the courts, that limitation has been found in the statute itself, and not in the activities of the departments. For the very reason that the present law is not clear as to the existence of a right of appeal to the courts, both the Ways and Means Committee and our committee have recommended the insertion of a provision in the law specifically conferring the right of appeal. We only differ as to the kind of an appeal that should be allowed. The Ways and Means Committee has recommended that review of the Board's decisions shall lie in a de novo proceeding before the Tax Court. While I am of the opinion that an entirely new hearing by the Tax Court, after the Board has already tried the case and handed down its decision, is wasteful of both public funds and manpower, the important thing is to assure some form of judicial review of the departmental decision. So long as judicial review of some sort is provided for, I am not disposed to quarrel over the form that that review will take. Accordingly, I urge that the Ways and Means Committee's recommendation in this respect be adopted.

The report of the Ways and Means Committee, in its third general conclusion, recommended that certain changes in the law should be made to make it more workable and equitable. Thus it recommends an amendment requiring the filing by all contractors of financial information with the Board. Our committee also urged such an amendment, finding that it was necessary to the efficient operation of the law.

The report of the Ways and Means Committee, as well as our report, concluded that it was only equitable that the contractor should be informed as to the facts upon which the determination of excessive profits is made, and of the reasons why the Board came to the conclusion that it did. The proposed bill would require the Board, upon the request of the contractor, to furnish such a statement to him. The absence of such a requirement was one of the principal defects in the original law, and I think it important that this defect be cured now by the prompt adoption of this recommendation.

Under the old law, there was no fixed time within which the departments were required to end a renegotiation proceeding once it had been begun. It could drag on indefinitely. This seemed to us unfair, and we recommended that some limitation be placed in the law. The Ways and Means Committee has proposed that the Board be required to bring a renegotiation proceeding to a conclusion within 1 year after its beginning. This is an excellent amendment and should be adopted.

Another defect in the old law was that excessive profits were defined as excessive profits. No standards were placed in the law which the departments were required to follow in the determination of what were excessive profits. Our committee felt that it was essential that such standard be written into the law, and on this point the Ways and Means Committee concurred. The standards which have been proposed in the bill now before the House are, in the language of the bill itself, similar to those which I proposed in the bill which I introduced. They were designed to lay down definite guideposts for the Board to follow, and yet to give the administrators a certain amount of needed flexibility in the operation of the law. While I agree with the bill itself, I am somewhat disturbed by language in the committee report, wherein it is said that—

> Your committee believes that in computing excessive profits consideration should be given to the financial problems in connection with reconversion in applying factor (g).

The evidence before our committee indicated very clearly that the problems of post-war reconversion, though very real and requiring prompt action by Congress, were not susceptible of solution through renegotiation. I am afraid, unless there is clarification of this point, that the language in the committee report may furnish some basis for construction by the courts of an intent on the part of Congress to make allowances for post-war reconversion in renegotiation. As one Member of the House, I do not mean my vote to indicate that. If allowances for post-war reconversion are to be provided through renegotiation, then it should be done by direct language in the bill, and not by the committee report. Apart from this one qualification, I favor the adoption of the standards laid down in the committee's bill.

The Ways and Means Committee has also recommended that the function of renegotiation should be centralized in one new board, rather than in the departments themselves. Our committee, in considering the problem, recognized the desirability of having a uniformity of approach on the part of all engaged in renegotiation. We felt that this already had been attained by the voluntary and informal coordination which the departments engaged in renegotiation had achieved. It was our thought that the creation of a formal joint board would do no more than formalize an arrangement which already existed. I see no real objection to the creation by statute of such a board, since one already exists by the voluntary action of the departments. And since the board is to be composed of persons selected by the heads of the procurement agencies to whom the board's powers of renegotiation may be delegated, the proposed arrangement preserves the close relationship between procurement and renegotiation, which is one of the chief values of renegotiation. Accordingly, that amendment should also be enacted.

The report of the Ways and Means Committee also recommends the adoption of an amendment authorizing the board to exempt from renegotiation contracts for standard commercial articles, where it appears that competitive conditions affecting the price of such articles already exist. This amendment merely spells out in greater detail a power of exemption already enjoyed by the departments. Since it does not require, but merely authorizes, the discretionary exemption of certain contracts in circumstances where fair prices will be obtained without the need of renegotiation, it does no violence to the principle of renegotiation, and should be adopted.

With the principal conclusions and recommendations of the Ways and Means Committee I am in agreement.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman knows much about this subject. His committee has gone into it extensively. What can you tell the House as to the amount of profits being allowed under Navy war contracts?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I can say to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan that we have recently made a complete analysis and an audit of every ship, and by using the words "every ship" I mean a combatant ship that has been delivered to the Navy, that has been finished, the contract closed, and it has been delivered to the Navy. The result of that shows that after renegotiation and before taxes, the prevailing profit made by the shipping industry per ship, each one by its name, has been running anywhere from 2 to 3 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am not going to take very much time in dwelling on the bill except to say I shall vote for it, I suppose, in the hope that it will prove to be more of a revenue measure than a relief bill. Under the circumstances, the bill constitutes the best effort of the committee. It is not my bill; it is not the bill of any individual Member. I do not think it is necessarily the majority or the minority bill. I think it is the composite work of the committee, and under the circumstances the best that can be had at the present time. I thought possibly the bill might extend a little beyond the figures which it is expected it will produce, but that was not possible, and my views did not prevail. As a consequence the bill is a little short of what I thought was proper. I advocated, as you recall, saving half and raising half of what the Treasury

requested. But here we have a bill of upward of $2,000,000,000 and I still think, even according to present-day calculations, $2,000,000,000 is an awful lot of money, especially so when you tack it on to what the taxpayer is expected to contribute already. This is an additional amount and will mean that ultimately the taxpayers of the United States will be called upon to pay $45,000,000,000 to $47,000,000,000.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. My colleague has suggested that his thought was that we should raise half of the amount asked by the Treasury and save half. I take it, then, my colleague believes there can be saved today in Government expenditures one-half of $10,500,000,000 a year?

Mr. DINGELL. I think that is correctly stated, provided we get ourselves into the right frame of mind as to what the sources are where this money can be saved. I do not think on the ordinary running expenses of the Government you can save that amount without wiping out all of the running expenses allowed for the conduct of the various agencies. But you can save it, for example, with the Army, with the Navy, and probably in the construction of the merchant ships. There is an awful lot of latitude and maybe looseness, as I think I brought out in the discussion with the Budget Director before the committee, and only recently we find that the Army did disgorge $13,600,000,000 previously appropriated. I hope whatever I might have said at the time to the Budget Director ultimately reached the Army and might have had some effect in bringing about this voluntary return of unexpended money. As the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] knows, the Army and the Navy, I believe, have appropriated and have before them, or did have at the time I examined Mr. Smith, the Budget Director, $206,000,000,000 appropriated and allocated and unallocated, or as he stated, committed and uncommitted, That amount at the current rate of expenditure of $7,000,000,000 per month was to carry the Army and Navy for upward of 29 months. In my estimation that amount of money piled up ahead of the spenders encouraged looseness. It encouraged the purchase of the entire salmon production, so it was stated in the newspapers. It encouraged the purchase of the entire sauerkraut pack. It encouraged the expenditure of $72,000,000 for the Pentagon Building, when we in Congress allowed but $32,000,000. It encouraged the construction of 27 bridges near the Pentagon Building; the construction of 40 miles of roads; the obliteration of one or two lakes in one spot out there and creating a new lake in another spot. It also encouraged the alteration of the entire northeastern section of the State of Virginia in connection with this project, and it encouraged such loose practice as to cause in Michigan recently the sale of $1,400,000 worth of standard tools which were sold as junk for $40,000 and then permitted these same people to sell back these standard tools to the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DINGELL. I ask for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. And it permitted these same purchasers of those standard tools to sell them back to the United States Government as new tools. In addition to that it encouraged the sale of a lot of new machinery and equipment down in Arkansas as junk or surplus material, when it was not surplus at all. Only recently we see where there is $130,000,000 expended for an oil pipe line or something or other up in Alaska that may or may not be justified. My aim all the way through has been to try to save money that is being loosely spent and that would have nothing to do whatsoever with the war effort.

Mr. MICHENER. I want to congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] on the statement he has just made because he is an outstanding leader in his own party.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MICHENER. If I had made that statement, it might have been charged that it was a partisan statement. But we will all be glad to read the gentleman's statement as it is, because it is true and it is fearless, and I am glad we are to have the cooperation of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan in an endeavor to stop this wasteful and needless expenditure of public money.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman a question on a particular part of the bill before us for consideration today. I have received a number of communications from small independent motion-picture theater operators in my State, calling my attention to the fact that the theater tax has been raised 100 percent. Will this tax be paid by the owners of moving-picture houses themselves or by the people who buy the admission tickets?

Mr. DINGELL. It will be paid by the purchaser of the admission tickets. I might say it was originally proposed at 200 percent, but the committee cut it in two. However, the tax is expected to be paid by the purchasers of the tickets.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Does the committee feel that this is going to increase the revenue considerably?

Mr. DINGELL. We were quite satisfied that that would not injure the revenues; that there would be no diminishing returns, and that the industry, under the circumstances, could well stand the increase.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I was thinking of the people who pay this tax. Does the gentleman think that this will discourage attendance and bring about less tax receipts from that source?

Mr. DINGELL. I think I answered the gentleman that there will be no decrease in the volume of revenues.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. My recollection is that the increase in revenue is estimated at about $163,000,000.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman, and I yield now to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I cannot support any bill that provides exemption for married men with an income in excess of $2,000 in one amount, and children in the amount of $350, and then have those with incomes less than $2,000 only receiving exemption of $700 for a wife and $100 per child. Is that provision in this bill?

Mr. DINGELL. I am not going to go technical in my answer to my friend. I will say this to him, that I am in entire accord with him with regard to exemptions. If there is to be any preference shown, I feel exactly as the gentleman feels about married men with children in the lower brackets. The greatest consideration should be given there. However, the committee did the very best it could under the circumstances.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. As one who has had the privilege and pleasure of serving on the Ways and Means Committee for many years with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] I just want to testify to the fact that he has been the leader throughout all the years in insisting upon more generous exemptions for dependents.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Can the gentleman tell us what is the maximum income which a person may have and still come under the minimum tax payment, as explained by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]?

Mr. DINGELL. I do not have the report before me, but I think that is pretty clearly covered in the report of the committee.

Mr. MILLS. If the gentleman will turn to pages 18 and 19 of the committee report, that information is set out in detail.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for this 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, in analyzing the action of the House on yesterday which placed the stamp of approval upon devastating and unrestrained inflation, I deduct from the cold

and merciless figures a clear and unchallengeable result which places the stamp of inflationist upon the Republican Party of this Nation. The figures do not lie—and they cannot now be expunged from the RECORD.

The so-called sound-money party has gone berserk, has become the inflationist party, doing everything possible to bring down the value of the American dollar to the low level of the depreciated German mark of the era which followed the last war.

The figures gleaned from the RECORD show that 178 Republicans voted for inflation and were joined by 98 Democrats and 2 minority party members for a total of 278.

Against this attempt to scuttle the dollar and the wrecking of the Nation Democrats cast 100 votes, while Republicans cast only 15, with minority party casting 2, for a total of 117 votes.

Every Republican in this House except 15 voted for unrestrained decimating inflation, for the total depreciation of the American dollar, for blowing the lid off, and for high prices. By their vote in the House yesterday the Members threw to the hungry wolves of inflation more than three-fourths of our population.

In industrial Michigan where the ratio of urban-industrial population is even greater than the rural-agricultural average of the Nation, you can well appreciate the injustice to the consumer. What is the explanation for this deliberate and menacing move? Politics is the answer, catering to the spokesmen for the organized minority farm group. The Republicans must have forgotten their teachings of past years about sound money, and that the Nation and Michigan are preponderantly urban-industrial. Throwing the worker in the cities to the wolves at this critical time is not going to aid the Republican Party—it will haunt and destroy it.

This concerted action was not spontaneous—it was prompted by the party. If you believe that you can fool the vast majority of the people by your action here yesterday, you are mistaken. The inflationist label will show through your party emblem. You will not be able to obliterate or cover it when talking to your people.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to bring to you one of the provisions of this law—section 106—which deals with personal exemptions and credit for dependents.

On page 16, line 13, of the bill as now presented under "(b) Credits for minimum normal tax, subparagraph (D)" there is this provision. I quote:

> Married person living with husband or wife: In the case of a married person living with husband or wife, if a joint return is filed or if one spouse has no gross income, a personal exemption of $1,200; or if each has a gross income and no joint return is filed, a personal exemption of $500. If a joint return is filed, the husband and wife shall receive but one personal exemption of $1,200 in the aggregate.

Again, on page 17, line 18, "Credits for minimum normal tax."

On the face of it it looks innocuous enough, perhaps, but on second reading the thoughtful person immediately sees the implications. Here is the whole matter of mandatory joint returns up again, and so camouflaged that most people fail to connect the section I have just read with the determination of the Treasury to force upon the people this wholly distasteful and unwarrantable tax provision.

Time and time again the Treasury has attempted to bring about the passage of this mandatory joint returns for husbands and wives living together, men and women carrying the responsibility of keeping alive the heart of American life and freedom—the home. Each time the people of the country have expressed themselves, and each time the Treasury effort has failed. The sentiment of the country has not changed. Indeed it is probable that there is increasing awareness on the part of both men and women of the implications of a law of joint income-tax returns. Women are particularly aware of the dangers lurking in the shadows. They know that it is a deliberate attack upon their individual property ownership rights and of their rights to individual incomes. Men sincerely interested in the security and independence of the women, both within and without their own families, should be equally alert to the situation.

I have said that the Treasury Department has so far failed to impose this procedure upon the people openly, now they resort to new methods—methods that cover their grim purposes with incentive payments.

To put the section of bill into simple language. If a woman protects her individual right to own property and to have an independent income she is penalized. She must pay an income tax of $500.

Her husband, too, if he respects her as a person, must pay more than if both of them agreed to abrogate so much that women have struggled to obtain and to return her voluntarily, mind you, to the status of chattel.

A $200 bonus will be given for this voluntary retrogression—this reacceptance of servitude. Oh, no, they do not have to file a joint return, but $200 is a lot of money these days, particularly when you have children. It may tempt many.

And what about another angle? Can the Treasury do without these many $200 items? It was my idea that increased taxes were sorely needed, and that the committee has felt the people were being pretty heavily squeezed. Why should this special amount be remitted when over and over the people have declared themselves against it. Do the people know now? Is the Ways and Means Committee itself fully aware of what has been tucked away in the pages of this bill?

Let me bring to your attention the procedure of the committee as I understand it.

The committee ruled that no testimony would be taken in open hearings relative to mandatory joint returns. This barred all opponents from expressing their views—it barred all women. The reason given was that the committee had heard all necessary evidence in previous open hearings. These hearings, if I remember correctly, were held in 1942. Since then the membership of the committee has very materially changed. I am inclined to believe that none of the new Members have read those earlier hearings, and that they would therefore have no considered opinions in the matter. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, open hearings were in order if fairness and justice were to prevail.

On July 17, 1942, after the last attempt to introduce this method of doing away with a part, at least, of private ownership of property I spoke on this floor, let me repeat it because it is still appropriate and pertinent even though the open method of that time has given place to considerable camouflage:

> I share the conviction of many that the Treasury has no intention of abandoning it (the mandatory joint tax return) as a measure by which to secure additional tax moneys. * * *
>
> We are waging war against a ruthless and relentless enemy. It is not a war like any other war for it is a war to the death in every corner of the globe. Freedom is at stake, and, gentleman, I would remind you that women have more to lose than men and, therefore, are more ready and willing to sacrifice even than men. But sacrifice is very different from acquiescence in a program of retrogression, particularly when the future status of the home is involved, and the terms of the mandatory joint returns are such as to put women back a hundred years.
>
> The women of America are being implored to go onto the production lines, they are being enlisted in noncombatant divisions of the Army and of the Navy, all this, in addition to their first responsibility which is the home and children. It is a strange psychology that seizes upon this moment when increasing demands are being made upon women's energies to attempt time after time to take from them their rights under the law. It is strange, also, to pick out of the great mass of women those who are married, who carry the heaviest responsibilities to the future. It is so wholly un-American, this penalizing those who successfully uphold the most fundamental institution of our American way of life—the home.
>
> I have no personal interest in the question, so am free to speak frankly to you, not just in the interest of married women but in the interest of women throughout the world. Yes; it is as far-reaching as that, because women everywhere watch what American standards for women are, and if the pressure of certain modes of thought is permitted to bring the mandatory joint tax return principle into being, women everywhere will feel their burden heavier than they can bear. The results of enactment would be incalculable.
>
> I am well aware that there are many very charming men who feel women unfitted to own property, and, in a way, rather resent the position of freedom under the law that we have won. These are splendid allies for any who would set the clock back, who are perhaps unaware of the march of time and the changes time and experience have brought about.

Let me therefore remind you that a nation's progress can be measured in a great degree by the status of her women. Women are understood to be the largest owners of property in the United States. Is this ownership to be made a travesty for those who are successful homemakers? * * *

Let us not lend ourselves to an action that would take from many group of women the hard-won right of being persons under the law at a moment when we must ask of that very group, not only the sons some have already given, but the further courage from others to bear children for tomorrow's dawn. * * *

The women of America are ready to meet material sacrifice with as great a courage as is theirs in meeting the infinitely greater one of giving their men who are their very lives that America may save the world. Have no doubt of the women; they will not fail you, nor will they fail tomorrow's world. But I charge you to keep faith with that same future by refusing to be party to retrogressive action no matter when it may come before you. Let us keep faith with America and so with the world.

The moment has again come. What will you do with it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to confine my brief remarks to the subject of renegotiation of war contracts and that part of the pending bill that touches upon that act. Back in the month of June 1943 the Naval Affairs Committee, of which I am privileged to be a member, held extensive hearings on this important subject. That committee is charged with the responsibility for legislation relating to the Navy Department and, of course, one of its major concerns was the greatly expanded procurement program which has been a necessary incident to the wartime expansion of our armed forces.

Following the conclusion of those hearings before the Naval Affairs Committee, both a majority and a minority report were written. I happen to be one of six who signed the minority report from that committee, and I commend that minority report to your careful study and attention. It sets forth, in my opinion, in very persuasive form, the objections to this act as presently administered that I shall endeavor to touch upon in these remarks.

In the early days of the expansion program of our Army and our Navy, we found that we required everything at once. Ships and planes and tanks and guns and thousands of other articles of war were needed immediately. And they were demanded in quantities never before dreamed of. Speed was the order of the day. Nothing else counted. Our manufacturers ripped their old machinery out of their plants and in many cases left the empty shell of a building remaining. The Government provided or furnished the means to provide new machinery and set up our industry in the business of making tools of war.

Manufacturers took contracts to make items that they had never seen before, items that they had never heard about. Under the stress of the moment, the need for speed, and the unheard-of quantities that were required, it naturally followed that neither the procurement officers of the Government agencies nor the manufacturers themselves could have any definite ideas as to unit costs in such a program. But costs were not the problem of the moment. Working men and women and management alike worked around the clock, 24 hours a day and 7 days a week, and turned out the greatest flood of tools of war that this world has ever seen. That never-ending supply of planes and tanks and guns and ships, manned and supported by the manpower of America and her allies, has brought about the turning point in this war.

Very shortly after Pearl Harbor it was realized that the guesses and estimates—and they were no more than that—upon which war contracts had been let were leaving excessive profits in many cases. Many times it had been stated that we wanted no war millionaires created out of this war. Everybody was and is in agreement on that.

At that time our excess-profits rates were on a graduated basis ranging up to something around 60 percent. It was agreed that for the purpose of these war contracts that that was insufficient. On April 28, 1942, the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of 1942 became effective. Section 403 thereof provided for the renegotiation of war contracts. Everyone was in sympathy with the purpose of that section. It had a worthy objective, it was based on good intentions, and it had the support of many good and sound businessmen. It had the support of most of the leaders of industry because none of them wanted to be known as a war profiteer—no one of them wanted to make inordinate profits out of the war.

The 1942 Revenue Act came along later in that year and raised the corporate excess-profits taxes to a high of 90 percent, with an 80-percent ceiling on over-all Federal income taxes. The act further provided for a post-war reserve equal to 10 percent of the excess-profits taxes paid. This was intended in part to help cushion the shock of reconversion back into peacetime business. However, the act of the Price Adjustment Boards in renegotiating war contracts on a before-taxes basis has thereby extinguished this 10-percent reserve. In other words, the interpretation and administration of renegotiation has to that extent nullified the reserves that Congress wrote into the 1942 Revenue Act.

The minority report of the Naval Affairs Committee made six specific recommendations which I shall discuss briefly.

First. The "recapture" provisions of the Renegotiation Act should be repealed as to contracts made after December 31, 1943. Even if we are to assume for the purposes of this argument that renegotiation was justified at the outset of our big procurement program, the fact remains that certainly the procurement agencies of the War and Navy and other departments concerned should now have had enough experience in the letting of contracts to do a reasonable and businesslike job in the letting of future contracts. Some of the procurement programs have already been drastically curtailed and at least so far as the experimental part of our procurement program is concerned, the workers and the management of American industry have brought us "over the hump." It should no longer be necessary to let procurement contracts on guesses or on a hit-and-miss basis such as was necessary 4 or 3, or even 2 years ago.

Let us dispense with renegotiation for future contracts. Let us quit requiring so much of the time and effort of American industry to comply with the wants of the numerous Price Adjustment Boards. One large manufacturer has offered to make airplanes at a cost to the Government of 10 percent under any competitor, if the company he represents can be relieved of the expense and the time consumed in renegotiation. Certainly we have had enough experience by now that we can ascertain costs with reasonable certainty and then let an effective excess-profits tax rate do the job.

Second. As we pointed out in the minority report of the Naval Affairs Committee, there is no such thing as profit before taxes. There are earnings before taxes, but the only profits that the stockholders of a company can actually claim as their own are those profits that remain after setting aside the amounts estimated for the State and Federal tax collectors. There is the further fact that the act of renegotiating before taxes works to the benefit of those old line companies that have favorable bases on which to compute excess profits taxes. Take the case of two corporations working side by side, both with the same earnings before taxes. If the Price Adjustment Boards continue in their determination to give no consideration to the amounts of estimated taxes, it can but mean that the corporation with the favorable tax base is going to fare much better than its competitor, even though the two companies concerned are producing the same item at the same unit cost.

Third. The Price Adjustment Boards have refused to make any allowances for reserves for reconversion. As I stated before, many companies actually ripped out their peacetime machinery and the Government supported them in setting up their business for the making of tools of war. The Government said, and rightly so, that the costs of such conversion into war business were properly an item of cost that might be passed on to the Government. But that same Government will not allow that same contractor in the renegotiation process a single dollar as a reserve as against the day when the process is reversed and the company concerned must reconvert into its peacetime business. The Government must not make it impossible for private industry in this country to meet the critical demands of that period of rehabilitation that will follow the cancelation of war contracts.

Fourth. As to those items upon which sufficient experience has not yet been obtained to accurately determine costs, it is felt that "target contracts" can supply adequate protection to both Government and the industry concerned. In other words, a periodic reconsideration, say every 3 or every 4 months, of the unit cost of the items concerned for the ensuing period.

Fifth. We recommended that the law be amended so that it be specifically understood that renegotiation was not intended to apply to contracts made and articles actually delivered before April 28, 1942. Certainly it cannot be contended that an act which alters contracts previously made and upon which deliveries have been completed, is by any stretch of the imagination constitutional and valid. The case of the aircraft carrier Hornet, as pointed out in our report, is an example of the extremes to which the interpretation of the retroactive features of renegotiation have been carried. The *Hornet* had been completed, delivered, joined the fleet, and had launched the only airplanes that have bombed Tokyo, all before the Renegotiation Act was on the books. Even the 6 months' guaranty period that follows delivery, and within which the Government holds back the final 10 percent of payment, had expired 8 days before the Renegotiation Act became effective. However, the Government had not gotten around to paying that final 10 percent and on that single thread claimed the right to renegotiate that contract. It is very inequitable to subject the contract or contractor to the process of renegotiation on a contract that had been completed before the law was enacted, but upon which the Government had delayed in making final payment.

Our position that the retroactive features of this law ought to be repealed was fortified by the possibility that the continued application of the retroactive features may some day result in a judicial declaration that the whole renegotiation process is not divisible and is unconstitutional and void in its entirety.

Sixth. In concluding our minority report, we reemphasized our agreement with the majority that, subject to the safeguards of national safety involved, the price adjustment boards should make full disclosure of the reasons prompting action in every case. Such disclosure would go a long way toward relieving the suspicion that arises in some cases that nothing more than arbitrary action of the members of the board has governed them in arriving at a decision. We further concluded that the law must protect the citizen in his inherent right to resort to the courts, and I am glad to see such a provision incorporated into the pending amendments.

The price adjustment boards of the different departments involved in renegotiation have made much of their claim of the billions that have been recaptured. It should be pointed out that roughly three-fourths of all of these sums would have been gathered by the tax collector, even if renegotiation had not entered the picture. As I have pointed out, the early contracts of the war were mostly a matter of guess. However, contracts that are let today ought to be predicated on sound business principles, and on these present-day contracts no pride should attach to any future announcement of moneys recaptured. Certainly it would be nothing more than an admission that the procurement officers of the governmental departments involved have just missed the boat by so many dollars, and, in the face of 2 and 3 and 4 years of experience, are still unable to do a reasonable, business-like job.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN].

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that this bill will reduce the area of renegotiation of war contracts as follows:

First. By increasing the existing exemption of $100,000 to $500,000.

Second. By exempting agricultural products.

Third. By narrowing the definition of subcontracts to include only those articles to become a component part of the final production.

Fourth. By exempting all subcontracts under exempt prime contracts and subcontracts.

Fifth. Providing for the discretionary exemption of standard commercial articles, as defined in the bill in cases where competitive conditions have been restored.

Sixth. By establishing a new war contracts price adjustment board of five members representing the Treasury, War and Navy Departments, the Maritime Commission, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, in the nature of a board of review. This board will review, on petition of the contractor, decisions of the departmental boards.

From these proposed amendments it is quite evident that the Ways and Means Committee realized that the present Renegotiation Act is not carrying out the will and intent of Congress. I think it may also be said that the committee was and is cognizant of the fact that the maladministration of the law presents a serious menace not only to our form of government, but to our economy. In fact, I have heard members of the committee from both sides of the aisle express great concern as to the ultimate effect of the administration of the act if carried to its logical conclusion on our system of government and our free institutions.

The proposed first four amendments are of minor importance, and while they may bring relief to a certain degree for a very limited number of war contractors, I believe it will be inconsequential.

The fifth proposed amendment would provide a remedy for a large class of contractors manufacturing standard commercial articles. However, the fact that this relief is made discretionary with the boards presents the same evil inherent in the present set-up—namely, that it imposes a government by men instead of a government by law.

The same vice inheres in the proposed sixth amendment providing for a board of appeals. The appeal thereby provided will be from the individual board which renegotiated the individual contract to a combination of such boards, all and each of whom function as original boards in similar renegotiation of war contracts. Inasmuch as the greatest criticism of these boards is and has been that they are supplanting government by law with government by men in the renegotiation of contracts, it is but natural to assume that on such appeal the war contractor will meet the same fate that was meted out to him by the board of original jurisdiction. Under the very theory of the renegotiation of contracts, these boards must hang together or they will hang separately. I say, therefore, that while in theory these amendments may appear to offer remedial legislation, in essence the same weakness and fallacy still remains. And while the contractor may, by the proposed amendments, gain some relief from the vices of the renegotiation law, in reality he is still the victim of absolute dictatorial domination from the very agencies with whom he first entered into contractual relations.

The truth of the foregoing statements is easily proved by a brief analysis of the renegotiation law and the history of its application during the past 18 months.

Renegotiation of certain war contracts was provided for in section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of 1942 in April of that year. It was intended to accomplish a very wholesome objective. This objective was to prevent unconscionable profits and profiteering on war contracts by providing for the renegotiation of those contracts in which excessive profits were being realized or likely to be realized.

The act provides in subsection C—

> The Secretary of each department is authorized and directed, whenever in his opinion excessive profits have been realized or are likely to be realized from any contract with such department or from any subcontracts thereunder, (1) to require the contractor or subcontractor to renegotiate the contract.

In plain words the purpose of the law was to afford a special remedy against fraudulent war profiteers. Its function was to supplant an action in tort or fraud for the recovery of unconscionable and fraudulent profits, which court action in fraud constituted the only remedy for the recovery of such fraudulent profits in World War No. 1. This class of actions had dragged out so indefinitely that one of them at least dragged on for 25 years and was disposed of about the time of the passage of the War Contracts Renegotiation Act. This Renegotiation Act in itself constituted a radical departure from the fundamental principles of constitutional government. Even the Honorable Maurice Karker, Chairman of the War Department Price Adjustment Board, described the renegotiation law as a dangerous and un-American statute. Instead of the war contractor who is suspected of fraud having the opportunity to meet the charge and issue on

that charge in the courts, as guaranteed by our Constitution for over a century and a half, the renegotiation law placed the determination of that issue in the hands of those with whom he had made the contract who were the opposite parties to the contract but who were, under the law, made the final judge, jury, and executives on that issue and its resultant dispositions and enforcement. In other words, it constitutes plain and unvarnished government by men instead of government by law.

Nevertheless the exigencies of the situation caused by the sudden plunge of our Nation into the greatest war in all history, requiring mass production on a scale never contemplated even by our mass producers, perhaps justified such an extraordinary remedy under the circumstances of the then existing national emergency. In all cases where the contractor is making an exorbitant profit on war materials, either because fraudulent advantage is taken of the Government, which, of course, amounts to actual fraud, or whether it be through inadvertence, inefficiency, or negligence of administrative officials, where, although there might be no actual fraud on the part of the contractor, it would amount to constructive fraud, there should be machinery to correct the wrong and prevent undue Government loss. And so I say that even though it was a dangerous and un-American statute, I believe that under the circumstances it had the general approval of the American people, providing that this remedy of renegotiation was confined to the purpose of the legislation and applied only in those cases in which excessive profits were realized as a result of actual or constructive fraud. However, this drastic remedy has not been confined by the renegotiation boards to war contracts yielding excessive profits, in other words, unconscionable and fraudulent profits. The opportunity for this abuse by the renegotiation boards was made possible largely by the enactment a few months later, and about the time that the renegotiation boards began to function, of the 90-percent excess-profits law, which provided that all profits on war contracts in excess of the basic earnings of the contractor, as measured by his average earnings from the years 1935 to 1939, should be subject to an excess-profits tax of 90 percent.

It must be borne in mind that the term "excess profits" in the tax law has a different connotation than the term "excessive profits" in the renegotiation law. The former contemplates profits in excess of a certain amount; in this case profits in excess of the average annual earnings over a given period before the war. These excess profits may inure from the operation of three 8-hour shifts instead of only one 8-hour shift before the war, entitling the war contractor to from two to three times its normal income, or there may be many other legitimate increases in the volume of business, resulting in increased but legitimate income for the industry. This increased profit, as long as it is not unconscionable profit, is the excess profit contemplated by the excess-profits tax. Although this excess profit is considered honest and legitimate, the tax law provides that being business as well as its consequent profit flowing from the war it shall not be retained, but 90 percent of this excess profit shall be recovered by the Government through the excess-profits tax.

This is the vital distinction. Excess profits are legitimate profits in excess of those previously earned, while excessive profit refers to marginal profit on articles which are priced too high and amount to actual or constructive fraud or gouging of the Government.

The failure to make this distinction is the glaring vice of the renegotiation bureaus. It was the function of the renegotiation boards to recover excessive profits and the function of the Treasury Department to collect in taxes 90 percent of excess profits. Had the renegotiation boards confined renegotiation to those contracts involving excessive or unconscionable profits, it would not only be carrying out the will and intent of Congress but it would have proved a wholesome measure to effect those intents and purposes. Not only that, but it could continuously be functioning alongside the excess-profits tax, each in its proper field—the one to prevent profiteering and the other to recapture legitimate profits resulting from increased industry and business flowing from the war. However, as is the case with much other wholesome and efficient legislation, maladministration of the officials has created far more vicious evils than those which were sought to be corrected, for instead of confining themselves to those war contracts in which excessive profits were being realized, the Price Adjustment Boards immediately proceeded to renegotiate all war contracts. In other words, they invaded and operated in the field reserved exclusively for the Treasury Department and renegotiated excess profits. The very high rate of taxation—to wit, 90 percent—made it easy for them to intimidate the honest contractor by saying that 90 percent of his profits would be taken from him, anyway, under the excess-profits tax, and thereby mulcting him of that, together with the slight margin constituting the other 10 percent.

To give a specific example, I know of a firm, and it is typical, having basic earnings of $425,000 per year. In 1942, by running three shifts most of the time, their earnings were $500,000 additional. The renegotiation board coolly told them that they would settle for $250,000, or one half of the excess profits. The firm settled. Here then the renegotiation board was deliberately mulcting the United States Treasury out of $225,000 which would have been paid as excess-profits taxes, and the company out of $25,000 which it would have been permitted to retain as legitimate profits except for this usurpation of authority. It is not difficult to understand and appreciate the company's claim that this slight margin of $25,000 was necessary for them to meet their normal dividends and provide reserves for post-war conversion; and that as a result of renegotiation they felt compelled to lower their dividends. The renegotiation boards themselves admit that of the $4,000,000,000 they had recovered by renegotiation, 70 percent or two billion eight hundred million would have been collected by the Treasury Department at all events. This leaves but one billion two hundred million, and the query is as to how much of that sum they have wrongfully taken from war contractors as excessive profits when in reality they constituted legitimate excess profits. This latter sum also undoubtedly includes the huge sums voluntarily returned by war contractors before and without renegotiation.

Be that as it may, by wrongfully invading and raiding the field of the Treasury Department in the collection of excess-profits taxes, they have not only mulcted the Treasury Department, but have cast an undue onus and odium on the war contractor, making excess although legitimate profits, and under this duress have mulcted him as well. They have stigmatized him as a war profiteer, penalizing him accordingly, whereas he was a patriotic American, willing to work harder and contribute the proceeds of his efforts to the war effort through the American principle of taxation.

In conclusion I wish to say that while the amendments proposed by the Committee on Ways and Means may give some relief, they do not at all reach the core of evil inherent in this dangerous and un-American statute. I believe that the war effort and the general welfare of the American people can be best benefited by H. R. 2698, being the bill introduced for repeal of the renegotiation law. The present law, because of its maladministration, cannot be patched or amended to prevent the destruction of our free institutions. It must be rooted out entirely and we must make a fresh start.

In reply to those who have the temerity to say that this repeal bill is for the benefit of those who would make millions in the nature of corporate profits out of the war effort, I say that I, as much as they and more, want to prevent the creation of war millionaires, but I do not believe in burning the house to catch a rat. If the renegotiation law is repealed, renegotiation could be placed under the jurisdiction of a board independent of the departments which are parties to the original contracts; for instance, the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Then there would be no incentive to raid the field of excess profits, as the Treasury Department would have no object in mulcting itself, but would confine itself, as the law intended, to those contracts in which excessive or unconscionable profits are being realized.

I could mention a dozen or more vices flowing from the present dangerous and un-American statute. The way in which it is administered simply does not fit into the American way of life, even in wartime. Let it suffice to say here that the renegotiation law, as the aforesaid facts show, has been distorted into an unconstitutional delegation of the taxing power to these boards and is supplanting our American system of taxation with the

arbitrary, discriminatory confiscation of totalitarian dictatorship. Some time ago the newspapers carried a story of an alleged claim by the administration that corporation taxes were eight hundred million less for 1942 than they were in 1941. From the foregoing facts it is clear that they were in reality at least $2,000,000,000 higher, only they were collected differently. It is high time that the Congress courageously recaptures the taxing power, lest it be lost to them and the people forever.

Furthermore, unless we repeal the law and enact legislation confined to its objectives and purposes against excessive profits, we will destroy private industry by robbing it of the funds necessary for conversion when the war shall have been won, thereby destroying millions of jobs for our homecoming soldiers and those who must leave war production jobs for civilian employment.

Most of the Members of Congress and most of the American people are aware of the machinery to change the American way of living, to destroy the American capitalistic system. The renegotiation-of-contracts law, regardless of its former efficacy, is at the present time one of the most promising mediums for those who are seeking the objective of taking over the economy of the country and establishing a socialistic or collectivist scheme of government in these United States.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF].

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, we have before us for consideration a bill to provide increased revenue for the year 1944. It is to be regretted that because of a closed rule amendments to this measure cannot be offered on the floor of the House. It is also to be regretted that no appreciable effort has been made to drain off some of the surplus funds in the hands of the consumer.

The time to get money is when there is money, and at no period in the history of the United States has there been so much money in the hands of the taxpayer. We cannot hope to collect any of this money when the flush times have passed and we are once more struggling with the problems of unemployment. It seems to me that it would have been a far more realistic view of our problem to have made a serious effort to help pay for the war by increased revenues. The present bill is not adequate. If I had my way and could pass any measure I saw fit, I would make it a law that the minute war is declared personal incomes should not exceed $1,000 net per month and that no gifts could be made in excess of $100,000 by any taxpayer. In addition to the above, I would establish a maximum percent of profits which could be earned by anyone, taking the excess over such amount for revenue for the payment of war obligations, and last but not least I would create a board which had the power to maintain a satisfactory relation and standard involving wages, commodity prices, and profits, as all three are interlocked and cannot be considered piecemeal in times of war emergency.

Perhaps it is an indication of the present appraisement of values when we see a resolution slumbering since last February in the Committee on Foreign Relations providing for the feeding of the starving children of the occupied countries of Europe; also there has been slumbering in the Committee on Agriculture since last May a resolution empowering that committee to investigate the profits of all middlemen dealing with foods, and no action has been taken on either resolution, but when whisky got scarce in the District of Columbia there was a rush made to investigate the reason for the scarcity with a view to taking appropriate measures to relieve the thirst of the afflicted, and yet mothers of small children can go through the stores of the city of Washington and not find heavy underwear for the cold months. But that is not of any importance—at least not nearly as important as the lack of a quart of whisky. I think it is time that we readjusted our sense of values and considered first things first.

I am opposed to this bill, and shall vote against it, although I know that there will be no opportunity to be recorded in a roll call.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, with the power to tax there is the power to destroy. Apparently, the Ways and Means Committee of this House is lending its best efforts to curtail and at least partially destroy such a vast and important public service and utility as the Postal Service.

The Post Office Department is not a revenue-raising institution for the general purpose of defraying governmental expenses. It is the Nation's largest business institution and has been permitted to function as such for over 150 years unhampered by those who would seek to make it another revenue-raising agency for the general purposes of the Government. There, therefore, seems to be no justification for the action of the Ways and Means Committee in voting its approval of postal rate increases. It simply acted in haste and without much consideration for the facts. Postal rate changes seem to have been picked out from nowhere. On one day the committee voted approval of a 3-percent tax on parcel post, 2 days later it approved an increase in the first-class rate from 3 to 4 cents and 24 hours later canceled this proposed increase. Certainly no careful consideration or study of the existing rates, or of the experience and processes of the past which led to their establishment, served as a basis for the rates now proposed. I also doubt very much whether the Post Office Department has been consulted about this matter.

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House is, in reality, the board of directors of the Post Office Department and is so regarded by the Department. The need for increased postal rates should be determined by that committee with the sole purpose in mind of putting the Post Office Department on a sound financial basis as the Government's biggest business venture and should not attempt to bleed it for general taxation purposes without any regard for the future and the welfare of the Postal Service itself.

Out of a total estimated yield of $1,901,000,000 in excess revenues voted by the committee, postal rate changes are estimated to produce $175,000,000. In 1932, when postal volume and revenues dropped to $588,000,000, the Post Office Department suffered a deficit of $206,885,000. Agitation at that time for higher postal rates to save the taxpayers this expense was defeated by the argument that the deficit could only be wiped out by maintaining low rates and building up postal volume and revenues. Time has proven the soundness of that argument.

In 1942, with the same low rates existing in 1932, revenues had increased to $889,817,000 and the deficit was reduced to $11,825,000, a saving to taxpayers of $195,000,000. For the fiscal year 1943 revenues are estimated at the all-time high of $961,059,690, with an all-time low deficit of only $3,543,122, notwithstanding Postmaster General Walker's own statement that additional revenue amounting to $103,000,000 would have accrued to the service if all governmental departments and agencies had been required to pay postage on their free penalty mail as proposed under the Burch bill. With this additional revenue the service would have shown a profit of nearly $100,000,000. These figures, and experience speak for themselves. Low postal rates encourage mailings and produce larger volume, higher revenues, and higher profits. Higher rates discourage mailings, reduce volume, and lower revenues and create deficits.

In 1917 Congress increased the penny postcard rate from 1 to 2 cents. The postcard had been producing a normal revenue of $20,000,000 a year. With a raise to 2 cents, the Post Office Department not only did not get the increase anticipated but the revenue dropped to $10,000,000. I predict that if Congress once more unwisely adopts the higher rates recommended by the House Ways and Means Committee, mailings and revenues in each class of mail and service affected will fall off to such an extent that, not only the additional revenues anticipated from the increase will not be produced but the actual postal revenues will be less. And the Government will have less revenue at the close of its fiscal year from the Postal Service than it would have if present rates are retained and postal volume and revenues are permitted to expand.

No department of government is closer to the people than the Post Office Department. It comes in contact with the people daily. They want efficient service and as low postal rates as possible commensurate with such efficient service. I am sure that the people of the country do not want to see the Postal Service used as another taxation agency. When we once dig into the Post Office Department for revenue to carry on all the general functions of government, the temptation immediately arises to continue this pro-

cedure until finally the Postal Service is entirely destroyed and it simply becomes another agency of taxation. We should not disturb the structure now that has withstood the pressure of 150 years.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I wish to elaborate a little further the suggestion I made earlier this afternoon to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY]. The need for post-war reconversion funds for business is a problem which is of great concern to businessmen and should be of great concern to Congress. The suggestion has been made that businessmen be permitted to withhold from war taxes a post-war reconversion reserve, in order to pay for the changes necessary in their plants. The argument has been made that the great benefit in furnishing prompt employment would warrant the withholding of these tax funds. I doubt whether this form of tax exemption is feasible, and, if it were put into practice, it would no doubt be surrounded with so many governmental regulations and inspections as to be very burdensome. Most businessmen are looking forward with longing to the day when they can avoid governmental forms and red tape in their business.

I have suggested to a number of members of the Ways and Means Committee and have discussed with businessmen the possibility of financing post-war reconversion through a tax-amortization plan which would be just the reverse of the war building amortization plan. When the war plants were built we permitted industry to amortize the cost of the plant over a period of 5 years through tax deductions. Now industry needs current funds for necessary post-war changes. Many a business is making very large profit from a small plant, but this war profit is going largely to the Government in taxes and renegotiation, as it should, and the business faces the future without necessary working capital. I believe that we could permit industry to withhold as much as half of the taxes due for this purpose and amortize the payments over a period of 5 years.

For instance, a business which owed $500,000 in taxes in 1944 could withhold one-half of this amount, or $250,000, for reconversion purposes, under proper safeguards to be prescribed by law. This amount might be sufficient to finance all, or a major part of the change-over. In the next 5 years, in addition to the regular taxes of the business, it would pay $50,000 a year in amortizing the payment which had been withheld. Interest would be charged approximating the interest on the Government debt so that there would be no ultimate loss to the Government. The only danger would be that the business might fail in the post-war years and the Government would not be able to make full collection. To this extent, the Government would be sharing the hazards of the businessmen's post-war fortunes. It might be feasible to make the amortization period longer than 5 years. Such a plan would not solve all of the problems of reconversion financing, but it would accomplish much without red tape or overhead.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has stated this afternoon that this whole problem must be examined soon. It is my hope that my suggestion can receive study and analysis at that time.

Although I realize that putting together a revenue measure is a monumental task, I confess my disappointment at many provisions of the present tax bill. I felt we should attempt to raise even more money. I feel even greater relief from bureaucratic caprice could have been given in the renegotiation amendments. I still feel, as I have always felt, that it is a mistake to consider such a bill under a gag rule. The small attendance here, the lack of interest in the debate, is evidence that the membership of this House will not give any great amount of time and attention to consideration of a tax bill under a gag rule. Of course, however, I am going to vote for this bill, rather than against it. I want to do my part in raising taxes to support the war effort.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, last December when we passed upon the so-called modified Ruml plan I thought we had about reached the zenith in unsound legislation, but I am satisfied that in the present bill we have under consideration we have a real "runner-upper." We still have a pay-as-you-go-before-you-know-what-ycu-owe bill. The American people had hoped that the committee would supply them with a pay-as-you-go-when-you-know-what-you-owe bill. They wanted simplicity but, despite their pleas, we still have all the complexities and all of the confusing uncertainties which were an integral part of the previous bill to which I have just alluded.

The American people are going to be greatly disappointed when they find that, on each of these succeeding quarterly periods, they will still have to go through the same mental gyrations and suffer the same indescribable confusion that they had to undergo when they were on the tax rack last September 15.

There are many features of this bill besides its complications that compel me to withhold my assent to it. I object particularly to the transportation tax of 3 percent upon freight charges. As it is the long-haul States that suffer the most from a tax of this character, as a Californian, I, of course, object to the unfairness of the operation of that kind of a tax upon the consumers and shippers of my great State. This tax is truly an unfair and discriminatory tax put against all of the border States of our great country, the Atlantic and Pacific Coastal States, the Gulf States, and the Mexican border States. Our specialty crops must be taken thousands of miles to the consuming markets, and when they are taken there and sold to the consumers not only does that production carry with it a high freight charge, which we know we cannot avoid, but it carries with it a 3-percent tax on that high freight charge, working as a penalty and nothing less.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. England and some of the other foreign countries, including Germany, have taken off the import duties and transportation tax as a means of avoiding having to give subsidies.

Mr. GEARHART. I am grateful for that observation. In order to emphasize let me point out that those of us who live in the West buy more per capita of automobiles, ice chests, radios, and things of that kind, but we do not buy them on an equality with the people who live in the center of the country where those things are produced. We have to pay a greater freight charge on them than others and then in addition thereto we have to pay this 3 percent on that excessive freight charge. The greater the charge, the greater the tax.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true that the agricultural areas pay the freight both ways? It is deducted from the price it receives for its products and it is added on to the price that it must pay for its manufactured goods. Likewise, the tax will follow the freight.

Mr. GEARHART. That is precisely true. Because they catch us coming and going the agricultural areas are the ones the people of which suffer the most. If there was anything resembling equality in the application of this tax, I would be the last to protest.

Mr. CURTIS. The interior of the country does not have the advantage of waterway freight either.

Mr. GEARHART. The opposition to this tax which has been engendered throughout the country ought to be sufficient to convince those who are assembled here, if not to the members of the Ways and Means Committee, that this tax is unfair and discriminatory. Commissioner Eastman, known throughout the country as its greatest transportation expert, has condemned it time and time again and on a number of occasions asked the Congress to repeal it. The Interstate Commerce Commission has also asked the Congress to wipe it from the statute books. The Office of Defense Transportation also condemns the levy as unsound, unfair, discriminatory, unequal, inequitable. Yet it remains in this bill—simply because it produces $175,000,000. That—so far as I can ascertain—is the only reason for it. Why a tax which is so discriminatory, unfair, and unequal in its operation impressed my colleagues of the great Ways and Means Committee as worthy of retention in the bill will remain one of the unsolved mysteries of modern times.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Is it not true that the same amount of money could be collected on another basis? In other words, the percentage basis used is really responsible for the inequity, whereas, if a per unit basis were used, the same amount on the commodity from wherever it may be shipped, then there would be no inequity, but we could still collect the same amount of money? Is that not true?

Mr. GEARHART. That is true. The gentleman from Oregon is quite correct. Other methods were suggested, but for some strange reasons—reasons which surpass human understanding—the committee seized upon and clung, with an unyielding tenacity, to the unfairest formula of them all.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. May I say, it is my recollection, the principle I just mentioned applies on some other commodities, notably coal. They did not use the percentage method on coal. The tax on the transportation of coal is so much per car, which I think is the proper way of distributing a tax.

Mr. GEARHART. If the tax theory which was applied to coal were applied across the board you would not hear me complaining today.

Another reason why I am opposed to this bill grows out of the provisions having to do with renegotiation. I am against renegotiation because I am quite convinced that the proposed statute is unconstitutional. All will agree, I am quite sure, that it is unconstitutional for Congress to delegate its legislative prerogative. Likewise, all will agree that it is unconstitutional to delegate the taxing power of the Congress to any agency. This bill does all that in its so-called renegotiation provisions. The Congress, applying the definition to all the people, has defined what income is. But the renegotiators are granted the privilege of redefining what income is in its application to a single individual. Congress, in writing the revenue laws, fixes the rate of taxation, the rate which shall apply equally to all of the people. The renegotiators are authorized to lay down a different rate of taxation—not on all the people—but upon the one person who happens to be the victim that they have marked for renegotiation treatment.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. My time is so short——

Mr. CASE. May I ask the gentleman if he does not want to make a differentiation between the recapture of profits and a repricing as to contracts that are entered into by a contractor where a renegotiation clause is part of the contract?

Mr. GEARHART. I agree that there is such a distinction. Put notwithstanding, both are jumbled together and are treated the same way. Because in their operation upon the contractor the procedure and the effect are the same in respect to both recapture of funds and repricing of articles no good purpose could possibly be served by bearing that distinction in mind.

I am against the renegotiation clauses for so many reasons it would be quite impossible to even list them within the short period which has been allotted me. For instance, the word "renegotiation" is a fraud upon the American people. That which is done has no relation to the meaning of that word. What does "renegotiation" mean? I think all will agree that to renegotiate means "to conduct conferences as a basis of agreement," "to treat with a view to coming to terms."

Is there anybody so guileless as to believe that any contractor who is cited in for renegotiation is given any opportunity to decide whether or not he wants to renegotiate, or, does anyone think that, after renegotiating, the contractor has any right to refuse to accept the consequences of those renegotiations or the conclusions the Price Renegotiation Board has arrived at? Not at all. The contractor is merely reached out for and taken by the nape of the neck and told, "Sign here. This is the new contract." There is no exchange of ideas, there is no meeting of minds, there is no agreement in respect to new terms. The whole procedure is arbitrary. In true totalitarian fashion, an order fixing new terms is, by ukase, substituted for the voluntary contract originally agreed upon. There is a confiscation of a portion of the profits which the contractor earned under his original contract without any compensation therefor whatsoever. This is a violation of the Constitution of the United States, only one of a hundred violations that I could name if time would permit.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment briefly on the proposed amendments to the so-called renegotiation law embodied in the pending revenue bill. The proposed amendments constitute a decided improvement of the existing law, but were we not precluded by the "gag rule" under which the bill is being debated I would offer an amendment to provide for the outright repeal of the entire renegotiation statute.

In the words of the former Chairman of the War Department Price Adjustment Board when he testified—page 2 of the hearings—before the Committee on Ways and Means, and I commend him for his frankness, "It is a dangerous and un-American statute." Such a law should never have been placed on our statute books, and I am personally convinced that if given the opportunity this House would vote its complete repeal. I suspect that the administration leadership would not have brought the bill to the floor of the House under a closed rule were it not realized that an open rule would undoubtedly mean the elimination of renegotiation.

We are representatives of the people. We are custodians of constitutional rights. Once it is clearly understood the extent to which the renegotiation law suspends — even abrogates — constitutional rights of American citizens I do not believe the membership of this House would accept any amendments except that providing for repeal. If the principle of renegotiation is un-American, the law providing for renegotiation does not become any less un-American by improving the technique or procedure of renegotiation.

This House has never had, nor do we have today, full opportunity to pass upon the real issue. That right has been denied us by administration strategists. It is denied us today. I must confess that the administration leaders have done a remarkably able job in preventing the issue from arising in the House.

Last year when the sixth supplemental national defense appropriation bill was before the House the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] secured the adoption of an amendment to limit profits on war contracts at 6 percent. There was no discussion of the amendment and to this day no one knows from the language of the amendment whether the 6-percent limitation was 6 percent of the contract price, of costs, or of sales. Very few Members were on the floor at the time and, on a division, the amendment was adopted by a vote of 70 to 8.

The profit limitation provided by the Case amendment was fixed and did not vest in the departments discretion as to what the profit should be. Moreover, the amendment related only to the particular appropriation then being made and to contractors dealing directly with the Government as prime contractors. Whatever the faults of the Case amendment, it had the great merit of fixing certain definite limitations.

When the appropriation bill came back to the House in the form of a conference report, which is not subject to amendment, renegotiation as we know it today was born. The administration seized upon this opportunity to have delegated to the departments the power to determine for themselves what constituted excessive profits. Renegotiation thus originated as a part of a pressing war appropriation need, and the next time Congress had the matter before it was in the form of a conference report on the revenue bill of 1942, which embodied certain amendments to the renegotiation law written into an appropriation bill.

Suffice it to say, Mr. Chairman, that there never was a renegotiation bill as such before a committee of this House or before the House as a whole. It was always a part of some other important bill, and I venture to say that a great many Members of the House never realized there was such a law until they began to see the effects of it and began to hear from the people back home.

I have many times protested against broad delegations of power to the executive branch of the Government. I have opposed such procedure and will continue to oppose it as long as I am privileged to have a seat in this great body. The sprawling, strangling bureaucracy which is killing the American way of life and placing impossible tax burdens on the people is the product of these delegations of power. The unlamented N. R. A. was characterized as "delegation run riot," and the renegotiation law is subject to the same characterization.

Who determines in renegotiation what are excessive profits? Government appointees. By what rule or standard do they make that determination? There is none. Who decides in renegotiation the amount of money that may be earned by a particular contractor or subcontractor? Government appointees. How do they decide? No one knows. Nor is there any effective appeal from their decision. Truly, "it is a dangerous and un-American statute."

Let me read to you the definition of excessive profits as set out in the law:

> The term "excessive profits" means any amount of a contract or subcontract price which is found as a result of renegotiation to represent "excessive profits."

In other words, Mr. Chairman, excessive profits are excessive profits to the amount that you, the price adjustment boards, decide they are excessive. It could be all the profits realized or it could be none.

Not only do the price adjustment boards have the power to determine what is excessive as a profit on war work, they do not have to furnish the contractor with any statement as to how they arrived at their conclusion. The whole proceeding is in complete secrecy. There is no public record of any kind. And the contractor must accept the decision of the board who renegotiated his contracts or he will not receive payment for his products, which, in most instances, would mean that the company can no longer continue in business.

Mr. Chairman, that is not the American system of government, and I protest the continuance of any such law. If the administration of this law should fall into the hands of the many remodelers now associated with the Government we will witness the complete destruction of the American system of free enterprise.

It has been argued that renegotiation is necessary to prevent war profiteering, and much has been said about the amount of money recovered through renegotiation. The figures that have been presented seem imposing, but they fail to take into account the taxes that we would have collected on these profits had they remained with the companies. Existing law provides for a 90-percent excess-profits tax, with an over-all limitation of 80 percent on corporate taxes. In general, therefore, 80 percent of the money recovered through renegotiation would be recovered through taxation. Moreover, the pending bill provides for a 95-percent excess-profits tax beginning January 1, 1944.

When we wrote the excess-profits-tax law we provided for a post-war credit of 10 percent. In other words, for every dollar paid in excess-profits tax 10 cents would be set aside by the Treasury Department as a reserve to assist American business in the difficult post-war transition period to peacetime production. Renegotiation does not provide for any such reserve, and inasmuch as renegotiation is before taxes rather than after taxes American business loses the post-war credit which Congress decided should be available for the future. Renegotiation is thus in direct conflict with the settled policy of Congress.

I fear for the future of American business if they are not permitted to build up reserves for converting plants to peacetime production, for meeting pay rolls until the company can place itself on a peacetime productive basis, and for rehabilitating their equipment now operating at maximum capacity. Unless business can set up appropriate reserves for the post-war period we will be confronted with the greatest depression in our history and all business will pass into the hands of the Government. We will thus lose through our own short-sightedness the very thing for which we are fighting and for which our boys are daily giving their lives—freedom.

There is no substitute for the American system of free enterprise. This is evidenced by the developments in the present war. Russia with 200,000,000 people and endless resources, Great Britain with 600,000,000 people and great natural resources, China with 400,000,000 people and endless natural resources, all look to the United States with 130,000,000 people. It is not the number of our people that makes us powerful. It is not the extent of our resources. Other countries have larger populations and greater natural resources. We are powerful because of our system of free enterprise, and it is for us to preserve it at all costs.

The renegotiation law is destroying this system and should be repealed. The pending amendments limit the area of renegotiation and set up certain standards for the determination of excessive profits. The amendments improve the existing law but its basic evils remain. I wish we would be given the opportunity to vote its repeal and leave to the tax law the control of profits. That is the American way.

Mr. Chairman, I wish also to direct some remarks to title IV of the pending revenue bill, providing for an increase in postal rates. This title has no place in a revenue measure. Postage was never intended to be a tax, but rather a charge for the special service of the Government, and when the Committee on Ways and Means presumes to report a bill containing provisions for increasing postal rates it is assuming jurisdiction over a matter which belongs to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

The proposed increase in the rates will not greatly affect the individual, but it will materially affect American business. Surely it is recognized that during this period many companies have been obliged to discontinue the use of salesmen in reaching a market for their products. Companies which previously maintained a large sales force have lost men to the armed services or to war production plants. Moreover, the gasoline shortage and the heavy burden on public carriers have made it necessary for hundreds of companies to find a substitute for traveling. The mails have thus become increasingly important to business, and it is now proposed by this increase in postal rates to place another burden on business.

According to the committee report the estimated additional revenue from the proposed rates is $166,800,000. While I do not have the details upon which this estimate was made, I venture the prediction that if these rates should go into effect the return will be far less than the estimate. There is a well-established economic law known as the law of diminishing return. If the return on 1,000 pieces of mail at 2 cents is $20, it does not follow that an increase in the rate to 3 cents will increase the return to $30. Invariably as the rate increases the number of pieces mailed will decline because the price becomes prohibitive.

But even assuming that some additional money may be realized by increases in postal rates, I am convinced that the effect of this action will be far more damaging to American business now so dependent on the mails than any sum that may for the moment be gained. At best the gain would only be temporary.

It does not seem to me logical, it just does not make sense to propose an increase in postage rates when the Post Office mail service is now on a paying basis and when the mails have become so important to the people as a whole. By this provision it is proposed to increase the burden of mail costs on the people while at the same time the various Government departments, bureaus, and agencies continue to send useless and unnecessary material through the mails under the franking privileges.

I am definitely opposed to this title in the bill, Mr. Chairman, and I wish it were possible to offer an amendment to strike it. I am sure such an amendment would have the overwhelming support of this House. Under the closed rule such an amendment can only be offered by the Committee on Ways and Means. In the event it does not offer such an amendment, I hope that when the bill is under consideration in the other body title IV will be stricken. The Committee on Ways and Means, I understand, held no hearings whatever on this subject of increase in postal rates.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS.]

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, much has been said here lately about the need for raising additional revenue for the purpose of financing our war effort and our ordinary government functions.

Also, much has been said about economy in government, and this is what I want to discuss. So that I shall not take up too much time I shall cite only one instance where economy and sounder business operation on the part of our Government would have saved the taxpayers countless dollars.

The proposal to construct a pipe line from Texas to Illinois at a cost of $44,000,000 was announced last February by Jesse Jones. The Defense Plant Corporation, upon the recommendation of the Petroleum Administration for War, agreed to finance the project which, after completion, would have a capacity of

about 235,000 barrels per day of gasoline and light petroleum products.

The War Emergency Pipelines, Inc., was set up to construct the line and operate it for the account of the Defense Plant Corporation.

In April, Mr. Jones announced that Defense Plant Corporation, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, upon recommendation of the Petroleum Administration for War, had agreed to finance the extension of this pipe line to the harbor areas of New York City.

This section, again to be constructed by War Emergency Pipelines, Inc., would complete the link from Illinois to the east coast.

The first section of the line—a 16-inch tube from Baytown and Port Arthur to Beaumont, Tex., and a 20-inch line from there to Norris City, Ill., and Seymour, Ind.—were approved at a cost of $44,000,000.

Completion of the Seymour-New York area section, also a 20-inch line, will bring the over-all cost of the entire project to approximately $95,000,000.

This pipe line, known in my country as the Big Inch, passes for 100 miles through my congressional district. Work has been going on in this area for some months and I have heard numerous complaints concerning wastefulness and payroll padding. After some personal investigation, I finally found an employee of the project who has acquainted me with many of the things which have been going on.

This man, a timekeeper, and an employee of the Government, when calling these conditions to the attention of the contractors, was told to "give the boys a break." Certain employees, after a few fist fights, numerous threats, and propositions to split up the "take" submitted to the deletions, but came back day after day and worked the same old racket, making it necessary for someone to be on the job each day to check the men. These employees receive time, time and one-half, and double time for their extra hours.

So-called working hours deleted by the diligence of this time clerk amounted to a saving of $7,966.01 from the period July 16 to October 20, 1943. This figure covers only 1 of 26 working gangs.

The hourly wage of the men involved on this project range from 75 cents to $1.50 per hour.

From the records which I have before me, it shows that on August 16, 98 men claimed hours at work which were deleted by the timekeeper, after a check-up. The hours deleted for this day total 171 hours, and resulted in a saving of $264.

The time allotted permits me to mention only some of the cases as follows:

Date	Hours deleted	Men involved	Saving
Aug. 18	125	84	$190
Aug. 20	156	110	234
Aug. 21	138	93	210
Aug. 22	154	15	210
Aug. 26	155	100	200
Aug. 27	123	55	192
Oct. 1	257	92	316
Oct. 10	141	53	128
Oct. 11	97	25	140

Now, Mr. Chairman, having cited the saving in man-hour payments, I call the attention of the House to money which would have also been wasted had it not been for the honesty of this employee.

In cases where a worker was found to have claimed to have been on the job, but was not, a check was made of his particular type of work on the project.

These men who had been dishonest about their hours were usually operators of heavy equipment, such as ditching machines, bulldozers, tractors, heavy trucks, and welders. When it was found that they had not worked it was also found that their equipment had remained idle, yet a claim was made for reimbursement for use of the equipment.

In checking the daily time sheets it was found that 5,133 hours could be knocked off of equipment charges for the period from August 15 to October 14, a period of only 2 months.

This equipment was rented on prices fixed by the O. P. A. The equipment ranged from tar and asphalt kettles at $23 a month to ditching machines at $1,450 per month.

While this equipment was paid for by the month, ofttimes machines broke down and remained in the repair shop for as long as 3 weeks at a time because of lack of repairs as well as scarcity of mechanics. So there were many days when some of the equipment was not operated at all, and much was operated only part time.

I will now cite deletions for certain equipment for certain days as follows:

Date	Number of machines	Hours deleted
Aug. 19	32	134
Aug. 26	41	134
Sept. 14	32	168
Sept. 30	29	135
Oct. 1	30	261
Oct. 2	23	107
Oct. 4	25	124
Oct. 5	33	146
Oct. 6	32	114
Oct. 7	32	124
Oct. 8	31	151
Oct. 10	36	171
Oct. 14	10	73

Mr. Chairman, I feel that the foregoing statement justifies the claims of the minority members of the committee that honesty and economy in government would completely eliminate the necessity of any increased taxes.

Complaints of the dickerings in connection with this project, made to officials of War Emergency Pipelines, Inc., a Government agency, answerable to Defense Plant Corporation, have gone unheeded.

I believe that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation owes it to the taxpayers to bring a thorough investigation of the entire project out into the open.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN].

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Chairman, were the pending measure just a revenue bill, I would not find it difficult to oppose it and this notwithstanding that I am not unmindful of the extraordinary needs of revenue for war purposes. These needs were fully considered on the enactment of the last revenue act.

I am going to support the bill, because I am in accord with the provisions which it is hoped will simplify the assessment and collection of the personal income taxes and clarify many of the provisions of existing law, including the revision of the Renegotiation Act. The only increases in the personal income taxes are nominal.

Also, I heartily approve of the proposal that in the future taxes shall be assessed on anticipated income and not made retroactive. Changes in our tax laws have been too frequent. They have left the people confused and embarrassed by not knowing or being able to anticipate what their taxes would amount to.

My approach to the preparation of the measure has been with the conviction that before any new taxes were imposed sufficient time should be allowed to ascertain with some degree of certainty the revenue to be realized under existing law. Treasury demands disregard this idea.

No sooner had the Revenue Act of 1942 been enacted, making drastic increases in personal income taxes, and before the yield of that measure could possibly be known, the Treasury was demanding further increases. The demand was made without regard to spending needs or the possibility of reducing expenditures by practicing economy and eliminating waste.

FEDERAL TAX RATES ARE HIGH ENOUGH

The Treasury, speaking for the administration, has asked Congress for $10,500,000,000 in new taxes. This startling request comes after a series of stiff tax increases which have left the American people staggering under tax burdens beyond their wildest dreams. Not content with tax rates which may yield approximately $45,000,000,000 in revenues this fiscal year, the Treasury would—without any qualms of conscience, add another $10,500,000,000.

The revenue from present taxes, in the aggregate, are steadily increasing with a rising national income and the expansion of consumer spending. In fact, the receipts from existing taxes are rising faster than the Treasury statisticians have anticipated. When the Current Tax Payment Act was adopted several months ago, the Treasury was willing to admit that it would add only $3,000,000,000 to tax revenues in 1944 and 1945. But, at the end of last July the Treasury conceded that its early estimate was too low, and it raised its estimate to $5,000,000,000. Recent reports indicate that this estimate is probably still too low.

The early operations of the pay-as-you-go plan disclose that there had been far more tax evasion than the Treasury has been willing publicly to admit. In fact, the Treasury has been very silent about the tax evasion. Collecting the income tax at the source, although it has placed inconceivable compliance burdens on employers, is adding vast amounts to Federal revenue and will add still more as evasion is stopped and as the national income increases.

TAX REVENUE AND THE NATIONAL INCOME

It is too early to forecast what the final revenues from the present taxes will be during the present and the ensuing fiscal years. With the national income trending upward and with prices and consumer spending on the rise, tax collections are bound to increase. In view of the existing very high tax rates, further increases should be avoided at least until we know what revenues our present taxes will produce.

The Treasury has time after time revised its estimates of the national income. Not long ago it was speaking of a possible income of $100,000,000,000. This was revised upward to $125,000,000,000, then to $130,000,000,000, and later to $140,000,000,000. Now the Treasury declares that an aggregate income of $152,000,000,000 will be paid out during the fiscal year 1944. We know it will not be long until this figure is revised upward to $200,000,000,000.

Inevitably, as the national income soars, tax receipts also soar. The existing high tax rates will return more and more revenue month by month as a consequence. Therefore it is not necessary to raise these rates to gather in more tax collections. In fact, in particular cases, higher rates may produce less revenue because of their effects upon the incentives and resources of the taxpayers.

INCREASING TAX RATES AND THE TOTAL BURDEN

Now, it may be urged that steeper rates of taxation can readily be borne as the national income flow expands. But keep in mind that the tax rates have already been raised time after time.

Never before have the American people paid such high rates of income taxation. Never before have they paid over to the Treasury such tremendous sums of money. Before the war we were paying about a billion dollars a year in personal income taxes. In this fiscal year, according to the conservative Treasury estimates, the American people will pay over $18,000,000,000 in income and Victory taxes.

But the appetite of the Treasury knows no bounds. It seeks to increase income-tax rates still higher, with the object of piling another $6,500,000,000 upon the individual taxpayers, whose total tax payments to the Treasury would then be approximately $25,000,000,000.

Mr. Paul, of the Treasury Department, recently stated in a public address that it would be reasonable to double the Treasury revenue program and ask for $21,000,000,000 in new taxes instead of $10,500,000,000. You may be sure that if we enact the taxes the Treasury now asks, it would not be long until it came back for another ten or fifteen billion dollars. It would soon be asking for thirty or forty billion dollars in individual income taxes.

We must now seriously consider whether the present tax rates are all that the American people can bear without grave and permanent injury to the national economy. These rates will supply more and more revenue as the national income rises. It may be questioned whether it is not unnecessary and unwise to increase those rates for fear that the higher rates might cause diminishing returns and dry up future revenue sources.

ABILITY TO PAY HIGHER TAXES

Because the national income goes up, it does not follow that the real purchasing power of all of the population increases. Prices have been rising and our dollars will buy far less now than they would a few years ago. Eggs which now retail at 70 cents a dozen were 40 cents, or less, a dozen a few years back. Fresh fruits and vegetables sold at prices before the war which were not much more than half of the prices prevailing today. Meats, poultry, fish, milk, butter, and other items in our diet were lower in price. So also were clothing, fuel, and other indispensable articles.

Moreover, many million income earners are receiving no more dollars in income than they received before the war, while others are receiving only a little more. Those in advanced years who are living on their small savings, the widows and their children who are sustained by the proceeds of insurance left at death, and the vast army of white collar workers who must get along upon fixed incomes are being punished terrifically by our present taxes, so are the professional people and all of those in our great middle class whose incomes are fixed or almost constant. Many millions of our people have enjoyed little, if any, of the war prosperity in the form of higher incomes.

THE EXCISE TAXES

I have spoken here only of the income and Victory taxes. These are not the only taxes paid by the American people. These are the so-called excise taxes, a disguised form of sales tax. On every package of popular-sized cigarettes, there is a tax of 7 cents. On furs, jewelry, and toilet preparations, there are taxes of 10 percent of the prices. On the transportation of persons there is a tax of 10 percent. On telephone services there are taxes of 10 to 20 percent. On other commodities and services there are corresponding taxes paid directly or indirectly by consumers. This bill will increase many of these excise taxes on commodities and services consumed by all of us. These are not simply the luxuries of the wealthy. We are all being hit at every turn by taxes upon tobacco, alcohol, admissions, sporting goods, gasoline, and many other items. Together these taxes will amount to about $4,000,000,000 this fiscal year. To the $25,000,000,000 which the Treasury wants to collect from our incomes directly, it wants to collect a further $6,500,000,000 by various excises.

I have not spoken here of the customs duties, which will surpass $300,000,000 this year. These will also be shifted to us as consumers and reduce our purchasing power.

STATE AND LOCAL TAXES

Nor have I spoken of the taxes which individuals must pay to the State and local governments. The Treasury declares that individuals are paying $2,000,000,000 directly to our State and local governments in property, income, and other taxes. This does not include taxes paid by renters upon property which they do not own, which would add at least another $1,000,000,000. Nor does it include the general sales, the gasoline, the tobacco, the amusement, the alcohol, and other taxes which are collected indirectly from individuals in their purchase of taxed commodities and services. Together this last group of State and local taxes will garner in $2,000,000,000. Directly and indirectly, the State and local governments are taking from individuals some $5,000,000,000, aside from the taxes upon business property and income and from the social security contributions. If we include all of the personal and business income and property taxes, commodity, and pay roll, and all other taxes, the State and local governments are collecting a stupendous sum of over $10,000,000,000.

REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES—WORLD WARS NO. 2 AND NO. 1 COMPARED

Altogether, Federal, State, and local taxes during the fiscal year 1944 will aggregate about $55,000,000,000. Together with minor nontax revenues, nearly one-half of our total governmental expenditures will be covered by nonborrowed funds.

This is a splendid accomplishment. It is far superior to our record during World War No. 1. In the fiscal year 1919, which brought our best financial results, we were able to raise only $5,000,000,000 in Federal taxes as compared with Federal expenditures of $18,500,000,000. Federal taxes were only 28 percent of Federal expenditures. In this fiscal year 1944 Federal taxes may surpass 40 percent of Federal expenditures.

THE PROBABLE COURSE OF EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES

If the war in Europe should end in the near future, war expenditures would very probably decline rapidly. We have about attained the peak of our war production. Military needs in some lines have been provided for greatly in advance of present requirements, and a tapering off of war expenditures in the coming months is not improbable. Moreover, it should be possible to accomplish further economies in nonwar spending and to avoid some of the waste in war spending, without endangering a single life in the armed forces and without prolonging the war.

On the revenue side, tax collections are mounting with the growth of the national income, the expansion of consumer spending, and higher tax rates. The existing tax rates are already very heavy. We have already provided for increases of 12.5 percent in the income tax upon income received in 1943 and 1944. The social-security tax rates will automatically increase in January, unless Congress provides otherwise. The American people are buying great amounts of bonds and are placing billions of dollars into other forms of saving. All in all, our tax burdens are now at an oppressive level, and further rate increases may be expected to add to their destructive effects.

On the spending side, war outlays seem to have reached a peak and should soon start to decline. To the extent that

governmental economies can be effected, and there is a strong sentiment in Congress and throughout the country for economies, spending needs may be further lightened.

CONCLUSION

In view of the known facts, I sincerely believe that the time has come to call a halt upon further tax increases. I might have dwelt at length upon the onerous tax burdens which have been placed upon business enterprise, which have paralleled the vast increases in individual taxes. Neither business nor the individual can, without grave injury, absorb higher tax rates.

Under these conditions, a tax holiday is demanded, at least until the full revenue effects of present taxes are known. Instead of increasing the tax rates we must seek to make the existing tax laws more effective in order to produce the maximum of revenues under the present rates.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the voices of the people are being heard on the tax bill that is being reported to the House today. The tax bill under discussion is not only a product of the Ways and Means Committee; it contains the composite views of the American taxpayers. They have emphatically warned Congress that we must have less spending—not more taxes. This does not mean that the American taxpayer is unwilling to pay taxes, but it does mean that he no longer intends to have his money wasted. Evidence is everywhere of waste, extravagant spending, and money squandered recklessly. Studies and investigations by congressional committees give ample proof that agencies of the Federal Government which were given large sums of money to spend in this emergency have been not only negligent, but in many cases violated the trust and confidence that Congress placed in them. Congress itself is being criticized for many of these wasteful and unnecessary expenditures. They cannot justly escape all blame but neither should they be held responsible for executive and administrative agencies which are responsible to Congress for effective and efficient administration. The taxpayer has one test for Federal expenditures—are they necessary for the war effort? There are indications that Federal taxes are now so high as to be undermining the tax base at an accelerating rate. This reduces future taxing opportunities, threatens extinction of the great American middle class, and imposes serious handicaps on business which may delay and prevent post-war resumption of production for peacetime and the employment so crucial in our economy. Legislative actions of today will decide post-war problems of tomorrow. Tax policies during our war period may well be the determining factor as to our type of government in the post-war period.

The policy approved by Congress may well determine whether we are to continue as a democracy, operate as a socialistic state, or be forced to adopt a totalitarian government. No doubt many will say we need have no fear about a totalitarian government in our Nation. General apathy on the part of our Government and the people could and would bring this about. We must face our fiscal problems practically. The fiscal problems of the war period have been most difficult, but it is my prediction that the post-war problems will be even more so. If we do not lay a firm foundation for our post-war economy during the remaining days of the war we will be forced to take temporary and drastic steps to protect our domestic economy and preserve our type of government. There are three ways of financing this war and every other war. They are, first, taxation; second, borrowing; and third, inflation.

The question is asked, "How much should we try to raise by taxation?" The ideal way would be to levy taxes that would take care of our Federal expenditures as we make them. This would eliminate the problem of both borrowing and inflation. Of course, everyone realizes the futility of even considering the levying of taxes to meet present Federal expenditures. Our national economy could not stand it.

During the past few years we have been levying taxes that would take care of 30 to 40 percent of our Federal expenditures. Present indications are that we will be able to meet 50 percent of our Federal expenditures in the fiscal year 1944 by taxation. This, in my opinion, is not only a worthy achievement for our people, but demonstrates that they are willing to assume a heavy tax load in order to insure freedom and democracy.

The difference between the amount we secure through taxation and our Federal expenditures must be borrowed in order to balance the budget. Our national debt has been growing by leaps and bounds. The present national debt is $165,000,000,000. Present indications are that it will reach $210,000,000,000 by the end of the fiscal year June 30, 1944. The amount of money borrowed can be reduced by increasing our tax load and reducing Federal expenditures. The tax burden for the fiscal year 1944 will increase and there must be a reduction in expenditures.

The President in his Budget message for the fiscal year 1944 advised Congress that we would spend $106,000,000,000. Many of us believed that we could not possibly spend over $90,000,000,000 in the fiscal year. Recent daily Treasury statements indicate that we may not reach this figure. The War Department has already advised Congress that they expect to spend $13,000,000,000 less than the estimate in the Budget. No doubt the Navy will submit a reduction of four or five billion dollars in expenditures. Congress is going to insist on the paring to the bone of other items of Federal expenditures. They must be reduced. It is easier to save a dollar than to raise it by taxes.

Once a nation enters upon a spending program that shifts its production of goods and materials from consumer demand to production of instruments of war we become threatened with inflation. This has been true in every war and it is true at the present time. Inflation today is not only threatening—it is here. It constitutes a real problem. The Treasury Department has consistently urged that we greatly increase the tax burden of our citizens in order to mop up this inflationary spending money. They and other agencies have submitted estimates of the inflationary gap varying from a few billion dollars up to $60,000,000,000. I am distrustful of figures which presume to measure this gap with any approach to exactness. Using 1943 figures as a basis it is possible to develop estimates of an inflationary gap ranging all the way from fifteen to twenty billion dollars all the way down to zero, depending upon how liberal or conservative the data is estimated. In fact, I believe it is possible to produce figures showing a negative inflationary gap while using estimates that have all the appearance of being reasonable. My personal opinion is that the restrictive programs of the present administration are doing more to cause inflation than the consumers themselves. Instead of trying to increase consumers goods, such as food, clothing, oil, and gasoline, which would mop up excess purchasing power, the administration, through the O. P. A., is reducing the production of these commodities. With increased spending capacity we must have an outlet for consumer purchasing power. Consumers would rather spend a few cents additional per pound for food than have a rigid price-control program that will destroy production to the extent that no goods will be available.

REDUCE GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

The elimination of unnecessary Government expenditures offers the most direct and effective attack upon inflationary policies. Federal expenditures can and must be reduced. The Byrd committee has from time to time called these unnecessary expenditures to the attention of Congress and made suggestions for a reduction of them. The Truman committee has from time to time called attention to the enormous waste of Federal funds. Innumerable instances could be mentioned, but I am not going to take the time to do it. We are not only spending Federal taxpayers' money recklessly in our own Nation—we are reaching out to every section of the globe. It is my contention that there will be a general revolt among our people when the curtain which shields much of this waste and extravagance is lifted. The day of reckoning is coming and the retribution will be drastic. Just as a sample of what we are doing with the taxpayers' money I wish to call attention to the following news story which appeared in the press at the time we were holding hearings on

the proposed ten and a half billion dollar tax bill:

MONTEVIDEO, URUGUAY, October 23.—The Uruguayan Government announced acceptance today of a $500,000 gift from the United States Office of Coordination of Inter-American Affairs to be devoted to sanitation work and health measures.

It will be remembered that our own W. P. A. carried out a similar project in this country, much to the disgust and expense of our taxpayers. And now we are going to do the same thing in far-away Uruguay, carrying out the good-neighbor policy as it were. But this is only one of many instances of extravagance and wastefulness that this administration is practicing, and it is high time a stop was put to it.

NATIONAL DEBT

Borrowing is an integral important factor in our war financing. Unfortunately, we were using deficit financing to balance our Federal Budget for 10 years previous to our entry into World War No. 2. It was hard to arouse the country and Congress as to the danger of this method of financing our national expenditures. Every imaginable demand was made upon the Federal Government. As a Nation we conceived various boondoggling programs on which to spend borrowed money.

Harry Hopkins, close adviser to the White House, on the eve of a recent election, said, "We will spend and spend, tax and tax, and elect and elect." As a Nation we had swallowed the philosophy of the British monetary expert, Lord Keynes.

KEYNES THEORY

According to Lord Keynes, a nation can spend without limit, regardless of its income, wealth, or debt, so long as we merely owe the debt internally to ourselves. The process of paying it off involves only siphoning of money through taxation from one pocket to another. If the pockets were in the pants of the same individual there might be merit in this philosophy. Unfortunately, the pockets are quite often in the other man's pants.

Vice President WALLACE and other New Deal administrators, advise us we need have no fear as to our national solvency, regardless of astronomical indebtedness. They labor under the impression that we can borrow and borrow and spend and spend. Their philosophy is that national debt is not dangerous but respectable and possibly virtuous as we owe it to ourselves.

The national debt per capita on October 31, 1943, amounted to nearly $1,204, or an average of $4,816 for a family of four. During the month of October 1943, the per capita national debt increased approximately $48, while the increase for the year ending October 31, 1943, amounted to about $517. The highest peak the national debt reached during World War No. 1 was about $250 per capita, or $954 less than the present debt burden.

GROWTH OF FEDERAL DEBT

In 1910 the Federal debt of the United States was only $1,470,000,000. By 1920 the cost of the First World War had raised this debt to $24,298,000,000. During the 1920's, the debt was reduced steadily, falling to $16,185,000,000 by 1930. Then the depression years of the 1930's raised the debt to $43,000,000,000 in 1940.

On October 31, 1943, the cost of the Second World War had already lifted the national debt to $165,000,000,000. At the present rate of expenditures and current tax collections, it is estimated that by June 30, 1944, our national debt will have reached $210,000,000,000. Estimates for 1945 reach $300,000,000,000.

A national debt of $300,000,000,000 in 1945 will mean a per capita debt of approximately $2,222 for every man, woman, and child in the country. In brief, in the span of 35 years, our per capita debt will have risen from $12 to $2,222, despite an increase of 47 percent in our population in this period.

The carrying charge on this indebtedness at an average interest rate of between 2 and 3 percent places a heavy burden on every taxpayer. Production that will be needed for post-war economic reconstruction must carry this burden.

Through our present deficit financing, we are unconsciously but certainly shaping our post-war economy. We must, therefore, eliminate waste, unnecessary expenditures, demand rigid economy, and a strict accounting for every dollar spent.

Per capita share of the national debt, World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 as of Oct. 31, 1943

	Total national debt	National debt per capita
	Billions of dollars	
World War No. 1:		
Pre-World War No. 1 debt (Mar. 31, 1917)	1.3	$12
Highest World War No. 1 debt (Aug. 31, 1919)	26.6	250
Lowest post-World War No. 1 debt (Dec. 31, 1930)	16.0	130
World War No. 2:		
Pre-World War No. 2 debt (Nov. 30, 1941)	55.0	412
World War No. 2 debt 1 year ago (Oct. 31, 1942)	92.9	686
World War No. 2 debt 1 month ago (Sept. 30, 1943)	158.3	1,156
Present World War No. 2 debt (Oct. 31, 1943)	[1] 165.0	1,204

[1] Does not include guaranteed obligations of the Government agencies, which amounted to 4.1 billion dollars.

Source: The Chicago Journal of Commerce, Nov. 4, 1943.

COST OF OUR DEFENSE AND WAR PROGRAM

Fighting a global war requires expenditures of funds that are beyond the comprehension of finite minds.

World War No. 1 cost the United States around $32,000,000,000. By August 1943 the Congress of the United States had appropriated nearly $340,000,000,000 for the prosecution of World War No. 2. Commitments, which are made up largely of contracts awarded and the like, totaled around $230,000,000,000. The actual cash paid out by the United States Treasury for war purposes amounted to over $124,000,000,000.

Cost of the war program to the U. S. Government (Cumulative Totals) [1]

[Billions of dollars]

Year and month	Program [2]	Commitments [2]	Cash-expenditures [2]
1940:			
July	9.4	4.0	0.2
December	21.4	14.5	1.9
1941:			
June	38.1	29.2	6.7
December	77.7	52.8	15.8
1942:			
June	175.6	123.9	34.9
December	237.9	183.8	68.2
1943:			
June	275.8	223.5	110.0
July	339.9	250.3	116.8
August	339.7		124.3

[1] Survey of Current Business, June 1943, p. 29, and October 1943, p. S. 18, U. S. Department of Commerce.
[2] The war program includes the money appropriated by Congress. Commitments include contracts awarded and the like. Cash expenditures are the amount of disbursements by the U. S. Treasury.

WAR-BOND PURCHASES

Are the much publicized War-bond drives a failure? A thorough analysis of the War-bond purchases in the First, Second, and Third War Loan drives convinces me that they are successful only in the dollar value of bonds sold. Every issue has been oversubscribed and that should be proof that the drives were successful. A War-bond drive is not successful unless the individual citizen purchases a large portion of the bonds sold. As of October 7, 1943, we sold approximately $50,000,000,000 of War bonds in the three War-loan drives. The individual citizen bought only seven and one-half billion dollars of this total. Generally speaking, over 80 percent of the bonds sold in the three drives were purchased by insurance companies, mutual savings banks, State and local governments, other corporations and associations, dealers and brokers, United States Government agencies, trust funds, and commercial banks. The commercial banks bought $10,145,000,000 worth in the First and Second Loan drives. They were prohibited from making subscriptions in the Third Loan drive. They and other financial institutions loaned purchasers over $2,000,000,000 with which to buy bonds. Since September 15 the banks have cashed in for individuals or corporations $3,000,000,000 worth of War bonds. Bonds purchased by banks create new credit. These purchases are highly inflationary. This policy demonstrates the futility of increasing taxes to close the inflationary gap as long as we sell large sums of War bonds to commercial banks. The insurance companies and other corporations and agencies purchased approximately $30,000,000,000 in War bonds in the first three War-loan drives. These purchases are not inflationary, but they fail to reach the individual's excess purchasing power.

The Secretary of the Treasury has announced the month of January as the opening of the Fourth War Loan drive. The goal will be $14,000,000,000. On the basis of previous purchases the individual citizen will take $3,000,000,000 of the quota. It is time we face these facts.

The day of depending on movie actors, entertainers, and theatrical performers to put over our bond drives must end. We do not question the motives of these patriotic people who have given so generously of time and talent. The bond quota has been oversubscribed. Despite this fact, I contend they have failed. Our people need to be informed of the danger of the concentration of large holdings of bonds in our financial institutions. We need an educational campaign that will reach every citizen. He must be convinced that it is to his best interests and his children's best interests to own this share in his own Government. Our sacrificing and patriotic people can and will assume this obligation.

Sales of securities in the first 3 war loans by classes of investors

[In millions of dollars]

	First War Loan	Second War Loan	Third War Loan (incomplete) [1]
Nonbanking investors:			
Individuals, partnerships, and personal trust accounts	1,593	3,290	4,435
Insurance companies	1,699	2,408	2,604
Mutual savings banks	620	1,195	1,502
State and local governments	200	503	773
Other corporations and associations [2]	2,711	5,155	6,899
Dealers and brokers	769	544	890
U. S. Government agencies and trust funds	270	391	630
Commercial banks	5,087	5,058	----------
Total	12,947	18,543	17,733

[1] Sales reported through Oct. 5. Reports not yet in will raise the total by at least $1,000,000,000, mostly sales to individuals.

[2] Includes eleemosynary institutions.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded to nearest million and will not necessarily add to totals.

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Division of Research and Statistics. Oct. 7, 1943.

CONTRACT BROKERS

Our committee is making further efforts to eliminate those leeches on our taxpayers who render no service to our war effort, yet in the aggregate draw millions of dollars in fat commissions as war brokers. While our boys are giving their very all on the battle fronts—while our citizens are groaning under a heavy tax burden—we hear of calloused and unscrupulous individuals who are concerned only about commissions and brokerage fees. These despicable creatures must be removed from the backs of the taxpayers. The House Naval Affairs Committee made an investigation of the commission agents and war brokers on the procurement of Government business. Legislation was recommended by that able committee and approved by Congress. No doubt great improvement has resulted from this action. Despite present Federal statutes, rumors continue that the problem is still with us. Evidence indicates that various means and devices are being used to evade the provisions of our present statutes. Suggestions are made that these brokers are being carried on the pay rolls and on the basis of contingent fees in order to receive these unearned gains. A study of some of the individual cases makes one wonder how responsible manufacturers would be so gullible. The members of our committee were unanimous in making an effort to stop this reprehensible practice. We realize there are legitimate commission agents and brokers. It was not our intention to disrupt these necessary services. There is no doubt in my mind but what the committee wanted to reach this group of individuals who, either through political influence or friendship with the contractor, was receiving compensation in any form as a war broker. The language in the pending bill was drafted from the following crudely drawn but all-inclusive amendment that I offered. It is quoted here so as to give the intent of the committee:

Any amount paid by a contractor to a contract broker or an individual, partnership, or corporation, as a fee for securing the contract, whether paid directly by a retainer or otherwise, will not be considered as an allowable cost item for taxation or renegotiation. Authorized agents and brokers, recognized as such in the mercantile field, are exempt from this provision.

The language in the proposed bill continues existing law which lists war-contract brokers as subcontractors and makes them subject to renegotiation where the total amount received exceeds $25,000. The language in the proposed bill broadens and strengthens existing law. The following statement analyzes the new proposal and is found on page 38 of the report accompanying H. R. 3687:

Your committee continued the provisions of existing law as to war-contract brokers, who are subject to renegotiation if the aggregate of the amounts received by such broker for the fiscal year exceeds $25,000. This provision was further strengthened by disallowing as costs to the prime contractor any commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee paid or payable to any person for, or in connection with, the soliciting or securing by such person of a contract with a department, unless such person is a bona fide established commercial or selling agency maintained by the contractor for the purpose of securing business.

CURRENT TAX PAYMENTS

During the debate on the House resolution providing for the extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation several statements were made as to the inflationary effect of the Ruml plan. In the first place, the Ruml plan was never approved by Congress, and secondly, its approval would have been deflationary. There can be no doubt about that statement because current tax collections on a higher income than the previous year's base at the same rate siphons off a larger amount of money than would have been collected in the current year on the past year's lower tax liability. Congress passed the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943. It became effective as of July 1 of this year. The statement has been made that this act was 75 percent of the Ruml plan. That is not a correct statement, but, regardless of that, tax collections will be fully current by March 15, 1945.

Let us analyze the results of this action and see how inflationary the action of Congress was. If Congress had not approved the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943 we would have collected $9,800,000,000 in personal income taxes in 1943. This was the personal income-tax liability for the year 1942 payable in 1943 under the law previous to enactment of the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943. Under the Current Tax Payment Act we will collect approximately $15,000,000,000 in 1943 instead of $9,800,000,000 under the old method. In other words, we collect $5,000,000,000 more in taxes because of the passage of that act and the fact that taxes will be collected on current income at last year's rates. This $5,000,000,000 additional increase in tax collections for the year 1943 refute every statement and argument that collecting taxes currently is inflationary. Let no one be deceived by statements that the present method of collecting taxes as approved recently in Congress is inflationary. Following is a colloquy between Mr. Randolph Paul, General Counsel for the Treasury, and myself as found on page 179 of the hearings on the Revenue Act for 1943:

Mr. CARLSON. Now, Mr. Paul, can you tell me how much additional personal-income-tax revenue we are going to collect in fiscal year 1944 because of the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943?

Mr. PAUL. Roughly nearly $5,000,000,000.

Mr. CARLSON. That added to the $9,800,000,000 would be $14,800,000,000 that you should collect this fiscal year because we passed the Current Tax Payment Act?

Mr. PAUL. We are collecting this year on the basis of a higher level of income, Mr. Carlson.

Mr. CARLSON. I fully understand that, but this is collections. We are making $14,800,000,000?

Mr. PAUL. I think that our estimates of individual income-tax collections for the fiscal year 1944 are $17,900,000,000.

Mr. CARLSON. Well, $18,000,000,000, roughly speaking, maybe we can get together on that.

Mr. PAUL. That may be it.

Mr. CARLSON. That additional $5,000,000,000 we have picked up was no doubt very helpful in this drive to stop inflation; is that right?

Mr. PAUL. Surely. Nobody that I have heard of in the Treasury opposed current collections.

Mr. CARLSON. At no time did the Treasury have to issue any bonds because of the recently enacted Current Withholding Act?

Mr. PAUL. I said that in answer to Mr. GEARHART'S question.

RENEGOTIATION

The purpose of renegotiation is to prevent an individual or corporation from retaining unconscionable war profits. Theoretically, this is a commendable law because no patriotic American citizen wants anyone to get rich out of war profits. Practically, it has not prevented war profiteering and the making of war millionaires. It is true that it has recaptured the profits from individuals and corporations who have been engaged in war production. It has, however, had no effect on concerns not engaged directly in war work.

The hotels, department stores, liquor dealers, and so on, whose business has been and will continue to be accelerated

by the war far beyond the increased acceleration in war industry are not subject to the Renegotiation Act. The justification for enactment of the Renegotiation Act was the national defense and war emergency. Necessarily a great and immediate expansion of our war program was imperative regardless of cost of our orderly procurement.

Our war effort required the immediate manufacture of many items and weapons and most of this material was produced on a large-volume basis. Under these conditions cost ascertainment was most difficult to secure and the profits were difficult to determine. The result was the approval of the Renegotiation Act.

The procurement officials have now had 3 years' experience in the purchase of war materials since Pearl Harbor. It does not seem to me that they can justify the continuance of this act as a repricing statute. Procurement officials who cannot purchase standard commodities in the open market and through competitive bid without a Federal repricing statute should be removed. An effort is being made by the officials in charge to designate the Renegotiation Act as a repricing measure instead of a tax measure. Regardless of their statements and efforts this act must be considered as a tax measure. It deals directly with the return of money to the Federal Treasury, which should have been returned through taxation.

There are, of course, instances where the tax base of a corporation was such that the 90 percent excess profits tax law did not secure full and complete elimination of excess profits. This inequality in our tax law and the need for repricing of new types of war material not previously manufactured or produced is the only basis for the continuance of the act. It is a dangerous law. It takes the taxing authority away from the Federal Government and places it in the hands of an individual. The contracts are renegotiated under existing law, not by standards established by Congress in its tax laws, but by the will and whim of individuals appointed by agents of administrative branches of our Government. Truly it can be said this is un-American.

Mr. Maurice Karker, Chairman of the War Price Adjustment Board, testifying before the Ways and Means Committee on September 9, stated: "The renegotiation of war contracts is a dangerous and un-American statute," but later condoned it on the grounds that "we are in a dangerous and destructive situation." Representatives of the War Department, Navy Department, Maritime Commission, and other agencies authorized to renegotiate contracts appeared before our committee. There is no doubt but what they are honest, capable, and patriotic. They protested vigorously any charges by members of the committee that they had shown favoritism as between manufacturers or individuals, that they had used duress in any form to secure the signature of the contractor on renegotiation, that they had in no instance destroyed or damaged the corporate structure of any corporation, and that they had at all times given credit and encouragement to manufacturers in order that the manufacturers reduce and eliminate cost as far as possible. Despite these protestations of their conduct of the proceedings witness after witness appeared before our committee testifying to the contrary. I am reminded of the old adage, "Your actions speak so loud I cannot hear what you say."

Evidence clearly indicated that patriotic, capable Americans making an honest and invaluable contribution to the war effort on the home front were persecuted by individuals representing these agencies in the renegotiation of contracts.

With this background, the committee set about to revise and rewrite the Renegotiation Act. The results, I am sure, are not satisfactory. There were those in the committee who wanted to repeal the act immediately, then there were others who wanted to greatly expand the work and operations of the act. As one member of that committee I am convinced we have made great improvement in existing law. I do not expect to mention specifically the many changes that are proposed as they have been frankly discussed in the committee. I do want to mention one item that was approved by the committee and later removed on the insistence of officials in the various agencies dealing with renegotiation. In the new proposal we set forth seven factors found in section 403–A of the proposed bill, which factors must be taken into consideration in determining excessive profits. During the writing of the bill I offered an amendment adding the following words to (vii) section 403–A:

Potential financial burden to reconvert.

In the report of the committee you will find the following statement on page 36 at the conclusion of item 6:

Your committee believes that in computing excessive profits consideration should be given to the financial problems in connection with reconversion in applying factor (g).

Contractor after contractor appeared before our committee and testified that the renegotiation of their profits had removed funds needed for post-war conversion. Our manufacturers must build substantial reserves for post-war conversion if they are to immediately reconvert to post-war production and take care of our unemployment problem. The present policies of the renegotiating agencies in this regard are not only unfair to the manufacturers but they will prove disastrous to our future economic structure. In my opinion it will be much better for the manufacturers to retain a portion of existing profits for reconversion rather than open up the doors of the Federal Treasury for post-war reconversion loans.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY].

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself to title IV of this bill. I do so not because I expect to change any votes here this afternoon or have this title removed from the bill, but because I want to call to the attention of the Committee what has been done by the Committee on Ways and Means with reference to postage rates.

I have profound respect for every member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and I recognize the tremendous task they have had in trying to find ways and means to raise revenue.

Title IV is a tax on postage. Frankly, I do not think it comes within the purview of the Committee on Ways and Means to deal with postage rates. No hearings were held on this particular subject, and the Post Office Department was not consulted, nor were any of the thousands of small businesses throughout the United States who are to be severely hurt, particularly by the revision of third-class rates, nor were any of the charitable and educational organizations that depend upon third-class mail for the solicitation of funds for their work.

Title IV is based on the naive assumption that by raising the postage rates we are going to receive additional revenue. The history of postal rates shows that the contrary is true. Back in 1925 we revised the rates on postal cards from 1 to 2 cents on the assumption that we would obtain double the revenue. The fact is that we received less than half the revenue after the rates on postal cards were increased.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I have some figures here that may interest the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Out of a total estimated yield of $1,901,000,000 in excess revenues voted by the committee, postal rate changes are estimated to produce $175,000,000. In 1932, when postal volume and revenues dropped to $588,000,000, the Post Office Department suffered a deficit of $206,885,000. Agitation at that time for higher postal rates to save the taxpayers this expense was defeated by the argument that the deficit could only be wiped out by maintaining low rates and building up postal volume and revenues. Time has proven the soundness of that argument.

In 1942, with the same low rates existing in 1932, revenues had increased to $889,817,000 and the deficit was reduced to $11,825,000, a saving to taxpayers of $195,000,000. For the fiscal year 1943, revenues are estimated at the all-time high of $961,059,690, with an all-time low deficit of only $3,543,122, notwithstanding Postmaster General Walker's own statement that additional revenue amounting to $103,000,000 would have accrued to the service if all governmental departments and agencies had been required to pay postage on their free penalty mail as proposed under the Burch bill. With this additional revenue, the

service would have shown a profit of nearly $100,000,000.

These figures and experience speak for themselves and I respectfully direct them to the attention of every Member of the House. Low postal rates encourage mailings and produce larger volume, higher revenues, and higher profits. Higher rates discourage mailings, reduce volume and lower revenues, and create deficits.

Mr. HARTLEY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, even though he did take me off my feet very effectively.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; but he is making a good speech for the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HARTLEY. That is right, I agree.

The gentleman has mentioned penalty mail. I call attention to the fact that the committee report states that the Post Office Department is operating in the red If they did what they are supposed to do and took credit for penalty mail, they would show a profit of over $100,000,000. We Members of Congress are accused many times of being very rash in our use of the franking privilege. I wish to make a comparison to show you where the real cost of mailing exists. It is apparent from the following table:

Comparison of commercial-rate cost of franked mail (congressional) and penalty mail (Government departments) from fiscal year 1932 to 1943, inclusive

Fiscal year	Penalty mail	Franked mail
1932	$9,155,899	$778,436
1933	14,315,414	1,019,621
1934	23,094,882	775,785
1935	31,281,600	577,162
1936	32,236,269	751,579
1937	34,081,927	1,137,440
1938	35,690,807	779,254
1939	38,231,125	1,003,558
1940	41,533,510	1,217,346
1941	51,557,496	920,686
1942	71,924,122	766,839
1943	[1] 103,000,000	1,000,000

[1] Approximately.

The proposal to double the rates of postage on third-class mail matter is designed to raise $74,400,000. The proposal completely ignores the law of diminishing returns. The estimate of additional revenue is based upon the postage actually received from third-class mail matter in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942, aggregating $74,378,000. As a matter of fact, the postage for third-class mail matter for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943, was $10,000,000 less than in the fiscal year 1942. This decrease in postage is due to a number of factors, among them the shortage of paper and curtailment of use of paper by order of the War Production Board.

Generally speaking, the postage rate on a large volume of third-class mail matter is 12 cents per pound, subject to minimum charge of 1 cent per piece. Under the Ways and Means Committee proposal this rate would be 24 cents per pound with a minimum of 2 cents per piece, and on mailings of third class by mailers who mail only small quantities, the rate would be increased from 1½ cents for each 2 ounces to 3 cents for each 2 ounces, and subject to minimum of 3 cents per piece. It is obvious that the mailer of third-class matter in small quantities, who now pays 1½ cents per piece, cannot pay 3 cents per piece for unsealed circular matter.

For the large mailer of third-class mail matter in bulk, the rate of 24 tents per pound, or a minimum of 2 cents per piece, will likewise be forced to curtail tremendously the volume of mailings. Therefore, it is probable that the Post Office Department would not realize as much postage on third-class mail under the higher rates as it now receives at the lower rates. Furthermore, it is doubtful whether the Department would be able to reduce expenditures to any appreciable extent by virtue of the reduced mailings.

In 1925 the Post Office Department had some experience with higher rates than the present rates on third-class mail matter, and the higher rates resulted in a decrease in total postage received. The Post Office Department also had similar disastrous experience with the doubling of the penny postal card rate in 1925, when it was increased from 1 to 2 cents. The postage formerly received from penny postal cards almost entirely disappeared from the postal account books. In the fiscal years 1933 and 1934 the maximum wartime rate on second class was restored by amendment to the 1932 Revenue Act. The experience of the Post Office in this increase, which averaged approximately 25 percent increase over the existing rates, resulted in the Post Office Department actually receiving less revenue at the increased rates than it did at the lower rates. In all these cases of decreased revenues the Department was unable to make any tangible reduction in expenditures, and its deficit was greatest in those years when its receipts from postage under higher rates was less than ordinarily.

In contrast, the Post Office Department is now operating on rates that encourage the use of postal facilities and notwithstanding the fact that the Department rendered free services for the Government departments amounting to $154,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, the Department had an operating deficit, that is, cash deficit without any credits for such free services, of only $3,543,000, and for the 12 months period ended September 30, 1943, the Postmaster General anonunced that for the first time in the history of the Department the total cash receipts aggregated over $1,000,000,000, and that the Department had a cash operating profit of $12,000,000, notwithstanding no credit was taken for the enormous amount of free services rendered the other Government departments.

The Post Office Department has a monopoly on first-class mail matter. This is the only class of mail matter where the law of diminishing returns does not apply to the same extent as in the other classes of mail, for the simple reason that there can be no competition with the Post Office Department on the transmission of letters, whereas other classes of mail matter move by competing methods of transportation, or do not originate at all because postage rates or rates of transportation are too high.

The Post Office Department must of necessity maintain an enormous organization for the handling of first-class mail matter. The lower rates on other classes of mail matter, such as second, third, fourth class (parcel post), money orders, registry, insurance, c. o. d., are in the nature of fillers-in and rates generally in the past have been fixed for those classes on a basis which will encourage the use of the maximum facilities of the postal establishment. The results for the 12 months ended September 30, 1943, which enabled the Department to show a cash operating profit of $12,000,000 and at the same time render $154,000,000 worth of free services for the other Government departments, for which they received no credit, should convince all fair-minded persons who wish to look the facts squarely in the face that postal rates on classes other than first-class mail should not be tampered with or without a most careful study.

The following letters and wires foretell the inevitable result of this tax on the Postal Service:

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Hon. FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr.,
House Post Office Committee:

Respectfully urge immediate reconsideration of proposed increase in third-class postage rate. Our nonprofit religious organization publishes New Testament missals and official religious books required for military and civilian use. Armed forces have been supplied with 2,000,000 New Testaments, for which we supplied original plates without cost to Government Printing Office. Armed forces have also been supplied with millions of my military missals and my Sunday missals through the U. S. O. at less than actual cost. Over 600,000 soldiers received gift books donated by our members. Increased third-class postage rates would force us to abandon mailing to these members, who make it possible for us to continue this subsidized production of the most vitally needed religious books for servicemen and chaplains in the armed services and for morale building amongst civilians.

Rev. JOSEPH F. STEDMAN,
Confraternity of the Precious Blood.

BALTIMORE, MD., *November 12, 1943.*

FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr.,
House Post Office Committee,
Washington, D. C.:

Our foreign mission headquarters appeals by mail for funds for charitable missionary work. Propcsed increase on third-class postage rates will decrease the income to our missioners by $15,000 each year. This may force us to cease mailing appeals, thus hampering religious activities and taking from the Post Office Department the great sum which we now spend on postage. Please register our objection to increase in postage rates.

Rev. RALPH M. FONTAINE.

BALTIMORE, MD., *November 10, 1943.*

Representative FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr.,
House Post Office Committee,
Washington, D. C.:

The proposed increase in postage rates, especially on mail under 562, would be impossible burden on Holy Trinity Fathers through increasing our annual postage expenses by $30,000. We seek financial aid for missioners and students for priesthood through mail appeals. Increased rates will

cause us to suffer irreparable loss and result in complete elimination of our mail.

Rev. E. Cyprian Nusca,
Holy Trinity Fathers,
Park Heights Avenue, Pikesville, Md.

Toner Institute,
Pittsburgh, Pa., November 10, 1943.

Mr. Fred A. Hartley, Jr.,
House Post Office Committee,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: Our home for orphan boys is supported mainly by contributions solicited by mail. We object to Ways and Means Committee proposed increase in third-class postage rate, as it would deprive us of funds necessary to care for orphans. Under proposed rate our mailing may have to be discontinued, causing great loss to the Post Office each year.

Sincerely yours,

Rev. Regis P. Krah,
O. M. Cap., Director.

Peter Henderson & Co.,
New York, N. Y., November 11, 1943.

The Honorable Fred A. Hartley, Jr.,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: We know that you will give careful consideration to the recommendation of the House Ways and Means Committee to increase certain postage rates. Once you have studied all the facts, however, we are confident that you will decide against their recommendation.

First, there is the irrefutable fact that an increase in postage rates is followed by a sharp reduction in volume. Thus there is a decrease in revenue instead of an increase. To cite one example, when in 1917 the rate on penny post cards was increased to 2 cents, revenue from this class of mail immediately dropped from $20,000,000 to $10,000,000.

Second, the Postal Service is an essential service and should not be employed as a taxing medium. It plays a vital part in the daily life of the Nation, and it should not be classified as a luxury.

Third, the present postal rates are doing a good job in producing revenue. Postmaster General Walker has said that if all governmental departments and agencies were required to pay postage on their free penalty mail, the Department would have shown a profit of $100,000,000 in 1942.

Fourth, the proposed 3 percent tax on parcel post would be a discriminatory tax against the mail-order houses, and more particularly against the seed industry which does the bulk of its business with Victory gardeners through the mail. It would seem that this tax is also directed against the dwellers in rural communities, since it is obvious that the people living in the larger towns have much less occasion to purchase by mail.

Lower postal rates encourage mailings, and they produce larger volume and higher revenue. Higher postal rates will have a disastrous effect on business mail users, and bring less revenue to the government.

Very truly yours,

Peter Henderson & Co.,
Harry Candy, *President.*

Tanners Shoe Co.,
Boston, Mass., November 12, 1943.

Hon. Fred A. Hartley, Jr.,
House Post Office and Post Roads
Committee, Washington, D. C.

Sir: We desire to enter our protest against the proposed increase in the postal rates now being considered by the House Ways and Means Committee.

We feel that the Postal Service should not be used as a means of taxation. The proposed increases are so great that their purpose can only be the raising of money for other purposes, and not for the expense of the Post Office.

The rate increase would be an unfair discrimination against certain classes of businesses. For example, for 23 years we have shipped single pairs of shoes to the consumer by parcel post, c. o. d. The doubling of the c. o. d. and the increase of the money-order fee would raise the cost of our shoes about 25 cents per pair. The raising of these rates would not affect the mail-order houses who do not use c. o. d., as the parcel-post rates are not to be increased.

The rate increase is a step against the Government policy of holding the line on prices. By a large increase in postal rates, there would have to be a corresponding increase in prices. Many firms would have to request higher price ceilings for their goods, for these excessive proposed increases could not be absorbed with present ceilings.

Furthermore, these new rates might well result in an actual loss of revenue. For example, we would possibly abandon our traditional method of c. o. d. shipment in favor of prepaid parcel post, thus losing for the Post Office the present revenue they get from c. o. d. shipments. Many firms would turn away from the mails to other forms of distribution.

Therefore we object to the proposed increases as a form of taxation, as a discrimination against certain types of businesses in favor of others, as a cause of increase in ceiling prices on many items, and as an ill-advised plan which may result in a very slight increase in revenue due to a transfer of present Post Office volume to other means of distribution.

Respectfully yours,

L. Shapiro, *General Manager.*

Educators Association, Inc.,
New York, N. Y. November 9, 1943.

Representative Fred A. Hartley, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Representative: May we ask you to please vote against the increasing of postage rates from the present rates? A few of my reasons are as follows:

First, this will be a disappointment in the raising of revenue to pay Government expenses because people will just reduce the use of the mails. If I remember rightly, in 1917, when the mail rate on postal cards was doubled, the revenue was reduced about 50 percent. I think this holds true in all classes of mail with one exception and that is air mail, because I believe that people will pay 8 cents to send an air-mail letter, where it now only costs 6 cents. I believe all the other proposed classes of mail at the new rates will simply reduce tremendously the amount of postage used. For example, the increase in money orders will make it unprofitable to send money orders, and people will use bank checks in place of them.

Second, such an increase will cause a reduction in all classes of mail that are sent to our boys in the armed forces and in our judgment that would be a national calamity.

Third, such an increase will drive many mail-order houses out of business and thus automatically the revenue will be reduced. Our firm does not fall in that class.

Very cordially yours,

L. L. Tully.

The Hensley Co.,
Chicago, November 8, 1943.

Hon. Fred A. Hartley, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable Sir: The surest and quickest way for Congress to make the United States Postal Department an insolvent beggar in the family of Government agencies is to permit the Ways and Means Committee to raise postal rates.

That statement comes straight from the men who buy the stamps—the business firms—the large mailers of first- and third-class mail—the mailers who are now and who have been keeping the Post Office in the black.

Every large national mailer we have talked to (and the list of 9 of our customers account for some 50,000,000 pieces of mail matter each year) is unalterably opposed to this blighting legislation.

No one could possibly gain from it, not even the individual who mails a single letter a day to a soldier, sailor, or marine. And everyone who mails, or who receives mail, or who handles mail and delivers it to the Nation's post offices would lose. And this is why: Instead of doubling present postal receipts (as some gullibles seem to dream) it will indubitably cut the amount of mail matter in half, or worse. Just as that foolish raise of the 1-cent post-card rate to 2 cents back in 1917 cut the normal yearly revenue of $20,000,000 down to $10,000,000.

To sum up the aroused sentiment: The Nation's mailers do not want it. The recipients of mail do not want it. (They are all mailers themselves.) And we, who serve the users of mail, naturally do not want it.

It would kill the "goose that lays the golden egg" for the Post Office.

Therefore, we respectfully appeal to you to vote against this pernicious bill.

Respectfully,

The Hensley Co.,
A. J. Jolie, *President.*

Condon Bros., Seedsmen,
Rockford, Ill., November 15, 1943.

Hon. Congressman Fred A. Hartley, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My Dear Congressman: Recent press releases indicating radical increases in postal rates, particularly in the third-class division, would, if put into effect in full or part, practically put us out of business in a mail-order way.

We have been growing and distributing garden seed to the planters of the Nation through the mail-order medium for more than one-third of a century. Our catalog circulation is in excess of 2,000,000 copies. We hit the 4 corners of the Nation and render service to planters both on proper varieties to plant in their section, quantity of seed required for given acreage, complete cultural directions, as well as canning guide instructions for preserving their surplus products.

It is a well-known fact that this service enlarged the past 2 years by Victory garden movement, made a great contribution to the welfare of the Nation. There is no other means of reaching and serving this vast number of customers except through the mail-order division, made possible by good postal service and reasonable rates.

We recognize the necessity of higher taxes on business in order to properly finance the war to complete victory and a lasting peace, but at the same time, if you tax the means of getting business before the business is secured, such as would occur in an increased postal rate on third-class matter, seed catalogs and seed packages, the Government would wake up with diminishing returns the same as developed back in about 1917, when they increased the penny postal card rate from 1 to 2 cents.

We solicit your earnest support and cooperation in a spirit of justice to all that the present postal rates be and remain as they are for the time being.

Yours sincerely,

Condon Bros., Seedsmen,
By Leonard R. Condon,
Secretary and Treasurer.

THE WARD-STILSON CO.,
Anderson, Ind., November 11, 1943.

The Honorable FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr.,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Being a very heavy mail user, we are naturally very much concerned over the possibility of increased postal rates.

We would like to register our protest against such action for the following reason:

Increased postal rates as a means of taxation is economically unsound, as it will result in curtailment of the use of mails wherever possible, and this will at least partially defeat the revenue-raising purpose.

The item that gives us greatest concern is the proposed increase on c. o. d. packages. Doubling this rate as proposed would increase our postal cost something more than $5,000 a month on our average of 40,000 c. o. d. shipments per month. This increased expense cannot be passed along to the purchaser in the face of present price controls.

Such an increase in expense would seriously jeopardize our business.

We recognize the difficulty of the problem at hand and realize that you are doing everything possible to make an equitable distribution of the tax levies. We trust that it will be possible for you to find a more desirable and practical method and that postal rates will be continued without increases.

Respectfully yours,

THE WARD-STILSON CO.,
W. K. STILSON, *President.*

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., July 7, 1942.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have your letter of June 25, 1942, which suggests certain action on the part of the Post Office Department in respect of postage rates on second and third class mail matter. Careful consideration has been given to this letter, which informs me of a motion of the Committee on Ways and Means, and the request of the committee that the language of the motion be studied, and that I report as to the feasibility of the proposition therein expressed, and make such recommendations as may seem appropriate.

This proposition of the Committee on Ways and Means is as follows:

"SEC. —. The Postmaster General is hereby authorized and directed to prescribe after notice and hearings, but not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this act, regulations providing for such increases in the rates of postage applicable to mail matter of the second class (except free county matter) and mail matter of the third class as may be necessary in order that the revenues in the case of each such class and in the case of reasonable classifications within each such class will fairly approximate the costs and expenditures attributable thereto, and to amend such regulations, from time to time, to the extent necessary to carry out the purpose of this act. The rates of postage provided for in such regulations shall become effective, in lieu of the rates now provided by law, within such reasonable time after the promulgation of such regulations as the Postmaster General may provide therein. The regulations prescribed pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be published in the Federal Register."

May I at the outset say that I heartily approve your proposal that the Postmaster General be authorized and directed to conduct public hearings for the purpose of examining and studying postal rates and making recommendations to Congress with reference thereto. The proposal is the most important made in modern postal history. The need for this study is most urgent. I feel it is highly desirable that the hearings be conducted publicly. This is in the best interests of the Postal Establishment and the host of mail users as well. It should serve also to bring to the public a better understanding of the affairs of the Postal Service and should lead to a more clearly defined public policy.

I beg leave, however, to make the following recommendations to your committee:

1. That the proposed legislation direct that the study, hearings, and authority embrace all postage rates and rates for all services performed by the Postal Establishment;

2. That no time limit be prescribed for the fixing of rates but that the proposed legislation direct that the studies and hearings be begun promptly;

3. That the language of the proposed legislation be amended to require that postage rates and rates for postal services in cases, classes, and classifications within classes, wherein the Government has the monopoly, be fixed so as to fairly approximate the costs and expenditures respectively attributable thereto;

4. That the proposed legislation be amended to require that costs and expenditures be determined respectively attributable to all other cases, classes, and classifications within classes, wherein the Government does not have the monopoly, and that the rates therefor be fixed in the light of the general welfare and the public interest; and

5. That the legislation be amended so that regulations of the Postmaster General establishing a rate of postage or a rate for service be not effective until 60 days after the regulation fixing the rate is reported to both Houses of Congress.

At my first appearance before the Bureau of the Budget and the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee last year, I indicated that in my opinion there was a real necessity for a scientific study of costs and revenues, and an intelligent application of the results of the study to the postal business.

Few appreciate the magnitude or the vastness of the Postal Establishment. Few realize what an immense and involved business structure and service agency it has come to be. It is a business operated through more than 44,000 post offices. It employs more than 336,000 persons. It handles each year accountable cash, property, and stock of the value of more than $8,000,000,000. It is an intricate, involved, and complicated enterprise of immense detail and tremendous day-to-day operation. Its work is most exacting and requires the best in efficiency. This huge enterprise is operated with a main or headquarters office personnel of 1,317 persons. It is inspected, audited, and instructed in its workings by an inspection force of 750 men.

It is obvious that the important and exacting work of cost and revenue studies cannot be carried forward adequately with the limited departmental and inspection force available, for even now the staff is overburdened with the tremendous task of day-to-day operations.

These views, as I have said, were presented to the Bureau of the Budget and to the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee last year in connection with the 1943 estimates for the Postal Establishment, and again in the past few months in connection with the deficiency appropriation for 1942. The Congress sympathetically considered our management problems, and we were allowed, effective July 1, 1942, for the fiscal year 1943, $25,000 for budget and administrative planning, 4 minor executive places, and 27 minor clerical places for the departmental service, and 100 additional post-office inspectors. Our estimates for these requirements were substantially larger, and were based upon a peacetime postal service. Subsequently, the Congress allowed the recruitment of the additional post-office inspectors to begin April 1, and several weeks ago these inspectors completed their preliminary training, which starts them on their 3½-year course to become qualified post-office inspectors.

These recommendations to the Budget and the Appropriations Committee were made to care for a condition existing in the Department a year since. Before relief was granted, the war was upon us, and its coming brought new and greater problems to the establishment. Wartime postal security and conservation procedures had to be planned and placed in operation. Not only was it necessary to instruct and train the entire postal personnel in the application of these procedures, but we have the continual task of seeing to it that these procedures are followed and made more effective throughout the entire Postal Establishment.

In addition, the rubber shortage caused by the war has brought us the altogether new problem of finding ways and means and formulating plans for moving the mails over 3,236,000,000 tire-miles per year, notwithstanding curtailments of rubber supplies. Unless an adequate supply of rubber is made available, this will be a problem of readjustment of the first magnitude necessarily involving vast changes in routes, schedules, and mail-handling operations, not only during the war period, but requiring readjustments of comparable complexity after the war.

In addition to all this there have come tremendous demands for additional postal work and services from other departments and agencies of the Government to assist in the war effort.

For these reasons the Department cannot study and plan adequately for improvement and simplification of operation and management procedures, nor can it make the continuous and essentially scientific cost and revenue studies that must be made, nor can it plan sufficiently for the readjustments so necessary to meet the present daily changes in the postal business, in general business, and in the national economy during the wartime and in the time of peace to come.

Departmental hours have been increased; officials and the inspection force have extended their own hours to the utmost. But we have not been able thereby to obtain the management manpower necessary to perform even our daily tasks in the manner and with the thoughtful and deliberate consideration that all of us in the Postal Service recognize as absolutely essential.

With the encouragement we have received from Congress in recent months, and realizing the desire of Congress to see to it that the Postal Service is implemented sufficiently to conduct its affairs on a businesslike basis, I have in the meantime attempted, within the limits of available personnel, to make a start on certain phases of postal operations which are directly related to costs, revenues, and rates.

Postal business has been managed upon revenue and expenditure figures. It has seemed to me that the real guide for management is to be found in the volume and costs. I have felt for some time, as I indicated in the hearings before the Appropriations Committee last year and again in my annual report for the fiscal year 1941, that the peak of postal revenues would soon be reached and that postal work volume and costs would increase. In discussing general postal business with the Appropriations subcommittee last year before the inception of the war, I stated that I was very dubious of the general financial position of the postal establishment as then estimated for the fiscal year 1943, because costs were steadily mounting. I felt then, as I do now, that we should have more complete operation and cost data in order that significant changes in the trend of postal affairs might be brought promptly to the attention of the executive and legislative branches of the Government for necessary action.

In order to keep informed currently of the situation, in February of this year I instituted a system of monthly reports from 172 of the largest post offices to reflect promptly trends in postal business. While the reports are not conclusive and as yet do not contain the detail which I believe the Department should have continuously before it, I feel that these reports are accurately representative of the trends. On the basis of this information, the fiscal year 1942 as a whole will show an increase in revenues over the fiscal year 1941, and the actual postal deficit will be the smallest since 1926. The Department has definitely passed the peak of revenues, yet the work-load volume is steadily increasing and will continue to do so. In my opinion, there will be a substantial decline in postal revenues for the fiscal year 1943 and a substantial increase in work-load volume. This will cause expenditures to greatly exceed revenues and result in a substantial postal deficit.

To what extent, and to what amount in money this will be reflected, I am not yet in a position to approximate since this is an entirely new phase in postal history. Heretofore when there has been a decline in postal revenues, there has also been a decline in postal work-load volume, not actually corresponding but nevertheless rather parallel. The Department, therefore, more than ever before, needs to equip itself with operating, volume, and cost data.

To obtain and analyze these essential data and to begin promptly the necessary budget and administrative planning work on the effective date of the 1943 appropriation, I had in readiness certain plans which were put in effect July 1, 1942. I have established the Office of Budget and Administrative Planning and laid down a program of work for it. I have brought together under the Bureau of Accounts all the work of the Department in connection with reports and accounts affecting over-all operations and the ascertainment of costs.

Last year I started the work of surveying all mail handling and financial operations in the field in order that there might be available for the first time complete and factually accurate bases for the continuous improvement and simplification of postal operations, and for use in the analyses of factors of cost. The preliminary gathering of these data has been completed and graphic charts showing these field operations in detail have been furnished to departmental officials and the inspection force for study.

As a result of information obtained during this preliminary survey the Department has been able to eliminate and consolidate more reports and forms than in any like period in modern postal history. This has been possible without detracting in any way from the efficiency of operations and without dispensing with necessary financial and management data. By the discontinuance of one report form, the Postal Service has been saved each year the necessity of preparing and submitting 229,000 individual reports. By dispensing with one group of 22 reports, the work of preparing and verifying more than 47,000,000 entries in the field and reviewing them in the Department each year has been eliminated. By the abolition of one group of 8 reports, the Postal Establishment has not only saved the actual cost of 444,000 envelopes, but what is more important, it has eliminated the work of preparing the reports involved and the cost of addressing, handling, and distributing them each year.

In order that instructions for the guidance of the 44,000 post offices and the postal personnel be simplified, made uniform, and consistent, and so that instructions might be more economically and efficiently placed in effect by the postal personnel, I made certain changes in the Postal Bulletin effective March 15, 1942. It has been found possible not only to curtail the publication of the daily Postal Bulletin to three issues a week, but also to reduce the average number of pages published each month from 62 to 20. The cost of printing the Postal Bulletin during the months of April and May 1940 and 1941 averaged $8,500, whereas during April and May 1942 costs have been reduced to $4,450. This saving has been made notwithstanding the increase in per page printing cost of over 20 percent. By this curtailment and reduction of the Postal Bulletin, not only does the field continue to be as well informed, but there will be a saving of over 1,000,000 envelopes each year.

I cite these few examples merely for the purpose of demonstrating the possibilities of benefits and savings that may be had if and when sufficient manpower is available to scrutinize constantly procedures, reports, and forms from the standpont of efficiency and economy of operations. The Postal Establishment must constantly seek to simplify and improve its operations and methods so that greater efficiency and intelligent economy may result. Savings due to these efforts should be important and substantial in dollar amount.

However, these savings, in terms of percentage of total postal expenditures, are necessarily small. Economies in the Postal Establishment are confined to a narrow field. Of total annual postal expenditures of more than $800,000,000, approximately 75 cents of each dollar expended is paid out for the services of personnel in the field and 20 cents of each dollar is paid out for transportation of the mails. By reason of statutory limitations, requirements, and directions made over the years, permanent charges have been placed upon the Postal Establishment in these two classes of expenditures. These charges make it virtually impossible to flatly or arbitrarily cut expenditures—if the mail is to be moved with dispatch—if the facilities of the Postal Service are to remain available to the public, and if the postal organization is to be used by the Government to carry out national-policy programs. Thus the field of opportunity for working out economies is limited to the remaining 5 cents of the dollar expended.

There remains but one alternative in the field of economy and that is to restrict the type and kind of service that is in the very tradition of the United States Postal Service. A step in this direction would, of necessity, have as its effect the curtailment of deliveries and dispatches, would reduce the facilities of the Postal Service available for hire by the public, and would limit substantially the use of the postal organization by the Government in carrying out national-policy activities. Such a radical step would be contrary to the tradition of the Department and a drastic departure from the national policy pursued by our Government since the creation of the Postal Establishment.

Another and even larger factor in this relationship between revenues and expenditures is the work and service performed by the Postal Establishment for other governmental agencies. Other branches and agencies of the Government continue to rely more and more upon the postal organization to assist and implement their work. The free mail privilege for governmental agencies, and the provision for custodial and maintenance equipment and services for quarters located in post-office buildings and used by other Government agencies, are important and well-known services furnished by the establishment.

However, at no time in its modern-day history have so many services in such tremendous volume been expected of and required to be furnished by the Postal Establishment. Registration of aliens, reregistration of enemy aliens, rehandling of mail for censorship, establishment of postal facilities for more than 700 military units, free mail privilege for our armed forces, selling and accounting for 58,000,000 motor use tax stamps valued at $206,000,000, selling and accounting for 19,000,000 Defense-War Savings bonds valued at $958,000,000,[1] selling and accounting for 1,517,000,000 Defense-War Savings stamps valued at $310,000,000,[1] and dozens of other services added substantially to the postal work-load during the past year.

For the past year a serious effort has been made to obtain reimbursement from other agencies of the Government for this work. While the Department has had more success in obtaining reimbursement than heretofore, yet statutory restrictions and directions prevent reimbursement for many of these services. On the whole, the Postal Establishment is being reimbursed only a minor fraction of the expense incurred for these services. The performance of these services likewise has a distinct bearing upon the relationship of revenues and expenditures of the Postal Establishment, and upon the revenues derived from the various classes of mail and special services and the costs and expenditures attributable thereto.

Another and vital factor in these relationships has been the enormous changes occurring in our national economy due to the war effort. In modern postal history there have been no such great shifts of population and no great conversions of industry. Thus plans for field personnel, buildings, equipment, and transportation could be based upon the expectation of a rather predictable growth in population and business. True, business cycles had their effect upon the postal business, but this effect was almost solely limited to declining or increasing postal volume and postal receipts. Postal expenditures, to some extent, paralleled postal revenues, and it has been axiomatic in the Postal Service that declining revenues meant declining work volume.

In a period of business depression the adjustment of postal expenditures to revenues has never been easily managed. Beginning in the early thirties, the Postal Establishment had the experience and felt the effect of decreased postal income and volume, which dropped sharply with the decline in general business activity. The public curtailed the use of postal services and facilities; that meant less postal work load and volume, and obviously less expenditures for personnel and transportation were required to move the mails and provide the services. Executive and legislative action, though distasteful, became imperative. This adjustment between revenues and expenditures took many months and was climaxed by the payless furlough, affecting every employee in the Postal Service.

---

[1] During the last war the Postal Establishment was also utilized to sell Government securities of two kinds, 25-cent Thrift stamps and $5 War stamps. While the volume and amount of these sales were tremendous, they were, in a recent comparable period of this war, greatly exceeded.

Postal Establishment sale of Government securities

Securities sold	Dec. 1, 1917, to June 30, 1918	Dec. 1, 1941, to June 30, 1942	Percentage increase
Savings and War stamps	$386,920,504.03	$284,053,000	------
Savings bonds	----------	744,329,000	------
Total	386,920,504.03	1,028,382,000	165.52
Total number of individual securities sold	283,255,239	1,520,244,000	436.70

At this time the Postal Establishment has encountered no mere change in the business cycle. It is confronted by great, and at this time unpredictable, changes in the national economy, great shifts in population, great mobilization of military forces, and complete conversion of business to war industry. All previous gages, principles, and factors which have been useful in charting and forecasting the future of the operations of the Postal Establishment have become virtually valueless and meaningless.

To illustrate this, it now appears that during May 1942, at the 172 largest post offices which have usually accounted for 71 percent of total postal revenues, there was a decrease of $2,351,450, or 5.62 percent, in postal revenues and a decrease of 529,139, or 9.36 percent in the number of sacks of parcel post dispatched, compared with May 1941.

In the same period the number of domestic money orders issued increased 896,910, or 13.39 percent; the number of savings bonds sold increased 1,034,640, or 394 percent; the number of paid domestic registered articles increased 1,458,434, or 61.48 percent; the number of free domestic registered articles increased 425,547, or 61.88 percent; the number of special delivery articles delivered increased 577,523, or 9.4 percent; and the number of pouches of mail other than parcel post received and dispatched increased 196,909, or 7.5 percent. Thus, notwithstanding the sharp decline in postal revenues shown in these few offices, there was an increase of more than 4,500,000 in the number of transactions in the various postal services.

The expenditures at these 172 largest post offices for the month of May 1941 totaled $35,616,771.55, and for the month of May 1942 the expenditures of these offices were $37,149,672.83, an increase of $1,532,901.28, or 4.3 percent.

Business at the smaller offices differed substantially. During May 1942 stamp sales to the 28,000 fourth-class offices increased 6.15 percent over May 1941, and stamp sales to the 10,000 third-class offices increased 4.77 percent. During the same month the number of money orders paid at the 38,000 third- and fourth-class post offices increased 23.93 percent.

The usual relationships and trends between postal revenues, volume, and transactions, and as between classes of post offices, no longer exist.

The present dynamics of the national economy have and will continue to have a most important bearing upon the relation of the revenues derived from the various classes of mail and the special services, and the costs and expenditures attributable thereto.

The largest factor in this relationship between postal revenues and expenditures, as the proposal of your committee indicates, is postal rates—rates for service as well as for mail. My studies have brought me definitely to the conclusion that too little attention has been paid to the relationship that exists between postal rates on the one hand, and financial considerations and the public welfare on the other. Notwithstanding that postal rates and costs are involved and complex, it is in the public interest that they be understood more widely and more often subjected to public scrutiny.

In private business, costs have always been the principal consideration in fixing the rates or charges for the product. In postal business, public welfare has received serious consideration in the fixing of rates. It is proper that this policy should be continued in some measure. However, in fixing the postal rate structure consideration should be given to the factor of actual cost as well as to the public welfare. It seems to me that these considerations and factors have never been adequately integrated in postal rates.

It has been said that revenues from few classes of mail or postal services approximate the costs and expenditures attributable thereto—for instance, special delivery. A special delivery fee of 10 cents for a letter is fixed by statute. Another statute fixes a fee of 9 cents to be paid the special delivery messenger. The cost of the extra work involved in this transaction is not at all commensurate with the 1 cent which remains available to meet postal operating expense. If the special delivery message is to bear the costs and expenditures attributable to it, it should bear the cost of (1) printing the special delivery stamp; (2) sending the stamp to the post office for sale; (3) charging the stamp out to the window clerk for sale; (4) clerical time in selling the stamp and accounting for its purchase; (5) clerical time attributable to the handling of the stamp in and on the necessary accounting forms, records, and reports concerning the disposition of the stamp and its proceeds, and the attributable share of the cost of the yearly audit of the post office selling the stamp; (6) preferential handling of the special delivery letter from the place of collection through the post offices of dispatch, through the post office of receipt of the place of delivery; (7) clerical time attributable to the handling of the letter and recording it on forms, records, and reports at the post office of delivery, and the attributable share of the cost of the yearly inspection of the post office and facilities handling the special delivery letter, and (8) attributable share of the cost of supervision of the special delivery system. Last year more than 103,000,000 special deliveries were made and the volume is increasing.

An examination of the money-order system may cause one to reach the same conclusion, as the minimum fee of 6 cents fixed by statute is said not to be commensurate with the cost of the extra work involved in money-order transactions. Handling of a money order involves substantially more postal work than a special-delivery message. In the issuance of a money order, more than 15 separate entries must be made by the issuing clerk. Much special office equipment must be utilized. Last year more than 275,000,000 money orders were issued and paid. This makes 550,000,000 separate accounting and auditing transactions. Money-order volume is increasing.

Likewise, it may be said that third-class mail does not approximate the costs and expenditures attributable thereto. The basic statutory rate of postage on third-class matter is 1½ cents for each 2 ounces or fraction thereof (first-class nonlocal mail is 3 cents per ounce, or fraction thereof). For the 1½ cents, the Postal Service will deliver a 2-ounce item of printed matter to any postal patron anywhere in the United States. In the main, there is little difference in the expense involved in the transmission and delivery of a 2-ounce first-class letter, for which the Postal Service would receive 6 cents, and the 2-ounce piece of third-class matter for which the Postal Service receives 1½ cents, except that the third-class matter does not receive the same priority in handling. It does require a comparable amount of clerical work in connection with its collection, distribution, transportation, and delivery.

Thus, it may appear by these illustrations that the postal fees or rates charged do not meet the expense attributable to the service.

Many say that these services are in the public interest. The public must have an inexpensive method of quick communication—thus special delivery; others contend that business and private affairs require an economical means of security for the transmission of small sums of money—thus money orders; still others say that industry in order to develop and increase employment, must have a means of bringing its products directly to the attention of prospective purchasers at nominal rates—thus low third-class postage rates.

Surmounting these considerations is the actual but seemingly intangible contribution that the Postal Establishment by its service has made to the unity of the Nation through the dissemination of information and knowledge, and the more obvious aid it has been to the progress and growth of business and industry through its Nation-wide facilities for the transmission and safeguarding of communications and valuables at nominal cost to its patrons.

Services performed in the public welfare should not be rendered, however, with entire disregard of public cost.

It seems that postal costs have not as yet been measured scientifically. In the last 20 years great strides have been made in the techniques of time and cost studies and in the methods of cost accounting, but the Postal Service has not been equipped to keep its cost studies progressing in the light of improvements and gains in techniques. This tedious, exacting, and painstaking work is not to be accomplished without the expenditure of funds. Insufficient funds to properly carry out such work may be far worse than not doing the work at all, because fragmentary and indefinite figures which may result from insufficient analysis and study may be responsible for the drawing of factually incorrect conclusions. While the sample drawn for cost study may be appropriate, the lack of scientific and professional personnel to see to it that the sample is adequately controlled, tested, analyzed, and checked may result in wholly unjustified inferences and determinations being drawn from the data. Notwithstanding the inadequacy of funds for analytical work, the Department has made every effort to be as scientific as possible in its work of ascertaining costs. I believe, however, that the Postal Establishment has suffered and will now suffer even more because of its continued lack of facilities to establish, maintain, and improve its time and cost studies and analyses.

Expenditures for management personnel, which include departmental officials and employees and the inspection service, amount to but $0.006 of each dollar of postal expenditures. Included in that amount are the funds made available for all the departmental general administrative examination of accounts and reports of day-to-day operations as well as the amounts made available for departmental study and analysis of cost ascertainment data. These funds amount to $125,000 for the Bureau of Accounts and $35,000 for personnel services in the District of Columbia for cost ascertainment; a total of $160,000, or $0.00019 of each dollar of postal expenditures. The factual statement that the average yearly salary of the 81 officials and employees engaged in this work is $1,975 is a sufficient comment on the lack of importance that has been attached to this vital, exacting, scientific, and professional work.

Encouraged by the sympathetic interest displayed by the Congress in our management problems, I have combined all the over-all accounting, reports, and cost work in one bureau, effective July 1, and have laid down a plan of operations. By these means I have hope of improving this work. But it goes almost without saying that these preliminary steps will not alone solve the problem of insufficient manpower to do the job as it should be done.

The desirability of some method of cost accounting has been recognized for many years. In the fiscal year 1907-8 statistics were gathered and used to show comparisons of revenues and expenditures by classes of mail and special services, and the results of that study were published in the Annual Report of the Postmaster General for 1909. This was analyzed and carried forward with certain modifications by the Hughes Commis-

sion in 1911–12, but the conclusions were thrown into disarray almost immediately thereafter with the inauguration of the parcel post system on January 1, 1913.

The matter then remained in suspense until 1921, when the Joint Commission of Congress on Postal Service agreed that the Department undertake the work of obtaining more adequate information with respect to the cost of carrying and handling the several classes of mail matter and performing the special services. A comprehensive plan, embracing special instructions and forms, for gathering the data was then prepared with the collaboration of expert accountants employed by the Joint Commission and postal experts from the departmental and field services, but due to lack of funds the work was delayed.

The basic data were finally gathered during the period from September 21 to October 20, 1923, at 559 designated post offices of all classes and in representative lines and terminals in each division of the Railway Mail Service. The statistics thus obtained were applied to the audited revenues and expenditures of and for the fiscal year 1923, and the results were submitted to the Sixty-eighth Congress on December 2, 1924, as "a fair and reasonably accurate approximation of the relative revenues and expenditures applicable to the several classes of mail and special services."

As a consequence, the Congress passed the act of February 28, 1925, authorizing the continuance of the cost ascertainment, under which authority the statistical results have been reported each fiscal year beginning with 1926.

It is impossible for the Post Office Department and the General Accounting Office to maintain records of each individual item of revenue and expenditure according to every single class of mail and each special service by each particular rate. Therefore, the break-up of the audited revenues from the general sources and the audited expenditures from the various appropriations must depend in the main upon apportionments based upon as representative and as reliable data as possible. This, cost ascertainment has sought to accomplish by means of the procedure approved in 1924, on the basis of statistics and tests in a limited number of post offices at selected points during four 7-day statistical periods in the year, on the theory that the sample thus procured would be a cross-section of the postal business for the fiscal year.

The original 1924 cost ascertainment plan has been retained but so far as possible details have been modified from year to year to keep abreast of changes in classification, postal rates, and services. The scope of cost ascertainment has been broadened to embrace the comparison for certain subclasses and divisions of classes and also to show the number of pieces, weight, volume, and average haul of mail by classes, as well as the number of transactions in the special services. The purpose of the cost ascertainment is to credit as accurately as possible to each class of mail and each special service the revenue earned by it, and to charge each class of mail and each special service with its proper share of the expenditures.

No attempt is made to reflect such intangible factors as the relative priority of service, the relative intrinsic and economic values of the mails of the several classes, and the degrees of preferment in handling. For example, first-class mails are afforded safeguards in handling that are not accorded mails of the second and third classes, such as lock pouches in transportation and checking of receipt and dispatch of such pouches. They are also afforded the most expeditious handling in both offices of mailing and delivery and in transportation. Perishable and fragile matter are afforded special treatment in handling and transportation. Special delivery parcels and newspapers are afforded expeditious handling in transit over and above that accorded regular mails of the fourth and second classes. The cost of these priorities and preferments and the value of them to mailers are not reflected in cost ascertainment figures.

It is obvious that the present cost ascertainment methods and techniques are predicated upon the existence of reasonable uniformity in postal activity throughout the year. But we know that the usual static position in postal affairs is now a thing of the past. The great changes in our national economy, shifts in population, conversion of American business as we have known it to war industry, are producing and will continue to produce during the wartime and after the wartime such a dislocation of postal operations that determinations of costs on the existing bases will lead to factually incorrect conclusions.

The Postal Establishment looks forward to profound changes in the transportation of the mails as a direct result of the war. Even before the war new horizons came in view. The great growth in transportation of the mails by air, the successful experiments with air-mail pick-up service (wherein mail is picked up and discharged by planes traveling at high speeds, an operation recently adapted to military use) and the advancement in the technique of transportation by towed gliders have forecast the shape of things to come. After the war, the Nation will have vast numbers of highly trained and experienced pilots, navigators, and technicians, as well as an enormous supply of large and powerful transport planes. The Postal Establishment must be in a position, on behalf of the public, to take immediate advantage of these opportunities for better and more economical postal service which will be available almost immediately at the war's end. Mail handling equipment and facilities for the distribution and dispatch of mail, the location of terminals, and mail-handling operating methods must be planned so that these resources available to the Nation may be intelligently integrated in the Nation's Postal Service. There will be produced changes as revolutionary in the transportation and handling of the mails as came with the railroads. This is not a visionary prophecy, but it is the considered judgment of many thoughtful men of sound technical training and business experience.

Yet this is all the more reason why our cost and planning studies must be continued, improved, and made more scientific.

The proposal of your honorable committee not only requires adequate, dependable, and comprehensible cost figures, but it demands also a proper forecast of the effect of new rates upon the volume of postal business, as well as an appropriate evaluation of the large considerations of public policy and public welfare.

There has long been an historic policy of encouraging by low postal rates the dissemination of news and information; and the extent to which this policy has proved successful must not be minimized. Most careful consideration should be given to any change in rates which would seriously hamper the circulation of useful information or which would tend to dislocate business and industry. The public has been afforded low postal service rates for the general benefit of the Nation, and the extent to which these rates for the classes of mail and the special postal services and special facilities such as registry, money order, and the like have contributed to the growth and comfort, the culture and influence of the Nation and its democratic processes, must not be overlooked.

If rates for mail and postal services were fixed immediately on a basis commensurate with the existing estimates of cost, not only would such rates be established on a factually faulty basis, but they would dislocate the service and produce such entirely new conditions that new cost computations would be required to determine whether the new rates, under the new conditions, were approximating fairly the costs and expenditures attributable to the services rendered.

For example, the cost ascertainment report for the fiscal year 1941 indicates there was an excess of apportioned expenditures over revenues on second-class matter of about $84,000,000, based on revenues of $24,000,000 and apportioned expenditures of $108,000,000. It does not necessarily follow that by increasing second-class rates four and a half times that the total expenditure figure will be met, because it would be pure conjecture to assume that the volume of second-class matter that was in the mails in 1941 would find its way into the mails in 1943 at these increased rates. The probable effect would be to drive second-class matter out of the mails. It by no means follows that the elimination of second-class mail would work a saving of $108,000,000 in expenditures. This item might be eliminated in a statistical table, but the Postal Establishment's financial statement might then very well indicate that the $108,000,000 had been apportioned to the other classes remaining in the mails, leading to larger amounts in the statistical statement of the excess of apportioned expenditures over revenues, as well as reducing the actual postal revenues by $24,000,000.

The postal system established by the Constitution and under the laws of Congress must of necessity operate as a going concern. If no second-class matter were in the mails, it would not thereby eliminate a proportionate share of the departmental personnel, the inspection force, the clerks, the carriers, the laborers, the Railway Mail clerks, the rural carriers, rent, light, and fuel because it is not possible to eliminate that portion of the personnel, the equipment, the buildings, the mail cars, and the trucks of the Postal Establishment that are handling the work load of second-class matter. We have no post offices or parts of post offices designed, equipped, and maintained to handle second-class mail exclusively. We have no railway mail cars or motor vehicles exclusively devoted to second-class mail. We have no post-office clerks or carriers, village delivery carriers, star-route carriers, or mail messengers recruited, trained, and employed to handle nothing but second-class matter. The Postal System is not composed of mail and service expense compartments which can be automatically eliminated or flatly reduced by the curtailment of expenditures when losses of mail or services occur in a particular category or classification. This elimination might lighten the burden of the employees, but it is very doubtful that it would work any great saving in manpower. The efficiency and economy of the Postal System depend upon the continual maintenance of a high degree of integration of all services and operations.

It was in the light of all these problems and factors, which I have here attempted to discuss as briefly as possible, that I made the five recommendations which are set forth in the early part of this communication. The fact that the problems confronting the Postal Establishment are of great difficulty and complexity should not act as a deterrent to the proposal of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Irrespective of the ultimate decision of the Congress on the motion proposed by your committee, or on the recommendations I have made, it will be my policy, provided that the Congress authorizes the necessary expenditures, to implement and augment the work of cost ascertainment and cost analysis to the end that there should be continuing

scientific studies of postal rates for mail and services in order that the most dependable data obtainable be available for use by the Post Office Department and by Congress. Furthermore, it will be my policy to bring together in one place in the Postal Establishment all work incident to the proposing and fixing of rates for mail matter and postal services, and to so organize this work that evaluations based upon the data collected continually in cost ascertainment and cost studies will receive adequate consideration and scientific study in the determination or fixing of rates and classification of mail matter and services.

By the action of your committee in proposing a scientific study of rates to be developed publicly, I am encouraged in the work I have started in the Department, and I will continue on that program so that by the joint and cooperative action of the executive and legislative branches of the Government the public may be assured that the Postal Service will continue to be the finest service of its kind in the world.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANK C. WALKER,
Postmaster General.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 8, 1942.

Hon. FRANK C. WALKER,
Postmaster General, Post Office Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WALKER: In acknowledging receipt of your letter of July 7 with reference to postal rates, which was a reply to our letter of June 25, the Committee on Ways and Means desires to inform you that the letter was presented to the committee by the chairman this morning. Its contents were thoroughly discussed.

The committee recognizes the magnitude and importance of the subject but it also appreciates the fact that the question of bringing rates of postage in the second- and third-class mail matter more closely in line with the cost of handling such mail, has been the subject of consideration and discussion for the past 30 or 35 years. Certainly you realize that it is not a good business practice to permit these deficits to continue without some remedial action. In spite of past discussions, nothing has ever been done.

We find that in 1933, the President of the United States was given the authority to do the very thing that our committee desires to have done, but so far no move has been made in that direction. Now, while we are in the very uncomfortable position of trying to find much needed revenue for the support of our Government in these precarious times, we feel this is one place where a very large saving should be effected.

We are particularly pleased to note that you approve the principle of our proposal, but you do make some recommendations, which are not entirely clear to us, many of which are beyond the jurisdiction of our committee. Furthermore we recognize that jurisdiction on all postal matters, not involving revenue, lies in the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. We certainly have no desire to violate this jurisdiction. Therefore, we decided to eliminate the proposed section from the tax bill and assume that you will not permit this matter to lie dormant.

Copies of our original letter to you dated June 25, of your reply of July 7, and of this letter are being sent to the Honorable M. A. ROMJUE, chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, leaving to him such action as his committee deems appropriate.

By direction of the Committee on Ways and Means,

R. L. DOUGHTON, *Chairman.*

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

SUBSIDY TO DAIRY FARMERS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, in our consideration today of another tax bill, it seems to me vitally important that while and if we vote further taxes upon the people of this Nation, that the question of utmost possible economy in the various branches of the Government should receive the deepest study.

There comes to my mind in this connection an example of what I mean when I state that economy in government and taxation go hand in hand. In today's mail I have received a sight draft for dairy feed payment, constituting a producer subsidy of 4 cents per pound on butterfat from my small herd of Holstein cows in Minnesota.

I note in the letter accompanying the check that it is stated by a very good friend of mine, Mr. Frank Brandt, a leader in our A. A. A. work in Lincoln County, as follows: "Enclosed is your dairy subsidy check for the butterfat sold during the month of October."

I hold up here to your view the check in this particular instance and you will note that this requires the use of 8½" x 8½" paper, whereas it would seem that an ordinary check blank would do the purpose and save two-thirds of the amount of paper used.

I also present for your inspection two forms which this good friend of mine, acting in his capacity as head of the A. C. Q. in my home county, has sent to me for signature. I assume from this that similar blanks will go to every farmer making application for this producer's subsidy and these forms, as you will note, measure 8½"x15¼".

Mr. Chairman, in the first place our Government, in its profound wisdom, has clamped a virtual ceiling on butterfat through its roll-back subsidy to consumers, placed into effect last June. To dispute the statements of those who claimed that particular roll-back aided the farmer I have here my price statements for butterfat from my local creamery at Tyler which show that whereas in February I received 55 cents per pound for butterfat, that that was the highest price received during the past 7 months and that for October, 54 cents per pound was paid. I believe any sensible person will agree that this roll-back as applied to butter and put into effect last June has resulted in a virtual ceiling on this product of the farm—yes, to such an extent that production decrease became so alarming that our same Government has decided that the dairymen now need a subsidy in order that they can stay in business.

Just yesterday it was called to my attention that the production of butter in the State of Minnesota for the next 12 months in all probability will be 25 percent under the production in the same State for the past 12 months. So here I have this morning this new wrinkle, a 4-cent-per-pound subsidy for the production of the past month of butterfat from the herd of cows back in that great State.

First, let us take into account the fact that 2,000,000 farmers in the United States will probably receive similar checks and forms and will probably have to sign these two same forms that I am asked to sign in connection with receiving this particular subsidy. Imagine, if you can, 2,000,000 of these sets of documents which I hold in my hand and put out 12 months of the year, 24,000,000 sets in a year's time.

It would be interesting if some person would compute the tonnage of paper required to put out these particular forms. It would also be highly interesting if some such (mathematically inclined) person would compute the amount of clerical work necessary to give to myself and 2,000,000 other farmers 4 cents per pound or an equivalent subsidy on butterfat or dairy products. It would be very interesting to receive from the Post Office Department an estimate of the cost to that Department to transport these documents through the mails, postage free as they are.

How much simpler, Mr. Chairman, it would have been, and how much easier on the Treasury of the United States it would have been, if our Government, in its great wisdom, had permitted butterfat and dairy products to go to the point where the cost of production decrees that they should go and that point, in my opinion, should be approximately 10 cents per pound higher for butterfat than it is at present.

In that manner, Mr. Chairman, it would allow the farmer to receive full payment in the open market from the actual consumer of his product and it would not be necessary for the Treasury of the United States to eventually pay $3 at the very least in interest and principle for every dollar I receive as a dairy farmer in this line of producer's subsidy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] such time as he may require.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, in approaching the subject of the individual income tax, especially in the light of its present burden, two factors stood out in the minds of your committee members as having been imperfectly understood in most tax discussions. One factor was the weight of the unforgiven tax payable in 1944 and 1945, and the other, the weight of direct taxation on those with fixed or decreasing incomes.

In connection with the unforgiven burden, there can be no purpose in reviving the recent bitter controversy. Certain conclusions from that controversy are, however, undeniable. Whether or not taxpayers should set aside reserves for taxes, we recognized that they did not. Our choice was not simply whether or not taxpayers would pay as they went or pay a year behind, but we were forced to institute pay as you go or face large-scale default in the year of declining income. We felt that, while current payment was desirable, individuals should make some payment on top of their 1944

and 1945 tax to offset, at least partially, this forgiveness. Recognizing that, in virtually all cases, this payment would have to be out of current income, we set it as high as we thought could be borne in addition to current taxes. Thus the Congress adopted as much forgiveness as 75 percent in some instances, because it felt that many taxpayers did not have the capacity for paying more carry-over or doubling up, and that larger doubling up would involve defaults.

The second problem comes in connection with fixed incomes. There are many individuals who are actually making a substantial contribution to the war but whose income is fixed for any of a variety of reasons. In the face of rising prices these people are put at a serious disadvantage. There are many expenditures that they must make no matter what the level of prices or of incomes; these are expenses associated with the place in which they live; expenses associated with the living standards to which they have become accustomed; expenses associated with fixed obligations which they have contracted, such as mortgages or insurance policies.

We gave some attention to the problem of distinguishing between those with fixed and those with rising incomes. There seemed to be too great complications in attempting to place a tax directly on the increases in individual incomes. There would be difficulties in fixing a base period income; there would be numerous hardships where the base period was unusually low; hardships where the increase was associated with a move to a high-cost-of-living community. Above all there might be serious consequences where the tax on increases would interfere with incentive.

Many of the same difficulties arose in connection with a deduction for fixed incomes against a general increase in taxes. It would run into conflict with withholding and would add an insuperable problem of verifying returns.

I should like to talk to you a little while about the individual income tax proposals contained in the committee bill. As you know, one of the main features is the elimination of the Victory tax and its integration with the regular income tax by providing for a so-called minimum tax. To explain this integration properly, perhaps it would be well to trace briefly the history of the Victory tax and our present withholding system.

The Victory tax, when it was originally adopted in the Revenue Act of 1942, had two definite advantages: In the first place it afforded an opportunity to introduce into the income tax system at least a small measure of current tax payment for all taxpayers. At the time the withholding of the Victory tax was provided for it was hoped that as a result of experience under this tax, withholding could be extended to the regular income tax at some subsequent date. Another reason for adoption of the Victory tax was to reach the incomes of a large number of citizens who were below the income tax exemptions, but who nevertheless had some ability to pay income taxes, since in the case of a married person with four dependents, the income could reach nearly $3,000 before it was subject to regular Federal income tax. The Victory tax was levied on gross income before any deductions, except business expenses, and applied after the allowance of an exemption of $624, regardless of family status. Family status was given recognition not for the 5 percent gross Victory tax, but only for the net Victory tax after post-war credit.

The first withholding system was thereby made extremely simple for employers, as everyone was given the same exemption for withholding and the base of the tax was the wage received by the employee. At the same time, few adjustments were required at the end of the year for over-withholding or under-withholding.

Withholding of the Victory tax worked so well that we were encouraged, last spring, to attempt to provide for the withholding of the full liability of the first surtax bracket for all taxpayers. A method for doing this was established in the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943, which also provided for an abatement of a portion of 1942 or 1943 taxes in order to make taxpayers fully current through withholding and quarterly payments.

When the refinements of the income tax were thus introduced into the withholding system, the Victory tax, simple enough in itself, became an extra cog in the tax machinery. It required a different tax base from that used for the normal tax and surtax, and its special treatment of family status in connection with the post-war credit made it impossible to include the Victory tax in the tax table shown on the short-form income-tax return. Recently, a separate bill was originated in the Ways and Means Committee to eliminate those complications caused by the Victory tax post-war credit, which would in virtually all cases be taken currently. However, there still remained complications even under this improved Victory tax, and there was dissatisfaction with the use of a flat exemption for all persons, regardless of family statute, since some very poor families would have to pay the tax, no matter how many children had to be supported.

Now that we have, under the Current Tax Payment Act, a withholding system which collects currently the full basic tax from all wage and salary earners, and the method of quarterly payments for others, it is unnecessary to retain the complicated Victory tax, and it seemed highly desirable to devise a simpler method of reaching those taxpayers below the income-tax exemptions. In effect, the minimum tax replaces the Victory tax in the lowest income brackets, and provision has been made for family statute by modifying the previously used $624 exemption for all, to: $700 for married persons, $500 for single persons, and a credit for dependents equal to $100 each. The committee bill provides that the total income tax shall not be less than 3 percent of the net income in excess of these exemptions and credits. Under the improved Victory tax, the rates applied to the gross income in excess of $624 were: 3 percent in the case of a married person, and 3.75 percent in the case of a single person, reduced by 0.1 percent for each dependent.

For those who under present law were subject to the regular income tax as well as the Victory tax, an increase of four points in the normal tax rate, bringing that rate to a total of 10 percent, is substituted for the Victory tax. In addition the allowance of earned income credit is repealed, in order to avoid having to raise the normal tax rate still further to prevent a net loss in revenue; moreover, it was recognized that business taxes result in placing a double burden upon unearned income, constituting sufficient discrimination in favor of earned income.

Very slight adjustments were made in surtax rates in order to bring the total tax at various income levels as close as possible to the burden under present law. Reductions of one point each were made in the surtax brackets from $6,000 to $12,000, while increases of one, two, or three points were made in each bracket above $38,000. The increases above $38,000 were required because of the limitation on the post-war credit under the Victory tax, as a result of which some taxpayers were made to pay a net Victory tax nearly as high as 5 percent, a rate the repeal of which would not have been completely offset by an increase of 4 points in the normal tax rate.

Having done away, in the committee bill, with the Victory tax and its flat exemption, it was unnecessary to retain for withholding purposes the exemptions of $1,248 for married persons, $624 for single persons, and $312 credit for dependents, which are all divisible by 12, 24, 26, and 52, so that they may easily be adapted to various pay-roll periods. These so-called magic numbers were used to offset at least in part, any difficulties encountered by employers in instituting the withholding system. The exemptions have therefore been slightly revised in the committee bill to conform more closely to the exemptions actually allowed for income tax and minimum tax when filing the return. The annual exemptions used for withholding are still divisible by 12, and if the weekly exemptions are multiplied by 52, the results come very close to the correct annual figures. Exemptions for withholding are higher than those for the tax return in order to allow for deductions. Two sets of exemptions and credits for dependents are established—one for minimum tax and one for income tax, but the two taxes are integrated in the withholding table in such a manner that they are indistinguishable. Employers who wish to use the optional method of computing the tax for withholding purposes may be informed by the Treasury Department of the points where the income tax first starts to apply, so that they will not need to compute both taxes.

As there is virtually no change in income-tax burden under the committee bill, it was not necessary to depart from the present law withholding rates of 20 percent for the regular income tax, and

3 percent for those subject only to Victory tax. Under the committee bill, the 20-percent rate will be applied where the individual is subject to the income tax, while the 3-percent rate will be applied in the case of those individuals subject only to the minimum tax. The withholding table brackets have been made considerably narrower than they were in the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943, thereby reducing in large measure the amount of under-withholding or over-withholding arising out of the fact that wages for a given employee may not fall precisely at the midpoint of the bracket where the tax figure contained in the table was actually computed.

Several improvements have been made in the short-form income-tax return, the optional return to be used by persons having gross incomes of $3,000 and less, composed of wages, salaries, compensation for personal services, dividends, interest, or annuities. In the first place, the separate computations of Victory tax and credit taken currently have been eliminated. Second, provision has been made for the number of dependents in the income-tax table, thereby eliminating the deduction of the credit for dependents on the face of the return; third, the number of alternative headings for family status has been reduced in the short-form table from three to two. In computing the figures shown in the tax table contained in the bill, deductions of 6 percent have been allowed just as under present law.

For those using the long form of return, also, the separate computation of Victory tax and credit taken currently have been eliminated. The income tax base subject to normal tax and surtax has been made the same for practically all persons—all those not receiving partially tax-exempt interest. The computation of earned income credit has been eliminated. We believe these to be important steps toward simplification of the individual income tax.

By setting July 1 of the taxable year as the determination date for the family status of the taxpayer for the entire year the committee bill achieves a further simplification; under present law this date has been used only for purposes of the short-form return, making it necessary for users of the long form, whose status has changed during the year, to prorate exemptions and credits over the year. Hereafter July 1 will be used to determine the family status of all taxpayers for the entire taxable year, even for purposes of the declaration of estimated tax, and there will be no necessity for proration.

In order to achieve the simplification of the short-form return, it was necessary to require married persons filing separate returns, each to take a single person's exemption. The effect of this provision is to reduce the total married exemption for the regular income tax from $1,200 to $1,000, if the option of separate returns is chosen; on the other hand, the minimum tax exemption for a joint return would be $700, and for separate returns $1,000, an increase of $300 in the total exemption under the separate returns option. The effect of this provision will be, in general, to reduce, but not eliminate, the advantage gained by persons in the higher brackets through filing separate returns as distinguished from joint returns. In the lower income tax groups this provision will not always operate to the disadvantage of the taxpayer when filing separate returns, because, as was pointed out above, the total exemption for the minimum tax would be greater with separate returns than with a joint return.

Two further modifications were made with respect to individual income taxes. Heretofore certain excise taxes, those levied directly on the consumer, have been allowed as deductions in computing net income. Some of the more important ones were the admissions tax, the tax on communications, and the tax on transportation. As, under existing law, the factor determining whether a Federal excise tax is deductible is the manner in which it is levied, rather than the justification of the deduction, it results in some discrimination against those persons whose Federal excise taxes paid are heavily weighted by nondeductible taxes, such as those on tobacco, liquor, sporting goods, and so forth. In addition, under existing law the same dollar amount of deductible Federal excise taxes paid results in a tax saving which varies proportionately with the surtax bracket in which the taxpayer's highest segment of income falls; for example, $10 of deductible Federal excise taxes would result in a tax saving of 19 percent, or $1.90, to an individual in the first surtax bracket, but would amount to 85 percent, or $8.50, to an individual in the bracket from $100,000 to $150,000 of surtax net income.

These considerations, plus the fact that there was $140,000,000 of revenue to be gained, influenced the committee in deciding to include the provision which, in the future, will disallow the deduction of Federal excise taxes paid, except those which are business expenses.

It was brought to the attention of your committee that blind persons are, in most instances, required to make certain additional living expenditures as a result of their infirmity. For example, many of them must employ guides or readers or attendants. It was, therefore, agreed that a provision should be inserted in the committee bill to allow a special deduction of $500 to every blind taxpayer for purposes of computing his taxable net income. In many cases, this allowance would relieve blind persons of any tax whatsoever, and in other cases it would materially reduce the tax. The committee adopted for the definition of a blind person the language used by the Social Security Board for the purpose of carrying out title X of the Social Security Act, as amended, relating to grants to States for aid to the blind. The committee established July 1 of the taxable year as the date for determining the status of the taxpayer for the entire year for purposes of this special deduction.

Under the circumstances which faced the committee, some of which have been outlined, the committee proposals in regard to individual incomes should be accepted by the House although all the proposals may not meet with the approval of any Member.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP] 10 minutes.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I feel sure that the bill the Committee on Ways and Means has brought here represents as much careful thought and hard work as any revenue bill this House has considered in many years. Beginning its deliberations September 4 the committee has spent 11 weeks of tireless work, with daily and many night sessions, exploring all fields of revenue. While the bill does not provide for any great increase of national revenue, it does, in my opinion, provide all the increases necessary at this time, and all that our people can, under present circumstances, pay.

When the great expenditures for national defense began it was thought by many authorities that if our people could pay as much as one-third of the cost of this war as we went along, we would reach a goal that would be ideal from every economic standpoint, but the American people are doing that and more. We are today paying nearly one-half of the Government's war expenditures as we go, and the American taxpayer is bearing the heaviest tax load of any in the world.

It was suggested that taxes be increased at least ten and one-half billion dollars for the next fiscal year, and this suggestion was said to be based on two propositions: First, the great need of the Government for the additional money, and, second, the inflationary problem.

Let us consider the first proposition a moment. It was estimated on August 1 by the executive branch that 1944 Federal expenditures, excluding debt retirement and trust-fund disbursements, would total $104,000,000,000, $97,000,000,000 of same being war expenditures.

Since that time the War and Navy Departments estimate that they will return unused to the Treasury from $13,000,000,000 to $15,000,000,000 of this, leaving Government expenditures at about $90,000,000,000, of which $82,000,000,000 is for war purposes. This is, of course, the largest war expense of all times. A comparison with the war expenditures of other countries gives a better idea of it. It is estimated that the war expenditures of Great Britain in 1944 will be $23,000,000,000, and that of Canada $5,500,000,000. However, the American taxpayers will pay next year more than the total war expenditures of both Britain and Canada; in fact, the most conservative estimate is that they will pay over $40,000,000,000 in taxes, or one-half of our total war cost for the year.

Now as to the second proposition, the inflationary problem. A serious study of the many proposals brought here under the guise and in the name of preventing inflation will show that many of our economists are "straining at a gnat and

swallowing a camel". I would not minimize the danger of inflation. Of course we must do everything we can to close the inflationary gap, but the answer certainly does not lie in placing on our people an additional tax load of $10,500,000,000, a load that will be burdensome and cause suffering, when all the time that sum is only a fraction of the grand total of over $100,000,000,000 of accumulated savings in the hands of individuals in the form of War Savings bonds, cash surrender value of life insurance policies, savings deposits, demand deposits, and idle currency. This represents $60,000,000,000 excess buying power. If we can maintain in this country the psychology that will render our people free of the fear of inflation there will be no harmful inflation, and I believe this psychology can be best maintained by strict economy in governmental expenditures, by effective price control and rationing, and by control of wages—and not by burdensome taxes beyond the ability of many of our people to pay, and not by subsidies which must be paid by taxpayers.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, I believe, raises as much revenue as can reasonably be borne by our people at this time without unduly disturbing our economy.

As far as individual income tax is concerned we are approaching, if indeed we have not already approached, the point of diminished returns. Few of our people know or realize that in America today, under existing tax laws for the years 1944 and 1945, no person, no matter how large his or her income, will have left during these years, after the payment of Federal taxes as much as $24,000 net income per year. A man with $100,000 of net income will have to pay $76,591 Federal taxes, leaving him $23,408.14, and this tax increases from that figure of net income, until when we reach the man with a net income of $700,000 we find that his taxes consume all of his income. This burden of taxation on individuals has been increasing so rapidly that our people have hardly been able to adjust their budgets to it, and I think that it is wise for Congress to let them remain level for a while.

Corporate taxes are in a similar condition. It is recognized that the taxes which are now being imposed directly upon corporations, and indirectly upon the dividend income flowing to shareholders, are as high or higher than those imposed by the other Allied Nations.

It is of vital importance that our corporations be kept in sound financial condition, so that they may be able to convert to peacetime production and provide employment for men leaving the armed forces after the war.

The withholding tax coming out of the weekly and monthly wages of every wage earner and salaried person in America has brought home to them the mounting cost of Government expenditures. Every American now watches Government spending as never before. These people will rise and demand economy and they know that every saving in Government expenditures will lighten their tax burden.

"A penny saved is a penny earned." There is no need to raise more taxes if public economies are practiced.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. LUDLOW. I shall address my remarks solely to the postal provisions which are found on pages 88–91 of the print now before the Committee.

I am absolutely opposed to the increase in postage rates which are provided for in the tax bill. I think the provisions relating to postage should be stricken in toto from the bill. If it were not for the fact that the closed rule under which this bill comes before the House prevents the offering of amendments I would propose an amendment eliminating these provisions entirely. I hope that in the other legislative body, which operates slightly more democratically and where freedom of amendments is permitted, an amendment will be adopted striking all of these postal items. If that is done I will support the amendment when the bill returns to the House.

With all of the respect I have for the great Ways and Means Committee and the able and eminent chairman and members who compose it, I think it goes entirely outside of the field of legitimate and proper taxation and establishes a bad precedent when it undertakes to regulate postage rates. The Post Office Department is a great service institution and we should be careful to see that in its operations it is not hampered and hamstrung by laws that impair its service character. Postage rates should be levied on a basis of justice to patrons of the post office and should not be tied in with the fluctuating requirements of the Government in respect to revenue. That is the only sound procedure. If we look at a postage rate solely with an eye on the revenue we think it will squeeze out of taxpayers, the possibilities of crippling and destroying business and inflicting hardships on postal patrons are great indeed. I have no hesitancy in saying that the postage increases carried in this bill will either drive many businesses to the wall or cripple them considerably, besides inflicting undue hardships on individual users of the postal system.

I wish to submit as a primary proposition that the Postal Service is not a proper channel for taxation. I know that it has been so misused in some instances in the past, but that is no reason why we should continue and confirm a bad practice. It is understandable that the Ways and Means Committee in its proper and diligent search for every tax dollar should explore all prospects, but there are some fields it should not enter. This is one of them. Postage rates should be dealt with separately from taxation on the basis of the needs of the Postal Service and what is best for the patrons of that Service, and I think there is much argument to support the position that the subject should be handled legislatively by the regular legislative committee that is constituted to handle such questions, the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, of which the able gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH] is chairman.

The inadvisability of undertaking to make a revision of postage rates on a tax bill at this time becomes apparent when we are reminded that the Post Office Department now has that very matter under thorough consideration and investigation but has not had time to come to any conclusion thereon. The Appropriations Subcommittee of which I happen to be chairman, dealing with the Post Office Department appropriations, took cognizance of this situation and in the post office appropriation bill for the current fiscal year there was set up a cost ascertainment unit which will enable the Postmaster General to find out what it costs to handle each class of mail and to determine accurately and scientifically the profit on some classes of mail and the losses on other classes, the amount of increase of postage certain classes can be expected to stand without injustice to patrons and without incurring the risk of diminishing volume which might defeat the purpose of any increase. All of this information, accurately and scientifically ascertained and determined, is essential as a basis for any postage increase that will be anything more than a haphazard guess in the dark inspired by a desire to reach out and grasp something to tax. The cost ascertainment I speak of is something the Postmaster General has long yearned for. He has repeatedly lamented that although he is at the head of the largest business establishment in the world he has no idea what the actual cost is of handling the various classes of mail which either produce net income or drag down the net revenues of that establishment. Pursuant to the authorization which we gave him in our bill he has created his cost ascertainment unit and has called to his service in directing the investigation two of the most eminent cost experts in the country, Charles A. Heiss, comptroller, and Allan B. Crunden, assistant comptroller, of the American Telegraph & Telephone Co. Mr. Heiss and Mr. Crunden came to Washington early in this fiscal year and organized a staff of high efficiency which is now in the midst of investigating and developing the facts on which it will be possible to make a sound revision of the postal rates.

I submit that it would be a common sense viewpoint of this matter and a wiser procedure to allow that cost ascertainment unit to function and to develop its findings before we undertake to fix postage rates blindly on a tax bill without having any dependable idea of the effect of what we are doing. I hope that the able chairman and members of the Ways and Means Committee will consider the facts I have presented about the unit that is already functioning in the Post Office Department in respect to a revision of postal rates and that before this tax bill gets through Congress the provisions increasing postage rates will be stricken out, so that later when we have before us all of the factors of profit and

loss, and the probable effects of changing rates on volume, we may be able to revise the postage rates in a more logical and satisfactory way.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I would like to compliment the gentleman on his speech. I am a member of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee. I, too, am opposed to any increase in postal rates.

Mr. LUDLOW. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. BREHM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. If I have time, I yield.

Mr. BREHM. I would like to compliment the gentleman upon his remarks, and I regret that the rule under which the bill was brought before us prevents him from offering an amendment as he suggested. I would consider it a pleasure to vote for such an amendment.

Mr. LUDLOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I desire to observe that the Post Office Department is at the present time in the black for the first time in many years, in spite of all this penalty mail and Government pamphlets that they have to carry to the various parts of the United States and its possessions.

Mr. LUDLOW. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The Post Office Department made $1,300,000 in the fiscal year 1943, over and above all expenses put together. It is in the black to the extent of $1,300,000.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. For the first time in many years.

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I, too, would like to be able to vote to strike title 4 from this bill.

Mr. LUDLOW. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I wish to voice my opposition to an increase in taxes on theater tickets and first-class postage. In my opinion this phase of the proposed bill will bring less, not more, money into the tax tills. Why do I say that? I have been bombarded with letters from my district from the theater people saying higher admission price will decrease attendance at theaters to the point where it will not mean any more Federal revenue than is now derived from this source. I think we should lend an ear to their views in this matter. Theater men have certainly done their part in the war effort from the standpoint of morale, public education, and War bond drives. And school children are another angle to consider. They make up a larger part of the theater patronage and their limited funds could not stand an increase in admission. I trust your Committee will agree to an amendment to place the tax on show tickets back to its present rate and give the show-going folk and the show people a chance to continue with their good work.

Now, about an increase in postage. I do not believe this should be saddled on the backs of the businessmen and patrons. I sensed when the Ruml plan was before us earlier in the session that such a tax bill as H. R. 3687 would be in the offing and so here it is. I consider this bill a mere plug to raise a portion of your liberal forgiveness of $10,000,000,000 to those who have made their big profits primarily out of war contracts—to shift the burden from the superrich to the average and underprivileged taxpayer. I did not vote for the Ruml tax plan and I cannot vote for this bill.

Time does not permit me to discuss the many objections I have to this measure, but upon the subject of the increase in picture-show tickets and postage rates I have tried to make myself clear.

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include one wire and three letters.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has permission to revise and extend his own remarks, but to include extraneous matter he must get permission from the House.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to state to Members of the House that postal rates should not be used for purposes of taxation. We all recognize the very difficult problem and the grave responsibilities confronting Members of Congress in producing a tax program that will provide the tremendous revenues necessary to meet needs of the Government. We in the Congress are charged with the responsibility of determining how these revenues are to be raised and where the taxes are to be applied.

In reaching such decisions I believe that Congress must and will take into consideration the maintenance and welfare of the various parts of our economic life that will be vitally affected by these taxes. Legislation, unless carefully considered, can destroy overnight businesses that in many instances have taken a lifetime to build.

We all realize that additional revenues must be secured; however, there can be no justification for the Committee to vote its approval of postal-rate increases without careful consideration, and give those vitally affected an opportunity to present their views to protect their interests and investments they have made.

I would like to know if the postal authorities have been consulted or if a careful study of existing rates or of the experiences of the past served as a basis for rates now proposed. I am of the opinion we should proceed more cautiously.

NEW PROCESS CO.,
Warren, Pa., November 4, 1943.

Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GAVIN: No doubt you are aware that in a direct mail-order business, of which there are a great many in the United States, the item of postage used in circularization looms as about the largest item of expense. The volume of business obtained depends on the number of individual circulars sent out, and the number of circulars that can be mailed with profitable results depends on the responsiveness of various lists of names. Obviously, when the cost of third-class postage goes up the number of names that can profitably be circularized goes down, and if the rates are doubled for this class of postage, as now proposed, the amount of circularization of this kind will necessarily become but a fraction of what it is now, since it will be possible to circularize without loss only the most responsive lists. This will result in tremendous loss of business for us and other direct mail-order concerns. Facilities built up to handle a large volume of business with efficiency will be largely idle, though carrying charges will continue, and employment of white-collar people who are for the most part not eligible for employment in war industries will decline precipitately here in Warren, for example, where the part these employees play in the prosperity of the local economy need not be pointed out to you.

And what will the Government gain from the proposed doubling of third-class rates—specifically, bulk rates, under section 562, Postal Laws and Regulations (with which we are primarily concerned)? The answer, to the best of our belief, is "little or nothing," since it is quite obvious that reduction in the volume of circularizing forced on us and others by the unconscionable boost in rates would drastically curtail postal revenues from this source. The only results would be harm to concerns like us, our employees, printers, other suppliers of all kinds, our local merchants, who depend upon our hundreds of employees for patronage, together with no advantage to the Government.

We have recited the facts above in the hope and belief that they will aid you in doing all in your power to combat the proposed increase, or rather doubling of third-class postal rates, including (most important from our standpoint) bulk rates under section 562, Postal Laws and Regulations. * * *

Respectfully,

NEW PROCESS CO.,
JOHN L. BLAIR,
President.
HAROLD C. PUTNAM,
Treasurer.

LANCASTER, PA., *November 22, 1943.*

Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

New tax bill (H. R. 3687) with its proposed doubling of third-class rates, would put us completely out of business. Last year our third-class postage cost us $46,256.71, doubling this amount under new proposed bill would be confiscatory taxation for our business. Your support of motion to recommit tax bill with a view to having postal section transferred to the House Post Office and Post Roads Committee urgently requested.

WILLIAM A. FREW,
President, Lancaster County Seed Co.

THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF PRINTING HOUSE CRAFTSMEN, INC.,
November 20, 1943.

Hon LEON H. GAVIN,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR:

* * * * *

1. Higher third-class rates will penalize small and medium-sized businesses, which are the largest users of third-class mail. The increased rates will seriously impair, or even destroy, one of the most economic methods of getting business, especially now when there is a shortage of manpower, gasoline, and tires.

2. With larger businesses, the added operating expenses which will be incurred through increased postal rates will come out of excess-profits taxes, in effect taking money from one Government pocket and putting it into another.

3. Businesses operating under price ceilings have no way of recovering the additional expense forced upon them.

4. The Postal Service is an essential service and a public utility, and should not be classed as a luxury along with cosmetics, liquor, and cigars. Also, the Postal Service is not a proper channel for taxation.

5. Higher rates will reduce postal revenues instead of increasing them. Experience has shown that whenever postal rates are increased, volume falls to such an extent that revenues are less under the higher rates than they were under the lower. I cite the following proof:

a. In 1917 the penny postcard rate was increased to 2 cents. Prior to the increase the Post Office Department had been receiving an average annual revenue of $20,000,000 from this source. After the increase became effective the revenue dropped to $10,000,000 a year, not only failing to produce the expected revenue increase, but even resulting in revenues being cut in half.

b. When in 1932 the Department increased the first-class letter rate from 2 to 3 cents, volume dropped from 4,000,000,000 to 2,000,000,000 pieces annually, the revenue decreased. It required 10 years to restore local first-class volume to its 1932 figure.

Very sincerely,
DOUGLAS C. MCMURTRIE.

ORAL HYGIENE PUBLICATIONS,
Pittsburgh, Pa., November 9, 1943.

Hon. LEON H. GAVIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Through the newspapers, we have learned that the House Ways and Means Committee's proposal to increase postal rates includes the doubling of third class rates. As publishers of so-called controlled-circulation magazines for the dental profession and the dental trade, we are large users of this postage classification. We pay the already high rate of 8 cents per pound.

For the first 9 months of this year our third class postage bill for the mailing of our magazines alone—not including our other expenditures for postage—totals $19,225. At this rate, our expenditure for the year will be in excess of $25,500.

If the rate is doubled, it can result in confiscation of our 33-year-old business, since the additional $25,000 represents nearly 10 percent of our gross volume—a much higher percentage than any net profit we can earn.

Obviously, many other magazine publishers are faced with a similar disaster if the third class rate is increased substantially, let alone being doubled. Moreover, the readers of magazines so affected, and the manufacturers who use them as advertising media, would be deprived of publications upon which they depend.

In my opinion, the proposed increase of third class rates would fail to produce any increase in the Government's revenue. If publisher's current profits are turned into losses, and if some publishers are driven out of business, the present high taxes we are paying would no longer be forthcoming.

Yours sincerely,
M. B. MASSOL, *President.*

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWE].

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill because of the provision in it which arbitrarily increases the third-class mail rates.

Many publications which are of great educational value use this class of mail for distribution. These publications are not chiefly advertising mediums. They render a distinct service and it is quite possible that their distribution will be seriously reduced in the future. If this provision remains in the bill and finally becomes law, a group of publishers in this country will be singled out to pay a disproportionate share of the tax sought to be raised under this bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARNOLD].

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, the proposed increase in taxes on telephones will necessitate the discontinuance of telephone service in numerous farm and rural homes.

Mr. Chairman, the telephone is a necessity; it is not a luxury. The telephone industry has been classified by the War Manpower Commission as one of the 35 most essential to the prosecution of the war.

Local telephone service is essential to the domestic and business life of every community. It is vital to the national welfare.

The independent telephone companies of the country operate in about 12,000 of the 18,000 communities that enjoy telephone service.

This independent-company service includes more than 4,000,000 telephones, or about one-fifth of the total telephones in the United States.

More than 80 percent of these 4,000,000 telephones are in residences.

One million telephones are in rural homes, serving farmers.

Dwindling gasoline and tire supplies make the telephone all the more essential to farmers.

Without the telephone the farmer would not only be handicapped in farm operations, necessitating frequent contacts with neighbors and business people in town, the health and safety of his family would be jeopardized for want of ready communication with the family physician.

The proposed increases in taxes on telephones is confiscatory. It will necessitate the discontinuance of telephone service in numerous farm and rural-town homes.

The tax is discriminatory. It is more in the nature of a selective sales tax than an excise.

The tax is an increased and unnecessary burden upon already overburdened local, independent telephone businesses. While the tax is paid by the subscriber, the telephone company is responsible for its collection. The job of serving as tax collector, computing, collecting, recording, and remitting grows more onerous all the time.

Telephone companies are experiencing an acute shortage of manpower. It was testified before the House committee that the turn-over of female help is almost 400 percent in some offices, and that if 12 girls were hired on Friday, only 5 would show up on Monday.

While the expense of collecting the tax is not available for the more than 6,400 independent telephone companies in the country, if figures were available they would show a sizable amount which these companies have to spend to do the collecting and remitting of taxes. Such costs, of course, become a part of the operating expenses which are ultimately paid by the telephone users, and thus constitute a further tax increase.

There are something over 6,400 independent telephone companies in the United States. These have been classified into four groups, as follows:

A. Those having an annual operating revenue in excess of $100,000.

B. Those ranging from $50,000 to $100,000.

C. Those ranging from $25,000 to $50,000.

D. Those having less than $25,000 annual operating revenue.

In groups A and B together there are something over 200 companies. Groups C and D, therefore, represent about 6,200 companies, and these are typical of small business enterprise about which there has been so much said and so little done.

These 6,200 companies have a total of 2,383,614 telephones, or an average of 384 telephones per company. In other words, the typical independent small rural telephone company has an annual operating revenue of less than $50,000, and an average subscriber list of 384 telephones.

Mr. Chairman, it would seem that in all fairness, and in proportion to ability to meet the costs of the tax burden and continue in business, the small independent rural telephone company with a subscriber list of less than 850 telephones should be exempted from further tax increases above those at present in force.

The failure of small business concerns is a calamity which our country cannot afford to let come to pass. To give small independent telephone companies a push toward failure by congressional act is unthinkable. And yet that is what we will be doing if we approve these tax increases.

In this matter, the Congress has a great opportunity to protect small business enterprise, as it impliedly committed itself to do in the appointment of both Senate and House committees on small business. These committees have evidently been very active. I am informed that their annual expenditures for all their operations, including travel, investigation, clerical help, etc., have been, for Senate and House committees, respectively, $57,445.22 and $47,500, or a total of approximately $105,000 for a year of investigation of small business problems and conditions. Here we have an opportunity to make to the taxpayers

some return for all this money of theirs which has been so spent.

Mr. Chairman, the results of the proposed increases in taxes on telephones is well set forth in a letter and a telegram which I recently received from the presidents of two of these small companies located in the First Congressional District of Missouri, which I include herein as follows:

FARMERS TELEPHONE CO.,
Milan, Mo., November 11, 1943.

Hon. WAT ARNOLD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are a small corporation protesting against higher taxes on the telephone industry.

Congress has picked communications out of the rest of the utility family for a tax burden in the revenue law enacted in 1941. This resulted in a 6-percent monthly tax on local exchange service, which was increased to 10 percent last year.

We accepted this tax cheerfully and have cheerfully acted as a tax-collecting agency for the Government. Now comes a proposed raise in this tax.

As you probably know—coming from this part of the country—that a large percentage of rural and small-town telephone users keep their phones mainly because they have sons or other relatives in the armed forces and feel that they must have their telephones.

However, many have told me that if taxes on telephone services are increased again they will be forced to discontinue their telephones, and that if this 15- to 20-cent increase goes into effect there is nothing else for them to do.

We feel that this proposed increase is a selective tax and a discrimination, and is unfair to the industry and, in addition, it will weaken the morale of the rural and small-town people, who cannot afford telephones.

In large cities and large corporations this might work out, but small corporations are already tax burdened almost beyond our capacity to pay and still keep our service up to the standard we wish to have.

We maintain that a telephone in rural communities is a necessity and not a semi-luxury.

I am writing to you, whom I feel understand conditions here, so that you can in our behalf protest to the members of the Ways and Means Committee.

We hope you will be able to help us.

Sincerely,

VENNIE G. LOVE,
President.

GALLATIN, MO., *November 20, 1943.*

Hon. WAT ARNOLD,
Congressman, First District,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Please protect us from an increase in the selective sales tax on the telephone service of our Daviess and De Kalb County subscribers, of which approximately 85 percent are farmers. This service is not a luxury but a necessity with dwindling gasoline and tire supplies. With your knowledge of these rural communities you know 15-percent tax on telephone service is confiscatory. Anything you can do to block this tax increase will be greatly appreciated.

JOE M. ROBERTS,
President Inter-County Telephone Co.

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I shall address myself to two phases of the bill, or at least, two phases of the discussion this afternoon which have to do with the appropriations in which the War Department Appropriations Subcommittee is interested. That is as to the savings under this $13,000,000,000 that was reported the other day and as to the renegotiation features of the bill.

Already this afternoon during the remarks made by others, there has been some discussion of this $13,000,000,000 and its relation to the fiscal burdens of the Government. Because of limited time I am only going to refer to that at this time to say that the true credit, the real credit for the saving of that $13,000,000,000 should go to the boys in Australia, in Alaska, in Africa, in Italy, in Sicily, and on the high seas, who are responsible for the change in the military situation which made possible that financial cut-back from the military picture as it was presented to us last May.

With respect to the renegotiation features of this bill, as I said early during the afternoon, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] and the members of the subcommittee that handled this provision are entitled to a great deal of credit, as are other members of the committee who worked on this most difficult problem we have in connection with war financing.

Renegotiation was developed in the War Department Appropriation Subcommittee to meet a special and extraordinary problem. It was a problem that has scarcely been touched upon here today, the problem of vast and extraordinary profits being made on war contracts. It is a problem on which the public has been getting but one side, lately. Here is a circular put out by Mr. Edward G. Budd, president of the Budd Manufacturing Co., and the Budd Wheel Co., entitled "The Dangerous Injustice of Renegotiation," which was on your desks this morning, I presume. Now, the situation in the Budd companies is the kind of situation that produced a demand for something to curb excessive war expenditures and since this circular appeared yesterday and today, I use it as a convenient illustration of the problem. After reading the circular I called on the War Department for their figures in the Budd case and I have here a break-down of the profit sheet of the Budd Manufacturing Co. Contrary to the impression one might receive from the generalities in this circular that they had made a profit of only 1 percent or something like that, listen to these figures from the records in possession of the War Department:

The Budd Wheel Co. for the fiscal year ending December 31, 1942, did a war business of $41,271,000. Its profit, before taxes, was $9,999,000, or 24.2 percent on its total volume of business. Its profit after taxes, if there had been no renegotiation, would have been $3,033,000, or 55.8 percent of the net worth of the company. After renegotiation its profit was still 12 percent of its net sales, and its net profit after payment of taxes was 26 percent of the net worth of the company.

When the War Department Appropriation Committee ran into situations like this, is it any wonder that some of us thought that you, and you, and you, would be held accountable by the members of your district if you permitted these vast sums of money to be paid out of the Federal Treasury without any attempt at recovery?

One further reference to the facts on the Budd Co. The salary of Mr. Budd in 1938 was $43,200, from the Budd Manufacturing Co. In 1942 that was jumped to $65,410. But in addition to the Budd Manufacturing Co. they now had the Budd Wheel Co., and from the Budd Wheel Co. Mr. Budd received an additional salary of $140,318, making an increase in his annual salary from $43,000 in 1938 to $205,000 in 1942.

Similar examples of greatly increased profits and salaries were coming before us in the spring of 1942—get the full facts on any case you hear about. You will understand what I mean when I say that the origin of renegotiation was the situation that we confronted.

The Government, the country, was in a situation parallel to the parent who found his child about to die. He said, "Send for a doctor." Somebody said, "Which doctor shall I get? Shall I get the expensive doctor?" "Well, there is only one in town. You run and get him and do not ask what it is going to cost." The father said, "We have to have a doctor right away. This is a case of life and death."

A lot of the war contracts were made in that fashion. I do not justify them. I supported the effort of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] to eliminate cost plus and cost plus-fixed-fee contracts before we got into the war. But that lost, and later we got into the war and contracts were let right and left. Many times neither the contractor nor the Government had any idea of what the cost would be to change a washing machine factory to a munition factory. So we sent for the doctor—any doctor we could get. After the doctor came, perhaps he was an expensive doctor. Perhaps he found his costs were not as much as expected and that his prices were high.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CASE. So what did we propose? Go back to the father who sent for the doctor to treat his child. After he got the doctor's bill, it is possible that he found the bill pretty stiff. He renegotiated. Perhaps he just said, "Let us look this over. I cannot use you again at this rate. Let us reprice this a little." Anyway he renegotiated. Repricing is nothing new in business and nothing new in industry.

The amendments which this bill will propose are good amendments to the bill. As a matter of fact, I went before the committee and I suggested to them that I thought the same as I did over a year ago, when we adopted the statute origi-

nally, that the statute was imperfect. That it was merely a start. That somebody should work on it further and perfect the details, or even try something else if it would do a better job.

This committee has done a splendid job in the amendments offered. It has given excellent study to the whole problem. Naturally I am pleased to find that five of the changes that I suggested to the committee are incorporated in the amendments now offered to the statute.

For instance, there is the explicit right of appeal by setting up a tax court, a court of appeal body, and before that, a review body. So that now the right of appeal will be expressly provided in the statute.

In addition to that, the size of the exemption is to be raised from contractors with war business up to $100,000, increased to extend up to $500,000 total Government war business.

In addition to that there is a definition of standard commercial articles, which makes it possible for the Secretary or the Single Price Adjustment Board to exempt the articles where substantial competition exists.

For they have also adopted the idea of one central price adjustment board, so as to create uniform policies throughout the program for all agencies concerned and provision is made for terminating renegotiation when the war ends, not 3 years afterward.

I know my time is about to expire again, but let me say again that there is no perfect answer to the problem of excessive war profits. You may have ideas that will further improve the statute, and "if you know a better hole, go to it."

There is not a Member of this House who has not repeatedly, publicly and privately, said that he would do all in his power to prevent excessive war profits if we ever got into war again. The law was new; it was not perfect and these amendments, while they improve it, will not make it perfect. But it works. It has saved over $5,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money and is getting better prices on new contracts.

You take any one of the celebrated cases and get the facts from the War Department or the Navy Department and you will agree with me that were it not for renegotiation there is not a Member of this House who could go back to his district and defend the excessive profits that would have been made from War and Navy and ship contracts, without renegotiation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I have asked the indulgence of members of the Committee at this time to read a letter I have written to our popular and able Chief of Staff of the United States Army, in which I felt it my painful duty to discuss the General Patton incident and request that in view of the wide publicity given same, the general in question be removed from his command immediately.

The letter follows:

NOVEMBER 24, 1943.

Gen. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff,
War Department General Staff,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL MARSHALL: I am taking the liberty of writing you with regard to the despicable incident involving Lt. Gen. George S. Patton, Jr., who evidently in a fit of anger cursed and struck a shell-shocked soldier in a hospital tent in Sicily last August.

I have read a number of accounts of this incident since the story was first told by a well-known radio commentator last Sunday evening. The following day, the newspapers of the country published what was said to be an official Army headquarters statement, as follows:

"General Patton is commanding the Seventh Army, has commanded it since it was activated and is continuing to command it. General Patton has never been reprimanded at any time by General Eisenhower or by anyone else in this theater."

Today the country is told that although the general had not been "officially" reprimanded, that General Eisenhower upon hearing of the incident immediately wrote the general denouncing his reprehensible conduct and ordered him to make amends, or be removed from his command, which the country is assured the general did "on his own volition." The apologies, however, according to front-line dispatches, were not forthcoming until the general was ordered to do so by General Eisenhower. The same front-line dispatches say that although the facts of the incident were generally known among officers and men throughout the entire division, the incident was not disclosed for 3½ months after it occurred. There is little doubt that it never would have been disclosed if the story had not broken over the radio. The following paragraphs of one of the dispatches, which evidently cleared through Army headquarters, follows:

"The incident for which Eisenhower rebuked one of his ablest battle leaders occurred early in August when the Sicilian campaign was at a critical period. Patton, visiting an evacuation hospital, was walking among the wounded, patting some on the head and sympathizing with them, when he came upon a soldier sitting on a cot with his head in his hands, weeping.

"In reply to Patton's question as to what was the matter with him, the soldier was quoted as replying: 'It's my nerves. I guess I can't stand shelling.'

"According to those present, the general thereupon burst into a rage, and, employing profanity, called the soldier a coward and yellow belly and other epithets and ordered him back to the front. The scene attracted several persons, including the commanding officer of the hospital, the doctor who had admitted the soldier, and a nurse.

"In a fit of fury Patton struck the soldier on the rear of the head with the back of his hand. The soldier fell over slightly, and a nurse, intent on protecting the patient, made a dive toward Patton, but was pulled back by a doctor. The commander of the hospital then intervened.

"Patton, still in high temper, told other patients his views, then returned to berate the shell-shocked soldier again. The soldier appeared dazed, but offered to return to the front and tried to gain his feet as Patton left the hospital without making further investigation of the case.

"It was later ascertained that the soldier had been diagnosed as a medical case a week before the hospital incident, but he refused to leave the front until he finally was ordered back by his unit doctor. After Patton left the hospital the soldier demanded to return to the front immediately, but was forced to rest for another week."

The dispatch further added that doctors at the hospital diagnosed the private's illness as acute malaria and said he was partially delirious at the time of the general's incident, one report revealed.

Now, General, these facts speak for themselves. Assuming these front-line reports are true, I am amazed and chagrined at the statement that General Patton is still in command of the Seventh Army, and the further statement that the incident is closed.

Permit me to say that I served as a buck private in France for more than a year with the Thirty-sixth Division during World War No. 1, and saw active service in the front lines. I know first-hand of the horrors and excruciating pain of shells landing all about me If the officers and men in the Seventh Army really know the facts in connection with this unfortunate incident and of the inexcusable and despicable acts of the general in question, I know from personal experience that they would not want him in command of their outfit; but whether they are aware of the true facts or not, the mothers and fathers of these gallant lads are entitled to know that their commanding officers can be depended upon under any and all circumstances to protect them if and when humanly possible to do so. Such incidents might be overlooked and closed with an unofficial spanking in Hitler's army, but not in Uncle Sam's.

I have a boy—a fine, upstanding orphan boy I reared from infancy who is now somewhere in the European theater. He also enlisted as a buck private. His devoted wife and other loved ones in Oklahoma and elsewhere, as well as the loved ones of millions of other brave young officers and men are entitled to know that no such incident will ever occur in the future.

Let me add, General Marshall, that I am not now, nor have I ever set myself up, as a military expert. I have profound confidence in you as a military leader, and as a member of the House Appropriations Committee have voted for every dollar the Army has requested, resolving any doubt in favor of the demands of yourself and other military leaders. I feel that we have a great Army, and I want it to continue to be great and well disciplined.

I do not have a personal acquaintance with General Patton, but I have some responsibility to our men and women in uniform, as well as to the fathers and mothers of our country's defenders.

I would not cast any aspersions on the general's previous record. Reports from the fighting front indicate that prior to this incident, General Patton had demonstrated outstanding ability as a commander, but it should be obvious that this unprovoked attack upon a private soldier has destroyed the general's usefulness as a commander of the Seventh Army or any other division.

In view of the wide and unfavorable publicity the incident has received, I do not consider it presumptuous to suggest that General Patton be relieved of his command immediately.

Sincerely yours,

JED JOHNSON.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, today we consider a new tax bill. Taxes are already high—almost unbearably high, especially for some of our people. Yet, I believe that if the people are given economy and wise administration, they will be willing to try to pay a greater portion of the cost of the war now rather than leave an extra burden for the men in uniform to shoulder when they return to their native land.

Too much emphasis has been placed on the demand for more wages and profits. If I were away in some remote quarter of the earth, fighting a war to prevent the conquest and destruction of my country and against a ruthless and cruel enemy, it would arouse my indignation and disgust if I should learn that the folks back home in the United States were striking, wrangling over wages and profits, and carrying on in such a way as to appear to be oblivious of my perilous position and the issues involved in this terrible war.

The sacrifice of the men on the fighting fronts is terrific. It is indescribable. There is anxiety, privation, hunger, bullets and bombs, wounds—both physical and mental—and death. Occasionally we may sense for a moment a realization of what our fighting men must endure. But it is impossible for us who are far from the war zones to see and feel the true picture. Fighting men who return home with broken bodies cannot portray to us—make real to us—the terrible strain and stress of the front lines.

Against that background of war we consider this new tax bill. Nobody likes high taxes. But as long as about 10,000,000 of our men in uniform hazard their lives in this war, I think that most civilians have a feeling that they, too, would like to do a little sacrificing—in fact, a great deal of sacrificing for the common good, realizing that their sacrifices at home cannot even be compared with the contribution of our men who are fighting this war. If they give their blood, we can give our toil and our money, and the sacrifice will still be quite unequal.

Immediately after Pearl Harbor, waste, extravagance, and profiteering should have been cut to the minimum and we should have begun to pay a greater portion of the costs of this war. That statement will have to be included in a true history of World War No. 2. And is there anything wrong with a policy which requires that civilians toil and produce and pay while others train and fight?

But our tax program has been badly bungled. The year 1942 began 24 days after Pearl Harbor. Our 1942 national income was the greatest in history up to that time. Did we pay adequate taxes on 1942 individual income? No. About 75 percent of all individual income taxes on 1942 income was canceled. About $7,000,000,000 in individual income taxes were canceled by the adoption of the so-called modified Ruml tax plan which became the law on June 9, 1943. I shall always be glad that I voted against that iniquitous tax bill. The more the people learn of its effect and the confusion it has wrought, the more those of us who opposed the measure will be vindicated in our stand. If millionaires are made out of this war—and many are becoming rich while others die—that tax bill will share a large portion of the responsibility.

There were those who wanted to cancel 100 percent of the income tax on individuals on 1942 income. I am willing to predict that in the post-war period the angry cry will not be that too little was canceled, but that too much was canceled.

Regarding the profits being made during this war, let me say with all the emphasis at my command that when the history of this war is written it will not be said that the civilians, generally speaking, made too little profit out of the war, but that they made too much. And let me make this statement. When the history of this war is written, perhaps by some soldier who has returned from a rendezvous with the Japs in the jungles of the southwest Pacific, it will not be said that the American people paid too much in taxes to help support the war effort, but that many Americans paid too little in taxes to support the war effort.

I heard someone say the other day that we could not pay more taxes—and, indeed, there are many who cannot bear any additional tax burden. It was cleverly pointed out that "you can shear a sheep many times but you can skin him only once." But that adage must not be used in defense of the profiteer. And many cases of war profiteering have already been exposed. We cannot overdo the job of trying to prevent war profiteering, and of recapturing excessive profits in taxes. When the profits and profiteers of this war are truly understood, I predict that it will not be sufficient to glibly say, "You can shear a sheep many times, but you can skin him only once." That will not afford shelter for those black sheep who have taken advantage of the war to make undue and unreasonably high profits.

I think I know the attitude of the people whom I represent. When I had the opportunity to be among them this past summer, I made it my business to find out what the people thought. I think I found out what they thought, and I do not think they have changed their minds. The great heart of the American people is still true and just and fair. The people are willing to pay taxes to the very limit if they are assured that their money will not be wasted and trifled away by people who are charged under our system of government with the serious business of running the war. Yes, I found out that the people were even willing to pay more taxes if the above-stated conditions were met—certainly for the duration of the war, and in cases where it is possible for them to pay more.

I found out some other things. The people are not interested in politics as such, and they are not interested in public officials whose chief concern is politics. They are sick at heart over waste and abuse, yet most of them realize that some waste is inevitable in time of war. Undoubtedly, economy in Government will be a stimulant of the first order to the people.

The people want to win this war at the earliest possible opportunity, and they are willing to pay the price, but in trying to pay the price of freedom they do not want to be overcharged, deceived, and misled, nor do they want this country to cease to be the land of freedom and opportunity for themselves and their children when this war is over.

Others may regret that the people hate bureaucracy and regimentation. But democracy will be threatened if the people ever cease to have a wholesome and active interest in the affairs of their Government. What the people really hate is incompetency—the incompetent, egotistical, impractical, bungling, wasteful bureaucrat who is hurting the war effort and confusing the people. Americans have not lost appreciation for humble, efficient, and hard-working public servants who are doing a good job in the various bureaus and agencies of the Government. And there are many of that very type who deserve not the scorn but the thanks of our people.

Business institutions are pointing out that if they are to survive after the war, all profits cannot be taken away in taxes. This is correct. After all, upon business institutions we will have to rely for the employment of many returning servicemen and others when the war is over. We cannot serve the public interest by destroying either individuals or corporations and thereby destroying the economic structure of our country. On the other hand, we cannot afford to be too generous in providing for the financial security of our people at home for the after-the-war period at a time when nearly 10,000,000 men in uniform are immobilized insofar as civilian life is concerned. They have no chance to lay aside for a rainy day. They have no chance for profits. They only have a chance to fight—perhaps to die. They have no chance to get rich during the war; they only have a chance to get killed. One cannot make a proper approach to the tax question without having these 10,000,000 men constantly in mind, and Americans who have those men in mind will want to pay as they fight. A proper approach requires rigid economy in Government, less liberal appropriations by Congress and a stronger tax policy.

The Nineteenth Congressional District of Texas is an agricultural, not an industrial district. Those who produce food and fiber are not happy about the ugly charges which have been made to the effect that the farmers are greedy and selfish; that they are trying to profiteer out of the war. What the farmer is trying to do is to produce for victory. It does arouse the indignation of the farmer to see excessive wages being paid in war plants and to observe the excessive profits of many of the war industries. Fortunately, the bill before us increases the excess-profits tax on corporations to 95 percent.

If civilians at home are now angered by the profiteering of selfish groups in this country at this time, do you not know that when the war is over, and our men come marching home, their indignation over these wartime profiteers will reach a very high peak indeed?

The question with us should not be how much money we can make out of the war, but how much we can contribute by every means at our command toward winning the victory at the earliest

possible moment. The full and complete cooperation of all our people is required. We are standing at the threshold of great opportunity and we cannot afford to fail.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, last August a soldier from the district which I have the honor to represent, Pvt. Charles H. Kuhl, of Mishawaka, Ind., was with the American Seventh Army in Sicily. He was then confined to a hospital suffering from malaria and shell shock. On August 4 he wrote his family, saying:

> General Patton slapped my face yesterday, and kicked me in the pants, and cussed me.

That family kept the letter and that unfortunate incident, that hurt, to itself.

Following the widespread publicity given the incidents relating to Lt. Gen. George S. Patton, Jr., in the last several hours, this family has made known the contents of that letter. Of course, they could not help but feel as any American father and mother would feel over such an incident, but like every other American, their paramount thought is the early and successful end to the war.

It is with considerable pride that I read to you, Mr. Chairman, a statement which was issued today in Mishawaka, Ind., by the father of this young soldier:

> I hold no personal feelings against General Patton. If he is a good man, as they say, let's keep him. We need good men. I am willing to let the case rest as is and drop the whole thing, and get on with the war. I want to make it clear that we did not make public the letter from Charles to spite the general; otherwise, we would have made it public long ago. As it was, we kept silent about the whole affair until a report of the incident was made in the newspaper. Then we felt that we should inform the South Bend Tribune of the letter we had received from our son. We don't want to stand in the way of a promotion of General Patton.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the kind of stuff of which Americans are made. Let the Army handle its own problems and let us get on with the winning of the war.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Would the gentleman tell us the date of that incident?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. This letter was dated August 4. It said the incident happened the day before.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, a little while ago when members of the Committee on Ways and Means were asking unanimous consent to extend their remarks I was earnestly in the hope that some member of the committee would ask unanimous consent to expunge everything the committee had done up to now. I realize, however, they had a tough job and I am very much pleased over the fact that we are sending this bill over to the Senate today. I feel that the American taxpayers are entitled to a tax bill that is not retroactive, and I hope the bill comes back and becomes a law before the calendar year 1943 expires.

The chairman of the committee told us that in the last 5 years the tax hand of Uncle Sam has reached down into the incomes, pay envelopes, and other properties of the American people to the extent of changing our tax revenues from $5,000,000,000 a year to $43,500,000,000.

I wonder who was hurt by taking that additional $38,000,000,000? I believe for the most part people continue to consume food; no doubt they continue to buy clothing—at least what is available to be bought—but I believe, Mr. Chairman, that more than any other one group in America that has been hurt by this excessive tax program, our religious and charitable institutions have been hurt. It has been the endowed colleges, the hospitals of America, the orphanages, if you please, and the churches of America that have taken the brunt of this cut in the national income by reason of our tax program.

In 1942 the contributions to religious institutions were the lowest on a percentage basis in the history of America. In 1943 it will be still lower. An unfortunate thing happened when we passed the withholding tax—something that violated a principle long established in America. We have always held that 15 percent of an individual's income if contributed to religious and charitable institutions was exempt from taxation; but consider the individual—and there are millions of them—whose sole income is a salary subject to the withholding tax. In order for them to carry on paying to these splendid institutions they must pay a tax on exempt income and then at the end of the year file a claim for refund or credit against the United States Government. The result is that it is making a tremendous inroad upon the income of these splendid institutions.

I offered a bill to the committee which would provide that an employee may notify his employer of his anticipated contributions at the beginning of a taxable year and have that amount subtracted from his wage at each pay-roll period before the withholding tax was applied.

That principle has the support of the colleges of America of practically every denomination, Protestant and Catholic. In the very few minutes at my disposal I do not have time to go into this thoroughly. I could read resolutions from the Protestants, the Lutherans, the Christian Scientists, the Catholics, the American Association of Colleges, and various hospital associations. Yet the committee turned a deaf ear to that proposal. Eventually it will come. We cannot go on taxing exempt income and then expect people to file a claim for a refund at the end of the year. We cannot go on destroying the institutions that make for a strong citizenry and have any national income or property left in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, the primary purpose of this bill is to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation for such time as the war emergency may require. The House unanimously agrees that this should be done.

There is difference of opinion, however, as to section 3 of the bill, which would terminate the payment of consumer subsidies on any agricultural commodity, or commodity manufactured therefrom, after January 1, 1944, provided, however, that the payment of subsidies might be continued "in transactions with respect to competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oil seed."

In short, the only controversy before the House is as to the advisability of the payment of certain consumer subsidies out of the Treasury of the United States.

It has been repeatedly said throughout the debate that the rank and file of the people are confused as to what subsidies mean and as to what inflation means. In order to appreciate the controversy, it is necessary to have some understanding as to what these terms mean or imply. The dictionary defines the subsidy about which we are talking as—

> Pecuniary aid directly granted by government to an individual or commercial enterprise deemed productive of public benefit.

A leading economist defines inflation as:

> An increase in consumers' purchasing power in relation to the quantity of consumers' goods, manifesting itself in a rise in the general price level. The causes of inflation are those forces that tend either to increase consumers' purchasing power or decrease the quantity of consumers' goods.

We should all agree that consumer subsidies are advisable if productive of public benefit. I cannot conceive of a Member voting against subsidies if he is convinced that subsidies will in the end be productive of public benefit. The public is made up of all the people and it is seldom, if ever, possible to enact a law that is equally beneficial to all individuals, classes, and groups. That is why no law satisfies everybody. That is why all laws should be so framed as to provide maximum benefits to the maximum number. Special privileges and particular benefits to groups and classes should always be avoided insofar as possible. The public good is paramount.

This subsidy controversy resolves itself into this question: Will the payment of these subsidies be beneficial to the public in the long run?

It must not be forgotten that these subsidies are of two kinds:

First. Producers' subsidies, the payment of which is for the purpose of increasing production of materials, commodities, and things necessary in this war period. Here, again, the debate has shown unanimity of opinion on the part of the House; that is, there is no controversy as to the payment of producers' subsidies. This bill in no way affects such payments; therefore, producers' subsidies are not an issue in this debate.

Second. Subsidies to be paid by the Government to the consumer. Section 3 deals only with food and food products. It works like this: The Government taxes the people, or sells bonds to the people, to raise money to make it possible for the consumer to buy his groceries and food at a price below that which he would pay if the Government did not pay a part of his grocery bill. These subsidies would inure to the benefit of everybody who purchased groceries and food regardless of the wealth, the wage, or the income of the person making the purchase. There would be no distinction between paying the grocery bill of Henry Ford or the widow with the small income; that is, a general, over-all, uniform present—out of the taxpayers' money—is given to all of the people of the country who buy groceries and food.

Our people may be divided into two general groups for the purpose of this discussion: (a) The war worker and others now receiving the highest income ever received for like work in human history. This group constitutes a large segment of our population. (b) The professional person, the peacetime worker, including school teachers, municipal employees, clerks, pensioners, and others, who have had no commensurate increase in income during the war.

The cost of living has increased definitely during the war. During the same period the war worker wage has increased much more. For instance, I have in mind a national defense area where approximately 40,000 persons are employed in war industry at an almost unbelievably high wage. In the same community there reside approximately 3,000 persons who constitute the lower income group referred to in (b). The 40,000 persons were never so financially able to pay their own grocery bills as they are right now. The 3,000 persons find it very difficult to meet their living expenses because of the high cost of living and their limited income.

Those who advocate over-all consumer subsidies would pay a like part of the grocery bills of each group. It is difficult for me to reconcile this type of public spending. The Federal Government is billions of dollars in the red and should not be called upon to pay the living costs of any group of our people which is abundantly able to support itself.

Equity and justice require that some method be devised to make it possible for both groups to enjoy the American standard of living. This is a difficult problem and it seems to me that the stamp plan embodied in the bill offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] has possibilities and, if adopted, would make it possible for the Federal Government, at much less expense and with more justice, to give aid to the so-called white-collar low-income group without subsidizing the other group. At least some consideration should be given to this or some other alternative suggestion before the Government embarks upon a policy of universal grocery-bill paying.

It is not fair to tax all of the people, including the boys in the front lines who are receiving only $50 a month, to pay the living expenses of those who are safe and secure in bombproof jobs, when this group is amply able, by reason of war wages, to feed itself. Nevertheless, that is just what the administration's consumer-subsidy policy contemplates.

Mr. Chairman, the payment of food subsidies is not a new idea. It was tried out by, and contributed to, the fall of the Roman Empire. Subsidies brought on unbridled and uncontrolled inflation in Germany after World War I. Subsidies beget subsidies. Like opium, a small dose is invigorating, but if taken in sufficient quantities leads to ruin. The first dose is innocent and harmless but, when the patient feels the sensation, the will to resist is progressively destroyed. It is the province of the citizen to support the State rather than the State to support the citizen.

Prices must not be permitted to continue to rise, and it is the duty of the Congress and the administration to prevent this. I voted for the O. P. A. law giving the President the power to control prices. That was more than 2 years ago. At that time, however, I supported the Baruch amendment requiring the freezing of prices and wages as of a given date. I opposed selective freezing of commodity prices at random. I felt then that it would be wiser to require an overall freezing of ceilings, and then make provision for the thawing of price ceilings if, when and where inequalities were found to exist. I think that all of us are convinced now that that would have been the better procedure. The administration thought otherwise and its views prevailed. That is water gone over the dam. Nevertheless, the President and the O. P. A. have sufficient power today and, if these authorities will administer the law as drected by Congress, food subsidies should not be required. In this connection, I quote from an editorial appearing on November 27, 1943, in Labor, the official organ of the 15 recognized standard railroad labor organizations. That editorial says in part:

> Organized labor has gone along with the O. P. A. in its efforts to control prices—even to the extent of supporting the administration's subsidy program—but prices have continued to soar. * * * Congress gave the O. P. A. plenty of power. We still believe that price have soared because that power has never been vigorously used.

Mr. Chairman, I agree precisely with this editorial. The paper, Labor, is notoriously pro-New Deal, which fact adds much weight to its criticism of O. P. A. administration of the Price Stabilization Act.

The opponents of consumer subsidies believe that the principle is economically and fundamentally unsound; that the Congress has already given the President sufficient power to control prices; that it is economically and morally wrong to take tax money out of the Federal Treasury and hand it over to high-income groups which do not need it; and that such procedure will increase the spending power of these high-income groups, thereby stimulating materially the dreaded inflation which we all fear so much.

The Administration in its advocacy of consumer subsidies insists that without such gratuitous payment on the part of the Government, the general price level will rise, that inflation will become rampant, and that the whole economic structure will collapse. Indeed, the consumer subsidy leaders throughout the debate have indicated that the economic life of the Nation hinges on the defeat of section 3 of this bill. They say that the country is going to the dogs in a hurry if this section is permitted to remain. This position is supported largely by organized labor groups and is ballyhooed by some radio commentators and newspaper columnists. Generally speaking, organized labor and organized farmers are the pro and con leaders in this consumer subsidy dispute. Let us be practical and say that the farmer wants to secure the highest legitimate price possible for his products, and that organized labor wants to receive the highest wage possible; but let us not forget the rest of the people—who are not farmers or not high paid organized labor workers. This common man, in between these organization groups, has no lobbyists in Washington except his hired men in the Congress. It is, therefore, our responsibility to give due weight to the whole problem and, in the end, cast our own votes without fear or favor so far as either organized group is concerned. We cannot please both groups.

I am satisfied that some prices are going to rise and that the cost of living is going to be increased, whether consumer subsidies are paid or not. If these subsidies are paid, it will mean borrowing the money, and last but not least, it will mean repaying this money by the taxpayers together with interest; that is, an additional mortgage to the amount of the subsidy paid will be placed on the United States. You who have had experience with mortgages know what the payment of interest, as well as the payment of principal, means. Let us not deceive ourselves because there is no easy honest way to pay off a public debt. Necessary aid, yes. Needless contributions and gratuities, no.

Now let us consider inflation for a moment. If "the causes of inflation are those forces that tend either to increase consumer purchasing power or decrease the quantity of consumer goods" then the payment of consumer subsidies will be inflationary because it will increase purchasing power and will not increase the quantity of consumer goods. The

effect will be the same as if the wage or the income of the consumer were increased to the amount of the subsidy. The spending money of the war worker who is now receiving $150 a week in wages will be increased exactly to the amount that the Federal Government helps pay his grocery bill. Of course, this is inflation, and the greater the subsidies the greater the inflation. The roll-back philosophy is just an indirect method of increasing wages without admitting it.

The Government economists tell us that inflation can only be avoided by taking away from the people some of the money, which they now have, in the form of higher taxes, and by producing more goods and commodities. This means that the law of supply and demand is really what controls inflation. Surely, paying a part of the consumers' food bills will not produce more food. Again, we must not forget the difference between producers' subsidies and consumer subsidies. I repeat, the economists tell the Congress that "we must take steps either to reduce the spending money of consumers or to increase the supply of available goods." The payment of consumer subsidies does neither. The effect is just the opposite.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has been thoroughly considered and passed the House on a roll-call vote of 278 for and 118 against. It is silly to say that this is a political partisan matter. The bill was reported favorably by the Banking and Currency Committee which has a large Democratic majority. The author of the bill, as well as many of its chief spokesmen, are outstanding Democrats and many of them New Dealers.

Every Member of the House had an opportunity to offer any amendment he desired under the general rules of the House. The bill was not considered under a "gag" rule, even though some of the newspapers of the country have so stated. I voted for the Monroney amendment which would have tied in subsidies with wages and, to this extent, would have permitted temporary limited subsidies. After hearing all the debate and considering the threat of the Administrator of the O. P. A., that if all subsidies were eliminated immediately, food prices would automatically increase all along the line, I voted for the Kunkel amendment, postponing the date of the elimination of consumer subsidies until further study could be made by the Congress. Both of these amendments were defeated. I then voted to send the bill to the Senate. The O. P. A. has power to permit prices to rise to any level it desires. Its declaration that unless Congress takes certain action then prices will go up, certainly should give us reason to pause.

In conclusion, the Congress is confronted with a threat susceptible of fulfillment. We are dealing with a practical situation, not with a theory. Inflation is now abroad in the land. Prices have not been controlled and stabilized as contemplated when the O. P. A. law vested adequate power in the President. This is no time to talk about what should be because we are confronted with what is.

While I am diametrically opposed to the general subsidy philosophy, nevertheless, because of the way in which the price-control law has been administered, the country is in a fix, and I am in much the same frame of mind as the editorial writer of the largest daily in my congressional district, who stated:

> But we may have reached a point in our economic problems which calls for seeking any old port in a storm.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take the full 5 minutes by any means; I hope no one will begrudge me a few minutes to express my gratitude for this moment of vindication.

A little over a year ago when we were considering the conference report on the tax bill for which I had previously voted, the conference report came into the House from the Senate containing what is now known and what was then known as the Victory tax. I believed that tax was the most unworkable, the most anything you want to call it, piece of legislation I had ever seen and I had the temerity, with only one other Member of the House, to vote against it. Two of those most affable gentlemen of the fourth estate who preside over the destinies of our words approached me following that vote and asked: "Did you vote against that Victory tax?" I said, " I did."

Those words went far and wide over the country and this gentleman was very bitterly condemned at home. That came just before election and some of my friends and political opponents stated, "HINSHAW has voted against victory by voting against the Victory tax." Now, I find that the noble Committee on Ways and Means, the Treasury Department, and everybody in the United States agrees that it was a miserable tax to start with.

I therefore appreciate these few sweet moments of vindication. The Victory tax is repealed by this bill. It should not have been enacted in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, this bill we are considering today will please no one. Mr. and Mrs. John Public are entitled to a simplification of tax returns. It is suggested that the Ways and Means Committee take a long vacation from considering new forms of taxes, so that they may be able to retire into their cloisters and do a job of simplification. It takes a Philadelphia lawyer and a Shanghai accountant to make out one of these returns and even then there is no even close certainty that the return is correct. People do not mind paying taxes but they go into fits of profound despondency when they contemplate making out the returns.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this tax bill. There are several reasons. The principal reason is the inclusion of the minimum tax provision whereby the families of lowest incomes are subject to taxation. The exemption for a married man is but $500 and but $100 for each child. Does no one ever give a thought to the struggles of the poor to win meat, bread, and butter, and their consequent inability to pay taxes? This smacks of rank injustice.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am disturbed over this bill in more ways than one.

In the first place, I am afraid that we are dodging our tax responsibility. Under the tax bill passed sometime ago, we forgave billions of dollars and now in response to the demands of the President and the Treasury for a bill that would produce ten or eleven billions of dollars, we come in with a bill estimated to bring in some $2,000,000,000. Do not forget that we are spending billions of dollars, the greater part of which we are borrowing, and that some day we have got to pay back every cent we borrow. The time, in my opinion, to increase taxes is when our people are making money, as they are today, and can stand the additional burden. Are we meeting our responsibility as representatives of the people, when the Treasury needs money like it never did before, by forgiving billions of dollars as we did in the first tax bill, and then in response to a request from our Secretary of the Treasury for a bill providing for ten or eleven billions of dollars, bringing in a bill for only $2,000,000,000.

On yesterday, when the subsidy bill was before the House, the argument was made that, in paying subsidies, we were asking our soldier boys to not only do the fighting but to pay a part of our food bill as well. While I thought the argument spurious and demagogic, in forgiving in the first tax bill and in this tax bill only giving the Treasury two of the ten or eleven billions asked for, I am not so certain that the argument cannot be advanced that in pursuing such a course we are forcing our boys to do both the fighting and the paying.

In the second place, I do not think title VII, which provides for the renegotiation of war contracts, has any place in a tax bill. Why? Well, let me tell you why. A tax bill has to be brought in under a closed rule. This is necessary in order to prevent amendments that would, in all probability, wreck the bill. A tax bill, being highly technical, needs careful and painstaking consideration, and it would be impossible to write such a bill upon the floor. No, I am not objecting to the gag rule, so far as it applies to that part of the bill raising taxes. What I am objecting to is tacking title VII onto the bill and attempting to gag me into voting for or against the bill as a whole. It has been charged, and I understand upon good authority, that while the bill under consideration will raise around $2,000,000,000, the opening up of hundreds of closed-contract cases, cases that have been finally settled, and renegotiating settlements of these cases under the

new rules set forth in title VII, will in all probability cost the Government some $5,000,000,000. Are we about to raise $2,000,000,000 by taxes, give away $5,000,000,000 in opening up and renegotiating settled war contracts, and wind up some $3,000,000,000 worse off than when we commenced? I wonder.

If it is right for these closed cases to be opened up, why did not the committee bring in a separate bill on the subject, and give the membership of the House an opportunity to look thoroughly into the matter? Why legislate on the subject in a tax bill. Are we about to put through legislation by tacking it onto a tax bill that it would be impossible to put through if considered independently after free and open debate and with the right to amend?

Mr. Chairman, because this bill contains title VII, I cannot vote for it.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. The gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] objected to any renegotiations. I wanted to ask them if they felt that the soldier who was drafted into the service had the right to renegotiate?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The charge was made here yesterday that in paying a subsidy we were asking the soldier boys to not only do the fighting but to pay a part of our food bill. I am wondering what the soldier boys are going to say when they come back and find that in the first tax bill we forgave seven or eight billion dollars, then came along with a bill providing for renegotiation of contracts that will probably cost the taxpayers $5,000,000,000. Are we asking them to do the fighting and the paying also? I wonder.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia, who just addressed the Committee, outline one of the reasons why I opposed a closed rule on this bill.

First of all, may I say that my regard for the members of the Ways and Means Committee is a very sincere one and what I am going to say in criticism of this bill I am sure they will all understand. I have sincere appreciation for the fact that the members of that committee, year after year, have been patient and kind enough to listen to me come before them and testify.

The most clear obligation of the Congress has not been fulfilled in this bill. The job that Congress should have done in taxation has not been done in this bill. I agree with the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee when he said that there has been too much talk about inflation. There has been too much of the wrong kind of talk about inflation. There has been too much talk about how a change in a farm price or a change in a wage level is going to cause inflation. I do not believe it does. These things are the result of an inflationary situation.

Furthermore, inflation is not nearly as ruinous to a nation as deflation is. I have warned before of this, and I warn again that our greatest danger to the rank and file of the people in this country—and especially to agriculture—is going to be from an attempt to bring about a deflation after this war is over. But that attempt will most certainly be stronger to the extent that we permit an inflation to take place now. Furthermore, the Government has taken the responsibility for determining by and large the level of income of almost every single person in this Nation. As long as that is true, we have a corresponding obligation to see to it that the money they receive is not deflated or diluted in value, which is what will happen to the extent we permit inflation to happen.

The reason I think the tax bill should have been written from the standpoint of the real need of wartime revenue of the Nation on the one hand and the divergence between the potential supply of consumer goods and the income of the people on the other is briefly as follows:

The only real answer to inflation, since inflation is a monetary problem, is to remove the pressure upon prices. The way to remove the pressure on prices is not fundamentally by setting up an O. P. A., not fundamentally by paying subsidies—those are second-best methods that you have to use if you do not use the fundamental method—the fundamental method is to write your tax law so it does the job. That was the burden of my testimony to the committee some weeks ago. I advocated then a program different from the Treasury proposal, but one which would have yielded about the same amount of revenue to help pay now for this war.

Briefly, the figures are as follows: $136,000,000,000 of income paid out, $21,000,000,000 of personal taxes, leaving a total of $115,000,000,000 of spendable income in the hands of the people, not evenly distributed, most of it distributed to the people getting fairly good incomes. At the same time, the maximum consumer goods we can produce will be $90,000,000,000, if we continue to produce for the war, as, of course, we must and will.

We could raise more money by taxes, I believe, and I think we ought to. It would be hard. I know it would be hard. I agree with everything anybody said about its being hard. But this is a hard time, the hardest time America has ever known. If we had that kind of a tax program, then a bill such as was enacted by the House yesterday would not necessarily result in forcing prices up, because the pressure upon prices would have been removed to a great extent. With a courageous tax program supply and demand would generally balance and much more freedom could be allowed in the whole economy.

People cannot really save the income they are receiving now except if they save it for expenditure over long periods of time. I think an expansion of the social-security program should be provided for with long-term savings of a compulsory nature so that they would come back to the people gradually over a period of time as they faced the contingencies of old age, ill health, and so on.

I do not believe a proposal such as the Treasury made would have worked, for you would have had great refunds right after the war. I think that would have been a dangerous way to do it, because a large part of the value of these refunds would almost surely have been taken away in a brief but violent post-war inflation.

In this whole problem Congress has gotten itself fairly badly confused in its thinking. On yesterday the debate centered around the question of inflation. The majority voting for the bill yesterday contend the people all had ample buying power to stand sharp increases in prices. On today debate has centered around the question of the tax burden with Members contending the country is bled white. Yet in this bill today we confront the one fundamental measure that could be taken, the one effective measure that could be taken in combating inflation. As I said a moment ago, unless that measure, courageous taxation, is taken we are forced back on less desirable methods, methods that are not as effective, methods that do employ a greater degree of governmental control of the economy. But we have to use those methods if we do not effectively use the fundamental one. Generally speaking we have to have the O. P. A., subsidies, and all the rest, for the simple reason that we have not passed a scientific and effective tax program.

As a matter of actual fact, from the figures I quoted a moment ago I can point out that the amount of income received on the average by American families today is about $4,000. But it is by no means evenly distributed, of course. Fifteen million families receive less than $1,000. Some receive, of course, high incomes. Total income to persons who receive in excess of $5,000 of income in this country amounts to one-fifth as much as the income received by people who get less than $5,000. A good deal has been made of that point. It has been said that our tax burden on the people below $5,000 is not commensurate even under the Treasury proposal. I do not quite agree, because after all there are 28 times as many people getting incomes less than $5,000 as there are those getting more than $5,000. I would make the tax program equitable all the way along the line, but I would make it in accordance with the ability to pay. After all, it is not true that people with large incomes do not spend it, it is not true that people with large incomes do not contribute to an inflationary demand for goods. They do. Everybody does, except that group of low and fixed income people who were forgotten by the House on yesterday.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DISNEY. How would the gentleman make an equitable tax on ability to pay where the variation between incomes is so great under $5,000? A world of people are not making any more now than they did prior to the war.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right.

Mr. DISNEY. A great many are making much more.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right.

Mr. DISNEY. What formula would the gentleman suggest by which to reach those who can pay, and not hurt those who have not had any higher income?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman asks me that question when I have maybe a half minute remaining and when I have promised the Chairman that I would not ask him for any further time, so I shall do a thing I ordinarily would not like to do, refer the gentleman to my testimony before his own committee, where I attempted to outline how I would solve that problem. He will find there my answer to his question.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I have continually tried to help the white-collar worker, and if there had been an open rule I would have offered the following amendment:

On page 9, line 13, of H. R. 3687, introduced by Mr. DOUGHTON, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, November 18, 1943, strike out the colon and add the following: "*Be it provided further*, That on individuals whose gross income for the taxable year is not greater than 120 percent of his gross income for the taxable year beginning in 1941: *And provided further*, That he has no dependents and that his gross income for the taxable year is not over $1,200: *Provided further*, That an individual who has one or more dependents and that his gross income for the taxable year is not over $1,500: *Provided further*, That an individual who has a husband or wife, and no other dependents and that his gross income for the taxable year is not over $1,800: *And provided*, That an individual who has a husband or wife and one or more dependents and that his gross income for the taxable year is not over $2,400, and the provision shall prevail (that in each case neither individual's income shall be 120 percent of his gross income for the taxable year beginning in 1941), shall not be subject to the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, if the taxable year begins prior to the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President."

This amendment simply provides that a person who has not received as much as a 20-percent increase in his income since January 1, 1941, shall be exempt from paying a tax on his income provided he or she is single and has no dependents and makes $1,200 per year or less.

If the individual is single and has one dependent he would be exempt if he made $1,500 or less; if married and no other dependents, he would be exempt if he made $1,800 or less; if he was married and had one or more dependents, he would be exempt if he made $2,400 or less.

Let us see exactly what this means. A single person making $1,200 or less who has had not as much as a 20-percent increase in his earnings since January 1, 1941, would actually receive a yearly raise of $147.10 in his salary, or approximately $12.25 per month.

If a person with one dependent was earning $1,500 and had received less than a 20-percent increase in his income since January 1, 1941, he would actually receive $131.50 for the year, or an increase of approximately $10.95 per month.

A person married with no other dependents, making $1,800 per year under the same circumstances, would receive $115.90 for the year, or $9.65 per month.

A person married and with one dependent, making $2,400, would receive $165.10, or $13.75 per month.

Naturally, the more dependents the less they would receive by the exemption. The highest figure of $13.75 per month for a man, wife, and one child would be less than a 10-percent raise, which you can plainly see would come within the Little Steel formula.

This would help the white-collar workers we hear so much about. We heard many in the well of this House say they could not vote for subsidies because they would be really paying the grocery bill for the rich as well as the poor. Now we have a proposition here that will help only those who are actually suffering, and I believe we will all agree they need help.

I hope we will find some way to help those who are really bearing the heaviest burdens on the home front. To exempt them from paying an income tax would give them a raise that their employers have been unable to grant. There would be no color of a dole attached to this relief and there would be no expense as far as administering is concerned.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for this bill but I cannot vote for it without first saying that I think it is a weak and faint-hearted approach to a real, honest-to-goodness, wartime tax bill. I think it is weak because of the insignificant amount of revenue it provides in relationship to our expenditures in this year of the war. I think it is faint-hearted because I think it marks another congressional retreat in action we should be taking to try to hold the line against inflation.

I was afraid for the stability of this country when we were spending $4,000,000,000 more per year than we were getting in from taxation. Now when we are spending $40,000,000,000 more per year than we are getting in from taxation, I think it is time for Congress to tighten our belt and bring in a real wartime tax bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I voted this morning for an open rule in the handling of this bill. I am opposed to some of the provisions of H. R. 3687 and in order to obtain a separate vote on these sections, an open rule was necessary. In the vote this morning, the overwhelming majority of the House indicated its desire for a closed rule which was adopted. As a result of this action, it serves no useful purpose to continue opposition to certain sections of this bill and in voting the membership of the House must accept or reject the bill in toto. I have sought this time merely to make plain my position in reference to the adoption of the rule under which the bill is being handled.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am in receipt of a letter from William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, protesting against the provisions of section 112 of the pending bill.

Any views or opinions of Mr. Green are always worthy of deep consideration.

This letter states the position of the A. F. of L. in opposition to section 112. In the event the Senate amends section 112 in a manner satisfactory to the A. F. of L., I know the contents of this letter will receive the serious consideration of the House conferees when the bill is in conference.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., November 22, 1943.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I wish to direct your attention to section 112, found on page 28, of H. R. 3687, the tax bill now pending before the United States House of Representatives.

This section requires every organization, with a few exceptions, who are exempt from taxes under section 101, to file an annual return, stating specifically the items of gross income, receipts, and disbursements.

On page 24 of the committee report on the bill your attention is directed to the committee's announced reasons for requiring these reports.

"Under existing law a large group of corporations enjoy tax exemption and many of which are not required to file information returns.

"It has come to the attention of your committee that many of these exempt corporations and organizations are directly competing with companies required to pay income taxes, and that this practice is becoming more widespread and affording a loophole for tax evasion and avoidance.

"These organizations were originally given this tax exemption on the theory that they were not operated for profit, and that none of their proceeds inured to the benefit of shareholders. However, many of these organizations are now engaged in operation of apartment houses, office buildings, and other businesses which directly compete with individuals and corporations required to pay taxes on income derived from like operations."

These reasons are absurd if an attempt should be made to apply them to labor organizations, and unless some ulterior motive lies behind the reasons for incorporating such language in the bill we cannot understand why labor organizations were not included in the exemptions in section 112.

We realize fully that as a gag rule has been granted for the consideration of this bill that very little can be done about it when the House considers the bill, but nevertheless we wish to emphatically register our protest against section 112.

Sincerely yours,

WM. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule under which the bill is being considered, at the conclusion of general debate the bill is considered as read, and amendments may be offered only at the direction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. DOUGHTON: On page 11, in the third column of the table, strike out "260.40" and insert "260.60."

On page 56, line 25, before "Section", insert "(a) In general.—"; and on page 57, after line 3, insert the following:

"(b) Taxable years to which applicable: The amendment made by subsection (a) insofar as it relates to flake graphite shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1942."

Page 121, line 9, strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)."

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, these are clarifying amendments that carry out the intent of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GORE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3687) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 360, reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 165]

Allen, La.	Fitzpatrick	Johnson, Ind.
Auchincloss	Fogarty	Johnson, Okla.
Baldwin, Md.	Ford	Jones
Barden	Fuller	Kearney
Bates, Mass.	Fulmer	Kee
Bland	Furlong	Keefe
Bolton	Gale	Kennedy
Boykin	Gallagher	Kerr
Bradley, Pa.	Gavagan	Kilburn
Buckley	Gavin	King
Byrne	Gillette	Kinzer
Canfield	Goodwin	Klein
Cannon, Mo.	Graham	LaFollette
Carter	Grant, Ala.	Lambertson
Celler	Green	Lesinski
Chenoweth	Hale	Lewis, Colo.
Compton	Halleck	Luce
Crawford	Harness, Ind.	Martin, Mass.
Cullen	Harris, Va.	Mason
Dewey	Hart	May
Dickstein	Hébert	Merritt
Dies	Heffernan	Miller, Conn.
Dirksen	Hendricks	Miller, Pa.
Douglas	Hobbs	Morrison, La.
Eaton	Holifield	Murphy
Eberharter	Holmes, Wash.	Myers
Fay	Jackson	Newsome
Fish	Jarman	Norton
O'Brien, N. Y.	Scott	Troutman
O'Leary	Simpson, Pa.	Vinson, Ga.
O'Toole	Smith, Ohio	Wadsworth
Philbin	Smith, Wis.	Walter
Plumley	Snyder	Weiss
Powers	Sparkman	Wene
Pracht	Starnes, Ala.	Whelchel, Ga.
Ramspeck	Sullivan	Whitten
Reece, Tenn.	Sundstrom	Wigglesworth
Reed, Ill.	Taber	Wolfenden, Pa.
Robsion, Ky.	Thomas, N. J.	Wolverton, N. J.
Rodgers, Pa.	Thomas, Tex.	Woodrum, Va.
Rogers, Calif.	Tibbott	
Sabath	Tolan	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 305 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GEARHART. I am opposed to the bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GEARHART moves to recommit the bill H. R. 3687 to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HULL) there were—ayes 200, noes 27.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on the revenue act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Friday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. I desire to announce that there will be no business on Friday.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] may address the House for 15 minutes?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] who addressed the committee this afternoon may be permitted to extend his remarks and include therein three letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS NO. 1

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 367) which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, of the State of Mississippi, and ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ, of the State of New Mexico, be, and they are hereby, elected members of the Standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Elections No. 1.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Miles City (Mont.) Star, a daily newspaper in Montana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I pointed out here yesterday that we have on storage in the United States today 630,000,000 pounds of beef, pork, mutton, and lamb, and still the value of the points is so high for all these meats that it is impossible for the American people to buy a needed supply of meat. I have just received the following telegram from three of the leading stockmen in the State of Montana:

Livestock values continue to grow worse as markets are becoming congested. Why not remove all point values on meat? Montana livestock growers are looking to you to help save our industry.

RUSSELL MANGER.
ED MCREYNOLDS.
OLIVER EVERT.

And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this is only one of a flood of telegrams along this line that I am receiving. In addition to the stored meats the country is full of beef cattle, sheep and hogs that could be slaughtered.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therewith certain parts of an article by my colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on three topics and in connection with each to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION BILL

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] was unable because of sudden illness to be present to vote last night on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill. I am authorized to state that had he been present he would have voted for the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a short poem.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a speech delivered by Hon. Harold L. Ickes at the twenty-fourth annual meeting of the Petroleum Institute in Chicago. It is estimated that this will cost $117.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a speech made by Ralph K. Davies, Deputy Petroleum Administrator for War, also at the American Petroleum Institute's twenty-fourth annual meeting, on November 10. This is estimated to cost $135.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, without objection the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made this afternoon several letters in connection with title IV of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RIGHTS OF VETERANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the President on yesterday sent to the House a message asking that certain legislation be passed for the benefit of veterans. I agree with those suggestions, but I would like to state that the administration should see to it that the bills we have already passed for the veterans be properly carried out and that the veterans receive the full benefit of those laws. This is not the case today, and I am greatly distressed. Men and women are going home from hospitals without compensation; and veterans are going home and nothing is done about their rehabilitation. No real effort is made while they are hospitalized to tell them of their rights under laws we have passed. There is a growing tide of resentment because they have not been informed and assisted with their claims. The longer the time elapses after a veteran's discharge, the harder it is to establish service connection for a disability or aggravation of a disability which existed prior to enlistment; the harder it is to secure employment, the harder it is to secure the right kind of training and rehabilitation. The service men and women deserve the Government's every consideration. It is the just obligation of the administration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein two letters.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an address by the dean of the law school of Duke University. It is estimated that this will cost $144.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two resolutions adopted by New England commissioners of agriculture, representatives of milk-control boards, and principal cooperative milk producers' associations of New England on November 19, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CARSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BISHOP]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include some editorial comments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. PLOESER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include editorials from two papers in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Harold G. Aron and Frederick W. Eisner. Mr. Speaker, this article will occupy more space in the RECORD than permitted, and pursuant to the rule I have applied to the Public Printer for an estimate and he informs me that it will take five and three-fifths pages and the cost to the Government will be $252. I ask unanimous consent that this be included notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include correspondence between the Food Administrator and myself, together with an article from the Fort Wayne News Sentinel concerning the Government's failure to maintain a support price on hogs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain editorials and newspaper comments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a list of newspapers that have published editorials in support of the Lea civil aviation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Boston Daily Globe, on the question of subsidies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]?

There was no objection.

SULLIVAN VERSUS MILLER

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 368), as follows:

Resolved, That the election contest of John B. Sullivan, contestant, against Louis E. Miller, contestee, Eleventh Congressional District of Missouri, be dismissed.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Messrs. EATON, POWERS, CANFIELD, AUCHINCLOSS, THOMAS of New Jersey, SUNDSTROM, and WOLVERTON of New Jersey, on account of attending funeral of the late Senator Barbour, of New Jersey.

To Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. BROOKS), for 2 days, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the end of debate in the Committee of the Whole today I may be permitted to insert my own remarks and to include therein a letter sent to me by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

CONSTRUCTIVE SUGGESTIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I listened with deep interest to the remarks made by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]. I always have a feeling of pleasure when I hear anything uttered on the floor of a constructive nature, and that includes criticism that is constructive.

No matter what side of the aisle we sit on, we are all interested in the men and women who wear the country's uniform and we are all interested in the men and women who may be discharged from the Army because of wounds or for any other medical reason. We are all particularly interested in such persons receiving the compensation to which they are entitled under the law as quickly as possible. We all realize that there are some practical difficulties, but there should not be any delay beyond the minimum.

As an individual member I welcome the suggestion of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] and I join with her in urging the agencies of the Government to whom we have delegated the administration of laws relating to our veterans, those who have been discharged up to this time or those who may be discharged in the future, to expedite action as quickly as possible in seeing that those men and women who have served our country in war and who have been discharged because of physical disabilities receive as quickly as is humanly possible the rights that our Government has determined they are entitled to under the law.

I welcome, as I know all Members do, constructive suggestions and constructive criticism of the nature just given by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to special order heretofore adopted, adjourned until Friday, November 26, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Foreign Affairs will meet in executive session at 10 a. m., Friday, November 26, 1943, for further consideration of House Resolution 350 and House Resolution 352, providing for the creation by the Executive of a commission to effectuate the rescue of the Jewish people of Europe.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

928. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Civilian Defense, transmitting a revised copy of quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1943, covering the protective property program of the Office of Civilian Defense as submitted to the Bureau of the Budget; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

929. A letter from the secretary, United States Employees' Compensation Commission, transmitting copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements presented to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

930. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in Building B. O. Q. O–3 at the United States Naval Construction Training Center, Davisville, R. I., on March 27, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

931. A letter from the Chairman, War Production Board, transmitting the eighth report upon the operations of the Chairman of the War Production Board; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

932. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

933. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements, as transmitted to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, setting forth the estimate of the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the War Department, for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

934. A letter from the chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, transmitting in accordance with title 6 of the Revenue Act of 1941, Public Law 250, Seventy-seventh Congress, a report on Federal personnel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

935. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

936. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 8, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Cape Porpoise Harbor, Maine, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on March 11, 1941; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

937. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 12, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of report on the Tennessee River and tributaries, with a view to determining whether any improvement of Bear Creek, tributary of the Tennessee River, in the States of Mississippi and Alabama, is advisable, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on May 2, 1939; to the Committee on Flood Control.

938. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 20, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Brazos Island Harbor, Tex., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 11, 1941; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

939. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 12, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Calleguas Creek, Calif., which comes within the authorization of the Flood Control Act approved on June 28, 1938, for streams in Los Angeles and Ventura Counties, draining the Santa Monica Mountains, Calif., directly into the Pacific Ocean; to the Committee on Flood Control.

940. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 21, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Black River, Sanilac and St. Clair Counties, Mich., requested by resolutions of the

Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on October 5 and December 6, 1940; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 1410. An act to amend section 4 of the act approved June 13, 1940; with amendment (Rept. No. 886). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia: Committee on Elections No. 3. House Resolution 368. Resolution to dismiss election contest case of John B. Sullivan, contestant, against Louis E. Miller, contestee, Eleventh Congressional District of Missouri; without amendment (Rept. No. 887). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. S. 990. An act for the relief of the Washington, Brandywine & Point Lookout Railroad Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 880). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1412. A bill for the relief of Mildred B. Hampton; with amendment (Rept. No. 881). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2097. A bill for the relief of W. J. Cox; with amendment (Rept. No. 882). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2109. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Minerva C. Davis; with amendment (Rept. No. 883). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3537. A bill for the relief of Bessie Eason; with amendment (Rept. No. 884). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2690. A bill for the relief of Oswald L. Sawyer; with amendment (Rept. No. 885). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 3730. A bill to provide for Federal aid to the several States in carrying out plans for industrial rehabilitation in the counties thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 3731. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the district of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3732. A bill to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge in the district of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 3733. A bill to provide for college education for qualified post-war veterans; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3734. A bill to provide for Federal aid to the several States in carrying out plans for industrial rehabilitation in the counties thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 3735. A bill to provide for the readjustment and rehabilitation of veterans in the present war, during the post-war period, by the extension of compensation after honorable discharge from the service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 3736. A bill to permit individuals to deduct from gross income for income-tax purposes certain amounts paid as life insurance premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. Res. 364. Resolution to provide for the trial and deportation of individuals convicted of disloyalty or treason to the United States Government; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. Res. 365. Resolution to amend rule XI of the Rules of the House, so as to grant to standing committees the power of subpena; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. Res. 366. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the war relocation camp at Tulelake, Calif., be transferred to the Department of War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 3737. A bill for the relief of M. H. Harris; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PAGÁN:

H. R. 3738. A bill granting an increase of pension to Jose Vega Martinez; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROLPH:

H. R. 3739. A bill for the relief of the Wesix Electric Heater Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3718. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Ruth W. Cooley and 33 other citizens of Denver, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3719. Also, petition of Rev. C. H. French and 85 other members of the First Methodist Church, of Cameron, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3720. Also, petition of Mrs. Harry Lybrook and 58 other citizens of Camden, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3721. Also, petition of Dr. G. F. Jones and 105 other citizens of Jackson, Tenn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3722. Also, petition of V. H. Lewis and 149 other citizens of Norman, Okla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3723. Also, petition of Mrs. L. H. Peterson and 30 other citizens of Erskine, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3724. Also, petition of Ruby E. Trapahagan and 48 other citizens of Richland, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3725. Also, petition of Rev. A. P. Gregory and 86 other members of First Church of God, of Modesto, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3726. Also, petition of Iris Whittlesu and 33 other citizens, of Portland, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3727. Also, petition of 681 citizens of Ottumwa, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3728. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Ivan T. Lawson and 55 other citizens of Ijamsburg, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3729. Also, petition of Mrs. John Van Oden and 20 other citizens of Livingston, Mont., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by

prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3730. Also, petition of Rev. George Woodall and 50 other members of the Methodist Church of St. Helena, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3731. Also, petition of Mrs. F. H. Burns and 220 other citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3732. Also, petition of Mrs. Joe Franklin and 122 other citizens of Corpus Christi, Tex., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3733. Also, petition of Edith Johnson and 19 other citizens of Tacoma, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3734. Also, petition of 75 citizens of Vallejo, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3735. Also, petition of Rev. Hillyer H. Straton and 161 other citizens of Detroit, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3736. Also, petition of Rev. H. A. Hammer and 20 citizens of Redwood City, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3737. Also, petition of Mrs. Fred Barnum and 53 other citizens of Goodwell, Okla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3738. Also, petition of Rev. Milton A. Marcy and 101 members of the First Methodist Church of Tacoma, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3739. Also, petition of Mrs. O. Olsen and 100 other citizens of Chicago, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3740. Also, petition of 50 citizens of Bangor, Maine, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3741. Also, petition of 24 citizens of Roseburg, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3742. Also, petition of Floyd F. Smith and 22 other citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3743. Also, petition of Rev. George W. Henderson and 80 other members of United Presbyterian Church, of West Sunbury, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3744. Also, petition of 90 citizens of Maryville, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3745. Also, petition of 86 citizens of Willows, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3746. Also, petition of Mrs. Ernest Hutchenson and 31 other citizens of Elizabeth, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3747. Also, petition of Mrs. Minnie Way and 38 citizens of Sea Isle City, N. J., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3748. Also, petition of 180 citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3749. Also, petition of Mrs. Earl Nielson and 80 other citizens of Milbank, S. Dak., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3750. Also, petition of Warren K. Douglas and 81 other citizens of Portland, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3751. Also, petition of Mrs. Earle Coleman and 33 other citizens of Sudlersville, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3752. Also, petition of Fred R. Cox and 35 other citizens of McLouth, Kans., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3753. Also, petition of 39 citizens of Seattle, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3754. Also, petition of Mr. S. A. Derr and 36 other citizens of Alva, Okla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3755. Also, petition of Hazel Thomas and 30 other citizens of Edison, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judicary.

3756. Also, petition of A. L. Fuller and 32 other citizens of Union, Maine, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3757. Also, petition of Rev. Spencer Baker and 27 other citizens of Baldwin, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to

reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3758. Also, petition of Ora Upham and 65 other citizens of Lebanon, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3759. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution No. 4 of the Kiwanis International, California-Nevada district, approving the decentralization of governmental agencies; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

3760. Also, resolution No. 2 of the Kiwanis International, California-Nevada district, opposing return of persons of Japanese ancestry to the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3761. Also, resolution of the Building and Construction Trades Council of San Francisco, requesting the National Housing Agency to program allocations to civilians' new homes and that the immigrant war workers directive be set aside for these homes, and that the War Production Board release materials and grant priorities for their construction in accordance with the civilian needs of metropolitan centers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3762. By Mr. KEOGH: Resolution adopted by the Mining and Metallurgical Society of America with reference to the so-called Kilgore-Patman bills; to the Committee on Patents.

3763. Also, resolution adopted by the American Institute of Consulting Engineers with reference to the so-called Kilgore-Patman bills; to the Committee on Patents.

3764. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Nitro, W. Va., asking Congress to pass the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3765. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Jos. C. Walsh and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3766. Also, petition of C. H. Schauwecker and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3767. Also, petition of R. J. Long and 22 othe citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3768. Also, petition of Peter Eisel and signed by 98 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3769. Also, petition of Josephine McMahon and 83 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3770. Also, petition in the form of a telegram submitted by President Morris Shapior, and Secretary Noah W. Salz, of the Vaad Hoeir Council of St. Louis Orthodox Jewry, composed of 21 congregations, urgently urging support of the Rogers-Baldwin resolution creating a commission to formulate and effectuate a plan to save the surviving Jewish people of Europe from extinction at the hands of Nazi Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3771. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of Mrs. R. O. Moore and signed by many other residents of Mason City, Iowa, urging passage of House bill 2082, commonly known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3772. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of employees of El Paso Natural Gas Co., urging that the present rate for pay-roll deductions under the Social Security Act be frozen at the present level; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3773. Also, petition of employees of the Zork Hardware Co., of El Paso, Tex., voicing opposition to increase in social-security tax, and approval of freezing the tax at the present rate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3774. Also, petition of employees of the El Paso Electric Co., urging that present rate for pay-roll deductions under the Social Security Act be frozen at the present level; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3775. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Phares E. Reeder, acting executive secretary of the West Virginia State Education Association, Charleston, W. Va., urging the passage of legislation providing Federal aid to the public schools of the Nation; to the Committee on Education.

3776. By Mr. VURSELL: Petition signed by Rev. E. L. Banta, of Jacksonville, Ill., and 1,795 other citizens of Illinois, calling upon the Congress and the Government to stop the sale of alcoholic beverages and to suppress vice in and around Army camps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3777. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Brown Swiss Cattle Breeders' Association, requesting a curtailment of Government regulations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3778. Also, petition of the clerk, board of supervisors, county of Los Angeles, State of California, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposing passage of Senate bill 1257 and House bill 3018; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

3779. Also, petition of the secretary, Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 3477; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1943

(Legislative day of Thursday, November 18, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all mercies, now that our day of national thanksgiving has passed as an observance we would put not away the garments of praise; but with thankful hearts we would take the cup of salvation and with the grace of gratitude bow in reverence before Thee, the giver of all good.

We thank Thee for all the comrades of the years who have walked and wrought by our side. Especially do we thank Thee for the life and service of our friend and colleague who, after so many faithful years in this Chamber, has suddenly ended his earthly labors. We remember his stalwart form which was but the fitting tabernacle for a personality which radiated kindness and courtesy and an unfaltering fidelity to public duty and to the service of the Nation. Comfort those whose hearts are stricken at his going. While we mourn that we shall see his face no more, solemnize us by the uncertainty of our own working day. The hurrying pace of these crowded years frightens and amazes us. Ere ever the day has worn to noon or we have even planned the work we meant to do, the night comes down upon us and we can work no more. We wake to mourn what we have missed, to value most what comes no more.

May we lengthen our brief life by intensity of living, filling swift hours with mighty deeds. Let us hasten to speak that which is within us, lest we be called away before the story is begun. If there is anything Thou hast meant us to do in life, O spare us until we have accomplished it. If there is any kindness we can show, may we not neglect nor defer it, seeing that we pass this way but once. And when the shadows gather round us, whether that twilight shall be sooner or later, may we be very near to the eternal morning and to Thee and to those we have loved and lost a while. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, November 23, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. W. Warren Barbour, late a Senator from the State of New Jersey.

The message announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3477. An act to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3687. An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 175. Joint resolution commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the first airplane flight by Wilbur and Orville Wright.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 630. An act to amend section 107 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the district court for the middle district of Tennessee;

S. 759. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee to hear, determine,

and render judgment upon the claim of W. I. Dooly;

S. 763. An act amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 770. An act for the relief of Eddie Percle;

S. 862. An act for the relief of the Grafton Boat Works;

S. 950. An act for the relief of the Milford Trust Co. and Blanche R. Bennett, as administrators of the estate of Charles E. Reed, deceased;

S. 1008. An act for the relief of Gerald G. Woods;

S. 1246. An act for the relief of Ervin S. Finley;

S. 1309. An act for the relief of Pan American Airways, Inc.;

S. 1382. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; and

S. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LEGISLATION PASSED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War (3), Navy, Agriculture, and Commerce; the Federal Trade Commission and Federal Security Agency (2) which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PROVISION FOR DEMOBILIZED MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT; BILL INTRODUCED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk and referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

All of us are concentrating now on the one primary objective of winning this war. But even as we devote our energy and resources to that purpose, we cannot neglect to plan for things to come after victory is won.

The problem of reconverting wartime America to a peacetime basis is one for which we are now laying plans to be submitted to the Congress for action. As I said last July:

> The returning soldier and sailor and marine are a part of the problem of demobilizing the rest of the millions of Americans who have been working and living in a war economy since 1941. * * * But the members of the armed forces have been compelled to make greater economic sacrifice and every other kind of sacrifice than the rest of us, and are entitled to definite action to help take care of their special problems.

At that time I outlined what seemed to be a minimum of action to which the members of our armed forces are entitled over and above that taken for other citizens.

What our service men and women want, more than anything else, is the assurance of satisfactory employment upon their return to civil life. The first task after the war is to provide employment for them and for our demobilized war workers.

There were skeptics who said that our wartime production goals would never be attained. There will also be skeptics who will question our ability to make the necessary plans to meet the problems of unemployment and want after the war. But, I am confident that if industry and labor and Government tackle the problems of economic readjustment after the war with the same unity of purpose and with the same ingenuity, resourcefulness, and boldness that they have employed to such advantage in wartime production, they can solve them.

We must not lower our sights to prewar levels. The goal after the war should be the maximum utilization of our human and material resources. This is the way to rout the forces of insecurity and unemployment at home as completely as we shall have defeated the forces of tyranny and oppression on the fields of battle.

There are, however, certain measures which merit the immediate attention of the Congress to round out the program already commenced for the special protection of the members of the armed forces.

The Congress has already enacted a generous program of benefits for servicemen and for the widows and dependents of those killed in action.

For example:

1. Under the National Service Life Insurance Act, life insurance at low premium rates is now available to members of the armed forces in amounts not less than $1,000 and not more than $10,000 per person. A total of nearly $90,000,000,000 of insurance has already been applied for.

2. In addition, provision has been made under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act for the guaranty by the Government of the payment of premiums on commercial policies held by members of the armed forces while in service. Premiums on insurance totaling $135,582,000 have been guaranteed as a result of 56,276 applications by servicemen for such relief.

3. The Congress has also enacted legislation making provision for the hospitalization and medical care of all veterans of the present war and for the vocational rehabilitation and training of those suffering from disability incurred n or aggravated by military service, when such disability results in a vocational handicap preventing reemployment. Similar provision has been made for the rehabilitation of disabled persons in civil life who, with proper training, can be equipped to play a useful part in the war effort at home. Men who are rejected for military service because of physical or mental defects, or who are discharged from the armed forces because of a disability existing at the time of induction, are thus eligible for such rehabilitation services and training as may be necessary and feasible in order to fit them for useful and gainful employment.

4. By recent legislation our present service men and women have been assured the same pension benefits for death or disability incurred in the line of duty while in active military service as are provided for the veterans of prior wars. The pension rates for the families of those killed in this war were recently increased by the Congress.

The Veterans' Administration will, from time to time, request the consideration by the Congress of various amendments of existing laws which will facilitate administration, and which will correct any defects in our present statutory scheme which experience may disclose. I am confident that the Congress, in line with the historic policy of this Government toward its ill, injured, and disabled service men and women, will provide generous appropriations to the Veterans' Administration with which to carry out these laws.

5. Numerous other measures have been adopted for the protection of our servicemen, such as the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against members of the armed forces; the creation of reemployment rights under the Selective Service Act; and the provision for emergency maternity care to the wives and infants of enlisted men.

However, I believe that we must go much further.

We must make provision now to help our returning service men and women bridge the gap from war to peace activity. When the war is over, our men and women in the armed forces will be eager to rejoin their families, get a job, or continue their education, and to pick up the threads of their former lives. They will return at a time when industry will be in the throes of reconversion. Our plans for demobilization of soldiers and sailors must be consistent with our plans for the reconversion of industry and for the creation of employment opportunities for both servicemen and war workers. Already the armed forces have returned many thousands of service men and women to civil life.

The following further steps seem desirable now:

1. To help service men and women tide over the difficult period of readjustment from military to civilian life, mustering-out pay will be needed. It will relieve them of anxiety while they seek private employment or make their personal plans for the future. I therefore recommend to the Congress that it enact legislation and provide funds for the payment of a uniform, reasonable mustering-out pay to all members of the armed forces upon

their honorable discharge or transfer to inactive duty. This pay should not be in a lump sum but on a monthly installment basis.

2. We must anticipate, however, that some members of the armed forces may not be able to obtain employment within a reasonable time after their return to civil life. For them, unemployment allowances should be provided until they can reasonably be absorbed by private industry.

Members of the armed services are not now adequately covered by existing unemployment insurance laws of the States. It is estimated that approximately one-half of them will have no unemployment-insurance protection at all when they leave military service. Benefits payable to those who are covered by State law are unequal, and will vary greatly among the States because of the wide differences in the provisions of the State laws. The protection in many cases will be inadequate. It is plainly a Federal responsibility to provide for the payment of adequate and equitable allowances to those service men and women who are unable to find employment after their demobilization.

For these reasons I recommend to the Congress that a uniform system of allowances for unemployed service men and women be established.

I believe that there should be a fixed and uniform rate of benefit for a fixed period of time for all members of the armed forces who, after leaving the service, are unable to find suitable work. In order to qualify for an unemployment allowance each person should be obliged to register with the United States Employment Service, and, following the usual practice in unemployment insurance, must be willing to accept available and suitable employment, or to engage in a training course to prepare him for such employment. The protection under this system should be continued for an adequate length of time following the period for which mustering-out payment is made.

At present, persons serving in the merchant marine are not insured under State unemployment insurance laws, primarily because the very nature of their employment carries them beyond the confines of any particular State. I believe that the most effective way of protecting maritime workers against postwar unemployment is to enact without delay a Federal maritime unemployment insurance act. There has been in effect since 1938 a railroad unemployment insurance act, and a similar act for maritime workers is long overdue. Marine workers are, however, insured under the existing Federal old-age and survivors' insurance law.

3. Members of the armed forces are not receiving credit under the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance law for their period of military service. Credit under the law can be obtained only while a person is engaged in certain specific types of employment. Service in the armed forces is not included in these types. Since the size of the insurance benefits depends upon the total number of years in which credits are obtained, the exclusion of military service will operate to decrease the old-age retirement benefits which will eventually be payable to service men and women. Furthermore, a large number of persons whose dependents were protected by the survivors' insurance benefits at the time they entered the armed forces, are losing entirely those insurance rights while they are in service.

I therefore recommend that the Congress enact legislation to make it possible for members of the armed forces to obtain credit under the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance law during their period of military service. The burden of this extension of old-age and survivors' insurance to members of the armed forces should be carried by the Federal Government, and the Federal contributions should be uniform for all members of the armed forces irrespective of their rank.

I have already communicated with the Congress requesting the enactment of legislation to provide educational and training opportunities for the members of the armed forces who desire to pursue their studies after their discharge.

The Congress will agree, I am sure, that this time we must have plans and legislation ready for our returning veterans instead of waiting until the last moment. It will give notice to our armed forces that the people back home do not propose to let them down.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 23, 1943.*

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement regarding the introduction of a bill, which I shall ask unanimous consent to introduce out of order.

The time to prepare for peace is before the end of hostilities. There will be many difficult problems to be solved after the last shot is fired on the field of battle. Their solution will not be easy.

We have already raised the largest Army and Navy this country has ever known. Our armed forces are growing each day in strength and numbers. The tasks involved in creating and providing for an Army and Navy of such large proportions have been of unprecedented magnitude. It will be to the everlasting credit of the United States that no difficulty was too great, no problem was insurmountable, with the result that in so small a period of time so much has been accomplished. This is something our enemies had not counted on.

The problems of mobilization for war have been met because we were able to pool our common energies for the task. The problems of demobilization for peace will be just as numerous, just as urgent, and just as critical to the future of our country. These, too, will be solved if we employ our common energies.

One of the problems will be: What will be the position of our servicemen just after they have been demobilized? They will need new civilian clothes to replace the uniforms which they have worn so proudly. Civilian clothes will symbolize to them their return to the pursuits of peace.

They will need to reestablish their homes, to reunite their families. There will be many practical little things that will have to be done in order for them to reestablish the way of life they had to give up when they joined the colors. Many will need some help until they are able to readjust themselves to a manner of life that will seem new, and until our factories and plants will have had time to reconvert to civilian production.

The Government, which provided so well for the mobilization of these men and women, owes both to them and to the country as a whole the duty of arranging for their orderly demobilization.

Accordingly, I am introducing a bill to provide for the payment of mustering-out pay to servicemen upon their demobilization from the armed forces. No mustering-out pay would be given to commissioned officers of ranks above that of captain in the Army, since persons of such ranks undoubtedly will have saved sufficiently from their salaries to tide them over the transition period. Likewise, persons who are entitled to be placed on the retirement lists will not be paid any mustering-out pay, since they will be receiving a steady and assured income immediately upon demobilization.

All other servicemen who are not dishonorably discharged, who have served in the armed forces, would receive the sum of $300 as mustering-out pay, $100 of which would be payable immediately upon discharge, the remainder in two equal monthly installments. It is believed that such a sum would do much toward enabling the demobilized soldier, sailor, and marine to go through the necessary readjustment period without any undue hardship until they are able to assume their rightful places as self-supporting members of the community.

Provision is also made in the bill for paying to the surviving widow, minor children, or parents the mustering-out pay of any serviceman who dies after discharge but before receiving the full amount.

I believe this bill will be the solution of one of the many problems we will face when the war is over. It is an important first step in easing the return of our boys and girls to civilian life.

I might say, in addition, that the bill applies to members of all the armed services, the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, as well as to the women's organizations which have become component parts of our armed services.

It applies also to those who have been heretofore discharged. Under the bill the same amount would be paid to them that would be paid to those discharged hereafter.

I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to introduce the bill, and that it be printed in the body of the RECORD following the statement I have just made.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1543) to provide for payment of mustering-out pay to members of the armed forces, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and

ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SEC. 1. All members of the armed forces of the United States, who shall have been in active service during the present war and who shall have been discharged or relieved from active duty under other than dishonorable conditions after December 7, 1941, shall be eligible to receive mustering-out pay: *Provided*, That mustering-out pay shall not be payable to any person who, at the time of discharge or relief from active service, holds a commission, either permanent or temporary, of any rank above captain in the Army, or of any equivalent rank in any of the other armed services: *Provided further*, That mustering-out pay shall not be payable to members of the armed forces who, at the time of discharge or relief from active duty, shall be eligible for placement on the retired list.

SEC. 2. Mustering-out pay, for persons eligible under section 1, shall be in the sum of $300. One hundred dollars of mustering-out pay shall be paid to all eligible persons at the time of discharge or relief from active duty. The remaining amount of mustering-out pay shall be paid in two consecutive monthly installments: *Provided*, That in the case of persons selected for training under the Servicemen's Education and Training Act of 1943 all payments under this act shall be suspendid during the time that such person has been selected for attendance at an approved educational institution.

SEC. 3. Members of the armed forces entitled to mustering-out pay who shall have been discharged or relieved from active duty under other than dishonorable conditions before the effective date of this act shall receive the first installment of their mustering-out pay 1 month after the effective date of this act.

SEC. 4. If any member of the armed forces, after his discharge or relief from active duty, shall die before receiving the full amount of the mustering-out pay payable to such person, the amount which he would have received had he lived shall be payable to his surviving widow, if any, and if he shall leave no surviving widow, then in equal shares to his minor children, if any, and if he shall leave no surviving widow or minor children, then in equal shares to his surviving parents, if any: *Provided*, That no payments under this act shall be made to any other person.

SEC. 5. The term "member of the armed forces of the United States" as used herein means any member of the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, the United States Marine Corps, the United States Coast Guard, or any of their respective components.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall administer this act within their respective services.

SEC. 7. This act may be cited as "The Mustering-out Pay Act of 1943."

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Resolutions adopted by a convention of the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., and the Joint Conference Committee on Public Relations, representing several Baptist conventions, Washington, D. C., favoring the enactment of pending legislation to repeal the Chinese exclusion acts; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the Association of Graduate Women of the University of Puerto Rico, San Juan, P. R., expressing satisfaction with proposed changes in the organic law for Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A resolution adopted by the annual meeting of the Michigan Milk Producers Association, favoring the enactment of the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the annual meeting of the Michigan Milk Producers Association, favoring discontinuance of the discrepancy in required rationed points as between butter and butter substitutes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution of the Michigan Board of Aeronautics, protesting against the enactment of the bill (H. R. 3420) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes, until the establishment of peace; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Michigan Retail Institute, Lansing, Mich., protesting against an increase in the social-security-tax rate at the present time; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution transmitted from the chamber of commerce, at Holland, Mich., being a proposed declaration of independence from possible post-war regimentation, adopted by a conference of American small business organizations, representing 200 organizations in 39 States; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the annual meeting of the Michigan Milk Producers Association, protesting against the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2400) to eliminate the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to taxes on domestic margarine and relating to license taxes upon manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers of margarine; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the common council of the city of Hamtramck, Mich., endorsing decisions reached by the Moscow Conference, saluting the military accomplishments of the Red Army, and greeting the people of the Soviet Union on their twenty-sixth anniversary; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by a convention of the Moms of America (mothers of men in the service) at Ann Arbor, Mich., favoring the use of railroad trains exclusively by those whose business thereon has a direct bearing upon the war; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the annual meeting of the Michigan Milk Producers Association, favoring the preservation of self-government in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2082) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A memorial of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the relaxation of Government regulations controlling the manufacture of alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Huron County (Mich.) Farm Bureau, favoring action by the Government to identify farm workers so that they may not be placed in the category of slackers in connection with the war effort; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Stewards' Body of Local 490, U. A. W. A.–C. I. O., of Detroit, Mich., protesting against the enactment of the so-called Luce bill, being the bill (H. R. 3556) to create an Army and Navy maintenance corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution adopted by a convention of the Michigan State Branch of the N. A. P. S., at Three Rivers, Mich., favoring the enactment of legislation authorizing overtime pay to postal supervisors; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A resolution adopted by the Michigan Committee on Intrastate Cooperation, at Lansing, Mich., protesting against the enactment of the bill (S. 1152) to provide for the conservation of wildlife on public lands and reservations of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

A resolution adopted by a convention of the Moms of America (mothers of men in the service) at Ann Arbor, Mich., favoring the adoption of the so-called Ball-Hill-Burton-Hatch resolution, being Senate resolution 114, favoring organization of the United Nations to maintain peace; ordered to lie on the table.

GENERAL WELFARE AND OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE LEGISLATION—PETITION

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD the body of a petition signed by 100 members of the United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, asking support of Senate bill 1161 and House bill 2861, relating to general welfare and granting old-age assistance.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Finance and the body thereof, without the signatures attached, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We voters of the Third Congressional District of Indiana petition you as Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of these United States, representing all the people of the United States, to work for and vote for the passage of S. 1161 and H. R. 2861, social-security bills introduced by Messrs. WAGNER, MURRAY, and DINGELL.

We also request this petition be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

FOOD SUBSIDY PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF INDIANA FARM BUREAU, INC., INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution passed unanimously at the twenty-fifth annual convention of the Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind., November 17, 1943.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANA FARM BUREAU, INC.,
Indianapolis, Ind., November 17, 1943.

As members of the Indiana Farm Bureau and representing more than 200,000 Indiana farm people, we respectfully present and urge your due consideration of our official and personal concern regarding subsidies as they affect agricultural commodities.

Ceilings on corn, hogs, and cattle, established by Government decree and in direct violation of the Price Stabilization Act of October 1942, have definitely checked the natural upward trend of prices. In the instance of cattle and hog price ceilings, the market, coincident with the announcement of ceiling prices, fell—and to exactly the Government price-ceiling levels. Government-assured floors are ignored to the detriment of both producers and consumers.

Now comes the proposal to subsidize from the Federal Treasury sufficiently to span the gap between ceiling prices and the natural levels comparable to the purchasing ability of the consuming public. We are opposed to this and urge that you vote against increased subsidies for the following reasons:

1. The public has sufficient purchasing power to amply provide all its needs.
2. Reduced living costs through subsidies leave more money in the pockets of consumers to bid for fewer articles.
3. Subsidies will add indebtedness for future generations as well as for our fighting men to pay when they come home.
4. Farmers will help to pay their own subsidies.
5. Subsidies enlarged and more widespread can lead to a Government-controlled agriculture.
6. Ceiling prices were the forerunner for an excuse to subsidize.
7. Subsidies have every tendency to create inflation.
8. Ceiling prices and subsidies will bring about reduced food and fiber in this Nation.
9. Farm people do not desire the finger of scorn pointed toward them as receiving hand-outs from the Federal Treasury.
10. Give us manpower and machinery, a fair price in the market places, and there will be no excuse for subsidies.

This resolution was passed unanimously at the twenty-fifth annual convention of the Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind., November 17, 1943.

Again we ask your cooperation against subsidies.

RESOLUTION FAVORING EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION ADOPTED AT PURCELLVILLE, VA.

Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. GLASS) presented a resolution adopted by a group of over 100 women attending the post-war women's program presented by the Purcellville Woman's Club, at Purcellville, Va., on November 19, 1943, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Virginia Members of Congress.

GENTLEMEN: Whenever the fundamentals of the supreme law are under consideration, it has been the privilege of Virginia's statesmen to be in the front ranks. The Declaration of Independence has become a landmark for reforms in other governments.

The National Constitution, written largely by James Madison in 1787, has been a model for other federal governments. And the status of world neutrality arose from George Washington's 1793 Neutrality Proclamation.

Today women from several Virginia counties have heard not only plans for greater opportunities for post-war women, they have also heard glowing accounts of the rapid infiltration of women into defense plants and battle fronts throughout the world.

From all this we are forced to conclude that if ever we are to build the America of our dreams, this present team play of men and women must become a permanent reality. Women must become full citizens with men. This can be done only by the passage of the equal-rights amendment to the Federal Constitution reading:

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

We therefore appeal to our Representatives in Congress to do honor to their statesman ancestors by rising to leadership in the passage of a law endowing for all time the mothers of men with all that great wealth of experience arising out of responsibilities, opportunities, and duties now common to the life of men, enjoying full and unrestricted citizenship.

Mrs. Contee L. Adams, Hamilton; Mrs. William S. Ashbrook, Waterford; Mrs. Henry W. Beatty, Bluemont; Mrs. Frank W. McComb, Bluemont; Mrs. J. Lynn Cornwell, Purcellville; Mrs. Arthur E. Lybolt, Purcellville; Mrs. Gertrude J. Robey, Purcellville; Mrs. Franklin P. Wilson, Purcellville; Mrs. William G. Fletcher, Upperville; Mrs. Howard A. Gray, Ashburn; Mrs. Richard Lake, Philomont; Mrs. A. D. Neale, Round Hill; Miss Charlotte Noland, Middleburg; Mrs. John T. Owens, Leesburg; Mrs. Jack Potterfield, Lovettsville; Mrs. Mildred R. Shackleford, Unison; Mrs. William T. Smith, Lincoln; Mrs. C. Malcolm Hoge, Lincoln; Mrs. Heyward C. Thompson, Hillsboro, the resolution committee.

PRICE CONTROL, SUBSIDIES, AND INFLATION

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference, and to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, a telegram from the city clerk of Detroit reporting upon a resolution adopted by the Detroit Common Council regarding consumer subsidies.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DETROIT, MICH., *November 23, 1943.*

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
Member of Congress, Washington D. C.:

The following resolution was adopted by Detroit Common Council in formal session tonight:

Whereas the city of Detroit and its citizens have a tremendous stake in the attempt of our Government to prevent inflation; and

"Whereas if the fight against inflation is lost the Detroit area may well be one of the most seriously affected areas in the country by the consequent competition between prices and wages; and

"Whereas the Common Council of the City of Detroit has had presented to it petitions from city employees asking for general wage increases in the belief that the fight against inflation had been lost, and petitions from citizen's groups requesting our aid in the support of price control: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Common Council of the City of Detroit does hereby petition the Members of the House and Senate from the State of Michigan to give vigorous support to the President of the United States in his fight against inflation, and particularly to join the battle against the proposal now pending before Congress to eliminate the payment of subsidies upon which price control depends."

FOOD-SUBSIDY PROGRAM—LETTER FROM FORD COUNTY (KANS.) FARM BUREAU

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference a letter from John P. Perrier, county agent of Ford County, Kans., informing me of the action of the Ford County Farm Bureau, which went on record at its meeting on November 15 in opposition to the food-subsidy program.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORD COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
Dodge City, Kans., November 20, 1943.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senator from Kansas, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a community A. A. A. election meeting held in Ford County, Monday night, November 15, it was voted by the delegation to endorse the action of the farm bloc of Congress and the farm organizations on their stand with regard to the food-subsidy program.

This group is opposed to food subsidies and wanted us to inform you about it.

Very truly yours,

JOHN P. PERRIER,
County Agent.

GENERAL SALES TAX—RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA FARMERS UNION

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I present a letter embodying a resolution adopted by the recent annual convention of the North Dakota Farmers Union, stating their position in regard to a general sales tax, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter embodying a resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., *November 18, 1943.*

Senator GERALD P. NYE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NYE: Following is a portion of the program for 1944 adopted by the recent annual convention of the North Dakota Farmers Union.

Because of the current importance of this section the delegates asked that transmittal be made as soon after the convention as possible to the congressional delegation from North Dakota bearing the request that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Following is the convention's position on the general sales tax:

"Stabilization of economy: We recommend our national and State leadership for standing firm for the Farmers Union policy formulated before Pearl Harbor for the complete stabilization of our internal economy and positive control of inflation. We recognize that at all costs we must prevent the repetition of the inflation and resultant deflation following World War No. 1 which caused 1,000,000 American farmers to lose their homes, and eventually caused 16,000,000 workers to lose their jobs.

"To that end we support: Opposition, with every ounce of strength we can muster, to a general sales tax which if passed would be highly inflationary—not deflationary."

Very shortly we will have available the entire program in printed form. We shall forward a copy to you very soon.

Yours very truly,

NORTH DAKOTA FARMERS UNION,
A. L. HELLEBUST, *Acting Secretary.*

SUBSIDY PAYMENTS—RESOLUTION BY SOUTH VERDIGRIS LOCAL FARMERS UNION, NO. 1498, MADISON, KANS.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a letter embodying a resolution which I have received from the Madison (Kans.) Farmers Union.

There being no objection, the letter embodying a resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At a regular meeting of the South Verdigris Local No. 1498, of the Farmers Union, held on November 18, 1943, the following resolution was offered and voted on—25 voted for, none opposed the resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the members of the South Verdigris Local No. 1498 are opposed to subsidies."

The local voted to send copies of the resolution to Senators Clyde Reed and Arthur Capper, Representatives Edward Rees and William Lambertson, National Farmers Union president, James G. Patton, and the Kansas Union Farmer.

Yours truly,

FRED BANS, *Secretary.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1324. A bill for the relief of the Wisconsin Electric Power Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 540); and

H. R. 3039. A bill for the relief of Mrs. C. W. Selby; without amendment (Rept. No. 541).

By Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1146. A bill to amend section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; without amendment (Rept. No. 542).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. Res. 195. Resolution requesting an investigation concerning Government property and materials no longer needed for war purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 543); and

S. Res. 198. Resolution to investigate the matter of the termination of Government procurement contracts; with amendments, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 296. A bill for the relief of Hector H. Perry; without amendment (Rept. No. 544).

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. Res. 197. Resolution authorizing the employment of assistants and the expenditure of funds in a proposed investigation of the administration of the Rural Electrification Act (submitted by Mr. SMITH on October 25, 1943); with amendments (Rept. No. 545), and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. BARKLEY introduced Senate bill 1543, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1544. A bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels, landing craft, and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. WAGNER (for himself, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. CLARK of Missouri), introduced Senate bill 1545, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'DANIEL (for Mr. MCCARRAN):

S. 1546. A bill to amend an Act relating to the incorporation of Providence Hospital, Washington, D. C., approved April 8, 1864; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLARK OF MISSOURI:

S. 1547. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MCKELLAR:

S. 1548. A bill to limit the jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SOCIAL SECURITY FOR DEMOBILIZED MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, in behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], and myself I ask unanimous consent at this time to introduce for reference to the Finance Committee and explain briefly a bill carrying out the recommendations made in the President's message regarding social security for servicemen.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1545) to amend the Social Security Act, to give insurance credits under the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance provisions of that act for military service, and to provide unemployment allowances for members of the armed forces after their demobilization, introduced by Mr. WAGNER (for himself, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. CLARK of Missouri) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, the bill is in the form of amendments to the Social Security Act. Somewhat similar provisions are written into the broad social-security measure, Senate bill 1161, introduced on June 3 by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and myself. The technical background of such legislation was discussed at length by the Chairman of the Social Security Board, in memoranda printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 25 and October 26.

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS' INSURANCE

Under the bill just introduced, every member of our armed forces receives a credit toward old-age and survivors' insurance under the Social Security Act, for each month of active service since September 16, 1940, the date of the Selective Service Act. The credit is related to a uniform wage base of $160 per month. The same wage basis was provided for railroad employees now in the armed forces, under 1942 amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. The sums needed to cover both the employee and the employer tax contribution, at this rate of wage, are authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors' Trust Fund.

This credit is provided whether or not the serviceman was previously covered by the Social Security Act. It extends to every member of the armed forces, including the Army, Navy, marines, Coast Guard, or any of their components, such as WAVES, WAC's, and SPARS. The only exceptions are members of the armed forces who are already receiving such military service credits under amendments to the Railway Retirement or Civil Service Retirement Acts.

UNEMPLOYMENT ALLOWANCES

The bill provides for payment of unemployment allowances for each week of unemployment, up to 52 weeks, occuring during the 15-month period after the individual serviceman or woman is demobilized. No allowance would be paid, however, for any week during which the individual is receiving Federal mustering-out pay or educational allowances, such as provided for in the bill just introduced by the senior Senator from Kentucky.

The unemployment allowance is $15 a week for a single man or woman, $5 additional for a dependent wife, and $2.50 additional for each dependent child. The maximum allowance per week is $25. The allowance would be paid to every eligible serviceman who is discharged or relieved from active duty under other than dishonorable conditions after the effective date of this part of the bill. We also make special provision for those demobilized in the recent past, who may become unemployed hereafter.

This benefit is surrounded with the usual safeguards under unemployment insurance laws. The applicant must register with and report to a public employment office, or attend a suitable free training course. Partial wages earned during any week, in excess of $3 are deducted from the amount of the benefit. No benefit would be paid if the applicant failed to report for suitable work, unless good cause were shown. The bill provides, however, that unemployment allowances should not be cut off if the veteran becomes disabled or ill after a period of unemployment had commenced. This is a modified form of disability insurance, especially necessary for demobilized veterans who have not quite shaken off the strain of military life.

Any serviceman whose claim for an allowance has been denied is entitled to a fair hearing before an impartial tribunal and to the usual court review given in unemployment insurance cases.

RELATION TO STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE LAWS

The Social Security Board is authorized to administer the unemployment allowances. The Board may utilize the available facilities and services of other Federal departments and agencies, and may enter into agreements with appropriate State or other public or private agencies or institutions to utilize their services or facilities. However, any State unemployment agency which desires to enter into and operate under such an agreement or cooperative working arrangement shall be permitted to do so, under express provision of the bill.

While the State agencies have their place in the administration of these unemployment allowances, the benefit amount is uniform for every serviceman with the same number of dependents, regardless of the State he came from, the amount he might have received under any State law, or whether he was covered by a State law before he entered military service. This uniformity is a matter of simple justice and equity for those who have served in our armed forces. It is the only sound course available in the present circumstances, with 51 different State laws varying widely as to coverage, amount, and duration of benefits.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed a table showing these variations in detail.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Selected unemployment compensation data

[Corrected to Aug. 16, 1943]

State	Coverage		Benefits										Financing				
	Minimum size of firm coverage [1]	Workers with wage credits in 1942 (in thousands)	Eligibility requirement [2] [3] (minimum earnings or multiple of W. B. A.)	Weekly benefit amount			Percentage distribution of payments for total unemployment, January-December 1942				Maximum duration (*—uniform)	Average actual duration, claimants exhausting rights, benefit years ending in 1942	Exhaustion ratio for benefit years ending in 1942	Experience rating			Funds available as of June 30, 1943 (in thousands)	Date benefits first payable
				Fraction of highest quarterly earnings	Minimum	Maximum	Less than $5	$5-$9.99	$10-$14.99	$15 and over				Estimated average employer contribution rate, 1943 (40 States)	Percentage of rated employers with reduced rates, 1943 (40 States)	Percentage of rated employers with rates of less than 1 percent, 1943 (27 States)		
All States		40,600					1.3	25.2	29.7	43.8				[5] 1.7	[6] 73.5	38.4	$4,007,524	
Alabama	8	736	$60 (30x, inc. $39.01 in 1 quarter).	1/26	$2	$15	10.3	45.8	24.9	19.0	20x	17.0	39.7	[7] 1.2	95.2	43.8	41,893	Jan. 1938
Alaska	8	35	$125 (25x)	1/50	5	16	------	8.4	12.8	78.8	16x	(8)	(8)	(9)	(9)	(9)	3,663	Jan. 1939
Arizona	3	183	$70 (14x) [3]	[10] 1/26	5	15	------	28.2	28.9	42.9	14x	9.8	44.6	2.3	55.7	--------	10,189	Jan. 1938
Arkansas	1 in 10 days	403	$66 (22x)	1/26	3	15	20.0	53.0	17.6	9.4	16x	9.5	46.2	[7] 2.2	70.4	--------	16,928	Jan. 1939
California	4	3,533	$300	1/50	10	20	------	------	40.0	60.0	23.4 x	16.7	33.6	[7] 2.3	37.0	--------	363,927	Jan. 1938
Colorado	8	331	$150 (30x)	[10] 1/25	5	15	------	41.5	30.3	28.2	16x	(11)	(11)	1.9	72.1	50.1	21,902	Jan. 1939
Connecticut	4 in 13 weeks	989	$144	(12)	6	[13] 22	------	30.2	35.8	34.0	[12] 18x	10.4	22.5	[7] 2.1	85.5	--------	105,463	Jan. 1938
Delaware	1	144	$200	1/25	5	18	------	57.3	26.6	16.1	20x	[14] 9.0	[14] 50.2	.9	96.8	75.0	11,663	Jan. 1939
District of Columbia	1 at any time	359	$150 (25x) [15]	1/53	6	20	.1	23.5	35.7	40.7	20x	(8)	(8)	(16)	(16)	(16)	36,898	Jan. 1938
Florida	8	691	$150 (30x)	(12)	5	15	.1	42.4	32.9	24.6	16x	11.4	52.7	[7] 2.2	70.9	--------	25,689	Jan. 1939
Georgia	8	806	$100 (table: 25x, 30x and 40x, including wages in 2 quarters).	(12)	4	18	9.9	54.8	17.6	17.7	*16x	[13] 14.0	[13] 46.2	[7] 2.1	80.4	--------	45,537	Do.
Hawaii	1	205	$150 (30x)	1/25	5	20	------	47.5	23.6	28.9	*20x	15.7	14.1	[7] 1.7	97.6	34.0	12,988	Do.
Idaho	1 and $78 in 1 quarter.	[17] 178	$140 (table: 28-52x, including wages in 2 quarters, and at least $78 in 1 quarter).	(12)	5	18	------	23.0	48.1	28.9	17x	12.2	33.3	(16)	(16)	(16)	7,916	Sept. 1938
Illinois	6	[17] 3,208	$225	1/50	7	18	------	12.3	31.9	55.8	20x	12.1	30.1	1.3	80.2	33.3	350,097	July 1939
Indiana	8	1,233	$250 and $150 in last 2 quarters.	1/25	5	18	.2	18.1	32.8	48.9	18x	11.8	35.8	[7] 2.2	60.4	33.7	104,945	Apr. 1938
Iowa	8 in 15 weeks	[17] 504	(15x)	[10] 1/26	[18] 5	15	.6	41.4	27.7	30.3	15x	8.5	46.7	1.9	72.6	46.4	34,456	July 1938
Kansas	8	362	$200 or $100 in 2 quarters.	1/25	5	15	------	37.7	31.0	31.3	16x	10.4	47.6	[7] 2.0	72.0	40.8	29,254	Jan. 1939
Kentucky	8 or $50 to each of 4 workers during each of 3 quarters.	568	$200	(19)	5	16	8.6	60.2	23.7	7.5	*16x	16.0	46.0	[7] 2.2	72.7	9.1	58,421	Do.
Louisiana	4	626	$60 (20x)	[10] 1/20	3	18	6.6	50.9	17.7	24.8	20x	(8)	(8)	(9)	(9)	(9)	36,759	Jan. 1938
Maine	8	273	$144	(19)	6	18	(20)	68.6	24.6	6.8	[21] *16x	14.0	21.9	(16)	(16)	(16)	18,817	Do.
Maryland	4	833	$210 (30x)	1/20	7	20	------	21.2	31.1	47.7	23x	10.9	44.9	(16)	(16)	(16)	69,105	Do.
Massachusetts	1	[17] 1,865	$150	1/20	6	18	------	35.3	33.1	31.6	20x	15.4	47.2	[7] 1.2	79.5	39.7	154,438	Do.
Michigan	8	2,050	$250 (including wages in 2 quarters).	1/25	7	16	------	4.9	18.1	77.0	18x	15.2	26.9	(8)	(8)	(8)	173,104	July 1938
Minnesota	1 [22]	653	$200	(19)	7	[13] 20	------	22.2	36.8	41.0	16x	13.8	42.6	1.7	77.3	42.4	43,940	Jan. 1938
Mississippi	8	383	$90 (30x)	1/26	3	15	10.2	51.6	18.8	19.4	*14x	14.0	43.0	(9)	(9)	(9)	12,074	Apr. 1938
Missouri	8	[17] 1,173	$120 (40x) including wages in 3 quarters. [3]	1/25	3	18	3.4	30.6	24.2	41.8	16x	11.0	41.4	1.6	81.6	58.7	99,500	Jan. 1939
Montana	1 or in excess of $500 in 1 year.	134	$150	1/25	5	15	------	34.9	31.6	33.5	*16x	16.0	32.0	(9)	(9)	(9)	10,021	July 1939
Nebraska	8	[17] 290	$200	1/25	5	15	------	38.1	36.4	25.5	16x	13.9	36.4	[7] 2.0	66.6	39.9	15,015	Jan. 1939
Nevada	1 and $225 in 1 quarter.	105	$200 [23]	1/20	5	15	------	9.0	28.1	62.9	18x	13.1	37.3	(9)	(9)	(9)	5,276	Do.
New Hampshire	4	[17] 183	$200	(19)	6	[24] 18	------	55.5	35.3	9.2	[24] 18x	14.9	18.4	[7] 2.3	66.9	0	14,114	Jan. 1938
New Jersey	8	1,755	$150	1/52	7	18	------	18.9	32.1	49.0	18x	[25] 10.5	[25] 39.7	(8)	(8)	(8)	256,692	Jan. 1939
New Mexico	2 in 13 weeks or $450 in 1 quarter.	[17] 138	$150 (30x, including $78 in 1 quarter).	1/26	5	15	11.2	45.3	21.9	21.6	16x	14.7	35.2	2.1	60.6	38.0	5,595	Dec. 1938
New York [26]	4 in 15 days	[17] 5,800	$250 (25x) [27]	1/53	[27] 10	[27] 18	------	23.6	32.2	44.2	[27] *20x	13.0	46.6	(9)	(9)	(9)	501,004	Jan. 1938
North Carolina	8	[17] 1,061	$130	(16)	3	15	18.8	65.5	13.1	2.6	*16x	16.0	43.7	[7] 2.6	24.6	.2	60,497	Do.
North Dakota	8	59	$150 (30x)	1/26	5	15	------	41.8	30.7	27.5	*16x	[13] 13.5	[13] 38.7	[7] 1.8	74.7	--------	3,253	Jan. 1939
Ohio	3 at any time	2,865	$160 and 20 weeks employment.	(12)	5	16	.5	21.4	36.4	41.7	*18x	[28] 18.0	24.3	1.4	92.7	41.4	302,002	Do.
Oklahoma	8	[17] 491	$132 (22x)	1/50	6	16	.1	28.8	28.5	42.6	16x	8.8	56.7	[7] 1.5	80.1	25.3	29,652	Dec. 1938
Oregon	4 on 1 day and $500 in same quarter.	[17] 503	[3] $200	6%	10	15	------	.3	23.3	76.4	16x	6.5	29.6	2.3	60.7	--------	34,739	Jan. 1938
Pennsylvania	1	4,014	$100 ($50 in each of 2 quarters).	1/26	8	18	------	32.5	31.3	36.2	16x	9.2	36.5	(9)	(9)	(9)	393,832	Do.
Rhode Island	4	387	$100	(12)	6.75	18	------	20.2	41.5	38.3	20x	9.1	52.6	(9)	(9)	(9)	40,934	Do.
South Carolina	8	481	$120 (30x; 40x for all amounts above minimum).	1/26	4	15	14.0	56.5	16.6	12.9	*16x	(8)	(8)	1.8	75.7	47.5	24,331	July 1938
South Dakota	8	81	$126	(19)	7	15	.1	68.6	21.3	10.0	[29] *16x	[14] 14.0	[14] 31.4	[7] 1.3	72.4	60.4	4,801	Jan. 1939

Footnotes at end of table.

Selected unemployment compensation data—Continued

State	Coverage		Benefits										Financing				
	Minimum size of firm coverage [1]	Workers with wage credits in 1942 (in thousands)	Eligibility requirement [2 3] (minimum earnings or multiple of W. B. A.)	Weekly benefit amount			Percentage distribution of payments for total unemployment, January-December 1942				Maximum duration (*—uniform)	Average actual duration, claimants exhausting rights, benefit years ending in 1943	Exhaustion ratio for benefit years ending in 1942	Experience rating			Funds available as of June 30, 1943 (in thousands)	Date benefits first payable
				Fraction of highest quarterly earnings	Minimum	Maximum	Less than $5	$5–$9.99	$10–$14.99	$15 and over				Estimated average employer contribution rate, 1943 (40 States)	Percentage of rated employers with reduced rates, 1943 (40 States)	Percentage of rated employers with rates of less than 1 percent, 1943 (27 States)		
Tennessee	8	710	$125 (25x; 30x for all amounts above minimum).	[29] 1/26	$5	$15	0.1	57.5	24.2	18.2	*16x	16.0	42.7	(9)	(9)	(9)	38,301	Jan. 1938
Texas	8	1,660	$80 (16x)	1/26	5	15	.....	60.1	18.9	21.0	16x	9.4	57.3	1.3	24.1	51.6	96,876	Do.
Utah	1 and $140 in calendar quarter.	225	$150 (30x)	1/20	5	20	.....	20.2	29.6	50.2	*20x	20.0	25.1	(9)	(9)	(9)	12,968	Do.
Vermont	8	93	$180 (30x)	(12)	6	15	.1	49.9	28.2	21.8	18x	13.2	37.0	[7] 2.3	54.0	.....	7,385	Do.
Virginia	8	891	$100 (25x)	1/25	4	15	6.5	51.2	23.5	18.8	16x	13.4	24.3	[7] 1.5	92.6	.....	41,423	Do.
Washington	1 at any time	[17] 784	$200	1/20	7	15	.....	16.6	27.3	56.1	16x	11.6	17.3	(9)	(9)	(9)	68,835	Jan. 1939
West Virginia	8	507	$250	(19)	7	18	.....	49.0	31.2	19.8	*16x	16.0	31.0	[7] 1.6	85.6	43.5	44,033	Jan. 1938
Wisconsin	6 in 18 weeks [20]	889	{14 weeks employment.}	(12)	8	20	.....	24.3	30.3	45.4	{[31] 20–36½x}	12.7	26.8	1.7	66.8	31.1	92,577	July 1936
Wyoming	1 and $150 in 1 quarter.	[17] 79	$175 (25x, including $70 in 1 quarter).	1/20	7	20	.....	19.0	23.3	57.7	16x	10.3	24.5	2.0	65.6	0	4,803	Jan. 1939

[1] Requires employment of specified minimum number of workers in at least 20 weeks except where otherwise stated.
[2] The dollar amount represents the minimum earnings requirement; where the wage qualification is a multiple of the weekly benefit rate, the multiple is shown in parentheses.
[3] The qualifying wages must have been earned in a 1 year base period in all States except the following: Arizona, 3-quarter base period; Missouri, 2-year base period; Oregon, 1-year base period that may be extended up to 2 years.
[4] Adjusted for duplication arising from employment of individuals in more than one State.
[5] Based on 34 States.
[6] Based on 24 States.
[7] Law provides for maximum contribution rate of 2.7 percent.
[8] Data not available.
[9] Experience rating not in effect in 1943; contribution rate is 2.7 percent.
[10] Or 50 percent of full-time weekly wage.
[11] State changed from individual to uniform benefit year; therefore, comparable data not available.
[12] Table.
[13] Lower maximum rates and duration are provided when balance in the fund is less than 2 percent of the pay roll for 3 years ending with the base period for the benefit year
[14] Data relate to operations under provisions which since have been liberalized; the presently included statistics are the latest available.
[15] Maximum $250.
[16] Experience rating became effective July 1, 1943.
[17] Estimated by State agency.
[18] Or full-time weekly wage, whichever is the lesser.
[19] Annual table.
[20] Less than 0.05 percent.
[21] Benefit duration for lower wage classes is less.
[22] But services for employers not subject to Federal unemployment tax and located outside the corporate limits of a city, village, or borough of 10,000 population are excluded.
[23] Or twice the square of the weekly benefit amount, whichever is greater, and including earnings in either case of five times the weekly benefit amount in some quarter other than that of highest earnings.
[24] $15 maximum weekly benefit amount and maximum duration of 16 weeks if fund fails to equal or exceed $8,000,000 for 2 successive months.
[25] Benefit years ending July-December 1942.
[26] Day base plan in effect since November 30, 1942, whereby benefits are paid for accumulations of 4 "effective days" of unemployment instead of weeks of unemployment.
[27] Benefits are paid for each accumulation of 4 "effective days." "Effective day" is defined as the fourth and every subsequent day of total unemployment in a week in which not more than $24 is paid to the individual.
[28] For nondisqualified claimants filing on or after Oct. 1, 1941; 12.0 for disqualified claimants.
[29] Rate is 1/20 and 1/25 for weekly benefit amounts of $5 and $6.
[30] Or where employer's records do not permit accurate count, if total annual pay roll is $6,000 or more.
[31] Duration depends on continuity of unemployment and number of base-period employers.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, on June 3 I inserted in the RECORD several other tables on this point.

About half the servicemen are probably not covered by any of these laws, either because they were in farming or some other excluded occupation, or had not worked long enough in civilian life to earn the necessary credits. As for those who had benefit rights, a few States have made no effort to protect their rights; and most of the others have simply adopted provisions freezing the benefit status. This denies the serviceman the increased credits he would have earned if he remained in civilian employment instead of serving in the armed forces.

Assuming that the serviceman is eligible for State unemployment benefits, he would probably find they were inadequate in amount and were paid for too short a period. A majority of States pay a maximum of $16 a week. The minimum goes below $5 in 9 States. Most States stop paying benefits after 16 weeks of unemployment. The effective maximum duration is often reduced still more because of various technical limitations. As a result, in the 2 years before Pearl Harbor, half the beneficiaries of the State laws exhausted their benefit rights before they had found other jobs.

At present, only the District of Columbia law authorizes added benefits for dependent wives and children. There is only 1 State, Rhode Island, which pays benefits when the man is unemployed because of sickness—the very time when he needs money for doctor's bills.

While Senators may differ about nationalizing the entire unemployment insurance system, I believe that every Senator will see the justice of paying our returning servicemen unemployment allowances on a uniform national basis, as this bill provides.

RELATION TO OTHER VETERAN BENEFITS

The bill makes provision for fair adjustment of the benefits where they duplicate similar benefits paid under some other Federal or State plan to which the claimant has made no direct contributions of his own. For example, any unemployment compensation benefit received under the usual State law would be subtracted from the allowance payable under this Federal bill. Let me emphasize, however, that this bill does not reduce or eliminate any veteran's allowances or benefits, contributory or noncontributory, available to servicemen or their dependents through the Veterans' Administration by existing law.

ESTIMATES OF COST

It is not possible to give a precisely correct estimate of the sums that would have to be appropriated out of the Federal Treasury for the benefits provided by this bill. The reasons are obvious. We have no way of predicting how long the war will last, when and how rapidly our forces will be demobilized, what the casualty figures will be, how large a standing Army and Navy we will retain after the war, and whether private industry can be ready to absorb these servicemen when they are demobilized. Another uncertain factor is the extent to which servicemen will return to their old jobs, under the partial guaranty of

the Selective Service Act. Undoubtedly, many will try to find new jobs more suitable either to the skill they have obtained in the armed forces, or to the new training and education they may obtain under the excellent bill sponsored by the able senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who, by the way, is beginning his hearings on that particular bill on December 13.

I may say, however, that by any reasonable estimate, the cost of this bill will not exceed our cost of running the war for about 2 weeks during the present fiscal year.

URGENT NEED FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION

In closing, I desire to emphasize the necessity for immediate action on this proposed legislation. Since introduction of Senate bill 1161 last June, in public statements and addresses, I have constantly urged prompt consideration of that broad measure, which covered not only the temporary needs of demobilized servicemen, but also the long-range needs of the whole population.

Many sound and necessary measures are under discussion to plan ahead for the period of demobilization and readjustment. That includes plans for canceling Government contracts, disposing of surplus Government property and Government-owned war plants, and building up corporate reserves. Along with those plans, I believe we must develop a broad social-security program to help the average American build up reserves for post-war security, for himself and his family. That is good sense, good finance, and good business.

The sponsors of that broad proposed legislation will continue to press for its full and early consideration.

The bill I have just introduced does not preclude that broad measure, nor is the bill a substitute for it. This bill, however, has great urgency, especially because of the time that has elapsed since introduction of Senate bill 1161, which was some 6 months ago. About 700,000 men have been demobilized since Pearl Harbor, either because of temporary or permanent disability, maladjustment in the armed forces, over age, or other reasons. The number so demobilized is increasing month by month. In addition, there is an increasing number of cases in which the widows and dependents of men killed in action have lost their rights to survivors' insurance, under social security, because the servicemen's credits had been impaired by their absence from civilian employment.

We cannot wait for more advisory councils and more surveys. Here is a bill which makes special retroactive provision for these survivors, for the millions of men and women in service, and for the increasing thousands who are returning to civilian life day by day. Let us, therefore, consider this bill and act upon it without delay.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1545) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,

TITLE I

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS' INSURANCE

SEC. 101. Title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by adding the following:

"CREDIT FOR MILITARY SERVICE

"SEC. 210. Every member of the armed forces of the United States shall receive a credit at the rate of $160 per calendar month as wages for employment within the meaning of this title for each month of active service after September 16, 1940: *Provided, however,* That this provision shall not apply to such members of the armed forces who receive credit for such service under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, as may be provided by regulations prescribed by the Railroad Retirement Board after consultation with the Social Security Board, or such members who receive retirement credit for such service under the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, as may be provided by regulations prescribed by the Civil Service Commission after consultation with the Social Security Board.

"APPROPRIATIONS IN LIEU OF EMPLOYER'S AND EMPLOYEE'S TAX

"SEC. 211. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time to the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance trust fund amounts equal to the sum of (a) the product of all wages credited to members of the armed forces under section 210 multiplied by the current rate of the tax imposed on employees under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 26, sec. 1400) and (b) the product of all such wages multiplied by the current rate of the tax imposed on employers under that act (U. S. C., title 26, sec. 1410).

"DEATH BEFORE PASSAGE OF THE ACT

"SEC. 212. (a) Upon the filing of an application within such period as may be prescribed by the Board, benefits payable with respect to the death of any individual which are based in whole or in part upon credits received under section 210 of this title shall be payable to persons entitled thereto as of the date of the death of any individual who was a member of the armed forces and who died prior to the date of the Armed Forces Social Security Act of 1943.

"(b) In the case of any benefit to which an individual became entitled prior to the effective date of the Armed Forces Social Security Act of 1943, the amount of such benefit may be recomputed to include wages credited under section 210 if such recompensation would increase the amount of the benefit payable to such individual.

"ADJUSTMENT OF DUPLICATE BENEFITS

"SEC. 213. (a) Where any benefit is payable to an individual for a month under title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, and where any Federal noncontributory benefit is payable for the same month with respect to an individual who died or attained the age of 65, the benefit payable under such title shall be adjusted as follows:

"(1) If the benefit payable under such title is greater than that payable under the Federal noncontributory benefit plan the benefit payable under such title shall be reduced by an amount equal to one-half the benefit payable under the Federal noncontributory plan.

"(2) If the benefit payable under such title is equal to or less than the benefit payable under the Federal noncontributory benefit plan the benefit payable under such title shall be reduced by one-half.

"(b) The benefits to be adjusted shall be the final net benefits payable under such title and under a Federal noncontributory benefit plan. Benefits payable under such title shall be adjusted regardless of any temporary modification of, or delay in, the payment of a benefit under a Federal noncontributory plan.

"(c) No adjustment under this section in any benefit to which an individual had become entitled before the date of enactment of the Armed Forces Social Security Act of 1943 shall reduce such benefit to an amount less than the benefit payable before such date."

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by adding the following new title:

"TITLE XII

"UNEMPLOYMENT ALLOWANCES FOR FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

"Benefit period and eligibility

"SEC. 1201. (a) Any eligible member of the armed forces of the United States who shall have been discharged or relieved from active duty under other than dishonorable conditions after the effective date of this title or within the 52-week period preceding such date shall be entitled, in accordance with such regulations as the Board may prescribe, to receive an allowance for each week of unemployment, up to 52 weeks, which (1) begins after the effective date of this title, and (2) occurs during the 15-month period after he is so discharged or relieved from active duty: *Provided,* That no such allowance shall be paid him during the 4 weeks following the receipt of mustering-out pay under 'the Mustering-Out Pay Act of 1943' or for any period for which he received educational allowances under 'the Servicemen's Education and Training Act of 1943.'

"(b) Such member of the armed forces shall be deemed eligible to receive an allowance for any week of unemployment if he makes a claim for such allowance and the Board finds with respect to such week that:

"(1) He is residing in the United States at the time of such claim.

"(2) He is completely unemployed in that he has performed no services and received no wages, or he is partially unemployed in that he has performed services for less than a full workweek and his wages for the week are less than his allowance under this title plus $3.

"(3) He registers with and continues to report to a public employment office, or such other agency as the Board may designate, in accordance with regulations of the Board.

"(4) He is able to work and available for suitable work or is with the approval of the Board attending a training course: *Provided,* That no claimant shall be considered ineligible in any period of continuous unemployment for failure to comply with the provisions of this subparagraph if such failure is due to an illness or disability which occurs after the commencement of such period.

"Disqualifications

"SEC. 1202. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1201, a claimant shall be disqualified from receiving an allowance if—

"(1) He leaves suitable work voluntarily without good cause or if he is suspended or discharged for misconduct in the course of his employment;

"(2) He, without good cause, fails to apply for suitable work, in accordance with regulations of the Board, or to accept suitable work when offered him;

"(3) He, without good cause, does not attend a free training course, in accordance with regulations of the Board.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1201 a claimant shall also be disqualified from receiving an allowance for any week with respect to which it is found that his unemployment is due to a stoppage of work which exists because of a labor dispute at the factory, establishment, or other premises at

which he is or was last employed: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply if it is shown that:

"1. He is not participating in or directly interested in the labor dispute which caused the stoppage of work; and

"2. He does not belong to a grade or class of workers of which, immediately before the commencement of the stoppage there were members employed at the premises at which the stoppage occurs, any of whom are participating in or directly interested in the dispute: *Provided, however*, That if in any case separate branches of work which are commonly conducted as separate businesses in separate premises are conducted in separate departments of the same premises, each such department shall, for the purposes of this subsection, be deemed to be a separate factory, establishment, or other premises.

"(c) If a claimant is disqualified under the provisions of paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a) of this section, the disqualification period shall be the week in which the cause of his disqualification occurred and the consecutive weeks of unemployment, not more than 4, which immediately followed such week.

"(d) (1) In determining under subsection (a) of this section the suitability of work or the existence of good cause with respect to a claimant, there shall be considered, among other factors, the degree of risk involved to his health, safety, and morals, his physical fitness and prior training, his experience and prior or probable earnings in his customary occupation or one for which he has been trained, the length of his unemployment, his prospects for obtaining work in his customary occupation or one for which he has been trained, the distance of available work from his residence and prospects for obtaining local work. No work shall be deemed unsuitable for an individual solely because the wages are less than his unemployment allowance.

"(2) No work shall be deemed suitable if:

"(a) The position offered is vacant due directly to a strike, lock-out, or other labor dispute;

"(b) The wages, hours, or other conditions of the work offered are substantially less favorable to him than those prevailing for similar work in the locality;

"(c) As a condition of being employed, he would be required to join a company union or to resign from or refrain from joining any bona fide labor organization.

"Amount of an allowance

"SEC. 1203. (a) The allowance for a week shall be—

"(1) $15 plus:

"(2) (A) $5 if the claimant has one dependent, or

"(B) $7.50 if he has two dependents, or

"(C) $10 if he has three or more dependents,

less that part of the wages payable to him for such week which is in excess of $3: *Provided*, That where the allowance is less than $1, it shall be raised to $1.

"(b) (1) As used in this section the term 'dependent' includes only:

"(a) The lawful wife of a claimant living with him or receiving regular support from him, who, in the week for which an allowance is claimed, has not received $5 or more either as wages, as an allowance under this title, or under any Federal or State unemployment or disability compensation law.

"(b) An unmarried child either (i) under 18 years of age, or (ii) of any age, if incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defect.

"(2) As used in this section the term 'child' shall include only:

"(a) A legitimate child;

"(b) A child legally adopted;

"(c) A stepchild, if a member of the claimant's household;

"(d) A child to whom the claimant stands in loco parentis and has so stood for not less than 12 months prior to the date of claim on behalf of such child.

"(3) The Board may find an individual to be a dependent of a claimant if a claimant certified the facts required by the provisions of this subsection.

"(c) Where a child is a dependent of more than one claimant, allowance for the child shall be made only on behalf of one claimant, as determined by the Board.

"(d) Where a claimant seeks an allowance for a dependent who is separated from him under court order or written agreement, the allowance for the dependent shall not exceed the amount fixed in the court order or in the written agreement. If such amount is not fixed at a weekly rate, the portion payable for each week shall be determined in accordance with regulations of the Board.

"Payment

"SEC. 1204. (a) Unemployment allowances shall be paid at reasonable intervals prescribed by the Board.

"(b) Any allowance remaining unpaid upon the death of a claimant shall not be considered a part of the assets of the estate of the claimant, or liable for the payment of his debts, or subject to any administration of his estate, and the Board may make payment thereof to such person or persons it finds most equitably entitled thereto.

"Adjustment of duplicate benefits

"SEC. 1205. Where an allowance is payable to a claimant for a week under this title and where, for the same week, either an allowance or benefit is received under any Federal or State unemployment or disability compensation law or a Federal or State noncontributory benefit is received, the amount received from such other source shall be subtracted from the allowance payable under this title.

"Administration

"SEC. 1206. (a) The Social Security Board, under the direction and supervision of the Federal Security Administrator, is authorized to administer this title and to prescribe such rules and regulations and require such records and reports as it may find necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

"(b) The Board may utilize the available facilities and services of other Federal departments and agencies, through agreement with the heads of such departments and agencies, and payment therefor shall be made either in advance or by reimbursement. It may enter into agreements with appropriate State or other public agencies and private persons, agencies, or institutions to utilize their facilities and services with or without compensation: *Provided*, That any State unemployment agency receiving funds under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, desiring to cooperate under such an agreement shall be permitted to do so as long as it functions in accordance with the terms of such agreement. It may delegate to any officer or employee of its own or of any agency of the Federal Government or of any State, such of its powers and duties, except that of prescribing regulations, as it may consider necessary to carry out the purposes of this title. It may require any such officer or employee to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as it may deem necessary, and the cost of such bond may be paid out of sums appropriated for the administration of this title.

"(c) Allowances shall be paid, upon certification by the Board and in accordance with such regulations as it may prescribe. The Board shall also, from time to time, certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment in advance or otherwise such sums as it estimates to be necessary to compensate such agencies, institutions, or persons for their administrative expenses under this title. Such sums shall cover periods of no longer than 6 months.

"(d) The Secretary of the Treasury, through the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury, and prior to audit and settlement by the General Accounting Office shall pay, at the time or times fixed by the Board, to the individuals or agencies designated, the amounts certified pursuant to subsection (c) of this section. Any money paid to any cooperating agency, person, or institution which is not used for the purpose for which it was paid shall, upon termination of the agreement with such agency, person, or institution, be returned to the Treasury and credited to the current appropriation for carrying out the purposes of this title or, if returned after the expiration of this title, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"Liability of certifying and disbursing officers

"SEC. 1207. (a) No person designated by the Board as a certifying officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to the payment of any allowance certified by him under this title.

"(b) No disbursing officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payment by him under this title if it was based upon a voucher signed by a certifying officer designated by the Board.

"Hearing

"SEC. 1208. Any claimant whose claim for an allowance has been denied shall be entitled to a fair hearing before an impartial tribunal in accordance with regulations of the Board.

"Decisions and procedure

"SEC. 1209. (a) Any decision or certification with respect to an allowance by the Board, or by any agency or person to whom authority to make such decision or certification has been delegated, shall be subject to review in the same manner and to the same extent as provided in subsections (g) and (h) of section 205.

"(b) During any hearing, investigation, or other proceedings, the Board and, to the extent the Board determines, any agency or person to whom the Board has delegated such authority may administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence. Insofar as they are applicable to the administration of this title, the Board shall have all the powers and duties conferred upon it by subsections (d), (j), and (k) of section 205 and the provisions of subsections (e) and (f) of that section and the provisions of sections 204, 206, and 207 shall be applicable to this title in the same manner and to the same extent as they are applicable to title II.

"Requirement of reporting

"SEC. 1210. Any claimant shall report the occurrence of any event which makes him ineligible for, or reduces his allowance. Any claimant who fails to report any such event of which he has knowledge and who accepts an allowance to which he is not entitled because of such event shall be ineligible to receive an allowance for 4 weeks of unemployment thereafter.

"Penalties

"SEC. 1211. (a) Whoever, for the purpose of causing an increase in any allowance authorized under this title, or for the purpose of causing any allowance to be paid where none is authorized under this title, shall make or cause to be made any false statement or representation as to any wages paid or received or the period during which earned or paid, or whoever makes or causes to be made any false statement of a material fact in any claim for any allowance under this

title, or whoever makes or causes to be made any false statement, representation, affidavit, or document in connection with such a claim, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

"(b) Whoever shall obtain or receive any money, check, or allowance under this title, without being entitled thereto and with intent to defraud, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

"Appropriation authorized

"SEC. 1212. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time sums sufficient to carry out the purposes of this title.

"Definitions

"SEC. 1213. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'week' means such period of 7 consecutive calendar days as may be prescribed in regulations by the Board.

"(b) The term 'United States,' used geographically, means the several States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

"(c) The term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

"(d) The term 'wages' means all remuneration for services from whatever source, including commissions and bonuses and the cash value of all remuneration in any medium other than cash.

"Effective date

"SEC. 1214. This title shall become effective 3 calendar months after the month in which the Armed Forces Social Security Act of 1943 is enacted."

TITLE III

MISCELLANEOUS

Furnishing of information

SEC. 301. Any department or agency of the Federal Government shall, at the request of the Social Security Board, furnish such information with respect to individuals coming within the scope of this act as may be necessary for the purposes of this act.

General definitions

SEC. 302. As used in this act—

(a) The term "member of the Armed Forces of the United States" means any member of the Army of the United States, United States Navy, United States Marine Corps, United States Coast Guard, or any of their respective components.

(b) The term "noncontributory benefit" means a cash benefit, allowance, annuity, or compensation (including payments under any workmen's compensation law) payable by reason of the past employment or services of any individual, under any law or plan of the United States, any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or any political subdivision or instrumentality of any of the foregoing, creating a system of such payments to individuals (including payments made under any such law or plan by private insurance carriers), if with respect to such individual the benefit system is supported without direct and substantial contributions by wage earners.

Name of act

SEC. 303. This act shall be known as The Armed Forces Social Security Act of 1943.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 3477. An act to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3687. An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H. J. Res. 175. Joint resolution commemorating the fortieth aniversary of the first airplane flight by Wilbur and Orville Wright; to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENTS TO REVENUE BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3687) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUSHFIELD submitted several amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. WHITE (for Mr. DANAHER) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by Mr. DANAHER to Senate bill 1285, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

JOHN HANSON DAY

Mr. GILLETTE (by request) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Whereas on the 15th day of November 1944 it will be 161 years since the passing of John Hanson, outstanding citizen of the State of Maryland, who ranked foremost among our Nation's colonial patriots, statesmen, and builders; and

Whereas he rendered invaluable service as a civil leader in the hazardous days of the American Revolution, and worked also incessantly and successfully in formulating the American Union of Sovereign States, and in the establishment of American democracy; he made the first successful attempt at establishing our Nation as a civil structure, endowed with perpetuity and necessary governmental functions; and for this he has been rightfully termed the "Father of the Western Domain" and was elevated to the office of first "President of the United States in Congress Assembled" under the specific terms of the Articles of Confederation, but regretfully, under the stress and strain involved in those vast, complicated, and perilous movements, his service and memory have become obscured and forgotten, together with many of the important phases of the history of that period; and

Whereas influential organizations, including a number of students and writers, have become intensely interested in the importance of the events and the activities of the leaders of that period and have devoted years of untiring efforts in especially studying the contributions made by John Hanson, and have successfully and truthfully revealed his unparalleled accomplishments in helping lay the foundation for our national order, and it is now known that he actually began the regime of "government of the people, by the people, and for the people"; and

Whereas as President of the United States in Congress assembled, he gave remarkable consideration, without precedent nor guidance, to foreign and domestic state affairs, which during his term in office resulted in friendship and respect both at home and abroad, and to recognition of the United States by the kingdoms of Sweden and Holland as a new organization in the family nations; he, too, welcomed General Washington to the Congress after his glorious defeat of Cornwallis at Yorktown; he issued innumerable valuable state papers, ordered and first used the great seal of the United States; he organized the first Cabinet and named the first members thereof, and, lastly, caused to be prepared the first Thanksgiving Day proclamation, setting aside the last Thursday in November in the year 1782 as Thanksgiving Day; and

Whereas the hallowed resting place of this immortal is unknown, although every effort has been made to determine the location of his grave, suggestions and plans have been proposed for the erection of a monument as a shrine to his memory at Frederick, Md., his home, a place famous for its historic annals and national lore, and any activities in relation thereto should be rightly encouraged; and

Whereas in the present crisis a renewed interest in and a better knowledge of our heritage is vitally important to appreciate the value of liberty and democracy so as to better understand the importance of removing oppression and tyranny among people and destroy dictatorship everywhere; to more fully realize the importance of United States and her allies winning the present struggle aimed at these ends; and to arouse such interest it is believed that steps should be taken to commemorate the life and work of the almost forgotten John Hanson to acquaint our people with his service to this Nation and to mankind; and

Whereas more attention to matters of this nature have a tendency to cause our people to have a better understanding and deeper appreciation of the real value of this Nation, not to our own people alone, but to the entire world: Be it therefore

Resolved, That November 15, 1944, be designated as John Hanson Day, which shall be likewise so termed at each annual anniversary thereafter, and that the Senate and the House be, and are hereby requested to give due recognition thereof by appropriate proceedings.

INVESTIGATION OF PERSONNEL POLICIES AND ADMINISTRATION, GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 212), which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of personnel policies and administration in the Government Printing Office, particularly with respect to the recruitment and promotion of employees, and to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The

expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF DISCRIMINATORY USE OF RADIO TIME

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 213), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct an investigation for the purpose of (1) ascertaining the reasons and the person or persons responsible for the refusal of the National Broadcasting Co. to permit the use of radio time contracted for by representatives of the dairy industry for a program scheduled to be broadcast at 12 o'clock meridian, central war time, on November 21, 1943, and the granting of such time to representatives of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and (2) determining whether the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, should be further amended to authorize the Federal Communications Commission to prevent such discrimination. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR BARBOUR

Mr. HAWKES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 214), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the Vice President in arranging for, and attending the funeral of, Hon. W. WARREN BARBOUR, late a Senator from the State of New Jersey, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

GOVERNMENT, BUSINESS, AND PEOPLE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Government, Business, and People," delivered by him at a luncheon of the New York Chapter of the American Marketing Association, at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, November 23, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

IMPENDING BOOM IN FARM PRICES—ARTICLE FROM MIAMI HERALD

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Rocketing Farm Values Bring Fear of Boom," published in the Miami Herald of November 21, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

WOODROW WILSON'S PLANS AND IDEALS

[Mrs. CARAWAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter entitled "Says Woodrow Wilson's Plans and Ideals Have Been Reborn," signed by John Park Cravens, published in the Arkansas Gazette which appears in the Appendix.]

FOOD FOR FRENCH AND BELGIANS—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "French and Belgians Seeking Food Aid for Homelands Now," published in the New York Herald Tribune of November 17, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEDICATION OF RHOADS GENERAL HOSPITAL, UTICA, N. Y.

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD several speeches made on the occasion of the dedication of the Rhoads General Hospital, Utica, N. Y., on October 30, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE REVIVAL OF NATIONALISM

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Revival of Nationalism," by George E. Sokolsky, published in the New York Sun of November 15, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

LIBERTY LOAN DRIVE IN NEW YORK STATE

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a portion of a letter from Generoso Pope, a statement, and an editorial from Il Progresso Italo-Americano of September 10, 1943, pertaining to the Liberty Loan drive in New York State, which appears in the Appendix.]

FUNDS FOR O. W. I.—EDITORIAL FROM THE CATHOLIC WEEKLY, AMERICA

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Funds for O. W. I." from the October 30, 1943, issue of the Catholic weekly, America, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUBSIDIES—EDITORIAL BY TOM LINDER

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Subsidies" written by Hon. Tom Linder and published in the November 17, 1943, issue of the Georgia Farmer's Market Bulletin, which appears in the Appendix.]

DID ISOLATIONISM FAIL?—ARTICLE FROM THE PROGRESSIVE

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Did Isolationism Fail?" by William Henry Chamberlain, published in the November 22, 1943, issue of the Progressive, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POLL TAX

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I desire to read into the RECORD an unusual letter. I especially direct the attention of any Senator who has in mind the support of the notorious poll-tax bill. The letter was written by the National Republican Committeeman from Mississippi, who is an outstanding lawyer in the city of Washington at the present time. He is a former assistant United States attorney, and he is known to the Republican Party as one of the leading Republicans and one of the distinguished lawyers at the bar. The letter is such an eye-opener that it should put every Senator and the people of the country on notice of the foolish thing which is being attempted here in the midst of war. The letter was written to the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and is dated November 20, 1943.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Pursuant to promise at the meeting of the Mu-So-Lit Club last evening, which you addressed so forcibly, effectively, and admirably, I am writing you in reference to the matter of the poll-tax bill.

I wish to most respectfully repeat what I said on last evening, and that is, that the bill so drawn is not worth the paper it is written on so far as it guarantees the colored man a vote in the South, and I base this statement upon the following reasons:

The leading Republican from Mississippi, a Negro, is stating that the bill which is before the Senate is not worth the paper it is written on, if Senators mean by it to guarantee to the Negroes of the South the right to vote. I have been trying to impress that fact on the minds of Senators ever since the bill has been up. Here is authority for Republican Senators from their own household:

1. If one has paid his poll tax for 40 years on time without breaking the continuity, he must register before he can vote.

2. The matter of registration is in the hands of the circuit court clerk and there is no appeal from his decision to the courts when he denies one the right to register.

3. Under the understanding clause, or educational clause, this clerk can arbitrarily use any subterfuge to prevent one from registering, even though he is a graduate of a leading university of the land, a large taxpayer, and one of unimpeachable character.

Therefore, the bill should be amended, and should have the following amendment, to wit: *Provided, however*, That each active political party in a State shall have representation in the matter of registration of voters so that each applicant will be protected in his right to register when he qualifies."

If Senators amend the bill by adding that amendment, of course under all their contentions they would make the bill still further unconstitutional.

The letter continues:

This amendment, if passed, would reconstruct the voting system of the South and make suffrage universal, and at the same time it would maintain a high standard for qualified voters.

May I add that the colored people of the South are willing to pay the poll tax if they are given a chance to register, but they do not wish the farcical performance of paying poll tax but cannot register and vote.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BILBO. No. The letter continues:

Indeed it will be very unfortunate for my people in this country if either political party should succeed in passing this poll-tax bill as drawn for the reason that the party passing it will place upon the shoulders of the American negroes a political debt that it will take more than 50 years to pay when by the passage of the existing bill they are getting nothing in return. I challenge any American to the platform on this issue.

I represent the largest Negro-populated State in the Union, and I have given years of study to the laws of our State and the

South generally, and I want to appeal to you and other Members of this great body that you not hand us a gold brick and take up the time of the Congress with a farcical proceeding.

I wish to add here that the great leaders in Mississippi in the Constitutional Convention of 1890 promised that when they fixed the educational test as a prerequisite for voting that it would be fairly and impartially enforced and in proportion as the colored man measured up he would be permitted to vote. This was promised by such eminent men as Messrs. George and Walthall, but it has not been kept by their successors.

I represent the minority group and I am openly and not secretively asking the leaders of my State to cooperate with you in a matter of simple justice, and not a matter that is revolutionary.

I think the time has come that someone who knows the situation should speak out in frankness at a time when many white and colored leaders are trying to do something in absolute ignorance of the results.

With all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

PERRY W. HOWARD.

Mr. LANGER subsequently said: Mr. President, in view of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "Civil Liberties in Memphis" published in the Chicago Sun of November 21.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL LIBERTIES IN MEMPHIS

Boss Crump of Memphis has gone all out for home-town isolationism. No "blatherskite or demagogue of the North or South," he says, should be permitted to interfere with the friendly relations between white and Negro races in Memphis.

That is the gist of Boss Crump's answer to criticism for having his henchmen intimidate Memphis Negroes into canceling a recently scheduled mass meeting on Negro problems. The meeting was to have been addressed by A. Philip Randolph, president of the International Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters and member of the National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax.

Mr. Randolph may be a blatherskite to Mr. Crump—but he is a national leader in the ranks of labor and in the cause of Negro betterment. Doubtless his opposition to the poll tax infuriates Boss Crump, who owes his power in large degree to that indefensible instrument for thwarting and corrupting democracy. Doubtless most things that Mr. Randolph stands for infuriate the czar of Memphis. But for all his zeal in stifling civil liberties in the Randolph case Mr. Crump will lose in the end. Memphis will not permit him to isolate it permanently from the American way of democracy and free speech.

REPEAL OF CHINESE EXCLUSION ACTS

Mr. ANDREWS obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3070, Calendar No. 543, a bill to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3070) to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, it is my desire to explain briefly the much-discussed measure dealing with the repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws.

Early in May of this year Representative SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, as chairman of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, began hearings on H. R. 1882, introduced by Hon. MARTIN J. KENNEDY, of New York. Representative WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of the State of Washington, later introduced H. R. 3070, which we are now considering and which appears to have been based mainly on the facts developed as a result of House hearings on the former bill.

H. R. 3070 having been passed by the House on October 21, 1943, upon coming to the Senate was referred, with S. 1404, introduced by me on September 30, 1943, to the Senate Immigration Committee, whereupon both bills were referred to a subcommittee composed of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], and of which I was chairman.

We had several hearings, and on at least two occasions we met with the full Immigration Committee, which resulted in reporting favorably H. R. 3070, which was substituted for S. 1404. It is important to note that H. R. 3070 now comes before the Senate in the same language as when it passed the House. It is hoped that the bill will now receive approval of the Senate without any changes in form or substance, so that it will be immediately enrolled and signed by the President, who has expressed his desire for its passage in messages to Congress.

Inasmuch as there is a rather complete analysis of this bill, section by section, in Committee Report No. 535, Calendar No. 543, I will attempt here to describe, in as few words as possible, the main objectives of each of the three sections of the bill.

Beginning with the year 1882, following an immigration treaty with China of 1880, this Government enacted the first of a long series of laws dealing with the exclusion and deportation of Chinese persons. Some 13 acts, or parts of acts, were enacted on this subject matter between the years 1882 and 1913.

The Chinese are the only persons who were singled out by nationality or origin for discrimination in our immigration laws. It naturally has been a source of embarrassment to the Chinese, because they feel the inference is that the United States has set them apart as an inferior people. It is true that Japanese and Koreans, prior to the basic Quota Act of 1924, were prevented, generally, from coming to the United States because of the Executive orders of 1907 and 1913, limiting such persons coming to this country.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I wish to call attention to the word "inferior" as used in the Senator's statement. I protest against the use of the word "inferior" in this discussion.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to reply, I am using the language which was used when those exclusion acts were passed. It is not my language. There is no indication or insinuation in my statement of any inferiority.

Mr. HOLMAN. If the Senator will permit this further observation, that idea permeates the entire discussion of immigration, and is particularly applied in considering the restrictive laws on the immigration of the Chinese. I, and those who entertain views on immigration similar to mine, protest against the use of the word "inferior." I do not contend that the Chinese are an inferior race, but they, in large numbers, are incompatible in that their civilization and their racial characteristics are entirely divergent from our own. I base my thoughts on the subject not on the ground of inferiority of any race or group but on the ground of incompatability when in large unassimilable groups they settle permanently among us.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, it is also true that natives of all that part of southern Asia coming within the so-called geographically prescribed zone, have not, generally speaking, been admitted to the United States since 1917. But when we search our statutes we find that the Chinese are the only persons who have been classified by native origin and denied the right to enter or remain in this country.

The repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws will not substantially change our basic immigration policy for the following reason: When the Congress passed the act which became effective on July 1, 1924, it put a provision in that act—section 13 (c), to be specific—which provided, in substance, with certain very limited exceptions such as ministers and professors, that no person racially ineligible to naturalization could be admitted to the United States. As a matter of fact, the Chinese exclusion laws could very well have been repealed at that time because this broad provision of the 1924 act, in a comparatively few words, accomplished the major objectives of the various Chinese exclusion laws.

All that section 2 does is to grant an annual quota of 105 to cover all Chinese persons, no matter where they are born. This differs from the present quota laws, in which nativity is almost the sole determining factor as to the quota to which a person may be charged. The Chinese quota is based entirely upon Chinese people as such. In fact, it states that "all Chinese persons entering the United States annually as immigrants shall be

allocated to the quota for the Chinese." Under this language, a Chinese coming to the United States as an immigrant to reside permanently shall be charged to the one quota of 105 set aside for persons of the Chinese race, regardless of where they are born.

Fears have been expressed during the course of the committee hearings that persons born outside of China could be charged to the quota of the country in which they were born, or, if born in nonquota countries, such as countries of the Western Hemisphere, could enter regardless of the Chinese quota.

However, a careful reading of the section should dispel that assumption. It merely means that 105 Chinese immigrants, not now entitled to enter the United States, may come here to reside. The committee report carefully states this to be a fact.

I desire to make it clear that the 105 persons permitted to enter the United States under section 2 must, of course, meet all of the mental, moral, physical, and financial standards provided for in existing immigration laws.

All that section 3 does is to make Chinese persons eligible for naturalization. Under the present law, only white persons, African black persons, and "persons of races indigenous to the Western Hemisphere," the latter language simply meaning American Indians, are eligible for naturalization. The amendment provided for in section 3 merely adds Chinese persons or persons of Chinese descent—and these two terms are interpreted synonymously—as being persons of a race eligible to naturalization. They must also meet all of the existing laws dealing with naturalization, such as the so-called educational requirements, establishment of good moral character, attachment to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and so forth.

Thus far I have, in a very general way, attempted to tell what is hoped to be accomplished by the bill. As Senators know, hundreds of editorials and news articles have appeared in the newspapers throughout the country since last May, when the House committee began its long series of public hearings. I believe I am safe in saying that practically 95 percent of the newspaper comment has been definitely favorable to legislation of this kind.

The purpose of this bill has been so well publicized that I do not think it is necessary for me to take up much of the time of the Senate in speaking on its merits as a whole. I do wish, however, to quote from the statement made by Admiral H. E. Yarnell, United States Navy, retired, in the House committee hearings. The statement is short, but should of itself be sufficient argument to convince us of the necessity of legislation of this kind at this time. Admiral Yarnell spent a goodly part of his 50 years of service in the Navy in Asiatic stations. I quote Admiral Yarnell:

> It is generally appreciated by those who follow the course of the war in the Far East that the main attack on Japan must come from the mainland of Asia. This area is the only one from which air power adequate to inflict serious or decisive damage to Japanese arsenals and munition plants can operate and from which forces for the invasion of the main Japanese islands can be based.
>
> Russian bases cannot be relied upon since these would probably be occupied by Japanese troops very soon after any war between Japan and Russia began. This is due to the exposed position of the Vladivostok area with reference to the advantageous position of the powerful Japanese Army in Manchuria which renders the successful defense of this area a very difficult operation.
>
> This leaves the mainland of China the only area from which long-range bombers can reach Japan, and leads to the conclusion that Allied success against Japan requires the continuance of China in the war.
>
> It is needless to enlarge upon the desperate situation in China today, and the grave possibility that the Nationalist Government may collapse unless effective aid is given at the earliest possible moment.
>
> The military situation is, of course, known to those in authority in this country and Great Britain, and doubtless every effort is being made to give all possible military assistance.
>
> There are other means, however, of strengthening the determination of the Chinese Government and people to fight on until real and adequate assistance can be given.
>
> The most effective method is to consider, by act as well as word, China as an equal in every respect with the other three Allied Nations in the conduct of the war and in the post-war settlement.
>
> A step in this direction has been made in the announced intention of annulling the treaties regarding extraterritoriality and special privileges.
>
> A greater step will be the repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws. Such a step will compare with that of the dissolution of the Third International in the effect it will have on the Allied cause.
>
> As you know, Japan has utilized American exclusion laws with much effect in her propaganda campaign in China and other areas of the Far East. By the repeal of these laws, this means of stirring up hatred of the western nations will be eliminated.

At this point I wish to add to the observation of Admiral Yarnell that even since his remarks concerning the propaganda Japan has made of the Chinese exclusion laws, we have been advised that the Japanese radio has continued to broadcast into China, even up to the point of broadcasting the House committee's minority report, word for word, and the names of the five Members who signed that minority report.

I should also like to invite attention to something which will show what occurred recently during the deliberations in the House on this measure. A minority report against this bill was made to the House, signed by five members of the committee. During the discussion on the subject the minority report was brought up. We later learned that the report was broadcast to the world from Tokyo at 11:30 that night, and that the name of each Member who signed the report was given. In other words, what we are doing here now will probably be known in Japan within 6 hours. We do not know who furnishes the information, but it is furnished nevertheless.

I continue to quote from Admiral Yarnell's statement:

> In the consideration of the repeal of these laws, we also should look beyond the war to the peace settlement and the years to follow.
>
> When the time for that settlement comes, the four nations that have contributed the most to the defeat of the Axis Powers will have the main task and responsibility of arriving at terms that will insure a durable peace. Each should have an equal voice and there should be no bar which will interfere.
>
> Furthermore, in order to insure peace in the Far East, there must be a strong, stable, and democratic government in China. We have every reason to expect that if the Nationalist regime remains in power in China, we need not fear from that nation a policy of world conquest such as has been the curse of Japan. Chinese tradition, history, and philosophy oppose such policy.
>
> The friendship that has existed between the United States and China for many years must continue in the future if we hope to maintain peace in the world. It cannot continue if these laws are retained on the statute books. Modern China is determined to take her rightful place in the congress of nations. It is our duty and it is to our interest to help her attain that end.
>
> In conclusion it is my conviction that the repeal of these laws will have far-reaching effects as a war and as a post-war measure. It will also be a partial recognition of the bravery and endurance of a great people, who for 6 years have been fighting America's most dangerous enemy.

In conclusion let me also say that from a reading of the bill and a study of our committee report, it will be seen that it is proposed to remove discriminations against the Chinese which have been a source of misunderstanding in the relations between our two peoples for more than 60 years, and have aroused widespread resentment among the Chinese people.

We are all aware that the original act of exclusion was not born of ill will toward the Chinese people. The moving cause was exclusively economic. But profound changes have taken place in 60 years everywhere over the world.

We have had ample time and abundant occasion to reflect on the finer qualities of the Chinese people. Above all, the tenacity and courage of the Chinese in their terrible ordeal of the last 7 years has impelled a respect that we are proud to acknowledge.

It is clear today that only a few short years stand between the Chinese people and the full use of their vast resources, both human and material, for their own betterment and well-being, free from any outside control. It has always been the policy of the United States to help China in her struggle against encroachment upon her independence and sovereignty, and we are now comrades in arms in that cause. It is fitting, therefore, that the discriminatory legislation, inconsistent with the dignity of both our peoples, should be eliminated.

It is clear that the morale of fighting China will be greatly enhanced by the news of the enactment of this bill, and our chances of an earlier victory against the Japanese would follow as a direct result.

Mr. President, I have many hundreds of resolutions, petitions, and letters from outstanding religious, educational, and other organizations over the United States endorsing and requesting that this

bill be passed. I have received very few, comparatively, against the enactment of the bill. We have given much time and consideration to those who oppose this measure, and I feel that the immense benefits resulting to both China and America by the enactment of this bill far outweigh any disadvantages pointed out by opponents in all the hearings before the committees.

The difference between the term "Chinese persons" as used in section 2, and the term "persons of Chinese descent" as used in section 3, will be found in detailed explanation in that part of the written report under the heading of section 3.

The Immigration Service and the State Department have had a number of informal meetings and have mutually agreed that in the case of mixed blood the term "Chinese persons or persons of Chinese descent" means "persons who are of as much as one-half Chinese blood and are not as much as one-half blood of a race ineligible for citizenship." In other words, this definition accords with both judicial and administrative interpretations down through the years. It simply means that if a person is as much as one-half Chinese blood with a mixture of other eligible bloods, such as white, black, or American Indian, he will be classed as a Chinese person, both for the purposes of section 2 and section 3 of the bill. However, if he is of as much as one-half of a blood still ineligible to citizenship, such as Jap, Hindu, and so forth, he will be classed as a person racially ineligible to citizenship, and neither admissible to the United States nor admissible to naturalization. In other words, in case of admixture of blood, Chinese persons will be continued to be classified as they have been classed in the past, which is entirely consistent with the purpose of the bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the message of the President which was sent to Congress favoring the passage of this measure.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

There is now pending before the Congress legislation to permit the immigration of Chinese people into this country and to allow Chinese residents here to become American citizens. I regard this legislation as important in the cause of winning the war and of establishing a secure peace.

China is our ally. For many long years she stood alone in the fight against aggression. Today we fight at her side. She has continued her gallant struggle against very great odds.

China has understood that the strategy of victory in this world war first required the concentration of the greater part of our strength upon the European front. She has understood that the amount of supplies we could make available to her has been limited by difficulties of transportation. She knows that substantial aid will be forthcoming as soon as possible—aid not only in the form of weapons and supplies, but also in carrying out plans already made for offensive, effective action. We and our allies will aim our forces at the heart of Japan—in ever-increasing strength until the common enemy is driven from China's soil.

But China's resistance does not depend alone on guns and planes and on attacks on land, on the sea, and from the air. It is based as much in the spirit of her people and her faith in her allies. We owe it to the Chinese to strengthen that faith. One step in this direction is to wipe from the statute books those anachronisms in our law which forbid the immigration of Chinese people into this country and which bar Chinese residents from American citizenship.

Nations like individuals make mistakes. We must be big enough to acknowledge our mistakes of the past and to correct them.

By the repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws, we can correct a historic mistake and silence the distorted Japanese propaganda. The enactment of legislation now pending before the Congress would put Chinese immigrants or a parity with those from other countries. The Chinese quota would, therefore, be only about 100 immigrants a year. There can be no reasonable apprehension that any such number of immigrants will cause unemployment or provide competition in the search for jobs.

The extension of the privileges of citizenship to the relatively few Chinese residents in our country would operate as another meaningful display of friendship. It would be additional proof that we regard China not only as a partner in waging war but that we shall regard her as a partner in days of peace. While it would give the Chinese a preferred status over certain other oriental people, their great contribution to the cause of decency and freedom entitles them to such preference.

I feel confident that the Congress is in full agreement that these measures—long overdue—should be taken to correct an injustice to our friends. Action by the Congress now will be an earnest of our purpose to apply the policy of the good neighbor to our relations with other peoples.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 11, 1943.*

Mr. ANDREWS. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the office of the Attorney General of the United States, Hon. Francis Biddle, addressed to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Immigration, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] endorsing the bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., October 13, 1943.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Immigration,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This acknowledges your letter of October 1, 1943, requesting my views relative to a bill (S. 1404) to repeal the Chinese exclusion laws, to establish quotas, and to make Chinese residents of the United States eligible for naturalization. The measure would repeal all existing statutory provisions excluding persons of the Chinese race from entry into the United States (sec. 1). It would apply the immigration quota provisions to Chinese, and would allocate all Chinese persons entering the United States as immigrants to the quota for China (sec. 2). The existing naturalization laws, which are limited to white persons, persons of African nativity or descent, and descendants of races indigenous to the Western Hemisphere, would be extended so as to include Chinese persons and persons of Chinese descent (sec. 3).

The Chinese exclusion laws were enacted during a period when immigration to this country was not restricted by any quota provisions, the quota limitations having been first introduced into the laws by the Immigration Act of 1924. The quota restrictions are a sufficient protection to this country against excessive immigration, generally, and against the possibility of an unreasonable number of immigrants from any one country. No useful purpose is being served by retaining the Chinese exclusion laws in effect since under the quota provisions the Chinese quota would be only 105 persons annually.

The heroism of the Chinese people has won the respect and admiration of the United Nations. A repeal by the Congress of our antiquated exclusion laws can be an expression of our gratitude and a symbol of our esteem.

Similarly, we should extend to Chinese residents in this country the same eligibility for citizenship that is now given peoples of other nations. While only approximately 45,000 Chinese residents who are in the United States would benefit directly by such action, the good will created would extend to the millions in China who are fighting at our side.

Accordingly, I recommend the enactment of the bill.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a letter from the Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service, signed by Hon. Earl G. Harrison, Commissioner of Immigration, who endorses the pending bill and gives reasons why it should be passed.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
Philadelphia, November 12, 1943.

Senator CHARLES O. ANDREWS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR ANDREWS: Mr. Shaughnessy has informed me that at two recent meetings, one of the full committee and one of the subcommittee, which met to consider the Bill H. R. 3070, relating to the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Laws, Senator HOLMAN indicated that it had come to his attention that this Service had borrowed an architect from the U. S. Forest Service for the purpose of remodeling abandoned C. C. C. camps into apartments to be used for housing refugees.

To acquaint you and the other members of the Senate Immigration Committee with the facts concerning this matter, I am taking the liberty of addressing this letter to you to explain the purpose for which we borrowed the services of an architect from the Forest Service, because beyond that one point Senator HOLMAN has been misinformed.

Mr. Shaughnessy being unfamiliar with the details of our alien enemy detention work was not in a position to give your committee the full particulars.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service is responsible for the detention of all resident civilian alien enemies who have been ordered interned after apprehension by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In addition, the State Department requested the Department of Justice to provide detention camp space for dangerous alien enemy residents of several Latin-American countries brought to the United States for internment,

pursuant to agreements made between the State Department and the governments of these Latin-American countries. These latter steps were taken and agreements entered into in the interests of hemispheric security. The policy was not determined by the Immigration and Naturalization Service; its only function was to set up and provide detention camp facilities pursuant to request.

The program involves the detention of entire families, since it is the established policy to reunite in family internment camps the families of internees who originated in the United States and its possessions where both husband and wife have been interned and in cases where the separation of the families causes an unusual hardship. In addition some family groups have been brought from Latin-America under the State Department agreements mentioned above.

At the present time we have 2 so-called family camps: 1 at Seagoville, Tex., which can accommodate approximately 500 persons and which is used generally for the detention of single females and childless couples; and the other at Crystal City, Tex., having a capacity of about 3,000 persons where families only are detained. Seagoville is filled very nearly to capacity. At Crystal City there are 1,710 internees and we are due to receive approximately 300 more from Latin America in a few days.

We are committed to accept for internment somewhere between 1,200 and 2,000 additional aliens in family groups from Latin America and must be prepared to accommodate them by March 1, 1944. In addition, there are Japanese families in war relocation centers in the United States numbering approximately 2,300 persons, the heads of which families are in one of this service's internment camps. These Japanese, totaling approximately 3,100, will have to be provided for as soon as possible.

The result is that we must have additional facilities for family internment and we have borrowed an architect from the United States Forest Service to make a study of our camp at Fort Missoula, Mont., which is comprised partly of C. C. C. type barracks, with a view to determining the cost and feasibility of converting Fort Missoula into a family camp for Japanese internees as there is some possibility that the Italian internees now at Fort Missoula will be paroled or released, thus making that camp available for other uses.

This Service is not making a study of C. C. C. camps or any other type of facility with a view to accommodating European or any other class of refugees. We have no knowledge of any such proposal and I cannot imagine how Senator HOLMAN got his information unless he was misinformed as to the purpose of the engineering study we are now having made by the Forest Service architect at Fort Missoula.

I am addressing a similar letter to Senator RUSSELL, chairman of the Immigration Committee. I would appreciate it if you would see fit to bring to the attention of the other members of your subcommittee the true facts of the matter.

Sincerely yours,

EARL G. HARRISON,
Commissioner.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Department of State signed E. R. Stettinius, Jr., Under Secretary, endorsing the measure. If there is any department of our Government which ought to know what the situation is with respect to the subject under discussion, and to be in a position to recommend legislation on the subject, it is the Department of State.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D. C., October 11, 1943.

The Honorable RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: I refer to your letter of October 1, 1943, requesting the views of the Department concerning S. 1404, "To repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes."

The bill repeals the Chinese exclusion laws and provides that all Chinese persons entering the United States annually as immigrants shall be allocated to a quota for China computed under the provisions of the Immigration Act of 1924, with the exception of persons previously lawfully admitted for permanent residence returning from a temporary visit abroad, ministers and professors, their wives and unmarried children under 18 years of age, students entering the United States temporarily for study, and Chinese women who were citizens of the United States and who by reason of marriage, lost such citizenship. The bill provides that a preference up to 75 percent of the quota shall be given to Chinese born and resident in China and that Chinese lawfully admitted as immigrants may become naturalized citizens of this country.

As the bill will remove discriminations against the Chinese which have been a source of misunderstanding in the relations between the United States and China for over 60 years and have aroused widespread resentment among the Chinese people its enactment is recommended.

Sincerely yours,

E. R. STETTINIUS, Jr.,
Under Secretary.

Mr. ANDREWS. Recently, at a meeting held in Moscow, the Chinese Government was represented, together with Russia, Great Britain, and the United States. The members of the conference promulgated and signed a resolution which, in my judgment, will change the minds of people—particularly the free people of the world. The representative of China was one of those who signed. The four great nations endorsing the resolution are now, and will continue to be, in a position to guarantee the peace of the world when the present terrible scourge is over.

Mr. President, several statements have been made to the effect that the American Legion is not in favor of the pending measure. When it met several months ago it declined to endorse the pending bill or any similar measure. I have before me a telegram addressed to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of our Senate Committee on Immigration, dated November 19, 1943, after a meeting of the American Legion council held in Indianapolis on that date. At that time the Senator from Georgia, who was recently in China, addressed the American Legion council. The telegram, which is signed by Frank Sullivan, and is addressed to the Senator from Georgia, is as follows:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *November 19, 1943.*

RICHARD RUSSELL,
United States Senator from Georgia, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

By executive committee action, the American Legion favors the repeal of Chinese exclusion in our immigration laws. The American Legion, however, is mandated to oppose all immigration for permanent residence in the United States until such time as unemployment has dropped to less than 1,000,000.

Mr. President, I should like to place in the RECORD at this point something in which all Christian Americans feel a great interest and pride. It is from the president of Wesleyan College, at Macon, Ga. I read:

WESLEYAN COLLEGE,
Macon, Ga., October 8, 1943.

Senator CHARLES O. ANDREWS,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDREWS: I understand you have introduced a bill to repeal the Chinese exclusion laws. I want to commend you for this act and I trust your colleagues will rally to your support and that very quickly this bill may be taken from our statutes. We at Wesleyan are particularly interested in the Chinese people, having had the privilege of having the three Soong sisters study here and the privilege this summer of Mme. Chiang's visit to our campus. As I understand the situation only a very few Chinese would be able to enter under the regular immigration quota should the exclusion law be repealed. Certainly it would be a fine gesture and the right thing for the United States to take this step in connection with its brave Ally. I wanted to let you know that I appreciate what you are doing.

Under separate cover I am sending you a copy of the Bulletin issued by our alumni office in connection with Mme. Chiang's visit here this summer.

Sincerely yours,

N. C. MCPHERSON, Jr.,
President.

By the way, a doctor's degree was conferred upon Mme. Chiang by Wesleyan College. Mme. Chiang is a Christian, as is her husband also. Never since the advent of history has there been a greater opportunity to do something worth while for a great people, whose civilization goes back 3,000 years beyond ours. What an opportunity this is. We must not let it pass.

I have here something which should impress my colleagues. Of course, I have a great deal of material like this, urging the enactment of the pending measure. The petition I hold in my hand is from Samuel McCrae Cavert, general secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and it reads:

DEAR SENATOR: I have the honor to show you herewith a copy of a petition signed by about 1,000 leaders in the religious and educational life of America, for the repeal of the measures which discriminate against Chinese, in our immigration and naturalization policies.

Mr. President, I have looked over this petition. It is signed by representatives of the Christian churches in every State of the Union.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, before the Senator yields the floor, will he permit a question?

Mr. ANDREWS. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. GILLETTE. The use of the language "Chinese persons or persons of Chinese descent," which the Senator discussed in the closing part of his formal statement, leads me to propound this inquiry. In the Chosen Peninsula there are, I believe, some 26,000,000 people known as Koreans, closely related to the Chinese, and probably originally from the same stock. Since 1910 the sovereignty over that people has been claimed

by Japan, but a provisional government of the Korean people has been maintained, and now exists. My question is, under the language "persons of Chinese descent," would the elimination of the exclusion provisions extend to the Korean people, or was that considered at all by the committee?

Mr. ANDREWS. I rather think it would not extend to them. The Korean people are now under the Japanese.

Mr. GILLETTE. Under the claimed sovereignty of Japan, but they maintain their provisional government. I just wondered whether the question had been considered.

Mr. ANDREWS. I do not know that it was, because those people have been under Japan for some time.

Mr. GILLETTE. Since 1910.

Mr. ANDREWS. I think we all hope that when the present war is over, the people in Korea can be restored to their mother country, and be free again.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator. I share his hope.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in following the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] I do so with a great deal of satisfaction. I shall speak in behalf of the passage of the bill.

As we approach this subject, such a question as that asked by the Senator from Iowa brings to our minds the fact that all questions in regard to the origins of people have by no means been settled. The Korean people will, of course, claim relationship to the great Chinese nationality. The tremendous strength of China, and her great institutions, are to an American very, very satisfying, because China learned how to work out first, and to work them out best, the ordinary fundamentals of what we recognize as democratic institutions.

A couple of generations ago—I almost hesitate to mention the time—I was one of a national committee made up of Americans from all parts of our Nation to seriously enter into a study of our immigration problems. The committee was called the Committee for Constructive Immigration Legislation, and after a number of years of study and recommendation the act which is now known as the act of 1924, which established the quota system, became the law of our land. Had that act been pasesd as it was expected it would be passed, had not an incident in regard to the Japanese arisen at that time, there probably would have been no need today for the bill we are considering. But Senators present remember that there was an unfortunate incident, and, as a result, the Chinese Exclusion Act was expanded, rather than contracted.

At this time especially we are happy to take part in a discussion of the kind now proceeding, because everyone knows that the friendship of China and the friendship of the Chinese people are elements in our own national growth of such value that they cannot be estimated. Let us be sordidly economic for just 1 minute. I wonder if anyone else has ever estimated the buying power of 400,000,000 people. I have done it; I have gone into a study of the question; and that study gave me, at least, a key to an idea in regard to world prosperity which can be borne out by a perusal of history. For 2,500 years, during the time for which statistics have been available, and for all the time we have been able to trace history, there was prosperity in Europe, and later prosperity in America, so long as trading facilities were normal with the great mass of people included in China. In other words, the buying power and consuming power of the concentrated millions of this earth are such that they take the surpluses of the producing and exporting nations which manufacture many articles from raw materials.

I state that simple fact, Mr. President, because most persons seem to feel that because there have been great panics and depressions in the past after war, panics and depressions will inevitably follow this great war. Judging from the past, some may think we ought to have the greatest of all panics and the greatest of all depressions after this war, because it is the greatest of all wars. But that need not be so, if we approach the subject of rehabilitation in an enlightened way and on the basis of fundamental studies of history and economics.

I am happy that on this day, I can take part in the present debate, and I think I am justified in throwing into the discussion a personal touch. It is now 30 years since I gave my first course on the Orient. For 30 years we have been striving to build that bridge of friendship between the east and west, the building of which now bids fair to contribute so much to the new world.

Mr. President, the problem facing America, which is dealt with in the proposed legislation, cannot be stated more clearly than it was by the President of the United States, in the message he sent to Congress with respect to the proposed legislation, and I would not add to the President's words. But, Mr. President, in considering the pending legislation, and the attempts which are being made to bring about better understanding among nations, so that we may have a better world, I think it is time for the Congress to do things because it is morally right to do them, and not simply do things because it is expedient.

Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] very wisely and very sensibly rose a moment or two ago when he happened to hear the word "inferior" mentioned in speaking about these people. There are no superior and inferior races, Mr. President. There are races with different habits of life, with different outlooks on life, with racial differences which make them incompatible, as the Senator from Oregon has stated, and there will probably always be an incompatibility between the white and the yellow races so long as they live apart from each other and so long as they follow the habits of their ancestors.

President Wilson was probably the wisest of the men who faced this question at Versailles when the treaty was being considered. The Japanese, it will be remembered, were asking for an article in the Covenant of the League of Nations which would declare racial equality. But our President—and I am proud that he was able to face the question on the basis of right and justice and with an understanding of history—stated to the Japanese that there was no such thing as racial equality. And since there is no such thing as racial equality, a declaration to that effect in any kind of a document, no matter how universally that doctrine may be preached, will not bring about racial equality. It does not exist. Then President Wilson, with his genius in dealing with the subject, instead of saying "These yellow people are inferior to our people," stated the facts. He said that we could not compete with the yellow man, because of his racial characteristics and racial habits. The yellow man works longer. He sleeps less. He lives on a lower standard. He wants less leisure. He marries earlier. He has more children. All of that may be a sign of strength rather than a sign of weakness. At any rate, the white man feared the onrush of the yellow man, and it was that fear which brought the Exclusion Act. The action was not based on a superiority-inferiority comparison.

But, Mr. President, there are other factors in the world beside the simple factor of doing the right thing at this time for the Chinese people, although that is sufficient argument to justify the passage of the proposed legislation. But there are reasons why it should pass at this particular time. Above all is the reason of that understanding of what we are fighting for, which is becoming so well known in the world. It would have been almost an act of hypocrisy to have adopted the Connally resolution a few weeks ago if we had not theretofore renounced our extraterritorial rights in China, because we would not have been justified in talking about sovereign nations and sovereign states when we ourselves did not recognize the sovereignty of one of the four leading nations engaged on our side in the great contest. We cannot go to the world with a program for the future if we do not settle the differences which exist among ourselves. Now is the time to adjust the differences between the Allies, while we are fighting shoulder to shoulder, and while we see eye to eye with each other.

No one, however, should have an exaggerated idea about the ultimate effects of the proposed legislation. Its enactment does not mean free entry of the Chinese into our country. It does not mean that in the ordinary sense we would lessen the restrictions against the great mass of Chinese who might wish to come to this country. It means merely two things. It means that China will be placed on an equality with other nations so far as the quota system is concerned, and the quota will operate against the Chinese as it does against all nationalities.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'DANIEL in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. One thing which has bothered me seriously in the consideration of the proposed legislation, both in

the subcommittee and in the full Committee on Immigration, is the doubt as to whether the bill will solve the problem it is presumably intended to solve. Will the bill, in the Senator's opinion, satisfy the Chinese that they are not what one might term "discriminated against"? Does the Senator think the provisions of the bill are sufficiently broad to meet the objection with respect to discrimination which seems to prevail?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I surely believe that the measure is sufficiently broad to meet the objection of discrimination, because under its terms we would tell the Chinese that we treat China in exactly the same way we treat every other country. We do discriminate in our immigration legislation, but we do it in a fair way. We lay down first of all the principle that a certain racial and ethnical compatability exists in the American Nation, and we want to keep it that way. Therefore one nationality does not have an equal chance with another nationality in coming into the United States. Immigration is highly graded. One might think that because of the fact that there are 400,000,000 Chinese, more Chinese should be allowed to come into the country than nationals of other countries, but less are allowed to come in, because immigration rests upon the basis of the stock of the American people. But we do say to China, "We do not exclude your nationals. We treat them in the same way we do those of any other country. The Exclusion Act is repealed." We do not admit the same number of Germans, for example, as English. We do discriminate between various peoples under our immigration legislation, and that would be continued, but we discriminate on the basis of our own ideas, of what we want our national stock to be, instead of on the basis of being against the admission of a given person.

Mr. AUSTIN rose.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I desire to say that I am interested in having the proposed legislation enacted into law, but I wish to have the RECORD show at this time, if it is possible to do so, something about the selection of immigrants. Who would be entitled under the bill, if enacted into law, to come into the United States? Is there a discrimination among Chinese, based on any regulation or rule?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Probably the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] would prefer to answer that question, rather than to leave it to me, since he is in charge of the bill. I think it would be better if he answered it. However, I should say there is discrimination.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, it is very difficult to go into the phases of that matter; but the report the committee has filed with the Senate, and which is now printed and lying on the desks of Senators, I believe, will explain that matter perhaps better than I could do at this time.

Mr. AUSTIN. Can the Senator answer as to how many Chinese would be permitted per annum on the present basis?

Mr. ANDREWS. Only 105, but that would merely be making the law as it was before it was changed.

Mr. AUSTIN. Can the Senator say whether they would be admitted only in the order of the date of their application for admittance?

Mr. ANDREWS. That would depend upon the rules of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. In the United States there are many thousands of Chinese who were born here. They do not know any other country. Many of them are tradesmen. Many of them are men who trade with China. We have our great flow of commerce with China through those tradesmen. Some of those people will be admitted to citizenship, but they will have to stand the literacy test and every other test required of ordinary applicants for admission to citizenship. Those persons are already here. The 105 will merely be those who from time to time may apply for admission, but no more than that number may be admitted in any one year.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one other question?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Would any condition be required of the Chinese, other than conditions with respect to morality, education, health, and such general conditions which are required of other foreign nationals?

Mr. ANDREWS. My understanding is that the requirements made of them would be the same as those made of any other peoples.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, from the surface point of view it may seem surprising that we are spending time and effort in deliberating over a measure which provides for allowing 105 persons to come into the United States each year. In these critical days we are making momentous decisions affecting continents and hemispheres. We are considering appropriations so huge that the human imagination cannot fully visualize them. We are studying plans for building ships as large as cities, for demolishing areas bigger than one of our States, for transporting masses of soldiers great enough to populate a whole nation.

Yet the Senate finds it worth while to discuss a program involving the entrance into our Nation of 105 people.

It is clear that there is involved in this measure something larger than anything which can be found by a literal reading of its words. There is something larger, even, than is contained in the arguments for and against it, far-reaching though those arguments may be. It is my hope to say something about that larger issue at this time.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator has referred to an annual increment of 105 Chinese, I believe, under the terms of the proposed legislation. That number does not disturb me at all. I understand there are approximately forty-odd thousand Chinese in Hawaii and in the United States, some 39,000 of them being in the continental United States. What would the bill do to those persons? Would it make them de jure citizens of the United States?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think not, although again I had better let the Senator in charge of the bill reply. I am sure immigration from Hawaii to the United States would be restricted, but I think the Senator from Florida should answer the question in a de jure way.

Mr. WHITE. I was interested in knowing how many of them could become citizens under the proposed law, or how many might hereafter become citizens under the terms of other laws.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, there are many thousands of Chinese who have lived in this country all their lives. In fact, our great trade with China is largely due to the tradesmen who came here from China and who have lived here indefinitely, because under the law they are allowed to live here indefinitely. There are many Chinese who are native-born in the United States.

Mr. WHITE. Are they native-born citizens at the present time, so that the proposed law is not necessary to affect their status? What number in addition to those would become citizens under the terms of the pending bill?

Mr. ANDREWS. My understanding is that as to perhaps 17,000 Chinese who have been in the United States all their lives, and who will be here right along, such of them who might desire to become citizens, and who might have a right to make application for that purpose, would not need to be considered with the quota of 105, because they would be living here anyway.

Mr. WHITE. Then 17,000 could become citizens; but I understand that the Senator assumes that, in fact, because of various reasons, many of them would not become citizens.

Mr. ANDREWS. They would have to stand every test. As I have said, many of them have been here right along, and it would seem only justice that they be permitted to take a part in our Government. That is something which has been thought of a long time, and which has been covered under the pending bill.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HOLMAN. Elaborating, if I may, on the answer to the question relative to the number of Chinese in this country who would be affected by the status of citizenship permitted under the terms of the pending bill, I should like to make a statement; also, I should like the attention of the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], so that he may correct me if we are not in agreement on the

matter. It is my understanding that under the terms of the pending bill approximately 42,000 Chinese would be permitted to become citizens. Five thousand of these are in the Hawaiian Islands. The figures I am giving are approximate ones. Some 20,000, or nearly that many, already are citizens, being native-born; and under the terms of the pending bill the balance, or approximately 17,000, would be permitted to apply for citizenship. Those are the overall figures.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much. I think what he has stated is correct. I think that regardless of whatever way one looks at the question, whether from the standpoint of nationality or from the standpoint of immigration, he will find that what I have said before is the fact, that under the terms of the pending bill there would be no great letting down of the bars. Every Chinese who might apply for citizenship would have to meet all the requirements which any other person who is naturalized in the United States has to meet—the educational requirements, the question-and-answer requirements, the requirement relative to ability to understand the Constitution of the United States, and the other requirements which are imposed upon those who ask for citizenship after a certain length of residence here.

If one will simply pay attention to the way in which our immigration has worked, if one will realize that immigration into Hawaii was stopped, that immigration of Chinese into the United States was stopped in the 'Eighties of the last century, I think one will realize that since the Wong Kim Ark case, Chinese born in the United States have been citizens of the United States, that already the major portion of the Chinese in the United States are citizens of the United States, and that, providing the quota remains as it is, as time goes on, a lesser number of persons who are eligible will apply for naturalization.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Assuming that a person of Chinese blood, a member of the Chinese race, but one who was born under the British flag, makes application for citizenship in the United States, would he have a status different from that of a Chinese born in China and who might come to the United States directly from China?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Oh, yes, Mr. President; such a Chinese would come here as a British national, and would come on a British passport.

Mr. AUSTIN. And under a British quota?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. He would be, if he were coming in for business purposes. He would come under a British quota. However, under our requirements today, I imagine he would be banned. In such a case the blood question would definitely arise; but I imagine that the matter with which the Senator is dealing would be handled under a different jurisdiction.

Mr. AUSTIN. I happen to know of such instances in the case of persons who are now in the armed services of the British.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That question cannot be covered merely by saying "Chinese." It simply cannot be done. A Chinese protégé, for instance, who comes from such a place as Hongkong is not a Chinese in a political sense at all. Also there are Chinese in the Philippines who are persons of a very different type.

Mr. AUSTIN. Their exclusion under the existing law is made because of their race; is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I should think so.

Mr. AUSTIN. Would the pending bill affect the extinguishment of that cause for exclusion; that is, the racial cause?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is what the law does and all it can do.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Is it not the understanding of the Senator from Utah that in the instance which was mentioned by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] the only way in which that Chinese-British national could come in would be under the quota of 105? Certainly I think so.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If he were to come in as a Chinese, he would surely be under the quota of 105. If he were to come in as a British citizen, which I do not think he could do, he could have only temporary residence here under a British passport, as our law stands today.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. There certainly is a misunderstanding in the reply of the Senator to the question of the Senator from Vermont. I should like to have the Senator from Florida correct me if I am mistaken. The testimony before the committee was positive to the effect that, regardless of where they may come from, anywhere in the whole wide world or under what conditions, there would be a limit of 105 from the Chinese race admitted to this country in any year. The bill would change the entire philosophy of our present immigration laws from national to racial limitations.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is what I tried to say in answering the Senator from Vermont. I am glad the Senator from Oregon has made it plainer.

So far as the pending measure is concerned, there is no opposition to what it will do. The opposition to it is honest and sincere, but it is based on a misapprehension. During the last 25 years I believe I have become qualified to speak on the subject of immigration, for in a modest way I have helped to shape our immigration policy, which protects our American workers against the threat of their employers to import substitutes from overseas whose living standards enable them to accept wages below those which are fair according to the American standard. For many years that protection has been established and maintained, and I would be the last man to support any movement to alter our immigration policy.

But this measure does not alter that policy. It reaffirms it. It strengthens it. This measure clarifies the sound principle of restrictions on immigration which may bring injury to American workers. It applies the principle to the Chinese people which has proved safe and successful in the case of other peoples. It makes impossible their ever becoming a factor in our economy which can harm our labor structure. The number of Chinese who can be admitted annually under its provisions, 105, speaks for itself.

It is not my intention to go into the arguments for this measure, because others will make them clear. I shall not elaborate on the obvious purpose of the measure, that of being just to the people of China by recognizing openly, as we have already done in the matter of extraterritoriality, that the Chinese have earned the right to be accorded the treatment we accord to citizens of other free and sovereign nations.

I have said again and again that the more international problems we solve before the war is over, the more chance there will be of creating a lasting peace. When the last shot has been fired and the last misshapen, bullet-riddled body has been buried, the whole world will face problems such as have never been known before. If we can arrive at that point with some of our present problems out of the way, our job will be much simpler. That is why I keep repeating that we should do everything we can now.

This measure is an example of something we can do now and should do now to reduce our post-war problems. But it is something besides that. It is a definite, concrete step toward winning the war. It is a military action just as surely as is winning a battle in Italy, occupying Bougainville, or bombing a German munitions center. It is an act of warfare—of that department called psychological warfare, which strengthens our allies and weakens our enemies.

This is the larger issue which I mentioned a moment ago, and I want to speak of it not only as it relates to the measure we are discussing, but also as it relates to our whole prosecution of the war on every front. Unless we understand the power and the importance of psychological warfare, we do not grasp what is going on throughout the world today.

Psychological warfare is sometimes spoken of with a trace of contempt as "the war of words," with the implication that words are of no account when compared to bullets. Particularly in time of war it becomes fashionable to call for action, not phrases; for blows, not speeches; for the sword, not the pen. Yet there is no time when words and the thoughts behind them are more important, when they are more capable of inspiring men to heroic deeds and conversely, of breaking their spirit. There is no time when words become more closely part of the pattern of victory or defeat.

Mr. President, I do not need to refer to our own great commander, General Marshall. Every Senator knows from

experience in the last war and from experiences which he has had in this war, that when we fail to keep up the spirits of men in far-off places who are fighting our battles in the most vulnerable spots in the world, we fail to do our duty to those soldier boys. The plea came from General Marshall that we should not forget the men in India, China, and Persia who are so far removed from the centers. We should write to them. That is part of the psychological warfare in behalf of our own. If we can build up our own and at the same time destroy the morale of our enemy, the battle is half won. After all, the pen is mightier than the sword; and when it is effective it saves lives, not in a small way but by the millions. If the United States, due to the fact that it is unrecognized throughout the world as fighting an unselfish war, can save the lives of our allies as we save the lives of our own men, we shall contribute much to what is being done.

But psychological warfare is not confined to words alone, nor even to thoughts alone. Psychological warfare is action in the realm of the mind and the spirit. I have been struck during the past week with two addresses touching on the subject by two American leaders in this field, Elmer Davis, Director of the Office of War Information, and Robert E. Sherwood, Director of the Overseas Branch of that organization. What they said bears repeating, and I shall quote briefly from those addresses.

Speaking before the Herald Tribune Forum on November 16, Robert Sherwood said:

> In time of war we dwell quite naturally upon the measurable, tangible power of the weapons that are necessary for the destruction of our enemies. And we are inclined to forget about the immeasurable, intangible spirit that animates those weapons—the spirit of the men who design them, and build them, and use them.
>
> It is that spirit, and that alone, which will achieve a civilized world, if we are ever to have one.
>
> The particular qualities which we associate with the word "pioneer" include, of course, daring and resourcefulness, enterprise, and rugged strength. But the one distinguishing quality, above all others, is faith.
>
> Pioneers discovered and made this country. Columbus, the men and women and children of the *Mayflower*, George Washington and Ben Franklin, Lewis and Clarke and young Abe Lincoln, Walter Reed and Wright brothers, and the thousands and millions of humble people of the steerage—all were pioneers who realized "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen."
>
> A great Spaniard who became a great American, George Santayana, wrote:
>
> "Columbus found a world and had no chart,
> Save one that faith deciphered in the skies;
> To trust the soul's invincible surmise
> Was all his science and his only art."
>
> And another great American, Carl Sandburg, the son of an emigrant from Sweden, wrote:
>
> "The Republic is a dream.
> Nothing happens unless first a dream."
>
> I think that those two quotations contain the very essence of our American faith. We "trust the soul's invincible surmise." We know in our hearts that "nothing happens unless first a dream."
>
> War is generally conceded to be the most thoroughly materialistic of the nonessential activities of man.
>
> There could be nothing less tainted with any consideration of sentimentality than the traditional military precept that "God is always on the side of the heaviest battalions."
>
> And yet Napoleon Bonaparte died—as Adolf Hitler will die and as Benito Mussolini and the war lords of Japan will die—wondering why, when the heaviest battalions were unquestionably on his side, God gave final victory to the other side.
>
> This war, more than any previous war, might be considered a war of tangibles, of mathematical certainties. Computed in terms of these tangibles, we could only observe that our enemies had all the advantage of vastly superior anticipation and preparation and position—and that therefore there was no valid reason why they should not win.
>
> And yet, all along the line that stretched around the world, they were stopped short of final victory. And what stopped them?
>
> Well—future historians may have innumerable theories about this. But it is my belief that they were stopped by nothing more tangible than sheer spiritual superiority—by nothing less than a miracle of faith.

I think there is no one who will disagree with these words of Mr. Sherwood. They stress and teach a profound lesson. No war is fought with weapons alone. No war is fought with the bodies of men alone. Underlying everything else is the spirit which makes men offer their lives on the altar of liberty.

In the present instance, we are face to face with a problem involving the Chinese people as well as ourselves. A realistic statement of our relationship to China was made recently by the Vice President of the United States in a radio address. He said:

> China stands with us in this war not by an accident of world politics, or through a grouping of nations into balance-of-power teams. She stands with us and we stand with her because the people of the Chinese Republic and the people of the American Republic believe fundamentally in the same way of life.
>
> In these days it is conventional to say that China needs our help. The fact is not only that we need the help of China as much as she needs ours, but that this war is something more than a matter of donations, contributions, generous aid. It is a mutual action of the nations of the world who believe in the sovereignty of the people in the affairs of life.

That statement is the truth. We in the United States know that it is the truth. But it is our job to show the Chinese that it is the truth. And that is the essence of psychological warfare—to build the spirit of our allies, as well as to weaken that of our enemies.

Due to the length of China's resistance to Japan, China's energies have been inevitably lessened. As a result of her relative physical isolation from her friends due to war developments, and of priorities in supply which have been necessarily given to Europe and other military theatres, China might be expected to develop a feeling of being really alone, waging a war against too great odds and which she could never expect to win. Japan could be expected to find in this feeling something on which to play to weaken the Chinese in continuing an already long and inevitably depeleting resistance. Under the circumstances, it is necessary for those with whom China is united to do whatever can be done to maintain the feeling in China of the certainty of her ultimate success and her common participation in a common effort, on the outcome of which China's future as a great State depends.

Last week Elmer Davis addressed the members of the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco. He outlined the specific functions of psychological warfare in using propaganda, and gave some historical examples. I shall read a part of what he said:

> The functions of our Overseas Branch are various—to give to our allies and the neutral nations as much news as possible about the American war effort, and as complete an understanding as possible of what America is like, in the conviction that that understanding will promote not only a closer cooperation among the United Nations and a speedier victory, but will enhance the good will felt toward this country abroad, and will consequently promote American interests not only in the war, but in the peace that will follow.
>
> In those Allied countries where American troops are stationed, it is our task to try to make the inhabitants regard those troops as friends who should be welcome and who deserve the highest degree of cooperation. In the occupied countries we conduct propaganda—by radio, by leaflets dropped from planes, and by other methods—to convince them that the hour of liberation is drawing nearer, that the enemy's cause is certainly and irrevocably lost, that the war will end in victory and the restoration of freedom.
>
> And to the enemy countries we send the message that their downfall is certain and ineluctable, that the mass of their populations is being compelled to fight a hopeless war whose continuance can serve the interest of no one but the leaders so stained with crime that they dare not surrender. More and more of our work overseas, from now on, will be conducted in support of military operations—front-line propaganda against enemy troops, long-range propaganda against the enemy populations behind them, and simultaneous encouragement to the people of the occupied nations who will be liberated by our advancing armies. In that field we have already been conspicuously successful in the Mediterranean theater—a fact to which we have the testimony of General Marshall, General Eisenhower, Admiral Cunningham, and of enemy leaders too. We hope presently to attain an equal degree of success in other theaters of war, soon to be opened.
>
> Propaganda does not win wars by itself; wars are won primarily by fighting. But propaganda—or psychological warfare, or political warfare, as it is now the fashion to call it—is a powerful adjunct to the operations of armies, both offensive and defensive; it can cushion the effects of defeat—as O. W. I. propaganda did in the Near East and India in the summer of 1942—and it can bring about a speedier victory, to the considerable saving of lives and money.
>
> This is an old story. The armies of Xerxes, 2,500 years ago, were preceded by rumor spreaders who tried to scare the Greeks with stories that when the Persians shot off their arrows they blotted out the light of the sun; but most of the Greeks of those days were as impervious as their modern descendants to the propaganda of the despotic invader.
>
> The unparalleled conquests of Genghis Khan were due partly to novel tactics, but almost as much to an excellent intelligence and propaganda service which brought enemy armies into the field against him half beaten before the battle started. And, in modern times, we are all familiar with the enormous effectiveness of German propaganda in bringing about the fall of France in 1940.

Happily, modern examples no longer need to be drawn from the enemy. After the surrender of Italy, the Japanese Government broadcast to its people that this was the result of American and British propaganda, and warned them to be on their guard against the same demoralizing attack. And Adolf Hitler, speaking in Munich on the 8th of this month, observed that Germany's enemies are trying to wear down the German people with propaganda, I quote, "trying to create the impression among the German people and even more among the people of Germany's allies not only that the war is already decided"—against Germany, naturally—"but that in Germany and its allied nations great masses are longing for this development to occur." Well, that is exactly what we are trying to do; Mr. Hitler must be one of our listeners. It is true that Hitler says that nobody in Germany believes us except maybe some few criminals, and that he will take care of them; he will cut off their heads. He is cutting off their heads every day—the heads of people who are hearing our propaganda, and believing it, and telling other Germans about it; he would not so passionately declare that the collapse of 1918 will not be repeated this time if he were not afraid that there is really a considerable danger of something of the sort, that even a nazified Germany has lost its will to victory.

To Mr. Davis' example of Hitler's understanding of the power of psychological warfare I can add the testimony of Hitler's counterpart in Japan, Premier Tojo, given at just about the time Mr. Davis was delivering his address in San Francisco. To be exact, it was the day before, November 18, that Premier Tojo spoke at a luncheon given to delegates to a press convention in Tokyo. These men had been coralled from all parts of the empire, and occupied areas, to plan future Japanese propaganda. In a broadcast describing Tojo's speech, Domei, the Japanese news service, stated:

He emphasized that successful prosecution of "thought warfare" * * * side by side with armed war is vitally necessary for ultimate victory as well as for building up greater east Asia.

And then on the next day the puppet journalists issued a declaration of principles which acknowledged the effect of American and English propaganda throughout the Far East in these words:

In spite of the * * * propaganda of the United States and Britain, which cannot be made light of—

I repeat—

which cannot be made light of, our conviction in the successful prosecution of the war of greater east Asia and the construction of greater east Asia grows firmer than ever.

It is sometimes stated that whereas psychological warfare has been overwhelmingly successful against the Italians, and is becoming increasingly successful against the Germans, it will never have any effect against the Japanese. It is stated that they have become too thoroughly indoctrinated with their own propaganda to pay any attention to propaganda from us. I should like to remind my colleagues that the same thing was said about the Italians, who had been subjected to 23 years of Fascist propaganda, and it was said of the Germans, who for 10 years had been stuffed with the lies of Hitler and Mussolini.

Regarding the Japanese, I should like to cite the testimony of a gentleman who knows those people better than almost any other living American—Ambassador Joseph P. Grew, who served this country with such great honor and distinction as Ambassador to Japan for the 7 fateful years preceding Pearl Harbor.

Mr. Grew has no illusions that the Japanese are soft. He has done much to inform this country of the toughness of the job we face in the war in the Far East. But Mr. Grew has stated:

I have no doubt that when our bombers start regular routine flights over the military objectives of the main island of Japan the Japanese Government will fear the dropping of pamphlets almost as much as they dread the dropping of bombs. The Japanese people can be made free by the truth, and Japan's militarists know it.

Admittedly, it will take a long time for our propaganda to achieve demoralization of the Japanese people—just as it will take a long time for our armed forces to destroy their military power. Then those of us who know Japan as Ambassador Grew knows Japan, can agree with him that even in those Asiatic islands "the truth is mighty and will prevail."

Japanese propaganda broadcasts, to which this Government listens constantly and with most careful attention, have revealed over and over again the sensitivity of the Japanese to our American propaganda. They frequently attack the Office of War Information by name—and they certainly would not make such attacks if they did not consider that the O. W. I. is wielding a weapon that is highly injurious to them. For instance, here is a quotation from one Japanese propaganda broadcast from Tokyo:

Okumura, vice president of the board of information, explained as follows in today's regular vice minister's meeting about the organization of the American Office of War Information and its propaganda policy; and revealing the true nature of America's propaganda schemes which have recently become very active, he issued a warning to the people of the nation.

The Office (O. W. I.) is emphasizing that speedy victory in this World War lies with America and Britain and the main strength of propaganda is devoted to creating this impression in many ways. Consequently, in spite of defeats in various battles, the point that America's national strength is very enormous is being propagandized. In this manner the plans for propaganda of America and Britain are centered on impressing everyone at home and abroad with the magnificence of their nations.

As against the Axis Nations of Japan, Germany, Italy, and others, they are strengthening the war of nerves which follows along with a war of long duration and are planning internal confusion by spreading false propaganda in an even more lively manner. Consequently, if false propaganda not based on truth arises in our (Japanese) ranks regarding uneasiness over the war situation or criticism of our (Japanese) war leaders, to believe in it will in itself be falling prey to the propaganda schemes of enemy countries. Therefore, the people of this nation (Japan) must not be seduced by such false propaganda, must cooperate as one, and fight to the end to win in this war of thought.

Mr. President, I am neither an expert nor an authority on psychological warfare, but all of us whose words appear in print or are heard over the radio are learning that every word we say is—for good or for bad, consciously or unconsciously—part of American's psychological warfare overseas. Our allies hear it almost instantly, either from our Government programs or from the enemy's programs. In all our expressions, we are talking to the world. The discussion of the proposed repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act on this floor is being listened to not only by ourselves, by vistors in the gallery, by American press and radio representatives, but by all the nations with whom and against whom we are fighting.

Not long ago Representative JOHN M. COFFEE, of Washington, told the House how within 24 hours the Tokyo radio broadcasting with great approbation an attack on the Office of War Information made by an American newspaper columnist—an attack which, incidentally, was entirely false. This is only one of hundreds of instances of the same nature, in a good many of which, I regret to say, Members of Congress have been praised and quoted at length by Tokyo and Berlin.

But that is the negative side of the psychological warfare in which we participate. The positive side is far more significant. Like a great many of my colleagues in the Senate and the House, of all parties and political views, I have had the privilege of cooperating actively with the Overseas Branch of the O. W. I. in the preparation and dissemination of positive statements which form an important part of the propaganda pattern. We, too, are quoted on the enemy radio—not so much quoted as denounced, and denounced in terms so vigorous as to be almost, but not quite, terrifying.

I cannot help smiling a bit when I reread those words and recall two incidents. About the time of the third of my broadcasts to Japan, which went out on the anniversary of Pearl Harbor under my name, the Japanese officers described me as "Public enemy No. 2." Along about the seventh or eighth or ninth I received information in the most round-about way, through Lisbon, away over in Europe, how the Japanese word came back to us. There the Japanese propagandist told the truth. He said that no one need pay any attention to this Senator THOMAS of Utah, that in reality he was not a real Senator, that he was just a Senator by accident, that he did not stand with the other Senators in any way, that he was merely a broken-down school teacher, and that they did not have to listen to him.

Mr. President, it is fine to be elevated in the minds of the Japanese from the place of general public enemy No. 2 to just a "broken-down school teacher." If I could find the Japanese who said that—likely he was one of my students—I would agree with him and would thank

him. I take great pride in being an "old broken-down school teacher."

My practical knowledge of psychological warfare is made up of my personal experiences in preparing messages which have been published in newspapers in many neutral and Allied countries and which have been broadcast throughout the world.

On the 7th of December my twenty-fourth monthly message to the people of Japan will be broadcast in Japanese to Japan, and will also be published in Japanese-language newspapers in Hawaii. What precise effect these messages have had will probably never be known, but I was greatly pleased at the time of the first to read the following description in an editorial in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat:

> A few weeks ago a Tokyo short-wave station broke into a broadcast from KGEI with the announcement that Japanese bombers had caused great damage in San Francisco. Probably there is nothing they would desire more than an air raid that would silence this station, which continues to broadcast information and deny false reports circulated by the enemy.
>
> Doubtless one of the most remarkable incidents in this radio offensive was an address delivered some days ago by Senator THOMAS of Utah. Addressing the Japanese people in their own language he warned them that they were heading toward ultimate disaster by fighting the United States and that their early victories would be followed by defeats from which they would never recover.

Besides the broadcast to Japan, I have prepared many messages to the people of China, a people who know me, and who believe my sincere statements about our cooperation with China. Today I have quoted the enemy in admissions of the power of psychological propaganda. It is equally impressive to see how our expressions of friendship and unity with our allies help them in their struggle for a mutual victory. An example of this was contained in a broadcast to the Chinese people from Chungking some time ago. It was a national anniversary, and China had received from the United States and others of the United Nations messages telling of the determination and the responsibility of all of us to do our part in winning the war.

That such messages are more than bouquets of flowers—that they produce military results—is shown by the words of the Chinese speaker to his fellow countrymen, which I quote:

> Numerous messages sent to China on this anniversary by both government and public leaders of our allies are encouraging indeed. It is our belief that the best way to make ourselves worthy of their praise is to redouble our war effort. I hope every Chinese, irrespective of age or sex, does not fail to respond to the Government's call to contribute wholly to the further prosecution of the war on the Asiatic mainland—responsibility for which rests essentially on our shoulders.

Mr. President, I know from personal experience that the renunciation of the extraterritorial treaties by our country was heralded in China as one of the greatest of all victories. It was the achievement of the long, hard work of Sun Yat-sen, and China seemed to feel that one of the objectives of her great revolution had been attained. Every Chinese throughout the whole republic had a chance to hear the words, the greatest unifying element, probably, that has ever come to that widely scattered people.

I have been privileged also to prepare a large number of statements and messages for European nations, among them Greece and Yugoslavia. Peoples who have escaped from these two latter tortured countries have informed us that such messages by American legislators and other officials are a great comfort and encouragement to the stricken people. They are gratified by the fact that we appreciate their continued resistance to the brutal invaders. I have sent similar messages to Poland, Czechoslovakia, France, Norway, the Netherlands, and other occupied countries, as well as to such countries as Iceland and Turkey.

In the case of Turkey, a few months ago a number of statements by some colleagues in the Senate and myself were published in the Turkish press. They were congratulatory messages on the occasion of the unanimous reelection of the President of Turkey, messages evidencing our sincere interest in the problems of Turkey.

When, a few days later in a session of the Turkish National Assembly, reference was made by the Turkish Foreign Minister to these statements by American legislators, according to the Associated Press, a 5-minute enthusiastic ovation greeted the words of the Turkish statesman. The Turkish legislators stood in honor of the United States and applauded happily, acclaiming the keen interest of the American legislators in Turkish problems. I am informed that at that time German Minister of Finance and Commerce, Dr. Klodius, was in Turkey trying to secure all of Turkey's output of chromium for Germany. The dismal failure of his mission is now a matter of historic record.

I have said that psychological propaganda is action in the realm of the mind and spirit. It takes many forms, from leaflets which induce enemy soldiers to surrender in the heat of battle, to the type of congratulations I have been mentioning; from powerful thrusts at discouraged workers in enemy countries which weaken their resolution and slow their production, to instructions at the right moment to the underground which bring on sabotage and revolt. All of these are valuable. All are essential.

I want to make public for the first time one of the many actions of the Office of War Information about which most of us never hear, because it is the job of the O. W. I. not to talk about itself to the American people, but instead to talk about the war to the rest of the world. It was just an incident in the day-by-day work of the O. W. I., but it seems to me impressive in showing psychological warfare in action.

Last year on the anniversary of the delivery of the Gettysburg Address by Abraham Lincoln in 1863, the O. W. I. decided to broadcast its text throughout the world. This document of 267 words has probably stirred more human hearts in the cause of freedom than any other. Moreover, it is as fresh and vivid today as when it was first delivered.

Accordingly, the Library of Congress was searched for translations of the Gettysburg Address into foreign languages. It was amazing to find out that in a majority of languages no translation was available, either because it had never been made or could not be found by librarians and members of foreign embassies and legations. With this discovery, it became all the more important to broadcast this fundamental document of democracy to the world.

So the O. W. I. translators were put to work on it, and on the appointed day, 79 years after Abraham Lincoln had electrified the Nation with its profound appeal, millions of people scattered over the world heard it for the first time in one of the 46 languages and dialects which are used for short-wave broadcasts. Listeners in Germany, Japan, and Fascist Italy, secretly defying their totalitarian masters, heard the gospel of human liberty proclaimed, filled with the same spirit that emboldened the slaves of Rome to listen to the words of Spartacus in ages gone by.

There is something deeply moving to me in the thought of men and women in Siam and in Iceland, in Norway, and in the struggling Republic of China, everywhere in the world, listening to the simple eloquence which we Americans know so well, but which was entirely new to many of them.

Most of it might well have been written yesterday. Its second sentence, "Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure," certainly applies to the World War of today. And its assurance "that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth," is being reinforced by the United Nations offensives over the world which are leading the enemies of the people to unconditional surrender.

As I have pointed out, the measure which we are considering today, and what we say and do about it, are a part of the psychological warfare we are waging against Germany and Japan. Its passage will signify that we mean what we say when we talk about justice and the sovereignty of free nations.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Immigration. He is ill and not able to be present to make his representations in person with respect to the bill now under discussion, which he opposes. He has requested me to indicate for the record his opposition to the bill and to ask that a statement made by him on the subject before the Committee on Immigration, together with a prepared statement of factual matter entitled "The Story of Legislation on Oriental Labor," which he has prepared, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statements are as follows:

My opposition to the pending bill does not indicate a lack of appreciation for the courageous fight of the Chinese people to preserve their independence. Nor is it inspired by any prejudice toward the Chinese at home or abroad.

Apropos of this thought, I venture to quote the great philosopher, Mr. Hu Shih, former Chinese Ambassador to the United States, who concluded a notable address with this sage admonition: "Those who differ with you and energetically oppose your point of view are not necessarily stupid or evil-minded."

And at the outset I want to make it emphatically clear that my position, and that of those who appear here in my behalf, does not imply in any degree inferiority of the Chinese race in those matters to which they give their attention. It is on the very ground of this superiority in what is known as squatting occupations that the Chinese demonstrate their superiority.

It is well known, of course, that California has borne the brunt of the long struggle for effective Asiatic exclusion. The working people of California were the pioneers in urging legislation to exclude Asiatics. When California, as a State, had accepted this policy there still remained the task of converting the Nation. The vast majority of immigrants from Asia have landed and remained in California. This situation has had a tendency to prolong the struggle. If Californians had been able to legislate on the subject, it would have been settled in 1858, when the State legislature passed a rigid Chinese Exclusion Act. Of course, that law and all other State laws of similar nature were unconstitutional.

In considering early history of the anti-Asiatic movement it is interesting to note that while our first treaty with China was signed in 1884 the anti-Chinese agitation was in full swing in California at the very time when Commodore Perry made his first visit to Japan and attempted to persuade that country to do business with the world at large.

The demand for a Chinese exclusion law was based upon the first law of nature: Self-preservation. The advance guard of China's 400,000,000 were beginning to move across the Pacific, to a land of milk and honey, largely undeveloped and sparsely settled. There are those who now maintain that Chinese immigrants never were a menace to our country but the record speaks for itself. Without restriction, the teeming population of China could have literally overwhelmed our western shores in an incredibly short period. The opposition to Chinese immigration was not a racial but wholly an economic issue.

For three decades, the white residents of California and adjacent States tried out every conceivable method to discourage Chinese immigration. There was an unending series of discriminatory State laws and city ordinances. There were anti-Chinese demonstrations, riots, and persecutions without number. California in 1879 and Nevada in 1880 each took a State-wide referendum vote on the subject. The results were virtually unanimous for exclusion. In the end the realization came that Federal legislation was the only remedy. An energetic campaign was carried on and Congress responded by passing regulatory measures as substitutes for exclusion. Among such was a bill providing that no master of a vessel should take aboard more than 15 Chinese passengers bound for a United States port. The bill was promptly vetoed by President Hayes. However, because of the constantly increasing political pressure from the Pacific coast the President negotiated a new treaty with China which enabled Congress to restrict immigration from China. A bill excluding Chinese laborers for a period of 20 years was passed by Congress early in 1882. President Arthur vetoed this bill because he felt that the 20-year period was too long and that it violated the spirit of the treaty with China. Congress took the hint and passed another bill providing for a 10-year exclusion period only. The exclusion law of 1882 did not prove entirely satisfactory. There were too many loopholes.

So the agitation went on. Additional restrictions were added during the next Congress. And when the 10-year exclusion law was renewed in 1892, still more restrictive features were adopted. In 1902 Congress renewed for an indefinite period all the laws prohibiting and regulating the coming of Chinese.

Upon the refusal of China to continue the then existing treaty after 1904, Congress on April 27, 1904, again reenacted, "extending and continuing without modification, limitation, or condition," all restrictive laws then in force.

The Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, did not disturb the Chinese Exclusion Act but added virtually all other Asiatics to the excluded classes by geographical definition of a barred zone. The restricted area thus established added to the excluded classes the natives of India, Siam, Indochina and the islands of New Guinea, Borneo, Sumatra, Java, as well as numerous lesser islands.

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION

Japanese immigration became an issue during the early years of the present century. The anti-Japanese agitation was mild and innocuous in comparison with the violent anti-Chinese movement that had raged in the coast States for several decades.

The Japanese Government showed extraordinary readiness to guard and protect the rights and privileges of her nationals residing in the United States. As the years rolled by the reason of this paternal solicitude of the Japanese Government became thoroughly understod in California, at least. Japanese immigrants did not come to America with any desire or intent to lose their racial or national identity. They came in ever-increasing numbers for the purpose of establishing self-sustaining colonies of the proud Yamato race. And when we pause to think of the congested area of Japan it is really not surprising that so many were ready to venture across the Pacific.

When and where in all history was there a more glorious opportunity or a more promising prospect than California offered to Japan? Both have approximately the same area. But Japan had 390 inhabitants to the square mile while California had only 15. It was the fear of this new menace from the Orient that caused Californians of all classes to unite in the demand for Japanese exclusion legislation of the same sort as existed for the Chinese.

President Theodore Roosevelt strenuously opposed Japanese exclusion by law. In a message to Congress he also recommended that the privilege of naturalization be extended to Japanese who are residents of the United States. Finally, as a substitute for an exclusion law, President Roosevelt in 1907 negotiated a gentlemen's agreement with Japan.

In substance, this agreement provided that the United States would not adopt a law excluding Japanese. In return, Japan of her own accord agreed to refrain from issuing passports to Japanese laborers desiring to enter continental United States or Territories contiguous to continental United States.

This substitute for exclusion took effect about the middle of 1908, but it did not put an end to the anti-Japanese agitation among the residents of the Pacific slope. The agreement did not produce the results anticipated and promised by President Roosevelt.

Investigations made by the California State Board of Control showed that the Japanese population of California increased during the decade 1910–20 by more than 25,000 from immigration only. During the same period the net increase of the Chinese population, including births, was only 789. In other words, the Chinese Exclusion Act actually excluded. The Japanese gentlemen's agreement did not.

So the insistent demand for effective exclusion found an answer when Congress wrote in the Immigration Act of 1924 a clause providing that "no alien ineligible to citizenship shall be admitted to the United States."

Exclusion of all aliens ineligible to citizenship offered a logical, simple, practical, and effective solution of the entire Asiatic immigration problem. It followed the Federal law which since 1790 has made all the yellow and brown races ineligible to citizenship because of unassimilability and the menace they would offer if established here. Certainly if immigration is to be restricted, we should commence with that element which is barred from citizenship.

Of course, Japan protested against such legislation on the grounds of discrimination and she was the only nation which did protest. The measure is not discriminatory against Japan, for it applies to half the population of the globe, and the Japanese constitute not more than 7 or 8 percent of those affected. It should be remembered, too, that Japan in protection of her own people, wisely excludes Chinese and Koreans, thus discriminating against people of her own color.

Some of the American spokesmen for Japan were very active in insisting that Japan has been insulted or offended by the passage of the ineligible-to-citizenship clause in the immigration law of 1924. Until Pearl Harbor, they kept up a constant agitation for the repeal or at least a modification of this clause.

Now it is seriously, and with equal vigor, contended that a partial repeal of our Asiatic exclusion laws would be a contribution to the war effort.

Was there ever a more fallacious argument?

Having placed all Asiatic peoples on an equal basis with respect to immigration and naturalization, Congress is now about to pass a bill discriminating in favor of one Asiatic nation as against all other peoples of the Orient who were excluded because of ineligibility to citizenship.

The proponents of this discriminatory legislation contend that it is merely a friendly gesture toward a brave Ally in the present war. But China is not our only Ally subject to our exclusion laws. What about our brave Allies the Filipinos, and what about all the potential Allies in the Orient, the natives of India, Burma, Malaya, the Dutch East Indies, and others?

Is not this proposed legislation a deliberate slap in the face for all Asiatic peoples, except only the Chinese?

Is it not a complete reversal of America's carefully considered, nondiscriminatory immigration policy toward all nations and races of Asia?

It has been stated that Congress, in the adoption of various Asiatic exclusion laws, has never referred to any specific class of persons by race, except the Chinese.

This is true, and if it removes any implied stigma upon the Chinese people to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, as amended, or any supplementary exclusion legislation specifically mentioning the Chinese, there can be no valid objection, since other laws, more general in character and nondiscriminatory as between races and peoples of Asia, fully meet the object sought by the original Chinese Exclusion Act.

Such, however, is not the purpose of the pending bill. To the contrary, the enactment of this bill will place upon our statute

books an immigration policy frankly and clearly discriminatory against a far greater number of Asiatics than the Chinese.

THE STORY OF LEGISLATION ON ORIENTAL LABOR

The legislation on oriental labor sprang from the people. The centers of anti-Chinese agitation have always been found at the points of the greatest contact between the two types of labor, hence the laws on the subject have not been of the type which far-seeing statesmen first suggest, and whose support is largely a matter of the education of public opinion. They (the laws) were the product of the actual experiences—sometimes of the race prejudices—of those in the humblest ranks of society. For 30 years the working people persistently made known their needs, winning at last a practically unanimous support in the State, so that all classes united to urge the tardy Federal legislation for exclusion. The largely instinctive judgment of the working people of California, which has refused to sanction this admixture of races, has been accepted as the policy of the Nation. This origin of the anti-Chinese legislation is shown in the relationship which the different groups of laws bear to each other. The regulations made in the miners' meetings are repeated in the State laws and even in the Federal statutes; the demands of the labor unions are reflected in city ordinances, and these in turn suggested measures passed by the State legislature; while the futile attempts at State exclusion furnished the models for Federal laws regulating immigration.

The legislation upon the subject of oriental labor has been rendered intricate by the triple jurisdiction resulting from our peculiar form of government. Police measures, the control of licenses, and of many other conditions of labor, are largely exercised by the local governing bodies of towns or cities. The State has paramount jurisdiction on the same subjects, and attempted to exercise the right to exclude altogether, or to tax heavily, the importation of undesirable immigrants. But here it came into conflict with the Federal Government, which, by virtue of its treaty-making powers and control of commerce has the right to regulate immigration.[1] The United States Supreme Court in a series of decisions has refused to recognize any State legislation encroaching on these powers. Thus the final action on this question, which was of the most vital importance in the social and economic development of California, was left to the representatives of States where no such problems had ever been met, and where there was a more or less complete ignorance of their significance.

In studying the great mass of legislation by which these law-making bodies have attempted to deal with the problems of oriental labor, we find that the measures fall naturally into four groups:

First, the ordinances or orders of local authorities.

Second, State laws which aimed to discourage immigration by special taxation or the curtailment of political and civil rights.

Third, the attempts of the State to discourage or diminish immigration.

Fourth, Federal legislation regulating immigration.

In studying these four groups of measures, we will find three well-marked periods of development:

First, the period prior to 1867, when the opposition to the Chinese was not well organized.

Second, the strong, well-organized, anti-Chinese movements of the later sixties and the seventies, culminating in the radical provisions of the new constitution of the State, and the Federal exclusion law of 1882.

Third, the period since the enactment of the exclusion law.

LOCAL REGULATION OF CHINESE LABOR, 1852–67

It is difficult to trace the history of the local regulations affecting the Chinese, or to estimate correctly the influence of those measures of which it is possible to find the record. Many of the State laws merely gave authority for local enactments, and these measures were of a character not usually enforced with any degree of uniformity.[2] Often the most significant and effective action was extralegal. For example, there are communities where by the unanimous consent of the public, the Chinese, without sanction of law, have been effectually excluded for years.

As has been pointed out, the opposition to the Chinese developed first in the mining regions, and it is here that the legislation against them began. It is impossible to learn much of the details of these regulations of the miners. There seems to have been no uniformity in the rules governing the different districts, and we have but scanty records of the miners' meetings. We do not know what part of the status of the Chinese was determined by definite enactment, and what part by common consent. They appear to have worked only the less profitable claims, and to have acquired title by purchase from the whites, or to have leased the right to work from white owners. They worked in companies under Chinese masters. White men sometimes employed them, but it was claimed that the latter always had to pay a higher rate of wages.[3]

It is evident that they were never permitted to work in some of the mining districts and that others passed laws expelling them. Bothwick, who visited several mining camps, says, "In some parts of the mines, however, the miners had their own ideas on the subject, and would not allow the Chinese to come among them; but generally they were not interfered with as they contented themselves with working such poor diggings as it was not thought worth while to take from them."[4] We have found a few newspaper reports of the acts of miners' meetings excluding the Chinese. In 1858, the Agua Fria District, Mariposa County, passed a resolution to the effect that "the regulations which have been in vogue for 2½ years prohibiting Chinese from working within our district shall be the law and rule of this district. Any Chinaman who tries to mine must leave on 24 hours' notice, otherwise the miners will inflict such punishment as they deem proper."[5] The Gold Hill and Placerville miners in Eldorado County passed resolutions in 1858 and 1859 to prevent the Gold Hill Canal Co. from acquiring claims for the purpose of speculation by selling them to Chinamen.[6] At a mass meeting of the Gold Hill miners in 1858, resolutions were passed expelling the Chinese from Diamond Springs Township. It was provided, however, that those who had purchased claims should be allowed to work them out before leaving.[7] The miners of Colville passed a law in 1862 excluding Chinese from the mines.[8] The miners of the Buckeye Mining District held a meeting in 1867 to discuss the admission of Chinese to their district. They had never before been admitted and it was decided to continue the exclusion.[9] These examples are sufficient to establish the possibility of local action of this kind. When we consider the strong feeling against the Chinese, and the failure to obtain relief from State laws, we have every reason to believe that there were many other districts with similar local regulations.

By the authority of an act of the legislature, approved December 21, 1877, the people of the State were called upon to express themselves upon the subject of Chinese exclusion in the election of September 3, 1879. The results of this vote indicate a very remarkable unanimity of opinion throughout the State; of the 161,405 votes cast, 154,638 were opposed to the admission of the Chinese, and 883 favored it, 5,884 failing to vote on the question. In his message transmitting the results of the election, Governor Irwin laid great emphasis on the significance of this popular verdict. He declared that there was no reason to discount the result as an expression of the wishes of the people of the State, as the vote was by secret ballot at a time when there was no undue excitement. He claimed that the decision could not be attributed to ignorance or prejudice, as fully two-thirds of the voters of the State were natives of the United States, the majority of them from Northern and Western States. They were men not inclined to race prejudice, who by education and association had been well grounded in the principles of our free institutions and who fully appreciated the sacredness of individual liberty.

A year later a similar vote was taken in Nevada with the results: Total vote cast, 18,397; for the admission of the Chinese, 183; against it, 17,200; not voting 955. Even when one makes allowance for the influence of any peculiarities in the printing of the ballots, the results of these elections indicate a remarkable uniformity of public opinion. Those favoring the admission of the Chinese or failing to vote might easily have been persons whose economic welfare depended on a supply of cheap Asiatic labor. There can be no question that the great majority of the citizens of those States were thoroughly convinced that men of this race were unfitted for membership in an American commonwealth.

CONTINUED EFFORTS OF THE LABOR ORGANIZATIONS TO SECURE CHINESE EXCLUSION

During the eighties the efforts to solve the Chinese problem were transferred from the State to the National legislative bodies, but the workingmen's organizations of the Pacific coast were still back of the whole movement. They never relaxed their strenuous efforts to enlist the active support of fellow-trade-unionists in the East, or ceased to make known their grim determination to prevent the continued influx of oriental labor, even if by a last resort to violence. They ignored all party lines and voted steadily and consistently with a view to the promotion of this one issue. The special anti-Chinese leagues were continued, and all new organizations of workingmen recognized this as one of their chief aims. Special conventions for the consideration of the subject of Chinese exclusion were held in 1882 and 1885, as well as at subsequent periods when the renewal of the legislation on the subject was

[1] Passenger Cases, *Smith* v. *Turner*, 7 Howard 282.

[2] The law requiring a certain number of cubic feet of air to each person in sleeping apartments is an example of this. Also laws permitting the removal of Chinese houses of prostitution, or even at a later time, the removal of the Chinese quarters. The school regulations are also examples of local regulations authorized by State law.

[3] Bothwick, J. D., Three Years in California, ch. xvii. Edinburgh and London, 1858.

[4] Ibid., p. 262.

[5] Bulletin, November 24, 1858.

[6] Historical Souvenir of Eldorado County, Calif., etc., Oakland, 1883, p. 102.

[7] Ibid., p. 102.

[8] Bulletin, December 2, 1862.

[9] Ibid., September 11, 1867. (A History of California Labor Legislation—California University Economics—Berkeley, 1910, by Lucile Eaves, pp. 115, 116, 117, 118, 119.)

under discussion. The more detailed accounts of the actions of these conventions will be given in connection with the history of the Federal anti-Chinese legislation.

JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE OF INVESTIGATION OF 1876

We have seen that between 1870 and 1880 there was a great and, to the Californians, a most alarming increase in the number of Chinese arriving at San Francisco, and that during this period the people of California, particularly the workingmen of San Francisco, were engaged in a continuous anti-Chinese campaign, which broke out at intervals in great popular demonstrations. We remember that the year 1876 was the one marked by the greatest influx of Chinese and by a correspondingly vigorous demonstration. The California Representatives in Washington faithfully reflected the feelings and made known the demands of their constituents. In February 1876, Senator Booth presented the resolutions of the California Legislature calling for a modification of the Burlingame Treaty.[10] Sargent[11] in the Senate, and Page[12] in the House promptly brought in concurrent resolutions requesting the President to open negotiations with the Chinese Government for the purpose of securing such changes in the treaty as would permit a restriction of immigration. The resolutions were passed, but the President failed to act in the matter. Committees were appointed in the Senate[13] and House to investigate the character and extent of the objectionable immigration, and, at the suggestion of Senator Sargent, it was agreed that they should act as a joint committee.[14] This committee began taking testimony in San Francisco in the following October, and in February 1877 brought in a voluminous report of over 12,000 pages.[15]

As a result of this investigation a majority of the committee brought in a recommendation to the effect that, "Measures be taken by the Executive looking toward a modification of the existing treaty with China, confining it to strictly commercial purposes; and that Congress legislate to restrain the great influx of Asiatics to this country. It is not believed that either of these measures would be looked upon with disfavor by the Chinese Government. Whether this is so or not, a duty is owed to the Pacific States and Territories, which are suffering under a terrible scourge, but are patiently waiting for relief from Congress." The committee said that violence could be restrained so long as there was a reasonable hope that Congress would apply a remedy, but declared that the safety of the State demanded that political power should not be placed in the hands of the Chinese, as they had no love for or appreciation of our institutions.[16] The report states that, while the resources of the Pacific coast could be more quickly developed with the help of the Chinese, whose labor was profitable for the capitalist classes, the laboring men and artisans were, without exception, opposed to the further admission of the Chinese. The committee found many lawyers, doctors, merchants, divines, judges, and other intelligent citizens, who declared that the apparent prosperity derived from the presence of the Chinese was deceptive and unwholesome, "ruinous to our laboring classes, promotive of caste, and dangerous to free institutions." Twenty operatives of different trades testified that the competition of the Chinese had reduced their wages to the starvation point. The facts that these hardships bore with especial weight on women wageworkers was emphasized.[17]

THE FIRST RESTRICTIVE LEGISLATION—THE 15 PASSENGER BILL

The report of the joint committee prepared the way for congressional action for a restriction of immigration, and the violent agitation against the Chinese by the Workingmen's Party of California[18] made the need seem more urgent. A number of bills were brought in at the next session of Congress proposing varied plans for dealing with the question. In the House, Davis[19] from San Francisco, and Luttrell[20] from Santa Rosa, considered it their duty as representatives of California interests to present bills restricting the immigration of the Chinese or preventing their employment and naturalization. The Nevada Representative had a bill ready,[21] and Shelley from Alabama proposed a plan which not only prohibited further immigration,[22] but undertook to transport and colonize the Chinese already here.[23] The California Senators also busied themselves with the Chinese legislation. Sargent presented a bill for the restriction of immigration,[24] but he and Booth devoted their efforts chiefly to procuring the passage of a concurrent resolution calling on the President to open correspondence with China and Great Britain[25] for the abrogation of the treaty provisions permitting unlimited immigration of the Chinese.

The House Committee on Education and Commerce sent in a prompt and unanimous endorsement of the resolution calling for the opening of correspondence for the purpose of securing a restriction of immigration. Willis, the chairman of this committee, was a Kentuckian who had a strong sympathy for the Californians in their efforts to solve the difficult race problem of the Pacific coast.

At the next session of Congress, the House, impatient with the long delay, showed a determination to take some action even though it meant the repudiation of the treaty with China. The Committee on Education and Labor, to whom the numerous resolutions, memorials, petitions, and bills on the Chinese had been referred, recommended a bill providing that no master of a vessel should be permitted to take aboard more than 15 Chinese passengers bound for a United States port. In presenting this bill the committee reviewed the previous efforts to secure restrictive legislation, referring to the numerous petitions urging such legislation, that the people of the Pacific coast had sent to Congress since 1868, and calling attention to the fact that the President had twice been presented with joint resolutions urging him to seek a modification of the treaty. The committee discussed the question of the power of Congress to pass laws which would supersede a treaty, maintaining that, "To refuse to execute a treaty for reasons which approve themselves to the conscientious judgment of a nation is a matter of the utmost gravity, but the power to do so is a prerogative of which no nation can be deprived without deeply affecting its independence.[26]

Willis, the chairman of the committee recommending the bill, was one of the ablest advocates of the measure on the floor of the House. In his speech in its support he states: "There are today in the hands of our committee the joint resolutions of four State legislatures, the memorial of the Constitutional Convention of California, passed only a few days ago without a single dissenting voice, together with the proceedings of innumerable societies, religious bodies, labor conventions, and the petitions of over 100,000 private citizens, setting forth from different standpoints the evils of Chinese immigration, and urging upon Congress the necessity for prompt and vigorous measures of relief."[27] The bill restricting the number of Chinese passengers passed the House on January 28, 1879, the vote standing, yeas 155, nays 72, not voting 61.[28]

Judging by an extract quoted from a letter Senator Sargent, the rejoicing in San Francisco over the passage of this bill was quite hysterical in its intensity. His correspondent declared that men—strangers to each other—embraced upon the streets and wept for joy when they received the news.[29] But their joy was short-lived, for it was soon rumored that the President would veto the bill. Everything possible was done to prevent such action. The chambers of commerce of the coast cities,[30] and the constitutional convention sent telegrams urging the signature of the bill. The merchants of San Francisco closed their places of business so that their employees might swell the numbers of the great mass meetings held under the auspices of the city and State officials.[31] The Pacific coast Representatives called on the President and his Cabinet with additional arguments and evidences of the urgent demands for the approval of the measure.

But no amount of pressure would induce President Hayes to sign the bill. In his veto message he said that while he recognized the right of Congress to terminate a treaty, such a denunciation was justified only by a great necessity. He also pointed out that the abrogation of a part of the treaty might invalidate the whole and thus leave American interests in China unprotected.[32]

BITTER RESENTMENT OF THE VETO OF THE BILL

In the test vote of September 1879, only 224 of the 41,258 voters of San Francisco had voted in favor of the continued admission of the Chinese. The past history of the city furnished ample precedents for the execution of the will of the majority of the citizens by illegal or extralegal popular uprisings.

THE EXCLUSION LAW OF 1882

Miller in opening the Senate debate made a dignified and forceful argument in support of the bill, which he presented as the unanimous report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He pointed out that the Government was already committed to such legislation, since a treaty had just been negotiated for the purpose of permitting it. In the

[10] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, IV, 44th Cong., 1st sess., p. 901.
[11] Ibid., p. 2850.
[12] Ibid., pp. 3087, 3763.
[13] Ibid., p. 4421.
[14] Ibid., pp. 4678, 4705.
[15] 44th Cong., 2d sess., Rept. No. 689 (published in a separate volume, serial No. 1734).
[16] Report of the joint committee, 44th Cong., 2d sess., No. 689, pp. v–viii, serial No. 1734.
[17] Report of the joint committee, etc., p. iv.
[18] See above, pp. 30, 150.
[19] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, VII, 45th Cong., 2d sess., p. 383.
[20] Ibid., pp. 98, 271.
[21] Ibid., p. 318.
[22] Ibid., 6, 68.
[23] Ibid., p. 320.
[24] Ibid., p. 81.
[25] This was necessary because the Chinese coming from Hong Kong were subjects of Great Britain.
[26] H. Rept. No. 62, 45th Cong., 3d sess., serial No. 1866.
[27] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD VIII, 45th Cong., 3d sess., p. 789.
[28] Ibid., pp. 791–792, 793, 793–800.
[29] Alta, February 26, 1879 (reprint of Sargent's speech).
[30] Ibid, February 25.
[31] San Francisco daily papers of February 27 and 28, 1879. The Alta publishes a list of 82 merchants who closed their places of business during the meetings.
[32] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 45th Cong., 3d sess., pp. 2275–2276.

last election both political parties and their candidates had pledged themselves to a restriction of Chinese immigration. He quoted the results of the test vote in California and Nevada to show how universal was the opposition to its continuance on the part of people best fitted to judge of its significance. He produced statistics showing the magnitude of the immigration, and its possible development in case this measure failed to pass. The conditions making it impossible for the two types of labor to compete were fully explained, and figures presented showing the encroachment of the Chinese in the industries of the Pacific coast. He declared that, "An irrepressible conflict is now upon us in full force, and those who do not see it in progress are not so wise as the men who saw the approach of that other 'irrepressible conflict' which shook the very foundations of American empire on this continent."

The other Senators from the region west of the Rocky Mountains were, of course, equally ardent in their support of the bill.

By this time the labor organizations all over the country were thoroughly enlisted. Petitions and memorials expressing the wishes of hundreds of thousands of workingmen were presented from New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Missouri, Iowa, Indiana, Alabama, Maryland, and California. As was frequently pointed out in the debates the bill marked a radical departure from the national policy which had hitherto welcomed the foreign immigrant of every country, but it is impossible to question the full endorsement of this legislation by the American people.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I also desire to call the attention of the Senate to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 28, 1882, at which time Senator Miller, of California, made a very comprehensive statement with respect to conditions then existing in California, the Western States, and in the United States, in connection with the question of immigration of orientals into the United States. The statement appears on page 1481 of volume 13, part 2, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

My statement at this time is simply an act of courtesy to the senior Senator from California.

EXPENDITURES BY UNITED STATES IN CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICAN COUNTRIES (S. DOC. NO. 132)

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, during the July and August recess of the Senate I made use of the available time in a study, first-hand and on-the-ground, of relations and activities of the Government of the United States in Latin America. I desire to report to the Senate briefly on some of the things I found. The report will be filed later. It contains a tremendous amount of detailed information, and I think, due to the press of time today, I should request that there be no interruption during the short presentation I wish to make of this report.

First, however, I should like to express my appreciation for the facilities and courtesies extended to me by representatives of our American Government and of the governments of Latin American nations. I was graciously and hospitably received in every country visited. Every opportunity was afforded me to make unhampered inquiry into the problems and conditions which concerned us. I found that many of the problems that concerned us, as citizens of the United States, were likewise giving great concern to the thoughtful citizens of these neighbor nations.

I should like to say, at once, that a single trip of the duration of mine makes no man an expert on Latin American affairs. I do not come before the Senate as an expert. There are a great many things which I did not find out. About some things, however, I have found out enough to arouse in me something more than mere partisan curiosity to find out more. I intend to pursue those matters further.

If I missed some things, there are other things in regard to our activities in Latin America which no honest traveler could possibly miss.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD letters signed by the chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures and the chairman of the Special Committee Investigating the Defense Program—the Truman committee—which I carried with me on the trip.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 2, 1943

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This letter will confirm our oral discussion relative to your mission in Latin America.

I trust you will make as thorough a study of United States nonessential spending and activities throughout Central and South America as circumstances will permit, and report to the chairman and this committee your findings.

This letter will serve as your authorization as a special investigator for this committee. The same applies to your aide, Mr. Maurice Mumford.

I feel confident that your report to us will contain information that will be of value to this committee and the war effort of the United States.

Faithfully yours,

HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senator.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 2, 1943.*

Hon. HUGH A. BUTLER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This letter will confirm our oral discussion relative to your mission in Latin America.

I trust you will make as thorough a study of United States defense spending and activities throughout Central and South America as circumstances will permit, and report to the chairman and this committee your findings.

This letter will serve as your authorization as a special investigator for this committee.

I feel confident that your report to us will contain information that will be of great value to this committee and the war effort of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN,
United States Senator.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page A4163, there appears a copy of a speech I made on the food situation in South America; and also in the Appendix of the RECORD, at page A5073, appears a copy of an article published in the current issue of the Reader's Digest, which I wrote on the subject Our Deep, Dark Secrets in Latin America. Senators may desire to review those articles in connection with my remarks and the report I am filing today.

When making plans for this trip, I was approached by Chairman BYRD, of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and also by Chairman TRUMAN, of the Special Committee to Investigate the national defense program, suggesting that I be on the lookout for such information as might be useful to them in their respective positions on these committees. Each of these chairmen clothed me with authority to represent their committees, as per copies of the letters which I have requested to have made a part of my remarks.

In order to be as well prepared as possible to carry out these requests, I gathered in advance and organized as much statistical information as possible with reference to our programs and financial obligations in the 20 countries to be visited. This material added considerably to the weight of the baggage we took along, and the inspectors at Maimi, where we arrived on our first night en route, were most curious about the whole assortment of figures, data, and so forth. We were advised along about 9 o'clock, following our arrival in Miami, that the Government customs inspectors would have to go through our baggage and inspect everything, before our departure the next morning. We were told how two specialists from some Detroit factory, going by air on an emergency call to the airfields in England, only a short time before, had been delayed while United States inspectors went through their baggage, and the men finally had to go to England without the blue prints they required for the work they were to do when they reached England. The blueprints arrived weeks later in England. In the meantime duplicates had been mailed direct to them in England from the Detroit factory. Not wanting to proceed south without our files, I called my secretary, toward midnight, asking him to attempt to contact Secretary Hull in person. Secretary Hull had been most cooperative in assisting me in all my plans. Mr. Hull was not at home until later, but he called the secretary and when he heard of the situation he called Secretary Morgenthau; and by morning the customs inspectors were told to pass our baggage without inspection.

There are more than 175 typewritten pages in the report I am filing. As I just stated, much of the information was gathered before my departure. During the trip and since my return there have been many additions to the reports. Besides the material I am handing to the committees, I have several times the amount yet in my files. It would be miraculous if all errors were avoided in making such a long and detailed report, especially as regards the figures

covering actual expenditures, commitments, and extensions of credit, totaling more than $6,000,000,000.

As I proceed with my short report, I should like to call to the attention of Senators, simply in order to give them an indication of what the report contains, a few words on budget comparisons. I read a short paragraph from the report:

> In per capita terms, a great difference exists between the Latin-American nations and the United States. For instance, the total of the budgets of all 20 Latin American countries was $1,067,000,000, in 1941. This is roughly $8.45 per capita for the 120,000,000 people of these 20 countries. The United States Budget in 1941 was $60,000,000,000, this being roughly around $461, per capita.
>
> The 1942 budget for these Latin American countries totals roughly only $1,500,000,000, or $12.50 per capita. In the United States the 1942 Budget was $100,000,000,000, or roughly $769 per capita.

It had been my intention to go into some detail, in making the report to the Senate, in connection with the details of the trip, the itinerary, and so forth. However, due to the press of business before the Senate, and to the fact that other Senators desire to obtain the floor today, I shall omit very much of that part of what I had intended to say. Nevertheless, I should like to outline very briefly the route we took. We proceeded from Miami to Cuba, from Cuba through Yucatan, all the way by air, of course. From there we went to Mexico City; from Mexico City south to the Central-American countries, down the west coast of South America as far as Santiago, across the Andes, and through Argentina. Then we visited Uruguay, Paraguay, Brazil, the Guineas, and came on home, through the Caribbean, where we made several stops—at Trinidad, Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic, and the Haitian Republic. There are many interesting things which I should like to tell the Senate sometime, when we have more time for such a recitation.

I should like to speak of the courteous treatment I received from the American Ambassadors. My visit to the 20 foreign countries, where I contacted representatives of the United States—the Ambassadors in many cases, and their principal staff personnel in other cases—leads me to comment that I deem it a very wise plan for us to select successful businessmen as our Ambassadors when that is possible. I think we may be inclined to appoint too many career men as our Ambassadors—men worthy and competent in every way except for their lack of business experience. Our contacts with foreign countries are largely business contacts. An Ambassador versed in protocol but lacking business acumen can stand in the way of great steps in intercountry progress and development.

Generally speaking, I was very favorably impressed with the men and women who staff our embassy offices in Central America and South America; but they are underpaid. We have raised to the rank of Ambassadors all those who represent the United States in the territories I have visited; but we have left the pay at the same base of that which they received as consular representatives.

Any criticism I may appear to have directed toward the waste and extravagance in Central America and South America does not apply to our State Department. On the other hand, I should be inclined to criticize that Department for its policy of keeping expenses at too low a minimum. I was most sympathetic with the staff members of our embassies, who were plainly hampered due to the lack of funds, when all around we were following the extreme reverse policy in every other program. We can well afford to adopt a more liberal policy toward the salaries and expenses of those who represent this country abroad.

One Ambassador made what I thought was a very splendid and practical suggestion as to the desirability of having our Ambassadors spend more time in the United States. His suggestion was that at least every so often, perhaps every 3 years, the Ambassador and his principal assistant should be required to spend approximately an equal amount of time in the home country, principally through the agricultural areas where men and women really have to work for what they get. I am quoting the words of the American Ambassador to one of the countries to the south of us.

I was very favorably impressed with the high quality of the work being done by American business representatives. American firms doing business in Latin America are among our best ambassadors of good will. They build hospitals and schools on their own. They attempt to get a balanced diet for the people, through their own efforts.

One of the common questions which was asked me at each of the stops I made in the 20 countries—and in some countries we made 3 or 4 stops—was, "Senator, how does it happen that you are making this trip? We looked you up in the Directory, and we noticed you are a member of the minority party." That fact rather surprised them.

I then proceeded to try to convince them that the majority party—regardless of which one of our parties happens to be in the majority—is not the only one interested in friendly relations with our neighbors. I went on to explain that President Hoover had made a trip to South America, that under his administration the phrase "good neighbor" was adopted, that our policy on that basis has been continued, and that it should be continued during whatever administration may have control in the United States.

I went on to speak of Dwight Morrow, who is acknowledged in all the countries I visited as the outstanding Ambassador who has represented the United States in any Latin American country during recent times. Of course, he accomplished a great deal of good. I then also called their attention to the fact that on the patent side of their weekly papers—this occurred in Colombia—there was a picture of James G. Blaine, one-time Secretary of State of the United States, and an article about him. He is in a way their Thomas Jefferson, because they look upon him as the originator of the Pan American Union. I spoke of all this for the purpose of showing them that the members of both political parties in the United States, just as the members of different parties in their own countries, are keenly interested in maintaining friendly relations.

As I said a moment ago, I undoubtedly missed many interesting facts in connection with our activities in Latin America, but I should like to list several facts plainly apparent to any honest observer.

One cannot miss the fact, in the first place, that our policy toward Latin America, which began as good neighborism, has, in these days of the New Deal reign, ceased to be good neighborism. It has become "rich uncleism." Beneficence is, perhaps, a quality of old age. But the beneficence in this case surpasses anything known in the long history of handouts. The instrumentality of our so-called good-neighbor policy is not, as we are often and feelingly told, good will. The instrumentality of the United States' so-called good-neighbor policy is the United States Treasury. We are not winning the friendly collaboration of the peoples of Latin America. We are trying to buy it.

That is the first fact that no honest American traveler can fail to find out in Latin America.

The second fact is like unto it. Our beneficence in Latin America is not beneficent. It is profligacy, and the long-term results of profligacy are sure to be disastrous. Our wastefulness is already inviting disaster from two directions.

First. First of all, American money in Latin America is fastening projects on the nations of Latin America which Latin American money could not support and which, in many instances, it would not support if it could. However much we may dislike it and whatever further gigantic sums it may cost us, we have the bear by the tail. Having provided those countries with many institutions and enterprises which, apparently, they do not seriously want, we are committed as a nation to keep them going.

Second. In the second place our wastefulness in Latin America has thrown the economy of those countries out of joint and put them on the crest of the wave of prosperity. In the United States, during the New Deal's early days we used to hear a good deal about spending our way into prosperity. This, I believe, is the first time in the history of financial irresponsibility when one nation has undertaken to spend another nation into prosperity—and not one other nation, merely, but 20 of them.

Our hold on the bear's tail thus is tightened. If we keep on spending we shall continue to be hated down there—as we are hated already—for upsetting their economy. If we stop spending, we shall be hated even worse because we made their boom collapse.

That is the second fact that no honest American traveler can fail to find out in Latin America.

The third fact is that in these projects in Latin America we are doing, for 20 countries, exactly what the commonsense of the American people has refused

to allow to be continued here at home. A trip through Latin America these days is like nothing quite so much as a trip through the United States in the Hopkins-Tugwell heyday of the New Deal. Under one guise or another, we have all the New Deal's repudiated agencies—the W. P. A., the P. W. A., the N. Y. A., the F. S. A., the C. C. C.—all the way up or down the line. In country after country we go from boondoggle to boondoggle. Now having, after their fashion, made over the United States, the New Deal's experimentors have rolled up their sleeves to make over Latin America. The collectivism which we have turned down here in the United States has been wrapped up in United States currency and is being foisted upon Latin America. When the awakening comes, the people of those nations are likely to have about the same regard for the United States as the people of the United States have come to have for the New Deal.

No honest American traveler can fail to find out that fact in Latin America.

The fourth thing which we find out is that the thoughtful people of Latin America do not like what we are doing any better than the American people, if they knew, would like it. Latin Americans are not suppliants. Neither are they paupers. They do not want handouts. They want to make their own way. They can make it. What they want from us is not to be led by the hand, as we would lead a child. It is not to be fed from a silver spoon. What they want from us is our cooperation, not in doing things our way, but in doing things their way. They want our leadership and example, not in what we can do for them, but as to how we have been able to do so well by ourselves.

Everywhere I went, I found that the men who take the long look in those countries are alarmed at our attitudes and policies. This alarm can readily degenerate into hate. That is what, inevitably, will happen unless at once we initiate a policy which treats the people of those countries neither as mendicants nor as children, but as adults, capable of making a good future with what they have and by their own efforts.

There is a fifth fact that no honest American traveler can fail to find out in Latin America. It is that the people of the United States have not been told—they have not even had it hinted at—what is actually going on there. The keynote of the New Deal's bookkeeping in Latin America is deception. Congress is deceived as to how much should be appropriated. The country is deceived in regard to the way it is spent. The peoples of Latin America are deceived into believing that the spending can go on forever.

Some very intelligent persons have been taken in by these deceptions. Some members of each of our major parties have been taken in by them. I am even ready to believe that some of the Government's own administrators of Latin-American affairs have been taken in by them.

But the fact remains that no clear picture of what we are spending in Latin America has ever been drawn by this administration. Every obstacle is thrown into the path of a Senator who, like myself, tries to get the materials for such a picture. No comprehensive and honest statement has ever been made, capable of being understood, as to what this spending is specifically and actually for. In short, what we have here is one of the most serious instances in the history of our Government of plain and gigantic misrepresentation.

These are some of the things I found out in Latin America. The specific data to illustrate and support these general conclusions are unbelievably voluminous. Some of them, however, I should like to call to the immediate attention of the Senate through the report I am today filing with the Truman committee. There will be more to follow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report, about which I have spoken, be ordered printed as a Senate document and referred to the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, at whose request this investigation was made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Just a moment. A while ago I spoke of the friendly attitude of the people everywhere I went. I was treated with the greatest of courtesy; and I prize, more highly, perhaps, than any other single document I have following the trip, an appreciative letter from our Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, following a very brief statement which I was asked to make to the Senate of Chile. With the permission of the Senate, I should like to read that statement into the RECORD. It consists of less than two pages. It is addressed to the president and members of the Chilean Senate, and is as follows:

Mr. President, Honorable Members of the Senate, it is indeed a pleasure and an honor to address you. From what I have read and observed, I am convinced that the Senate of Chile is one of the great factors for good and for human progress among the governments of the Western Hemisphere. I, therefore, count it a great privilege to appear before this august body.

I was also unexpectedly honored by being granted a personal interview with your distinguished President, Senor Rios, whose graciousness to me as a common citizen of the United States of America added to the warmth in my heart for the splendid people of Chile.

I am visiting each of the twenty republics of Central and South America, pioneering a trail of better understanding through personal visits which I hope many of my colleagues in the United States Senate will follow.

My parents were pioneers on the prairies of Nebraska. They helped in the building of a great Nation. I am pioneering, myself, to help the building of a genuine hemispheric understanding. I hope more of my people can visit your beautiful, bountiful, and wonderful country, and also that more of your people can visit us in the United States.

No other continents of the world, extending from pole to pole, peopled with citizens whose objectives and programs are so much in harmony, whose religions look to the same God, have such a great opportunity as these of this hemisphere. Together we are a tremendous power for peace in the world.

The people of the United States have a deep and genuine desire to always be friends of the people of Chile; to visit in your country; to work with you toward world peace; to trade with you; to be looked upon as friends. This attitude of the people means that our good relations will continue to bear fruit, no matter who sits in the administrative chair in either Chile or the United States, or what political party is elected to administer the affairs of government.

As Senators, you here, as we in the United States, are servants of all the people and not of any one group alone. This you have well demonstrated in your sensible labor legislation which requires a high degree of accountability from both labor's leadership and the employer.

The people of Chile have benefited in numerous other ways from the progressive legislation enacted by this body.

The people of the United States are eager to continue as friends with the people of Chile and of all other governments in the world. We, as a people, have no imperialistic desires. We, as a people, want only peace and fair trade and friendship, and I am sure your objectives are the same.

Only a few days ago a distinguished Member of this body, the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] addressed a meeting of the National Grange in Michigan. I do not have his permission to insert his statement in the RECORD, but it fits so well with the thought which I carried in every contact I made in South America, and the thought I am trying to express here today, that I wish to read from it. The junior Senator from Vermont said:

Whether we want it or not, most of the nations of the earth look to America for leadership today. We will accept that leadership and pray that we may use it wisely. It must not carry with it, however, any pledge to support the rest of the world. We should not promise that which we cannot do. We can only help the other people to help themselves. We will not do this by scattering American resources in careless abandonment. Above all, let us promise ourselves that while we will assume leadership, it will be leadership and not domination.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has said that we have spent $6,000,000,000 in South America, virtually in buying those countries.

Mr. BUTLER. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator know how much has been spent in buying critical war materials down there, based on any of the figures which he has?

Mr. BUTLER. I would say in answer to the Senator from Tennessee that the report which I have is not paged, but I can assure him that it includes the details of that item.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator recall——

Mr. BUTLER. Allow me to explain further, please. The report also states that in no one place have we actually spent $6,000,000,000. There have been expenditures; there have been allotments, and credits have been extended in an amount much greater than $8,000,000,000, and that statement is included in

the report. But I base my article on the $6,000,000,000 rather the $8,000,000,000 plus.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator not state, if he has made an examination, that $1,004,000,000 of the total amount was expended in the purchase of critical materials needed by the United States in the war? Is that not true?

Mr. BUTLER. If the Senator from Tennessee will permit me, I will make an additional statement which no doubt should have been in my statement to the Senate. In the list there are many items in connection with the purchase of critical materials which I would not criticize. The statement contains the information that where certain materials are selling, for example, at a unit cost of about 70 cents in Central or South America, we are now paying a price of about seven or eight dollars per unit here, so the billion or more which the Senator has mentioned covers, in my opinion, a tremendous amount of waste.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me ask the Senator a question. He says that $6,000,000,000 or $8,000,000,000 has been appropriated for use down there. Is it not true that the Senator, within the last 2 days, has written the department to ascertain how much has been spent? Is that not true?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes. I will state to the Senator that after I received the assignment from the two committees mentioned——

Mr. McKELLAR. Did the Senator receive an assignment from two committees to make the investigation, or did he make it on his own authority?

Mr. BUTLER. I will read the letter to which I referred, if the Senator wishes me to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, I should be glad to have it read.

Mr. BUTLER. The letter is addressed to me and signed by HARRY S. TRUMAN, chairman of the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program. The letter reads as follows:

DEAR SENATOR: This letter will confirm our oral discussion relative to your mission in Latin America.

I trust you will make as thorough a study of United States defense spending and activities throughout Central and South America as circumstances will permit, and report to the chairman and this committee your findings.

This letter will serve as your authorization as a special investigator for this committee.

I feel confident that your report to us will contain information that will be of value to this committee and the war effort of the United States.

The same kind of a letter was received from the Byrd committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has the Senator made his individual report to the Truman committee and to the Byrd committee? I happen to be a member of the Byrd committee, and I have never seen the report.

Mr. BUTLER. Each of the committees has received a copy of the report.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me ask the Senator another question. He could have easily ascertained the facts by not only asking the departments, but by coming to the Appropriations Committee, where I should have been happy to give him all the information which our committee has on the subject. From the reports which I have, the entire amount spent in South America is $2,207,000,000, of which $1,004,000,000 was for materials we received. In other words, nearly half the money was spent for critical war materials which we have received to be used in the war. Does the Senator dispute that statement?

Mr. BUTLER. Answering the Senator, and continuing the answer to the question which the Senator asked previously as to whether I had a compilation of the figures covering $6,000,000,000; as I started to say, after receiving the letters I made it my business to obtain the figures from as many departments of the Government as I could, and get them tabulated, and that information is all in my report. It shows a total of over $6,000,000,000. Since my return the letters to which the Senator referred, which I received from different departments of the Government of whom I made inquiry within the last few days, were in an attempt to bring my report somewhat up to date.

Mr. McKELLAR. In this time of war, when we are on perfectly good terms with our South American neighbors, for the Senator to come here and say to the Senate that more than $6,000,000,000 has been spent in South America, when he does not know what has been spent, and is now attempting to ascertain, does he not think that his statement is rather unfair and unjust?

Mr. BUTLER. Well, of course, the Senator has a right to his own opinion. I cleared my conscience, I will say to the Senator, by tabulating and proving every statement I have made.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, we shall be glad to look into that. I shall do so. I went to the Senator today and told him that we had figures in the Appropriations Committee, and that the appropriations had been allowed after investigation. I told him that I should be glad to get the figures for him, and I asked him if he would not postpone his talk today until we could get the facts. I did not for a moment dream that the Senator wished to make a statement unless he was absolutely certain of its accuracy. I wish to assure him that I shall be glad to furnish him with every figure concerning the matter.

The Senator has already written an article on Our Deep, Dark Secrets in Latin America, and I find in it that the Senator has made the statement that we have spent millions of dollars in Ecuador which we ought not to have spent. Does the Senator know that in dealing with Ecuador we had to establish bases on islands belonging to Ecuador in order to protect the Panama Canal from Japan, and that the bulk of that money was spent for that purpose? Did the Senator look into that matter?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not believe that the largest part of the military expenditures are included in the statements given to me. The reply usually made to me was that the matter was secret information, and I did not ask that any figures of that nature be surrendered to me.

Mr. McKELLAR. So the Senator does not know that through dealing with Ecuador we obtained security from Japanese invasion of the great Panama Canal?

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator also knows that there is but one country in South America which has furnished a single soldier to the war.

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, I do not know that even one country has done so. But let me answer the question the Senator has asked. I wish to say that with nearly all of the South and Central American nations to the south of us we were friendly. The Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, to whom the Senator has referred, went to South America a year or two ago, and made a great impression there. He is on the friendliest of terms with South American countries. We knew that the Japanese had great business interests in South American states; that Germany also had large interests there, that they did much trading there, as did Italy also. It seems to me that if our Nation under those circumstances was able by the good-neighbor policy to keep those countries friendly to us, we should have done so. We never have had a particle of trouble, and if we had had any trouble it would have cost us infinitely more than all the money that the Senator has referred to. It does seem to me that he should have gone to the officials of his own Government and obtained exact figures before making his statement.

Mr. BUTLER. They are all documented in my report, I will say to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, they may be documented, but I wish to look at the documents. I am very sorry, but I told the Senator I had heard of this only yesterday, and I am not prepared to answer all his statements. But in view of the fact that we have gotten along so well in our good-neighbor policy in South and Central America, and that we have been so successful in our policy under the most adverse circumstances, I do think that it is not fair or just, without first examining our own data, to bring in statements or statistics from other nations and submit them to the country at a time like the present.

If I understand correctly, $2,207,000,000 is all that has been spent down there for every purpose, including the purchase of material, including the many things we have done down there for our own benefit, and got a return for it.

Mr. BUTLER. Let me ask the Senator a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly; the Senator can ask me anything he wishes.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator is the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and I think he was quite enthusiastically in favor of a resolution adopted by his commitee recently to investigate the lend-lease. Most of the loans to which I have been referring may

turn out to be a manipulation of the lend-lease. I am not saying that as a positive fact, but I think that if the Senator will do a thorough job in the Committee on Appropriations in the investigation not only of lend-lease, but of the other appropriations and transfer of funds from other departments, he will find some interesting facts. Let me say, further, that only a small percentage—I would not attempt to say how much, perhaps around one-third or one-fourth of the total sum, is in any way connected with defense.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say to the Senator that in the Committee on Appropriations every item of expenditure comes before the committee, and is given the most careful and painstaking attention. Recently, without regard to party, without regard to differences of opinion, the committee unanimously voted to employ a staff to go into all these matters, lend-lease and every other appropriation and that will be done. But instead of the Senator waiting to get a report from the committee which has the power and the right and the knowledge in the matter, he makes his statement here. First, he makes it in the Reader's Digest for December 1943 on "Our Deep, Dark Secrets in Latin America," and then comes forward with a nearly 200-page report from a committee which does not exist. The Senator does not represent a committee. The Senator represents the Senator from Nebraska, and he has a perfect right to make a report to the Senate, in the way of a report or anything else, but it does not come from a committee of this body, and I say that, in my judgment, the Senator just let his imagination run away with him. He has not the facts, he has not the figures, and it seems to me the most inappropriate time in the world to make such a report, when we are getting along beautifully with our South American and Central American neighbors, which means so much to us. Why should we not continue the good-neighbor policy, which has been endorsed here? The people of Central and South America are great people. We are doing the right thing by them. We are cooperating with them; we are doing business with them; we are trying our best to work with them, and to help them, and at the same time have them help us in the great enterprise in which we are engaged.

I recall the Senator stated a while ago that he was told by representatives of nations down there that they did not like receiving money from the United States for any purpose. That was the substance of the statement. If that is true, is the Senator's statement authenticated by any officials of any of those governments? I am sure the Senator has not a president or a secretary of the treasury or a secretary of any other department of any of those nations who will vouch for the statement that they do not want anything from America, because they have made applications for these things and we have granted them, where the purposes were proper and right and when we got value received for the money.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I have the greatest respect for the Senator, and he is entitled to his opinion, just as I am to mine; but I have stated several times that the statements I have made are based on what were purported to be facts received from departments of the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. What government?

Mr. BUTLER. Our Government. Let me say further that we are doing everything we possibly can to avoid inflation in this country, and we all know what the administration is now doing to defeat the antisubsidy bill. But let me just quote from one page:

"Labor wage rates in Latin American nations compared to the United States:

"In the Dominican Republic the average labor wage is 70 cents. The United States project rate in the Dominican Republic"—and there are several projects—"is $3 to $5. In Cuba the rate is $1.25. Ours is $4 to $6. In Paraguay the rate is 60 cents. On United States projects in that country the rate is $3 to $5. In Brazil the rate is $1.80. Our rates in that country are $5 to $10. In Bolivia the rate is 90 cents. Ours in that country is $6 to $8."

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. How many South American or Central American countries receive any lend-lease money at all?

Mr. BUTLER. Every one of them, to some extent. It is all covered in the report.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am informed that, quite to the contrary, probably only one or two of them receive any—Brazil, and one or two others.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not believe the Argentine receives any strictly lend-lease aid, but they have some projects.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think the Argentine or many of the others have received lend-lease money.

Mr. BUTLER. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator that the Argentine is considered in this country as one country that perhaps is unfriendly. I found it the exact contrary; and I did not visit one place, like Buenos Aires; I went to a dozen places. I went out to the ranches, and visited with the common people, as well as with those of the official classes, and, if I can judge anything at all, I will say that 90 percent of the people of Argentina are as friendly to the United States of America as are those of any other nation in South America, and we are doing less for them. It is not the money we spend that makes friends.

Mr. McKELLAR. Can the Senator cite one single official of any Central or South American country who made complaint against what was taking place between the United States and South America, any official? If so, what was his name? When the Senator was on this mission, his personal mission, looking after the facts—I do not question that—did anyone make the statement to the Senator that he did not believe in our arrangements?

Mr. AUSTIN rose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Wait one moment. I am asking the Senator from Nebraska a question, whether there was any official who made the statement, and if so, to give his name.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator repeat his question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Did any official of any South American or Central American government make any statement to the Senator to the effect that he disapproved the present arrangement; and if so, what was his name?

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator must know that while I was touring South America I made every effort, representing myself personally, but being a Member of the Senate of the United States, to avoid any complications of that kind, and I did not return home to insult the good people of South America. I could answer the Senator, but I will do so privately, if he wishes, and I will give him the facts.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has made an astounding statement, that $6,000,000,000 has been spent in "boondoggling" in South and Central America, and I think he should not have any secrets about it. I think he should take us all into his confidence. Of course, I shall be glad to talk with the Senator at any time, because he and I enjoy the best of relations, but the Senator is appealing to the Senate to do something about this, and if he is, he should be willing to take the whole Senate into his confidence.

Mr. BUTLER. If the distinguished Senator will take time to read the 176 pages, he will have the information, and the answers to all the questions he has been putting.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall certainly look into the 176 pages, and I intend to give all the facts as shown by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate. I wish to say to the Senate that, as I think every Senator here knows, I am as much opposed as is any human being on earth to extravagant or wasteful or improper appropriations. I am spending the best years of my life trying to cut down appropriations. I am engaged in that undertaking almost at this very moment, because I was excused from the Committee on Appropriations to come to the Senate floor when I learned the Senator was not willing to let the matter go over until the time when I would know more about it, and when I could answer what I believed to be the mistaken assumptions of the Senator.

Later, Mr. President, I shall ask unanimous consent to bring figures to the attention of every Senator in this body, and of the American public, and show just what the facts are, let the chips fall where they may, because I am not in favor of extravagant appropriations.

Mr. BUTLER. The figures have already been released.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the statement of the Senator from Tennessee that he proposes to bring in a later statement with reference to what the Committee on Appropriations has passed in the way of appropriations for the purposes covered by the Senator

from Nebraska, it seems to me a little inconsistent for us to have authorized that the report of the Senator from Nebraska be made a Senate document, because when the Senator from Tennessee makes his report, it might be appropriate to make that a Senate document, too, and the two Senate documents would be contradictory.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think the statement of the Senator from Nebraska is entitled, under the rules of the Senate, to be called a Senate document, because it is an individual report. I made a trip abroad a few years ago, and when I returned I made a report, for my own use. I never brought it to the Senate, or attempted to have it reproduced as a Senate document, but I treated it as a private matter. I do not believe that under the rules what was submitted by the Senator should be treated as a Senate document, and if I may, I make the point of order against it being so denominated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). The Senator from Nebraska asked unanimous consent.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; I was ready to object.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair was not presiding at the time, but he is advised by the parliamentarian that the Chair said "Without objection, it will be printed as a Senate document", and no objection was made.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not as a Senate document. I was particular about listening for those words.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Tennessee is mistaken. The Senator from Nebraska did request that it be printed as a Senate document. At the moment I thought it was rather unusual that a Senator should ask that an individual report be printed as a Senate document, but I made no objection.

Mr. BUSHFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I feel that the Members of this body owe a debt of gratitude to the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] for the recent trip he made to 20 countries of Central America and South America, investigating the matters he has reported to this body.

In view of the fact that some objections and comments have been made by one of the Members of this body about his report, I think it only fair to the Senator from Nebraska to say to this body that he paid his own expenses on that lengthy trip, during which he discovered that some $6,000,000,000 of American money had been dumped into South America and Central America.

TEXANS OF THE THIRTY-SIXTH DIVISION AT SALERNO

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, during the tragic days when our American forces were forcing an entrance at Salerno into the forbidden land of Hitler's European fortress, some of us Texans believed the brave boys of our own Texas National Guard Division, now the Thirty-sixth, were leading the way. On account of war regulations we could say nothing then.

Since then our belief has been proven a fact. Silence on our part is no longer necessary. The Washington Evening Star on Thanksgiving Day published an article by Associated Press war correspondent Relman Morin, in which he gave an account of the invasion and stated:

There is another star in the flag of Texas today.

We Texans, and, without doubt, all Americans, are proud of those Texas men and the brave men from other States who bitterly fought and won that victory, but the price in human lives and misery was great, and our hearts are sad.

Those brave Texas boys carried with them, as they stormed the shores amidst intensive gunfire, a copy of the reply Lt. Col. William Barrett Travis and his little band of 187 patriots in the Alamo in 1836 gave to Mexican Dictator Santa Ana and his 3,000 or more well-equipped soldiers when they demanded his surrender. That message was addressed:

To the people of Texas and all Americans in the world:

And read:

I shall never surrender or retreat. I am determined to sustain myself as long as possible and die like a soldier who never forgets what is due to his own honor and that of his country—victory or death.

Every one of those brave men died at his post of duty in the Alamo. Not one was left.

That type of undaunted bravery, as spoken and exemplified by Colonel Travis and his men, still goes marching on. That spirit makes our freedom and liberty secure.

Inasmuch as this news item which I have mentioned gives a splendid account of the invasion at Salerno, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Texans Are Revealed as Men Who Broke Defenses at Salerno," be printed in full at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXANS ARE REVEALED AS MEN WHO BROKE DEFENSES AT SALERNO

(By Relman Morin)

WITH THE AMERICAN FIFTH ARMY IN ITALY, November 25.—There is another star in the flag of Texas today.

It was emblazoned there the morning of September 9 when the Fifth Army landed on the shores of Italy. The first troops to hit the beach that thunderous morning wore T patches on their shoulders. The letter T stood for Texas and the patch for the Thirty-sixth Division.

The Germans have come to know well the men of the Thirty-sixth.

The division was identified officially yesterday. Now the story of the Thirty-sixth can be told and nowhere in the military history of the United States is there a finer one.

It was an untried division—untried in the sense that it never had been in combat.

GIVEN SPECIAL TRAINING

Throughout the Army it was known as a "hot" outfit, however. It had distinguished itself time and time again in maneuvers. As a result it had been given special training for amphibious operations. Originally it had been slated for a major role in the north African landing but through a change in plans it was held back for something bigger.

The Thirty-sixth was famous before it went into action. But it still was untried and there is no trial like battle.

It was given a key mission in the invasion of Italy. If you asked its officers why this green division was entrusted with so important an assignment they replied unblushingly, "Because it's a Texas division."

The division brought a Lone Star flag with it and carried it into battle. In the standard there is a parchment bearing a copy of Colonel Travis' last message from the Alamo. Every man in the division, including those not natives of Texas, can repeat it by heart.

LANDED AT SALERNO

The Thirty-sixth came ashore in the Gulf of Salerno at dawn September 9. The defenses of the beaches were well constructed and German troops were manning them. The surrender of Italy had been announced the night before. But days before the Sixteenth Panzer Division had moved into position on these particular beaches. They were ready and waiting.

The Thirty-sixth hit hard but it hit a strong wall. The first assault wave was pinned down by machine-gun fire. The second and third waded ashore through a hail of bullets and shells. It looked for a time as though none of the three waves would be able to breach the German shore defenses.

Finally the division broke through. For sheer courage in the face of withering fire, their attack at that moment rivals the greatest actions of American troops in any of our wars.

Their first objective was a railroad line about 1,000 yards from shore and once off the beach they roared straight across the fields through some marshlands until they reached it.

Then came the first of two critical moments in the establishment of the beachhead.

PASSES MACHINE GUNS

The Thirty-sixth swept right past and around a cluster of machine-guns and a few strong points which prudently remained silent during the charge of the first Texas elements.

The succeeding waves were caught in German fire when they tried to come up to the railroad. At the same time, German artillery in well-chosen sites in the hills a few miles back, again shelling the beach.

For perhaps a half hour, then, the battle hung in the balance.

At this moment the commanding general and his staff waded through the surf, crossed the beach and made their way through the hottest part of the action up to the railroad where the general took personal command of the action, his presence in the thick of the battle having an electric effect.

Two staff officers were in the Thirty-sixth in the last war. Lt. Col. Albert B. Crowther, San Antonio, Tex., was a sergeant then, and Lt. Col. William H. Martin, Houston, Tex., was a lieutenant.

They will tell you that the Gulf of Salerno that morning compared with the worst moments of the Meuse-Argonne offensive.

REPORT BY GENERAL EISENHOWER OF INCIDENT IN SICILY INVOLVING LT. GEN. GEORGE S. PATTON, JR.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Military Affairs made request of Secretary of War Stimson for information and report concerning the General Patton affair. I have before me a letter received by me from the Secretary of War, and accompanying

that letter is the report received by the War Department from Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. I ask that the letter and the report be read at the desk for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Without objection, the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read the letter and the report, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, November 25, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: In sending you herewith the report requested by you on the incident involving Lt. Gen. George S. Patton, Jr., I wish to make clear certain basic principles which, from the beginning of the war, the War Department has followed because the Chief of Staff and I have considered adherence to them necessary to bring to our country, as quickly and with as little loss of life as possible, the ultimate victory in the great struggle being fought around the world.

In the first place, the greatest care was exercised in selecting the commanders of the distant theaters of war. The selected commander was then given the fullest authority to deal with all problems which might arise within his theater. Our principle in doing this was that the man on the ground knows the details of each such problem much better than we could know them in Washington. We then held—and hold—the theater commanders responsible for results.

Accordingly, General Eisenhower is responsible for all matters of discipline within his theater. I am, therefore, sending you his report with the full confidence of the War Department that his sense of justice and fairness has resulted in his acting in this matter, as in all others, in the highest interest of his soldiers and his country. The decision to weigh Lieutenant General Patton's great services to his country, in World War No. 1 and in World War No. 2, from these shores to Casablanca and through Tunisia to triumph in Sicily, on the one hand, against an indefensible act on the other, was General Eisenhower's. As his report shows, General Eisenhower, in making his decision also considered the value to our country of General Patton's aggressive, winning leadership in the bitter battles which are to come before final victory.

I am confident that you will agree with me that General Eisenhower's decision, under these difficult circumstances, was right and proper.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

During the Sicilian campaign General Patton was the mainspring of the effort during the sustained drive of the Seventh Army from Gela all the way to Messina. He absolutely refused to accept procrastination or any excuse for delay, with a resulting rapid advance of that Army which had much to do with the early collapse of resistance in Sicily. He drove himself as hard as he did the members of his Army throughout the campaign and consequently became almost ruthless in his demands upon individual men. While visiting wounded in hospitals in two instances he encountered unwounded patients who had been evacuated for what is commonly known as "battle anxiety," specifically nerve difficulty. Also, one man had a temperature. He momentarily lost his temper in these two instances, and in an unseemly and indefensible manner upbraided the individuals, and in one of the cases cuffed the individual involved so that the man's helmet rolled off his head. These incidents were first reported officially to me by a medical officer, this report being followed by reports from three reputable newspapermen. Prior to receiving the report from the pressmen I took the following action:

First, to General Patton I wrote a letter advising him of the allegation, expressing my extreme displeasure, and informing him that any repetition would result in his instant relief. Further, I told him that he would necessarily make, on his own initiative to the individuals involved, amends, and, if necessary, take the necessary steps to make proper amends before his whole Army. I also told him that I would reserve decision affecting his relief from command of the Army until I coul determine the effect of his own corrective action.

Second, the problem before me was whether the incidents as reported were sufficiently damaging to Patton and to his standing in his Army to compel me to relieve him, thus losing to the United Nations his unquestioned value as commander of an assault force, or whether less drastic measures would be appropriate. I sent General Lucas to make a complete investigation of the affair. I also sent another general officer to Sicily and made a short visit there myself for the purpose of determining whether or not any resentment existed in the Seventh Army against General Patton.

The following action was taken by Patton: He personally sought out the individuals involved and the persons who were present at the time the incidents took place. To these he made full apologies which it was reported to me were accepted. In addition, he visited each and every division in the Seventh Army and called together all officers to whom he registered his regret that he should have been guilty of any conduct which could be considered unfair or un-American. The officers of these divisions in turn relayed this message to the enlisted men. The measures taken by Patton were discussed by me with three newspapermen who have reported the incident, and apparently they were convinced that the measures taken were adequate in the circumstances. On top of all this I sent the theater inspector general to make a thorough inspection of the Seventh Army with the particular mission of determining whether or not there existed in that force any general resentment against Patton. The inspector general reported to me that, while there was more or less general knowledge that incidents of the character described had taken place, the men themselves felt that General Patton had done a splendid over-all job and no great harm had been done.

In this connection it must be remembered that, while the conduct of Patton in these specific cases was indefensible and resented by every officer who knew of it, Patton has in thousands of cases personally supported, encouraged, and sustained individuals. The net result was that throughout the Sicilian campaign the Seventh Army had a high morale. I personally supervised this investigation throughout and took those steps that seemed applicable in the circumstances because I believe that General Patton has a great field of usefulness in any assault where loyalty, drive, and gallantry on the part of the Army commander will be essential.

General Smith had a press conference yesterday with all of the representatives of the press and explained the essentials of the entire story as given above. This was done because of reports of the publication in the United States of exaggerated versions of the story. In this connection I commend the great body of American newspapermen in this theater because all of them knew something of the facts involved and some of them knew all including the corrective action taken and the circumstances that tended to ameliorate the obvious injustice of Patton's acts. These men chose to regard the matter as one in which the high command acted for the best interests of the war effort and let the matter rest there. To them I am grateful.

Summing the matter up: It is true that General Patton was guilty of reprehensible conduct with respect to two enlisted men. They were both suffering from a nervous disorder and one man in the case had a temperature. Following an exhaustive investigation including a personal visit to Sicily I decided that the corrective action as described above was suitable in the circumstances and adequate. I still believe that this decision was sound. Finally it has been reported many times to me that in every recent public appearance of Patton before any crowd composed of his own soldiers he is greeted by thunderous applause.

GENERAL HERSHEY AND THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM—STATEMENT BY SENATOR AUSTIN

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, this is the first opportunity I have had, either today or at any other time since I previously made a statement on the subject, to make a correction. During my statement on November 22, 1943, in connection with the conference report on Senate bill 763, I said in referring to General Hershey:

> The Congress chose to place the execution of the law in the hands of a civilian agency, namely, the Selective Service System, with a director at its head, who came out of the body of civilians. Today he wears a uniform, but he is, indeed, a civilian; he was not chosen from the Army.

That statement clearly was meant by me to refer to General Hershey. As a matter of fact, the statement was accurate in respect of the representation it made that a civilian was first appointed as director, as I shall point out; but in respect of the real intendment which I conveyed, and which I think was understood, it was an error.

I received a telephone message from a friend to the effect that my statement was inaccurate, inasmuch as General Hershey is an officer of the Regular Army; and it is my desire at this time to rectify my statement.

In view of the close association Congress and particularly members of the Military Affairs Committees have had with General Hershey, and in view of his long participation in selective-service planning, commencing in 1936, 4 years prior to the enactment of the Selective Service Act, and thereafter extending up to the present time, and in view of his civilian background prior to entering the National Guard and becoming a member of the armed forces, I have come to consider General Hershey as having a civilian outlook, although technically he is an officer of the Regular Army.

General Hershey was commissioned as an officer in the Regular Army, following the World War. Prior to that time he was a civilian, engaging in civilian activities of various kinds, except for his participation as a member of the National Guard and his service with the National Guard on the Mexican border, and during World War No. 1. Among his civilian activities, General Hershey engaged in farming, teaching school, serving as principal of a high school, and as deputy sheriff.

During the time General Hershey has been an officer in the Regular Army, he spent 4 years as assistant professor of military science and tactics in the R. O. T. C. unit of Ohio State University, which assignment kept him in continual contact with students at the university and with civilians. Also during his tour of duty with the Regular Army, for almost 8 years—from 1936 up to the present time—General Hershey has been working on selective-service planning and operations, which activity has kept him in continual association with the civilian representatives of the Selective Service System, the Governors, and the civilian Reserve and National Guard officers with whom he worked on the joint Army and Navy selective service committee and in the Selective Service System.

As I was technically in error, I desire, of course, to correct that error, which is, to all intents and purposes immaterial, as I am attempting to show. The important factor which this statement gives me the opportunity to stress is that General Hershey, because of his civilian background and because of his long association, extending since 1936, with the civilian officers connected with selective service, has very definitely the civilian outlook. But in addition to that civilian outlook, by reason of his participation in military matters as an officer in the Army in the interim between his civilian activities and his assignment to selective-service matters, he also has the military outlook. Therefore, he is an ideal person to administer the Selective Service System under the direction of the President, inasmuch as that assignment requires selection, classification, and deferment not only to procure manpower for the military forces, but also to leave men in essential civilian activities in order to provide for the support and maintenance of the Army and Navy and also to provide for the support and maintenance of the civilian population.

In order that my colleagues may have a brief but complete understanding of the background of the Selective Service System and of its predominantly civilian characteristics and personnel, together with General Hershey's long association with it, I present the following statement on that subject:

Under authority conferred by the National Defense Act, the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee was created in 1926 for the purpose of undertaking selective-service planning so that, in the event of an emergency, proposed legislation and rules and regulations would be available for procuring military manpower for the armed forces in an orderly, democratic, and selective basis, toward the end that sufficient numbers of men would be obtained for the armed forces, while at the same time making available by way of deferment sufficient numbers of men for war production and essential civilian activities.

It was recognized that in order to formulate the type of legislation and rules and regulations which would not only accomplish the above purpose but would accomplish it in such a manner as to conform with our democratic processes, and be entirely acceptable to all of the people of this Nation, participation of, and advice from, civilians would be required. Consequently, in order to obtain this civilian advice and participation in the formulation of legislation and rules and regulations, and also in order to have personnel with a civilian outlook available to guide the administration of the legislation and rules and regulations in the event of an emergency, the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee was authorized to grant Reserve commissions in the Army and Navy to a limited number of specially chosen civilians from all parts of the country. Although lack of funds and the general attitude of the Nation during the period between 1926 and 1939 retarded progress, a number of civilians were commissioned, and commencing in 1935, in addition to correspondence courses, annual 2-week conferences were conducted by the members of the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee in four different sections of the Nation—namely, at San Francisco, New Orleans, Chicago, and Washington. Civilian Reserve officers who were carefully selected to work with the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee attended one of these conferences each year.

At these conferences all participants, including members of the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee, were in civilian clothes, and the question of rank was entirely disregarded, inasmuch as the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee desired to have the civilian officers make criticisms and recommendations freely, toward the end that the most workable plans would be developed. As a result, the selective-service legislation and rules and regulations which were in effect during World War No. 1, and which had been partially revised by the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee, were entirely revised and streamlined on the basis of such criticisms and recommendations from those having the civilian outlook.

In 1935, when the civilians living west of the Mississippi were commissioned, a short statement was issued explaining the program. They read as follows:

For the past 10 years the War and Navy Departments have had a Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee busy preparing laws and regulations governing the obtaining of manpower in the time of war. They have perfected, with the assistance of a group of Reserve officers who administered the draft during the World War, a proposed law and a set of regulations to carry the law into effect. This has all been approved by the Secretaries of War and Navy. This Committee is now busily engaged in organizing a group of Reserve officers to receive training in the basic principles of selective service in order that they may administer the law in time of war. Authority has been granted for the recruiting of 85 officers in the Army and 10 in the Navy. This number is about one-half filled and partially trained. A study of the geographical location of this personnel indicates that there is scarcely no one located west of the Mississippi River. The War Department is anxious to secure 10 or 15 outstanding men in the far West to be commissioned in the Reserve.

The War Department's basic idea in securing this personnel is to take them when they are fairly young and over a period of years to train and inculcate them with the principles of selective service so that they can go out in an emergency and see that adequate manpower is obtained. One of this group will be placed in each State, to offer the Governor aid and guide him in the high-speed effort that must be put forth in obtaining manpower by the Selective Service System.

The War Department feels that this group should be about the age of 30, so that they can be commissioned as lieutenants and captains. Primarily they need men of recognized standing in the community. Some people have the idea that they should be lawyers. This is not necessary. This group will have to become very familiar with the selective-service law and regulations. This will be done by means of correspondence courses and assemblage for an annual training period of 14 days. This latter method cannot take place more than once every 2 years, due to lack of appropriations. Upon being ordered to active duty, they will receive the pay of the grade in which they are serving. Such orders are not issued without the consent of the officer in each case. In view of the distance, it is not contemplated to bring this personnel from the west coast to Washington, but to assemble them at some central point in the West, possibly San Francisco.

It was initially contemplated that the civilian Reserve officers would serve as a nucleus for the operation of the Selective Service System, serving as officials in national headquarters and also in each of the State headquarters. It subsequently developed, however, that additional personnel would be required for this purpose, both in number as well as from the standpoint of obtaining full and complete cooperation and participation by the respective States. Consequently, from 1936 to 1940, as a result of negotiations by the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee with the adjutant generals of the respective States, full and complete cooperation and participation was obtained from the adjutant generals and the civilian National Guard officers attached to the respective State staffs.

These civilian National Guard officers attended the regional conferences in increasing numbers during that period and, under the direction and with the full cooperation of the adjutant generals of the respective States, were invaluable in furnishing full and complete cooperation from their States in the formulation of individual plans for each State, based upon the particular problems and circumstances existing in each State with which they were entirely familiar. Undoubtedly, all Members of the Senate are personally acquainted with the adjutant generals and their civilian National Guard staff officers in their respective States, whose assistance and participation have proved to be so valuable in the furthering of the war effort.

The national and State plans, together with the proposed legislation and rules and regulations, were reviewed and rereviewed at every conference and in correspondence courses and special research studies between conferences, so that revisions were constantly made in

them as a result of criticisms, suggestions, and recommendations submitted by the civilian officers having an intimate knowledge of their respective localities and States and of the people residing there.

Also, at these conferences all in attendance rehearsed at each conference all of the operational functions set forth in the proposed legislation, the rules and regulations, and the plans. In this connection, those in attendance served in turn as officials of national headquarters, as field coordinators from national headquarters, as officials of State headquarters, as field coordinators from State headquarters, as members of local boards, as local board physicians, as Government appeal agents, as medical advisory boards, and as appeal boards. In such capacities they rehearsed time after time the actual operating functions of a prospective Selective Service System and, in doing so, used actual cases of World War No. 1 registrants, and not only coped with the innumerable problems and situations that were confronted by those in charge of manpower procurement in World War No. 1, the Civil War, and other wars, but also coped with the additional and new problems that were anticipated to be encountered under a current or future operation of such a system.

At these conferences they studied in detail the methods used in raising armies during the course of past wars, both in this country and elsewhere. They traced in detail the evolution of selective service from the earliest days, when no selection was required other than the physical ability to hold a spear, up through the ages, to and including World War No. 1, when much more careful selection was required in view of the changed methods of warfare and the vast essential production required to carry it on. From time to time in the course of these studies errors and mistakes in past operations and procurement methods were disclosed. They were to be meticulously avoided in plans for any possible future operations.

As a result of this specialized study and training, tempered by the completely civilian outlook of these Reserve officers, the proposed plans, legislation, rules and regulations were formulated on the basis that it would be imperative to maintain a proper balance between military manpower and essential production both for the military and for the civilian population, and that the selection and classification would have to be made on the most decentralized basis possible and in such a manner that the public generally, and those to be selected particularly, would accept the selection and classification without question as being fair, impartial, democratic, and the best manner of raising an army and navy, while at the same time providing for their support and maintenance as well as for the support and maintenance of the civilian economy and social structure. To accomplish this purpose, it was recognized that the selection and classification should be conducted by the civilian neighbors of the men who were to be selected and classified. On the other hand, it was recognized that the civilian officers, both the Reserve officers and the State staff National Guard men, should participate in State headquarters under the Governors and in national headquarters under the President, but should confine their activities to advisory, educational, and guiding functions with respect to policies set forth in the plans, the legislation, and the rules and regulations, as modified from time to time.

In 1936, Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey was assigned as executive officer of the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee, and in such capacity worked with the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee and the civilian National Guard and Reserve officers. He attended the annual regional conferences, and conducted other outside work in the form of special studies and correspondence courses assigned to these officers. His 4-year assignment on selective-service planning was scheduled to terminate in 1940, but in view of the world situation at that time, his orders relieving him of that assignment were canceled, and he was reordered to continue in his assignment as the executive officer of the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee, because of his familiarity with manpower procurement and the possibility, or even probability, that legislation would be enacted setting up a selective-service system which would require his full participation and maximum efforts, along with those of the civilian officers, in order to approach a successful administration, and also in order to carry out the program that had been so carefully and studiously prepared against just such a situation.

So, when the Burke-Wadsworth bill was introduced and when hearings on it were being held before the respective Committees on Military Affairs, Congress naturally looked to him as the source of information and advice with respect to the manner in which the legislation should be drafted and the manner in which such legislation ought to be administered and carried out. When this legislation was introduced, General Hershey began to call in some of the civilian officers to assist him in conferring with members of the executive branch of the Government and with Congress, and to have everything in readiness in the event the legislation was passed, so that the system could commence to function properly at the earliest possible moment.

Congress, in setting up the Selective Service Act, conferred almost full authority upon the President, but provided that there should be a Director of Selective Service, to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and also provided that there should be civilian local boards and appeal boards. Additional provisions were inserted in the legislation in accordance with the plans and studies that had been made under General Hershey's supervision. Necessarily, it was impossible and impracticable to set forth all of the details of operation within the legislation, but General Hershey and his civilian officers, in answer to Congressional inquiries, outlined in detail the substance of the contemplated rules and regulations and the exact manner in which they expected the act to be administered. The hearings and debates on this legislation are full and complete in that respect.

During the period from the introduction of the Burke-Wadsworth bill to the date of its enactment on September 16, 1940, and thereafter until October 1940, General Hershey and the other members of the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee, together with the civilian officers who had come to active duty at his request, served as members of the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee or as officers attached thereto. On September 23, 1940, the President officially created the Selective Service System under the Selective Service Act; and on October 1, 1940, General Hershey was assigned to the Selective Service System; and the civilian officers were assigned on October 8, 1940, under the specific authority contained in section 10 (a) (3) of that act, which contemplated that General Hershey and such officers would, because of their thorough knowledge and complete training, necessarily participate in its administration.

The President appointed a Selective Service Advisory Committee to work with General Hershey and his officers; and that group—namely, the Advisory Committee, General Hershey, and his officers—did all of the detail work following the enactment of the act, to and including the appointment of Dr. Clarence Dykstra as Director of Selective Service on October 17, 1940, 1 day following the registration of all of the men between 21 and 35 years of age. In the interim preceding the appointment of Dr. Dykstra, the President, by two Executive orders, authorized General Hershey to perform all of the authority conferred upon the Director of Selective Service by the rules and regulations which he had prescribed, together with the authority to appoint local board members and other personnel of the Selective Service System which were necessarily required in order to conduct the registration and perform the other functions required under the act. This authority was to terminate upon the appointment of a Director of Selective Service. General Hershey served as Dr. Dykstra's first assistant and executive officer until December 19, 1940, when he was appointed Deputy Director by the President, and was confirmed by the Senate.

Dr. Dykstra served as Director of Selective Service from October 17, 1940, to March 21, 1941, during which time he relied upon General Hershey and the civilian officers in national headquarters and in State headquarters.

Such relationship, together with the full cooperation of the Governors who accepted responsibility for the decentralized operation of Selective Service within their respective States, resulted in the closest coordination and teamwork, and in the smooth and orderly operation of the Selective Service System, which is a matter of record. Following Dr. Dykstra's resignation, no new Di-

rector of Selective Service was appointed until July 31, 1941. During that time General Hershey administered the Selective Service System under the authority vested in him as Deputy Director, until he was appointed Director of Selective Service by the President, and was confirmed by the Senate on July 31, 1941.

In addition to General Hershey, whose semicivilian and semimilitary attributes I have already covered at length, there are not more than 5 officers of the Regular armed forces—3 of whom are retired—participating in the administration of the Selective Service System. The other officers presently on active duty with the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps are civilians who are but temporarily in the armed forces. They are in number 566 in the Army, 71 in the Navy, and 55 in the Marine Corps. In addition to these representatives of the Selective Service System, there are approximately 187,803 representatives of the Selective Service System who are civilians. 164,274 of whom are uncompensated.

The Members of the Senate know General Hershey, and each Member of the House of Representatives knows the civilian Reserve officers or civilian National Guard officers who are in national headquarters or in his respective State and who come from his respective district. They have received long training and experience on the back ground and operations of selective service and the procurement of manpower, and are well qualified to administer the Selective Service System. When we praise the local representatives of the Selective Service System serving on the local boards, appeal boards, and in other capacities, we should not overlook these civilian officers serving both in national headquarters and under the Governors and State directors in the respective State headquarters, for they have done their best to make the System work. Many of them, because of their belief in General Hershey and in the fundamental principles of selective service with which they became indoctrinated in the years preceding the enactment of the Selective Service Act, voluntarily came to duty in 1940 at the request of General Hershey at a considerable personal sacrifice, and at a time when there was no provision of law under which they could be ordered to active duty. They felt a personal loyalty to General Hershey, and felt a moral and patriotic obligation to comply with his request more than a year preceding Pearl Harbor, and at a time when many persons sincerely believed we would not be directly engaged in the war.

General Hershey and these civilian officers have, therefore, been in selective-service planning and selective-service operations during this entire time, and they are qualified because of their attitude and experience to administer this act.

Consider what the situation would have been if this selective-service planning had not been done and if General Hershey and the civilian officers had not been thoroughly trained and had not been available to participate in the administration of the Selective Service System. I wish that planning for other wartime operations had been conducted with comparable efficiency and foresight, and that all of our wartime agencies were staffed with personnel having comparable training and experience in the line of work which they are undertaking.

A very important additional factor should be kept in mind, namely, that the operations of the Selective Service System have been nonpolitical and must remain that way in order to continue to have public confidence.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire merely to make a notation, both in connection with what the Senator from Vermont has said with regard to the connection of General Hershey with the National Guard, and more particularly in connection with the matter inserted in the RECORD a little while ago by the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] in well-justified glorification of the Thirty-sixth Division, made up of the National Guard of Texas and Oklahoma.

I desire merely to note, Mr. President—at this time, when the effort of the General Staff of the Regular Army is to discredit the National Guard of the United States, break up its organizations, and if possible make impossible the reestablishment of the National Guard after this war—that the first two divisions which landed at Salerno, in one of the most difficult operations of all time from a military standpoint, were two National Guard divisions.

I undertake to say, Mr. President, that the National Guard divisions of the United States and the smaller organizations into which the National Guard divisions have been broken up by the jealousy of the Regular Army at various times, will show equal valor and equal efficiency in their military operations in the future. I believe that a notation of the fact that the first two divisions to land at Salerno, in what is admittedly such a very difficult military operation, were National Guard divisions, is the smallest possible tribute that can be paid to the gallant men who made up the National Guard before the war started.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I urge Senators to confine themselves from now on until the bill has been disposed of, to the matter before the Senate. It is desirable not to hold a session tomorrow if it can be avoided. The soldiers' vote bill is the unfinished business and will come up on Monday. It is, therefore, desirable that action on the bill now before the Senate to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts be concluded today. I hope Senators will forego the pleasure of addressing the Senate on other matters, at least until that bill is disposed of. I am sure the Senate will stay in session long enough to hear any Senator who wishes to speak on any subject this afternoon, but it is very important that the bill be disposed of.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I desire to supplement what has been said by my colleagues in regard to the work of the National Guard men and the National Guard officers. I call attention to the fact the Munda airport battle, the Rendova Island battle, and other battles in the Solomons campaign were won by the Forty-third, the Thirty-seventh, and part of one other division—particularly the Forty-third Division, which is an old National Guard division which was commanded by Maj. Gen. Leonard Wing, of Vermont, who worked his way up through the National Guard to the position he now holds.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to say that one of the divisions which participated in the capture of the Munda Airport was the Ohio National Guard Division, the Thirty-seventh Division, under the command of Major General Beightler, who was a general in the National Guard. He commanded the Thirty-seventh Division at the battle of Munda Airport.

Mr. AIKEN. I appreciate what the Senator from Ohio has said. I understand that the National Guard Division from Ohio was very close behind the Forty-third Division in landing on Rendova Island and entering upon the Munda Airport.

REPEAL OF CHINESE EXCLUSION ACTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3070) to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, unfortunately, I was not in the Chamber during the entire period consumed by the very able Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] in discussing the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Acts. I am sorry I was not present, because I have a very great affection for the Senator from Florida, and I regret exceedingly that at this hour I find myself in opposition to his ideas in reference to the repeal of those acts.

Since I first came to the Senate I have opposed all immigration into this country, and vigorously did so during those years when we had anywhere from 10,000,000 to 15,000,000 people out of employment. I oppose any change in our immigration laws at the present time, because I recognize, with Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, that after the termination of this war we shall have millions of Americans on the streets looking for jobs.

I happen to be for Americans first. I happen—perhaps unfortunately in the eyes of some—to be one of those who are more interested in the welfare of native-born and naturalized citizens than that of others. I believe that every American job should be held by an American citizen, whether he be a native-born citizen or a naturalized citizen. I draw no line of distinction whatsoever between those who are born upon American soil and those who come here from other countries and later become American citizens. Some of the ablest Members of this body were born on foreign shores, and over the years they have been among our most outstanding Members.

Mr. President, the bill before us at the present time, designated as House bill 3070, is for the purpose of repealing the

Chinese Exclusion Acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes. I read from the report one paragraph thereof entitled "Purpose of the Bill":

> The legislation proposed in this bill is for the purpose of repealing the Chinese exclusion laws, to place Chinese persons on a small quota basis, and to make persons of the Chinese race eligible to become naturalized United States citizens.

Mr. President, if I may be permitted to repeat, I vigorously oppose any change in our immigration laws, because I recognize that at the present time we have more than seven million soldiers, sailors, and men of the air in uniform in this country and on 72 fighting fronts throughout the world. Those men are fighting for the life of America. They are fighting for the preservation of the American way of life, as we have heretofore known it. I say that when they return at the expiration of the war those heroes will be entitled to any jobs which are to spare on these shores.

I recognize that today we are experiencing war hysteria. If anyone states that a certain thing is going to help win the war, there is always support for it; but I state emphatically that permission to allow 105 Chinese to enter this country every year is not going to help win the war. I want any jobs available after this war to go to our soldiers. I am going to fight for those soldiers; and when I vote against repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Acts, I believe conscientiously in my heart and soul that I am voting for every American man and woman in uniform with the United States armed forces today. Not only that, but I am ready and willing to vote for anything that will be of help to those men and women who have been dislocated, so to speak, from civilian life and taken into the armed forces in order that they might be able to help win the war, which they are now doing. I am for the American soldier, sailor, and airman, not by way of mere words. I am going to evidence my interest in the American soldier by casting my vote for him every time I have an opportunity to do so.

In that connection, I understand that the able senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has just introduced a bill to provide a cash payment to every man in the armed forces immediately upon his return to American soil. I shall support that bill, recognizing as I do that the able Senator from Kentucky is interested, as I am, in the American soldier, and that we should give the men and women in uniform every possible consideration.

Mr. President, many of us forget too soon. I remember, as do other Senators, when we had between 10,000,000 and 13,000,000 people out of employment in this country; and during the same hours, weeks, and months when we had millions of people out of employment in America we were permitting thousands of people to come to our land from foreign shores and compete with American citizens for American jobs. I am against the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Acts.

Not so long ago a very able gentleman by the name of Multer, president of the Sons of the American Revolution, delivered an address on Americanism. In the course of his remarks he made this observation:

> All immigration laws would be repealed so that the citizens of the world could move about and locate where they please the same as citizens of the United States can change their residence from State to State. It requires no imagination to foresee that millions would come here to enjoy "the more abundant life" rather than to stay home to build up and struggle amid the ruins and desolations of war. Indeed, people from all over the earth would hasten here to the land, where, they are told, the streets are paved with gold. As a consequence, our standards of living, whether in the factory, on the farm, or in commercial pursuits, would soon go down to the level of the Hottentot. And so we might go on.

If we were to follow the advice of some radical internationalists, we would permit anyone from any country in the world to come to the United States and take over the United States of America.

In the course of the able address delivered by him at Williamsburg, one of the most historic spots in all America, Mr. Multer further said:

> While millions of immigrants came to our shores, the great majority came to enjoy the blessings found under our form of government and became imbued with the spirit of our free institutions. It is true we closed the gates, when later on there began an influx of those whose ideas and customs and hereditary instincts were inimical to our way of life; and we intend to keep the gates closed.

I hope that we can keep them closed now, so far as the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Acts is concerned.

Let me say something further about the Chinese. I know of no better people. I have been to China a number of times. I have traveled all over China. I like the Chinese people immensely. They are hard workers. They are diligent, honest, trustworthy, and are very patriotic people. I have nothing against the Chinese. I am simply against permitting anyone to come into this country until such time as we have assimilated the 6,000,000 aliens we have on American soil at the present time. The Chinese are fine people. They are our allies. We who know them like them. The Japanese, who cannot trust themselves, always have hired Chinese to work in the Japanese banks, because the Japanese knew that their own cashiers, tellers, and bookkeepers were dishonest. They imported the Chinese, whom they knew to be honest, for the purpose of working in the Japanese banks.

I have nothing against the Chinese, but I have more interest in the United States of America and in Americans than I have in any other country or any other people on the face of the earth. Therefore, without hesitation, I speak this afternoon in what I believe to be the interest of America and the American people, because I am an American nationalist, and I believe in saving America for Americans.

There are those who would tell us that we should now repeal the Chinese exclusion law, that we should provide quotas for the Chinese, and then should admit 105 Chinese into this country annually. They say we should do that in order to evidence and make a display of our friendship to the Chinese Government. They say that if we will allow 105 Chinese to come into America annually it will help win the war. I do not understand such arguments. Every one of the 105 Chinese who would be permitted to come into this country would necessarily on examination be found to be a Chinaman of excellent character, and one who unquestionably would make for us a good American citizen. If what we read in the newspapers about the war between China and Japan is true, and doubtless it is true, in the hard fight Gen. Chiang Kai-shek is having in China, he needs every good, able-bodied citizen of China he can possibly get. I am sure Gen. Chiang Kai-shek does not want has good citizens, his able-bodied men, to leave China at a time when the Chinese are fighting for their very lives. He wants them to remain in China where they can help him. But by permitting them to come to this country, as provided under this bill, they would not do him any good at all. He wants them to remain in China.

I have not heard anyone say that China has requested the repeal of the exclusion law. Perhaps the Chinese have requested it. But are we going to comply with every request made by every country in the world to permit their nationals to enter this country? If we do we might just as well erase everything which stands for America, and which is imbedded in the minds of true Americans.

Mr. President, the American Federation of Labor is opposed to the repeal of this law. The American Federation of Labor takes that position because it represents millions of laborers in America. In an article published not many months ago Mr. Green stated that after the war ends there will be millions upon millions of American citizens, native-born and naturalized, walking the streets in search of jobs they cannot find. I respectfully submit to my colleagues in this, the upper House of Congress, that it is our duty to preserve every single job—one job or 105 jobs or millions of jobs. We should preserve those jobs for the men and women who return from the war. Today many of our uniformed men and women are giving their blood, laying down their lives, and dying in order that we may enjoy the American way of life in this land.

The propaganda for the passage of this legislation has been intense, but there are certain facts relating to the whole problem of Chinese exclusion which have not had the publicity their importance demands.

First, attention must be called to the fact that the President in his message to Congress characterized the Chinese Exclusion Acts and the prohibition against the naturalization of Chinese as something which should never have taken place.

The President further stated that—

> Nations like individuals make mistakes. We must be big enough to acknowledge our mistakes of the past and to correct them.

This seems an extraordinary pronouncement for the President to make; because had Congress not enacted the Chinese Exclusion Acts when it did, our country would now have on its hands a race problem. In fact, if Congress had not finally developed the principle of Chinese exclusion into total Asiatic exclusion, our existing Japanese problem would have been so magnified as to constitute a grave military menace.

The appalling nature of this menace is made perhaps more vivid if the statistics for the decade 1933–42 are analyzed. During this decade the British had available a total of 657,210 visas. Against this total, however, only 26,476 visas are charged. That leaves an unused balance of 630,734 visas. Had the United States not had in the immigration law a provision that persons ineligible to citizenship were not admissible, this unused balance of 630,734 would have been available for British subjects of Chinese descent who were born in one or another of the British dependencies, such as Hong Kong, the Straits Settlements, and the Malay States, not to mention the West Indies, where a good many Chinese coolies have settled. Also, as immigration from the Western Hemisphere has never been placed on a quota basis, the descendants of the large number of Chinese who were permitted to migrate into various countries of Latin America could have moved here in a flood of indeterminable magnitude.

When these facts were brought before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the advocates of the policy of repealing Asiatic exclusion, so far as it applied to the Chinese, apparently realized that Congress, and the public at large when they understood the situation would not tolerate legislation of this character. Hence, House bill 3070, known as the Magnuson bill, is offered to the Congress as a measure to placate the Chinese and counteract the Japanese propaganda that our legislation is discriminatory against our ally, China.

The Andrews bill, if enacted, would establish a racial basis as distinguished from the existing system of determining quotas in accordance with national contributions to our population. By this method and a requirement that only 25 percent of the quota be given to Chinese born and resident in countries other than China, the intolerable evils attendant on giving China real equality with other quota countries whose citizens are now eligible to citizenship in the United States, are obviated. Unfortunately, this result would be just as discriminatory, and perhaps more so, than the present system which treats all Asiatics on exactly the same basis.

Mr. President, the provision of the act of 1924, excluding persons ineligible to citizenship in the United States was written into that act on economic grounds. Congress never took the position that the white race was superior to the Mongolian or other Asiatic races. Congress was, in fact, concerned over the indisputable fact that the white race is unable to compete with Asiatics in any industrial or agricultural enterprise in which labor costs determine success or failure.

If Congress can be said to have taken a position which by implication raises the question of racial superiority or inferiority, it must be admitted to have conceded the superiority of Asiatics as compared with whites.

The Andrews bill would establish a dangerous precedent by creating a racial quota as distinguished from the national quotas under which immigrants now enter from all quota countries whose citizens are eligible for citizenship in the United States. Such a precedent might be capitalized by anti-Semites because of the fact that people of the Hebrew race now come into the United States as nationals of the country of their birth. By reason of this fact, 43,450 Hebrews entered the United States in 1939, out of a total lawful immigration of 82,998 of all races. Under a racial quota, applicable to Hebrews, probably less than 6,000 could have entered the United States in any 1 year.

As it has been always opposed to the promotion of anti-Semitism, it regards the introduction of the principle of racial quotas into our immigration laws as a grave menace to national unity.

It will be seen that the Andrews bill does not place China on a parity with other quota nations whose citizens are eligible for citizenship in the United States. Therefore, this bill, S. 1404, is no answer to the charge of discrimination against the Chinese. If they do not meet this requirement, they are not only a futile gesture but they are a gesture which threatens a colossal breach in our immigration barriers. It can indeed be said that H. R. 3070 and S. 1404 threatens a breach in our immigration barriers because inasmuch as they will inevitably fail to satisfy the Chinese, the next step will be to open wide the flood gates of a Chinese migration into the United States.

Furthermore, if this bill should be enacted it is difficult to see how Congress could consistently refuse to grant to other Asiatic states or races equality with the Chinese. As the quota list now stands, that policy would immediately add approximately 2,000 Asiatic immigrants as admissible for entry under the minimum quotas now assigned. Also, many thousands of Asiatics now resident in the United States would become eligible for citizenship. When naturalized, these Asiatics of all races, including the Chinese, will be entitled to bring in an endless chain of relatives.

The persistent introduction of special bills to legalize the entry of individual Asiatics of various racial origins and the propaganda circulated for their passage is good evidence of the fact that as soon as the Andrews bill is passed, if it should be passed, a campaign for its extension to other Asiatic peoples will be initiated.

The argument that the British India people are entitled to entry and to naturalization because they are fighting Japan would be identical with and just as cogent as that used to pass the Andrews bill in the Senate.

Should British India disintegrate into its component States and minimum quotas be assigned on the present basis to such States, we could reasonably expect a migration of from ten to fifty thousand Asiatics a year, over and above the 105 Chinese to be admitted if the Andrews bill should be enacted.

There is, of course, a solution to this problem which can offend no race and no nation. That is, the enactment of total exclusion of all immigration, except the wives and minor children of persons lawfully resident in the United States. If Congress adopts this policy, it may then, but only then, be justified in repealing the prohibition against the naturalization of Chinese who are now lawful residents of the United States.

Inasmuch as the number of unemployed in the United States during the 10 years preceding our entry into the war ranged from 8,000,000 to 10,000,000 people, and even more on occasion, is it not reasonable to suggest to Congress that it hold all American jobs, even 105 American jobs, as a sacred trust for the men and women in our armed forces now engaged in war? These men and women are battling enemies who are seeking to conquer the United States by force of arms. How can Congress, therefore, justify a grant of permission to any race of people the privilege of conquering our country by peaceful infiltration of immigrants through breaches in our immigration laws.

Mr. President, I have prepared a statement containing a review of facts pertinent to this question, which I wish to present at this time.

First. The original controversy between China and Japan arose over the inspired immigration of Japanese subjects into Manchuria. These Japanese subjects leased lands from Chinese peasants and when the Chinese landlords sought to resume occupancy of the lands on the expiration of the leases, the Japanese tenants would not give up the properties. The Chinese landlords naturally organized into bands to expel their tenants, and then the Japanese Government publicized to the world that these landlords were bandits. Whatever the merits of that phase of the quarrel were, it was the migration of Japanese subjects into Manchuria which became the basic cause of the conflict now raging throughout the East.

Second. The war between China and Japan, which began 4 years before we entered the struggle, was China's war for the survival of China as a nation. The threat suggested by some of the sponsors of the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Acts that China may desert the United Nations and join Japan in a war for Asia for the Asiatics, if such legislation be not passed, is international political blackmail. It is blackmail against an ally now mobilizing all its forces to crush China's traditional enemy, Japan.

Third. If the sponsors of this legislation are consistent in their attitude that China must get what she demands, they must be prepared to take a position on the question of returning Hong Kong to China, or to England of which it has been a dependency for many years. Are United States forces to be permitted to reconquer Chinese territory for reincorporation in the British Empire, or are they to be used to restore Hong Kong to China from which the British took it.

Fourth. The argument advanced by selfish financial interests that the repeal of this legislation is necessary to assure preferential treatment for American business is controverted by the intense propaganda now being circulated for a post-war world in which no such preferences shall be granted.

On the basis of the facts set forth above, it is obvious that no good purpose will be served by the passage of the bill to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts. Such a course will inevitably lead to demands that the whole structure of legislation providing for exclusion of all Asiatics be abolished.

As has already been said, the way to end once and for all the charge of discrimination against any race or people, is to exclude immigration from every source.

The way to prove our friendship for China is to provide adequate military support to our military and naval officers now leading our armies and fleets in a supreme effort to defeat Japan.

Mr. President, I have before me a report of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor submitted at the sixty-third annual convention held in Boston, Mass., on October 4, 1943. I ask that the portions of the report which I have designated be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Numerous proposals modifying immigration and naturalization laws are pending in the Seventy-eighth Congress, as those who favor opening the immigration doors are fully alive to the situation and realize that circumstances have now created ideal conditions for the accomplishment of their purposes.

Generally speaking, the pending measures excuse those who entered the country illegally, remove existing immigration bars even against Chinese, and make naturalization a farce in many instances.

Many of these proposals emanate from those in high places, and toward the end of the Seventy-seventh Congress three bills granting the President the power to vitiate all immigration and tariff laws were introduced at his request. These proposals were defeated in committee after many modifying amendments were considered in executive session.

Antirestrictionists of immigration are proceeding very boldly by advocating repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act, realizing that if this portion of the immigration laws is repealed they will encounter little difficulty in securing entry for those in whom they are really interested. They rely on the popularity of Mme. Chiang Kai-shek and the gallant fight of the Chinese against the Japanese for this purpose.

As there are no quotas in the Western Hemisphere, West Indians, Mexicans, and others are being brought into this country by the tens of thousands.

When this war ends the return of the millions in the armed forces and the adjustment of industry from a war to a consumer basis will create an unemployment problem never previously known. It will be absolutely impossible for this country to absorb the millions now desirous of immigrating to the United States.

The representatives of the American Federation of Labor have followed the immigration restriction policies as laid down by American Federation of Labor conventions and in regard to the pending bills these policies should be adhered to as it will be impossible for the workers in this country to compete with a flood of European and Asiatic immigrants.

One of the first acts of the first convention of the American Federation of Labor held in 1881 (p. 4) was to declare:

"Thirty years' experience of the Pacific coast with Chinese had proved their competition with white labor was the greatest evil with which a country could be afflicted; that publicity as to its true character be disseminated throughout the country and Congress urged to enact an exclusion act."

In 1882 great demonstrations against Chinese immigration were made throughout the country, all participated in by representatives of the American Federation of Labor, and a law was enacted which was made ineffective by administrative and court actions.

The question of Chinese exclusion was one of the most important questions pending before American Federation of Labor conventions, beginning with its first one, and including the present law enacted in 1924, which prohibits the entiry into this country of persons ineligible to citizenship.

As Chinese, Japanese, and others of oriental blood are, under law, ineligible to citizenship, such persons cannot emigrate to this country.

From its inception the American Federation of Labor has vigorously maintained that orientals should be barred from entering this country and that they should not be permitted to become citizens.

The advocates of repeal of Chinese exclusion muster many specious arguments in favor of the proposal and minimize its importance, contending that but 105 will enter the United States annually. However, repeal means the doors are open to Chinese and in order to be consistent the next step will be to permit all orientals to emigrate to the United States and become citizens.

Once the bar is raised agitation will begin to permit the entry of such races in ever-increasing numbers.

The fact that China is our ally in the present world war should not influence us to permit repeal of the oriental exclusion law any more than the fact that Russia is an ally should influence us to embrace communism.

The executive council directs that the officers of the American Federation of Labor carry out the decisions of conventions regarding immigration exclusion laws.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, this reveals the fact that the American Federation of Labor has gone on record innumerable times as opposing the repeal of the Chinese exclusion law.

I have before me a letter from the New York Herald Tribune of October 14, 1943, written by J. H. B. Hoffmann, entitled "Would Not Admit Asiatics," which I ask to have published in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOULD NOT ADMIT ASIATICS

To the New York Herald Tribune:

I am sorry the administration has lent its support to the Magnuson bill providing for quota immigration of Chinese. It would have been much better, I think, had President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull explained to Generalissimo Chiang, Mme. Chiang and Mr. Soong that our oriental exclusion laws are based on the plain fact that the races are too different from us to assimilate readily, and that recognition of this fact implies no disparagement or reflection on the merits per se of any Asiatic people.

If we now compromise this basic principle underlying oriental exclusion, Koreans, Hindus and other east Asiatics will want their quotas. There is a large "liberal" minority among us who want to break down the barriers, whose ideal United States of America would be a sort of multiracial, polyglot mosaic of peoples all united by a sort of a religion called "democracy." Personally, I believe that God created all men equal, but He also created them different.

J. H. B. HOFFMANN.

NEW YORK, *October 14, 1943.*

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have another letter which sometime ago I clipped from the columns of the Washington News, of Washington, D. C., signed by Edward R. Lewis entitled "Quota of 105 Would Not Always Satisfy Chinese," which I ask to have published in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUOTA OF 105 WOULD NOT ALWAYS SATISFY CHINESE

There seems to be a vast amount of misunderstanding on the question of Chinese exclusion. We are told that all that is involved is 105 Chinese immigrants a year. But if Chinese exclusion is repealed, there would be no tenable argument after this war to deny admission as immigrants to the Japanese, Hindus, Malays, and all other people of the brown and yellow races. I count at least 20 countries with people of the brown and yellow races, each of which would be entitled in all fairness to a minimum quota of 100, if China is granted a quota. This makes 2,000 immigrants of the brown and yellow races each year, instead of a mere 105.

Secondly, we may be certain that neither the Japanese nor the Chinese would ever remain satisfied with a paltry minimum quota of 105 when several European countries have quotas of several thousand each.

Thirdly, we may be certain that neither Japan nor China would allow white American common laborers or farm laborers to enter their countries.

Finally, there is no insult asserted or intended by the policy of Japanese or Chinese exclusion. There is no assertion that the Japanese, Hindus, Malays, or Chinese are inferior. There is merely an assertion that the introduction of yellow and brown common laborers would eventually lead to grievous race trouble in this country.

EDWARD R. LEWIS.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, at Lynn, Mass., on November 18, 1943, the Honorable James A. Farley addressed the Rotary International. In his speech he made this one remark:

I think the war will be over sooner than some people expect. After the war, there will be an economic upset. Millions will be thrown out of work.

I wish to impress the Members of this body with the fact that I and many others think that immediately succeeding the war millions of men will be out of employment and without work of any sort.

The National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, has as its national secretary Mr. James R. Wilmeth, of Philadelphia, Pa. He has directed to me a letter as of November 1, 1943, in vigorous opposition to the passage of the pending bill. I ask that the portion of his letter which I have not deleted be published in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. The Chinese were undesirable as immigrants and citizens to such an extent that, in 1882, under solemn treaty with their mother country, the United States enacted exclusion laws—61 years ago.

2. Chinese laborers, working for small wages, were in direct competition with the American workingmen.

3. Chinese worked for such low wages that our American working people would starve to death working for such wages.

4. The use of opium was introduced into this country by the Chinese. They established dens of vice and opium joints, and engaged in tong wars and other unlawful customs and practices.

5. Chinese in this country today would offer the same competition, at low wages, as resulted during the period of their admission as immigrants, prior to 1882. To admit them at this time as immigrants would present destructive competition which would be demoralizing, and Chinamen admitted, no matter how small the number, would take the jobs which ought to be held and preserved for our returning victorious soldiers.

6. The quota of 105, which is argued with so much force by the proponents, appears to be misleading. It does not take into account Chinamen who are living in British territory, such as Honk Kong, Canada, and the South American republics, who, under the immigration laws, are admitted regardless of the quotas. There are no quotas for the Western Hemisphere; therefore Chinamen could be admitted on the same terms as other subjects of Canada and the republics of the Western Hemisphere.

7. In the admission of any immigrants, we should give first consideration to the good of America and its people. The burden of arguments of the proponents of these repeal measures seems to be that America owes it to the Chinese people to break down the immigration barriers, and let them in, on the grounds of sentimentality.

8. Good common-sense American business demands that we look out for our own interest first, and to the providing of jobs for our own citizens, before that of any foreign country; and particularly for our returning soldiers.

9. Following the victorious conclusion of this war, it is safe to assume that, after sometime, we shall find ourselves in the depths of another depression, with many of our own people out of employment. Good business sense demands that, in our planning for an after-war program, we take into consideration our own citizens, and their best interest, before we attempt to include Chinese, or any other class of immigrants.

10. The yellow race is not assimilable with the white or Caucasian race. The introduction of a large number of Asiatic orientals at this time would complicate the race situation in the United States. We have all the race troubles at the present time that we can handle. Why complicate, by the introduction of unassimilable people of the yellow race, no matter how small the number?

11. Communism has been introduced into China during the last decade or two. If we are to believe the reports we read, there are large numbers of Chinese people, who have espoused, and are devoted to the doctrines and principles of communism. The introduction of even a small number of Chinese who are indoctrinated with communism will further complicate our political and economic condition.

We have followed the debates in the House of Representatives, and are forced to the conclusion that sentiment and sympathy appear to be the moving considerations of those who are advocates of the repeal. It has been argued that China is now an ally of the United States in the war against Japan, and that Japan is using the exclusion laws of the United States against China, in their radio broadcasts, to belittle the United States and to turn the Chinese people against us. We submit that those who have hung their support of the repeal on the propaganda peg will find that, in the event the exclusion laws are repealed, with only 105 Chinamen eligible to enter the United States in any one given fiscal year, Japan will have a real reason for belittling us, and using propaganda against such a feeble legislative gesture. In our opinion, this will be one of the most fruitful sources of hurtful propaganda against the United States, if the admission of 105 Chinese to the United States is the measure of our regard for them; considering that there are nearly 500,000,000 Chinese subjects, then we may expect that Japan will get busy with the Chinese people to show them how small is our regard for them, as reflected in such a bill. In our testimony before the House Immigration Committee, we brought out the fact that if this measure were intended simply to appease the Chinese people, it was a very feeble gesture.

We submit that the question of changing an immigration law that has been in force for 62 years, with such small benefits to the Chinese people, while we are in the midst of a global war, with some 10,000,000 of American boys far away from their own homes and country, fighting to preserve our liberties, is, to say the least, a questionable legislative procedure.

That this repeal is controversial is shown by the hearings before the House Immigration Committee and the debates before the House of Representatives. It is a pity that it should be brought out at such a time. We fail to see where there is going to be a great deal of benefit accrue to the Chinese people, in the event the Chinese exclusion laws are repealed. Very few can come from the mainland of China, hardly enough to count. As an ally, in this global war, China will have to look to more substantial things than that proposed in this measure, if she is to be greatly benefited. We submit that what China needs at the present time is not immigration laws which will permit 105 of her citizens to come into the United States but she needs more in the way of food, airplanes, and soldiers to help her win the war against Japan. America is giving such supplies in rather large measure to the Chinese people. We are encouraging her in a substantial way in her war effort. Money has been loaned in excess of $500,000,000, which it is doubtful will ever be repaid. In the matter of food, $200,000,000 worth, and in war munitions, under the Lend-Lease Act; while American boys have been fighting on Chinese soil to help protect and save her integrity. It is likely that, in the next year or so, many thousands of our American soldiers will tread upon Chinese soil, with guns on their backs, helping her to defeat Japan. We submit that these things we are doing for the Chinese people now fully demonstrate our interest in and for them. Now, to resort to an appeasement bill by Congress is a small sop, which will amount to but little; in fact, will contribute nothing toward enabling China to win the war against Japan.

What China needs now is more of what we have been doing for her, in a substantial way. We submit that, if this law should be passed, it will not contribute one iota toward the Chinese victory over Japan. If this statement be true, why should America go out of her way to lower the immigration barriers and standards in what appears to be an almost meaningless effort, so far as the Chinese proper, is concerned.

We submit that this legislative attempt to change the immigration status of the Chinese people is one that has been promoted chiefly here in our own country. There are people in America who would sponsor legislation of almost any kind if it was found that it would break down our immigration laws. It seems to us that this present attempt to repeal these laws is intended to accomplish that very purpose.

We submit that we are not only helping China in a most substantial manner at the present time in her heroic struggle, but we have been her friend for decades. The United States, through its good offices, prevented partition being made of China, following the Boxer Rebellion. We have been her friend in trade and commerce. We have welcomed her sons and daughters to our schools, colleges, and universities, here in America, year by year, in numbers far beyond what the sponsors of this measure claim will be extended to the Chinese people in the way of admissible immigrants. There has been reciprocal trade and commerce, and the United States and China have enjoyed the respect and admiration, one for the other, governmentally speaking, which, in our judgment, would not be influenced or enlarged by the repeal of the exclusion laws.

We submit that the exclusion laws of 1882 were passed, upon tacit understanding and agreement by the Government of China that if their nationals became embarrassing to the United States their Government would not object to the imposition of such exclusion laws. That is exactly what was done, and the treaty was passed upon such understandings and agreements. Why change now, when, as we understand, China has not requested our Government to do so?

Under the high tempo of war we are apt to do many things which, in a sober, calmer moment, we would not attempt to do. This repeal seems to be a war experiment which may be ended before any of these 105 immigrants could land on our shores. Why rush in and upset the immigrant status quo of 61 years, because we are running in high war gear?

We submit, finally, that it will not be to the interest of our country to enact such legislation at this time. America is the asylum of more immigrants than any country on the face of the earth. We have many more than our share, nationally speaking. It is time for us to give serious consideration to the welfare of our own people, and our institutions and our Government, before we further extend immigration privileges to other peoples and nations. The thing which should determine what we should do in a case of this kind is, "Will it be for the best interest of our Government and our people for us to do this or that particular thing?" In the light of the foregoing statement, we submit that the best interest of our country is to let the Chinese immigration laws remain as they are at present on our statute books.

Fraternally yours,

JAMES L. WILMETH,
National Secretary.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In addition to that, Mr. President, I have a letter from the

legislative representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Washington, Spokane, Wash., over the signature of W. J. Wallace, protesting against the repeal of the Chinese exclusion law. Attached to the letter is a petition to the Congress of the United States. I ask that the letter, together with the petition, be published in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter and petition were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Seattle, Wash., October 8, 1943.

R. R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senator,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

We, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, are very much interested in defeating any legislation that will in any way let down the bars to permit emigration to these United States. Let us first prove our ability to furnish adequate employment to the bonified citizens that are at present within and entitled to be within the continental limits of these United States, that they may be able to follow such gainful occupations that will enable them a livelihood without having to accept of that morale-destroying system or systems such as P. W. A., W. P. A., or direct relief. We look upon this scurrilous attempt, by legislation, to insert an entering wedge into the Chinese exclusion laws.

We, you, and other legislators are expressing our opinions as to how rehabilitation of our people is to be accomplished when this war is over and I am sure, on your giving it a mere casual thought, your honest opinion will be that rehabilitation of our own citizens, who, at present go to make up the population of these United States, cannot be accomplished and that objective reached, if in any way the laws of immigration are relaxed. It is our opinion that, the laws governing emigration of all nationalities should be tightened, and it would be provident to close the gates of these United States entirely. We, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, do request that you use that American prerogative endowed by that wonderful document, the Constitution of these United States.

Truly yours,

W. J. WALLACE.

We, the members of Hillyard Post, No. 1474, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in regular session assembled: Being aware of the fact that, in the year 1939, the Chief Executive of these United States, did request, that the Congress of our country reduce immigration quotas of all nationalities, and quotas so gained be applied to refugees from Germany and Austria, said refugees be privileged to enter and flood these United States with undesirables of all nations; and

Whereas other legislation would be inimical to the well-being of the bona fide citizens of these United States through the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, and a matter of record, That Hillyard Post, No. 1474, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, do oppose the repeal of the Chinese exclusion law, and declare such legislation detrimental to the welfare of the citizens of these United States, and would definitely destroy any and all efforts of rehabilitation of both War No. 1 and No. 2.

Comrades, it is essential that the immigration laws of our country be revised, and in doing so, close any and all loopholes, thus tightening up on various provisions. Too, it would not be improvident to close the gates of immigration for a period of 20 years. Incidentally, comrades and sisters, if we are to successfully carry out our huge program of rehabilitation of our comrades of these wars, it will be necessary to stop the visitation of the open-armed policy upon those of foreign lands. First, let us prove our ability to care for our own, the bona fide citizens of this great Republic. These are facts, comrades and sisters, and by checkmating their activities we will be able to prevent a repetition of what transpired from 1928 to 1939—the P. W. A., W. P. A., and direct relief of our people while some 5,000,000 aliens in our midst were holding down white-collared positions in this United States. Think it over.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, if we repeal the Chinese exclusion law, it will mean merely the opening wedge. It will mean merely the sticking of the big toe in the door which many radical internationalists want to open up. Next, if the big toe gets into that door, as provided by the repeal of the Chinese exclusion law, we will find the foot, then the leg, then the whole body, and all the immigration gates of America will be opened up to the peoples of the world to come here and compete with our own people.

Mr. President, I wish to have published at this point, as a part of my remarks, in order that the time of the Senate may be saved, a letter addressed to me by Mr. James S. Farley, 162 West Seventy-eighth Street, New York City, under date of October 18, 1943, in which he provides me with a report of the grand jury of the State of New York entitled "Post-war Peril in Immigration." The grand jury, after having studied the immigration matter for several months, made some very pertinent and valuable points. I wish to have the report published in the RECORD, as they recommended against the wholesale immigration we are experiencing at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POST-WAR PERIL IN IMMIGRATION [1]

In a presentment which predicted an unprecedented "wave of proposed immigration" after the war, the Federal grand jury in the southern district of New York, which returned indictments in the German-American Bund cases last year, recommended that "selective immigration" be adopted in the United States to avoid placing the Nation in the gravest jeopardy in the post-war period.

The presentment, which specifically urges that aliens be required to speak, read, and write the English language on at least an eighth-grade level before being admitted to citizenship, was handed up to Judge J. Waties Waring in the United States district court last Friday and was made public yesterday by A. Vere Shaw, jury foreman, who is a senior partner in the firm of investment counselors bearing his name at 15 William Street.

Mr. Shaw said the grand jury convened on May 19, 1942, and after it had completed its work in the bund cases, which led to the conviction up to last October of 27 persons on charges of conspiracy to violate the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, the jury members held themselves in session to look into the immigration and naturalization problem. The jury was discharged last Friday.

The presentment, which was signed by 22 members of the jury, stated that it is the unanimous opinion of the jury that the "safety of this country and its institutions is being jeopardized" because undesirable aliens have been and may be admitted into this country as immigrants and naturalized as citizens and because the supervision and education of aliens and the facilities for continued education of naturalized citizens by the Government of this country are not adequate.

The presentment said that this conviction was arrived at by the jury after hearing, over a period of months, the testimony of a great number of naturalized citizens, "many of whom had been living in this country for a long period of years."

"Some of these witnesses," the presentment said, "were virtually unable to speak or understand English. Many could not read or write English. Others appeared to be wholly illiterate."

The presentment said that the "jury believes in immigration, but in selective immigration." "It affirms the principle that, in all legislation governing immigration, the paramount consideration is the welfare of the United States, not that of the immigrant," the presentment read.

[1] Federal grand jury report, southern district of New York, September 21, 1943.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, as I stated a moment ago, this is merely the opening wedge. As soon as the war is over, there will be a great drive to break down the barriers, to open up the gates, to let millions of Chinese come into the United States in competition with American labor, whether it is native-born or naturalized.

Let us look a little into the future. A few days ago Mr. LaGuardia, the mayor of New York City, issued a statement in which he recommended seasonal immigration. That is referred to in an Associated Press dispatch dated November 12. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEASONAL IMMIGRATION PROPOSED BY LAGUARDIA

NEW YORK, November 12.—Mayor F. H. LaGuardia, advocating a plan for seasonal immigration of workers after the war, said yesterday the Nation's public education system had depleted the ranks of unskilled labor by training youths for skilled and professional jobs.

"The country can't continue the course of its great public education system and then expect to have unskilled labor," he said at the formal opening of new district headquarters of the National Immigration and Naturalization Service. "There is going to be a shortage of unskilled and farm labor and we must make up our minds what we are going to do about it."

The mayor said a policy could be worked out by Congress "to bring in workers when they are needed: A given number for a given period of time."

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, just prior to that, on November 6, I clipped from the New York Herald Tribune an article which will provide us with some foresight into what we may expect in the

future so far as breaking down our immigration barriers and opening up our gates is concerned. I read the headline:

United States may import million Italians to meet shortage of manpower.

Plan, under consideration in Washington, would go into effect if war lasted long enough; not only war prisoners would be used.

The article is by Mr. Bert Andrews, and is dated Washington, D. C., November 6. Another paragraph reads:

The plan, stripped to its barest essentials, is to bring 1,000,000 Italians from their homeland to the United States for the duration of the manpower emergency.

I ask that the article be published in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, November 7, 1943]

UNITED STATES MAY IMPORT MILLION ITALIANS TO MEET SHORTAGE OF MANPOWER—PLAN, UNDER CONSIDERATION IN WASHINGTON, WOULD GO INTO EFFECT IF WAR LASTED LONG ENOUGH; NOT ONLY WAR PRISONERS WOULD BE USED

(By Bert Andrews)

WASHINGTON, November 6.—The truest words that have been spoken recently in Washington—and this is not intended to suggest that anybody ever tells a lie in the Nation's Capital—came from Walter Brown, assistant to James F. Byrnes, Director of the Office of War Mobilization.

Mr. Brown had been asked by telephone to comment on a published article, complete with charts, which purported to contain the complete low-down on the Roosevelt administration's plan for returning the national economy to a peacetime basis after the war.

Mr. Brown said he had no personal knowledge of the plan, but did not dismiss it as a possibility.

"Everybody has a plan," he said. "There are hundreds of plans."

While Mr. Brown was speaking only about plans for the post-war period, what he said was equally true as applied to plans for the period of the war—whether it turns out to be short or long.

For example (and at this point a formal farewell is taken for Mr. Brown so that no one will think any of the rest of this came from him) there is a startling plan under serious consideration in high official circles as to how to solve the labor shortage—particularly in agriculture—if the conflict goes on long enough to require drastic additional drafting of America's manpower.

The plan, stripped to its barest essentials, is to bring 1,000,000 Italians from their homeland to the United States for the duration of the manpower emergency!!!!!

The five exclamation points that close the foregoing sentence were put there after due consideration, with the thought that each exclamation point could symbolize a dozen question marks that have been raised as the new subject has been battled back and forth in the high councils.

Anyone who glances at the proposal invariably adds many questions of his own, but the following list shows the chief ones already raised, with the answers from the advocates of the proposal:

Question. When would the Italians be brought here?

Answer. Only when the labor shortage grows stringent enough to make it imperative to obtain additional manpower.

Question. Would the American people stand for the idea?

Answer. If the labor shortage grew severe enough, they'd welcome it.

Question. Would war prisoners only be brought?

Answer. No. The idea would be to get voluntary recruits. They could be transported easily on ships that are now returning empty from the war zones.

Question. How would they be paid? And how much?

Answer. By the employers, under Government supervision. They'd get prevailing wages.

Question. Would they be allowed to keep all the money?

Answer. No indeed; part of the money would be withheld with the aim of keeping Uncle Sam from becoming Uncle Sucker.

Question. How would you do that?

Answer. Well, in the first place they'd be charged for the boat rides. All the other details haven't been worked out, but consider some of the other possibilities. Presumably they would be subject to normal taxes, and goodness knows we need all the tax revenue we can get. They would be eating here—and paying for it. That would save us the cost of sending food to Italy to give away to them. They would be required to send money home to relatives. Thus those relatives would have money to pay for supplies, instead of being able to demand them free as the right of starving people.

Question. How about getting them back after the war?

Answer. They would come in under Government supervision. They would be subject to Government supervision and regulations, including fingerprinting. They would be brought in for a specified time; all would be subject to repatriation beginning, say, a month after the armistice.

Question. But how would you move a million Italians home in a brief time?

Answer. How have we moved soldiers in wartime? Besides, we'll have ships galore. This mass movement not only would keep them busy, but the shipping lines would get paid in cash, since the Italian workers would have had money withheld for their passage.

Question. But what about the labor unions? Wouldn't there be a terrific kick from them about bringing in Italian labor?

Answer. Most obstacles could be knocked down. Suppose additional labor were absolutely essential to assure an adequate food supply. Wouldn't that remove some of the objections? Suppose safeguards were thrown up so that in no event could the use of such labor injure the rights or prevailing wages of labor. Wouldn't that help, too?

Question. Does that mean that the Italian labor would be kept entirely out of unionized industries?

Answer. Presumably there would be no need for them in such industries. The need would come in fields from which labor had been drained off to provide for the demands of the armed services and war industries.

Question. Whew!

Answer. Whew! if you like. But while all this is just in the planning stage now, it will come to pass if the war goes on long enough. Depend upon that.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, when we entered the war we had between five and six million aliens in the United States. Since war was declared on September 3, 1939—I believe it was 11 o'clock in the morning by Great Britain, and 5 o'clock in the afternoon by France—more than 480,000, nearly half a million, aliens have been permitted to enter the United States of America. While those 480,000, nearly half a million, aliens from Europe, were coming into this country, our own American boys were being uniformed and sent to the lands of these aliens across the seas to fight for the freedom and the safety sought by the hundreds of thousands of aliens who left their lands and came to our land.

Mr. President, I hardly think that is right. I think able-bodied men of all European countries, whose lands were invaded by the Axis powers, should have stayed at home to have aided in the fighting of their countries' battles, instead of coming to America to bask in the sunshine of prosperity and safety, while our American sons went to their lands to lay down their lives for them.

So it is in connection with the proposed legislation we are now considering. While China is engaged in a death struggle, are we going to encourage the good citizens of China now to leave their country, where they are needed desperately by the Generalissimo himself, and come to the United States in search of gold, safety, and prosperity? I say that any man of China who would come to the United States, who would leave his land when his people are engaged in a death struggle, is not the kind of citizen we want here, because any Chinaman good enough to become an American citizen must be good enough to stay in his homeland and fight in behalf of his country, and therefore, I argue, he would not want to come here.

Mr. President, I have a number of papers on my desk dealing with the proposed legislation, which I could ask to insert in the RECORD, but I shall not do so. I do not want unduly to weigh down the RECORD.

Mr. President, some of the best citizens we have ever had in America are those who came from foreign countries and who were born on foreign shores. Some of the best citizens we have in this country today are naturalized American citizens. They are persons who have come from Poland, from Czechoslovakia, from Yugoslavia, from Albania, and from Greece; there are persons who have come from Estonia; Latvia, Lithuania, and Finland. They are all fine people. Those who are here make wonderful citizens. I know many of them personally. If we are going to let anyone in, let us make a reexamination of the whole question and permit to come in, first, the mothers, and the fathers, and the children, and the mothers, and the sisters of men and women who have previously come to America from Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Finland, Yugoslavia, Albania, Greece, and Czechoslovakia.

I repeat that I know many fine citizens of foreign birth, and I repeat without hesitation that some of the finest citizens we have in America today were born on foreign soil. I recognize the fact that we can assimilate them, and that they make fine American citizens.

Not so long ago, when we had the Connally resolution up for consideration in the Senate, I submitted an amendment to the resolution which would guarantee the freedom and the political integrity of the territory of Poland, Yugoslavia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Greece, and all

other such countries. I did so because I have found that persons who have come from those soils were naturally interested in the political integrity of their home countries, and they are interested in matters relating to those countries. They make good American citizens.

Mr. President, I say that we should stop all immigration now for 1 year after the war, which would afford us sufficient time to make a reexamination and reappraisal of the immigration question, and to study the whole question and find out what groups we can assimilate and what groups we cannot assimilate; what groups we want and what groups we do not want. I do not think anyone would protest against such action.

I now wish to refer to the American Legion. My distinguished friend the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] stated to the Senate in an eloquent address today that the American Legion favored the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act. I read in that connection a portion of an editorial from the Washington Post of Thursday, October 28, 1943, entitled "Immigration," in which the following appears:

> This resolution urges that "all immigration be barred from the United States from the date of the end of hostilities of the present war until employment has dropped to less than 1,000,000."

Mr. President, that is the language of a proposed amendment sent to me today by a representative of the American Legion with the request that I today submit it as an amendment to the pending bill on the floor of the Senate.

The amendment provides that no one shall be permitted to enter the United States as an immigrant in competition with our own American people if we have here unemployed 1,000,000 persons or more. So I offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

> That no immigrant (as defined in section 203, title 8, U. S. Code) shall be admitted into the United States during any calendar year that the number of unemployed persons within the United States is 1,000,000 or more, such number of unemployed persons to be based upon statistics of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I stated a moment ago that since the beginning of the present war more than 480,000 aliens had come into the United States. Some of them, of course, will return to their own countries. But I dare to say that a great number of those 480,000 will remain in the United States. I think we in America should have an opportunity to reappraise the entire situation. I think no one should be permitted to come into this country now as a permanent resident for at least 1 year after the war is over, in order that we may have an opportunity to study and reappraise the whole situation. Therefore, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the pending bill, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read for the benefit of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

> That after the date of enactment of this act, and until the expiration of 1 year after the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President, no immigration visa shall be issued to any immigrant.
>
> SEC. 2. Terms defined in the Immigration Act of 1924 shall, when used in this act, have the meaning assigned to such terms in that act.

It is proposed to amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide for the suspension of immigration of aliens into the United States during the present war, and for other purposes."

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, at the proper time I should like to have the two amendments acted upon.

Mr. President, in conclusion I wish to say that it has been my understanding, based on the information I have received, that a majority of the Members of this body are going to vote for the repeal of the Chinese exclusion law. I shall not ask for a record vote on the measure, but I simply have desired the opportunity to go on record to the effect that I oppose the repeal of the Chinese exclusion law, and that I oppose it because I say it will be the opening wedge. If we permit 105 Chinese, orientals, to come into the United States now it will in my opinion mean propaganda for further relaxation of our laws, and it will mean that in the years to come hundreds of thousands, persons aggregating into the millions, will pour into the United States in competition with the people of our country.

I simply wish to make my position clear on the record, and to state that I find no fault with the opinions held by my brothers here in the Senate who do not see eye to eye with me in the matter. Of course, I naturally dislike to be in the minority, but I have been in the minority so many times that it really does not have a great deal of effect upon me. I take the position I am now taking because it has been my position since I came to the Senate in 1932. I have opposed every bill offered in the Senate to open up the immigration gate, and I have done my best to aid others in defeating a number of bills which were before Congress to open up the American immigration gates, which would result in bringing more competition to American citizens than they have heretofore had.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say on the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from North Carolina.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute submitted by the Senator from North Carolina.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate, and is open to amendment.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I have had the opportunity of being a member of the full committee and of the subcommittee which has considered this measure. I am heartily in accord with the conclusions which have been reached in regard to the matter, and I hope the bill will pass, and will pass now.

Just a moment ago it was suggested that if this bill passes possibly 105 Chinese might come into this country each year, and that it would be better for them to stay in Asia and to fight against our common enemy, the Japanese. It is possible that 105 Chinese might come into the United States in any one year, and it is also possible that all those 105 might be persons who would be eligible for military service in Asia; but even if that be so, those 105 are an infinitesimal number in comparison with the millions of men China has kept in the field in the present fight against oppression and against our totalitarian enemies who would conquer and enslave the world. Consequently, Mr. President, if the 105 Chinese should come in annually, I think that fact would be insignificant in comparison with the invaluable efforts which China is making in the interests of humanity.

The chairman of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], has made such a full statement in regard to the bill that I shall not attempt to elaborate upon it. However, I gladly take advantage of the present opportunity to pay tribute to the highly valuable and constructive part which has been played by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] in these deliberations and in the consideration of the bill. He is making a profound study of the subject of immigration, and I know that his assistance in working out such matters of legislation will continue to be very helpful.

The pending bill simply provides for the admission of 105 Chinese as a maximum, with certain other provisions as to naturalization and other subjects. There are many questions in regard to the subject of limitation of immigration which probably will come up for consideration a little later on. They should have, and I am sure they will receive, the most careful attention of the Senate at the time when they are presented. We cannot now foresee just what our general immigration policy should be, but certainly I should be opposed to opening the doors wide to immigration from any source whatever after the war.

The pending bill is really a much deserved token of our realization and appreciation of the splendid work China has been doing in the fight for freedom. The bill has convincing intrinsic merits. The bill is a very timely one, and I sincerely hope that the action of the Senate will be favorable in regard to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, although I do not have the letter here—if I had I would ask to have it printed in the RECORD in its entirety—I promised the Episcopal bishop of the State of North Dakota to state on the floor of the Senate that he has endorsed the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? [Putting the question.]

The bill (H. R. 3070) was passed.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I feel that it is my duty to revert to some remarks made a few days ago by the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], to which I would have replied at the time if I had been on the floor. I was absent from the floor, at lunch, and I had no notice that during the discussion of an amendment to the Bankhead newspaper bill, which the Senator from North Dakota offered, being an amendment to include radios, he would divert his attention from that matter to a discussion of a personal nature concerning two estimable and eminent gentlemen from my State, which discussion I think was beside the question at the time before the Senate, and in which I think the Senator from North Dakota indulged in unfair personalities. I regret that I have delayed so long in referring to this matter; but, as I stated one day last week, the Senate adjourned from Tuesday, the 16th of November, until the following Thursday, and it was then that my attention was called to those remarks; and I went to the Senator from North Dakota about them, and told him I felt it my duty to call attention to them and to reply to some of the personal criticisms and aspersions which he had hurled at these two gentlemen, but that I wanted to let him know that I felt that way about the matter, so that he could be present. He asked me not to do so on that day, which was Thursday, and said that, if I would not do so, on the following Monday he would deliver an address to the Senate on the subject, that he would submit it to me in advance, and that he would assure me it would be satisfactory to me. So I agreed not to do anything about it until the following Monday.

In the meantime he asked me to mark the paragraphs to which I objected; and what he said about these two Kentuckians was so interspersed in each paragraph of his remarks that I marked all of them as being objectionable. Because of that, I suppose, the Senator refused to comply with his own suggestion that he would make amends or at least would make a satisfactory explanation, and would show it to me in advance.

In the midst of his discussion on the subject of the radio amendment which he had offered, the Senator from North Dakota said this:

> I agree with what so many Senators who spoke yesterday said, that if we are to take care of the small newspapers we should also take care of the small radio stations. If we do not, I believe we shall be in the position indicated by an article which appeared the other day in the Washington Post, apropos of the Bankhead bill to place Government advertising in daily and weekly newspapers. The article was written by Drew Pearson. My judgment is that the most hated man in America today is former Congressman Fred Vinson who, Drew Pearson added, is hated by bankers, cattlemen, oilmen, farmers, railroad labor, and John L. Lewis.

I do not recall that that was an exact quotation from Mr. Pearson's article, which I read; and I do not think it is an exact quotation. Although I think the article Mr. Pearson wrote was on the whole intended to be complimentary to Judge Vinson, because of the courage he had displayed in the action he had taken since becoming Director of Economic Stabilization, I doubt very much if the quotation or reference to it by the Senator from North Dakota was intended to be a compliment.

Personally, I do not know whether Judge Vinson is the most hated man in America or not. I have great doubt about it. I have not taken a census of the American people to determine that; and, so far as I know, a Gallup poll has not been taken of the American people on the question whether Judge Vinson is the most hated man in America and on whether he is entitled to be placed in what the Senator from North Dakota says is a well-known list of Roosevelt haters and lovers. I do not know that Judge Vinson qualifies in either category. I am not certain that he is hated by any of those in the categories to which the Senator from North Dakota has referred; and even if he were, it would have no direct bearing upon his character or his integrity or his courage.

Mr. President, it is always easy for Members of the Senate or others to indulge in billingsgate with reference to anyone who may have done something which displeases them or which they do not like or of which they do not approve.

I have known Judge Vinson for many years. He was elected to the House of Representatives in 1923, succeeding former Gov. William J. Fields, who resigned from the House of Representatives, in which he had represented what was then the Ninth Congressional District of Kentucky, to become Governor of the State.

Prior to that time Judge Vinson had been commonwealth attorney in the district in which he lived. He served in the House of Representatives, almost without opposition, from 1923 until he resigned from that office, upon appointment to the bench by President Roosevelt, some 5 or 6 years ago.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] reminds me of the fact that in 1928, in the Hoover landslide, Judge Vinson was defeated, as were many others from the State of Kentucky and elsewhere, and was out of the House for 2 years, but was reelected at the end of the 2-year term for which he was defeated.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will permit me, that was largely due to the fact that Judge Vinson voluntarily left his own district and left the State in an effort to elect the Democratic nominee for President. For several months during that campaign he served as vice chairman of the regional headquarters at St. Louis, in the effort to elect the national ticket, and so neglected his own district.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator. That is true. He was one of the important managers of the Democratic campaign for President in 1928—the famous Hoover-Smith campaign. He remained out of his own district practically during the whole time until the election, and as a result of his absence and his devotion to the larger phases of that campaign he was defeated; but that was a temporary defeat, because he was overwhelmingly elected at the end of that 2-year period.

In the statement of the Senator from North Dakota, in an effort to ridicule Judge Vinson, he stated that when he came to Congress he was quite ambitious, and that he desired to become a tax expert. I do not know that that is true; but even if it be true, I do not know that it is any discredit to a Member of the House of Representatives to try to learn something about the tax laws of the United States. God knows, there is a need for such knowledge, not only among Members of the House, but also Members of the Senate. If there is even now a man in the Senate or House of Representatives who can properly claim to be a tax expert, he is worth his weight in gold. The subject of taxation is one of the most difficult to understand and master, as members of the Finance Committee of the Senate and members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House know, and as every Senator and every Member of the House knows.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Whether Judge Vinson came to Congress with the idea of becoming a tax expert or not, it is a matter of record that he did become a tax expert and was the outstanding tax expert in the House for several years before his resignation to accept a place on the bench. He was chairman of the Subcommittee on Taxation of the Ways and Means Committee, and as such was the recognized tax expert in the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is correct. I might say also that members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House are elected by a majority of the votes on the Democratic side. I think that a similar situation is true also of the Republican side; but it has been true for many years that in the Democratic caucus members of the Ways and Means

Committee, which in addition to being the committee on taxation is also the committee on committees in the House and distributes all committee memberships for the majority, are elected.

Judge Vinson was elected by a majority of the members of his party to membership on the Ways and Means Committee and served on that committee for a number of years. He was a member of it at the time he resigned to accept appointment to the bench. He was so industrious and assiduous in his devotion to the duties of the position of member of the Ways and Means Committee that he really became, as the Senator from Missouri has said, the outstanding tax expert of the House. He was named as the chairman of the subcommittee on taxation of the House Ways and Means Committee, and played a very important, outstanding, and leading part in the framing of tax bills originating in the House under the provision of the Constitution which requires that they shall originate there.

He resigned that position after many years in the House when offered an appointment to the bench. I dare say that if he had not resigned from that position he would, in all likelihood, still be a Member of the House of Representatives, because he was very strong in his district. He was popular in all parts of the district, which, notwithstanding the aspersion cast at the district by referring to it as a district populated by people who still carry long guns—which is not an exact quotation from Drew Pearson's article, I will say—is one of the most cultured and refined districts in the State of Kentucky or any other State. It is largely an agricultural district. The largest city in that district is the city of Ashland, made up of about 35,000 people. Most of the other towns are typical county seats of agricultural counties.

In that district, in the city of Morehead, is located one of the State teachers' colleges. There are other educational institutions in the district. There is not a more typically American district in the United States than what was at one time the Ninth District and which is now, I believe, the Eighth District in Kentucky, due to a loss of membership under the last census.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator is speaking of the culture of the district which Judge Vinson represented. It is a fact, is it not, that Judge Vinson himself is a graduate—and I believe an honor graduate—of one of the finest, oldest, and best small colleges in the United States; namely, Centre College?

Mr. BARKLEY. Absolutely. It is still one of the outstanding educational institutions of the State. Judge Vinson graduated with high honors and is still regarded by that institution as one of its outstanding graduates.

In the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota he said:

> I do not need to bore the Senate with quotations about "the power to tax is the power to destroy"—

He is referring to Judge Vinson as a tax expert—

> but underlying that ambition—

This is the thing to which I object—

> is a deeper desire, a desire to secure unlimited power without electoral responsibility.

I suppose the same thing might be said, if one wished to draw on his imagination, of any Member of either the House or Senate who became a member of the taxing committee. It would be just as true to say of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] or of myself, or of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], or any other Senator who is a member of the Finance Committee, that we connived at our own appointment to membership on that committee in order that we might gratify a deeper underlying desire "to secure unlimited power without electoral responsibility." No man can become a member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House or of the Finance Committee of the Senate without electoral responsibility. He must be elected to one House or the other in order to be eligible for appointment as a member of either of those committees.

The Senator from North Dakota further stated:

> So now we have Mr. Vinson as the Price and Wage Stabilizer, and he admits freely to arousing the enmity of the farmer, the worker, the oil, the banking, the mining, and the cattle interests of the Nation.

That is the first time I have heard from anyone's lips or pen that Judge Vinson freely admits having aroused the enmity of those groups. I am quite certain that he has not said anything of the kind, and I do not think anyone else, aside from the Senator from North Dakota, has said anything like that about him. Certainly Drew Pearson did not say that he freely admitted having aroused the enmity of those gentlemen.

> Yet if any Member of the Senate were to arouse the hatred of so many groups, he could not possibly return to the Senate.

That is a speculative remark concerning which no one can offer any proof. No Senator ever knows, no matter of what committee he may be a Member, and no Member of the House ever knows whether, after he casts a vote on any subject, he will or will not be reelected to the Senate or the House of Representatives.

I digress long enough to say that it is a poor Representative indeed who, every time he casts a vote upon any great question, has his eyes focused upon the next election. I should dislike to think that all the Members of the United States Senate and all the Members of the House of Representatives, however human we are in our approach to questions, have regard only for the effect upon our reelection to one body or the other.

Mr. President, I wish to say just this about Judge Vinson: No man in public life, or who has been in public life, has enjoyed and now enjoys a greater respect among those who know him and those who have associated with him than does Fred Vinson.

I have not always agreed with Mr. Vinson in matters of legislation. Although he was a member of the Ways and Means Committee and I a member of the Finance Committee, both of us being from the same State, I did not always agree with him in regard to the theory of taxation. I did not hesitate to express my views upon questions of taxation as they appealed to me. I did not expect Judge Vinson to hesitate to express his views in regard to the theory of taxation. Sometimes when he was a conferee on the part of the House and I was a conferee on the part of the Senate, meeting day by day to resolve the differences between the two Houses on questions of taxation, I found myself in disagreement with him, but that did not thereby lessen my respect for him. It did not thereby reduce my regard for his integrity, his honesty, his sincerity, or his courage.

Whatever one may say about Judge Vinson, no one can attack his sincerity or integrity, and certainly not his courage. He did not seek the position which he now holds under appointment by the President of the United States. He was asked by the President to accept it, just as Mr. Justice Byrnes was asked to accept the same appointment, which involved his resignation from the Supreme Court of the United States, a position which I know Justice Byrnes desired, and which he felt highly honored in receiving. But when the President asked him to give up that secure, lifetime tenure in order to do a job for the Government of the United States and the people of the United States in one of our great emergencies, he surrendered that lifetime position and accepted the responsibility as Director of Economic Stabilization. When the President reorganized that agency and made Mr. Justice Byrnes Director of the War Mobilization Agency, the position to which he had been appointed and for which he resigned from the bench was left vacant, and the President asked Judge Vinson to accept that place.

I have never been called upon to settle a question of that sort in my own mind, but I believe that when a man has a dignified, honorable, and lifetime position on the Federal bench and is asked by the President of the United States, or anyone else, to surrender that position in order to accept a temporary appointment of any kind, it places before him a very delicate and perhaps in some cases an embarrassing situation.

Neither Justice Byrnes nor Judge Vinson hesitated for a moment. While neither of them sought the position to which he was appointed, neither of them hesitated when he was called upon to decide whether to render a service to his country in a position that was bound to be temporary or remain in a safe berth on the bench of the United States. Neither of them hesitated to surrender his position on the bench and accept the appointment which was tendered to him by the President of the United States.

While I have disagreed with Judge Vinson, as I have already indicated, and may find myself in disagreement with him in regard to some matters upon

which he has been called to decide as Director of Economic Stabilization, I respect him as a man and as a public servant. I respect him for his honesty, his dignity, and his courage. I am proud to give testimony, if it is needed, in that regard. The only reason that I feel justified in taking the time of the Senate to talk about this matter is that what the Senator from North Dakota has said on the subject is already in the temporary RECORD of the Congress and will be in the permanent RECORD which will be handed down and read by generations yet to come. I am unwilling for the permanent RECORD to go down to future generations without some reply to what I think was an unfair attack upon Judge Vinson in the speech made by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky has already said, much better than I could, what I desired to say. Whether or not anyone agrees with the actions taken by Justice Byrnes and by Judge Vinson in their official positions—and I have disagreed with both of them at times and expect to disagree with both of them in the future—no one but an idiot could possibly question the high motives and the high patriotism of men who, after long and distinguished public careers, had come to judicial positions, and who gave them up under the sole impulse of serving their country in this great emergency. As I say, no one except an idiot, it seems to me, could possibly attack the high courage of those men in the course which they are pursuing. Perhaps they are mistaken, but I am certain that everyone agrees that they are bringing to bear upon their particular positions the best intelligence which their high character and intellect give them.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate what the Senator from Missouri has said, and of course it is abundantly true. I might also add, as I have indicated a moment ago, that I have disagreed with them. I find myself in disagreement now with some of the things which have been done under the Economic Stabilization Agency, but that does not make it necessary for me to doubt the integrity or honesty or good faith of men who have been responsible for those actions.

For a long time I have been on terms of intimacy and friendship with some of those involved in the decisions which have been made, and I am in position to say that while one or two of the decisions rendered by Judge Vinson and Justice Byrnes do not meet the approval of large numbers of men in this country, even they have a high regard for the integrity, honesty, and courage of both of these public servants.

In his remarks the Senator from North Dakota went out of his way also to attack a young man who is in the office of Judge Vinson at the present time, but who was not originally appointed by him. The Senator referred rather sarcastically and in an effort at ridicule to Mr. Edward Pritchard, who happens to be a young man from the State of Kentucky. I think this young man is one of the most brilliant men with whom it has ever been my privilege to come in contact.

Before I ever knew him I had a conversation which I recall with the late Senator from Illinois, Hon. James Hamilton Lewis, who was on his way to Europe in the summer of 1936 or 1937—I have forgotten which. When Senator Lewis returned he said to me, "On my way over I came in contact with a young man who was on his way to England. He had been appointed a Rhodes scholar. I should like to know if you know him." I said, "I do not know. Who was he?" The Senator replied, "His name is Edward Pritchard." I said, "I do not know young Pritchard. I know his father." His father was a State Senator in Kentucky. He was an honorable man and served in the State Senate of Kentucky with distinction to himself and credit to his district.

Young Pritchard was a graduate of Princeton University. Following his graduation from Princeton University he was appointed as a Rhodes scholar. We all know how Rhodes scholarships are awarded. Pritchard was not appointed because of any political pull. I do not believe political pull could bring such an appointment about. He was appointed as a Rhodes scholar because of his outstanding record as a student in Princeton University. He went to Oxford, I believe, and completed his studies under his appointment as a Rhodes scholar.

He returned home and entered the Harvard Law School, of which the present Justice Felix Frankfurter was dean. The Senator from North Dakota seems to cast some aspersion on young Pritchard because he fell under the influence of Justice Frankfurter, who was then dean of the Harvard Law School. I suppose the only way any young American who desired to study law at Harvard could avoid coming under the influence of Justice Frankfurter, then Dean Frankfurter, was to go to some other school. Justice Frankfurter was then dean of the Harvard Law School. The Harvard Law School was probably as popular, as widely known, and as highly favored as the law school of any other university in the United States.

Young Pritchard was a student under Dean Frankfurter at Harvard Law School. He graduated from that law school with high honors. About that time Dean Frankfurter was appointed to the Supreme Court. Justice Holmes and other justices followed the practice of bringing outstanding graduates of the law school to Washington and giving them positions as clerks for a year. I recall many who are now outstanding lawyers in this country who were brought to Washington by Justice Holmes and made his law clerk for a period of a year. Afterward they entered the practice of law. Of course, they regarded it as a very valuable experience. I think that any young lawyer would regard it as a very valuable experience to be law clerk to a member of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Following that example, and knowing Mr. Pritchard, Justice Frankfurter brought him to Washington and appointed him as his clerk for a year. He went from there into various branches of the Government service. He was not appointed by Justice Vinson to the position which he now holds. He was appointed to that position by Justice Byrnes. I do not recall what other place young Pritchard occupied in the legal departments of Washington prior to his appointment by Justice Byrnes as one of his employees while he himself was the Director of Economic Stabilization.

Before Justice Byrnes was made Director of War Mobilization, young Pritchard joined the Army of the United States. I do not know how he got into the Army in the first place. He is greatly overweight. Anyone who has seen young Pritchard knows that he is a very heavy young man for his age. He is greatly overweight. However, he joined the Army because of a desire to render some service in a military capacity. I think the truth is that the Army found it could not train him down to the proper proportions, and it relieved him of service in the Army with an honorable discharge. Pritchard went back to the position which he had held under Justice Byrnes prior to entering the Army.

The Senator from North Dakota has referred to this young man as Judge Vinson's alter ego. I think it is fair to say that Judge Vinson has no alter ego. He is his own man in his own right. I have no doubt that when the Army honorably discharged young Pritchard for the reasons which I have already indicated, and he went back to the position which he had forsaken when he went into the Army, Judge Vinson, who in the meantime had taken over the position previously held by Justice Byrnes, was glad to reinstate Pritchard in the position which he had formerly occupied. I presume that the fact that Judge Vinson had been a schoolmate, although not a classmate, of young Pritchard's father in years past would not militate against his reinstatement in that position; and no invidious distinctions or inferences are to be drawn from the fact that when he came back to his office and found Judge Vinson as the head of the agency, he resumed his duties in that position.

Mr. President, I think it extremely unfair to men who cannot answer for themselves on this floor, or elsewhere, so far as that is concerned, to refer to them as this young man's honorable father has been referred to, as "Old Pritch," and this young man himself as "Young Pritch." That may be in accordance with the logic of events and of senatorial debate and discussion, but I hardly think it is up to senatorial standards.

In the course of his remarks the Senator proceeded to say that "Young Pritch" was never even elected dog catcher. I suppose that is true. Neither was the Senator from North Dakota ever elected dog catcher. I am not even going to say that an atmosphere of such a position as that would find congeniality for the Senator from North Dakota.

None of us here has been elected dog catcher, and if that is a disqualification for rendering important service to the United States, all of us should resign and go back home and run for dog catcher, in order to qualify for membership in the Senate of the United States, or to some other responsible position to which we might aspire.

Mr. President, it is a source of great regret to me that I find it necessary to take the time of the Senate and discuss this matter, but I do it, as I stated, because I am unwilling for the permanent RECORD of the debates of the Senate of the United States to be handed down to generations yet to come with no reference by me, one who has known both these men for many years, in both of whom I have the utmost confidence as to their integrity, their honesty, their good faith and their patriotism, and the courage they manifest in doing things which are unpopular, and which they probably know in advance will be unpopular when they do them.

We can disagree with men without aspersing their character or their honor. Under the rules of the Senate we are not allowed to say anything about Members of the Senate which would be in any way an attack upon their character or their integrity. However, there is no rule which binds us in the same regard with reference to men outside this body who have no opportunity to defend themselves or to speak up when they are attacked.

I am happy and I am proud to have been able to say these things about Judge Vinson and about young Edward Pritchard. I am sure that, regardless of any one's views as to their official actions, those who know them will agree that what I have said about them is true.

Mr. LANGER obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a Senator sitting near me says that I neglected to state, in the course of my remarks, what the late Senator James Hamilton Lewis said about young Mr. Pritchard. I thought I had quoted Senator Lewis. When he returned from Europe, having traveled on the same ship with young Mr. Pritchard, he sought me out to tell me that he found him one of the most brilliant young men with whom he had ever come in contact in all his travels and all his experience. I am sure that every one who has known young Mr. Pritchard will confirm what the late Senator Lewis said about him.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, first of all, I wish to call the attention of my fellow Senators to the fact that nowhere in the entire talk of mine which has been quoted did I attack the honesty or integrity of Mr. Vinson. The record speaks for itself.

The distinguished Senator said a moment ago that upon the Senate floor one may not attack the character of another Senator, and that, I am glad to say, is true; but the distinguished Senator from Kentucky is now trying to extend the rule and, apparently, he does not want me to attack a single employee of the President of the United States.

The Senator says there was not anything said by Mr. Drew Pearson about Mr. Vinson being "the most hated man in America." I have in my hand Mr. Drew Pearson's article.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I will not yield until I get through. I did not interrupt the Senator, and I should rather he did not interrupt me.

Mr. BARKLEY. I said——

Mr. LANGER. I refuse to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota declines to yield, and he has a right to the floor.

Mr. LANGER. I hold in my hand the article in question, and the very heading of it reads:

> Drew Pearson today awards the brass ring and a free ride on the Washington Merry-Go-Round to "the most hated man in Washington"—Judge Fred M. Vinson.

That is the heading.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. LANGER. I refuse to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has been quoting me——

Mr. LANGER. Mr. Pearson proceeds to say in his article, which apparently the Senator from Kentucky never read:

> He has rowed with the farmers, he has earned the undying enmity of railroad labor, he has fought the big oil companies, he has the cattlemen swearing vengeance against him, he has stamped on the toes of John L. Lewis, he has even taken on Harold Ickes.

I did not mention Harold Ickes in my speech. Mr. Drew Pearson goes further and says:

> In this particular fight, Vinson was bucking the big oil companies and the entire oil industry. In another fight, however, he was bucking the coal miners and took just as adamant a stand against John L. Lewis.

Then he proceeds to say in another place—and let Senators decide whether he said this man was hated:

> The most hated man in the United States of America, as far as railroad labor is concerned, is Fred Vinson. Some rail workers actually think that Vinson must have been paid by the railroad executives to block their demand for a wage increase.

Then, coming to the matter of guns in Kentucky, at which the distinguished Senator seems to have taken very great offense, this is what Mr. Pearson says:

> Louisa, Judge Vinson's birthplace, is up in the Kentucky mountains where some people still carry guns, and where some of the judge's friends, in all seriousness, have promised to bring their Winchesters to Washington if he gets in trouble.

With reference to the remarks of the distinguished Senator about Mr. Vinson being a leading tax expert, and nothing being said in the article about that, Mr. Pearson says in the statement that Mr. Vinson "soon became a leading tax legislator."

Again referring to the matter of hatred, Mr. Pearson says:

> Though it hasn't been featured in the papers, Vinson is hated by the big cattle ranchers, even more by railroad men.

The very last paragraph states, in conclusion, as the Senator would have known if he had read the article:

> Vinson feels what he says, lives it, practices it; and, though he may be hated by bankers, cattlemen, oilmen, railroad labor, and John L. Lewis, it will take the President of the United States himself to overrule Fred Vinson.

Mr. President, apparently the distinguished Senator did not read the speech I made on November 12, a few days previous to the one to which he takes objection, so I call his attention to page 9449 of the RECORD.

Of course a great many Senators upon the floor have known me only from the time I came into the Senate, but when I was a boy, when I was out working for a neighbor farmer for a few dollars a month, when I was raised on a little place out in North Dakota, I learned that poor people most of the time have not very many friends. When I got to be about 16 years of age, a neighbor farmer of my father's hired me, even in those tender years, to become foreman of his place and operate it, with a great big crew, on one of those big farms in North Dakota. In those days migratory labor was called by the inappropriate name of "hobos" and "I. W. W.'s."

Mr. President, those men 30 years ago would get out at 4 o'clock or 4:30 in the morning, and they would work until late at night, for $1 a day, or one dollar and a half a day, or two or two and a half dollars a day. Some of those workers came from the great State of Kentucky, as they came from a great many other States. I became acquainted with many of them. When it rained they played poker. I saw those men fight when they had their disagreements, and I got to be a very good friend with many of them.

Later in life I met many railroad men. Mr. President, I say that the treatment these million laboring railroad men in America have received at the hands of the President is a disgrace to the country. It brings me back to the speech I made on the 12th day of November because—and examine that RECORD—I said then:

> During 1942 the railroads handled the greatest volume of freight and passenger business in history, and the business has climbed to still higher levels during the present year. In 1942, revenue freight ton-miles were almost 50 percent greater than in the pre-war peak year of 1929, and passenger business was almost double that of 1929.

Further on I said:

> In spite of the fact that the railroads entered upon the war period with a plant that had suffered from 10 years of business, and from 10 years of subnormal maintenance, they handled, in 1942, about 50 percent more freight business and almost 100 percent more passenger business with about 24 percent fewer employees.

I went on to say, Mr. President:

While the total railroad wage bill in 1942 was only $36,000,000 above that of 1929, the operating revenues of the railroads increased by $1,187,000,000 over 1929. This meant that while 46 cents out of each revenue dollar went for wages in 1929, only 39 cents went for wages in 1942.

However, the revenue freight ton-miles handled per employee—

I call particular attention of Senators to this language:

However, the revenue freight ton-miles handled per employee increased from 269,000 to 502,000, which was an increase in transportation output per employee of almost 100 percent.

Then I proceeded to state:

It was on the basis of this increased labor output, this new peak record of labor efficiency, and these higher operating revenues and higher net profits, which were realized without proportionately higher operating expenses, that the Board—

The Board, mind you, Mr. President, set up by law—

the Board found after 44 days of exhaustive public hearings that the 8-cent hourly increase was warranted by the facts, was justified under the stabilization program, could be met by the railroads without any increase in freight and passenger rates, and was necessary as an aid to the effective prosecution of the war.

Mr. President, although the increase was agreed to by the railroads, although it was agreed to by over a million railroad men, Mr. Vinson set it aside. I have before me the order in which Mr. Vinson set it aside:

In February of this year an emergency board was appointed, under the Railway Mediation Act and Presidential Executive orders, to consider the wage rates of the million nonoperating railway employees. That board, after weeks of hearings and consideration of hundreds of statistical exhibits on wage conditions, reported that the wages of these railway men are far below those of workers in comparable occupations in other industries. On 20 specific occupations there were only 3 where the railway workers are paid more than the lowest outside rates; in 10 of the occupations the lowest outside rate was at least 10 cents an hour above the railroad rate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete speech which I made on the subject of railroad labor's magnificent war record on November 12, 1943, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAILROAD LABOR'S MAGNIFICENT WAR RECORD

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the magnificent record of railroad labor that has so frequently been praised in the Halls of Congress was again recognized by the President's Emergency Board in its report to the President on May 24 with respect to the railroad-wage dispute which has now reached the proportions of a railroad crisis.

Following its comprehensive investigations conducted March 1 to May 7, the Board found that the record of the railroads during the war emergency, including the period of defense activity, has been a magnificent one. In this connection, the Board informed the President that—

"This outstanding performance of the railroads has been the result of the constructive, self-denying, and patriotic attitudes of both the managements and the men. * * * The labor force of the railroads has encouraged and supported every reasonable effort in these directions, has increasingly adjusted its working habits and arrangements to the needs of the emergency situation, and has used its skill and industry without stint in the interest of attaining these objectives. Fundamentally, a spirit of cooperation has vitalized the efforts of the managements and the men. Without free and complete and whole-hearted cooperation between the carriers and their employees the magnificent record of the railroads, as made thus far, could not have been achieved."

It is a most regrettable fact and a matter of grave national concern to find now that this splendid achievement in our Nation's vital transportation industry is being seriously impaired, even dangerously menaced, in this critical stage of our war activities, by the refusal of the Stabilization Director to approve the wage compromise recommended by the President's fact-finding body after such thorough and exhaustive investigations.

The remarkable record of labor productivity in the railroad industry has long been known to the Members of Congress. The long and unbroken record of harmonious industrial relations growing out of the high type of labor leadership in this industry has invoked unstinted praise upon the part of Congress on many occasions. The Railway Labor Act, when permitted to function without interference, has been universally recognized as the most satisfactory labor legislation ever enacted by Congress. In short, the labor productivity, labor harmony, and labor leadership in the railroad industry have long been the ideal that Congress has hoped for in the Nation's industries as a whole.

During 1942 the railroads handled the greatest volume of freight and passenger business in history, and the business has climbed to still higher levels during the present year. In 1942, revenue freight ton-miles were almost 50 percent greater than in the pre-war peak year of 1929, and passenger business was almost double that of 1929.

Due to the economies and deferred purchases which resulted from the 10 subnormal years following 1929, the railroads were called upon unexpectedly to meet these new and staggering war demands with fewer locomotives, fewer freight cars, fewer passenger cars, and with an accumulation of deferred maintenance in both roadway and equipment. The situation was made more difficult due to the fact that material shortages and war restrictions prevented the immediate replacements and rehabilitation of the plant that would otherwise have been made when the tremendously increased war revenues began rolling into the cash drawers of the railroad industries.

But as a result of these war restrictions, the job had to be done by greater effort on the part of management and men with a very limited amount of additional equipment.

Fortunately for the war effort and for the national well-being, it was done and on a magnificent basis. The tremendous contribution made by railroad labor is strikingly shown in the fact that the 1942 peak transportation job was handled by only 1,271,000 employees, which was 390,000 fewer than were employed in 1929 when the earlier peak business was handled by the railroads without the emergencies and the other factors incident to the war transportation job handled in 1942. Fewer men handled a bigger job with less equipment and under more difficult circumstances during the year 1942.

In spite of the fact that the railroads entered upon the war period with a plant that had suffered from 10 lean years of business, and from 10 years of subnormal maintenance, they handled, in 1942, about 50 percent more freight business and almost 100 percent more passenger business with about 24 percent fewer employees.

In the case of the railroad industry and its million and a quarter trained workers, the first critical year of our Nation's war effort was not another unhappy instance of "too little, too late." On the contrary, a greatly reduced number of workers, working with a railroad plant that had suffered from 10 years of undermaintenance, turned out the greatest transportation job in world history and made new records in labor efficiency and productivity.

While the total railroad wage bill in 1942 was only $36,000,000 above that of 1929, the operating revenues of the railroads increased by $1,187,000,000 over 1929. This meant that while 46 cents out of each revenue dollar went for wages in 1929, only 39 cents went for wages in 1942.

However, the revenue freight ton-miles handled per employee increased from 269,000 to 502,000, which was an increase in transportation output per employee of almost 100 percent.

As a result of this remarkable job by railroad labor, the President's emergency board was able to report to the President that, for the year 1942, the operating ratio—the ratio of operating expenses to operating revenues, frequently used as a measure of efficient and profitable railroad business—was more favorable in 1942 than for any other year on record.

It is also true that the 1942 wage ratio, that is to say, the relation of total wages to total operating revenues, also reached a new low when it dropped to the unprecedented ratio of 39.3.

As a result of the record business handled in 1942 with a reduced number of workers, the operating revenues climbed to fantastic peaks. Never before had total operating revenues reached the $7,000,000,000 figure. In the earlier peak year of 1929 they had soared to $6,279,000,000. However, in 1942 they reached the astronomic figure of $7,466,000,000.

This tremendous increase in total operating revenues was not accompanied by a proportionate increase in total operating expenses nor in total wages. As a result of this, the net railway operating income for 1942 climbed to the new high peak of $1,480,940,000.

It was on the basis of this increased labor output, this new peak record of labor efficiency, and these higher operating revenues and higher net profits, which were realized without proportionately higher operating expenses that the Board found after 44 days of exhaustive public hearings that the 8-cent hourly increase was warranted by the facts, was justified under the stabilization program, could be met by the railroads without any increase in freight and passenger rates, and was necessary as an aid to the effective prosecution of the war.

The Board, in reporting to the President on May 29, summed all this up very concisely when it said, on page 98 of its printed report:

"A careful study and analysis of the entire record leads to the conclusion that the correcting of gross inequities requires the recommended wage increases for the 73 classes of nonoperating railroad employees. The increases constitute the minimum adjustments necessary for this purpose. The addition to the wage bill of the railroad industry will not provide a basis for increases in railroad traffic rates or for resistance to justifiable reductions in these rates. The recommended increases are within the existing general levels of production costs in the sense that they

do not provide a basis for increases in railroad traffic rates or for increases in production costs in comparable industries and employments. The correction, by means of the recommended increases, of the gross inequities disclosed by the facts of record is indispensable to the maintenance of the railroad industry in a position that will enable it to aid most effectively in the prosecution of the war."

In the light of these findings on the part of the President's fact-finding board, it strikes me that the Stabilization Director in his arbitrary cancelation of this 8-cent hourly increase, has failed to do the job that he was appointed to do, which is to aid in the effective prosecution of the war, and that he has through his rigid determination to freeze wages actually impaired the war effort.

The crisis in railway labor relations has arisen only because a wage increase found by a Presidential emergency board to be "necessary to aid in the effective prosecution of the war" has been summarily vetoed by Stabilization Director Fred M. Vinson. If the Presidential board, composed of experts in the railway labor field, is right, then Judge Vinson has taken a stand which prevents maximum effectiveness in our war effort.

This conflict between Government agencies demands immediate attention. The importance of American railways in our war production jobs certainly needs no proof. These railroads are not only hauling raw materials—the ore, the lumber, the agricultural products—required to keep the war machine rolling, but they also haul the parts of the semifinished products which must arrive in tremendous volume and on close schedules at every vital assembly and production plant. The finished war materials must get to our seaboard to fit the schedules of overseas transportation. Not just the need for a great total volume of transportation, but also the imperative requirement for efficient and timely transportation of all of our war products rests squarely upon these American railroads.

Before the war emergency, railway staffs were at a minimum level; to meet the demands of the emergency, the railways have had to increase their forces by over 400,000 men. Railway transportation, furthermore, is not only a matter of the number of men and women working for the carriers, but it is also a matter of having enough employees with the necessary skill and experience to provide safe as well as continuous operation of our great railway systems.

To recruit this new army of railway workers and to hold the skilled men already working for the railroads, it is elementary common sense that the railroads must pay wages comparing with some degree of justice to those offered skilled workers in other industries. As a matter of fact, however, railroad wages are and have been far below those paid for similar skills in other industries.

In February of this year an emergency board was appointed, under the Railway Mediation Act and Presidential Executive orders, to consider the wage rates of the million nonoperating railway employees. That Board, after weeks of hearings and consideration of hundreds of statistical exhibits on wage conditions, reported that the wages of these railway men are far below those of workers in comparable occupations in other industries. On 20 specific occupations there were only 3 where the railway workers are paid more than the lowest outside rates; in 10 of the occupations the lowest outside rate was at least 10 cents an hour above the railroad rate. The top rates, in some cases, in outside industries were as much as $1 an hour above railway rates.

It takes no profound knowledge of economics or of human nature to know what has happened under those circumstances. Many thousands of skilled railway workers have gone into other employment. New workers entering railway service for the first time have speedily decided to go into other employment. The Railroad Retirement Board reported that in the year ending July 1, 1943, 1,300,000 employees were hired by the railroads, but 1,210,000 employees were lost. For every 13 men who went to work for the carriers 12 men quit and went elsewhere.

This tremendous turn-over of railway workers is a serious and devastating loss to the railway industry, but it is much more than that. Such a shift in employment is a net loss of major proportions to the total manpower resources of the Nation. The new railway worker, during his first weeks of service, is of little value. Moreover, the training he is being given takes the time of older workers and of railway supervisors, and his lack of skill endangers all his fellow employees. When that new worker, after complete or only partial training, leaves the railroad and goes into other industries, the Nation has lost the man-days or weeks of his own training, as well as the hours of effort expended by older employees and supervisors in that training. Much of this training on the railroad is utterly and completely valueless in any other industry.

That situation is what called forth the recommendation of the Emergency Board, appointed under the Railway Labor Act, that the wages of these railway men should be increased by 8 cents an hour. The Director of Economic Stabilization, in vetoing that wage increase, has made certain that there will be a continuance of manpower shortage on the railways. He has made certain that there will be a continuance of the excessive turn-over. He has guaranteed the continuance of the terrific losses to our inadequate manpower pool that the turn-over in the railway industry has caused. This act by Judge Vinson seems clearly in defiance of the Stabilization Act passed by Congress on October 2, 1942. The Congress has directed the administration so to adjust wages as to aid in the effective prosecution of the war. The administration has before it the decision by a competent board of experts that this wage increase is a war necessity. Judge Vinson, in setting aside this recommendation, has thus violated the clear mandates of the Congress, and has placed a major obstacle in the way of the rapid and successful conclusion of the war.

Mr. President, I make these remarks firm in the knowledge that the public at large has not had made available to it by the public press the true facts which are back of the present effort on the part of the railroad workers to have placed clearly before the people the demands which they make in connection with which a strike vote is now being taken. I deplore the strike vote. I am sorry it had to be taken; but in my judgment I do not know of anything else that the million men laboring upon the railroads could do.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, Mr. Vinson is not giving the railroad men a square deal at the present time. The newspapers only yesterday said that the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] himself went to the President within the last few days in an endeavor to see whether he could not do something about it.

Mr. President, while I was still upon the prairies of North Dakota, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky was a representative from the State of Kentucky. I heard then about this fighting champion of the common people of the State of Kentucky, and naturally I assumed when I came to the Senate that, regardless of friendship, if he found that the President was using someone for a stooge, he would get up and say so.

I say that in this case the President of the United States is not giving the railroad men a square deal, is simply using Fred Vinson, because the record itself shows that one time these railroad men went to the White House and they had made an agreement with the President of the United States, and when they went back at a later date they claim that he would not go through with that deal.

Mr. President, I have before me strong authority. I have here an article published in the Machinist's Monthly Journal. The International Association of Machinists is an organization with a membership of over 600,000. In the Journal is to be found an article—written by whom? It is by General Vice President Eric Peterson. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point, because it corroborates what I have said with respect to the trouble these men have had.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

A RARE AND UNUSUAL CASE

(By General Vice President Eric Peterson)

In spite of protestations to the contrary an economic dictatorship in this country is now an established fact; at least, as far as control over wage rates is concerned. Any doubt that may have existed regarding the absolute power vested in the Director of Economic Stabilization to veto wage increases was erased when the President issued an Executive order October 16, 1943, establishing a Special Emergency Board to report on the claims for wage adjustments of nonoperating railway employees.

Until that order was issued there was some reason to believe that adjustment of wage disputes in the railroad industry was still governed by the Railway Labor Act—legislation responsible for a 20-year record of peaceful labor relations in one of the Nation's most vital industries.

The extraordinary patience displayed by the Nation's railway employees during the 13 months of their request for a wage increase which has been considered by one Government agency after another, has been nothing short of amazing compared with the reaction of workers in other industries when experiencing inexcusable delays in adjustment of wage disputes.

And what is the reward for such patience and efficient and uninterrupted service?

A denial of economic justice.

That is what the President's Executive order of October 16 amounts to. That order is tantamount to a scrapping of the Railway Labor Act, as it relegates members of the Special Emergency Board to the role of puppets.

Of what use is it to appoint another Board to consider the merits of a dispute already passed on by a tribunal which reported its findings after 44 days of hearings, when the Board is specifically directed to make recommendations in conformity with the opinion of the Economic Stabilization Director?

Of what meaning is the language that "the recommendations of the Special Emergency Board in regard to proposed changes shall become effective 15 days after the date of the filing of its report to the President," when it is coupled with the phrase, "unless and except to the extent the Economic Stabilization Director otherwise directs."

Why go through the motions of appointing another board when its members are not free agents?

Why not dispense with the window dressing and bluntly tell the railway employees that the rights guaranteed them under the Railway Labor Act have been junked, and that the whims and theories of one man now rule their economic destiny?

In his opinion of June 30, 1943, the economic dictator blocked the insufficient wage increase of 8 cents per hour recommended by the Emergency Board appointed February 20, 1943, and in so doing completely disregarded the effect its edict would have on the effective prosecution of the war.

He substituted theory for reality when he refused to approve the agreement of August 7, 1943, negotiated with the carriers by the 15 nonoperating organizations.

No amount of theorizing by the director can nullify the following factual statement appearing in the letter addressed July 3, 1943, to the Economic Stabilization Director by Chairman J. L. Sharfman, Railroad Emergency Board:

"The Emergency Board recommended to the President what it deemed to be a fair and reasonable settlement of the dispute, after giving full weight to the requirements of the stabilization program and its authority under that program. On the record before the Board there is not justification for modifying its recommendations. The complete alternation of the basis of settlement suggested in your memorandum opinion would not only result in the perpetuation of gross inequities, as well as in the creation of new ones, but it would remove the adjustment of railway labor disputes from the agencies established by the Railway Labor Act and would thereby jeopardize the procedure and machinery of that act. There is real danger that such an outcome and such an approach would gravely impair the effective prosecution of the war."

In his disapproval of the recommended wage increase the dictator chose to ignore the right of the Board to grant increase in "rare and unusual cases in which the critical needs of war production require the setting of a wage at some point above the minimum of the going wage bracket."

He didn't find it difficult to approve wage increases in excess of the Little Steel formula for the lumber industry of Michigan and Wisconsin, and again in the aircraft industry when the N. W. L. B. on September 24, 1643, after a presentation made by the International Association of Machinists, established for the Boeing plants in the State of Washington a top rate of $1.60 for tool and die makers and a starting rate of 82½ cents per hour for unskilled help, retroactive to March 3, 1943.

The following significant statement appears in the written opinion filed by Mr. William H. Davis, Chairman, N. W. L. B., in support of the Board's award in the Boeing case:

"Boeing's chief worry in holding the relatively large numbers falling within the key classifications of labor grade V stems, however, from the employment opportunities offered to the thousands of workers by the shipbuilding yards within the Seattle area. There the minimum rate for most of the comparable occupational classifications is $1.20 per hour, with maximums for blacksmiths, burners, electricians, joiners, machinists, machine operators, sheet metal workers, welders, and others ranging upward to $1.38 and $1.46, and sometimes to $1.50 or more.

"In the face of these employment opportunities, it will not, in our opinion, solve the special problem that now confronts us, to fix Boeing grade V at the shipyard minimum of $1.20. A rate in excess of $1.20 must be approved if the Boeing workers are to be expected to remain at their jobs and increase their efficiency in these key classifications, rather than turn to outside shops or the shipyards at higher wages."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "The Forgotten Man," written by William Graham Sumner in 1883, and which is recommended reading for Labor Day, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FORGOTTEN MAN

Now who is the Forgotten Man? He is the simple, honest laborer, ready to earn his living by productive work. We pass him by because he is independent, self-supporting, and asks no favors. He does not appeal to the emotions or excite the sentiments. He only wants to make a contract and fulfill it, with respect on both sides and favor on neither side.

He is the clean, quiet, virtuous, domestic citizen, who pays his debts and his taxes and is never heard of out of his little circle. Yet who is there in the society of a civilized state who deserves to be remembered and considered by the legislator and statesman before this man?

The Forgotten Man is delving away in patient industry, supporting his family, paying his taxes, casting his vote, supporting the church and the school, reading his newspaper, and cheering for the politician of his admiration, but he is the only one for whom there is no provision in the great scramble and the big divide.

Such is the forgotten man. He works, he votes, generally he prays; but he always pays; yes, above all, he pays. He does not want an office; his name never gets into the newspaper except when he gets married or dies. He keeps production going on. He contributes to the strength of parties. He is flattered before election. He is strongly patriotic. He is wanted whenever, in his little circle, there is work to be done or counsel to be given. He may grumble some occasionally to his wife and family, but he does not frequent the grocery or talk politics at the tavern. Consequently, he is forgotten. He is a commonplace man. He gives no trouble. He excites no admiration. He is not in any way a hero (like a popular orator), or a problem (like tramps and outcasts), nor notorious (like criminals), nor an object of sentiment (like the poor and weak), nor a burden (like paupers and loafers), nor an object out of which social capital may be made (like the beneficiaries of church and State charities), nor an object for charitable aid and protection (like animals treated with cruelty), nor the object of a job (like the ignorant and illiterate), nor one over whom sentimental economists and statesmen can parade their fine sentiments (like inefficient workmen and shiftless artisans). Therefore, he is forgotten. All the burdens fall on him, or on her, for it is time to remember that the forgotten man is not seldom a woman.

It is plain enough that the forgotten man and the forgotten woman are the very life and substance of society. They are the ones who ought to be first and always remembered. They are always forgotten by sentimentalists, philanthropists, reformers, enthusiasts, and every description of speculator in sociology, political economy, or political science. If a student of any of these sciences ever comes to understand the position of the forgotten man and to appreciate his true value, you will find such student an uncompromising advocate of the strictest scientific thinking on all social topics, and a cold and hard-hearted skeptic toward all artificial schemes of social amelioration.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have before me the cover page of the American Federationist, the official magazine of the American Federation of Labor, William Green, editor. If the distinguished Senator from Kentucky thinks I am ridiculing Mr. Vinson, I suggest that he read the cover page of this magazine, in which William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, talks about Mr. Vinson's assertion that there has been but a 12-percent increase in the cost of living. Every farmer knows better. Every Senator upon this floor knows of scores and scores of items in which the increase in price has been more than doubled. I ask that the article on the cover page of the American Federationist entitled "Vinson's 12 Percent" may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VINSON'S 12 PERCENT

The statement from Mr. Fred Vinson, Director of Economic Stabilization, that a measure of success has been achieved in the effort to hold prices in this war at lower levels than they reached during the first 19 months of the corresponding period of World War No. 1 is undoubtedly true. Under Mr. Herbert Hoover's food price stabilization effort, for instance, eggs rose to $1.25 a dozen, and many will remember how such items as sugar soared.

With Mr. Vinson's assertion that prices have risen but 12 percent since Pearl Harbor, however, there is bound to be dissent. If Mr. Vinson has taken the whole price scale of all economic commodities as his guide, the guide is meaningless. A huge range of items are no longer obtainable and are not being bought by the ordinary mass of consumers at all.

Food, shelter, clothes and fuel are the major items of the working family budget in this country. Prices of food, as every housewife in New England knows, have risen in many instances between 200 and 300 percent. Eggs, potatoes, sweetpotatoes, apples, fruit generally, preserves, fish, vegetables, and many meats are selling at double what they sold for 19 months ago.

Food is the major headache of the average household. It does no good to attempt to tell those who buy it fairy tales about what they are paying, nor does it butter any parsnips to pretend that this matter of food prices can be comfortably buried in any total national price average and still have valid meaning.

True, rents have been frozen in many areas. In many they have not. Clothing likewise is up. The efforts of the Economic Stabilization Director have been commendable in many results obtained. Why exasperate the public with figures which they know to be meaningless in urgent categories of their daily living? (Boston Globe.)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, we come now to the matter of "Young Pritch." I do not know Mr. Vinson. I do not know "Young Pritch." But what I said about him was taken from the newspapers, and I hold clippings from them in my hand. I have here an article which appeared on the 14th day of July in the Washington Times. This is what Mr. Vinson himself said:

Stabilization Director Fred Vinson, former judge, former Representative, native Kentuckian, is "fed up" on stories about Edward Fretwell Pritchard, Jr., his assistant, Harvard

(class of 1935), who styles himself "the future Governor of Kentucky."

Mr. President, there certainly cannot be any disgrace, there cannot be anything wrong in a Senator getting up and saying that Mr. Pritchard aspired to be a future Governor of Kentucky, when the newspaper says that he aspires to be the future Governor of Kentucky. Certainly it cannot be a disgrace to be Governor of Kentucky, because the man who was just elected Governor of Kentucky, Mr. Willis, is well known to me, and is an outstanding citizen, not only of Kentucky, but of the entire United States of America, and in my judgment will make an outstanding Governor of that great State.

The article in the Washington Times-Herald continues:

Rotund Ed, or "Pritch" as classmates remember the 260-pound rosy-cheeked, coal-black-haired extrovert, has been getting the credit for writing opinions for Supreme Court Associate Justice Frankfurter, whose secretary he was. He also got the credit for upsetting the wage board award to the railroad employees and with issuing prematurely the meat roll-back subsidy plan.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the whole article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A YOUNG MAN GOES TO TOWN

Stabilization Director Fred Vinson, former judge, former Representative, native Kentuckian, is fed up on stories about Edward Fretwell Pritchard, Jr., his assistant, Harvard (class of 1935), who styles himself "the future Governor of Kentucky."

Rotund Ed, or Pritch, as classmates remember the 260-pound rosy-cheeked, coal-black-haired extrovert, has been getting the credit for writing opinions for Supreme Court Associate Justice Frankfurter, whose secretary he was. He also got the credit for upsetting the wage board award to the railroad employees and with issuing prematurely the meat roll-back subsidy plan.

Judge Vinson, who roomed with Ed's father at Center College, Kentucky, says:

"I have known my assistant since he was 10 years old. He went to Princeton and later to Harvard. He won honors at both schools. His uncle, Watt Pritchard, was a circuit court judge in Kentucky. The family came to the State in 1800 and has had many outstanding lawyers and judges among them. Personally, I am a cranky sort of individual who stands upon his own two feet. I personally handled the rail wage matter under the hold-the-line order and Judge Byrnes' (Jimmie) stabilization order. It was up to me to review the decision of the emergency panel, and I did. I signed the press release on the roll-back order on meat."

The judge added he wants the record straight on his own protege, who is IV–F in the draft, with a fine memory, a great reader, a brilliant man, extremely sensitive about the "ribbing" he has been getting from all concerned. He added he hopes his statement will close the record on "Big Pritch," who is here to stay as long as needed.

Judge Vinson is a man with tremendous drive. Ed seems to fit in well with one who has such drive. In his 5 years on the bench the judge has been reversed only twice, once in the Viereck case.

Ed's career has been fast and furious. Starting in 1939 with Justice Frankfurter, Ed had just left the LA FOLLETTE Civil Liberties Committee as investigator. He went to Justice Department, then to John Lord O'Brian in W. P. B., next to Justice Byrnes in O. E. S., thence to Judge Vinson. One of Ed's neatest tricks has been to sit in on the sessions of the nine-man advisory committee meeting alternate Fridays at Justice Byrnes' call. On this committee are William Green, Phil Murray, Jim Patton, Eric Johnson, Ed O'Neal, and Ralph Flanders.

Ed has been all ears when the labor boys have spoken, written profuse notes on their remarks. When mere industry or business has spoken Ed has folded his hands across his 3-foot wide chest, looked at the ceiling and closed his John Lewis like eyes. Pritchard got in the War Mobilization set-up about the time Fred Searles went over from W. P. B.

He is a politician of no mean ability. He made himself conspicuous at Princeton by putting the Democratic club in the groove as a vote-getting machine. Until recently Ed was a frequent diner at an inn near State Department.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, certainly all I have said about this man being unable to stand up in the Army is borne out by the newspaper clipping I hold in my hand. The clipping is from the same newspaper, and the article was published on August 28, 1943. It reads in part as follows:

Discharged from the Army after 1 month of service—most of it in Fort Custer Hospital—300-pound Edward F. Pritchard, who once dubbed himself a "barrel," is back in Washington with the opportunity, if he wants it, of returning to his former post as key assistant to Economic Stabilization Director Fred M. Vinson.

Mr President, I also have a clipping from a newspaper published on November 16, 1943. In the column known as the Roundup, the statement was made:

We notice Stabilization Director Vinson's Ed Pritchard and Attorney General Biddle's Herbert Weschler have lunch in a Tenth Street buffet.

Strangely enough, Mr. President, about the same time we find that Hammel's Restaurant, at 416 Tenth Street NW., was the subject of an announcement by District of Columbia O. P. A. officials, described in the following language in a newspaper article:

District O. P. A. officials last night announced a loan of 65,000 meat, fats, and cheese points to Hammel's Restaurant, 416 Tenth Street NW.

Mr. President, I do not claim that Mr. Pritchard used them all, but I simply mention the fact for what it may be worth, and because the distinguished Senator has said that I said some things about him which were not borne out by the facts. Perhaps these newspaper clippings are all wrong, but in any event I have them.

Mr. President, as I said a little while ago, I have not had the experience that some men in public life have had. When I was sent to the Senate, I was not sent here by any political machine to which I owe any allegiance. I do not owe Harry Hopkins anything. He did all he could to defeat me in North Dakota. I desire to say that if there is a man for whom I have the utmost contempt it is Harry Hopkins. I say that Harry Hopkins' presence in the White House at Washington these last months has done more to wreck the President of the United States of America than has any other man. I say I have a perfect right to criticize Harry Hopkins, Judge Vinson, Ed Pritchard, or anyone else, so long as I conscientiously believe they should be criticized.

Of course, Mr. President, my views may change as I go along in life. It may be that after I have been in Washington for 2 or 3 terms, after I have been in the Senate so long that I have forgotten about the common people in my State, after my views change, if they do change, I will take a different attitude. I am not as fortunate as the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky. Why, Mr. President, there sits a great man, a man who has had a variety of experience for years and years and years, a man who is close to the White House, a man who is a right-hand man to the President of the United States, a man who day after day after day is called into consultation by the President of the United States, possibly the most powerful figure in the world today. So it is natural that my viewpoint may be somewhat different from that of my distinguished colleague.

My sympathies are all with the railroad employees. Somehow or other, I found in my experience, slight as it was, as Governor of the State of North Dakota, that the railroads were able to take care of themselves. Perhaps after I have attended some parties given in my honor when I get to be 66 years old, such as the one given the other day for my distinguished friend, I shall have the same viewpoint, too.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a clipping from the Washington Times-Herald for Monday, November 22—a great page headed "Society." Of course, Mr. President, society does not mean anything to me, because it happens that I do not care anything about it. But, Mr. President, I was very much interested in noting that my distinguished friend, whom I respect so much, was entertained by Mrs. Edward Stotesbury and James H. R. Cromwell. They are well-known people—one the widow of a great railroad magnate and the other a man who married the richest girl in the world, Doris Duke. Just see, Mr. President, how this paper says Mrs. Stotesbury was dressed:

Mrs. Stotesbury, whose parties are as few as they are superb, received wearing a gown of heavy black satin that fell into deep shining folds under a jacket of black dotted net. Her six-strand pearl necklace with its diamond clasp matched her diamond and pearl earrings.

Mr. President, some might think it is a remarkable thing for a man, in a few short years after coming to Washington, to be entertained by people of that prominence. But, Mr. President, I was very, very proud of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. It shows us how gallant the southern gentlemen are.

The article continues:

There were so many persons present it was difficult to hear her beautifully modulated voice when speeches accompanied the cutting of a high-tiered cake with one sparkling candle. But we did hear Senator BARKLEY

boasting of his 39 years, interrupted by the lovely lady saying, "You see, Senator, I am proud to say that I am in my eightieth year."

Mr. President, only a man skilled in diplomacy, skilled in the arts of social finesse, could have given such a beautiful reply as the one given by the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky, when he replied—and I quote further from the article:

"Indeed, I don't see," answered the Senator, "but I hope you will live to look it."

Mr. President, it seems to me that Senators from Kentucky become very, very distinguished after they get here, and I imagine I would have to stay here for 20, or 40, or 50 years before I could possibly acquire their social arts; because here is another article, this one published on November 17, telling about the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky. The article is written by a lady called Elsa Maxwell. She said:

Yesterday Senator CHANDLER arrived in town for a few hours and called me up to ask me to lunch. I had already arranged to lunch with Elsie Woodward at the Colony, so I suggested to "Happy," that fiery Kentuckian, to check his toga in the cloak room and join us. Believe it or not, one of our most aggressive, fighting Democratic Senators had never heard of the Colony.

"Honey," said "Happy," "I only want a glass of milk and a chicken sandwich; but I'll certainly pay for you-all, if you'll allow me." So "Happy" came to the Colony and looked on in amazement. What went on there beat anything he'd seen on Capitol Hill. He was very interesting. He's a great guy—though he did spill the beans a bit too freely, so some think, after his return from the tour of England and our foreign battle fronts with his four colleagues.

I think "Happy" is an honest man, and I think he is pro-American—which really doesn't make him anti-British necessarily. He voted for the war—though he's opposed completely to the New Deal. He voted for the Army. He voted for Lend-Lease. And he backed Tom Connally to the hilt on his resolution which included the Moscow Pact.

So when "Happy" tells me that MacArthur had only 60 bombers to drive out the Japs in his present campaign, as compared to the 1,000 we use on a single raid in Europe; that Generals Chennault and Stilwell had only 90 bombers to bomb the Japs from their Chinese bases, it gives you an uneasy feeling at the bottom of your spine.

"Happy" swears by everything he holds holy that we are not getting enough supplies or planes to China, nor materials to fortify our Chinese bases. If this is true, I, for one, think it should be brought out into the open—immediately, if not sooner. Anyway, Senator CHANDLER thought the Colony a most unusual place. Maybe the Colony thought the Senator a most unusual man. At any rate, I think he's the "cat's whiskers!"

Reverting to the statements made by the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the official statement issued by Fred M. Vinson, signed by him as Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, X-22591, dated November 8, 1943. O. W. I. release 2694, in which he delivers an opinion in the nonoperating railway employee wage adjustment case.

Mr. President, I repeat that, reared in humble circumstances, and proud of it, I was sent here by the people of my State, the farmers, the laborers, and the small businessmen, to represent the interests of the common man. Whenever in my judgment, under my oath, I feel that anyone, whether he be appointed by the President of the United States or not, has acted improperly, it is my duty to object. A group of 1,000,000 men obeyed the law and went before the very boards which the law created. Many weeks were consumed in taking testimony, and the railroads and the workers did the unusual thing of agreeing. They have been to the White House, as they say, and at one time the President himself agreed. I say that I speak in their behalf when I object to a man like Fred Vinson coming along and setting aside that agreement.

I like the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. He did me the courtesy of saying to me a few days ago that he objected to the talk to which he directed the attention of the Senate this afternoon. I appreciated it. But, Mr. President. I wish to call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky to the fact—so far as I know—neither my distinguished colleague [Mr. NYE] nor I—certainly not during the time I have been in the Senate—has ever been discourteous either to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky or to any other Member of this body. I said to him at that time that if he would point out any part of the talk to which he objected, I should be glad to verify it, and would rise on the floor of the Senate and correct it if it were not true.

To repeat, I am not attacking the honesty or integrity of Judge Vinson. I am availing myself of my constitutional right—nay, doing my duty—to call the attention of the American people to the fact that 1,000,000 men carried out the law of the land and agreed with the railroad executives, and that that agreement was set aside by one stroke of Vinson's pen. In their behalf I object. Certainly there is no other place to which I could go, no other place where I could call the matter to the attention of my fellow Senators. As I view it, I simply did my duty as I saw it, according to my conscience. I have no quarrel with any other Senator, no matter how he may feel upon this or any other subject.

Let me repeat that I do not know Judge Vinson. I do not know Mr. Pritchard. I have seen John Lewis only once in my life, and that was many months ago. I simply tried, as I got the stories from the newspapers, to make an honest presentation of the question upon the floor of the Senate. I do not know of a single word which I used to which any Member of the Senate could honestly take exception. I can readily understand how badly the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky feels. Those men are friends of his. He has known them for a long time. He likes them. But Mr. President, I have found in public life that when one assumes a public office and takes the oath to be a trustee for the people the time may come when his very best friend and he may have to part company.

I like to picture in my mind that bold, fighting champion of the people of Kentucky personified by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky 10 or 15 years ago, when we used to read about him in the newspapers out West. I repeat, I like him. I respect him; and, Mr. President, if I were in serious personal trouble I would as soon go to my friend the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky and lay my trouble honestly and squarely before him as to go to many others who here in Washington call themselves my friends.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the only part of the Senator's remarks to which I wish to advert is that part in which he referred to a social occasion in my honor on last Sunday.

It is incredible to me that a Member of this great body should seek, by that cheap sort of device, to create a prejudice against me because a very charming lady saw fit to give me a birthday party on last Sunday.

Mrs. Stotesbury is 80 years old, she says. I have no reason to doubt it, except that she does not look it. She is one of the most gracious, kindly, and bighearted women it has been my privilege to know. Everyone who has ever come in contact with her testifies to that characteristic. I do not know anything about her wealth or lack of wealth. I never inquired about it from anyone. I do not know why she cultivated a friendship for me which would actuate her in giving me a little birthday party; but I will say to the Senator from North Dakota that I am proud that she thought that much of me. There is no favor on the face of the earth that she ever asked of me. There is no favor on earth that I could grant to her. She does not need me for anything. It is a beautiful thing now and then for a charming American woman who has nothing to ask of anyone, who has no reason to expect any reward for her friendship, to provide an hour or two of entertainment for friends of all kinds, rich and poor, in honor of someone whom she happens to respect.

I am very proud of my friends, whether they be rich or poor. I can say, for the benefit of the Senator from North Dakota, that while in my 30 years' experience and service in Congress I have enjoyed the friendship of many men and women, no friendship that I have ever enjoyed, and none that I ever expect to enjoy, has ever influenced or will ever influence me in the slightest degree in the performance of my duty as a United States Senator.

I can say also to the Senator from North Dakota that since I have been in public life I have not made a race for any office in which I was not enthusiastically endorsed, supported, and worked for by hundreds of thousands—even millions—of working people in the United States, including railroad employees and all other kinds of employees. I am satisfied that when my record has been examined in the minutest degree and has been combed by a fine-tooth

comb, no one who is a friend of the American workingman will fail to find that I have been uniformly his friend and supporter. I repeat that I deeply appreciate the gracious gesture of courtesy extended to me by a charming woman who has no axes to grind and no favors to ask. She would be the last woman in America to expect me to advocate or to oppose anything in the way of a public measure or public policy simply because, out of the kindness of her heart, she honored my birthday a few days ago.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that regardless of its aspect so far as I am personally concerned, the Senator from North Dakota was deliberately striking below the belt when he by inference attacked a good woman in this city for showing me the courtesy of a little entertainment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not desire to prolong this debate, but I do desire merely to emphasize, by underlining, what seems to me to be the crux of the matter, contained in an admission by the Senator from North Dakota, after his invidious remarks about Judge Vinson made the other day and repeated today. The Senator from North Dakota wound up with the admission that he did not know Judge Vinson. I think he said he had never seen him. He certainly demonstrated, in his two effusions on this floor, that he does not know anything about Fred Vinson. I think that that statement alone, Mr. President, can stand as an answer to the abuse of Judge Vinson by the Senator from North Dakota. I think the fact that he does not know Judge Vinson, and that he does not know anything about him, will certainly not stand in the future against the repeated expressions of esteem, admiration, and affection which have been made many times, both by those at the other end of the Capitol and by those at this end of the Capitol, as well as by those in executive positions who have known Judge Vinson, who know his high character, his great ability, his great public spirit, and the willingness for sacrifice which he exhibited when he accepted his present position.

It so happens that I do not agree with Judge Vinson on one of the matters presently in controversy which has to do with the railroad wage dispute. I believe he is wrong. But, I certainly do not intend to sit silent on this floor and hear Judge Vinson abused over a matter involving a difference of opinion on a great public question.

Mr. President, I assume it is not necessary for any Member of this body to express the opinion which all of us hold, with possibly very few exceptions, concerning the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the distinguished majority leader. I think it was highly improper—I am expressing my own personal opinion as a Senator on this floor—I think it was highly improper for the Senator from North Dakota to undertake during the discussion of a matter having to do with something else, to besmirch and belittle the Senator from Kentucky because of a gracious social act on the part of a lady who happens to reside in this town in paying honor and tribute to the Senator from Kentucky on his birthday. The Senator from Kentucky does not need any defense from me or anyone else. As one individual Senator I wish to express my indignation over dragging into such a debate as this a pleasant social occasion in honor, very justly and very kindly, of the birthday of the Senator from Kentucky.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for promotion and temporary appointment in the Army of the United States; and

Sundry officers for promotion or appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until next Monday at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, November 29, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, November 25 (legislative day of November 18), 1943:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Erline R. Scruggs, Coffeeville.
Willie Mae Hancock, Ethelsville.
Averell L. Purvis, Spring Hill.

ALASKA

Lew M. Williams, Wrangell.

CALIFORNIA

Ella S. Anderson, Auberry.
Gladys E. Beard, Yountville.

CONNECTICUT

Charles J. Schmid, Amston.
John T. Collins, Poquonock.
Dorothy E. Wilkinson, Tariffville.

DELAWARE

Anna A. Anderson, Ocean View.

FLORIDA

Eva R. Vaughn, Century.
Thomas M. Crouch, Fort White.

IDAHO

Charles I. Bartlett, Craigmont.

ILLINOIS

Fred M. Johnson, Jonesboro.

INDIANA

Harold W. Barker, Cayuga.

KANSAS

Fern T. Fencl, Haddam.

MAINE

Frances F. Quinn, Ellsworth Falls.
Hollis M. Smith, Mount Desert.
John M. Perkins, Sherman Station.
Thelma B. Mahar, West Pembroke.
Ina S. Knight, West Scarboro.

MARYLAND

Florence K. Hazard, Branchville.
Eleanor S. Canter, Charlotte Hall.
Aquilla Streaker, Daniels.
Esther M. Dennis, Willards.
John H. Dwyer, Worton.

MISSISSIPPI

Fred G. Martin, Dorsey.

MONTANA

Geneva Heath, Wilsall.

NEW MEXICO

Dave G. Cliver, Santa Rita.

NEW YORK

Ruth Larsen, King Ferry.

NORTH CAROLINA

E. Burke Gunter, Hamlet.

OREGON

Clare M. Sawyer, Drain.
Mildred B. Croner, Oakridge.

PENNSYLVANIA

Joseph A. Barnes, Ardmore.
Laura C. Blatt, West Leesport.
Millie E. Moore, Westover.
William B. Snyder, Windsor.

VIRGINIA

Edith E. Payne, Falmouth.
Mildred K. Smith, Sterling.
Percy Bradshaw, Zuni.

WASHINGTON

Lila Luella Henry, Bow.
Nancy J. Nance, Brush Prairie.
Josephine F. Johnson, Endicott.
Thomas W. Tait, Gig Harbor.
Ruth F. Walters, Moxee City.
John T. Scott, North Bend.
Theo V. Steele, Port Gamble.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, before whom the angels gather in praise and adoration, we bow in the glow of our national Thanksgiving Day; bless everyone with the mercy of a grateful heart; open the floodgates and let a great tide surge through our breasts. Thou art unto us the one clear place of refuge amid the ruined systems of this world, haunted by hate and revenge.

Thou who didst lead our fathers to these shores that they might lay here the foundations of a civil and religious liberty, bless to us the glorious heritage of faith and freedom which we have received from them. Preserve Thou the Nation which was established by their prayers, heroic deeds, and sacrifices. Help us to be true to the great ideals for which they stood and may our country ever be the home of justice, liberty, and true brotherhood. Defend it against every peril and may it be increasingly a blessing to all the world. In the name and spirit of our blessed Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, November 24, 1943, was read and approved.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to find out, if I can, what the program will be for next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no program for next week except that on either Monday or Tuesday there are some bills from the Committee on the District of Columbia to be considered. If the chairman of that committee desires that the bills be considered on Tuesday instead of Monday I hope the House will give unanimous consent that that be done. I understand he intends to bring up three noncontroversial bills. I do not know specifically what the bills are, but last Wednesday he told me there were three bills he wanted to bring up next week.

Outside of that, there is no legislation to be considered next week other than noncontroversial matters, for whose consideration unanimous consent may be sought, but I have no knowledge of any such now. However, those things develop from time to time. Of course, for a bill to be considered by unanimous consent it must have a unanimous committee report, the minority members must be agreeable to taking it up for consideration, and the minority leadership must be agreeable to it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Dorothy Thompson, and further to extend my remarks and include a brief article from Time magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SELECT COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 369), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the study and investigation by the select committee created by House Resolution 21, not to exceed $50,000 in addition to sums heretofore made available, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order of 15 minutes today. I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 10 minutes in which to answer the turkey dinner smear articles that were put in a Washington paper and a Detroit paper, one by Helen Essary and the other by Blair Moody.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Arthur Krock that appeared in the New York Times November 18, 1943, in regard to the Kefauver resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a story on Nebraska issued by the State of Nebraska, regardless of the length of the article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Lee Carson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LEND-LEASE AND NYLONS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the administration of Lend-Lease has perpetrated many sins of commission and omission, and the more that I see personally of the operation of that particular body, the more I feel that it should be investigated very thoroughly.

May I quote from Cedric Adams, commentator of the Minneapolis Star-Journal, from his column, In This Corner, of Friday, November 19:

This sort of thing makes you wonder. Mrs. R. F. Ross, of Walker, Minn., has forwarded a copy of the Auckland Star, a daily newspaper published in New Zealand. And the following excerpt is what hits us in the

eye: "Thousands of pairs of nylon stockings will be on sale in Australia within the next 3 months. Supplies are being sent from America under the lend-lease agreement with the United States and will be released through the clothing commission."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein excerpts from an address by Mr. Paul Bellamy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, charges have been made repeatedly on the floor of the House that the Corn Belt farmer is hoarding corn to the disadvantage and discrimination against poultry and egg producers of other sections of the country. I deny this allegation.

I now charge unfair discrimination against the Corn Belt farmer, in that now there are no ration points on poultry or eggs, while the Corn Belt farmer has a heavy ration point placed on his product.

Sixteen ration points per week per person consumes but very little beef, pork, lamb, all meat products, butter, and cheese. While at the same time, you can buy all the poultry and eggs you want without any rationing points.

No wonder the packers' refrigerators are overloaded and are now asking the farmer to hold his hogs from the market. No wonder everyone is getting tired of chicken and are hungry for a real steak or ham steak—yes, even a good hamburger, but you will have to take an egg sandwich instead.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks, including two letters, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests. I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein an article concerning cotton, and another to extend my own remarks and include therein a letter by L. Welch Pogue written to me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, today, the first day after this Thanksgiving, I am not thinking and criticizing my Government for each and everything that anybody who is opposed to it for a partisan purpose may do, but I am thinking of the American Army, the men of the American Army and the American Navy who yesterday and the day before won great victories for their country.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and for permission to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, while I hold no brief for the whisky drinkers of the United States, my attention has been drawn to the fact that the Senate subcommittee is investigating a real, or alleged, shortage of whisky in this country.

I am no expert in the distillation of whisky, nor am I learned in the science of chemistry, but I have been reliably informed that most of our domestic whisky is made up of 40 percent aged whisky and 60 percent ethyl alcohol.

The shortage of whisky is alleged to be due to the fact that all of the distilleries in the United States are now producing industrial alcohol for war purposes. It is made from sugar, sirups, or cereals. The cost of this alcohol, I understand, runs as high as 80 or 90 cents a gallon.

Canada is producing the same alcohol from waste sulfite liquor, a byproduct of the pulp mills, at a cost of 16 cents a gallon. When the Canadian alcohol plant was opened, I am informed, a big celebration was held, and the alcohol produced in this plant formed the principal ingredient of a beverage served at a large cocktail party. A few drops of juniper juice added to a gallon of alcohol, I am informed, makes a fair grade of bathtub gin.

It does seem to me that inasmuch as we have a superabundance of this waste sulfite liquor in the United States, it would be an act of common sense and prudence to convert it to alcohol and save the grain for other purposes; especially in view of the fact that the War Production Board has been considering for nearly 2 years an offer made by a reputable company to produce alcohol from waste sulfite liquor at a cost of approximately 18 or 20 cents a gallon. Why should we pay 80 cents a gallon, when we can buy it at 18 cents a gallon?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address delivered by my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] on the 12th of November.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include some brief editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks with respect to veterans' legislation recently enacted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks briefly with respect to a correction in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include two short editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include an article by Dr. Will P. Kennedy, of the Washington Star, with reference to the first meeting of Congress in Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain editorials and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HON. FRANK KNOX

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this moment to pay my respects to and to express my admiration for our Secretary of the Navy, Hon. Frank Knox. In 1940, when he was requested to accept the post of Secretary of the Navy, in accepting he said:

> It makes little difference what happens to me, but what happens to our country makes all the difference.

I shall not be able to add to his fame or raise him to a higher place in the deserved estimation of his fellow citizens, but I shall be able to answer to a call of duty on my own part when I rise to speak my own mind, and this I do now, asserting that in my opinion there is not a man in America who exceeds or excels him in degree or quality of patriotism or love of country.

If it has been necessary, or has had such an effect, he has buried every personal consideration or hope of political preferment that he might serve his country. I honor him for this, and he de-

serves the gratitude and good will of every American citizen.

THE LATEST BOOK: ONE MAN—WENDELL WILLKIE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, honest Americans at home, as well as soldiers in the field, will be shocked to read a book just out called One Man—Wendell Willkie, an exposé of the criminal rigging of the Republican convention at Philadelphia in 1940.

It was written by a leading Ohio Republican, Hon. C. Nelson Sparks, of Akron, former mayor of that city.

It reveals the greatest saturnalia of fraud, bribery, and corruption in the history of American politics, one that makes the Teapot Dome scandal look like a Sunday school affair.

It should be investigated by Congress at once, preferably by the United States Senate, since it not only refers to certain Senators who were leading candidates for the Presidential nomination and were the victims of the Philadelphia debauchery, but it also reveals a scheme to use the corrupt Willkie machine to purge, in the Democratic primaries next year, certain Senators whom those racketeers cannot bluff, bribe, or intimidate.

If these revelations are permitted to go unnoticed by the Congress of the United States, it will be notice to the world that political morality in America has degenerated to the vanishing point.

ONE MAN—WENDELL WILLKIE

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLEAN. I have asked for this 1 minute in order to ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] if it is not likely that there may be just a little partisan prejudice in his emotions at this moment.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLEAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say in response to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN] that there is not. I am merely quoting the words used by a leading Republican from Ohio who is telling about the bribery and corruption at the Republican convention that nominated Willkie at Philadelphia.

Mr. McLEAN. That is an answer. Nobody would ever suspect there would be any partisan thought in the mind of the enthusiastic gentleman from Mississippi when a matter of this kind arises.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say to the gentleman that I was quoting a leading Republican who was shocked at the way Willkie was forced onto the Republicans by a corrupt machine.

Mr. McLEAN. You have answered my question.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that Friday is not a proper laundry day.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD and show to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN] that this is a Republican leader of Ohio, who wrote this book, One Man—Wendell Willkie. This book may not be the best seller, but it certainly ought to be classed as the "worst smeller," as a result of the rottenness it turns up.

I hope the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN] will read it, for I am sure he would not condone the outrageous practices resorted to by the Willkie machine at Philadelphia.

Mr. KNUTSON. I renew my point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial on silver.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE REVENUE ACT OF 1943

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized.

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to an article that appeared in the Washington Post this morning, which is very unfair to Chairman DOUGHTON and the Committee on Ways and Means. I regret that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] is not here, because I think he could do a better job of skinning than I can. Unfortunately, he is absent from the city over the week end, being at his home in North Carolina. His work in preparing and passing the tax bill justifies the high esteem in which he is held in this House and by the country.

Anyone who knows the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] knows that he would not lend himself to slipping over jokers in any bill that comes from his committee. The article in the Post insinuates that this was done. Ordinarily Bob Albright, the author of this article, is very well informed and fair, but in this instance he has taken an unfair advantage and, in addition, has written an article that is not accurate nor historically correct. The article that I am referring to is headed "Revenue bill accounting joker makes labor howl—Green protests House requirement for yearly union financial report."

In the body of the article I read:

The American Federation of Labor detected the sleeper too late to block it in the House, but President William Green filed a protest with House Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

Further on in the article this statement is made:

There was ample indication the Ways and Means Committee knew what it was about and it was determined to get at union profit data for possible future tax purposes.

What are the facts? This particular item in the tax bill that we passed on Wednesday was considered by the Committee on Ways and Means on three different occasions, and after each meeting where we considered this particular section of the bill the chairman, as is his custom, held a press conference and in his conference he stated to the press—and I call upon the members in the press gallery to bear me out—the chairman frankly and openly stated to the press that the section in the revenue bill compelling all organizations to file financial returns of receipts and disbursements with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue included all organizations save religious and educational. Asked by Bob Humphreys, of I. N. S., if it included labor unions, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] said it did.

In this connection it may be pertinent to state that on November 19 the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman DOUGHTON, accompanied by several members of the Committee on Ways and Means, appeared before the Committee on Rules at a public hearing to ask for a rule to govern consideration of the revenue measure in the House 5 days later. Let me read from the record of that hearing. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], a member of the Rules Committee, was interrogating.

Mr. HALLECK. On page 28, section 112 speaks of returns by organizations exempt from taxation. What kinds of organizations will file those?

Mr. KNUTSON. I believe every kind except religious and educational.

Mr. HALLECK. How about labor unions?

Mr. KNUTSON. They will file. The purpose is to make them file returns so that we can see what the intake and outgo are. It is for our guidance in the future. There is a loophole there that should be closed.

Mr. Speaker, at least a half dozen newspapermen covered this hearing. Members of the House, I submit that this short excerpt from the committee hearings utterly refutes all insinuations that anything was "slipped over." If anything it would indicate that someone was asleep at the switch.

It is unfortunate that the Post was not aware of what had transpired, because I want to assume that the Post seeks to be fair. There was nothing hidden, neither did we try to hide anything. The press was kept fully informed of every move that we made in executive session, and any unbiased representative in the press gallery will bear me out in that statement. It is strange that Mr. Green did not know what was going on in the committee as other labor organizations did.

My only purpose in taking the floor is to refute this story because it reflects upon one of the most lovable and one of the most useful, honorable, and upright men in this House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. The letter that is referred to was sent with the request that it be communicated to the Members; and the gentleman knows that in my remarks I said:

I am in receipt of a letter from William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, protesting against the provisions of section 112 of the pending bill. Any views or opinions of Mr. Green are always worthy of deep consideration. We all admit that.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; and they usually come by freight. Go ahead.

Mr. McCORMACK. I further said:

This letter states the position of the A. F. of L. in opposition to section 112. In the event that the Senate amends section 112 in a manner satisfactory to the A. F. of L. I know the contents of this letter will have the serious consideration of the House conferees when the bill is in conference.

I was surprised myself when I read that statement this morning.

Mr. KNUTSON. It was entirely uncalled for and unfair.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly, and if any mistake is made it is an honest mistake and in the regular legislative processes we will be able to correct it. I join with the gentleman from Minnesota in his expression of proper, courteous, and respectful resentment at the implications contained in the article.

Mr. KNUTSON. Let me say to the majority leader that no mistake was made. We only did what should have been done 20 or 30 years ago.

GEN. GEORGE S. PATTON

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, much as I deplore the treatment of a shell-shocked veteran in a hospital by Lt. Gen. George S. Patton, I deplore almost as much the overemphasis and the publicity given to this episode 3½ months later which can only undermine the morale of the people back home and interfere with the greatest need of all, which is unity in winning this war. In the stress of modern war a general's nerves may become frayed the same as those of men in the ranks. It is not for us on the home front to attempt to indulge in back-seat driving and criticize those who are responsible for winning victories. I know General Patton personally; I have seen him with his troops. I believe he is the greatest fighting officer in the Army of the United States, and the Lord knows we need fighting generals. He has apologized to the individual, he has apologized to the staff of the hospital, he has apologized humbly to his entire division. What else do you want? I say to you that there is no greater, two-fisted fighting man in our Army, and I hope there will be no more publicity in the press and magazines because it can only be harmful. I should like to see this matter left to the military authorities and not paraded in the newspapers in the interest of national unity, Army morale, and winning the war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a resolution of the League of Iowa Municipalities at a meeting in Iowa City on November 5 last.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE] is recognized for 45 minutes.

THE O. P. A. RULES AND REGULATIONS

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, it has been said to me on more than one occasion that the Well of this House is a place of danger. I am sure my friends who so advised me were acting in good faith and were giving first consideration to my political well-being. I was impressed with their statements concerning the high political mortality rate of those who in the past had frequented this place in which I stand. A single terse sentence made here, though with good intent and faith, can prove to be the political death sentence of its author. So, being fully apprehensive of this danger, I subject myself to its utmost possibility. Imbued with temerity because the inalienable right in the pursuit of happiness of one of my constituents is threatened and the power of the great deliberative, legislative body is challenged, I bring to your attention today a matter of grave importance.

I quote the preamble of Food Distribution Order 27:

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by Executive Order 9280, dated December 5, 1942, and to assure an adequate supply and efficient distribution of meat, beef, veal, pork, lamb, and mutton to meet war and essential civilian needs, it is hereby ordered as follows—

Thereafter follows more than 3,000 words of definitions and restrictive prohibitions based on sanitary procedure and previous records for the small slaughterer and farmer.

Now, acting under the authority of this order, an area supervisor sent the following registered letter to my constituent to whom I have heretofore referred, and I quote:

The evidence which you have submitted in support of your slaughter quota base, as set out in your application for a permit, has been carefully reviewed. Upon consideration of this evidence, it has been found that it is insufficient to justify a quota base, and accordingly you are hereby notified that your permit has been recommended to the War Food Administration, Regional Office, Chicago, Ill., for cancelation. If the regional director concurs with this recommendation, you will be notified as to the effective date of cancelation. If you wish to appeal from this decision, you should file your appeal in triplicate with the County War Meat Committee, and it will be forwarded to the appropriate person for action.

Mr. Speaker, that letter has blasted into smithereens the hopes, the aspirations and the future of a man and his family just as surely as if he and his family were in the path of this modern age's most devastating military machine of destruction. That statement may seem a little far-fetched, but I would call to your attention the words of an English writer that "freedom and life are coexistent."

I fully appreciate the emergencies and the exigencies of a war program require hard and drastic rules, but a true and effective war effort can never be realized with the wheels of justice out of balance or the gateway of reasonable freedom to the people locked shut by a non-understanding fixed authority.

This constituent to whom I have referred is symbolic of the true character of generations past which have acquitted themselves with real credit for constructive effort in the historical progress of this great Nation. He is but one of millions who feel the heavy heel of a hindsight hierarchism superimposed over the traditional and regular lawmakers of our country.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you something about this man and his family. He was born on a farm and was one of a third generation of farmers, of which none lived more than 10 miles from the largest city of my district. In 1923 he married and rented a farm of 90 acres, which had a small acreage of woodland and pasture. From his boyhood days, he had helped slaughter cattle and pigs raised on their farm. This experience afforded him means to supplement meager earnings on the small farm where he, together with his good wife, began their family life. Five years later they moved to a new rented farm of twice the acreage. While on this second farm, he learned it was profitable to both buy and raise cattle to fatten and slaughter the suitable ones in the winter months. He also built up a meat route among his neighbors and friends in the nearby city and towns. His business grew and he moved to the third farm to increase crops, pasture and herds. He was then in position to buy a carload of cattle from the great arid plains of our western country, and also bring truckloads at times from the neighboring State of West Virginia.

He relates to me that he could put from 300 to 400 pounds of weight on each of these cattle by turning them into the rich pasture of Ohio lands and by further supplementing this pasturage with grain and ensilage in the autumn of the year.

On this larger farm he built himself a small storeroom on the main highway where he sold his meat in the winter season. In 1940 an opportunity came to him to rent a farm of 700 acres. The indomitable spirit of this man accepted hard, clean, honorable work as a challenge.

His family was growing and he had high aspirations for them. This new farm had facilities which broadened and straightened the highway to his conception of life's objectives. I quote from a letter to the Director of Food Distribution, of November 18, 1943:

It was my intention in moving on this Mason farm, to use my previous experience in conducting, with my son and a neighbor, a unified farming operation. I had accumulated some farming machinery and I acquired a sufficient amount of additional ma-

chinery to operate this farm successfully. The lease gave us limited possession of the Mason farm in the fall of 1940. I hired a man to look after the buildings from the fall of 1940 until the spring of 1941 when I moved from the smaller farm to the Mason farm. There was a building on the Mason farm admirably suited by proper improvement, to the slaughtering operation. This building was about 100 feet long and 20 feet wide, with an exterior of tile and concrete. It needed a concrete floor. During the summer of 1941 whenever time could be spent in doing so, my son and I, with the aid of a neighbor boy, worked in adapting this building to the meat business. We mixed the concrete necessary to make a concrete floor in the building; we hired a plumber and brought a pipe from a spring so there would be fresh water on the floor of the slaughter house; we built drains from the floor to a septic tank to take the offal; we built an overhead track in the building; and installed the necessary equipment for conducting a meat business during the winter months. Such an operation is known locally as frost butchering. We also equipped a small storeroom from which the meat could be sold.

After entering into this lease and performing the hard work necessary to do what he considered his part during the days and years of this Nation's severe trials, the heavy hand of our inner supergovernment fell upon him.

Let us see what his outlook was in going to this larger farm. I quote his words—page 4 of said letter:

With a well-balanced herd on this farm, which would not overtax the resources of the extensive, well-watered pasturage which exists on this farm, and which would be fed a reasonable amount of grain, I feel that I could make a real contribution in my limited way, to the food problem of this country. I could cause to be used up the natural growth in the pasture, which, unless fed up, would simply rot down unused, and that this operation would add something of real economic value to the agricultural resources of this country.

Here is a man who asks nothing more than space, which he was willing to pay and had paid for, the right to manage his own business, the privilege of hard work and the help from the God of his faith, together with fair and reasonable treatment under the law of his country, suffering the stigma of having committed a criminal act in the simple performance of what he considered his patriotic duty.

He recites the conditions which had existed on this large farm before he moved there. Let me further quote from his letter, pages 4 and 5:

In passing, I might say that before I moved on this large farm, an overseer and four or five laborers were operating it; they were using largely commercial fertilizers and farming it for the grain which they could get. The number of cattle maintained was small and their operation proved to be a failure. They were unable to pay to the owners even the amount of rent money. Many of the fields had been so exhausted through inadequate use of manure that I had to build some of them up. A large herd supplies a large amount of manure to be used on these fields and the fertility of those fields has improved as a result of the operation which I have carried on and which, with proper extension of my activities, I could perform to build up this land still further in fertility.

He had worked hard for 2 years building successfully for himself, his family, his community, and his Nation. After 2 years, where does he find himself? I quote from pages 5 and 6 from the aforementioned letter:

On or about the first of March 1943 an investigator from the Office of Price Administration called at my farm and asked me whether I had kept records of the number of cattle and hogs I had butchered in the years 1941, 1942, and up to March 1, 1943. I told him I had not kept specific data as to the number of pounds of each and the number of head of each which I had slaughtered. I gave him, however, my best recollection of the number of such animals killed, and such data was in manner and form as set forth in my application for a permit. My method of keeping books is somewhat simple. I operate on a cash basis. The money I receive I deposit in the bank and make practically all payments by check. I have made out my income-tax reports by going to my banker at Canal Fulton, Ohio, and he has taken my check books and bank books and from those, has ascertained the gross amount of my operations both in grain, butchering, and other farm operations. I have made my tax returns on that basis. Therefore, I was unable to give the statistical data requested by the investigator. He told me that a meat order had been made and that I could not slaughter nor sell meat in excess of what I had slaughtered and sold in the base year 1941. I told him I had never heard of this regulation; that I tried to keep in touch with anything which might affect my business or my farm.

On or about the 6th or 8th of March 1943, papers were served upon me stating that an injunction proceeding had been brought by the Office of Price Administration in the District Court of the United States, entitled "Case No. 21,689, for the Northern District of Ohio, Eastern Division," to restrain me from slaughtering or selling meat in excess of the quantities allowed by regulation. From the date of the service of those papers upon me I stopped slaughtering operations and have not slaughtered any cattle, hogs, or other livestock from that date excepting for the use of my own family. My operations in this regard are at a total standstill until I am authorized through proper governmental authority to engage in such operations. The hearing on the application for temporary injunction was held before the District Court in Cleveland, Ohio, on the 11th day of March 1943. At that time I appeared in Cleveland with my attorney, and he stated that I had not willfully disobeyed any regulation; that as the regulations stood, it indicated that until a permit was granted, there was a probability of a technical violation if I continued commercial slaughtering. He stated some of the facts which are set forth in this petition; he added that I had been a law-abiding citizen and had never been in any legal difficulty before; and requested of the judge that if a temporary injunction issue, under the circumstances that the order state that I had not willfully disobeyed any regulation of the United States Government. Judge Freed stated that all were supposed to know of the existence and application of these regulation and that a temporary injunction must issue.

Mr. LEMKE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. I would suggest that perhaps the judge was too dumb to actually know what was going on or else he would not have made such a statement.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Was not the judge just stating the application of the law?

Mr. ROWE. That may be possible.

Mr. LEMKE. It is not the law that an order or a directive that is made contrary to law, without authority of law, and in violation of both law and the Constitution, is not law?

Mr. ROWE. I would assume that is correct.

Quoting this gentleman further:

He was willing, however, that such order state that I had not willfully violated the law. The matter was then taken up later with the attorneys for the Office of Price Administration. The circumstances concerning my case were presented by the attorney for the Office of Price Administration, in Cleveland, to the court, and on the 8th day of May 1943 a decree of dismissal was entered in the United States district court by Judge Freed, which recited that at the time of the filing of the motion for temporary injunction I had engaged in the business of slaughtering livestock in excess of the total amounts thereof permitted under the terms of restriction order No. 1 of the Office of Price Administration; that on the 1st day of April 1943 restriction order No. 1 expired and there was duly issued food distribution order No. 27. The court further found that I had at no time willfully or intentionally violated any of the provisions of said restriction order No. 1; that since the date of the issuance of the preliminary injunction in that action I had wholly ceased from slaughtering any livestock and delivering any meat derived therefrom and that there no longer existed any need for the continuance of said preliminary injunction. The court order further stated that I should hereafter be entitled to engage in business in accordance with the authority and upon the terms and conditions created by or set forth in said food distribution order No. 27, and for these reasons the court found that the preliminary injunction against me was to be dissolved and I was to be permitted to apply to either the Food Distribution Administration or the Department of Agriculture for the issuance of permit and quota applicable to the business of slaughtering animals or livestock in which I might wish hereafter to engage.

In the latter part of May 1943, shortly after the dismissal of the injunction case, I tried, and have tried continuously since that date, to procure a permit. I have been unsuccessful in procuring it. The war meat committee of this county understands my situation and has been willing to grant me a permit, but they say they are limited in authority and that they cannot possibly go beyond the amount of meat which I butchered and sold in the year 1941. No permit has formally been issued although the notice of November 2, 1943, indicates that my permit has been recommended for cancelation. I am confident, however, by reason of the declarations of the members of the war meat committee and of the representatives of the War Food Administration from Columbus and Chicago, who attended the meeting with the county war meat committee, that no relief whatsoever can be expected by me beyond a quota which I might be able to establish in 1941. The representatives from Columbus and Chicago further stated that I would be obliged to present satisfactory evidence of the amount of cattle which was slaughtered in the year 1941. I told them I had not kept such figures; that I knew within a few head the

number of cattle and hogs killed; that my son, who worked with me, knew the number of cattle and hogs butchered in that period, and that both of us would make affidavit to that fact. I stated, however, that my operation did not afford the keeping of a bookkeeper nor of statistical data and that in 1941 I knew of no necessity for keeping such information.

The true character of this man is exemplified in his unwillingness to misstate the truth as he knew it in the face of this crushing edict. The balance of his petition better speaks of this fine character and I quote him:

I confidently believe that there is a real need for grazing and feeding operations such as I conduct on this farm. Ohio has hundreds of farms which have pasturage which is good all through the summer. There are times when other grazing lands become arid and cattle is shipped into the stockyards in a somewhat lean condition. Stockyards have no place to fatten this cattle, there is no well-watered pasturage such as we have, and no ensilage; if any attempt were made to fatten up cattle after arrival from rail transit from some far distant place, the only resource would be to feed them grain, which is a waste of valuable food products which can be used otherwise. In our operation, we can use much less grain in fattening cattle. Instead of having lean cattle slaughtered and put on the market, cattle which has fed on grass, ensilage and a limited amount of grain can be butchered and put on the market, of food value higher than meat from cattle which has been simply grass fed.

I am limited on my farm as to the number of cattle I can raise and feed for my operation, by the amount of pasturage and the amount of grain I can spare; and I cannot sell in my retail trade excepting to those who furnish the proper ration stamps. This of itself would limit my output.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Along the line that the gentleman is suggesting, I have a letter written on November 23 by one of the largest stock handlers in the Chicago area of feeder cattle as well as beef cattle, and I want to quote a paragraph or two, as follows:

The bottleneck in the food industry now is the lack of reliable skilled slaughterers. Just today one of the smaller outfits told me that on Monday they bought 400 head of good fat cattle, expecting to kill 100 head of them that afternoon. They had everything all ready, steam up and floors all ready to start killing operations, but their help failed to function. Too many absentees, and some that did show up were in no condition for work, and the result was they were only able to kill 12 head of cattle when they should have killed the 100 head, as planned. The unions are the greatest bottleneck in the packing industry that we have at this writing.

After the first of the year, it is our guess finished cattle will be a rarity. That is what the administration crowd seems to want. Furthermore, under the present point ruling, it is impossible for families to get good meat any more, as it takes too many ration points to get a pound of good meat, where there is a small family, and small families seem to be the general rule nowadays.

I may say to the gentleman from Ohio that before my committee this learned Dr. Gilbert, head of the price-fixing system up in the O. P. A., said to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] upon being asked his qualifications for the job, that he knew nothing of business, nothing of the livestock business, that he was an economist, a trained economist, and my friends say a good economist. I think we have the answer there in the Harvard hotshots.

Mr. ROWE. I thank the gentleman. I want to quote the writer of this letter further:

It might be asked, Why do I not sell the cattle which I raise and fatten on my farm, to the stockyards at Cleveland? There are several answers to this. (1) All of my skill and experience which I have acquired in over 20 years in butchering and preparing meat products for market would be lost; (2) The stockyard gets the profit of my work, and instead of employing my time during the winter months when the farm work is at the minimum, I must lose that employment and my farming operation might be a financial loss instead of a profit. (3) It is not always that a market is open for cattle such as I raise. For instance, this fall I was called up by a purchaser of cattle in Cleveland and he wanted to know if I did not want to buy a carload of cattle which had come in by rail. He said that the stockyards had experienced a shortage of manpower, that many of their employees had gone into war industries where they were earning a great deal more money than they could be paid in the stockyards operation, and that the stockyards had had more cattle offered to them than they could use. I told him I could not buy the cattle because I had no permit to slaughter. Under such conditions, if I had cattle to sell and wanted to let someone else make the profit on my work, where would I sell such cattle?

Realizing the importance of this situation not only to myself but also to others who conduct like farming operations, I want to give a more specific picture of my own farming operations. I have on my farm 115 head of cattle and 180 head of hogs, over one-half of which have been raised on my farm, the rest having been purchased for fattening on the farm. Of the cattle, 40 are milk cows. From my operations this year, I have in my bins, 10,000 bushels of corn, 2,000 bushels of wheat, a silo 14 by 32 is filled. I have approximately 100 tons of baled hay. I was not so successful with my crop of oats, for a storm destroyed some of it. However, it is hauled in the barn and is still in bundles awaiting threshing. I had 48 acres of oats out. I will get only a fair yield of oats. I have over $10,000 invested in farm equipment, the principal items of which are as follows: 3 tractors: a large model D tractor, a medium-sized model G tractor, and a smaller model A, which, however, is not the smallest size tractor; 1 combine; 1 pick-up hay baler; 1 2-row corn picker; 1 10-foot power take-off binder; 1 16-row grain drill; 2 3-bottom plows; 1 2-bottom plow; 1 power manure loader; 1 New Ideal manure spreader; 1 silo filler; 1 power hay mower; 1 corn elevator; 1 power feed grinder; 1 milking machine; 1 power corn driller; 2 motortrucks; full blacksmithing equipment; 1 full slaughterhouse equipment; disks, harrows, and other complete farm equipment not herein specified. My son 18 years old is my right-hand man. With his help and that of a neighbor boy and with the labor-saving equipment which I have accumulated, we operate this farm. My other children are: a daughter 16 years of age; twins, a son and daughter aged 12 years; and a daughter, aged 3 years. Each child has some duties on the farm; they are interested in what I am doing and I am trying to show them that there is a place for young people on a farm. I would not want them to feel that their father had transgressed any of the laws of the country. I am grateful to the judge and the attorney for the Office of Price Administration who saw to it that a record was not made which would throw discredit upon my name.

Mr. RAMEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. I concur with the gentlemen on the majority side that the judge should not be blamed. He followed the so-called law. On this particular Thanksgiving Day, I am grateful that in the Ninth District of Ohio, under the Administrator O. D. Wearley, who has just retired, an inspector of that kind would not be allowed. The inspectors in that district of Ohio would not slap soldiers in the face by participating in a Gestapo action of that kind. They know our boys are fighting and fighting for a free world. When those boys come back that inspector will not dare show his face and the gentleman knows that.

Mr. ROWE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RAMEY. I want to concur with the majority side in the statement that the judge is not to blame because he has to interpret the so-called law, but I am grateful today that most of these inspectors in the Lake Erie section of Ohio are not like that one.

Mr. ROWE. I thank the gentleman.

I do not want to have my children feel that a normal and proper farm operation is unlawful or is frowned upon by our Government. I have been offered work if I would leave my farm and seek employment elsewhere. I feel I can do more good for the country in the work in which I am engaged than I could in a factory. I would like to have my sons become farmers. I need to show them that a farming operation will enable a man to maintain his home, raise his family, and keep out of debt. So far I have been able to do this. I feel that on the farm where I am now situated I could raise a herd large enough to keep up my milk cattle and raise and feed steers for slaughtering and also feed a sufficient number of swine to enable me out of the cattle and hogs so raised and fed to kill at least 50 cattle per month for 6 months in the year and 120 hogs per month for a like period of 6 months. I am respectfully asking for a quota which would permit at least 300 head of cattle and 720 hogs per year to be slaughtered on my farm.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I want to again quote the preamble to the order which has blotted out the light of hope in this man's life:

And to assure an adequate supply and efficient distribution of beef, veal, pork, lamb, and mutton to meet war and essential civilian needs.

Is there any doubt in your minds why our people are losing faith in the present authority here in Washington?

We read of the distress among the cattle raisers, of high prices as a need for subsidies on meats, of scare statements by people in prominent places, and we have heard a colleague recite about his constituents having to take back to the farms hundreds of head of hogs because

there was no room to store the meat after butchering.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I should like to throw a little light on that, if I can. I have in my district a slaughterhouse that is listed by the War Labor Board as a national slaughterer. It so happens that since January 1, 1941, the wages in that slaughterhouse have arisen 21 percent, or 6 percent over the Little Steel formula, yet they cannot get skilled slaughterhouse employees. Because of that bottleneck my constituents haul their cattle to market and then haul them back again. So I am sure that we are going to have to look further than just labor in these slaughterhouses for the solution of a problem that is crying for action right now.

Mr. ROWE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Here is an instance where the man asks nothing except help from his God to proceed to raise his grain and fatten his cattle and to deliver and distribute the meat as this preamble to the order has described.

There comes along an investigator, not to say that he shall suspend, not that he shall cut down the quota, but that he shall cease and desist.

With conditions like this all over our land, and the sluggish action of the O. P. A. with the point system, the people are without meat as a glut prevails to further excuse the restrictive orders of the philosophy of scarcity.

Here is an agency stopping a real American from providing us with much good meat, while the First Lady of our land is quoted in the papers of my home town as saying:

> I lived through the last war and the cost of living doubled. It happened once and it can happen again. Look at China today, and remember Germany after the last war. Once inflation starts, money depreciates in value until it buys less and less.
>
> If prices are doubled, then pork chops will cost 76 cents a pound, instead of 38 cents.

Think of it, to make a statement like that when hogs are being returned to the farms because there is no place to store the meat.

Our people are troubled by a terrible war which we believe is not our fault or of our making. They are vexed at a sort of tyranny here at Washington which we do know is our fault. It is within the power of this Congress to give them relief, and the wind of inaction will bring the whirlwind of accounting.

The words of Confucius are an admonition on this day and now:

> The people are the root of a country; the root firm, the country is tranquil. What the people want, Heaven will be found to give effect to.

Mr. Speaker, there are good signs among us in these troubled days. Congress is taking its full authority unto itself. I recognize the tendency to set determined courses for a return to constitutional government and by the people's representatives. This march must be kept up and the tempo increased so that real Americans such as the man about whom I have spoken today shall not suffer a loss of morale, lest by the breaking of their spirit our kind of government shall fail and fall. This charge is ours. These orders which slowly but surely stifle and put out the lights of individual liberty and freedom are the heralding of a ringing challenge to our capacity to represent our people and keep their Government from passing out of their hands.

Listen, as silent chambers speak to us. Washington said:

> Other misfortunes may be borne or their effects overcome. If disastrous wars should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if they exhaust our Treasury, future industry may replenish it; if they desolate and lay waste our fields, still under new cultivation, they will grow green again and ripen to future harvests. It would be but a trifle even if the walls of yonder capital were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these may be rebuilt.
>
> But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished governments?
>
> Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty?
>
> Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty of State rights, individual security, and public prosperity? No, if these columns fall they will be raised not again. Like the Coliseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful and melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be the monuments of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional American liberty.

APPOINTMENT OF BRIGADIER GENERALS OF THE ARMY

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table for present consideration the bill (S. 1410) to amend section 4 of the act approved June 13, 1940.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. SHORT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I wish the chairman would take a minute or two to explain to the Members of the House the import of this particular measure.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under the National Defense Act brigadier generals can be commissioned from the line in the Army of the United States as permanent officers only when they have had 28 or more years of continuous commissioned service in the Regular Establishment. During the present war the President has sent to the Senate of the United States just recently a recommendation for the appointment and commissioning of five different officers of the rank of lieutenant colonel or above as lieutenant generals in the line. These officers have not had the 28 years of continuous service required by the National Defense Act.

For the information of the House, I may say that it applies to only five officers, four of whom have distinguished themselves on duty in combat areas on the war fronts in Europe and Asia. It particularly applies to Gen. Mark Clark, commander of the Fifth Army in Italy; General Kenney, the chief of the Fifth Air Force in the southwest Pacific; two other generals whose names I do not now recall; and one in the War Department. The only purpose of this measure is to enable those men to be commissioned as brigadier generals even though they have not had the 28 years of continuous service.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Does that apply only to brigadier generals or does it also apply to major generals?

Mr. MAY. Officers below the rank of lieutenant colonel cannot be commissioned as brigadier generals. The appointments must be of officers holding that rank or higher.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. But this does not apply to major generals?

Mr. MAY. No.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. This does not open the door to the promotion of men without that length of service to the post of major general?

Mr. MAY. No.

I would say further that the House committee struck out all of the bill which the Senate passed and wrote a new provision which limits the promotions to 25 percent of those available under existing law. The idea we had in mind was that there will be others who will have opportunities like Gen. Mark Clark and General Kenney and others to demonstrate their great ability as generals, and we will want to leave some place for them. Therefore we confined it to 25 percent of those authorized.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Is it or is it not true—and I believe it to be true—that General Pershing was promoted from a captaincy to a brigadier generalcy in order that we might have the benefit of the experience he had in the Philippines and other combat areas, for the purposes of the last war?

Mr. MAY. I understand that to be correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the person have to have 28 years of continuous service now regardless of what rank he holds before he is promoted?

Mr. MAY. That is right, before he can be commissioned as a brigadier general, and he must have a rank not below that of lieutenant colonel.

Mr. HINSHAW. When was that 28-year provision placed in the law?

Mr. MAY. In 1920, I believe.

Mr. HINSHAW. It seems to me that the world would have lost the services of a number of great officers who served as commanding generals at the age of 30 and 35 if that law had been in existence before.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman from California is absolutely correct. It is for

this very reason that we have brought in this proposed legislation.

Mr. HINSHAW. I can see no sense in the 28-year limitation when what you want is good officers.

Mr. SHORT. We can take officers of the line who are lieutenant colonels and above, and can make them brigadier generals, regardless of whether or not they have had 28 years of service, under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. I personally would like to take them with a lot less than 28 years' service, so that we could get some really capable men.

Mr. MAY. Some of them have had considerably less than 28 years of service, and because of their demonstrated ability we put this provision in the bill.

Mr. SHORT. May I explain to the Members of the House that several of the Members of our committee would like to have added to this bill an amendment providing that generals on reaching the age of 64, if they are physically and mentally fit, of sound body and mind, should be continued in the service and not retired, particularly for the duration of the war.

Mr. HINSHAW. I can understand that, but the thing that interests me is the fact that a good many of our officers, very capable officers, have had to serve for as long as 17 to 20 years as first lieutenants before they could be promoted to captains. If there is anything that is stultifying to the mind of an Army officer, it is to have to serve that long in a low grade such as I have mentioned.

Mr. SHORT. It is to cure that very defect that we have brought in this measure.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was going to bring up the very point the gentleman brought up. What is now the War Department's policy on the retirement of officers when they have reached the age limit of 64?

Mr. SHORT. The War Department up until the present time has been rather strong in its conviction they are automatically retired. Now, whether they are going to continue to do that or not, I cannot prophesy, but I want to do a little horse trading on this bill. I want them to yield as well as to take.

Mr. MAY. Let me explain that under the law it is mandatory that when colonels reach the age of 60 they must be retired; brigadier generals must be retired at the age of 62 and major generals at the age of 64. And if there is anybody at fault it is the Congress itself. There is a bill pending in the Military Affairs Committee of the House on which I expect to have some hearings rather early in order to ascertain the reason why they are discharging all of these good officers and not using them for other purposes in the armed forces.

Mr. SHORT. I think it is silly to say the least, and it is a great waste of manpower.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I ask this further question? I do not oppose this bill, I think it is the thing to do. But you are releasing the age limit at one end and then at the other end you have very many capable officers, and there is not a man on this floor that has not received some letters from his district, say, regarding one particular officer that we all know is capable. You are releasing them at one end and it seems to me logical the committee ought to release them on the other end. There are not many officers and after all age is not the criterion. The purpose of this law in its origin was to keep the ranks moving in the Army in peacetime so we would not be cluttered up with a lot of people at the other end.

Mr. MAY. We passed the promotion statute and made it mandatory in order to get this hump out of the Army, as we call it, where they had a vast excess of officers following the last war. Under the laws that exist, they can appoint probably 60 officers under the section of the National Defense Act, and we restrict these appointments to 25 percent of that number.

Mr. MAGNUSON. How many generals do we have in the Army now, may I ask the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee?

Mr. MAY. You mean brigadier generals on up?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Brigadier generals on up.

Mr. MAY. I do not have any idea.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is it true we have more lieutenant generals in this war than in all the other wars combined?

Mr. MAY. I do not know about that. I would not be surprised if we would not need a staff of them before we get through.

Mr. SHORT. Oh, yes; we have had infinitely more.

Mr. KNUTSON. In other wars?

Mr. SHORT. In this war, than in all other wars combined. Soon we will have as many lieutenant generals as we have privates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act approved June 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 381), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. That hereafter brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army shall be appointed from among officers of the line permanently commissioned in the Regular Army and carried on the promotion list in grades not below that of lieutenant colonel whose names are borne on an eligible list prepared annually by a board of not less than five general officers of the line, not below the grade of major general; and hereafter appointment as chief of any branch shall be made from among officers permanently commissioned in the Regular Army in grades not below that of lieutenant colonel and who have demonstrated by actual and extended service in such branch or on similar duty that they are qualified for such appointment."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out all of section 4 and insert:

"SEC. 4. That hereafter brigadier generals of the line shall be appointed from among officers of the line commissioned in grades not below that of lieutenant colonel who are credited with 28 years' continuous commissioned service in the Regular Army as hereinbefore provided and whose names are borne on an eligible list prepared annually by a board of not less than five general officers of the line, not below the grade of major general: *Provided however*, That not more than 25 percent of the total authorized number of brigadier generals of the line may be appointed, without regard to length of service, from among officers of the line commissioned in grades not below that of lieutenant colonel and whose names are borne on such eligible list. Hereafter appointment as chief of any branch shall be made from among officers commissioned in grades not below that of lieutenant colonel who are credited with 28 years' continuous commissioned service in the Regular Army as hereinbefore provided, and who have demonstrated by actual and extended service in such branch or on similar duty that they are qualified for such appointment."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein several quotations from official documents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, delay in fixing the policy of this country as to enemy-owned property which is under our control and within the undisputed powers of the Congress to use in aid of the war effort and to lessen the private war losses of American citizens is dangerous.

In the last war with Germany we said this was something to be decided when the war was over. As a result, to this day, 25 years later, the losses of our own citizens have never been fully paid. Because we did not define a policy until it was too late, 80 percent of German enemy property has been returned to its original owners to enrich the German Reich, to enable it to re-form its cartels, to destroy American commerce, and to rebuild the war machinery which is now being used to destroy American lives.

To delay action now is to open the way to an enemy-inspired propaganda campaign to arouse our sympathies for our soon-to-be-vanquished foe, at a time when the war spirit has waned, arouse a false sympathy for them which will lead us into a repetition of the same tragic mistake we made following World War No. 1. Failure to act decisively will hearten the German and Japanese bankers and industrialists, encourage them in the belief that, however the war goes,

they will get back their American investments.

Let us settle it once and for all here and now, that under no circumstances, at any time or in any manner, will they get back a dollar out of their American investments. Let us proclaim to the world that we are going to be as just to our own citizens as good morals and maxims of the law require us to be—to be just before we are generous.

And to make the more certain that there shall be in the acquisition proceedings no taint of confiscation, the conditions imposed upon our defeated enemies in the unconditional-surrender proclamation and in all treaties that may be negotiated later should require the defeated Axis Powers to reimburse their own citizens in their own currency for any losses suffered by reason of American legal action.

The Members of the present Congress should look at the record of German infidelity, ingratitude, and trickery, realizing that we can expect nothing better from Japan—a nation whose foul deeds and treacherous activities have long ago deprived it of any claim to considerate treatment at the hands of any self-respecting, treaty-observing peoples.

If there are any among us who still hesitate to act so drastically in respect to these still powerful and yet undefeated criminal nations, I hope that they will carefully read in the cold type the story of German depravity which is contained in the June 2, 1941, report of the Acting American Agent of the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, to the Secretary of State, who, under an agreement between our country and Germany, represented American victims of German ruthlessness in the last war. Consider, please, these paragraphs, excerpts from the preliminary statement:

This report, discussing the activity of the Commission and the American Agency since December 31, 1934, the date of the last previous report by the American agent, covers a period in which some of the most interesting and important work was accomplished.

During this period, all of the pending claims before the Commission were disposed of and, in accordance with the provisions of the notes exchanged between the two Governments on May 7, 1934, no other matters were to be dealt with by the Commission.

The claims thus disposed of were the claim of Katherine McNider Drier (Docket Nos. 4712 and 11485), that was dismissed by the Commission on October 30, 1939, and the well-known sabotage claims arising out of the destruction by German saboteurs, of the Black Tom terminal in New York Harbor in July 1916, and the ammunition assembling plant at Kingsland, N. J., in January 1917. Awards in the sabotage claims were entered by the Commission on October 30, 1939.

A concise account is given below of the stages of the litigation in the sabotage claims subsequent to December 31, 1934. Briefly, the final decision of the Commission not only found that the Hamburg decision of 1930 in favor of Germany had been obtained largely through the introduction on the part of Germany of false and fraudulent evidence but also found that Germany, on the basis of an exhaustive study of the entire record, was responsible for the destruction of the properties in question. It is believed that this is the first occasion on which a decision has been rendered by an international tribunal against a government, party to the arbitration, based on such findings.

The spectacular character of the proceedings was maintained to the end. In the final stages the German Commissioner on March 1, 1939, retired from the Commission in an obvious effort to render it incapable of handing down a decision adverse to Germany. The withdrawal of the German Commissioner took place after submission of briefs and exhaustive arguments and at a time when the three members of the Commission were engaged in a discussion of all questions, including the matter of false, perjured, and collusive evidence relating to the responsibility of Germany, except merely the question of the extent of the damages suffered by the American nationals involved. The Commission continued its deliberations in the absence of the German Commissioner, and arrived at its decision without consideration of any evidence except that which constituted part of the record at the time of the withdrawal of the German Commissioner.

Mr. Speaker, the base character of the enemy we have to deal with could not be revealed more clearly than it was in the crafty maneuvers the German Commissioner indulged in in the futile effort to prevent the issuance of awards to aggrieved American citizens.

Think of it! The German Commissioner voluntarily retires and then, calling attention to his own absence, insisted that for that reason alone the Commission was incompetent—that is, without jurisdiction to proceed with its business. But let us have it in the words of the report itself:

At meetings held on June 15 and October 30, 1939, after due notice to Germany, the commission finally disposed of the sabotage claims. Awards totaling over $21,100,000, exclusive of interest, were entered October 30, 1939, in these claims. These awards carry interest from various dates to date of payment. On October 31, 1939, the awards were duly certified by the Secretary of State to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment. Prior to such certification, protests had been filed with the Secretary of State by the German Government and with the American commissioner by the German commission which in effect urged the incompetency of the Commission to function following the voluntary retirement of the German commissioner. The protests also indulged in a number of intemperate accusations against the umpire of the Commission.

Let it be said, Mr. Speaker, to the eternal credit of our then Secretary of State that he did not hesitate to rebuke the German Government for its shoddy attempts to frustrate the Commission or to quickly resent its cheap, intemperate accusations against the Commission's umpire. Under date of October 18, 1939, the Secretary wrote the German Chargé d'Affaires ad interim—decisions and opinions of June and October 1939, appendix, page xxx—as follows:

I have entire confidence in the ability and integrity of the umpire and the commissioner appointed by the United States despite your severe and, I believe, entirely unwarranted criticisms, and I am constrained to invite your attention to the fact that the remarkable action of the commissioner appointed by Germany was apparently designed to frustrate or postpone indefinitely the work of the Commission at a time when, after years of labor on the particular cases involved, it was expected that its functions would be brought to a conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, do facts such as these warrant sympathy? It will take more than the tears of our professional sobbing sisters and our ever blubbering brothers to blot out this sordid record. Let us have action, and have it now.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter which I received and a copy of some other resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an item from last Sunday's Washington Star, in which Mr. Chester Bowles amplifies his inflation remarks at press conference and also an article entitled "The Spread of Russian Influence in Post-war Europe," by Constantine Brown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial of the Waukegan News-Sun of last Friday, November 19, in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, at this time I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes relative to a telegram received from Admiral Nimitz.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I was supplied this morning with a copy of a message that Admiral Nimitz, commanding our naval forces in the Pacific, had sent to the widow of our beloved colleague, Hon. J. William Ditter. The message reads:

The officers and men of the Pacific Fleet join me in deepest sympathy to you in your great loss. We hope that you will receive consolation in the knowledge that your husband contributed in a large measure to the construction of our magnificent fleet and that he lost his life in the service of his country.

And is signed "C. W. Nimitz, Admiral, United States Navy."

That is another grand and well-deserved tribute to our distinguished late colleague and friend, and I am particularly happy that Admiral Nimitz, who stands in the forefront of our naval leadership today, himself a truly great man, saw fit to acknowledge in this way the Navy's appreciation of Bill Ditter's large part in providing us with the formidable establishment we now have.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is recognized for 45 minutes.

A QUESTION PERIOD ON THE FLOOR OF THE HOUSE FOR HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, today I am going to talk about a matter in which most of us are interested. That is, a system by which many of us think the method of communication between Members of the House and heads of the executive departments can be improved; a method by which we can have an accounting from the heads of the departments as to how they are administering and interpreting the laws that we pass; a method that will bring about better team work between the Congress and the executive departments.

I have been granted 45 minutes, and during the discussion I will be glad to yield at any time to have the observations or comments of any Member who desires to make them.

The plan set forth in House Resolution 327 is a variation of an old idea. It is simple and can be put into effect by a mere change in the rules of the House. The resolution provides for a question period at least once in every 2 weeks, but not oftener than once a week. The period is limited to 2 hours. One half of the time is to be allotted to answering written questions which have been previously submitted by the committee issuing the invitation and having jurisdiction of the subject matter. The remaining half of the time is to be consumed by questions from the floor. Control of the time for asking the questions is to be divided between the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee which issued the invitation. The Rules Committee will fix the priority of appearances and the length of time for each period. Only one executive would appear during one period.

I am thoroughly convinced that a frank, open consultation between the independent agencies, which, of course, includes Cabinet members, and the Members of Congress would be beneficial to Congress, to the Executive, and in the interest of better Government.

I wish you would think of the men in the Government today who are best able to counsel us as to whether this or a similar procedure would be of value. If I should ask you which two men in the Government are best able to advise us of the merits or demerits of this proposal, I believe that most Members would agree those two men are Secretary of State Cordell Hull and Comptroller General Lindsay C. Warren. I believe that most of us would select Secretary Hull as eminently competent to advise us, because he has served long and ably in the House and in the Senate. Since 1933 he has been in the executive part of the Government as the first member of the Cabinet. Congress has always been close to his heart. His deep knowledge of Government and the high regard in which he is held by Members of Congress and by the people throughout the Nation give great weight and value to his opinion.

Mr. Hull appeared here before a joint session of the House and Senate. Had he thought his appearance would be in violation of the spirit of our Constitution, or of our tradition, he would not have accepted our invitation. Mr. Hull thought his appearance would be in the public interest, as indeed it was, otherwise, he would not have come before us.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. I am very much interested in the proposal the gentleman from Tennessee has made here, and I compliment him highly in presenting this method of communication and association between the Congress and the executive branches of the Government.

Is it not a fact that the appearance of Secretary Hull before the joint session of the Congress a few days ago was the first time in the history of this Congress that a member of the Cabinet or head of an executive department, other than the President, came before this body?

Mr. KEFAUVER. In answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Arkansas, as far as I know, the appearance of Mr. Hull was the first time a member of the Cabinet has appeared here before a session of Congress, since the First Congress. It occurred several times in the First Congress. I may be mistaken about it, but I have not found any instance in history where it occurred since the First Congress, except in the appearance of Mr. Hull.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. I think every Member of Congress will agree that the appearance of Secretary Hull before the Congress was certainly appreciated, and certainly was a move toward unanimity and better cooperation. Does the gentleman's proposal provide that the question and answer method is mandatory?

Mr. KEFAUVER. In answer to the gentleman from Arkansas, the resolution provides that they are invited to appear, and that only those who indicate a willingness to come will be invited.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. My thought was that in case some member of an executive department wanted to come up here and discuss a certain matter with Congress, the Congress would have to listen to him discuss that matter. Under the proposal made here, would that be permissible or would it be mandatory with us by the question and answer session?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Our procedure would operate in this way: Suppose Mr. Morgenthau or the Secretary of the Treasury, whoever he might be, was willing to discuss some tax problem and the Ways and Means Committee wished for him to do so. The Ways and Means Committee would issue an invitation and would prepare the questions which would direct the course of the discussion in the way that they desired. They could do that by their questions. Then he would be invited to appear and the time would be set by the Rules Committee. The first part of the time allotted would be in answer to the questions previously submitted to him. I take it that in answer to those, if it were pertinent to the matter under inquiry, he could address us and talk at length about the subject upon which we wanted information. Then the latter part of the period would be available for questions propounded from the floor of the House, with the control of the time for questions in the hands of the chairman and ranking minority members of the committee.

I thank the gentleman for bringing out those points.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am very much interested in the gentleman's proposal and believe it might work to the benefit of the entire country, through providing Congress with a means of obtaining certain information. It seems to me, however, that in considering the proposition for questions and answers to be made out by the committee, it will be merely duplicating that same thing which they already do in the committee. They are entitled to invite the Secretary of this department or that department or the administrator of some agency before the committee at any time and question him in the committee. It seems to me that the purpose of a meeting with the head of a particular department would be to enable Congress, outside of the committee, to learn more about what is going on. Therefore, I think I should have to object to the provision that the committee itself would make up the questions. I think that those questions ought to come from the Members outside of the committee, certainly as much as from members of the committee itself. I ask the gentleman what he thinks about that proposition.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. Of course, I want to say that the resolution I have prepared is rudimentary. It is only intended as something to open discussion on the subject. There are two problems to deal with.

In the first place you have got to have an orderly procedure to prevent embarrassment or heckling or the discussion from getting off on irrelevant subjects; and in the second place we want to have it as free and open as possible so every Member can ask a question if it is a proper one.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman knows the British system of handling that matter: The question is placed on the floor a week earlier and the member of the Cabinet is given an opportunity, I believe through his secretary if he chooses, to answer in a written statement, and any Member of Parliament may ask the head of the Department a question. The question may be as embarrassing as anyone likes; as a matter of fact, I believe they encourage the minority to ask embarrassing questions. I know that the gentleman may have difficulty in placing himself in his mind in the position of being a minority Member, but that might happen some day and I know that at that time he would enjoy asking a new administration some embarrassing questions just as the mi-

nority Members today would enjoy asking such questions.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say to the gentleman from California that I am thoroughly familiar with the British system but I think the procedure I have suggested would work better under our system than the British technique, because under the British system the ministers are creatures of the House of Commons; under our system they are not. Under our plan we expect to bring them here for particular purposes and at particular times. I believe a system can be worked out whereby a Member would have an opportunity of getting his question presented. In the first place he could talk to members of the committee about it and see if he could not get some member of the committee to include it; in the second place it is contemplated that a copy be sent to the Rules Committee and he would have a double shot at it in the Rules Committee.

In the third place half of the period is allowed for questions from the floor, and I think the chairmen and the ranking minority members of most committees are very liberal in giving any Member a right to speak. They certainly would be liberal in giving anybody a right to ask a question, particularly if it were a question intended to bring out something of importance. The technique of it, I may say to the gentleman from California, is something we shall have to work out. I have no particular set notions about it; at least I want some procedure inaugurated.

Mr. HINSHAW. I greatly appreciate the gentleman's idea; I think it is a good one. I am not criticizing the gentleman in any way, but on the contrary complimenting him in the highest possible terms.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HINSHAW. At the same time I know the gentleman does not want to preclude a minority Member from asking questions, yet I am afraid that if it filters through a committee the minority will be precluded from asking such questions as the minority may think embarrassing but on the other hand may turn out just the opposite.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It certainly was not my intention to deny the minority any prerogatives. I think it would work out so both sides would be on an equal footing. Certainly it was not my intention to put either side at a disadvantage. Also I did not mean to infer that embarrassing questions should not be asked so long as they are intended to bring out information. I meant that an executive should be protected from questions which were asked solely for the purpose of embarrassing him personally.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am sure the gentleman is eminently fair and I am merely making a suggestion which may assist him in the further consideration of the legislation.

Mr. MURDOCK and Mr. SUMNERS of Texas rose.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I, too, wish to compliment the gentleman on the proposal he is placing before us. I feel that it is a good one even though it is tentative, as has just been explained.

The thought brought out by the gentleman from Arkansas a moment ago as to the appearance of Secretary Hull being the first appearance of a Cabinet member before a joint session of Congress recalls to my mind that in the very beginnings of the Republic the President of the United States, George Washington, appeared before the Senate, feeling that it was his constitutional right to come to them personally to talk over treaty matters. It so happened they did not do it that way in the beginning and a different procedure became encrusted in precedent. I am not so sure but what the earlier procedure would have been better. Our liberal Constitution, brief though it be, permits us within its limitations to do a great many things in a constitutional manner and yet by different ways. I approve of the thing the gentleman is proposing here to bring about a closer relationship between these two great branches of government.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think the gentleman's observations are a great contribution to this discussion and I believe the incident the gentleman related of the first President's appearing in person before the Senate is definite evidence that our Constitution rather intended that some consultative custom like this be worked out.

There is nothing in the Constitution to prohibit this being done. The branches of the Government are separate but each branch affects the workings of the other branch. It was never intended by our Constitution makers that the divisions of Government should be kept separate in a strict and actual sense. The founding fathers, I think, intended that some procedure like this should be inaugurated. In the law organizing the Treasury Department, passed in 1789, it made it the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to "make reports and give information to either branch of the legislature, in person or in writing—as he may be required—respecting all matters which may be referred to him by the Senate or House of Representatives or which shall appertain to his office."

In the debate on that bill it was expressly objected to that it might lead to the introduction of all the Secretaries on the floor but the bill was nevertheless passed and without so much as a denial that such would be the result.

Nor has our history been without illustration of the necessity and of examples of this practice. In the early days of the Government the Secretaries were repeatedly called to the presence of either House for consultation, advice, and information.

Wednesday, July 22, 1789: The Secretary of Foreign Affairs (Mr. Jefferson) attended, agreeably to order, and made the necessary explanations. (Annals Congress, vol. 1, p. 51, 1st Cong.)

Saturday, August 22, 1789: The Senate again entered on executive business. The President of the United States came into the Senate Chamber, attended by General Knox (Secretary of War), and laid before the Senate the following statement of the facts, with the questions thereto annexed, for their advice and consent. (Annals of Congress, 1st Cong., vol. 1, p. 66.)

And again on the Monday following the President and General Knox were before the Senate.

Friday, August 7, 1789: The following message was received from the President of the United States, by General Knox (the Secretary of War), who delivered therewith sundry statements and papers relating to the same. (Proceedings of House of Representatives, Annals of Congress, vol. 1, p. 684.)

Monday, August 10, 1789: The following message was received from the President by General Knox (Secretary of War), who delivered in the same, together with statement of the troops in the service of the United States. (Proceedings of House of Representatives. Annals of Congress, vol. 1, p. 689.)

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. We have heard the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, so many, many times call here for teamwork between the various departments of our Government. That is what we need now; we need it in peacetime, but doubly so in wartime. I think I see a great gulf between the lawmaking branch of this Government and the administrative department; and I wish that gulf could be bridged to the advantage of our Nation. I believe the gentleman is working in the right direction.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say to the gentleman that I believe we are approaching the post-war period in a precarious situation with the terrible breach between the executive and the legislative branches. Unless we get some better working arrangements we cannot have a long-range foreign policy.

I am anxious to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, chairman of the great Committee on the Judiciary, who asked me to yield a few minutes ago.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. As I understand my colleague, what he is now trying to do is to submit to the judgment of the House the general proposition and to see if he cannot first procure an agreement with reference to the principle and basic policy.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. And if that can be done, then he does anticipate that in committees and through whatever other machinery we have in our legislative arrangement, we will then try to work out and develop how this thing is to operate so that both the majority and the minority may have all the rights which are inherent in our system of government and which ought to be exercised by each person who is a Member of the Congress.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman states my aim correctly. I presented this resolution as something to work on,

and I may say to the gentleman I have been thinking about this for a long time.

In January I introduced a bill similar to this resolution. Then I reached the conclusion that the better procedure would be to amend the rules of the House. In October we were invited by General Marshall and Secretary Stimson to hear them in the auditorium at the Congressional Library. When I was over there it occurred to me that the information we were getting was very valuable and interesting but we were like an audience in a picture show. We had no opportunity of directing the discussion along the channels we wanted information about, we could not ask any questions, we did not have any part in the procedure, yet in spite of those limitations it was a very valuable meeting and we were given much useful information. So I decided then it would be very, very much better, if we could have a consultation like that right here in our own forum on the floor of the House under our own rules, where we could guide and direct the discussion and secure the type of information we wanted.

On that very same day I came back to the floor and filed this resolution. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] has pointed out, it is merely something to work on, to see if we can get the general idea across. I am sure the Rules Committee, before whom the resolution is pending, will work it out so as to be fair and so as to protect the executive heads from picayune questions and personal embarrassment, and that they will also protect the rights of the minority and the prerogatives of the majority.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. As I understand the gentleman's proposal, it is to change or amend the rules of the House to permit rather round-table discussions with heads of the executive departments, agencies, and Cabinet officers. Since the Constitution provides that there shall be three independent branches of government—legislative, executive, and judicial—and since the Congress for many years has been rapidly tending toward uncontrolled bureaucracy, does not the gentleman fear a little bit that if we open the gates to the heads of these departments to make their play before the House of Representatives they might become more powerful than they are now even, when they not only disburse the funds we give them but control the disbursement of them, and that we might get into some little difficulty in that direction?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad the gentleman raises that subject. In the first place, while we say we have three separate and distinct divisions of our Government, that is not actually and literally true. They have to work in some degree of cooperation with each other.

The executive power is vested in the President but he is authorized to participate in the lawmaking power so as to give Congress information on the state of the Union; to recommend to the consideration of Congress such measures as he shall judge necessary; to convene both Houses of Congress, or either of them. Also, no resolution or bill to which the concurrence of the Senate and House may be necessary shall take effect without his approval unless passed by two-thirds majority over his disapproval. The Executive has the power of one-sixth of the membership of the House and one-sixth of the membership of the Senate by virtue of his power of veto.

The legislative power was confided to Congress. Congress has great control over the executive and judicial branches. Congress has the power to fix the compensation of all officers of the United States. It has provided who should act as President in the event of disqualification of the President and Vice President. It has power to establish all offices not prescribed in the Constitution. It has power to establish all courts not prescribed by the Constitution—to regulate the salaries, and to define the jurisdiction and powers of the judges. Congress defines all crimes which may be tried by these courts.

The judicial powers are confided to the Supreme Court of the United States, but the executive and legislative branches are not independent of the Supreme Court. The Court has the power to annul any law that Congress passes, or to set aside any order made by the Executive. The Chief Justice presides over the Senate in an impeachment trial of a President.

This shows that the departments of the Government, though separate, are yet in organization and function so entwined and interdependent that they cross the boundaries of each other. It is as Senator Pendleton said:

> They come in contact, but not in conflict. They cross the paths assigned to each without meeting or clashing in the pathways.

I may say to the gentleman from Kentucky that this system would not make the executive department more powerful. It would make the Congress more powerful. It would enable Congress to deal more effectively with the executive department. We would have better information. We would be able to see what they were doing. The galleries would be filled, the great importance of the Congress would be brought to the attention of the people of the Nation and the Congress would regain its position. Also if the executive heads knew they were to be asked up here to give an accounting they would be a whole lot more careful with the directives and orders they issue. We would have an opportunity face to face to tell them what the people want done and to explain to them the hopes, aspirations, and wishes of the people.

Mr. MAY. Does not the gentleman think that the regular standing committees of the House of Representatives as they are now constituted would be more apt to get detailed inside information out of a Cabinet officer or the head of an executive agency in a committee room than you would on the House floor where it is a round-table discussion and there are arguments one way or the other?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say to the gentleman this is not intended in any way to supplant the work of committees. The difficulty about the committee system in connection with big matters of national and international importance, and that is what we are going to deal with in these sessions, matters involving big governmental policies, is that the particular members of one committee have a hard time attending that committee regularly and all the Members of the House certainly cannot be at the particular meeting where those things are under discussion.

The hearings may not be printed for weeks or months afterward and they are so voluminous nobody can read them. So we would get better information on big matters under consideration if we could have these men up here and have a frank, free, and open discussion with them on the floor of the House.

It would help the committees in bringing about a more complete understanding of the problems and it would result in advising and making the Congress more conscious of the basic facts of the problem under consideration. There is much delay in printing of committee hearings and unless a bill is reported favorably the testimony before the committee may never be printed. Furthermore, as a practical matter, we cannot possibly read all the committee hearings. We glance through the voluminous volumes, pick out some particular item we are especially interested in and that is about all we can do. This plan is not presented in lieu of the work of the committees. It will implement and make the work of the committees easier because it is a means whereby all Members can secure direct information in the shortest possible length of time relative to the big problems that are facing us. The work of the committees would be easier if Members of Congress had more general information on the problems of government. It is said that Congress receives reports from the various departments and agencies. This is true. But how many of us can read all of these voluminous reports. It is humanly impossible to do so. Many of them contain much detail and Members of Congress generally do not, and cannot, study all of the reports sent by the departments. Furthermore, we need to be currently informed. These reports generally only tell us the things the departments want us to know. We need some method of ferreting out other information. We need to do that currently and not have to wait until the end of the year in order to find out what a department head has done.

Mr. DILWEG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DILWEG. I am in full accord with the gentleman's proposal, because I feel very strongly that we can effectively adjust ourselves to the needs of war if the heads of departments and independent agencies appeared before the House. Does not the gentleman believe that, if this procedure is followed, that it would

help eliminate the many special committees that we have appointed in this House?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Undoubtedly that is true. I asked the Library of Congress to give me information during the Seventy-seventh Congress on the number of resolutions for investigations filed during that Congress. The number they reported is 217; the requests for specific information from departments, and so forth, 37; and we have continued 16 special investigating committees. They say that probably they did not get all of them. The 217 requests for investigating committees certainly show that the Congress is in bad need of expert, detailed information. I am sure the necessity for a lot of these committees would be obviated if we could have the administrators up here, find out what they are doing, and get them to tell us about their plans and let them know what we think about it.

Mr. DILWEG. Would it not save the time of responsible departmental heads if we could call them before the House instead of having them appear before various overlapping committees?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It would. I checked up on that matter, and I have the record here. In 1 month one administrator appeared seven times before House committees and gave substantially the same testimony at each place. It must have been a great burden on him.

Mr. RAMEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. Following what was stated by the distinguished chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, prior to which the gentleman said that the members would be restricted so that there would be no what you called picayunish questions asked.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. RAMEY. Is there not grave danger that the Member would be restricted by what some other Member might say is a picayunish question? The department man or the Cabinet member who answers it might be allowed to make a self-serving declaration, rather than answer the question, just as we have Cabinet members appear before the committees. You ask a question; they will not answer it directly, but will circumvent or go around the mulberry bush, and perhaps he makes a speech. His so-called answer is not in reality an answer but just a self-serving declaration to set himself good while the Member is restricted in the question. Could we have it so the answer to a question must be direct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I say to the gentleman that that is the intention. I believe public opinion would require his answer be forthright and direct. If an administrator came here and evaded an issue or did not answer directly, or if he did not know his business, he would be awfully embarrassed before the bar of public opinion. He would not do it again.

Mr. RAMEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think it would have a very fine effect on the administrators, and certainly the President would be even more careful in selecting the Cabinet and the administrative officials if he knew they were to come up here and account to the Members of the House.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DISNEY. I have the impression that all the members of the British Cabinet are Members of the Parliament. Is that correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DISNEY. Then they have the right as well as the duty to be upon the floor. I am wondering if the gentleman senses any danger of an additional merger of the legislative branch of our Government with the executive branch, which is already going on pretty rapidly by this process.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Under the British system, ministers are Members of the House of Commons, elected by the House of Commons, and responsible to them. This could not be the entering wedge of a ministerial system for many, many reasons. In the first place, the Constitution sets up the legislative, executive, and judicial branches.

In the second place, the continuation of the separation of powers is guaranteed by the constitutional provision that no Member of the Congress shall hold any administrative office in the Government during his continuance in office. Therefore, we cannot under the Constitution have the ministerial system. We already have a kind of consultation between the Congress and the executive branch. We have it in our committees, in our offices, and in the cloakrooms. What we want to do is bring it out in the open, where we can all hear and here on the floor there will be frank discussion.

Some few Members, and I am glad they are few, are disinclined toward this idea because they say it might be said we are aping England. This is not a valid objection, because in the first place, if any nation has a legislative device which would be useful to us, I do not see why we should not make use of it. In the second place, this is a good American plan which is workable under our system and it can be sustained as a part of our American system. It is interesting to know that all nations, which have representative government, have a means of direct consultation such as is proposed here. It might with equal force be said that we would be copying the system of any of these other nations.

I view the floor of the House as a workshop for the people's representatives and a tool that will add to the dignity or enable us to do our job better is worthy of favorable consideration. As a matter of fact, I think most Members who have seen the question hour in practice in the House of Commons in England or in Canada will agree that it has real value to the legislative branch and to the people of those countries. While our systems of governments are different, I think we can and should benefit by their experiences, but it is important to bear in mind that the suggestion has its origin in the development of our own laws and I think we must discuss it within its capacity of adjustment to our American system.

Mr. DISNEY. Does the gentleman's resolution restrict the appearance on the floor to members of the Cabinet?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The resolution covers the heads of departments and independent agencies, which includes the Cabinet and the independent offices and commissions.

Mr. DISNEY. Of course, in doing this we would want to keep in mind that the departments have more influence on legislation nowadays than the Congress itself, at least according to the Washington newspapers. We would have to be pretty careful.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think we would be in a better position to pass legislation if we had more information. We would be better able to take care of ourselves and to use our independent judgment.

Mr. DISNEY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Certainly we would be in a better position to follow up how the laws we pass are being administered.

Mr. DISNEY. I realize our information is limited because we run so many errands we do not have time to keep up with everything.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct. We just do not physically have time to read all the hearings.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to my colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank my colleague. He, of course, is aware of my own enthusiasm for this proposal. I have been deeply gratified also at the favorable Nation-wide response to this proposal, made very recently.

The gentleman stated a few moments ago that the resolution was before the Committee on Rules. I feel that it is of great importance that this proposal be brought out as early as possible. We are near the end of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress. I wonder if in the opinion of my colleague it might be possible to get action on this proposal before the beginning of the second session in January? Is there anything to indicate any immediate action on the proposal by the Committee on Rules?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I greatly appreciate the gentleman's statement and his inquiry. In the first place, I have had very courteous treatment from the members of the Committee on Rules with reference to granting a hearing or getting consideration for granting a hearing. Most of them indicated that they would be willing to grant a hearing. I doubt if we shall be able to get one until the next session. I wish we could at an earlier date. I am sure the gentleman will make a great contribution if he will speak to the members of the Committee on Rules in that regard.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. I congratulate the gentleman from Tennessee on calling the attention of the House to legislation of this character. I really believe that if proper legislation can be worked out in this regard and is approved it will furnish all Members of the House information they otherwise would not receive, and would put all the Members of Congress in a better position to pass proper and necessary legislation. When that is done, of course, it will inure to the benefit of all the people of our country.

I again congratulate the gentleman from Tennessee on bringing this forward-looking proposal to the attention of the House.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I certainly thank the gentleman. I know he has given the matter a lot of consideration. His comments are very useful and encouraging. His opinion is valued highly.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I congratulate the gentleman from Tennessee on bringing to our attention a statesmanlike possibility, and I second what the gentleman from Texas has already said. Too often too many of us do not know just what is going on. I think it should be the first duty of the administration to give the necessary information to the Members of Congress. I recall, as the rest of the Members of the House do, that the War Department some 2 months ago made a statement in confidence to industrial and labor leaders, and a month and a half later they told us the story in the Library of Congress. If we could put through something on this order, would it not be possible that all of us would be in a position to have a better idea of what was being contemplated and what was actually going on?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think we undoubtedly would. I appreciate the gentleman's favorable remarks.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. There is one thing that troubles me about this. Under our form of Government, the President is the Executive Officer. These Cabinet officials are merely working for him. They are carrying out his will and his wishes. If we carry this proposal to its logical end, would we not require the attendance here of the President himself, so that we might interrogate him, on the theory that we would finally decide, "These are just underlings, they are just hired hands, just working for the President. Why should we fool away our time interrogating them when they can be changed at any time the President wants to change them? If they say something the President does not like, he can fire them and hire somebody else, so we would be interrogating subordinates all the time." Does not the gentleman think the logical conclusion would have to be that eventually we would bring the President up here and interrogate him?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is a very interesting inquiry. I may say to the gentleman there is absolutely no possibility of the thing he suggests happening. In the first place, this resolution only invites those to appear who are willing to appear. In the second place, the Constitution requires the President to submit a report on the state of the Union once a year, and that is the only duty imposed on the President insofar as consulting the House is concerned.

So we have no other control over him with reference to his appearance before Congress.

Mr. PATMAN. You understand, I am not advocating it, I am just suggesting that perhaps that would be the logical thing if we were to go on this road the gentleman suggests.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That same observation as to the committees would be true now. They do not ask the President to appear before the committees, yet they always ask these men.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What would be the difference?

Mr. PATMAN. At the same time they carry out the will and the wishes of the President.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think the gentleman from Arkansas has answered that question. There would not be any difference between that and the likelihood of calling the President before the committees. This would be more dignified. There would be more of us here and more of us would have an opportunity of hearing what they had to say.

I also wish to point out to the gentleman from Texas that the President is a constitutional officer. His duties are defined by the Constitution. This is not true of the members of the Cabinet. They are nowhere mentioned in the Constitution. They are created by law. We require them to give reports. Under the law establishing the Secretary of the Treasury he may be required to report to Congress in person. A distinction must be drawn between congressional power over the President and the Cabinet members.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With regard to this argument that this might subject us more to the influence of the departments, it seems to me to be exactly to the contrary. If we invite these department heads up here and, you might say, put them in the position of having to defend their own policies, it would enhance our own influence over their administration of the laws we pass. It would seem to me that is a logical conclusion.

Mr. KEFAUVER. There would seem to be no doubt about that. That seems to be the attitude of those who signed the Senate report, and other eminent students of government have reached the same conclusion as the gentleman.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And to go a little further, with regard to the minority's fear that they might not be given an opportunity, it seems to me in the general sense of the thing that it actually is designed perhaps more for the benefit of the opposition or the minority because they would be the ones most likely in the course of things to have criticism of whatever administration is in power, and that is actually the way it works in the British Parliament, is it not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think it would be another very valuable tool with which we could all work and which would work fairly to the majority and the minority. It would give them an additional way of finding out what is going on, just as it would for those of the majority. I think it would work for the benefit of both sides fairly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think so. Personally, I am very much in favor of it.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman from Arkansas has mentioned, as several others have, the possibility of this plan placing the legislative branch at a disadvantage. I realize that he felt it would not place it at a disadvantage; I mean he mentioned the subject matter. But it seems to me in that connection we ought to give consideration to a procedure which, to my mind, is imperative here, whether we adopt this plan or whether we do not. Certainly, if we adopt this plan it seems to me it strengthens the argument for giving our committees a real staff and enabling our committee to be able to conduct some independent investigations by the standing committees. Why should not this Congress implement a reasonable number of committees that handle the various subjects coming before them with a sufficient staff so that they will be able to know something about the subject matter when they are going to interrogate the head of a department? If you do not have anybody to give you any information, and he has 100,000 employees in his department to give him the full information, the Congress would then be at a decided disadvantage. In other words, if we adopt this plan without going ahead and carrying out the plan that has been suggested by many Members here already, that is now pending, of actually implementing the committees and making our standing committees something more than mere figureheads, it seems to me very important we give our standing committees an adequate staff to make the members of each committee familiar with the subject matter. For instance, as I am on the Committee on Agriculture, I will use that as an illustration; I think the members of the Committee on Agriculture ought to have all the information from their own staff that the Secretary of Agriculture can get from his staff. The members of the Foreign Affairs Committee ought to have information from their own staff. I do not have any criticism of either Mr. Wickard or Mr. Hull.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I fully agree with the gentleman we should be better supplied with information and we should have expert staffs of our own. I think that is another proposal under consideration.

Mr. GWYNNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. GWYNNE. I understand this is entirely a voluntary proposition?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GWYNNE. And these Cabinet officials would appear by invitation? Would that invitation be extended by the House or by the committee?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The invitation would be extended by the committee having jurisdiction of the type of subject matter that they want the Cabinet officer to discuss.

Mr. GWYNNE. And you would have a limit on the number of times any Cabinet officer could be called?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Rules Committee fixes the priorities and perhaps a better procedure would be, since there might be several requests pending, to let the Rules Committee actually issue the invitation for a particular period.

Mr. GWYNNE. It would be true, of course, if the President did not want any particular Cabinet officer to attend, he could refuse permission to have him attend?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Under this resolution I think that is correct. But I think public opinion would deal rather harshly with any officer who did not attend unless he had some very good reason or excuse for not doing so.

Mr. GWYNNE. I am inclined to think it is a very good idea. I trust the matter will be examined by the committee having charge of it. I think it is entitled to consideration.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am very much interested in the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee. I think he has put his finger on one of the real needs of this Congress. We, after all, in this body are the best hopes of democracy. Our job in carrying on will be dependent on the tools we have to work with. The most vital tool is one of information. The best way we can get information is from the source itself. The gentleman is advocating a procedure that will give us part of that information. In conjunction with what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has mentioned about better supplying Congress with a staff of technicians of committees, I would like to call his attention to the proposal which I have made in conjunction with Senator MALONEY in a concurrent resolution to provide for a bipartisan committee from both Houses to study ways and means of improving our own congressional machinery to deal with these ever-increasing problems, and to also study relationships between Congress and departments downtown, because I believe any thoughtful student of this Government realizes we cannot expect to do the job unless we have the proper equipment to do it with.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman is very farseeing in his ideas about improving the machinery of government. I am interested in his resolution. I hope we can have favorable action on it also.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman who just preceded me has dwelt on the fact that we can get more information furnished all around by the procedure suggested. I want to call attention to the fact that we can get better spirit among all. When I spoke a moment ago about the gulf existing between this Congress and the departments of government, I mean just exactly that. There is today suspicion and ill will, possibly because we Members do not know that the men down in the departments are working earnestly for the benefit of this Government, just as we are. If we do know it, we ignore it, evidently. I find in consulting with them, from the highest to the lowest with whom I have consulted, that they are working for the best interest of the Government, and we are working for the best interests of the Government. I think it was Mark Twain who said, concerning a neighbor that he did not think much of:

> I do not want to get better acquainted with him. I might learn to like him.

In my opinion, if we could get better acquainted with the administrative officials who are carrying on their stated duties, there would be a better spirit all around as well as more information.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I agree with the gentleman. The great part of our executive officers are trying their best to do their duty. Those few who are not, or, who are not following the intentions of Congress, ought to be called here, and we should have an accounting from them, to see why they have not done their duty.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I regret that I was unable to hear the questions of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE]. Perhaps he touched on the thing that I would like to be clear about myself. As I understand from what the distinguished gentleman has already said with reference to his resolution, the invitations to be extended can only be issued by a Committee of the House. Am I correct in that?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We have seen many instances where questions of great moment were before this House. The thought occurs to me that the House might also want the right, by resolution, or by motion passed by a majority of the Members, to invite Members of the Cabinet, such as the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to the gentleman, that this resolution is not intended to take the place of any right which we have now. It is to set up a regular procedure for periods and reports. We have certain rights of inquiry now by resolution if we would use it. In any event, that should be allowed.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman agrees that the House should have that right if it does not have it now?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I have a very important letter I wanted to read, and I have not had an opportunity to read it. I would like to ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are other special orders. Those members are present.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman.

The other great man and statesman most able to give us counsel on this proposal is the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren. Because of his long and useful service in the House, Mr. Warren is a stanch believer in Congress. He is our friend, and every one of us knows it. He is intimately acquainted with the machinery of Congress and with our needs. As Comptroller General he is now in an important executive position. He can also view the picture from the executive angle. The office of the Comptroller General is an agency of Congress. It was created by Congress. It is responsible to Congress. Because of this, and because of Mr. Warren's peculiar fitness to pass on the question, I felt justified in asking his official opinion of this resolution. On November 24 I wrote Mr. Warren the following letter:

NOVEMBER 24, 1943.

HON. LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR LINDSAY: On October 19 I introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives to amend the rules of the House to provide for a question period at which heads of executive departments and independent agencies would be requested to appear and answer questions. A sympathetic debate on this resolution ensued in the House on November 12, 1 week before Secretary Hull made a personal report to Congress on the Moscow Conference.

You, because of your long, active, and useful service as a Member of the House, have a first-hand knowledge of the needs of the Congress for better information and of the desirability of keeping in closer touch with the administration of laws.

You, as Comptroller General, an agent of Congress, the head of one of the most important departments, can also advise us as to whether this plan would be helpful to the executive departments.

I would greatly appreciate you writing me your views on this proposal. Because of the high esteem in which you are held by the Members of the House, and the fact that you have seen service in both branches of our

Government, I feel that your views would be of especial value.

I am enclosing a copy of the resolution. It is, of course, rudimentary—something to use to begin consideration.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER.

Following is the reply I received from Mr. Warren:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, November 25, 1943.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR ESTES: I am in receipt of your letter of November 24, enclosing a copy of House Resolution 327 introduced by you on October 19, 1943, which would amend the rules of the House to provide for a question period at which heads of executive departments and independent agencies would be requested to appear and answer questions. I am very glad to submit to you my views on the subject as requested by you.

While I have not studied the language of the resolution, it is, as you say, rudimentary and is something to use to begin consideration. I very strongly favor the proposal both personally and officially. While a Member of the House, I held this view many years ago and recall that I spoke on it before a luncheon club in North Carolina. Since I have been out of Congress and holding the position of Comptroller General of the United States I favor the proposal even more than formerly.

I am somewhat acquainted with the English system, where I understand it works well in the House of Commons. Why should not the House of Representatives make it also workable and informing? While heads of departments and independent agencies are constantly called before committees of the Congress, what sound reason can be advanced why, on stated occasions, they should not be called before a session of the House itself? What does the House as a whole know about any particular department or agency or its policy on a given subject? Why, if not contrary to the public interest, would an administrator object to answering questions that the House might desire answered?

It is true that annual reports are required to be submitted to the Congress. But, no matter how thorough and good they might be—and some of them are quite informing—do you know of anyone who really reads them? I am sure many Members throw them in the wastebasket or merely file them away, never to be read, the minute the postman brings them in. On many measures exhaustive hearings are held covering at times volumes of printed matter.

Only a handful of Members read all of the hearings on a bill. They simply don't have time to do it. When a Member of the House, I thought I was reasonably active and alert, but I found that I read more hearings in a month as Comptroller General than I did in the 16 years I was a Member of the House. If a department or agency head was before the House as a whole for 2 hours, the Members could get more information in that time than they could ever get from annual reports, hearings or correspondence, as I assume that on the day the "question period" was held there would be a large attendance of Members.

The terms of your resolution sufficiently prevent it from being used as a vehicle for heckling and harassing administrators. I have always observed that if anyone has anything to say, he is given respectful attention by the House. However, it would certainly have a leavening effect if the man who is responsible for the expenditure of appropriated funds would know that the branch of the Government that gave him those funds could publicly question him about his administration. At the same time the proposal could prove of inestimable value to a careful administrator who has been misunderstood by possibly many Members of the House. He would be given the means of presenting his problem with far better and broader effect than he could ever hope to achieve before either a small committee or in a written communication. Thus, the proposal would be a timesaver for a busy administrator, as he would have the opportunity, at one appearance, to acquaint the entire House membership with much of the work of his office, to supply information to clear up any misunderstanding or misapprehensions which might exist in the minds of Members and to present his views on pending legislation affecting his office and its problems.

Speaking for myself, while I have no idea how long I shall serve as Comptroller General, once more I point out that the Comptroller General is the agent of the Congress, and it seems to me that anyone holding this position would welcome the opportunity of being called before the House, as your resolution would provide. It would be peculiarly appropriate for the House to question its own agent, not only about the General Accounting Office, but about matters in other agencies that have come to his attention.

I believe your proposal, if adopted, will prove of the greatest value both to the House and to the administrative departments and independent agencies.

With high esteem, I am,

Sincerely,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

How could a stronger argument for the plan be made? Who is better able to testify on the merits of the proposal? Where can we find a more competent witness? Lindsay Warren values his friendship with the Members of this House. He has our interest at heart. He is anxious for Congress to regain and retain its position in the Government. Does not his strong endorsement, alone, justify us in giving this proposal a trial?

Why are we afraid to try new methods? Remember it can be done by a very simple change of the rules of the House. If the practice does not meet our expectations, we can, by a majority vote, repeal the rule. In that case the Nation would at least give us credit for trying to improve the tools we work with. The people of this country want us to do that. They want a strong Congress; one able to hold its own with the executive departments. The wide and mostly favorable comment on this simple resolution is strong evidence of that fact.

When this proposal has been presented from time to time, it is interesting to note that on occasions it was rejected because of opposition in Congress; on other occasions, because of opposition from the executive departments. Some people have argued against it on the theory that it would give the Congress too much power over the Executive. Other people have opposed the idea because they thought it might give the Executive an undue influence over Congress. Surely there must be some middle ground. There must be some way we can get better information, some way we can secure better accounting from the departments. There must be some method by which we can improve teamwork.

I think this is a proper time to bring out the objections that have been put forth against this idea whenever it has been advocated. It is said that allowing executives to consult with Members of the House on the floor is not in keeping with the spirit of our Constitution. Under the Constitution each House makes its own rules.

Another objection frequently made by the opponents of modernizing our methods of communication through the suggested procedure is that it might be in violation of the tradition of the House. That is, they say that no person, except a Member of the House, should be permitted to appear and address the House. I do not think Mr. Hull's recent appearance did any damage to our tradition. As a matter of fact, I think the prominence given the House by his appearance was a definite help to the standing of Congress.

Under the constitutional power of the House to fix its own rules, each House admits a chaplain to open the proceedings with prayer. Under this power the House of Representatives admits contestants to argue their title to membership, and sometimes admits counsel to argue in the same behalf. By the act of 1817 each Territory—

Shall have the right to send a Delegate to the House of Representatives, each such Delegate shall have a seat in the House of Representatives with the right of debating, but not of voting.

Under this authority the Delegates of the Territories sit today in the House of Representatives and participate in its debates. I think this is a very wholesome way to find out the needs and problems of the Territories. I do not see that it adversely affects the tradition of the House. Some Members seem to be afraid of the idea because it is new. As a matter of fact, it is not new. No President addressed Congress in person from the time of Jefferson until President Wilson revived the practice. When it was revived it was something new and objection was made on that ground. Yet it is a wholesome and worth-while practice and I hope it is continued. The economic, international, and social situation of our Nation and people have changed rapidly since the early days of the Republic. Congress must keep pace with these changes. We have to adopt new techniques. Can no progress be made because of the newness of the idea?

Many distinguished Members of the House and Senate drew up the Constitution of the Confederate States. Its framers thought that good results might be obtained by establishing intercourse between the executive and legislative departments. Accordingly, in the Confederate Constitution after the words—

And no person holding any office under the Confederate States shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office—

The identical provision of the Federal Constitution upon which it was modeled—the following clause was introduced:

but Congress may by law grant to the principal officers in each of the executive de-

partments a seat upon the floor of either House with the privilege of discussing any measures appertaining to his department.

And let us remember the Constitution of the Confederate States was modeled after the Federal Constitution. It had the same provisions for separate divisions.

I think it should be pointed out again that this proposal has a long history. A committee of the House, headed by Congressman Pendleton, unanimously recommended the adoption of a similar plan in 1864. A distinguished committee of the Senate, headed by Senator Pendleton, unanimously recommended the adoption of this idea by the Senate in 1881. Governor Montague, of Virginia, when a Member of the House advocated adopting the idea and made several scholarly addresses in its favor. At the last Congress, Hon. William R. Thom, of Ohio, filed a bill to authorize Cabinet members to participate in debate. His remarks on the subject were well considered and pertinent.

I could give you hundreds of recommendations by former Members of Congress, executives, historians, and other prominent Americans, urging favorable consideration of this means of communication. I will name only a few of our leaders who have advocated this procedure and will read short extracts from some of their statements in favor of it. These men are good authorities upon whom we can rely. In their statements are found many good reasons for the adoption of this system.

President William Howard Taft, in his message to Congress made December 19, 1912, made a forceful argument for adoption of this proposal. He said in part:

There has been much lost motion in the machinery of Congress due to the lack of cooperation and interchange of views face to face between the representatives of the Executive and the Members of the two legislative branches of the Government. It was never intended they should be separated in the sense of not being in constant effective touch and relationship to each other. The legislature and Executive each perform its own appropriation functions, but these functions must be coordinated. I do not think that I am mistaken in saying that the presence of the members of the Cabinet on the floor of each House would greatly contribute to the enactment of helpful legislation.

Chief Justice Charles E. Hughes, in 1924, when Secretary of State, said:

It ought to be possible for Cabinet officers to take part in debate in both Houses on matters touching their departments and thus be able to give exact information and to defend themselves against unjust attacks. Under the present arrangement a Cabinet officer often hears of misunderstandings and of an outpouring of mistaken notions which a brief statement from him would have corrected, but the misapprehension has been voiced and has gone through the country perhaps never to be overtaken.

We can preserve the advantages of stability and enhance the opportunity of Executive leadership, not by overriding the cherished prerogatives of the Congress or by attempting to gain an illicit advantage for the leadership but having a recognized contact through the regular admission of Cabinet officers to the floor of the House of Congress.

The late Elihu Root wrote, April 20, 1935:

It has long seemed clear to me that we ought to have some arrangement under which Congress would have the benefit of more prompt and authoritative information as to the action of the executive department.

On the other hand, I think that a sense of liability of prompt explanation has a very good effect upon the head and the leading members of an executive department.

The Honorable John W. Davis wrote, March 19, 1936:

I have always thought it would be a good thing if members of the Cabinet were given the privilege of the floor of either House of Congress.

Congress, having control of its own procedure, can undoubtedly inaugurate such a system if it wants to. I am not sure that each House could not do it on its own account. One of the greatest advantages of the attempt is that it could be abandoned if it proves a failure, without any permanent amendment to the Constitution.

I do no' remember that I have ever discussed the subject in any public address, but I am quite willing to be quoted in favor of the experiment.

President James A. Garfield said:

Who does not know that the enactment of such a law will tend to bring our ablest men into the Cabinet of the Republic? Who does not know that if a man is to be responsible to his executive acts and also be able to tell why he proposes new measures, and to comprehend the whole scope of his duties, weak men will shirk from taking such places? Who does not know that it will call out the best talent of the land, both executive and parliamentary? It is the silent, secret influence that saps and undermines the fabric of republics, and not the open appeal, the collision between intellects, the array of facts. I hope that this measure will be fairly considered. If it does not pass now, the day will come, I believe, when it will pass. When that day comes I expect to see a higher type of American statesmanship, not only in the Cabinet but in legislative halls.

On another occasion President Garfield said:

I have long believed that the official relations between the Executive and Congress should be more open and direct. They are now conducted by correspondence with the presiding officers of the two Houses, by consultation with committees, or by private interviews with individual Members. This frequently leads to misunderstanding, and may lead to corrupt combinations. It would be far better for both departments if the members of the Cabinet were permitted to sit in Congress and participate in the debates on measures relating to their several departments—but, of course, without a vote. This would tend to secure the ablest men for the chief executive offices; it would bring the policy of the administration into the fullest publicity by giving both parties ample opportunity for criticism and defense.

President Woodrow Wilson, Committee or Cabinet Government? Overland Monthly, volume 3, third session, January 1884, page 25, said:

Cabinet government would, moreover, put the necessary bit in the mouth of beast caucus, and reduce him to his proper service, for it would secure open-doored government. It would not suffer legislation to skulk in committee closets and caucus conferences. Light is the only thing that can sweeten our political atmosphere—light thrown upon every detail of administration in the departments * * *.

It cannot be too often repeated that while Congress remains the supreme power of the State, it is idle to talk of steadying or cleansing our politics without in some way linking together the interests of the Executive and the Legislature. So long as these two great branches are isolated, they must be ineffective just to the extent of the isolation. Congress will always be master, and will always enforce its commands on the administration. The only wise plan, therefore, is to facilitate its direction of the Government and to make it at the same time responsible, in the persons of its leaders, for the acts of control and for the manner in which its plans and commands are executed. The only hope of wrecking the present clumsy misrule of Congress lies in the establishment of responsible Cabinet government. Let the interests of the Legislature be indissolubly linked with the interests of the Executive. Let those who have authority to direct the course of legislation be those who have a deep personal concern in building up the executive departments in effectiveness, in strengthening law, and in unifying policies; men whose personal reputation depends upon successful administration, whose public station originates in the triumph of principles, and whose dearest ambition it is to be able to vindicate their wisdom and maintain their integrity.

Committee government is too clumsy and too clandestine a system to last. Other methods of government must sooner or later be sought, and a different economy established. First or last, Congress must be organized in conformity with what is now the prevailing legislative practice of the world. English precedent and the world's fashion must be followed in the institution of Cabinet government in the United States.

Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, and one of our greatest authorities on American government, in his excellent book, Is America Worth Saving, at page 60, had this to say:

The business of national government has become so huge and so complex that the sharp separation of the executive and the legislative powers to which we have been accustomed for 140 years, is now distinctly disadvantageous. It brings in its train lack of coherence and of continuity in public policy; it conceals from the people much that they should know, and it prevents effective and quick cooperation between the Congress and the executive departments, both in times of emergency and in the conduct of the ordinary business of government. There is a way to overcome these embarrassments and difficulties without in any way altering the form of our government or breaking down the wise safeguards which the Constitution contains. That is to provide by law, as may be done very simply, that the members of the Cabinet shall be entitled to occupy seats on the floor of the Senate and House of Representatives, with the right to participate in debate on matters relating to the business of their several departments, under such rules as the Senate and House, respectively, may prescribe. Such an act should further provide that the members of the Cabinet must attend sessions of the Senate and House of Representatives at design. ted times, in order to give information asked by resolution or to reply to questions which may be propounded to them under the rules of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Were such a custom to be established an almost certain result would be the selection as heads of the great executive departments of men of large ability and personal force—men able to explain and to defend their policies and measures before the Congress of the United States in the face of the whole country. It would also follow that

the Nation's Legislature would be enabled to exercise a more intelligent and a more effective control over the executive departments than is now the case, as well as to render them more intelligent and more effective aid in the form both of appropriations and of positive law.

When Representative Clyde Kelly, of Pennsylvania, became the champion of the proposal, in the course of his campaign for it he asked the views of Mr. Hoover, then a Cabinet member. In replying, June 23, 1922, Mr. Hoover said he believed this one of the most constructive steps that could be taken in furthering the development of our political machinery.

There are in my mind overwhelming arguments that can be introduced in favor of this change in our traditions. I do not believe that any fundamental criticism can be directed against it except by those who would deliberately exaggerate it as an attempt to establish a form of parliamentary government. Anyone who understands the basis of such European organization will at once recognize that the step you propose has no relation whatever to this form of government.

Dr. Charles A. Beard, the noted historian, stated:

This (requiring Cabinet members to attend Congress) should have a wholesome influence on both departments of government. Again and again Congress enacts laws in vague and general terms, leaving interpretation and application to executive authority. In such cases it frequently happens that the administrator departs, or seems to depart, from the intention of the legislation, assuming that it was ever clearly formulated. The Members of Congress attack the administration on the floor and the administration fires volleys through the press at Members of Congress. Not an edifying spectacle. More than that, it delays, confuses, and hampers the transaction of business. Every issue of this character should be defended on the floor of Congress with the parties in interest face to face, the press watching, and the country informed.

Justice Story, The Constitution, section 869, said:

The heads of the departments are, in fact, thus precluded from proposing or vindicating their own measures in the face of the Nation in the course of debate, and are compelled to submit them to other men who are either imperfectly acquainted with the measures or are indifferent to their success or failure. Thus that open and public responsibility for measures which properly belongs to the executive in all governments, and especially in a republican government, as its greatest security and strength, is completely done away. The executive is compelled to resort to secret and unseen influences, to private interviews, and private arrangements to accomplish its own appropriate purposes, instead of proposing and sustaining its own duties and measures by a bold and manly appeal to the Nation in the face of its representatives. One consequence of this state of things is, that there never can be traced home to the executive any responsibility for the measures which are planned and carried at its suggestion. Another consequence will be (if it has not yet been) that measures will be adopted or defeated by private intrigues, political combinations, irresponsible recommendations, and all the blandishments of office, and all the deadening weight of silent patronage.

Francis E. Leupp, The Cabinet in Congress, Atlantic Monthly, December 1917, pages 774–775, 776–777:

The presence and consultation of Cabinet officers while Congress is debating important bills would reduce to a minimum the exercise of the President's veto power, and thus avert a deal of friction. * * *

Such a change of practice as I have been advocating would materially abridge the activities of the lobby, with advantage to the political morals of the Nation. * * *

* * * the argument most commonly urged against the project which has furnished my present text: that the American Cabinet, unlike the cabinet of a country under parliamentary government, has no independent or organic standing. It is not mentioned in the Constitution, its nearest approach to recognition there being the authorization of the President to "require the opinion, in writing, of the principal officer in each of the executive departments, upon any subject relating to the duties of their respective offices." We are asked, therefore, how we could fitly dignify these outsiders as the direct representatives of the President, and seat them in the Halls of Congress to speak and advise in his name.

The answer is, that we are contemplating no radical innovation. The laws creating what we call the Cabinet offices, in some instances explicitly, and in all by implication, make their occupants, as it were, the living instruments of the President in the performance of his complex functions; and the solemn acts of the heads of departments have long been given effect, even for judicial purposes, as acts of the President. How well rooted this conception of the Cabinet has become in the minds of Congress and the people is evidenced by the law, enacted in 1886 after an exhaustive discussion, placing the heads of departments, in the order of their official seniority, in the line of succession in the event of a temporary vacancy of the Presidency and Vice Presidency. This provision seems to give them a recognizable and highly important standing in the Government, whether or not they ever had one before.

As to their bodily presence on the floor of Congress, surely it involves no worse incongruity than the presence there of a group of Territorial Delegates who for many years have been sitting and speaking in the House and doing substantially everything that regular Members are entitled to do, except vote, and we are asking no more for our Cabinet officers. If such a privilege is granted to representatives of minor bodies of our population not yet organized into full-participating political units, on what pretext shall we deny it to a group of Federal officers who in a peculiar sense represent the entire body politic for purposes of commenting on pending legislation? Nobody raises a protest against an outsider being brought into either Hall to conduct, as Chaplain, the religious exercises at the opening of every day's session, or against the services of another outsider, the Sergeant at Arms, when he uses the symbols of force to compel good behavior among the lawmakers elected by the people. Nay, it is within the range of possibility that the House may decide one day to have an outsider for its Speaker; there is not a word in the Constitution to forbid it, and within a dozen years the question has been quietly mooted. Concerning the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Constitution is similarly silent; and I remember its being seriously proposed, during the readjuster deadlock of 1881, that the Senate avert a threatened crisis by taking this officer from private life. So it seems not unfair to discard the familiar "outsider" objection as too fragile to block the way of a desired improvement.

Roland Young, in his excellent treatise entitled "This is Congress," published in 1943, had this to say at page 258:

The process of communication could be further advanced by allowing the important administrative heads to speak directly to Congress from time to time. There is now a considerable amount of irresponsible criticism of administrators in both Houses, and especially in the House of Representatives, and I believe that this irresponsibility would be decreased, that congressional knowledge would be increased, and that members of the administration would be better able to justify their policy if they could speak directly to Congress. Congressional hearings are now a very important factor in improving the communications between the administration and Congress, but they go only part way; many hearings are poorly attended, which means that the witnesses waste their talents before a slim and unrepresentative audience. Many Members of Congress cannot conveniently attend these hearings, and, if they do attend, they cannot participate. On the other hand, members of the administration cannot now appear before Congress to answer charges made against them. No matter how severe the criticism, unjust or otherwise, the man who is attacked cannot answer the charges himself. I do not propose that the Cabinet be given seats in Congress; that would be too great a waste of time for the benefits which would accrue. I do suggest, however, that on certain occasions members of the Cabinet and other important administrative officers be allowed to address the Houses of Congress and to submit themselves to questioning. They do this now at press conferences. They do this now at congressional hearings. But they do not do it before Congress, and I feel that this type of direct communication between Congress and the administrators would reinvigorate the congressional process.

I wish to point out that the Pendleton bill and all subsequent bills and resolutions followed the line of permitting Cabinet members and administrators to sit on the floor of the House and participate in debate affecting their departments. Many Members of Congress objected on the idea that these executives would be around Congress too much of the time, would interfere with our business and that undignified wrangles would result. It is with these objections in mind that I provided in House Resolution 327 that the executives come to the House at a particular time and for a particular purpose. They would not be here at any other time. To prevent the asking of impertinent or irrelevant questions, and to make sure that the discussion was in line with the matter under consideration, the resolution provides for a screening of the questions to be asked the executive.

I know that this plan can be made to work. I am sure it will be beneficial to us, to the executive departments, and to the Nation. I hope you will give it a trial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain excerpts and quotations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BILLS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. LEFEVRE. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight to-

night to file a report on the bill H. R. 3621 and the bill H. R. 3691.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 25 minutes.

NEWSPAPER ATTACKS ON MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, for some time there was a deliberate, a long-continued effort to destroy the confidence of the people in their chosen representatives. That campaign was climaxed before the 1942 election, when the New Republic, the Daily Worker, the New Masses, PM, the Chicago Sun, and several other publications, which reflect the views of the Communists and the New Dealers, charged some 96 Members of the House and Senate with being disloyal. The overwhelming repudiation of that campaign of vilification, hate, and falsehood at the next election caused it to lose some of its force. It lost in volume and it lost in bitterness. Apparently it is now being renewed under cover and by similar publications. The administration's radio creator of disunity and disseminator of falsehood is again on the air. To me it is more than passing strange that two of the worshipers at the New Deal footstool—Blair Moody, of the Detroit News, and Helen Essary, who writes in the Washington Times-Herald—should so far forget themselves as to print articles which are not only false but which can have no purpose other than to ridicule, to belittle, to disgrace Members of Congress.

Blair Moody knows personally many Members of Congress, he has had lunch with more than one of them in this same restaurant. He, when he wishes, eats at the table maintained in the same lunchroom for members of the press, and he uses the press gallery and all its facilities, paid for by tax money, for his business as a reporter, from which he makes a living. He has been doing it, he will continue to do it, and his paper—the Detroit News—will continue to use the press gallery provided by a subsidy but it will lie about Congressmen who pay full price for all they eat in the Capitol. He knows that no one ever had there a meal or lunch which was worth more than it cost. He knows every one of the Michigan Members of the House, and, while this article from the Detroit News charges that our meals are subsidized, Blair knows that charge is false. He may not have written the article himself, but he is the guiding spirit of the staff of the News and he has not repudiated it.

One of these articles, the one printed after the vote on subsidies, can serve no useful purpose. It can tend only—and that seems to be the apparent purpose—to make the people believe that their representatives in Congress—the Senators and the Members of the House—shall I say, are crooked? That we are dishonest? That is about what it amounts to, that we can be bought, and that we can be bought for the price of a meal or several meals. It would not be so bad if these two writers and the radio announcer who followed the same line would confine themselves to the truth. They know that Congressmen must eat. They know the House meets at 12. They know there is no other place where we can eat and also attend to our duties. They know we have paid for lunches there the price fixed by the O. P. A.

Take the Essary article. In that it is pointed out that the restaurants operated in the Senate and in the House suffered a loss in 1942 of $85,000. Then the lady—sweet Helen, we might call her—divides the $85,000 by the number of Senators and Congressmen, 531, and arrives at the figure of $160, which amount she says the Congressmen voted themselves as a food subsidy. Of course, these 2 writers are sore; that is a common term. When you get the veneer off they are just common folks. They are just sore because they did not get their New Deal way. They are just lacking in fairness, in truthfulness, in the milk of human kindness, in charitable impulses when they write such articles. What they are like ordinarily, I do not know, but those qualities are what they lacked at that particular time when those articles were written. For this reason: It is not true that the Members benefitted by $160 each. They give the impression that those restaurants are operated only for Members. I will confine myself to the House restaurant, which by the way did not operate in 1942 at a loss of $85,000 but at a loss of $20,508, while the cafeteria—and something more will be said of that later—over in the new House Office Building operated at a profit of $3,506. And by the way, many of us eat over at the cafeteria; and for myself I may say that I would be glad to eat the 1 meal a day which I am forced to eat on Capitol Hill at the cafeteria if it were possible to get over there and back from the time we are called at 12 o'clock noon and the time we adjourn without being off the floor when business is being transacted. I would prefer to eat over there because the room is larger, it is airy and clean, the food is better, and we are not crowded. But our duties require us to be over here at 12 o'clock and unfortunately the restaurant on the ground floor is the only place we can get a lunch, unless it be in the lunchrooms at the back of the Chamber. Many of us eat there. I sometimes carry my lunch, and on occasion become interested here on the floor and forget about it. I think we should use this occasion, this question having been brought up, as a spur to induce the House of Representatives to provide for us a decent eating place where we can get a decent meal at a fair price; and I might say, too, that I am charitable enough to continue the custom of which the lady made no mention—nor did Blair Moody—that permits the members of the press to have a table set aside for them down there where they may continue to eat with us, as they have for years. I hope, too, that their consciences will not bother them when they sit down and partake of the taxpayers' generosity—if that is what it is.

Helen herself eats down there because she said in this little article on Tuesday—and that was the day we had the turkey lunch—it was not Thanksgiving, it was Tuesday. On Tuesday she said:

> I had a tenderloin steak sandwich there with french-fried potatoes and that extra cup of coffee for 50 cents.

On that item the menu reads: "Tenderloin steak sandwich, french-fried potatoes, coleslaw, 50 cents."

Well, if she paid but 50 cents and had a cup of coffee she cheated the waiter out of a nickel because it costs Members 5 cents for every cup of coffee we drink except when we buy the regular 60-cent lunch. Now, she had better hustle down and give the House restaurant to apply on the deficit which will occur this year that nickel which she owes for that cup of coffee.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. If she only paid 50 cents for that lunch and had two cups of coffee then it is not a nickel she cheated the waiter out of but a dime.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman. I wanted to be generous with the lady.

She gave the impression that the House restaurant—in fact she says as much—that the House restaurant was operated exclusively for the benefit of Congress. As, for example, when she divided the amount of its deficit by the number of Senators and Congressmen. Now the woman knows that is not true. Of course, being a woman she is entitled to make a few misstatements, but she should not broadcast them all over the country, especially when she knows her statements are not true. That is not fair. She knew when she wrote that article that many of the meals down there that are paid for by Congressmen are served to their constituents, taxpayers who contribute to that so-called subsidy she writes about.

She knows that there is a large table there in the House restaurant over next to the wall set aside for employees, or secretaries of Members who have to come over on duty while we are in session, matters pertaining to our office work. She knows that the largest table is set aside for members of the press.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a small correction?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The lady evidently does not know that according to testimony given before our subcommittee in relation to this matter that approximately 900 people eat meals down there each day. All of us know that scarcely one-third of the House membership partake each day down at the restaurant.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I hope the gentleman will not fail to mention while he is discussing this question the fact that across the hall from the House restaurant is one exclusively for the public.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, the lady knew, and so did Blair Moody, and so did the radio announcer who tried to discredit Congressmen that a large section of the restaurant which is supposed to be for the use of Members is used by employees about the House and that just across the hall and served from the same kitchen, at the same price, is a restaurant under the same management where the public may eat the same kind of food served House employees, reporters, and Congressmen in the House restaurant.

I may say further that I have never seen any Member of the House sit down at the table set aside for our friends up there in the press gallery. Go down, boys and girls of the press, and get in on this so-called subsidy. We of the House are always glad to see you there. Watch closely when Blair and Helen eat—you will never see either choking over any subsidy meal because of a strained conscience. I do not blame the reporters, because they have to earn a living just as you and I, and unfortunately or otherwise they have to eat and there is no other place for them to eat. I do not blame them for writing the news. I do not blame them for being critical. That is their privilege. Let them hop to it. Any man who cannot take it should not be in Congress. But when unfair articles like these two go out, we should correct them even though we know we cannot fight the press. In fact, sometimes their critical remarks get votes for us back in our districts. I concede the ability of the reporters, they are here and sometimes they take my hide off. And with that I find no fault when they write the facts. But I wish they would pass the information along to their editors, when those editors and publishers are telling us what skunks we are and when they attempt to advise us on every question, while they continue to be responsible to no one, mind you, while they never stand for election, that those editors and publishers be patriotic enough to go into the districts and run for the House or Senate, come down here and give our poor, benighted people who selected us good, competent, honest, patriotic legislators and competent service. Send one or two of your editors or columnists over into my district and perhaps the district will get something worth while.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Let the RECORD show that if we did not have this restaurant down here, it is probably a mile downtown, and if the Members went downtown to eat, as this article would indicate we should, the expense to the Government would be many times what it is.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No, the gentleman is wrong. That is not the lady's idea at all. You are a big, husky man from Texas, you ought to be able to go from morning until night without anything to eat. You ought to be able to go up to this "greasy elbow" on the corner and get something to eat. Do you know that at Ted's place you can get a meal for less than we pay down here?

Mr. POAGE. About half.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; not half. For about 10 or 15 cents less, and a better meal at that. I have been back and forth, but I cannot go over there all the time. I cannot get the time when the House meets at 12 and continues in session until late in the afternoon.

Mr. POAGE. If the gentleman went over there it would be a loss to the Government.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would not go that far. It might be a benefit to the Government. According to some radio commentators, some editors, and writers of columns, the country could do without all of us while they directed the Government.

Mr. POAGE. Let the RECORD show also that the cost in the reporters' dining room is exactly the same as it is to the Congressmen.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What is the gentleman talking about? There is no reporters' room. They eat with us, in the same room, at a table reserved for them.

Mr. POAGE. The reporters' table, then. They all get the same food at the same price we do. There is no discrimination in favor of Congressmen.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I knew that, and so did Blair and Helen.

Mr. POAGE. Well, let the RECORD show it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; we all knew that. And we all know that the public gets the same food, the same service, at the same price under the same management in the same building in a room not 20 feet from where we eat.

Mr. POAGE. Yes; we knew it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. They talk about a turkey dinner. It was not a dinner; it was a lunch. Why, over in the Pentagon Building they served a turkey dinner for 30 cents. We should have gone over there.

Mr. POAGE. And the Government paid for that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I had some of that turkey served last Tuesday downstairs. I do not know whether you fellows ate the dressing or not. I did not. I am not blaming the cooks down there, I am not blaming the waiters nor the management. But go down and look through the kitchen, look down there where our food is prepared. It is in an old hole down in the ground. Everyone working down there is at a disadvantage. Most, if not all, are on part-time. Some are underpaid. Why have we not the sense and the courage to feed ourselves at least as well or intelligently as we feed our hogs and cattle back home on the farm? Why have we not that much sense? We do not do it. What did Dr. Calver say the other day in that published article of his? He said we were overworked. That may be news to some of you. I always thought we did overwork on occasions. He said our food was not what it ought to be, that we do not get our meals on time. That because of the rush and worry our stomachs get out of order. He said we were pushed this way and that. And here comes Helen and—about us to our people—we will have many, many letters to answer because of her false statements. It is our own fault that we do not have better food and a less crowded place in which to eat. Why do we let that go on? Because we are afraid of what the press will tell the public. Now, let us tell the press to go to for once in our existence and get ourselves a dining room, a lunchroom, or whatever you want to call it, equal to that which we have provided for the secretaries over in the New House Office Building, a kitchen that is clean and airy, a dining room with plenty of room, and food over there better than we get down here and on which the Government last year made a profit of over $3,000. These worshipers at the New Deal shrine jump on us, they print in the Detroit paper a picture of Republican Congressmen who, they falsely claim, vote themselves a subsidy and then deny a subsidy to the people around the country. That ought to be news to you, Brother PATMAN, you eat down there. Maybe that is why you voted for subsidies in the end. How silly the charge, how false, how harmful, how small and mean—yes, just mean and false.

Listen, that place down there that these two brilliant New Deal worshipers are squawking about is operated by the New Deal. Republicans are not in charge—the O. P. A. fixes the prices. What are they hollering about? Why not get after Eleanor on one of her frequent visits home, have her come down here, inspect the kitchen and eat a meal there once. Everyone knows what that food is down there. It is all right for one meal. Our constituents come in, we take them down there, as we are happy to do, and they like the food, but when you eat down there day after day, day after day, if you are like I am you put down as much as you can because you have to live, then you go on your way.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Old No. 6 came in downstairs with that slice of turkey. I was listening to the gentleman who substituted the other night for Fulton Lewis. That was broadcast all over the country, to millions of people. I gathered from what he said that we had about a five- or six-course turkey dinner down there that day. I wondered how I missed it. I had the same thing the gentleman did, a mess of questionable dressing with a little slice of turkey on top of it. That is all it was that Old No. 6 brought in.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then the lady says here, "or a chef's special 'A': fresh Mississippi shrimp, sea-food style, with steamed rice, coffee, tea, or milk, and that extra pat of butter, for a mere 35 cents."

I cannot find it on there. And I hold in my hand Tuesday's menu.

Mr. ANGELL. It is not on there.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot see it. Anyway, why should she sweat her shirt, that is what I want to know. She was out that day herself. Of course, she did not pay for it, a friend of hers paid for it, I assume, for she was a guest. I read the caption:

SOCIETY

Mrs. Edward Beale McLean holds annual Thanksgiving Day breakfast with 200 attending.

The lady finds a lot of fault with the Members of Congress, including the Senators, for getting in on this turkey luncheon, but she has no objection to associating with people—Senators who may vote against subsidies—that she intimates are disreputable, crooked, and a little bit off color, because in the paper here I find a long list of Senators and their wives she had breakfast with. It is a "breakfast" according to this writer in this paper. They had for lunch—what did they have?

Mr. POAGE. What time of day did they have that breakfast?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know. It is breakfast in one paper and it is lunch in the other. Did they eat it all day? The article in one paper is by Betty Hynes and the other is by Betty Milliken. I do not know those girls, but anyway, Betty Hynes writes about the breakfast and Betty Milliken writes about the luncheon.

Betty Milliken says:

The luncheon menu consisted of turkey, with chestnut dressing, sweetpotatoes, cranberry sauce, and peas, served with sauterne—

What kind of a food is that, sauterne?—

and a particularly delicious cream cake which was served with coffee later.

Then they had something we did not have.

After luncheon was over—

You see, it started with breakfast and it ended up with lunch, although in fairness I want to say that in my opinion it was all one meal and could not have taken over an hour and a half.

After luncheon was over, the guests strolled in the garden, where numerous statues of famous statesmen, against a setting of boxwood, line a large swimming pool. "Cheesy," a Maltese cat named by one of the maids in the household, hovered about, lending an air of home-like simplicity to an otherwise formal gathering.

Kitty! The claws show in this story by Helen.

You see the way it is, what they are trying to do. Every time they get the stomach ache, every time one of these columnists or how should I describe the female of the species? Anyway, any time one of them gets a little stomach ache, every time one of them gets a little headache, every time the Congress—and this time it was 2 to 1—every time the Congress, elected by the people, does its honest best to carry out the will of the folks who send us down here, but run counter to their ideas, along they come with a bucketful of abuse and falsehood and give it to us.

I am not complaining about it, do not get that idea. It is all duck soup to me, because the folks at home know that no one has ever been able to give me anything to which I am not entitled. These stories are just another example of the hysteria here in Washington.

They have charged us with everything they could think of for the last 2 years—yes, 4 years, have they not?—and still our folks send us back. So I might suggest that we let our own consciences be our guide, that we go along in the old homely way, that we continue to eat down here as it is the only place we have to eat. I am hoping that a good meal will soothe the dispositions of Helen and Blair, make them more charitable, and they will go back up in the gallery in the afternoons feeling better toward all humanity. Yes, God bless them. It is too bad that their dispositions cause them to print or pass such articles as those.

Now let us get to this question of subsidies and inflation.

ADMINISTRATION HAS INFLATION REMEDY

"Inflation" is the term used to describe a situation or condition where the volume of purchasing power, either by money or credit, exceeds in an unnatural or abnormal degree the volume of purchasable merchandise or service.

Inflation, if continued, results in an apparent prosperity, in a real depression. It first creates fictitious values, then a deflation which wipes out the savings of years.

Inflation and high prices are not synonymous. The law of supply and demand, operating in normal times, together with man's desire for a profit and an avoidance of losses, will prevent ruinous inflation but will not prevent temporarily high prices.

To illustrate, one fall early in married life when wages were low, my own being $6 a week, there was a scarcity of potatoes and the price was $5 a bushel. The next spring I planted an acre of potatoes, hoping to make a profit, certain we would eat potatoes without paying $5 a bushel. Evidently a few others had the same brilliant idea for that fall potatoes were 25 cents a bushel. Wages were still low but no less. Supply and demand got in its work.

Doctors, lawyers, professional men all, for an hour's service often receive many, many times the amount paid to others for work over a like period. We all know of and accept that situation because up to this time there has been a comparative shortage of competent professional men. Hence, they demanded and received greater compensation than others less skilled.

It is unnecessary to give other illustrations to show the difference between high prices and inflation. High prices originate and may continue for varying periods because of the operation of the law of supply and demand. Nevertheless, they are soon leveled off through the operation of that law. Inflation comes about because of the arbitrary pumping into the economic life of a nation, of abnormal, excessive purchasing power.

It may be brought about by issuing printing-press money, by borrowing, by government credits, or expenditures, which in turn permit excessive profits, by the payment of high wages or profits, by waste and extravagance.

Today we have inflation reflected in an increase in the cost of living. One cause was the spending of billions of dollars in the pre-war period for, to use a broad, general term, "boondoggling." Another cause, and this was unavoidable, was the spending of billions for the war effort. Coupled with the latter spending, however, was the unjustifiable procedure of paying excessive prices for war production. Now it is quite true that because of lack of time, much of the production could not be obtained without waste. But that was only a small part of the unnecessary spending.

Today there is ample proof that the Government has received but a fraction of what it should have received for the dollars expended. Within the month, before a subcommittee of the House Naval Affairs Committee, in a plant in which this Government has invested some sixty-odd million dollars, which has war contracts amounting to more than $130,000,000, the head of the union, responsible for the activities of 18,000 employees, admitted that although the employees had received pay-and-a-half and double pay for overtime and Sunday work, they had been but one-third efficient. They loafed while our men in the service fought and died.

The Detroit News of last week carried the story of a woman reporter who had worked for 2 years in two war plants in Detroit. She wrote that a 2-hour job was stretched into a 10-hour job and that the war plant workers purposely wasted their time in order to spread the work, prolong their jobs.

The Chicago Tribune last week published a series of articles showing that Communists had slowed down production at least 30 percent in numerous war plants in the Chicago area.

The Government, because of the contracts it makes with war industries, pays for this idle time and it pays the industrialists a profit on the time lost, the cost of which goes into the price charged the Government.

The administration, through lend-lease, has paid billions of dollars to foreign governments which in turn have used billions of dollars to finance purchases on the American market, regardless of cost. That sort of buying has tended to increase prices. All these have tended to bring on inflation.

More than 2 years ago from the floor of the House many a Member pointed out that ruinous inflation was on its way

and from the floor of the House the Congressman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] pleaded, yes begged, the House to adopt legislation he offered which would have prevented the conditions which now confront us.

Nevertheless, the administration would have none of it and the House compromised on a bill which was an effort to fix the price of commodities, but which at the President's demand, ignored and left to him the stabilizing of wages which was the other half of the problem.

How silly, how absurd to pretend that inflation can be prevented, the rising cost of living halted by the payment of subsidies, without fixing the price of commodities, without holding the line on wages.

In spite of the President's statement that he would hold the line and stabilize wages, if given the power to fix prices—and we gave it to him—many of us knew that because of the political tie-up with certain union leaders it would not be done. The President has not held the line and today he seeks to avoid the consequences of his own failure by charging that Congress, in refusing to vote subsidies, will be responsible for inflation.

Nor is the issue a political one, as shown by the fact that on the vote on the final passage of the bill banning subsidies, 98 Democrats voted for it; only two more voted against it.

Today, under the law which we gave him in January of 1942, the President has authority to prevent an increase in prices—a raise in the cost of living.

This administration insults the intelligence of the people when it says that Congress is responsible for the increase in the cost of living—when we see every day in the press of the country a list of prices which his administrative agencies have fixed. The administration has been fixing prices; it is fixing prices today, and it can continue to do so. If the cost of living goes up, no one but the administration is to blame. The administration has the power to prevent inflation. If for political purposes it insists upon refusing to use its power to halt the rising cost of living, the responsibility rests upon the administration.

It does not need—it does not want—subsidies to halt inflation; it wants subsidies to give an indirect raise in pay to industrial workers.

No, Mr. President, this inflation baby is your baby. It was conceived in the minds of your economic advisers; the midwives who attended its birth were the dreamy-eyed professors and its wet nurses have been, and are, your administrative agencies.

You will not be permitted by lambasting Congress, after it has given you all the power and all the money—except subsidy money for political purposes—for which you have asked, to escape responsibility for a condition which now threatens millions of white-collared workers, and all those who are living on fixed incomes. If they go hungry, the fault is that of your administration. You cannot shift it to Congress.

If because of high prices and low wages our people cannot purchase needed food, why not divert some of the millions of tons which are going to other countries to the feeding of our own people; why not use some of the billions of dollars sent to foreign lands, including South America, for the benefit of our white-collar consumers; why not, for once, begin to think of our own folks?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. STEVENSON (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) for 10 days, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a story by Mr. Relman Morin, of the Associated Press, with regard to activity of the Thirty-sixth Division overseas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Portsmouth (N. H.) Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] be permitted to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, November 29, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

941. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 369. Resolution providing additional funds for the expense of the Select Committee Investigating the Federal Communications Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 888). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3664. A bill to establish a boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 895). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3621. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the regulation of motor vehicle traffic in the District of Columbia, increase the number of judges of the police court, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 896). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3691. A bill to permit the construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for steam-heating purposes in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 897). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1062. A bill for the relief of the estate of John H. Cathcart; with amendment (Rept. No. 889). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2390. A bill for the relief of Joseph Scarpella and Dorothy Scarpella; with amendment (Rept. No. 890). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2457. A bill for the relief of David Hickey Post No. 235 of the American Legion; with amendment (Rept. No. 891). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2804. A bill for the relief of Ruth E. P. Phillips; with amendment (Rept. No. 892). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3157. A bill for the relief of Lloyd L. Johnson; with amendment (Rept. No. 893). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims: H. R. 3371. A bill for the relief of the dependents of Dr. Arthur B. Wyse, and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 894). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill H. R. 3710 for the relief of Jacob Wilkes Beasley, and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3740. A bill to expedite the issuance of marriage licenses in the District of Columbia to members of the armed services and merchant marine; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3741. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 3742. A bill to provide for payment of mustering-out pay to members of the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 3743. A bill to permit the use of live decoys in the taking of ducks; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. J. Res. 197. Joint resolution to provide for the teaching of the English language in the German nation after the present war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 3744. A bill for the relief of H. B. Gilliam and C. E. Ellis, receivers of the Quantico Co., Inc., for balance of purchase price, rentals, and interest for lands used and occupied by the United States Marine Corps at Quantico, Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 3745. A bill for the relief of Steve Hlass; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 3746. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to convey certain land within Des Moines County, Iowa; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3747. A bill for the relief of Marden Construction Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3780. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of 1,000 citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3781. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of the Barry-Wehmiller Machinery Co., of St. Louis, Mo., and signed by 25 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3782. Also, petition of A. F. Louis and 52 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3783. Also, petition of the Cook Paint & Varnish Co. of St. Louis, Mo., and signed by 44 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3784. Also, petition of the American Legion Post, No. 299, of St. Louis, Mo., and signed by 125 citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3785. Also, petition of the Barry-Wehmiller Machinery Co. and signed by 292 citizens of St. Louis, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3786. By Mr. SCRIVNER: Petition of sundry citizens of Kansas City, Wyandotte County, Kans., urging passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3787. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the employees of the Gorsart Co., of New York City, favoring the adoption of the resolution which provides for the creation by the President of a commission to effectuate a plan to rescue surviving European Jews; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3788. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of E. D. Reagan and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1943

(Legislative day of Thursday, November 18, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, source of the light that never fails or fades, we would yield the flickering torch of our insufficiency to Thee. Apart from Thee all is darkness and death. In the midst of world conditions that baffle us, of swift social currents which sweep away our strongest bulwarks, of evil forces let loose in the earth whose hideous cruelty stabs our anguished hearts, we confess that the world in which our lot is cast is too much for us; we must find a strength not our own or our feet will slip in this whelming flood.

We long for Thy life to flow through our anxious and weary hearts. Into Thy brooding presence we would lift up in this hallowed moment the thronging duties which haunt us day and night, the grievous problems affecting Thy children in all the world for which our human wisdom finds no answer. Anoint and cheer our soiled face with the abundance of Thy grace. Strengthen our faith in each other. Heal the divisions which shorten the arm of our national might in this dread hour. Guard our lips from chilling criticism which may wound some comrade plodding bravely by our side. Bring our spirits into captivity to that which is high and holy and of good report. Spurning and scorning the unworthy may we rejoice only in the fair and fragrant virtues of an honor untarnished. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, November 26, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1410) to amend section 4 of the act approved June 13, 1940, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR BARBOUR BY JEWISH WAR VETERANS

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by the Jewish War Veterans of the United States embodying a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States in tribute to our late beloved colleague, Senator Barbour. The resolution emphasizes the contribution by my late colleague to the fight against intolerance, and his efforts in behalf of Jewish war veterans.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK.—The memory of the late Senator W. Warren Barbour, United States Senator from New Jersey, was honored "as a loyal American and as a true friend of all minorities" by a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, it was announced by Archie H. Greenberg, national commander of the Jewish War Veterans.

The resolution pointed out that Senator Barbour had introduced a recent bill to admit 100,000 refugees into the United States; that he had introduced another bill to bar subversive literature from the mails; that he was cochairman with William Allen White of the Council Against Intolerance; and that he had introduced a resolution in the Senate to grant the Jewish War Veterans its national charter.

The resolution, copies of which were sent to the family of Senator Barbour and the United States Senate, follows:

"Whereas the late W. Warren Barbour, United States Senator from New Jersey, was a loyal American and a true friend of all minorities; and

"Whereas in his long career of public service he consistently espoused legislative action

to implement the principles of American fraternity and equality; and

"Whereas all believers in the fundamental principles of American democracy were heartened by 2 bills recently presented to the Senate by Senator Barbour, 1 bill which would admit 100,000 refugees into the United States and the other which would bar subversive literature from the mails; and

"Whereas as cochairman with William Allen White of the Council Against Intolerance, Senator Barbour was a valiant leader in the fight against intolerance of all minorities; and

"Whereas we of the Jewish War Veterans owe him a debt of gratitude for introducing a bill in the United States Senate to grant our organization its national charter: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the executive committee of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, an organization representing 250,000 Jewish veterans of the First World War, adopt this resolution expressing our sincere sympathy to the family of the late Senator Barbour on his untimely passing, and that we express our conviction that Senator Barbour was an outstanding American statesman, a true exponent of the American principles of democracy; and be it further

"Resolved, That National Commander Archie H. Greenberg forward copies of this resolution to the family of the late Senator Barbour and to his colleagues in the United States Senate."

SENATOR FROM NEW JERSEY—CREDENTIALS

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I present the credentials of Hon. ARTHUR WALSH, appointed by the Governor of New Jersey to succeed the late Honorable W. Warren Barbour as Senator from New Jersey. I ask that the credentials be read and placed on file.

The credentials were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY—CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of New Jersey, I, Charles Edison, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint ARTHUR WALSH to be Senator of said State to represent said State of New Jersey in the Senate of the United States, until the vacancy therein caused by the death of W. Warren Barbour is filled by election on November 7, 1944, as provided by law.

Witness His Excellency our Gov. Charles Edison, and our seal hereto affixed at Trenton this 26th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1943, and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and sixty-eighth.

By the Governor:

CHARLES EDISON,
Governor.

[SEAL] JOSEPH A. BROPHY,
Secretary of State.

APPOINTMENT OF BRIGADIER GENERALS OF THE LINE IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1410) to amend section 4 of the act approved June 13, 1940.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I move that the House amendment to Senate bill 1410, with the accompanying bill, be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HILL. What is the bill?

Mr. AUSTIN. It is the bill which removed a limitation of service of a certain number of years which exists in the law at the present time before an officer can be promoted.

Mr. HILL. Has the bill just come over from the House?

Mr. AUSTIN. It has.

Mr. HILL. I have not myself examined it. Is the House amendment unacceptable? Is it contrary to what the Senate Committee on Military Affairs thought to be the real purpose of the bill? Does it defeat the real purpose of the bill?

Mr. AUSTIN. I am unable to answer the question. The purpose of my motion is to ascertain the views of the committee regarding the House amendment.

Mr. HILL. Of course, I have no objection to ascertaining the views of the committee. As the distinguished Senator knows, when the Senate passes a bill and the House amends it, ordinarily we either concur in the amendment or the bill is sent to conference. We do not ordinarily send the matter to committee. So I really wondered why the Senator was seeking to have this matter sent to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think some other method might be pursued than sending the bill to conference. I think, perhaps, the committee has several courses it might take. It might report favorably the House amendment. It might report an amendment to the House amendment. If I may refer to the amendment for a moment, I call attention merely to one point. The new matter suggested by the House is in this language:

Provided, however, That not more than 25 percent of the total authorized number of brigadier generals of the line may be appointed, without regard to length of service, from among officers of the line commissioned in grades not below that of lieutenant colonel and whose names are borne on such eligible list.

I am not sure that I have covered the whole amendment, but I think I have. I have not had time to look over it. The House amendment has just been laid before the Senate.

Mr. HILL. It has just come over from the House, as I understand.

Mr. AUSTIN. It has.

Mr. HILL. Of course, I have no objection to the full committee passing on the matter. My reason for asking the Senator the question was that ordinarily we do not send a bill back to a committee, as I have stated. We ordinarily send it to conference, or concur in any amendment the House may have made. I suppose there will be a meeting of the full committee at an early date to pass on the question.

Mr. AUSTIN. I assume there will be a prompt meeting of the committee.

Mr. HILL. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont.

The motion was agreed to.

RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF CONNECTICUT CONCERNING WORLD FEDERATION

Mr. MALONEY presented a joint resolution of the General Assembly of Connecticut, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas it is necessary at the present critical juncture of human affairs to enlarge the bases of organized society by establishing some form of a government for the community of nations, in order to preserve civilization and to enable mankind to live in peace and to be free; and

Whereas it has become necessary for certain nations of the world to unite and cooperate to win the war, it is just as necessary and important that they should unite and cooperate to see that a lasting peace is secured for the benefit of all nations; and

Whereas the ceaseless changes wrought in human society by science and by the growth of spiritual, social and economic forces make no longer possible the political isolation of nations; and

Whereas nationalism alone has proven tragically incapable of preserving the rights and liberties of man and of protecting his life and property; and

Whereas history has revealed many instances by which free peoples inhabiting extensive territories without impairing their local autonomy have, through a federation or union of such peoples, acted together for the great benefit of all thus united and have thus preserved the whole without destroying any of its parts; and

Whereas such a union, federation, or commonwealth would vitalize all nations, members thereof, by endowing them with security and freedom to develop their respective cultures without menace of foreign domination or of wars; and

Whereas such a federation, union, or association of nations would reduce to its ultimate minimum the possibility of the occurrence of war, and mankind, saved from fear of conquest and released from the paralyzing expenditure of wealth and effort for endless war, would be free to give its full energies and intelligence to the common enterprise of building civilization for the benefit of all the people of the earth; and

Whereas the first step in achieving such protective security is the formulation of a constitution under which such a federation or union of peoples would operate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut does hereby declare itself in favor of the principle that all the peoples of the earth should upon the successful termination of the present world conflict or as soon as possible thereafter be united in a federation, union, league, or commonwealth of nations, providing the proposed articles of federation, union, league, or commonwealth of nations is possible without departure from the principles of constitutional liberty as established by irrepealable law in the Constitution of the United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That the General Assembly hereby requests the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives in Congress from the State of Connecticut to support and vote for a resolution in the Congress of the United States, approving the principle of world federation or of some form of world cooperation under law, and requesting the President of the United States to initiate at the proper

time the procedure necessary to formulate a constitution for such a federation, union, or league of the peoples of the world, which shall be submitted to the people of each nation for its ratification; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives in Congress from the State of Connecticut.

FORM OF GOVERNMENT FOR LEBANON

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a telegram I have received from Mrs. George Whibey, president, and Mrs. Abdullah Hamrah, secretary, of the United Ladies Lebanese Syrian American Society of Waterbury, Conn., relating to the Republic of Lebanon.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MERIDEN, CONN., *November 22, 1943.*

Senator FRANCIS T. MALONEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We believe that the present status of the Republic of Lebanon should be free of any foreign influence and not remain under the French mandate. We are a few of the many loyal citizens of the United States who reside in Connecticut and are proud of the many sons we have in the services. While we are of Lebanese extraction we still have many friends and relatives living in Lebanon and we prevail upon you to use your good office to maintain the promise made by the French commissioner to the Lebanese people to make Lebanon a free and independent republic.

UNITED LADIES LEBANESE SYRIAN
AMERICAN SOCIETY OF WATERBURY,
Mrs. GEORGE WHIBEY, *President,*
Mrs. ABDULLAH HAMRAH, *Secretary.*

PERSECUTION OF THE ARMENIANS

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing at this point in the RECORD a letter embodying a resolution which was passed unanimously at a mass meeting held by the Armenian-American citizens of Hartford, Conn., on November 12, 1943.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST HARTFORD, CONN.,
November 18, 1943.

The Honorable FRANCIS MALONEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: At a mass meeting held by the Armenian-American citizens of Hartford, Conn., on November 14, 1943, the following resolution was passed unanimously:

"Whereas recent information from Turkey through press correspondence and private letters reveals that the Turkish Government has launched a new persecution campaign against the non-Islam elements, especially the Armenians, through the enactment of an unjust wealth-taxing law; and

"Whereas those who are unable to meet the imposed tax are forced to forfeit their property including personal belongings, while the head of the family is sentenced to hard manual labor in the interior of Anatolia, being subjected to extreme hardships resulting in illness and death; and

"Whereas this is not an economic policy of the Turkish Government but a plain plan for the annihilation of the Armenians following a similar plan in the First World War, earnestly call your attention to this serious matter and urge you to intercede with our Government to exhort its restraining influence upon the Turkish Government in order to make an end of these persecutions. We are confident that our Government will not stay indifferent to this inhuman act of the Turkish Government against a defenseless people whose only fault has been their devotion to Christianity and civilization."

Very truly yours,

PETER RUSTIGIAN,
Chairman of Mass Meeting.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1427. A bill to authorize the appointment of Gregory Boyington a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 546); and

S. 1544. A bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels, landing craft, and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 547).

THE ALASKA HIGHWAY (REPT. NO. 548)

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, I submit a report adopting the report made to the full committee by a subcommittee composed of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and myself. The report is submitted under authority of Senate Resolution 161 agreed to July 1, 1943, and relates to a study of the Alaska Highway. I ask that the report may be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and printed.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on November 27, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 630. An act to amend section 107 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the district court for the middle district of Tennessee;

S. 759. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of W. I. Dooly;

S. 763. An act amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 770. An act for the relief of Eddie Percle;

S. 862. An act for the relief of the Grafton Boat Works;

S. 950. An act for the relief of the Milford Trust Co. and Blanche R. Bennett, as administrators of the estate of Charles E. Reed, deceased;

S. 1008. An act for the relief of Gerald G. Woods;

S. 1246. An act for the relief of Ervin S. Finley;

S. 1309. An act for the relief of Pan American Airways, Inc.;

S. 1382. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; and

S. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1549. A bill for the relief of Vern M. Stanchfield; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1550. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1551. A bill to limit the time within which the General Accounting Office shall make final settlement of the monthly or quarterly accounts of disbursing officers under the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1552. A bill to amend Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to make provision for payment of compensation to certain unemployed World War No. 2 veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENTS TO THE REVENUE BILL

Mr. VANDENBERG submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3687) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. OVERTON submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3687, supra, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. SMITH and Mr. DANAHER each submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting in time of war by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. BRIDGES (for Mr. FERGUSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. FERGUSON to Senate bill 1285, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. PEPPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 1285, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1944—AMENDMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them jointly to the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 23, after line 8, insert the following:

"That the section of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1944, approved July 12, 1943 (Public Law 133, 78th Cong., p. 22), which authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to purchase United States Treasury War bonds for the membership of the Shoshone Tribe of Indians is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed, with the consent of the business committee of the Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming, to purchase one United States Treasury Series E War bond of the denomination of $500 for each member of said Shoshone Tribe according to a roll of said tribe prepared as of July 12, 1943, and approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and to pay the total cost of the bonds so purchased out of the principal of the judgment fund of said tribe in the Treasury. Each bond shall be registered by the Treasury Department in the name of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in trust for the enrolled member of the Shoshone Tribe for whom purchased and shall be held by the United States until the date of maturity, whereupon said bond shall be redeemed and the proceeds thereof paid to the Indian owner free of any trust or restriction. In the event of the death of the Shoshone owner, the proceeds of said bond at maturity shall be distributed to his devisees or heirs or next of kin as provided by existing law. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to grant permission to the county chairman of the War bond purchase program of Fremont County, Wyo., in which county the Shoshone Tribe resides, to include the total amount of bonds purchased for the members of said tribe in his quota of War bond sales.'"

FIRE INSURANCE PREMIUMS AND FIRE LOSSES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this morning at a session of the Committee on the Judiciary I presented some statistics showing the average rate of premiums for fire insurance in the various States and Territories of the United States, the losses paid per $100 of insurance, and the percentage of such losses paid to the premiums. A great deal of interest was manifested in these tabulations, which were taken from the record of fire insurance by States, as published annually by the Weekly Underwriter. In order that members of the committee and of the Senate may have access to the complete statement, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fire-insurance premiums and fire losses by States—Stock companies

[10-year average 1931–40]

State	Average rate of premiums per $100	Losses per $100 insurance	Percent loss paid to premiums	Descending order of—		
				Average rate of premiums per $100	Losses per $100 insurance	Percent loss paid to premiums
Alabama	$0.99	$0.47	47.0	17	16	21
Alaska Territory	1.59	.75	47.2	1	1	20
Arizona	1.22	.57	46.8	3	4	22
Arkansas	1.18	.65	55.4	4	3	1
California	.81	.31	38.8	29	37	42
Colorado	.84	.28	32.9	25	41	49
Connecticut	.66	.24	36.3	42	46	44
Delaware	.59	.22	38.4	48	49	43
District of Columbia	.43	.10	24.5	51	50	50
Florida	1.00	.35	34.4	14	31	47
Georgia	.99	.51	50.9	16	8	8
Hawaii	.81	.07	9.2	30	51	51
Idaho	1.11	.50	44.8	8	10	31
Illinois	.67	.31	45.7	40	38	28
Indiana	.68	.29	42.2	39	40	38
Iowa	.66	.36	53.6	41	30	3
Kansas	.72	.37	50.8	36	29	9
Kentucky	.79	.39	49.7	32	24	14
Louisiana	.90	.42	46.5	24	20	25
Maine	1.02	.51	50.2	12	6	13
Maryland	.63	.27	42.7	46	43	36
Massachusetts	.73	.39	53.0	35	25	5
Michigan	.60	.30	50.5	47	39	11
Minnesota	.74	.35	46.7	34	32	23
Mississippi	1.37	.73	53.3	2	2	4
Missouri	.77	.42	53.9	33	21	2
Montana	1.16	.50	43.1	6	9	34
Nebraska	.65	.32	49.4	44	36	15
Nevada	1.17	.47	40.2	5	15	40
New Hampshire	1.11	.57	51.7	7	5	6
New Jersey	.66	.23	34.9	43	48	46
New Mexico	1.08	.44	40.6	9	19	39
New York	.57	.24	43.1	49	47	35
North Carolina	.81	.40	48.9	26	23	17
North Dakota	1.06	.46	43.3	10	17	33
Ohio	.54	.25	46.7	50	44	24
Oklahoma	.81	.37	46.0	27	28	27
Oregon	1.02	.49	48.2	11	11	19
Pennsylvania	.69	.24	35.0	38	45	45
Rhode Island	.69	.32	46.4	37	35	26
South Carolina	1.01	.51	50.6	13	7	10
South Dakota	.93	.37	39.8	22	26	41
Tennessee	.96	.49	51.2	19	12	7
Texas	.98	.48	49.2	18	13	16
Utah	.80	.34	42.6	31	33	37
Vermont	.95	.46	48.7	21	18	18
Virginia	.81	.37	45.6	28	27	29
Washington	.96	.48	50.4	20	14	12
West Virginia	.91	.41	44.9	23	22	30
Wisconsin	.63	.27	43.8	45	42	32
Wyoming	1.00	.33	33.4	15	34	48
Average	.72	.32	44.4	-----	-----	-----

Source: Record of Fire Insurance by States, published annually by the Weekly Underwriter.

"STREAMLINING" OF CONGRESS—EDITORIAL COMMENT ON SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 23

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "A Dominant Legislature," which appeared in the November 20, 1943, issue of the Washington Review of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

I submit this article in connection with Senate Concurrent Resolution 23, which I introduced on November 9, 1943, and which has been referred to the Senate Committee on Rules.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONGRESS A DOMINANT LEGISLATURE

At this most critical hour in the epoch of congressional government, Senator MALONEY and Representative MONRONEY have come forth with a most constructive proposal to bolster and retain a government by the people. This week they introduced companion resolutions (S. Con. Res. 23 and H. Con. Res. 54) to provide for an examination into the functions, duties, and operations of the House and Senate. Out of the knowledge derived from this study and analysis, they anticipate recommendations to fortify and to equip Congress to meet the needs of a "growing society." They propose to modernize Congress to fulfill all expectations of a deliberative body, which was conceived in the theory of representative government as an institutional bulwark of government by the people.

These resolutions would establish a bipartisan joint committee composed of six Senators and six Representatives to study "the organization and operation of each House of Congress; the relationship between the two Houses; the relationship between the Congress and other branches of the Government; the employment and remuneration of personnel by the members of the committees of the Congress; and the structure of, and the relationship between the various standing, special, and select committees of the Congress."

Some congressional procedure has become obsolete; much of it needs altering or remodeling. The relationship between Congress and the administration has become outmoded—the administrative machinery has been under constant examination and subjected to regular change; congressional machinery has just grown up without a plan.

A good nonpartisan joint committee could do much not only to assure an improved legislature, but to effect an efficient administration through the operation of a better functioning Congress.

Representatives and Senators, however, are shy or hesitant in doing anything for themselves, thus, to aid Congress in doing this job, they need the outspoken and active support of every public-spirited citizen who can contribute suggestions and encouragement. Do not let this opportunity pass.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask permission that there may be inserted at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the Amarillo (Tex.) News of November 16, 1943, entitled "Streamliner."

This editorial also refers to Senate Concurrent Resolution 23, which I submitted, and which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STREAMLINER

There's mounting interest here on the subject of streamlining Congress. The drive advanced considerably this week with introduction of a joint resolution by Senator FRANCIS MALONEY, of Connecticut, and Representative MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, calling for a special committee to study the subject. This marked the first time a House Member and Senator have gotten together to work for streamlining, although at least a score of bills and resolutions have been introduced by various Congressmen. The proposed Maloney-Monroney committee would recommend improved staffing of committees; and better liaison in committee structure; the need for better liaison between House and Senate committees to avoid needless duplication of work.

The growing feeling here is that Congress has failed to regain its much-espoused independence and to effect real economies in government because it simply does not have the modern machinery to attain those objectives. It lacks a staff of experts, advisers,

and investigators which confront Congress from the executive agencies. Its sprawling set-up of 80 standing committees (House and Senate together) rivals anything that bureaucracy has to offer in the way of duplication and rivalry. The congressional committee set-up has remained untouched for 50 years, whereas the executive branch was reorganized as recently as 1940 and the judiciary only a few years before. No wonder the Congress, with this oxcart organization, cannot keep abreast of the other coordinate branches of government, says the Maloney school.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Will Congress Reorganize To Meet the New Tempo?" from the Philadelphia Record of November 14, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL CONGRESS REORGANIZE TO MEET THE NEW TEMPO?

The streamlining of Congress to keep its processes abreast fast-moving events has been suggested many times in the last few years.

Now, two Members of Congress—Senator MALONEY, of Connecticut, and Representative MONRONEY, of Oklahoma—propose to do something about it. They have introduced a joint resolution to create a bipartisan Senate-House commission to speed up our legislative procedures.

Under the proposed resolution, the congressional commission would prepare plans even broader. It would go into:

(a) Organization and operation of each House; (b) relationships between the two houses, now often conflicting in needless detail; (c) relationships between Congress and other branches of the Government; (d) employment and pay of personnel by Members and committees; (e) structure and relationship of the various congressional committees.

Perhaps it is too much to expect the Senate to end some of the ancient rules by which obstruction is made easy and construction difficult.

For example, the rules of senatorial courtesy; the rule by which a single objection can tie up measures for varying lengths of time; the device of the filibuster, which has been used time and again to obstruct ordinary democratic processes by preventing the Senate from voting on major measures.

Even if these long-standing stumbling blocks to action in the upper house are not removed, there is much more work that a commission such as that proposed could accomplish.

For example, there has been need of a central committee of both houses to prepare congressional programs. In this day and age it is not enough that Congress say "No! No! No!" to proposals of the Executive. If it opposes a major measure, it should be prepared to meet the emergency with constructive counter-measures.

There has been need, also, for a congressional committee to perform liaison work between the legislative branch and the Cabinet, especially with the State Department.

True, the State Department has not welcomed proposals for such closer relations. But it is not fair to assume that such opposition would continue in the face of a constructive program by which Senators, Representatives, and State Department chiefs could meet on major problems—

So that in legislating on those problems there would be no interminable debate over trivial details.

The Connally resolution is a case in point. It was debated so long that when the vote finally came, events at Moscow had overtaken it and the resolution was hastily amended to bring it up to date.

Much of the misunderstanding on other administrative problems might be averted with closer liaison between the various executive departments and Congress. We have in mind rationing, the oil situation, the lend-lease controversy and other questions which ought not to be controversial at all in time of war.

That is why the Maloney-Monroney resolution is of vital importance to the country. That is why it should be passed by both Houses in the interests of more efficient and more democratic government.

If the commission chosen for the task of reorganization includes leaders of both parties, men with experience and influence to see the proposals through—the benefits to our representative form of government will be both immediate and enduring.

THANKSGIVING DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Thanksgiving Day address broadcast by him over stations in Wisconsin, which appears in the Appendix.]

MY VISIT WITH THE NEIGHBORS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BUTLER

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "My Visit With the Neighbors," delivered by Senator BUTLER on November 27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POETIC TRIBUTE TO SENATORS BURTON, BALL, HILL, AND HATCH

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to Senators BURTON, BALL, HILL, and HATCH, by Franklin P. Adams, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOME PREMISES OF PEACE—ADDRESS BY ASSOCIATE JUSTICE RUTLEDGE

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Some Premises of Peace," delivered by Hon. Wiley B. Rutledge, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, before the assembly of the American Bar Association on August 25, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FINAL DECLARATION OF THE THIRTIETH NATIONAL FOREIGN TRADE CONVENTION

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD final declaration of the Thirtieth National Foreign Trade Convention held at New York October 25–27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTER-AMERICAN COOPERATION—ADDRESS BY NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "What Inter-American Cooperation Means," delivered by Nelson A. Rockefeller, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, at the American Legion dinner at Washington, D. C., on November 26, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POLL TAX—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Surer Road," published in the Wilmington, Del., Journal-Every Evening of November 17, 1943, and an editorial entitled "H. R. 7," published in the Washington Post of November 20, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

MORE THROTTLEBOTTOM ANTICS—EDITORIAL FROM PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "More Throttlebottom Antics," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of November 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

OBLIGATIONS TO MEN DISCHARGED FROM ARMED FORCES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to address the Senate for a brief time on a subject which I think is of real interest to the people of the country. It relates to the obligation we owe to the returning men of the armed forces. This obligation is not a monetary obligation. We cannot dismiss it with $100 or $200 or $300 or even $1,000 to the individual who comes back. These fighting men do not want subsidies; they want jobs. Ask any of the 423,616 who have been returned to civilian life in the short time between Pearl Harbor and the middle of last month, and their answer will be they want to return to jobs.

We have heard much of rehabilitating our returning soldiers, of demobilization pay, of unemployment insurance, and of what amounts virtually to a subsidy to a great army of 10,000,000 men who are shortly to be returned to civilian life after months—indeed after years, for many of them—of military regimentation.

They are thinking now, whether within the limits of continental America, in Guadalcanal, in China, in the Aleutians, in Italy, or elsewhere, and their foremost thought, their most important problem, is What will I do when I go back?

Can we by giving them $100, $200, or $300 waive our obligation? If we do, again we will have a great, indeed our greatest, army of dissatisfied, disgruntled and disillusioned unemployed young men. Again we will have bonus armies or their equivalent. If we should ask any of the 423,616 young men who have been returned to civilian life between Pearl Harbor and the middle of last month what has been done to find them a normal living, a readjustment to all the concepts of civilian life from which they volunteered, or of which they were summarily deprived, their answer would be that nothing has been done.

True it is that we have assumed a moral obligation to give our servicemen their former jobs when they return. I wonder, though, should a survey be taken, how many of them would want the one they held before entering the service. How many of them at the age of 17 or 18 even had a job before leaving high school, or college, or the farm to take on their present grim task of war.

Will the farmer boy we are so proud of today, because we have given him special training, concentrated training, making him an excellent radio man, or a first-class mechanic, wish to return to the farm? No; I question whether many of them will. We have trained him for greater things; we have given him a wider vision; we have shown him other countries, new horizons, and we have

made him a highly trained specialist. No; not in every instance will that farm boy wish to return to the farm. On the reverse side, what of the underprivileged city boy whose military training has given him new visions—new visions of working with the soil, new visions of having his own farm? Will he wish to return to his former job—the routine of a gasoline station or the routine of a shipping clerk? I doubt it.

But is it our purpose to hand these boys a check, a small, temporary subsidy? For all future time we will instill in their minds the thought of pensions, bonuses, and payments on payments. Again will grow bonus armies, and from the pressure groups cries of "veteran malcontents." They will not be malcontents. They will be our neglected obligations.

Mr. President, within the Bureau established for the care of our servicemen there are many who might do something to solve this problem, but their plans and their operations are diversified. There is no cooperation. There are many who could do something, but there is no one to do it. There is no one to find jobs for our veterans. There have been messages from the Chief Executive; there have been newspaper articles; columnists have been giving their ideas; but there is no one now whose business it is to find jobs for the veterans,

A logical organization—the Veterans' Administration—is at hand. Already it deals with pension rights, insurance rights, and the hospitalization of veterans. Within a matter of weeks, even days, it can be ready to take on the tremendous task of organizing industry, commerce, and agriculture for jobs for our veterans. I repeat, 436,000 veterans have already been discharged. The Veterans' Administration knows the problems. Almost within hours it could begin the analyzing, and consulting with each individual, to ascertain where he might be most suitably placed, where he might be most valuable, and while doing that, begin the establishment of the necessary great post-war machine.

This, then, is my proposal:

First. Before his discharge from the service, prior to or after the armistice, each veteran is to submit his qualifications and desires for future employment. His questionnaire is to contain a complete dossier of his preservice and his service record. It is important that this be done while he is still under military jurisdiction and discipline.

I would stress here again the importance of having established each man's desires as to employment and locality of employment. We cannot turn these young men onto the street without some concrete objective for their future. Demobilization pay is important only if there is a definite plan as to where they are going, and what they are going to do. That plan should be executed immediately upon their discharge. If not, there will be countless numbers of unemployed veterans in every large city and community of the country, resulting in the beginning of the bread line again.

Second. Acting upon the information contained in paragraph 1 of the questionnaire to which I referred, an employment expert of the Veterans' Administration will personally consult with each of the veterans about to be discharged. Through the facilities of other organizations such as the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Red Cross, State and Government employment services, the United States Employment Service, and so forth, the expert will have at his disposal recorded lists of jobs and of qualifications for employment therein. After discussion with the veteran, through his experience and training, the representative of the Veterans' Administration will be in a position to determine the man's qualifications for the job best suited for him. He will know the locality to which the young man wishes to return, and why. He will not act arbitrarily, but will attempt to guide the veteran through the confusion of the readjustment period, return him to the section of the country to which he desires to go, with a definite appointment for trial to the job he wants.

Let me say, Mr. President, that there has been in contemplation—and that is what is set forth in the President's message—simply the payment on discharge of so much money. There has been in contemplation the idea that the veteran will go back to his job. I assert, and I think the statistics will bear out my statement, that more than one-third of the men who went into the armed services were never previously employed. They have no jobs. We do not want a repetition of what took place after the last World War. It is our obligation to use a little common sense in handling the problem.

To my mind, the most important phase of our program for the rehabilitation of servicemen is jobs for veterans. The organization is set up; it needs only expansion. We need only a little foresight to avoid the obvious havoc which is wrought by discharging these millions of men and women and sending them back into civilian life with a comparatively small amount of money, and an honorable record of service in the fighting forces of their country, which should be their greatest asset and the fastest, surest way of their getting jobs.

With other recommendations already made to the Congress I am in full accord. They are not matters of immediate moment; they are matters to which the veteran will naturally adjust himself on his return to normal life. They then become his problems, and ones which he will readily assume for himself after his readjustment. But return him first to a responsible job of his own choosing, with a pride in his military service and not a bitter resentment as he trudges the streets of a strange city knowing not where to turn for counsel and assistance. Insurance will not help him then.

Remember that a majority of these young men and women are untrained to the responsibilities of money. Their allotments to their families go home automatically; the money they have in their pockets does not mean food or a place to sleep. Give them their demobilization pay but do not turn them loose on the street. If that should happen, unless help is afforded them, they lead a good life for a few days, as they do now on a 48-hour liberty, but within a week or two they will not have a camp or a ship to return to; nor will most of them have a job. The trouble that would ensue is obvious. What I have said, Mr. President, can be confirmed on the streets of any great city in the country today.

Until we have taken positive steps to counsel and advise our returning service men and women, as we would our sons and our daughters in meeting a new, confused situation, we shall not have kept faith as we promised. Until we give notice that our plans go far beyond a summary dismissal, with a pocketful of change, we will not have given notice to our armed forces that the people back home do not propose to let them down.

Mr. President, I say it is letting them down if, when these boys come back, they are handed $100 or $200 or $300 and told "now go on your way." I say it is doing something more—it is taking the fine manhood that is there present, that has proven itself, and putting it in a position where it may undo itself.

While I am making this proposal before the Congress, I am taking further steps, as a matter of interest, to find what we might do as private citizens in furnishing not only employment but centers of rehabilitation and readjustment for our returning soldiers and sailors.

Wisconsin, as do all the other States, has many large industries which might be organized with a dual purpose:

First. Furnishing a healthy, gainful occupation for our veterans and an interim of unworried adjustment while they are returning to civilian life; and

Second. Furnishing the men with which to replace major manpower shortages for the production of materials of which we are now threatened with drastic shortages.

Wisconsin is one of the larger producers of pulpwood, pulp, and paper. Activities in these industries have been notably curtailed because of a shortage of men to harvest the pulpwood and turn it to its useful purposes at the mills.

I have written to the officers and directors of the Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association regarding the possibility of establishing relocation camps, which would serve this dual purpose, giving our boys an interlude—not military and not civilian—during which they would lead normal everyday lives while facing readjustment to their permanent future. I should like to read this letter and to make it a part of the RECORD. Addressed to 26 leading Wisconsin manufacturers, this is the letter:

DEAR SIR: Wisconsin has long been a leader in social reform. With this thought in mind, I appeal for your consideration of a plan submitted by me today before the Senate, supplementing what I believe to be an extremely necessary and important action in the rehabilitation of our returning war veterans. It is my thought that the important thing—the problem paramount in the minds of our young men—is returning to us assured of our help in securing immediate employment. They will have been too long removed from their daily associations to know by what manner or means to go about getting a job.

Hundreds of thousands of them have already been returned to civilian life; hundreds of thousands more will have been returned before the armistice.

It is on behalf of these young men that I ask your cooperation in furthering what has all the possibilities of being not only a humanitarian plan but one which will greatly benefit the war effort by advancing production.

Our country needs newsprint. We are faced with a drastic shortage. We have been told that it is impossible to harvest our pulpwood because of the manpower shortage. On the other hand, we have these thousands of young men returning to civilian life—goodly majority of them still strong and husky, below or near the age of 25, and without any plans or thoughts for employment in the immediate future. They face it bleakly.

Your consideration is asked of a plan to provide a State-wide chain of camps in which these boys may be employed, if they so desire, upon discharge. These are not to be rest camps. You are simply to consider yourself employing men to operate the pulpwood camps. They are to be fed, quartered, and paid just as you have paid your camp personnel in the past. The only additional facility to be provided would be that of a wider recreational nature, with also a bureau which would function in an advisory capacity in replacing these young men in permanent positions.

Undoubtedly camp sites and camps are already available, many of them already constructed, awaiting only the occupants that the manpower shortage has made it impossible to secure. I hope immediate consideration can be given to this thought, and that you will let me have your reactions on it as soon as possible.

I shall be in Wisconsin next week, and, if possible, should like to go into the matter with as many of you as might be available.

Yours for victory,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

Mr. President, many States have facilities available for the organization of similar location centers, such as the pulpwood industry, fishing, lumbering, farming, cattle, which would, by private enterprise, serve a great twofold purpose. Certainly it is a step in the right direction, although one we can consider only as private individuals. This, then, is the manner, as legislators and private citizens, in which I ask the Senate to take immediate action in accepting the responsibility to get jobs for our veterans. I repeat, monetary payments upon discharge will not solve this tremendous problem. They will merely mitigate it temporarily. The problems of insurance and social security are matters of importance, but are not of as immediate concern as getting the jobs.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee, as amended.

DENIAL OF VOTE TO SERVICEMEN FROM THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, while the Senate has under consideration the soldier-vote bill, I regard it as a sacred duty to invite attention to the fact, which might otherwise be overlooked, that this bill and the fine sentiment back of it lack consistency in at least one respect. No matter in what form this legislation shall finally emerge from Congress, the fighting men from an important community in our country—the District of Columbia—will not be among the beneficiaries. They will continue to be denied the right and privilege of voting in a national election, a right the exercise of which patriotic orators tell us goes hand in hand with arms-bearing.

Fighting side by side over there with the men from your State and mine, Mr. President, are the fighting men from the voteless and unrepresented District of Columbia, a total of about 70,000. They are the men who volunteered or were drafted, just like the boys from your State and mine. They are in the thick of the fight in all theaters of the war. They are shedding their blood and giving their all for their country and its democratic institutions, in which they do not fully share.

One of the most cherished of these institutions is the right to participate in the government of their country through the exercise of the elective franchise. This is a fundamental right which we now appear so anxious to preserve and assure to all in the armed forces. It is recognized as an established principle of democracy that arms bearing in the country's service and participation in government through the ballot box go together naturally.

Mr. President, if we truly believe in this self-evident principle, why do we not busy ourselves and see to it that the privilege of the vote in national elections is extended to those who fight, who bleed, and who die in the country's service, whose only offense, if any, is that their home is located in the voteless and unrepresented District of Columbia?

Of course, I know that such a reasonable and fully justified provision, to cover the fighting men from the District of Columbia, cannot be carried in the pending bill because of constitutional limitations; but I do know that it would be an act of justice, and consistent with our professed devotion to fundamental American fair play, to give prompt and favorable consideration to Senate Joint Resolution 33, which proposes to add to the Constitution of the United States the following amendment introduced by me in the Senate, and by Representative SUMNERS of Texas in the House of Representatives:

> The Congress shall have power to provide that there shall be in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President members elected by the people of the District constituting the seat of the Government of the United States, in such numbers and with such powers as the Congress shall determine. All legislation hereunder shall be subject to amendment and repeal.

From the local press I have culled interesting matter bearing very pertinently upon this question, and shall quote briefly from some of it. All of it shows that the prime reason for the pending soldier-vote legislation is the belief of Members of Congress and others that all the men who fight for their country should have the franchise.

The Washington Times-Herald, under date of September 10, 1942, quoted Representative DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, as saying:

> If a young man is willing to lay down his life in Russia, Iceland, Africa, Australia, and other parts of the world, he should have the franchise.

This article further stated that activating the great majority of the Members was the theme:

> Anyone willing to sacrifice his life in the country's defense has a right to vote.

The Washington Star of October 22, 1943, quoted Secretary of the Navy Knox as believing that—

> Every man in uniform or out of uniform should be given a chance to vote.

The Washington Post of November 16, 1943, stated that in a radio speech the preceding night the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], chairman of the Senate Privileges and Elections Committee, outlined provisions of the bill and urged that it be treated as a war measure. The Senator from Rhode Island was quoted directly as saying:

> It is not fair that these men, who are ready to give their last full measure of devotion, should, because of that fact, be prevented from enjoying the most fundamental right of a free man in a democratic country, the right to vote.

I should like also to incorporate in my remarks an editorial from the Washington Star of Thursday, August 27, 1942, entitled "Bearing Arms and Voting," and another editorial from the Star of Saturday, October 30, 1943, under the heading "Talk and Double Talk." Both of these are very pertinent in amplification of what I have been attempting to make clear to the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of August 27, 1942]

BEARING ARMS AND VOTING

Regardless of the fate of amendments waiving poll tax payments and other conditions of voting in the States, Senate action Tuesday in sending the so-called soldier vote bill to conference is intended to assure men and women in the service, no matter where they are stationed throughout the world, that they will be able to vote in national elections.

This exercise of their privilege as American citizens is in accord with the high principles they are defending in uniform, and is altogether appropriate. But what a contrast it offers between the rights of Americans who live in the States and those who live in the District of Columbia!

Men and women from Washington are serving in and out of uniform wherever Americans are serving in this war. The statistics on volunteers are for the present a military secret. But Washingtonians have filled their draft quotas in selective service and if history repeats they will exceed their quotas as volunteers.

To preserve the Union in the War between the States the first volunteers came from Washington, and Washingtonians supplied a greater percentage of troops in excess of

quota than almost any State of the Union. In the War with Spain Washington sent a fine regiment to Cuba, exceeding its quota in numbers. And in the First World War the total volunteers from the District exceeded the number of volunteers from eight of the States combined. Only five of the States exceeded, in ratio of volunteers to total enlistments, the World War record established by the District of Columbia.

Men and women from all the States now serving in the armed forces took part, in theory, in the enactment of laws which governed their service. They are citizens in a government which directly couples the right of representation with the duty of bearing arms in time of war. But for the Washingtonian, the highest privilege of the citizen—casting his vote—is denied; the highest duty of a citizen—to bear arms in defense of his country—is demanded in full and is loyally given.

There is ugly irony in the fact that when men and women in the armed services are called upon to vote next November the only ones forbidden to respond will be those whose homes are in the Capital of the United States, the Nation which has assumed the major role in preserving democratic principles of government in the world to come.

[From the Washington Evening Star of October 30, 1943]

TALK AND DOUBLE TALK

A subcommittee of the Senate Privileges and Elections Committee is working to perfect machinery for getting out the soldier vote next year. The device is the Green-Lucas bill, which cuts through registration and poll-tax requirements and simplifies the ballot to the point where the soldier could vote the national ticket merely by indicating his preference for "Democrat" or "Republican." A war ballot commission would draw up the rules and supervise the details.

Of the proposal Senator GREEN says: "Servicemen now constitute such a large part of the electorate that any national election in which they did not participate could hardly be called representative."

Few will quarrel with the general objectives of the legislation. Arms-bearing and the right to vote are inseparably coupled in the tradition of America.

Approval of the bill, nevertheless, would be another slurring act of discrimination against the loyal and patriotic Washingtonians now in the service and who are barred from voting because of the accident of their residence in the Capital of the United States.

Exact figures on the number of Washington men in the service is restricted information, but it is permissible to use 60,000 as an approximation in round numbers. These men, found in every branch of the service on every front in the world, are in every sense good Americans. They are making the same sacrifice that other Americans are making to preserve the principle that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." By every tenet of democratic government they have a valid claim to a voice in the government that sends them to war. To ignore that claim is in itself a repudiation of the very things they are asked to die for.

Yet, when the men in the service are told to vote as a patriotic duty, these 60,000 will be shunted aside, treated in this respect as convicted deserters or convicts, or lunatics. All this because they are residents of the Nation's Capital.

That is why a lot of the talk about the Nation's obligation to the soldier, in making it easy for him to vote in 1944, sounds like double talk to the people who live in Washington.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, war or no war, the people who are permanent residents of the District of Columbia are entitled to recognition as full-fledged Americans with voting participation in the government of their country. They are the peers of any people throughout the length and breadth of the United States. They are second to none in their patriotic devotion to their country, in their education and knowledge, and in their general qualifications to exercise the rights and privileges of American citizens.

While the men in the armed forces from the States might lose the national voting privilege in a single election, it should be remembered that the people of this District have been denied the privilege in each national election for 143 years. The hearts of statesmen bleed for the servicemen who might through their service be denied the vote in a single election, but there is little or no bleeding for their fellow Americans who are and have always been denied the vote in every national election since the seat of the Government was located here.

Mr. President, these people are the equals of the best among those in the States whose votes sent us here to Congress.

By intimate association with these people during the past 25 years, I consider myself fully competent to testify to their fine, patriotic, and public-spirited qualities. To me it has always been a source of mortification and shame to reflect that in actual practice these fine Americans are, politically, only the subjects of the United States, and by no means the political equals of the citizens of the States. I must qualify this statement, however, by admitting that the voteless and unrepresented people of the District of Columbia are the equals of the citizens of the States in possessing the duty, right, and privilege of bearing all the burdens of American citizenship, which fall alike upon all citizens of the Republic.

I appeal to all other Members of the Senate, Mr. President, to join with me in a movement to strike off the political bonds of these our fellow Americans of the District of Columbia, and to make it possible for them to be recognized as citizens in fact. Then we shall have clean hands, and may consistently spread the doctrine of democracy in other lands throughout the world.

Mr. President, I can see no reason, based on fundamental American grounds, for longer delaying favorable action on the proposed constitutional amendment which I have quoted. It would clothe Congress with the requisite power to give these good citizens of the Nation's Capital the American right and privilege of participating, through their duly elected representatives in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President, in the Government of their country. They need, as citizens of the Republic, to participate in both the legislative and the executive branches of their Government.

While this, of course, cannot be done in time to give District men now in the armed forces the right of participation in the next national election, it would prepare the way. Then the Congress and the States, having granted this gracious act of long-delayed justice, we would be ready on another occasion, if again visited by the misfortune of war, to treat the soldiers, sailors, marines, and Coast Guard men from the District of Columbia precisely, Mr. President, as we would treat those who went into the service from your State and mine. If we believe that the peoples of all the nations of the world should enjoy the same privileges and rights as their fellows in their nations, why is that not a good principle to follow in its application to our fellow Americans of the District of Columbia?

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I submitted earlier in the day, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 17, line 2, in the committee amendment, after the period, it is proposed to insert the following: "Such commissioners shall be appointed from lists of not less than six nominees submitted by the national committees of the respective political parties. Vacancies in the commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments, that is, from lists of not less than three nominees for each such vacancy submitted by the national committees of the respective political parties."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, does the Senator intend to speak on his amendment?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Eastland	Maloney
Andrews	Ellender	Maybank
Austin	George	Mead
Bankhead	Gillette	Millikin
Barkley	Green	Moore
Bilbo	Hatch	Murray
Bone	Hawkes	Nye
Bridges	Hayden	O'Daniel
Brooks	Hill	O'Mahoney
Burton	Holman	Overton
Bushfield	Johnson, Calif.	Pepper
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe
Byrd	Kilgore	Reed
Capper	Langer	Revercomb
Caraway	Lodge	Reynolds
Chavez	Lucas	Robertson
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Scrugham
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Shipstead
Danaher	McFarland	Smith
Davis	McKellar	Stewart

Thomas, Idaho	Tydings	Wheeler
Thomas, Okla.	Vandenberg	Wherry
Thomas, Utah	Van Nuys	White
Tobey	Wagner	Wiley
Truman	Wallgren	Willis
Tunnell	Walsh	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of the death of his sister.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are detained on public business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent on public business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent due to a death in his family.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is confined to his home with a cold.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent because of illness.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent on public business today and will be so absent tomorrow. I wish this announcement to stand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am wholeheartedly in favor of the principle of the bill now under consideration, Senate bill 1285. Like all other Members of this body, I have a direct personal interest in the welfare of the men and women who are serving us in the armed forces. I do not believe there is a Member of the Senate who has not given considerable thought and study to the ways and means by which the men and women in the armed services may vote next November. There is no Member of the Senate who does not wish to make that possible if it can be done without destroying the sanctity of the vote, and if, in trying to make such a vote possible, we do not pave the way for fraud or manipulation of the freedom of the ballot, which, in my judgment, is the greatest of our institutions in America. We must at all times maintain the faith of our people in the processes of free elections.

Mr. President, once before in America there was ill feeling throughout the country because of the outcome of a contested Presidential election. To this day there is the feeling—and I think historians will so record—that perhaps Tilden instead of Hayes was morally entitled to the Presidency in 1876. At that time we were threatened with another civil war. Tilden had received 184 uncontested electoral votes, and Hayes had received 163. Florida, Louisiana, Oregon, and South Carolina, with a total of 22 electoral votes, each sent in 2 sets of electoral ballots. In Louisiana, Florida, and South Carolina 1 set gave the whole vote to Tilden, and the other set gave it entirely to Hayes. One set from Oregon gave the State's 3 votes to Hayes. Another set gave 2 votes for Hayes and 1 to Tilden. Hayes had to receive all 22 votes in order to win.

In that year the House was controlled by the Democrats, and the Senate was controlled by the Republicans. Many constitutional questions immediately arose as to whether Congress could go behind the State certification—questions similar to those which we may now encounter. Feeling in the Nation was running so high, and the impossibility of the Senate and House reaching an agreement was so apparent, that an electoral commission was created, composed of five Members from each political party in Congress, two of each party from the Supreme Court, and another man was selected, Justice Joseph P. Bradley, a Republican, but he was not selected as a partisan.

We all know the result. On the face of the popular vote Hayes had carried South Carolina and Oregon, and Tilden had carried Florida and Louisiana. By a vote of 8 Republicans to 7 Democrats, Florida and Louisiana were given to Hayes. The commission unanimously gave him South Carolina and Oregon. In Louisiana the 8 Republicans on the commission, not only rejected the Democratic set of electoral votes, but, in the matter of the Republican set, refused to go behind the certification of a Republican board which had ruled out several thousand Democratic votes.

I cite this experience, Mr. President, by way of warning that the country may not stand any lack of confidence in the conduct of our 1944 elections. At a time of great crisis when feeling is running high amongst our people, at a time when we are living under the strain of a global war, we must make sure that there will be no question as to who is elected President in November 1944 or elected to the Senate and to the House in 1944. We must make sure that the outcome does not lend itself to legal quibbling, to legal technicalities. Under no circumstances must the people get the impression, rightly or wrongly, that their choice for President, for Senator, or for their Representative, has been denied them. There is too much suspicion already abroad in our land, Mr. President, and I cannot think of anything which would crystallize it so quickly as the circumstances which might develop from the proposed act in its present language.

Mr. President, any bill which is passed by the Senate with my vote must have very definite safeguards against the young men and women of our armed forces being intimidated to vote for their Commander in Chief. By "intimidation" I mean physical intimidation, or intimidation by propaganda spread by the O. W. I., or any other agency. We must be convinced that they who are giving so freely of their lives, will not be herded to the polls, so to speak, in the manner used by Boss Hague or Boss Kelly. We want to be convinced, too, that the young men of the merchant marine are not to be dominated or browbeaten by their Communist union boss under whom the United States Government has placed them, and who are are now being deferred from the draft by order of the high command in Washington.

I have recently sent to the desk an amendment to the pending bill. It would change the manner in which the bill would set up the ballot commission. It provides that the respective national committees shall submit not less than six nominees from whom two shall be selected to serve. In the case of a vacancy, it must be filled from not less than three nominees designated by the respective committees.

I think it is vital to maintain the integrity of this commission. It is no reflection on the present President of the United States. But if he should happen to be a candidate for re-election, I wish to safeguard the appointments to the proposed ballot law commission in such a way that the people of the country will have confidence in the integrity of the commission. Under the pending proposal there is nothing to prevent any President of the United States from appointing some Republicans—we have some in this country, who unfortunately have pink tendencies, New Deal tendencies, and some of whom are under obligation to the administration. I am not saying that the President would appoint them, but it would be possible for him to do so. So I think it is wise, fair, and proper at this time to safeguard the appointments. It is our duty to do this.

Mr. President, the other day it was stated by Members of the Senate on the floor—I think by the distinguised Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] that this would be a reflection on the President of the United States. We have established previous precedents in past years which the Presidents then in office did not consider to be a reflection upon them. We have passed good laws which have been enforced, and no other President has been insulted or offended by them.

If I were President Roosevelt and I had in my mind even the slightest thought that I should be a candidate for reelection for a fourth term, I would say to the American Congress, "If you want to establish a United States ballot law commission, set up all the safeguards you can, and by all means have the nominees from whom I shall appoint members of the commission nominated by the respective political parties." That would bring integrity and character to the commission. It would breed confidence throughout the country in the commission. That is what I am trying to do.

In order to show that we have actual examples or precedents for this proposal, I invite attention to two very definite acts. I refer to the Transportation Act

of 1920. Section 304 of the act states as follows:

> There is hereby established a board to be known as the Railroad Labor Board and to be composed of nine members, as follows:
>
> 1. Three members constituting the labor group, representing the employees and subordinate officials of the carriers, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from not less than six nominees whose nominations shall be made and offered by such employees in such manner as the Commission shall by regulation prescribe;
>
> 2. Three members, constituting the management group, representing the carriers, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from not less than six nominees whose nominations shall be made and offered by the carriers in such manner as the Commission shall by regulation prescribe; and
>
> 3. Three members, constituting the public group, representing the public, to be appointed directly by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

We also had a Commission known as the National Screw Thread Commission which was established under an act passed in 1926. I quote from that act as follows:

> That a Commission is hereby created, to be known as the Commission for the Standardization of Screw Threads, hereinafter referred to as the Commission, which shall be composed of nine commissioners, one of whom shall be the Director of the Bureau of Standards, who shall be Chairman of the Commission; two representatives of the Army, to be appointed by the Secretary of War; two representatives of the Navy, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Navy; and four to be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce; two of whom shall be chosen from nominations made by the American Society of Mechanical Engineers and two from nominations made by the Society of Automotive Engineers.

In other words, in many instances we have established the precedent of selecting from a list of nominees from which the President of the United States could make his choice. Under the presently proposed act, we are not saying to the President of the United States, "You must appoint John Jones and Bill Smith, two Republicans." We are offering him a list of six names, all of whom would be outstanding, reputable citizens in whom the respective party organizations would have confidence. We say to the President, "We are offering you this list. Now, Mr. President, take your choice, but appoint the Republicans from a list of regular Republican men and women in whom we will have confidence. This is not any reflection on you, Mr. President, but we do not want to take a chance, if I may say so, of having appointed Republicans of questionable party regularity or standing."

We are not attempting to interfere with the principle of this bill, but we are trying to set up definite safeguards so that the country will have confidence in the act and its administration.

One suggestion regarding the bill which some people are advancing, and which we frequently hear expressed, is that the parents of this country cannot be trusted to vote the welfare of their loved ones in the armed forces. This argument springs from the Communists, Mr. President, and it has been unwittingly accepted by many people who do not recognize its implications.

It is a part of an insidious campaign which has been going on in this country for several years—a campaign to split up the family unit. We have heard all too much in recent years to the effect that the parents of the past two generations have sold their children down the river and have fallen down on them. Some parents may have done so; some of them may be neglecting their children. Probably, however, it is not because of their own desire but because of some necessity or because of work in essential industries in this critical time. As a whole, parents think just as much of their children today as they ever did.

Today there are some 9,000,000 empty seats at the breakfast tables of this country, made vacant by the sons and daughters and husbands who are in the armed services and whose vacant chairs bear testimony to the fact of the family interest in loved ones overseas. Senators who may have read the editorial comment on the inside cover page of This Week magazine in the Sunday supplement yesterday noted the story of a great moving-picture actress, Greer Garson, who was aiding in the sale of bonds and who went to the State of West Virginia to tell the people there that they should get behind the bond drive. She wondered when she went through sections of West Virginia whether the people there were aware that the Nation was fighting a war; but when she went into the mining towns and saw literally hundreds and thousands of people marching by, one group representing 600 mothers, all proudly displaying their service buttons of sons and daughters in the service, she realized that the people of this country do know that there is a war going on, that they very definitely have an interest in the men and the women in the armed services, and they want them equitably and fairly treated, and in turn intend to carry on at home.

Mr. President, if any one thing can be called the cornerstone of representative government it is the free and untrammeled right of the people to choose their own officials in elections honestly conducted, for if elections are not free, then the Constitution itself is endangered.

There is not a Member of the Senate who does not believe that men who are offering their lives on the altar of freedom should have the right to participate in next year's elections when a new President of the United States will be elected. On the other hand, I am equally sure that there is not one among my colleagues who does not feel with me that it would be a cruel joke upon these men if in enacting legislation we did not do all within our power to insure that their votes will be treated in the same secret manner as are votes on the home front.

Now what are the provisions governing voting at the polls in the United States? They provide that elections shall be conducted in a bipartisan manner, with representatives of both major parties participating equally in preparing the machinery, in guarding the polls, and in counting the ballots. Stringent penalties, including jail sentences, are provided for tampering with an election.

Obviously this is impossible on the far-flung battlefields of the world where our boys are today fighting. In such circumstances there cannot possibly be this bipartisan operation. So we have the alternative of setting up the machinery in such a way that the commissioned officers of the Army and the Navy, in whom the Nation has the utmost faith, shall carry on the elections under the direction of a ballot commission.

In examining this proposed legislation, however, I find some strange words; I note language that is new to any election laws I have ever seen in this country.

At the very end of title 1 of this bill I find a section with the unusual caption, "Act to be liberally construed"; and then, under the caption I find the following words, unbelievable as it may seem:

> No mere informality in the manner of carrying out or executing the provisions of this title shall invalidate any ballots cast under it or otherwise be permitted to defeat its purposes. The provisions of this title shall be construed liberally.

Then follow the words, "substantial compliance with its requirements shall be deemed to be sufficient."

Mr. President, what do those words mean?

What is a liberal interpretation of an act of Congress, unless it means such liberties as New Deal executive agencies have taken with congressional acts in recent years under the pretext of Executive orders?

What is substantial compliance with an act of Congress?

Mr. President, this section of this proposed legislation standing by itself leaves the way open to invalidate any restrictions that Congress might write into this law to insure honest voting.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New Hampshire, I understand, is referring to the words "substantial compliance" as found on page 32 of the bill?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Subsection (c) on page 32 in section 114, as I recall, is the only place where the words "substantial compliance" occur, and they have been eliminated.

Mr. BRIDGES. If they have been eliminated by the Vandenberg amendment, then my remarks at that point are not in order.

Mr. LUCAS. I was not certain the Senator was present when section (c) was stricken from the bill, I think, a week ago today.

Mr. BRIDGES. On page 34, in section 119, the Senator from Illinois will find that the words "shall be construed liberally" and the words "substantial compliance" still remain in section 119. I do not believe those words at that point were eliminated by the Vandenberg amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. They were not.

Mr. BRIDGES. So my remarks would be pertinent to the bill as reported by the committee at that point.

I think it would be very unwise and unfair if we should pass a bill on this subject and leave it to some who are known to be political leaders in this country to interpret liberally or in a substantial way in compliance with the law its indefinite and intangible phrases. I think these things should be cleared up insofar as possible.

Mr. President, through Federal machinery or through the use of State election machinery it is our intention to make provision that the soldiers and sailors shall have a vote in the coming elections.

But, whatever our course may be, let us take out the loopholes that permit any fraud in connection with the voting; let us provide stiff penalties for any violation of the provisions we enact; let us guard against political propaganda being sneaked to our sons and daughters who are in uniform.

We have looked abroad, Mr. President, and seen one free people after another collapse into ruinous dictatorship because the right to free election of their own officials was stolen from them. We have looked at foreign lands and seen their youth propagandized until their very souls were permeated with the doctrines of their fuehers. We have seen them herded into polling booths to vote "Ja" virtually on penalty of death.

Free elections, I repeat, are the cornerstone of the Republic; and free elections cannot be conducted with the candidate for office naming his own voting commissioners, or with such voting commissioners instructed to give substantial compliance or liberal constructions to the laws which Congress enacts on the subject. Free elections are sacred, and must be safeguarded.

I think it is fair to say that the attitude which I represent here, which is expressed by many Senators on this side of the Chamber, is to the effect that we do not wish to interfere with the right of the soldiers, sailors, and marines, the men and women in the armed forces, to vote in the coming election, or to act at cross purposes in any way. We want the law to be so airtight, the supervising facility, which is to be the United States ballot law commission, so set up, that the American public will have confidence in the men and women selected as members of the commission and in their acts.

The only way by which all doubt can be removed is to have nominations by the respective political parties. I cannot see why the distinguished Senator from Illinois and the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island cannot accept the amendment, because they know, as well as I do, that it is a way to write into law a guaranty of the character and integrity of the commission.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I agree with the able Senator from New Hampshire that free and honest elections are the cornerstones of a successful Republican form of government. I yield to no Senator in my desire to throw every safeguard around the measure which has been proposed which will make it absolutely certain that in the end the soldier, sailor, or marine will have an opportunity to vote, regardless of where he is serving. I agree that the vote must be secret, and that his ballot ultimately be cast in the precinct where the voter resides.

I am against the proposed amendment, and made a short argument in opposition to it when the bill was being discussed last week. In view of the language creating the ballot commission, I see no reason why the amendment should be placed in the bill.

The ballot commission would have no function of making decisions. We have attempted from the beginning to keep the ballot commission from having other than ministerial or administrative duties, and when last week we agreed to strike from the bill paragraph (c) of section 114, we stripped the ballot commission of all power, insofar as it would have any decision of consequence to make.

Notwithstanding that, listening to the able Senator from New Hampshire would give one the impression that the ballot commission would be the instrumentality under which another Tilden-Hayes case might arise in the event of a close election. I undertake to say that by the wildest stretch of the imagination one could not read anything like that into the language which is proposed to set up the ballot commission. The only thing the ballot commission could do would be to take the reports submitted by the secretaries of state of the States and the officials in the various election precincts, and if the ballot commission should ascertain from analyzing those reports that something was wrong in connection with the counting of the votes, then the irregularity would be reported to the Congress of the United States, and the Congress then could do what it saw fit in that situation.

Last week I agreed with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] in connection with the formation of the commission. I undertake to say that, had we desired to have upon the ballot commission three Democrats and two Republicans, as the provision was originally written, we probably could have done it. That is usually the way boards are set up in every State. If the Governor is a Republican, and he creates a board of five individuals, he appoints three Republicans and two Democrats. That is the tradition of this country; it is traditional in the case of the Federal Government and of State governments. It is the American way of doing things. The party in power always has the majority on every board. Notwithstanding that, however, we yielded so far as to provide for the appointment of only two men from the Democratic Party and two from the Republican Party, and then, in case of a dispute, the majority must rule. How much further does the Senator want us to go?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Up to now the Senator has been very fair in his approach on the bill, and I think he showed excellent judgment and outstanding fairness in accepting the so-called Vandenberg amendment the last day the bill was under consideration, and we have today a much better and fairer bill than the bill as originally introduced. Why cannot the Senator from Illinois, who is a distinguished Senator, who says he wants to be very fair, and who I believe does wish to be fair, go all the way, so that there cannot be any question in the mind of anyone relative to the integrity of the commission?

Mr. LUCAS. I agree that there can be no question about the integrity of the commission. As it is proposed to be set up there will be no question. This is much ado about nothing. That is why I am on my feet objecting to the amendment. The implications of the amendment are such that I say, considerately and advisedly, that its adoption would be a reflection upon the President of the United States, especially at this time, and particularly in view of the fact that the President is the Commander in Chief of the Army. I for one am not going to say to him that I do not trust the President of the United States to nominate two Republicans and two Democrats who will be acceptable to the Senate. I have no doubt that the President of the United States will do exactly what the Senator seeks to have done by his amendment, but I do not intend to thrust that in his face and say, "You must do this—or else."

I went so far as to say on the floor of the Senate a few days ago, and I repeat, that in the event the President of the United States should send to us names of men who were not satisfactory to either the majority or minority leaders, I would vote not to confirm. That is how fair I want to be. But I do not think the enactment of such a proposal would be right, I do not think it would be fair, and I question the propriety of having an amendment such as this thrust upon the President of the United States.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield again?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator think it is any worse to adopt an amendment such as the one I have suggested, restricting the group from which the President shall appoint under the proposed law, than for Congress to have placed restrictions on other Presidents?

Mr. LUCAS. I heard the Senator read about the different boards which have been appointed, but each and every one of those boards had power to make decisions which affected the social, the economic, or the political life of the Nation.

What I am objecting to is the placing of the war ballot commission in the same category with persons who have something to do. Its members would be mere administrative clerks.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. They would not be mere clerks. The Senator would not designate as mere clerks a group of men and women who are going to supervise the voting of 10,000,000 men and women in a great national election, would he?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator does not understand the bill if he takes the position that the ballot commission is going to supervise the election.

Mr. BRIDGES. It is going to supervise these men and women voters, is it not?

Mr. LUCAS. There is not a chance of that. The Army and the Navy have all the responsibility for the supervision and control and conduct of the election. The only thing the ballot commission does under the bill is to prepare the ballot, prepare the instructions, and then pass the ballot on to the Army and the Navy, who assume all the responsibility for getting the ballot to the soldier, having it voted, having it returned to the ballot commission, and then when the vote is returned to the ballot commission it is transferred to a secretary of state. That is all the commission has to do.

Mr. BRIDGES. Under the measure setting up the ballot commission, are we not going to have some check on what goes to the soldiers in the way of propaganda and so on?

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator mean so far as magazines and literature and things of that kind are concerned?

Mr. BRIDGES. Anything that pertains to a campaign, anything of a political nature.

Mr. LUCAS. There is nothing in the bill that gives the ballot commission the right to send any political materials, any propaganda, or any arguments of any kind.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; but who is going to supervise it? Who is going to stop it in this country if it goes out?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not desire to go into that phase of the question because that comes under the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and I have a long argument in my brief case which I shall make when the time comes to consider that amendment. I do not desire to be diverted now.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is the Senator going to oppose the Taft amendment?

Mr. LUCAS. I certainly am.

Mr. BRIDGES. Why?

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the Senator that the reasons are contained in an hour and a half argument. I do not wish to discuss that subject now, because we are not considering the Taft amendment. I wish first to dispose of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire. When I get through discussing the Taft amendment I think the Senator from New Hampshire will be opposed to it. When the Senator from Ohio really understands the implications contained in his amendment he will withdraw his amendment in its present form.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have great admiration for the Senator from Illinois, but I will say to him that if he convinces me to the point where I shall be against the Taft amendment he will have done a good job indeed.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator will go along with the Senator from Ohio in the event he withdraws his amendment and presents something different, I take it?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not know that I shall agree in advance to go along with the Senator from Ohio in anything, but in general I approve of his amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not say that the Senator from Ohio is going to withdraw his amendment, but the Taft amendment presents quite a serious situation. It is not from a political standpoint I am speaking; I am speaking from the standpoint of the morale of the soldier.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. On page 18, in subsection (c) I read:

(c) It shall be the duty of the commission, acting so far as practicable in consultation with representatives of the War and Navy Departments and the other agencies and officials charged with the performance of duties under this act, to formulate such plans, make such arrangements, and adopt such measures not inconsistent with the purposes of this act as it may deem appropriate to further the purposes of this act and facilitate its administration. The commission is authorized to investigate any alleged neglect, misconduct, or irregularity in the administration of this act——

Mr. LUCAS. That language is out. We agreed to strike it out last week.

Mr. BRIDGES. The whole of what I have been reading is stricken out?

Mr. LUCAS. No. The language "The commission is authorized to investigate any alleged neglect, misconduct," and so forth—that is stricken out.

Mr. BRIDGES. Down to that point?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; that is stricken.

Mr. BRIDGES. That language does not make it appear as though everything has been turned over to the War Department and Navy Department. It looks as if the commission is called upon to consult the departments.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, the ballot commission has to consult with the War Department and the Navy Department if it is going to do the kind of job that everyone wants done, because on the shoulders of the Army and the Navy falls the responsibility for the administration of the act. We have told the ballot commission in the bill that they must consult with the Army and the Navy in order to ascertain what their plans are, and then the commission can proceed and perfect its plans in line with what they can do to make the act effective. That is all there is to that. It cannot be very serious.

Mr. President, I do not wish to say anything more about this particular amendment, except to suggest that there has been much misunderstanding with respect to the ballot commission. The commission has no worth-while power whatsoever. It is purely administrative. The commission makes no serious decision whatsover, and we should not thrust this proposal into the face of the President of the United States and say to him that he must take someone whom we are going to recommend.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. If the commission has so little power and is so insignificant in its power, as the Senator suggests, what can be the harm of my amendment?

Mr. LUCAS. Because the Senator is attempting to do something with the ballot commission that he should not do. We have already gone all the way, I will say to the Senator, in connection with the appointment of the members of the ballot commission. The recognition we gave to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] the other day ought to have been sufficient and should have satisfied everyone. I do not know why the Senator is so skeptical about this commission. In other words, I repeat what I said a moment ago, that by all the rules of the game there should be three Democrats on this commission and two Republicans, and the Senator must admit that, because when he was Governor of New Hampshire he never appointed two Republicans and two Democrats on committees of which there must be a majority in order to make a decision.

Mr. BRIDGES. As Governor of New Hampshire, if I were running for a second or a third or a fourth term I certainly, if I wanted the confidence of the people of my State, would never have tried to pack the ballot commission.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is in effect making a statement which he cannot support at all and he should not make it. He is too good a Senator to say that somebody is trying to pack the commission.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. Wait a minute, I do not yield now. The Senator should not make such a statement, because we retain in the Senate the right to confirm and approve any nomination the President of the United States may send here, and I will guarantee that there are enough Senators on this side of the aisle to take care of the situation in the event the minority leader and those on the other side who are in charge of the Republican Party do not agree with what the President does. I think I have been more than fair in attempting to meet what the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle seem to think is something very serious in connection with the duties of the ballot commission.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator rather inferred that I had implied at least that the President of the United States intended to pack the ballot commission.

Mr. LUCAS. That is exactly what I intended to infer.

Mr. BRIDGES. I did not intend to imply that at all. I said that he could pack the commission under the original set-up, or under a set-up of that kind, and that we should not allow that to be

done. Of course, if the country is to have confidence we should so limit the appointing power and so limit the set-up so there is no possibility of such a thing. Without casting any implications on the President, or anything of the kind, I still recognize that he is the most astute political character we have ever had in the White House. He does not miss many political bets.

Mr. LUCAS. On behalf of the President, I thank the Senator for that compliment.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator from Illinois made the statement a moment ago that he felt that we were perhaps doing an unusual thing in asking for an equal representation by the two parties on the commission rather than an unequal one. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the precedent set at least in the State of Ohio wherein a similar matter affecting commissions controlling elections it is provided by statute that the respective committees of the respective parties shall each appoint an equal number on such commissions, and the commissions are made up for all elections by equal representatives of the two parties.

Mr. LUCAS. Who has the veto power?

Mr. BURTON. When they reach a tie, the question is finally determined by the secretary of state, whoever he may be.

Mr. LUCAS. That is to say, the secretary of state would have the veto power.

Mr. BURTON. He finally would have the deciding vote, if they were unable to reach an agreement.

Mr. LUCAS. Primarily, in all such commissions there is someone who has the power of decision, the power to break a tie. Under the amendment, we would do the unusual by saying that it would take three to break a tie, when there would be only four members of the commission.

With all due respect to my colleagues, I say we have gone more than sled's length in attempting to be fair in connection with the proposed ballot commission, and I think we would be doing an unfair thing to follow through now with a proposition of this kind.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am sure the Senator recalls that in 1937 there was quite a controversy in the country over what was known as the court-packing scheme.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; I have heard about it.

Mr. BRIDGES. At that time the President of the United States attempted—I do not know whether it should be said that he attempted to pack the Supreme Court, but he certainly attempted to change the character of the Supreme Court by additional appointments—a process which was commonly known as "packing," and which I call "packing."

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. With that as a background, a great many persons would have some question in their minds, whether rightly or wrongly, about the character of the war ballot commission, unless Congress placed some restrictions on the appointive power under the bill. For that reason I say that the President should be the first to say, "Of course I want to appoint from nominees satisfactory to the respective national committees. Of course I favor the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not think the President of the United States attempted to pack the Supreme Court. I was just as much opposed to the President's position at that time as was the Senator from New Hampshire. In those days I was a Member of the House of Representatives, and I made a speech in the House against the President's proposal. Notwithstanding that, I still believe the President will appoint the kind of commission which would be satisfactory to the Senate. I do not desire to take the responsibility of saying to him, "You must appoint four from a group of certain persons to the war ballot commission," a commission which would have little or no power to make any important decision which would affect the election one way or the other. That is what I cannot understand. In other words, the members of the war ballot commission would not open the ballots. All they would do would be to prepare them. They would have nothing to do with conducting the election. They would have nothing to do with certifying to the taking of the soldier's oath.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. After the soldiers and sailors vote, and the ballots come back, to whom would they be sent first?

Mr. LUCAS. The ballots would be sent from every camp to the war ballot commission.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. The war ballot commission immediately would segregate the ballots by States, and would send them to the respective secretaries of state. That is all the members of the war ballot commission would do.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; but for the time being the war ballot commission would have in its possession sufficient ballots to determine the Presidency of the United States; would it not?

Mr. LUCAS. What does the Senator mean?

Mr. BRIDGES. Just what I have said.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator will have to elaborate; I do not quite follow him.

Mr. BRIDGES. I mean that the war ballot commission might have several million ballots passing through its hands.

Mr. LUCAS. It will have; certainly.

Mr. BRIDGES. Therefore, we want the war ballot commission to be of such character and integrity that no one will question the several million ballots passing through its hands — ballots which might determine the outcome of the election.

Mr. LUCAS. There is no question about that. However, all that the members of the commission would do would be to make sure that the respective secretaries of state had them in their hands, and that finally the election officials had them in their hands.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further,

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Little by little we are finding that the war ballot commission will have more and more duties on its hands.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; I realize that; but the duties it will have will be unimportant.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator has suggested that the war ballot commission would not have much power. I notice that it would have the power to set the balloting day for our soldiers at the battle fronts.

Mr. LUCAS. No; that would be done by the Army and the Navy.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I invite the Senator's attention to the language appearing at the bottom of page 27 and at the top of page 28:

> The appropriate commanding officer shall be required—
>
> 1. To designate a balloting day for voting in general elections which shall be, whenever possible, after he has received a list of candidates from all States, but which shall not be later than the date which the commission may fix for the area in which his command is located.

That is a rather important power.

Mr. LUCAS. That is true, of course. The war ballot commission would be in a better position than anyone else would be to know how long it would take to have the ballots returned from one particular area or another particular area and how long it would take to transfer the ballots from the war ballot commission to the secretaries of state. The man who is in the field in north Africa is not going to know, and is not going to take the time to ascertain, how long it will take to get the ballots back.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest to the Senator that the man who has the power to set the balloting day, to set the latest date on which the balloting could be held, has the power even to interfere with military operations.

Mr. LUCAS. No; he would not. There is no one who would have the power to interfere with military operations, regardless of what the bill says.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest further to the Senator that whoever can set the balloting day could change the whole course of the election; that the particular date set might mean the difference between the victory of one party or the victory of another party in the election.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator can take that position if he desires to do so. The matter of determining the date is one which must be decided by three members of the war ballot commission. I do not know of a much greater safeguard which we could throw around it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I was merely suggesting that the matters I have developed are highly important, it seems to me, and put enormous powers in the commission.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not agree with the Senator about the enormity of the powers which would be in the hands of the war ballot commission. Certainly the Senator would not suggest that the Army and the Navy fix the date; would he?

Mr. MILLIKIN. No; I think that is one of the weaknesses of the bill. It certainly is untraditional to be turning our electoral processes over to the military.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The alternative is to turn them over to civilians, but civilians may not be able to reconcile their election plans to the war effort. There is a dilemma there which is a difficult one, whichever way one turns.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator that the bill is not traditional; but never before in the history of this country have we had soldiers fighting all over the world at a time when we had a general election. However, when these emergencies arise we have to meet the conditions as they exist; and I undertake to say that the long arm of Uncle Sam, in this great emergency, cannot take a boy from Illinois or Colorado and send him to Guadalcanal or into Africa or to some other spot in the world where our boys are fighting the battle for freedom, without having the same Congress which is responsible for passing the Selective Service Act see to it that something is done under the Constitution to give that boy the right to vote. In other words, we cannot take away his political rights, in my humble opinion, when he is fighting for political rights and is willing to give his life for them, if need be.

I understand how difficult it is to draft a bill of any kind which would permit our fighting boys to vote when they are far away from home; but it should be done. It must be done. In my humble opinion we cannot take a chance on disfranchising 6,000,000 men in the most important election this country has held since the days of Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator spoke of disfranchising 6,000,000 men. Under the terms of the pending bill political rights, the right to vote, would be given to men who have never had the right of franchise. Is not that true?

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator give me an example?

Mr. EASTLAND. Under the terms of the bill, men who are not qualified to vote under the laws of the States would be permitted to vote.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not wish to become involved in a discussion with the Senator on the question of qualifications, regulations, or conditions. I undertake to say that under article I, section 4 of the Constitution, we have the right, so far as any regulations are concerned, to alter such regulations if made by a State.

Mr. EASTLAND. But not to prescribe qualifications.

Mr. LUCAS. Absolutely not. The Senator from Illinois has never at any time suggested that we take away the constitutional qualifications. Under the oath which the soldier must take, he must certify with respect to the constitutional qualifications of age, citizenship, and residence. I know what the Senator is driving at. That is a question which is debatable. There are good lawyers on both sides of the aisle who take different positions with respect to the constitutionality of the poll tax.

Mr. EASTLAND. The very heart of the right to vote, under the Constitution of Mississippi, is registration before a State official chosen for that purpose and the ability of the one who seeks to register to read and give a reasonable interpretation of a section of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot agree with the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator think that the Congress of the United States has the authority to strike down these State qualifications?

Mr. LUCAS. Take the case of a boy from the Senator's State who went into the Army when he was 20 years old. He has been in the Army for 2 years. He has never had an opportunity to register and could not have registered if he had so desired. Does the Senator think that that boy should be disfranchised?

Mr. EASTLAND. We have an absentee voters' law in the State of Mississippi which will take care of him. That is a matter which should be left to the States.

Furthermore, with reference to the powers of the proposed commission, if the ballot commission acts as all other Government commissions have acted, its power will be unlimited. Such commissions care nothing for the law. They care nothing for congressional intent. There is no greed in the world comparable to the greed of a governmental department for power, and the proposed commission would take whatever power it desired. Under the terms of the pending bill, authority would be given the commission to hire as many agents as it might desire.

This bill, if enacted into law, would send carpetbaggers into the South to control the elections. The commission would send a horde of agents, sneaks, and snoops over the country to dominate the next election. The situation in Indiana, Illinois, and Ohio would be worse than it would be in my State of Mississippi, because my State is "in the bag." The proposed legislation is the first step toward Federal control, toward bureaucratic control of the entire election machinery of this country.

The bill is called a soldiers' vote bill. The Senator has not stopped there. He would give the right of ballot to members of the merchant marine, civilians, and others who are not in the armed forces of this country. The bill, if enacted into law, would destroy the sacred principle of the control of each State over its own election machinery and the right of the State to define the qualifications of its electors.

Mr. LUCAS. If we disfranchise 6,000,000 soldiers from voting in the next election the Senator can tell them that when they come back.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not propose to disfranchise any of them. We do not want Federal qualifications for voting, and Federal control of elections.

Mr. LUCAS. Just a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. LUCAS. No, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I have permitted the Senator to make quite a speech in my time. I merely wish to answer him.

Mr. President, if we disfranchise 6,000,000 voters next year—and that is exactly what will happen unless we enact some kind of Federal legislation—when these soldiers return they will tell their story with respect to the failure of the Senate and the House of Representatives to enact legislation which would give them the opportunity to vote. They will charge the Congress with tragic failure. The people will agree with them.

I ask in all seriousness, If the individual who is willing to lay down his life for his country is not entitled to vote, then who is?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. Just a moment. If he is not entitled to vote, who is? I do not wish to enter into a discussion of the question of voting by absentee ballots from the States. I can convince any fair and reasonable man that it cannot be done. I can convince any fair and prudent mind that not a single soldier from the State of Illinois who is serving outside the continental limits of the United States could vote under the absentee ballot law of the State of Illinois. I am not condemning anybody for it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I shall yield in a moment. That is the situation which exists, Mr. President. I say that in this hour of peril the Congress of the United States has a duty to perform in enacting some kind of constructive legislation which will permit the soldier to have the opportunity to vote.

I now yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator says that soldiers from his State could not vote under the State's absentee voting system. I have before me some figures prepared by the War Department with respect to the Senator's State. From Springfield, Ill., the capital of the Senator's State, there is regular air-mail service to the farthest point in the Middle East. Under the State system, ballots could be sent from Springfield to that area and returned in 20 days.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the Senator where he obtained that information?

Mr. EASTLAND. The information came from Colonel Cutler, in the War Department. It was given to me by the ranking Democrat on the House committee which has already defeated the bill which we have under discussion.

Mr. LUCAS. Colonel Cutler does not give me the same figures. Colonel Cutler has also stated that he was misquoted in connection with certain figures.

Mr. EASTLAND. My information is contained in a letter from Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, a Representative from Mississippi, dated November 22.

Mr. LUCAS. Is Mr. RANKIN interested in this bill?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; he is interested in this bill. He helped kill this bill in the other House.

Mr. President, we have a duty, of course, to see that those members of the armed forces who are qualified to vote under the laws of each State shall have the opportunity to vote; but it is our first duty to be loyal to the oath we took to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has given certain figures. I did not want to enter into a debate upon this question. It is not germane to the amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. These are the figures which were given me by Colonel Cutler, who has made a special study of this subject:

From an overseas point in the North American area to Springfield, Ill., 22 days.

From an overseas point in the European theater to Springfield, Ill., 37 days——

Mr. EASTLAND. From where?

Mr. LUCAS. From an overseas point in the European theater, 37 days. The information does not state where the point is.

From an overseas point in the Pacific theater to Springfield, Ill., 43 days.

From an overseas point in the Far East to Springfield, Ill., 52 days.

There is only one area, namely, the North American area, which is within the 30-day period specified in the absentee-balloting law which has been written by the legislators of my State. Within that period of 22 days there must be five mail services. Under the absentee-ballot law of the State of Illinois, the first thing the individual must do is request a form. That represents one mail service. The form is returned from the county clerk to the soldier. That is the second mail service. Then when the form is returned to the county clerk there is a third mail service. The county clerk then sends the absentee voter a ballot, which is the fourth mail service, and the ballot is then returned, which is the fifth mail service.

Mr. EASTLAND. I will say——

Mr. LUCAS. Please wait a moment. Under the figures which have been given by Colonel Cutler there was provision made for only three mail services, and when we have two more even the 22 days required in our State go up to more than 30. So that is why I say there is not a single soldier in the State of Illinois who is fighting outside the continental limits of the United States who will have an opportunity to vote under present State laws unless we enact some type of Federal legislation.

Mr. EASTLAND. I will state to the distinguished Senator that under Colonel Cutler's figures, with respect to the Alaskan area, from Springfield to the nearest point in Alaska and back to Springfield requires 14 days; the farthest point in Alaska, 17 days. In the Pacific area, the nearest point, 18 days; the farthest point, 30 days. In the Canal Zone, 13 days. In the Caribbean area, the nearest, 12 days; farthest, 16 days. South Atlantic area, nearest, 14 days; farthest, 16 days. In the Middle East area, nearest, 18 days; farthest, 20 days. In the Persian Gulf area, 22 days. In the Far East area, nearest, 30 days; farthest, 46 days. In the Mediterranean area, nearest long haul, 21 days; short haul, 18 days; farthest long haul, 26 days; short haul, 22 days. In the North Atlantic area, nearest, 14 days; farthest, 24 days.

That is by regular mail service. When we extend the right, as we can do, of transportation of the ballots by air mail, the War Department has said that the time can be materially reduced.

I will say to the Senator that I am sure the State officials of Illinois desire to se that the soldier is given the privilege to vote. As for the time it takes to get the ballot to the soldier, the soldier's family and all those interested in his welfare are going to see that the ballot is rushed to him. In my judgment nine-tenths of the men in the armed forces can vote under the State absentee voting laws today. According to the time schedule of present Air Mail Service, the War Department has said that when priority is given the transportation of these ballots the time of transportation can be materially reduced. So I see no necessity for the Senator's bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not wish to discuss that matter at the present time; it is not at all germane to the pending amendment; but I suggest to the Senator that he consult Colonel Cutler, and I will guarantee that Colonel Cutler will give to him the same figures he has given me.

Mr. EASTLAND. I will say to the Senator that my information is that the figures I have given were filed by Colonel Cutler with the House committee.

Mr. LUCAS. There must be some mistake about these two sets of figures. He gave me the set of figures which I just read.

Mr. EASTLAND. I have before me a letter from the ranking Democrat on the House committee, who I see is now on the Senate floor, and I should like to say further that the House committee is 9 to 4 against this bill.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not care what may be the position of the House committee, and I am not going to yield to discuss what has happened in the House. If the bill ever gets over there, very well, but I do not think it is at all pertinent to the issue to discuss what the House of Representatives may have done or may do.

Now, Mr. President, I return to the amendment which is before the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes, I yield. The Senator is about to discuss the amendment, is he not?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. In relation to it I wish the Senator would refer to page 30, subsection (b) appearing near the top of the page. It reads as follows:

> In order to expedite the transmission of ballots cast outside the United States to the appropriate election officials, the commission may establish such regional offices as may be necessary to receive such ballots, sort them out, and forward them to the appropriate secretaries of state.

Now, let us see what that means? It means that they can set up regional offices. It does not say that the agency which directs the regional office will have to be bipartisan in nature, that is part Republican and part Democratic. It means, for instance, that in my section of the country we could have a regional office to cater to the six New England States, and New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, and that under all the restrictions in the bill the office could be set up in Jersey City under Hague.

The Senator has said that the commission does not have any power; but, if the Senator will look at the bill, I think he will see that he has tried to build a halo of insignificance around the commission which is not warranted by the text of the measure, or by the powers or responsibilities conferred on the commission.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am certain that the two Republicans on the commission will take care of all the speculative troubles of the Senator from New Hampshire.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which is really in the nature of a substitute for the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator that an amendment is now pending.

Mr SMITH. I simply ask that my amendment lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. President, I have listened to the debate, and am distressed at the thought that men who were elected by the voters of 48 sovereign States, recognizing the sovereignty of those States, should contend over a bill which would destroy that sovereignty from beginning to end. There are Members of the Senate who know that whenever we delegate to another power to determine the qualifications of the voter we have destroyed State's rights. That is what this bill would do.

In my amendment I have provided a means which seems to me to be very reasonable and logical. A year would be afforded in which to prepare ourselves. Every State would prepare lists of the qualified voters in the armed services. They would transmit them to the proper authorities to distribute among the absentee voters. The machinery would be set up by the State. We forget that 48 States make up this Government. Anyone who reads the history of the constitutional amendments knows that it is

States' rights that will suffer by the delegation of power. By the very force of circumstances, however, we are coming to consider this city to be the center of all government for America.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I agree with the Senator that we must maintain States' rights. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not agree that if the present Green-Lucas bill becomes law it will be attacked in the courts as being unconstitutional?

Mr. SMITH. What courts?

Mr. EASTLAND. Where would we be if the act should be declared unconstitutional?

Mr. SMITH. Exactly. Mr. President, I have heard the statement made on the floor of the Senate by one in whose constitutional knowledge I have confidence—I do not know how much his heart was devoted to it—that he thought the vote by an absentee voter is paramount to the Constitution.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. If this bill becomes law, will the Senator get ready to welcome the carpetbaggers back to South Carolina?

Mr. SMITH. We have them everywhere now. Sometimes it even looks as though the Senate is made up of them.

Mr. President, I am in deadly earnest about the preservation of the Constitution. Without it we would have anarchy, and the proposal to set up a Federal commission to regulate, not only the votes of absentee soldier patriots, but of p-a-y-t-r-i-o-t-s, would aim a fatal blow at the very foundation of our Government. Have we drifted so far away from our love and devotion to the Constitution that we are willing to twist it whenever the circumstances suit us?

I have drafted an amendment in the form of a substitute for the bill which would give each State the right to list its qualified absentee voters, send the list to the Army and Navy heads, in turn to be submitted to whatever division the absentee voters are in, and then give such voters the right to fill out their ballots, seal them, return them, and have them transmitted to the respective States of which the voters are citizens.

Why all this ado about a commission, and why is it proposed that every one of the armed forces without exception may vote? I heard awhile ago in the debate that the question of the qualifications of the men should not be considered, but every man willing to die for his country should be allowed to vote. Some men in the armed services may be murders on parole; some of them may be guilty of crimes which disqualify them in the States of their residence, but nevertheless, they are qualified to vote in this glorious hour. We must not lose sight of fundamental things, or the action we take may return to plague us. I believe in each State having the right to regulate its own voting and to determine the qualifications of its electors. I stood here, as every other Senator did, and took a solemn oath to uphold the Constitution against all enemies, both foreign and domestic, without any mental reservation. Yet, measures are advocated by men who ought to be ashamed of themselves in view of the oath they took, and some are contending that a soldier's vote is paramount to the Constitution.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. NYE. Does the Senator know of any provision in the Constitution that declares that when a Senator takes his oath to support the Constitution there is some higher law that must be considered in connection with living by his oath of office?

Mr. SMITH. I think when the average man takes an oath without any mental reservation that precludes any possibility of his voting for a proposal which is absolutely unconstitutional.

Mr. President, I have watched the progress of the Senate for a long time. It seems to me we are degenerating into a most unfortunate condition. We seem to forget the Constitution, and I doubt very much if many of us have ever read the decisions of the Supreme Court when we had a Supreme Court and its decisions were worth reading. When the "twilight zone" between the delegated powers and the reserved powers would come into question, with clear brain and full knowledge of the facts the Court would render decisions that have guided us until this hour. God knows what is to become of us from now on; I do not know.

Mr. President, I am not disposed to criticize or to be personal, but this bill to me is the most disgusting and infamous thing ever introduced into the Senate of the United States. Anyone who will read it will find that it has an objective which, in my opinion, in a sense, involves throwing the Constitution out the window. We ought to recognize the sovereign right of the States; they furnished the boys; they are taxed to support them; and yet, when it comes to giving them the vote, it is said, "Let the Federal Government run that."

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. In the Senator's remarks he referred to some individuals being "p-a-y-t-r-i-o-t-s," and to the doctrine of States' rights. May I pay tribute today to the outstanding advocate of States' rights, the p-a-t-r-i-o-t, Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. SMITH. Do not mention Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. TOBEY. You have recently honored the memory of Thomas Jefferson by erecting a mausoleum of beauty and marble on the borders of the Potomac's Basin; but while honoring the man you have forsaken his teachings and his faith in States' rights. They went into the discard 10 years ago.

Mr. SMITH. We will not mention Thomas Jefferson, or George Washington, or any of the miserable wretches who laid the foundation of the great Constitution under which we are now living. I am surprised the Senator should mention the names of those men here. They are despised by men who belong to a certain political faith and who control things now.

I did not intend to get into this subject; I merely wanted to stand here and voice my opposition to this miserable bill which is in contravention of constitutional principles.

The idea of sending boys out yonder and saying they are fighting to maintain the Constitution while we are breaking it. That is a hell of a note. Boys, yours and mine and those of our fellow citizens, are over there fighting.

Talking about our war policy, I want somebody to write it out for me. I try to be a patriot, not a "p-a-y-t-r-i-o-t," though I do not object to having the pay coming along, but this whole thing smells of partisan business. Here is the Senator from New Hampshire trying to get the Republicans a little hand-hold and the Senator from Illinois saying, No, it is ours; you stay out of it; it is ours; we have so worded it and we are going to have it that way. [Laughter.] Let the States determine the qualified voters, and send the list not to a commission but to the proper officers to be transmitted to the men in the armed forces wherever they may be. For God's sake let us be men for once and stop being mugwumps. I have sat here and listened to this debate and it is enough to turn the stomach even of new dealers.

Senator, let us be serious about this matter. How many Members of the Senate believe that this bill accords with the Constitution, and respects the dignity and the rights of 48 sovereign States? Do not forget that they still own America. We talk about what we are going to do next year. I hope the voters of America will say, "Now, we will show you who is boss." We must not forget that the States made the Constitution and the States have the right to repeal it. If three-fourths of the States of the Union were to meet in solemn convention assembled and declare that all powers delegated to the Federal Government were withdrawn, where would we be?

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. In addressing the Senate, as the Senator always does eloquently and interestingly, he is facing the Republican side of the aisle. Is there a deep significance in that? Is it not because he knows that on this side of the aisle there is fertile ground, where the seeds of Americanism, States' rights, and the doctrines of the Constitution, have taken root and flourish? Is that not the reason why he faces this side?

Mr. SMITH. I do not know; the dirt is pretty deep. [Laughter.] I wish now

to refer to something that occurred recently, when I was sitting with a number of Republicans.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will not the Senator face the front so that we can all hear? [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH. I will face this miserable crowd on the Democratic side. [Laughter.] In the group to which I have referred a Republican said, "If all Democrats were like ED SMITH we would not be in such a bad fix," and they said some complimentary things about me and my State. I replied, "I believe Einstein is right. He has said that everything depends on relativity, that a thing is a yard long because it is three times longer than a foot. By the same token I know how low I have sunk." "How is that?" I said, "A dirty, stinking Republican looks good to me now." [Laughter.] I repeat, I have reached the point where republicanism and democracy mean nothing to me. The question is, Are you an American? Do you love the Constitution? I do not care whether a man was born in Vermont or whether he was born in South Carolina, provided he loves his Government, and the splendid rights it gives the individual and the States, keeping the Government as near the people as possible, and maintaining it there.

But here we are, spending days and hours and a few billion dollars—for what purpose? To disrupt and destroy the Government which we love and to which we are devoted. There is not a man here present but who seriously thinks the Government is in danger. Every man believes that to be so. Why should we not believe it when we hear such talk as has been going on here this afternoon? It is not a question of saying, Do you believe this is constitutional, do you believe the States have a right to name their voters, and the qualifications of the voters? There is not a man here today who has sense enough to be a Senator—I mean who has votes enough—but knows there is not a single item in the Constitution, from article I to the last amendment which has been added—and which weakened it—which gives a right to the Federal Government to prescribe the qualifications of the voters in the States.

I am not pleading about the poll tax. I will let the "polecats" run that. The names are in a way synonymous. The poll tax is nothing in the world but a camouflage to enrage a race that does not understand it. The repeal of the poll-tax law, even in my State, would not result in one more vote, not one. We hear much said about the members of one race going overseas and fighting and dying. Mr. President, do you suppose a man who wanted to vote would not pay a dollar to vote? I have no brief for the poll tax; I do not think it should ever have been made a qualification for voting; but it is on the statute books, it is the law in my State, and, by the eternal gods, I shall observe it.

Mr. President, I rose for the purpose of saying I had offered a substitute for the bill, which would give each State the right to submit a list of its qualified voters, and to add to it from time to time, and to have the ballots distributed to the voters, wherever they may be, and, when they vote—the vote to be secret—have the ballots sent back to the States of which the voters are citizens. Anything outside of that is an absolute contravention of the Constitution and I, for one, took my oath a long time ago, solemnly swearing that I would uphold the Constitution against enemies both foreign and domestic. Was it not a wonderful thing to have inserted in that oath the word "domestic"? God knows we have domestic enemies. Both foreign and domestic, without any mental reservation. A man who will foreswear himself should be kicked out of this body, because a man who will swear a lie and then live it is not fit to be a United States Senator.

Mr. President, I felt like rising and expressing myself to those here who are quarreling about who will get the major part of the soldier vote, the Republicans or the Democrats. I do not give a darn, just so they vote as American citizens.

I am greatly worried about the situation. I have not very much longer to live. I know there are many who wish to God my time would be shortened [laughter]; but I am not going to die until I have to. I am going to fight for the right of my countrymen to express themselves, and to live under the Constitution. I do not believe in turning America over to an international group. We have never gotten anything out of the international group but some very unworthy immigrants.

Mr. President, I like to have a man rise and discuss facts. I do not object to any one differing with me so long as he is sincere, but I do despise a whippersnapper, who I know does not believe a word he is saying, coming around and stating "You do so and so." I feel like slapping the dog down. Senators have noticed day after day some little slick head telling them he believes so and so. He does not believe anything. If he ever had a bright original idea he would die of apoplexy. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, it is time for us to be men and representatives of sovereign States.

A Senator sitting in front of me a few days ago rose and said he believed the soldiers' right to vote was paramount to the Constitution. The junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] replied, and I intend to cut out and preserve what he said. His comment was not studied; it was the spontaneous ebullition of a real American statesman.

I hope my little castigation of our great constitutional statesmen will result in Senators voting to maintain the Constitution, and throwing this miserable bill out the window. It is not worthy of being considered by the Senate of the United States.

Oh, we hear someone say, "I want the boys to vote. I want the boys to vote—providing they vote for me." [Laughter.]

THE STABILIZATION PROGRAM—SUBSIDIES

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, one of the most stupendous assignments that ever confronted any Chief Executive of our Nation was the job of transforming us a peace-loving people, into one of the most potent fighting machines of all times.

When we realize how woefully unprepared we were only 2 years ago, when treacherously attacked at Pearl Harbor, and are now able to assert that we have the most powerful Navy on the seas, one of the best equipped armies in the field, and the most formidable air force in the skies, we are prone to ask ourselves, How did all of that come about; how was the miracle performed? Many reasons can be assigned, but I am going to dwell on the one I consider the most important—that is, our stabilization program.

The Price Control Act, as amended, was bound to present many difficulties because it necessarily curbed freedom-loving people in their usual and ordinary methods of carrying on their business. It necessarily encroached on our farmer's right to dispose of his commodities as he had been accustomed. We have come a long way in smoothing out the many obstacles that confronted the administrators of the law, and we are now reaching the point when the purposes of the act are better understood by the vast majority of our people. Its operation is getting progressively better. Mr. President, notwithstanding the vast amount of criticism that has been heaped upon our stabilization program, I predict that, when the war clouds fade away, it will stand out as a key factor we will look to in weighing the causes that saved our economy—our free-enterprise society—during this grave emergency.

Mr. President, I ask the Members of the Senate, Would it not be dangerous, would it not be folly, would it not lead to disaster, for us to abandon our present course in our fight for stabilization? As I have just indicated, we have come a long way. We started in the valley—our trail has been strenuous, it has been tortuous, it has brought many headaches to us and to the administrators of our program. But we have reached the crest. Our people have learned by experience the necessity for stabilization, and it would be tragic, to say the least, for us to deviate from our present course.

Mr. President, I do not like subsidies. We from the South are traditionally opposed to any form of subsidy. However, I am unable to devise any method that will more effectively stave off inflation than the utilization of subsidies in our fight for stabilization—nor, for that matter, has anyone else to my knowledge.

In considering this problem let us cast aside politics, let us not force it into an issue between the farmers on one side, the consumers on another, or, for that matter, as an issue between any of the particular groups that are upholding or opposing subsidies. Let us rather look at it in the light of protecting our economy and our whole system of free enterprise.

Mr. President, there is absolutely no doubt that the only alternative to subsidies is higher prices of consumer goods. Higher prices of consumer goods means a higher cost of living, and a higher cost of living will beget higher wages, and higher wages will again mean higher costs of consumer goods, and soon our economy will become enmeshed in a spiral of inflation that will not only wipe out the savings of millions of our people but will curtail our productivity now, and almost destroy it in post-war years.

Mr. President, I refuse to believe that the farmers of our Nation are set against subsidies or incentive payments in view of present circumstances. I venture to say they are being misrepresented by some of these high-pressure representatives of farm organizations throughout the country. I visited many parts of my State last summer, and I was agreeably surprised to learn that my people were for price control and for rationing. The vast majority of them were wholeheartedly for the stabilization program, notwithstanding the fact that it was badly managed at its inception. I am not contending that the farmers of my State fundamentally like subsidies, but when one explains to them how subsidies work, and how the system has had the effect of preventing inflation, they express satisfaction. I know they fear inflation. They do not favor run-away prices. Mr. President, it is my contention that if we let the bars down and permit the cost of living to rise—as it will, as sure as night follows day—the chief sufferers, when judgment day comes, will be the farmers of our Nation. I believe the farmers know that.

Farmers have benefited greatly from our war-food policy and from the stabilization program. Let us compare the aggregate net income of the American farmers, after all expenses, during some specific periods in the past with their receipts for the present year. The average aggregate net income of farmers in the years 1935 to 1939, both inclusive, the 5 years preceding the war, was $4,668,000,000. This year it will be over $12,000,000,000. Why, Senators, total farm income stands at the highest point in our history. It is almost three times its pre-war level. Likewise, per capita net farm income in 1943 will be practically triple the pre-war year of 1939, and it will be three and one-half times what it was in the years 1910–14, the period that is utilized for agricultural parity.

This increased income is not confined to any one type or group of farmers, but it extends to all of them.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator tell us what the dollars and cents per capita income of farmers will be in 1943? How many dollars?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator can easily figure that out. The net income will be $12,000,000,000, and I think there are about 6,000,000 farmers in the United States. That would mean an average net income of $2,000 per family.

Mr. AIKEN. There are about 30,000,000 persons on farms.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is about right.

Mr. AIKEN. That is about $400 per capita. Is that exorbitant?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; it is not. I should personally like to give the farmers much more than they are receiving, but I fear that if we attempt to do that by raising the prices of their commodities, they—the farmers—will suffer a great deal in the resulting inflation. On the other hand, an average net income of $400 per person in the farm family is not such a bad income.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator familiar with the statistics issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, I believe it is, showing that 68 percent of the farmers of the United States have less than $1,000 a year income on which to support their families?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am familiar with some of the statistics, but not the ones to which the Senator refers. I would hazard a guess, however, that the statistics to which the Senator refers are not up to date.

Mr. AIKEN. And that is not an exorbitant income, either?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I grant that to the Senator. Many of the smaller farmers of the South whose main crop is cotton have extremely low incomes.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a table which I should like to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. It shows the rise in income of all types of farmers while the stabilization program has been in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

Net cash income above expenses of typical commercial family-operated farms
1935–39 TO 1942 AND 1943

Type of farm	Location	Dollars increased income, 1942 over average 1935–39	Farm net cash income		
			1935–39	1940	1942
1. Wheat farms	Winter wheat area	$3,700	$1,990	$1,670	$5,690
2. Wheat, grain sorghum, livestock	do	3,264	1,700	1,600	4,960
3. Cash grain	Corn Belt	3,204	1,800	2,100	5,000
4. Hog-beef breeding, fattening	do	2,626	1,300	1,380	3,930
5. Wheat, corn, livestock	Winter wheat area	2,548	1,400	1,260	3,950
6. Hog, dairy	Corn Belt	1,331	1,090	839	2,420
7. Dairy	Wisconsin	1,078	1,110	1,270	[1] 2,190
8. Dairy	New York	1,040	960	1,200	[1] 2,000
9. Flue cured tobacco	Virginia	656	800	740	1,460
10. Texas black waxy prairie	Cotton area	400	500	500	900
11. Georgia 2-mule	do	248	300	330	648
12. Mississippi Delta 2-mule	do	306	300	246	610
13. Fire-cured tobacco	do	232	200	300	430
INFORMATION ON 1943 SO FAR AS AVAILABLE					
1. Wheat farms	Winter wheat area	$4,800	$1,990	$1,670	[2] $6,770
2. Wheat, grain sorghum, livestock	do	4,539	1,700	1,598	[2] 6,240
3. Wheat, corn, livestock	do	3,220	1,400	1,260	[2] 4,620

[1] Preliminary.
[2] 1943.
Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Nov. 5, 1943.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the table shows on typical commercial family operated farms the net cash income above expenses. Take the wheat farmer in the winter-wheat area. The dollars increase in income in 1942 over the average of 1935–39 was $3,700. Farm net cash income in 1935–39 was $1,990. In 1940 it was $1,670, and in 1942 it was $5,690. In 1943 it will be about $6,770.

Take wheat, grain, sorghum, and livestock farms. In 1942 the increase over the average of 1935–39 was $3,264.

The typical net income of this type of farm in 1935–39 was $1,700. In 1942 it was $4,960. In 1943 it will be $6,240.

On the other hand take a cotton farmer of the Mississippi Delta 2-mule type. His increased income in 1942 over the average income for the years 1935–39 was $306. His net farm-cash income for 1935–39 was $300, for 1940 it was $240, and for 1942, $610. The income is small but there is evidence of great improvement during this war.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Do I understand the Senator to say that that increase in the farm income is due to the fact that subsidies have been provided?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is due to our stabilization program. As I will indicate in my remarks as I proceed, the prices that the farmers pay for what they use on the farm have increased only about one-third as much as they did during World War No. 1, and that accounts to a large extent for the farmer's increased net income.

Mr. WHERRY. We have had a limited acreage in operation since Decem-

ber 1942. Could we not have had an increased production if the limitation in acreage had been taken off?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; but the Senator realizes that mose of the acres on which production of certain crops was limited were put into producing food we needed most urgently and that with less acreage we have been able to increase our farm production by 25 percent during this war in contrast with World War No. 1, when the increase was only 5 percent.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. We could have increased it a great deal more if we had had no limitations on acreages during the years 1940, 1941, and 1942; could we not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Perhaps that is true, if we had had the labor and everything else that were required.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. But, as I have indicated, on an acreage which is probably from 10 to 15 percent less than what we had in 1918, during World War No. 1, we have been able to produce 25 percent more farm commodities.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am especially interested in livestock, and I very much appreciate the contribution the Senator is making today.

Mr. ELLENDER. I will reach the point of livestock in just a moment. If the Senator does not mind waiting, I would prefer that he question me when I enter into a discussion of that subject.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall do so then.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I have indicated, the table to which I referred does not show increases for the wheat farmers and cattle farmers only, but shows them for all classes of farmers. I ask the Members of the Senate to study the table which I have had incorporated in the RECORD.

Mr. President, it might be of interest to Senators to compare prices for the first 4 years of World War No. 1, when we had very limited price controls and no subsidies, with prices for the first 4 years of World War No. 2. Those prices are indicated in a table entitled "Comparative Price Increases Over Four Years of Two World Wars." The table is a very illuminating one, Mr. President. It shows that in terms of the total cost of living, the percent price increase in World War No. 1—that is, from July 1914 to July 1918—was 50.3. That was for the total cost of living for the first 4 years of World War No. 1. For the first 4 years of the present war—that is, from August 1939, to August 1943—the percent increase in the total cost of living, was 24.9. In other words, it has been less than half the percent price increase in World War No. 1.

For 61 retail food items, during World War No. 1 the percent price increase was 63.9; during World War No. 2, 46.7.

For 111 items of clothing, in World War No. 1 the percent price increase was 85.3; during World War No. 2, 28.5.

For 39 items of house furnishings, during World War No. 1 the percent price increase was 77.2; during World War No. 2, 24.8.

Take wholesale prices: On a total of 889 items, during World War No. 1 the percent price increase was 96.1; during World War No. 2, only 37.5.

For 111 items of raw materials, during World War No. 1 the percent price increase was 102.1; during World War No. 2, 69.5.

Mr. President, now let us take some selected manufactured items at wholesale. For instance, let us consider steel plates. On steel plates, during World War No. 1, the percent price increase was 187.4; during World War No. 2 there has been no price increase whatever.

On copper ingots, during World War No. 1 the percent price increase was 90.3; during World War No. 2, only 14.

I may say parenthetically that that situation results from the subsidy payments made on copper production. As I recall the figures, the Government is actually saving $28 for every dollar of subsidy paid out.

With further reference to comparative wholesale price increases, we find that during World War No. 1 the percent price increase on plate glass was 76.1; during the present war there has been no price increase whatever.

On wool blankets, during World War No. 1, the percent price increase was 164.7; during the present World War, 50.

On men's cotton hosiery, during World War No. 1, the percent price increase was 132.3; during the present war, 71.9.

On blue denims, which are so widely used by the workingmen throughout this country, during World War No. 1 the percent price increase was 214.8; during the present war, 74.5.

Look at the contrast when we compare price movements of the things sold by farmers in the two wars. Cattle rose 58 percent last war, 89 percent this. Hogs rose 102 percent during World War No. 1, but 150 percent during this war. Corn rose 106 percent last war, 139 percent this. The general picture is clear. Things sold by farmers have gone up more than in the last war; things bought by farmers much less. Here is tangible proof of the benefits of stabilization to the farmers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire table be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparative price increases over 4 years of 2 world wars

	1914–18 World War No. 1 (percent price increase)[1]	1939–43 World War No. 2 (percent price increase)[2]
Cost of living, total [3]	50.3	24.9
Food (61 items)	63.9	46.7
Clothing (111 items)	85.3	28.5
House furnishings (39 items)	77.2	24.8
Wholesale prices, total (889 items)	96.1	37.5
Raw materials (111 items)	102.1	69.5
Semimanufactures (99 items)	131.3	24.7
Finished products (679 items)	87.6	26.0
Industrial commodities [4] (709 items)	92.4	21.2
Selected manufactured items:		
Steel plates (tank)	187.4	0
Copper ingots	90.3	14.
Plate glass	76.1	0
Wool blankets	164.7	[5] 50.0
Cotton hosiery (men's)	132.3	[5] 71.9
Blue denims	214.8	74.5
Prices received by farmers for all commodities	91	119
Prices received by farmers for 58 foods	78	116
Selected agricultural items:		
Cattle	58	89
Hogs	102	150
Cotton	127	128
Milk	46	94
Butter fat	73	122
Wheat	165	133
Corn	106	139
Prices paid by farmers for 174 commodities and for interest and taxes	[6] 71	34

[1] July 1914 to July 1918.
[2] August 1939 to August 1943.
[3] Rent and fuel, not available by months.
[4] All commodities other than farm products and foods.
[5] To May 1943, the latest available.
[6] 1914 to 1918, not available for World War No. 1 period.

Source: Farm prices, Bureau of Agricultural Economics; others, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator has referred to the subsidy on copper as having brought about great savings. Let me say that the situation in regard to copper is somewhat extraordinary; that is to say, on copper we have a two-price system. The producing mines—the mines which produce most of the copper, which were in operation previous to the war, and which have continued in operation—produce at one price. Another price is offered as an incentive to new copper mines. Copper is a little different in another respect: The Government takes all the copper; it purchases all the copper. Copper is not a commodity which goes out to the general public.

Mr. ELLENDER. It does to some extent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is restricted. The general public cannot get any copper. There has been such a shortage that even the Rural Electrification Administration has not been able to get any copper.

Mr. ELLENDER. I grant that the use of copper has been greatly curtailed; nevertheless, quite a good deal has been channeled for public use.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The point I am endeavoring to make is that to hold out copper as a case in justification of the application of subsidies is erroneous.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not agree with the Senator. The case may be an extreme one, but the facts remain that by subsidizing small producers the Government saved many millions of dollars. Mr. President, it will be noted from the table I have just had inserted in the RECORD that farm prices have risen substantially more during the present war than in the last war. As a matter of fact, they have increased 28 percent more than in World War No. 1; and yet retail food prices have gone up much less—only 47 percent, as against 64 percent, or 17 percent less—than in World War No. 1. Why is that? One of the important reasons is that under our present system of price control, with the aid of subsidies, we have been better able to control the middleman's margins. We have been able to prevent the pyramiding of markups by reducing prices of commodities at early stages of distribution, through the use of subsidies. On the other hand, subsidies have made it possible to permit higher farm prices without seriously affecting the cost of living. This has been accomplished by having the Government absorb a part of the higher costs to the farmers without having to raise the price of their commodities to consumers.

Mr. President, the farmers of today are paying substantially less for what they buy in their farming operations than they did during World War No. 1. Notwithstanding the fact that, as a rule, prices of what farmers buy usually keep pace—or more—with the rise in prices of what they sell, prices of commodities that the farmers must buy have risen only 34 percent in this war, as compared with a rise of 119 percent of the things the farmers sell. In World War No. 1, on the other hand, while prices farmers received rose 91 percent, prices farmers pay rose 71 percent. There is no doubt that much of the cause of the present good fortune of the farmers—one of the prime causes of their favorable income position—is the stabilization program, which has so markedly held down the cost of the things the farmers buy, while permitting much greater increases in the prices farmers receive.

So much for the farmers. Now, let us turn our attention to what the stabilization program has meant in savings in the cost of the war to the American taxpayers. Subsidies cost money, but inflation costs taxpayers infinitely more.

Prices of iron and steel, on the average, rose 139 percent during the first 4 years of World War No. 1. During the first 4 years of this war they have risen only 1.4 percent. As a result the wartime steel consumption of the Government, which this year is taking roughly 80 percent of the total steel production, has cost almost $10,000,000,000 less than if the steel used had had to be purchased at the prices which prevailed during World War No. 1. On the entire war program, it has been estimated by competent economists, the savings to our Government have been about $67,000,000,000 in comparison to what the same war program would have cost at World War No. 1 inflated prices. In addition, the consumers of our Nation would have had to pay $22,000,000,000 more for the goods and services they have consumed in the last 4 years if they had had to pay World War No. 1 prices for them.

Mr. President, as I indicated a while ago, if the Congress should make the mistake of dispensing with subsidies, inflation is bound to come, and when judgment day comes—that is, when deflation sets in—the farmers will be the first to suffer. I am sure that the situation which held true following World War No. 1 will hold true following World War No. 2, unless inflation is prevented. The records show that prices received by farmers fell by 41 percent from their high point between 1920 and 1921, whereas the prices paid by farmers for what they needed on the farm fell by only 18 percent in the same period. And that is not the whole story. The prices farmers received maintained a steady downward fall and remained at low ebb until the present war broke out, whereas the prices farmers paid stayed up for many years. American agriculture could not stand a repetition of this disaster. The way to avoid it is to prevent inflation.

Mr. President, as I pointed out to the Senate a moment ago, our country has made wonderful strides in its industrial and agricultural expansion during the war. There is no question that inflation would undermine both our war and our food programs. During World War No. 1, industrial production rose until the middle of 1917, when it exceeded pre-war production by about 25 percent. But thereafter, when inflation really set in, industrial production dropped off. During this war, by contrast, with industrial prices stabilized to a very substantial degree, industrial production has climbed much more markedly and steadily. The Federal Reserve index of industrial production reached 203 in April 1943 and stood at 205 in July, based on August of 1939 as 100. This phenomenal rise has been steady since early 1941, when price control began. It can be attributed in considerable measure to the stability of industrial prices and to the wartime stabilization program in general, which has prevented the profound disruptions which all agree inflation causes.

Farm production has also done much better during this war than the last. During this war farm production has risen almost 25 percent during the first 4 years, in contrast to only 5 percent in the first 4 years of World War No. 1. It is the stabilization of prices in the industrial segments of our economy which accounts in large part for the better showing. I repeat, the food-subsidy program deserves support as a necessary means to protect the vital stabilization program—to avert the utter disaster of inflation.

Mr. President, as I have indicated, subsidies permit adequate farm prices without materially increasing the cost of living and without endangering stabilization. They do not lower farm prices. Any producer who complains that under the subsidy program he is not getting enough for his product is misguided in attacking the subsidy as the cause of the difficulty he claims to be experiencing. The subsidy does not keep down the returns received by farmers. The prices farmers get are fixed by the War Food Administration and the Office of Price Administration at the levels those agencies feel are necessary and proper in view of wartime needs for full-speed agricultural production. If it is decided that the retail price should not reflect this farm price in full, a subsidy is paid somewhere along the line, ordinarily at the most convenient stage from the standpoint of administration. The mere removal of the subsidy would not increase the producer's return one whit. The only thing that can be said is that if no subsidies were permitted the W. F. A. and the O. P. A. would have less freedom to fix a favorable price to the farmer, since they would have to pay closer attention to its effect on the cost of living. Thus insofar as subsidies affect producer's returns they are price supports.

In the case of almost every subsidized foodstuff, the producer is assured—by means of price supports—of the higher price which the subsidy permits the purchaser of his product to pay. For all subsidized foods except meats this has been the case over the entire period during which the subsidies have been in effect. A support price for hogs has been in effect since long before the meat subsidy began, and steps have very recently been taken to insure that the price of hogs will not fall through the support price, despite record movement of hogs to market. The W. F. A. and the O. P. A. have shown effective cooperation in making this difficult support program effective by relaxing slaughtering restrictions and encouraging pork consumption. The new beef cattle program, by denying a subsidy to packers who pay less than support prices for cattle, helps insure that the average prices received by cattle growers will reflect the subsidy paid to slaughterers. I propose to discuss this program in some detail later in the course of my remarks.

In the case of butter, hogs, canning crops, fruits for processing, potatoes, sugar beets, eggs, poultry, processed milk products, peanuts, and a large number of other products, the Commodity Credit Corporation contracts to purchase at fixed support prices any portion of the supply which cannot be sold at those prices or higher. While subsidies permit a number of these foods—such as hogs, butter, cheese, canning crops, sugar beets, potatoes, peanuts, prunes, and raisins—to be sold at retail prices which do not reflect in full these higher support prices, the support prices insure that the subsidy will not simply increase the profits of processors and middlemen. For example, in the case of canning crops, only those canners who pay the support price or better for their ingredients are eligible for the subsidy, with-

out which, incidentally, they could not pay the support prices. In other cases, as for example in butter, the market for the dairyman's butterfat is supported by the fact that the C. C. C. will pay 46 cents per pound, Chicago basis, for 92-score butter. In addition there has recently been inaugurated a program by which farmers selling milk, either in the form of fluid milk or in the form of butterfat, receive a subsidy payment from the Defense Supplies Corporation.

In all these cases there is no question that the subsidy is effective in sustaining the return of the producer. Without the subsidies these returns could not be assured—that is, without laying ourselves wide open to uncontrolled and spiraling wages and prices. If higher food prices provoke inflation, the farmer's price may go higher, but his real returns, in terms of what he can buy for that price, will drop and drop disastrously.

Under the former beef subsidy program, it is true, there was no positive guaranty that the subsidy received by the packer would be passed on to the grower, since there was no assurance that temporary supply conditions might not cause the price of cattle to fall, even though the packers, by virtue of the subsidy payments, were in a position to pay higher cattle prices. It was assumed that the brisk demand for meats and the competition among slaughterers would make cattle prices reflect the subsidy in full. At all times, of course, the subsidy encouraged packers to pay higher prices for cattle, so there was no possibility that the subsidy could depress cattle prices. But the system did not make it necessary for the packers to pay this higher price if the market were temporarily glutted with cattle offerings.

Due to several circumstances, entirely unrelated to the subsidy system, there have been times this summer and fall when some of the packers may have been unduly enriched. These circumstances were, in the main, the following: First, the strong seasonal increase in cattle marketings; second, the fact that the supply of cattle had been pent up in the late spring and early summer by the expectation that cattle prices would rise later on, a temporary withholding of supply which was favored by unusually favorable range conditions in some areas; and especially, third, the growing shortage of feeds for cattle finishing relative to the extraordinarily large number of animals.

It accordingly became apparent that under these conditions the subsidy program was not satisfactorily fulfilling one of its important objectives, namely, the assurance of favorable prices to the producer.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I do not wish to interrupt the distinguished Senator from making his speech because I recognize that he is an authority on the matter under discussion.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the fact that the Senator's statistics are authentic because he usually puts them out in that form.

Let us take one statement which the Senator made. I refer to his statement concerning the subsidy program—that it does not decrease production. Let us take it and apply it to meat. From a realistic point of view, I am very much interested in it, and I have had some realistic experience along that line. Does the Senator recall what price was paid for prime beef at Chicago in 1918?

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe I have the figures before me, I will say to the Senator. For what month did the Senator inquire?

Mr. WHERRY. Let us take the highest month in 1918 for prime beef.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sorry. I misunderstood the Senator. I do not have price figures for 1918, except in a general way. It will appear from the table of comparative price increases which I placed in the RECORD a few minutes ago that cattle prices received by farmers rose 58 percent between July 1914 to July 1918 and rose by 89 percent in the comparable 4 years of this war.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point. I am talking about the price paid per pound by packers for live cattle. I believe that, if the Senator will examine his figures or obtain the applicable figures, he will find that during the latter part of 1918 and the fore part of 1919 double-A prime beef in Chicago brought as high as $17 a hundred and, in some instances, $17.50 a hundred. Today the same cattle, the same quality of beef, cannot possibly bring over $16 a hundred in the Chicago market. The Senator well knows why.

Mr. ELLENDER. Well, the Senator does not mean to say that it is due to the subsidies, does he?

Mr. WHERRY. It is due to the subsidy program.

Mr. ELLENDER. You have not shown that the subsidy itself holds the price down. That is the only point which I made.

Mr. WHERRY. The point I make is that because of the subsidy program the price to be paid the producer is such that, instead of increasing the amount of beef it is decreasing it in our country, and we are surely facing a scarcity of beef because of the subsidy program. The Food Administrator has said that the subsidy goes back to the producer.

Mr. ELLENDER. No. As the Senator knows, it was not intended that the subsidy should be paid directly to the producers but to the processors, so that the processors in turn could pay to the cattle producers the same price that they had received theretofore.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And give to the consumer the benefit of a lower price.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. That program was on the foundation that the processor should pay as high as $1.10 a hundred over whatever price he paid in the market, provided he did not exceed $16 a hundred to the cattle seller in Chicago.

Mr. ELLENDER. Well, that is the new formula which the Senator was speaking of. Under neither the new nor the old plan is the packer supposed to pay the subsidy in addition to the price he pays for the cattle to the seller. The subsidy simply permits the packer to pay a higher price to the seller than he otherwise could pay and sell his cut beef at established ceiling levels.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator was present at the Senate committee hearing on subsidies the other day and he knows that I asked the meat buyers if they paid, in addition to the $16 maximum, a subsidy of $1.10, and they said that the highest price of $16 a hundred was under the subsidy to those who produced and fed the cattle to sell on the market.

I wish to point out to the Senator that the highest price we can get for double-A prime beef which brought $17.50 a hundred during the latter part of 1918 and the fore part of 1919 is $16. Under the Little Steel formula, which was supposed to balance agriculture and wages, and under which we were permitted as agriculturalists to take the highest price the cattle brought between January 1 and September 15, 1942, which was $17.80, Chicago, we have had to lower the price from $17.80 at Chicago to $16 a hundred.

Mr. ELLENDER. The $16 price for prime beef reflects a higher average price to the farmer than he got during the period January 1 to September 15, 1942, according to seasonally adjusted prices published by the Secretary of Agriculture. Does the Senator know how the income of the cattle farmer during this war compares with his income received during the last war?

Mr. WHERRY. I will say to the Senator that there has not been a time in 48 years when the cattle feeder had less margin out of which to feed his cattle than now, and my contention is that it is because of the subsidy program. Under that theory the Food Administrator and the Price Stabilizer have said that the maximum price to be paid is $16 a hundred, and if we deduct from that what it costs to buy corn and hay, I assert that no producer can feed cattle today in the feed lot and put it on the Chicago market at the price being paid.

Mr. ELLENDER. As a matter of fact, choice steers sold for $16.50 to $16.75 on the Chicago market today. As I understand the new ruling, there is a 1-cent-per-hundredweight margin left so that the producers of certain grades of cattle can compete one with another. Prices can be higher than $16 per hundredweight so long as the average price paid over a specified period does not exceed $16. It can even go higher if the processor chooses to do so; however, he would forego his subsidy. Does the Senator not think it is better to have a margin of 1 cent than to have the ceiling in a rigid form?

Mr. WHERRY. Well, that has to do with the different classes of cattle. I am talking about double-A prime beef, and that is where we get our corn-fed beef which we feed to the civilian population and the military forces.

What actually is taking place in this country is that we are creating a scarcity of what we need most for the soldiers and the civilian population, and we are doing it under a subsidy program.

I hope the Senator will yield to me further. I should like to ask him a question because I respect his opinions. We need beef and the soldiers need beef. Most of the beef we get today is unfinished beef. It comes from the slaughter of small calves and canner cows. This type of beef does not provide the nutrition that is obtained from the old-type double-A prime beef. We need that kind of beef. But today the cattle feeder is operating on a margin so narrow that he is going out of business.

Let me cite an instance which occurred in my county: I live only 8 miles from the Kansas line. Between our farm where we had cattle for feeding and the Kansas line there is not one cattle feeder who has in his feed lots today any cattle which are needed to be fattened in order to provide beef for this country. Why is it? Because when cattle are shipped to Chicago the seller receives $16 a hundred, and on the $16 basis under the subsidy should be added $1.10, which the producer does not get but which the processor hands back to the consumer. The market ratio is made so narrow that it is taking cattle out of the feed lot.

The results expected to be achieved through the subsidy program are in contradiction with the facts. We are not getting cattle, and in 6 months the Senator will be on the floor asking for an increase in the supply of beef, not only for the military forces but for the civilian population.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not like to interrupt, but I might contribute a little to what the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Nebraska have said.

Between 50 and 51 percent of all beef being slaughtered this fall is from cows and heifers. It is the first time in a long, long while that such a condition has prevailed. I think it is about 50⅓ percent. Those cows and heifers do not bring 16 cents a pound.

Mr. ELLENDER. Well, the Senator attended the hearings held sometime ago before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Everytime I had occasion to be present I asked the witnesses what was the remedy. Higher prices? No, I think not. The main reasons why they cannot feed cattle is because the feed is not available. The cattle population has increased, I believe, by 17,000,000 head. I think the number of hogs has increased almost 40 percent over the normal period. Chicken and sheep have also increased greatly in numbers. Total animals for feed have increased to such an extent as a result of favorable prices that the food necessary to feed the cattle and the sheep and all the other animals is not available. To my way of thinking that is the main reason why we do not have as many feeders now as we had in the past.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. While it is true that the Price Stabilizer states that there is a shortage of corn, I think the Senator will agree with me, because he has attended all the hearings I have attended, that the problem that is confronting us more particularly is the price of cattle, and if corn commanded a good price it would be turned loose and we would get the corn necessary to feed the live animals.

Mr. ELLENDER. I will admit that, to a certain extent, but, as the record shows, the corn growers in Iowa and other corn States find it more profitable to feed corn to hogs than they do to feed it to cattle; and so the hog producers keep the corn for themselves and are unwilling to let it go to the cattle growers. And if the price of corn is raised, the cost of feeding cattle and sheep and hogs and chickens, and the cost of dairy products, will all rise further, and there will be still more pressure for higher prices.

Mr. WHERRY. What is actually being done is that the Price Stabilizer is holding the price of corn down to such a point that the corn farmer is not selling. I agree that that is one of the reasons why more cattle are not being fed; but there is still the unfavorable ratio—that is what the cattle feeders testify to—as being the prime reason why they are not replacing cattle in the feed lots. All of them say if the Price Stabilizer would rescind the $16 ceiling and go back to the Little Steel formula under which they were entitled to $17.80 a hundred f. o. b. Chicago for AA prime beef, the cattle feeders would fill their feed lots; they could get the corn to feed the cattle and would be glad to produce meat for this country.

If the Senator will yield further, he says they increase production; I say they decrease production. I think if we would take the ceiling off many farmers would put cattle back on the feed lots, and there would be more poundage; but they are not satisfied. The way to get the price down is by creating a surplus, not a scarcity. We need all that can be produced in order to keep down inflation, but the longer we maintain a program of scarcity by offering a subsidy, it will take that much longer for a price adjustment to be made on a supply and demand basis, and in the meantime we will have to buy the beef at a higher price, and force purchasers into the black market, unless we are permitted to go ahead and produce a surplus. I do not believe the subsidy has increased production of meat and if production is not increased how does the Senator suppose the inflation of meat prices will be held down? That is the point I should like to have the Senator answer.

Mr. ELLENDER. I tried to answer that suggestion in my prepared remarks. I am convinced that the payment of subsidies has nothing to do with the growing of more cattle or less cattle.

Mr. WHERRY. If there had not been a subsidy would a price of $16 a hundred been placed on live animals at Chicago?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no reason in the world why not. The $16 average top for prime beef is considered a fair price, and it does not matter whether part of this comes out of a subsidy paid the packers or not. The subsidy has nothing to do with the matter. It should be remarked, however, that the Senator's method of increasing the production of cattle is by raising the price.

Mr. WHERRY. No; by increasing the number of pounds of beef.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the raising of the price means increasing the cost of living.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no; I would rather have the poundage of meat.

Mr. ELLENDER. How can the Senator say that, when the ceiling price today is $16 and he wants $17.80? If that would not increase the price of beef to the consumer, I do not know what I am talking about.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will bear with me for one more observation, my contention is that by producing a surplus the price is controlled both downward and upward. The only way to do it is to do it on the profit motive basis without any restriction and without any subsidy.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator means then that if more cattle are produced in the future they will be sold for less than $17.80 a hundred? Perhaps for as little as $16?

Mr. WHERRY. That is exactly what is happening with the unfinished cattle, and that is the kind of cattle we are getting today.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have just indicated that one of the reasons, to my way of thinking, why more cattle are not being fed today is the increased population of cattle, hogs, sheep, and everything else that consumes feed, and the limited amount of feed available.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no increased poundage of cattle in this country; but beef calves and meat cows are simply being placed on the market at $6 a hundred——

Mr. AIKEN. That is the top price.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, that is the top price of the unfinished cattle people today are buying for beef, but under the subsidy program corn-fed beef is not going to the beef counters; the unfinished product is being sold there; and unless subsidies are taken off it will not be possible to control the prices, and the consumers will get beef from the black market.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say that many cattle buyers take advantage of the farmers in cattle-producing States, as they do in my own State, in regard to farm products. There is no reason why the farmer should sell for 6 cents, because the range of prices for the various grades of cattle as fixed by the stabilization program is as follows:

Choice, $15 to $16 per hundredweight.

Good, $14.25 to $15.25 per hundredweight.

Medium, $12 to $13 per hundredweight.

Common, $10 to $11 per hundredweight.

Cutter and canner, $7.25 to $8.25 per hundredweight.

Bologna bulls and stags—equivalent cutter and canner—$8.50 to $9.50 per hundredweight.

None of these prices are as low as $6.

Mr. WHERRY. Are they Chicago prices?

Mr. ELLENDER. They may be Chicago prices, but the cost of freight is not so great as to absorb as much as $3 per hundredweight.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to remind the Senator that at the hearings which were attended by some 200 cattlemen they unanimously agreed that they had not received the subsidy of $1.10 a hundred.

Mr. ELLENDER. It was not intended that they should receive it.

Mr. AIKEN. Oh, yes, it was. It was intended to keep up the price to the farmer.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well; that is what it was intended for; but, as I pointed out a while ago, the trouble was that many of the cattle growers held back their cattle for better prices and got caught when the very high prices of this spring did not hold up.

Mr. AIKEN. The trouble is that the buyers have got the cattle growers in a tight place and are depressing the price to them all over the country. They take the cattle to Chicago and the people read what they get in Chicago for it, but that does not represent at all what the farmer gets. Furthermore the buyer has to sign an agreement that he will turn the subsidy over to the man from whom he buys the cattle.

Mr. ELLENDER. If that was true, it has been remedied, for the rules and regulations have been changed.

Mr. AIKEN. How long ago were they changed?

Mr. ELLENDER. They were changed 3 weeks ago.

Mr. AIKEN. The cattle producers are certainly not getting the subsidy now.

Mr. ELLENDER. Unless the processor can show that he has paid to the farmer the support price he does not get the subsidy.

Mr. AIKEN. A processor does not buy from the farmer; he buys from a beef dealer, and one dealer buys from another. The processor has to pay the subsidy to the dealer he buys from, and the dealer does not pay it to anybody unless he sees fit to do so.

The Senator from Louisiana will recall that the representative of the meatpacking industry who testified before the committee was asked if the meat packers had not maintained their own purchasing agencies to whom they paid the subsidy, and he said "Yes." All the 200 cattlemen there said they did not get the subsidy.

The subsidy roll-back program on meats, as put into effect, was supposed to reduce the price of meat to the consumer. It has done that scarcely at all, except on the high-price cuts such as porterhouse and tenderloin. The subsidy was to hold up the price to the farmer but has not done so. Apparently, some middleman has kept the subsidy. It would appear that they have gotten together and agreed to depress the price to the farmer. Beef cows in the Northeast sold for 10 cents a pound when this program went into effect, but our top ceiling price today is 6 cents a pound, and that reduction has not been passed on to the consumer. The program has been an absolute failure.

Mr. ELLENDER. Bureau of Labor Statistics figures show that average retail meat prices fell by almost 10 percent when the subsidy went into effect and have stayed down since. Of course, the Senator is citing quite a few instances. What he states may have occurred, but I farmed for 22 or 23 years, and I know what these produce buyers do in order to keep the price of my commodities down. I presume the same thing has occurred with a few of the farmers who were present and who testified sometime ago. They are taken advantage of by these leeches in business, as I call them.

Mr. AIKEN. It includes practically all the dairy farms in the northeastern part of the country, some of them, even in the State of Connecticut, where it costs them so much to keep cows that they have no market whatsoever for a dry cow. They have to sell a dry cow for beef in order to get some salvage out of her before they can purchase new cows and produce milk.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question. I should like to get through.

Mr. WHERRY. This is in the form of a question. I will ask the Senator whether he heard the testimony of the man who testified, to whom the junior Senator from Vermont referred——

Mr. ELLENDER. What was his name?

Mr. WHERRY. Judge Montague, who testified that the processors were paying the subsidies to the producers. Judge Montague testified in connection with all these prices that were paid, that the packer stated, on a check or in a letter, that this included the subsidy that was allowed, and under the rule under which it was allowed, the price fixed in the directive, $16, includes the subsidy—that is, what the producer has to accept in full payment for the cattle purchased from the feeder.

The Senator read, in stating the prices at Chicago, that on prime beef there should be a range of $15 to $16 a hundred. As a practical farmer, the Senator knows that very few cattle sales are made at the top price, so that in reality this beef about which I spoke, the prime beef, seldom sold at $16. I doubt if the average price paid in Chicago is even $15.50 a hundred, and that includes the subsidy of $1.10 per hundred.

I should like to make an observation, because I know the Senator is sincere in the presentation of his figures by which he attempts to prove his position on the subsidy program. I want to give him some practical figures.

In September, before this directive went into effect, we sold AA prime beef on the Omaha market, which is around 75 cents a hundred under Chicago because of freight rates, at $15.75 a hundred. After this order went into effect the same kind of steers, out of the same lot, fed a month longer, brought $1.50 less.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish the Senator would explain how in the world the subsidy program can affect that price.

Mr. WHERRY. If I understood the Senator's remarks, the subsidy program increased production and did not decrease the farmer's price. Here is a subsidy program that is supposed to result in a subsidy being paid to the cattle producer, but which has decreased the price.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the Senator is talking about prices.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator says cattle sold for a certain amount before the program went into effect.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And afterward the price went down.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to have the Senator explain how the subsidy program could do that.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to answer that. It is because the subsidy program cut out the direct farm-to-market trade, which had a tendency to hold up the price to the farmer and to hold down the price to the consumer.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator means the method of selling cattle was changed?

Mr. AIKEN. The subsidy is not paid to any processor who dresses and sells less than 4,000 pounds of meat a month. That cut out probably hundreds of thousands of farmers who dress meat and sell direct to the consumer, and forced them to sell through the packing houses. Nine big packing houses handle about 70 percent of all the meat sold in this country, and the subsidy program forced all the small producers to market through the packing houses, which were thus enabled to get together, if they so chose—and it looks as if they did—and decrease the price to the farmer.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amount of beef that is taken over by the small processors who process less than 4,000 pounds per month is not a drop in the bucket, and I do not see how on God's green earth it could affect the prices to which the Senator from Nebraska refers. The Senator from Nebraska gave as an example the sale of cattle of the same kind on the same market.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to have him tell me, or to have the Senator from Vermont tell me, how the subsidy program could have affected those sales.

Mr. WHERRY. I will tell the Senator how it affected them. Under the program a subsidy of $1.10 is supposed to be paid in addition to the price the commission men pay the cattle feeders.

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, no. I have indicated on several occasions that the processor gets the subsidy, provided he reduces the ceiling prices of beef to consumers and provided further, under the new regulations, that he pay the support prices to farmers for the cattle.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask the Senator a question. Did he hear the question propounded to O. P. Wilson, secretary of Meat Producers' Association, as to whether they paid the subsidy to the farmer, and his affirmative answer?

Mr. ELLENDER. At that time there was no ceiling on live cattle and the livestock could have sold for as much as the processor desired to pay for it. If he wanted to lose money on it, he could have done so.

Mr. WHERRY. To which time is the Senator referring?

Mr. ELLENDER. The time to which the Senator is referring in the example he gave.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me restate it; I do not believe the Senator understood me. The cattle which sold prior to the directive on October 26 brought $15.75 a hundred. The same kind of cattle brought $16.50 a hundred before June 15. The 10-cent roll-back that was supposed to be paid to the consumer, if it was paid, did not go back to the producer. The Senator knows that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course not.

Mr. WHERRY. After October 26 there still was no subsidy paid to the producer, because a $16 top was placed on cattle, which automatically reduced the price of the cattle $1.50 a hundred; the subsidy of $1.10 was not paid to the cattle feeder. Here is a case where the price stabilizer has certainly not put on a price, fair according to the Little Steel formula, nor has he gotten increased production. By a subsidy, meant for the producer, but paid instead as a roll-back to consumer. It has decreased production, because cattle are not going out of the feed lot that ordinarily should, and it certainly has decreased prices.

Mr. ELLENDER. As a matter of fact the new beef cattle program does not go into effect until December 15. I do not believe the Senator and I can agree on that proposition because he shifts from production to prices.

Mr. WHERRY. Both are involved. Prices are controlled by production.

Mr. ELLENDER. I cannot for the life of me see how the subsidy program has in any wise affected the price of cattle.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the Senator believe that production is based on prices?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course.

Mr. WHERRY. Are they not comparable? If there is a lower price, will we get increased production?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not discussing that phase with the Senator. The point is that the purpose of the subsidy was to do what?

Mr. WHERRY. To increase production.

Mr. ELLENDER. The purpose of the subsidy was to guarantee to the producer, in a measure, that both the retail price of meat would be reduced, and the price for his livestock would be kept up.

Mr. WHERRY. Did he get the subsidy?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, he did not get the subsidy. It was paid to the processor, but the processor rolled back the meat price, I think, by $1.10 a hundred, and the subsidy made that up to the processor. In any case the rules and regulations have now been amended so that in order for a processor to obtain the subsidy he must show that he paid the producer—that is, the cattleman—the support price.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us not argue any more, because, with all due respect, I think that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska in a way mixes up the price structure with production.

Mr. WHERRY. It should be.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In the schedule of market prices the Senator just read I think he quoted the cutter and canner beef, and bologna bulls. Did he have any prices of feeders?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know whether those would be included in this category. This directive merely gives the grade of the cattle, and then the support prices of them, and they are designated as choice, good, medium, common, cutter and canner, bologna bulls, and stags.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It does not give any price on feeders?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; it does not.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Without the price on feeders being given I fail to see how the Senator can arrive at any decision as to the value in connection with what he is talking about. The Senator is talking about the producer and the marketing price. The producer has very little to do with the marketing price. The producer sells his cattle to a feeder through the market as a rule, and that feeder must be assured of a differential of at least 3 cents a pound to enable him to sell on the market and stay in business. I believe the Senator has missed the importance of the feeder operation in the production of beef.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may have, I will say to the Senator. I know that the distinguished Senator is a very eminent cattle grower in his State. For instance, the price fluctuation on good cattle—I do not know the designations—but the difference is $14.25 to $15.25. That is f. o. b. Chicago.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is merely a grade, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. How much should a steer ordinarily sell for on the farm so as to make it possible that the feeder would make a fair profit?

Mr. ROBERTSON. At least 3 cents more than he paid for it when he purchased it from the stock grower.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words if the feeder buys a medium steer—and here are the prices between $12 and $13—he would have to pay for that steer on the farm from $9 to $10.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. And if he pays 12 to 14 cents, as he has to today, then he has to get from 15 to 17 cents on the market in order to break even.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand. I recall hearing the testimony of one witness who was a producer of cattle, who said that if he could sell a feeder for from 9 to 10 cents f. o. b. farm he could make plenty of money.

Mr. ROBERTSON. He can?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. And I think that these prices about reflect that figure.

Mr. President, the beef program has now been revised so as to insure the objective of supporting the price of cattle as well as the maintenance of the cost-of-living line. Packers are now required to pay specified minimum prices for given grades of cattle to qualify for the full subsidy payment. If, over a period of time, they fail to pay these minimum prices for the cattle they buy, corresponding reductions are made in their subsidy payments. In this way the cattle producer is now reasonably assured the cattle prices which the subsidy program makes possible. If it is desired to guarantee absolutely that the prices of cattle do not fall below any given level, the only thing to do is have the W. F. A. or the C. C. C. promise to buy all offerings at that level. Removing the subsidy will do nothing to insure that the price of cattle will not fall when supplies glut the overworked slaughterers.

A more complete treatment of the beef subsidy program as related to beef prices is set forth in exhibit D, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, exhibit D was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYSIS OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE BEEF SUBSIDY AND CATTLE PRICES

In addition to the fact that nothing in the beef subsidy program could logically have any tendency toward reduction of cattle prices, beef cattle price statistics show no relationship between the introduction of the subsidy and the decline of the prices of choice and Good beef cattle which has taken place since the spring of the year.

Beef cattle prices reached their peak in early April, 3 weeks before there was any discussion whatever of the beef subsidy. (See table II.) By April 30, when the Price Administrator announced by radio that retail prices of meats and butter would be rolled back by payment of a subsidy, prices of Choice beef cattle had already fallen by 72 cents per hundredweight to $16.72 for the week ending May 1 from their peak of $17.45 for the week of April 10. During the following 6 weeks, before the roll-back and subsidy became effective, prices continued to ease slightly, the average price of Choice beef cattle being $16.48 for the week ending June 12. On June 14 the roll-back went into effect at the processor level. From then through the week of September 25, while prices fluctuated considerably, there was a net decline of only 14 cents per hundredweight, the price of Choice beef cattle averaging $16.30 for the week ending September 25. Average monthly prices averaged lowest in July at $15.98 and jumped back to $16.24 in September. During the 2½ months of operation of the subsidy, in other words, Choice beef prices held practically at their level at the time of the introduction of the plan. The average monthly price for September was only 11 cents per hundredweight below that of June, in which the subsidy

was introduced. (See table I.) The prices of Good beef cattle showed rather similar trends during the periods discussed above. The price behavior indicates that the subsidy permitted and even encouraged maintenance of prices despite an extraordinary rise in the numbers coming to markets between April and May and the later months. (See table III.)

Behavior of prices of Medium and Common grade cattle, which are usually purchased primarily for feeder purposes, show a different movement, an almost steady decline from the high levels in early April through the end of October. From the week of April 10 to the week of Ocotber 30 the price of Medium steers fell by $2.87 and the price of Common grade steers by $3.60. This behavior, when viewed in relation to the substantial steadiness of Good and Choice varieties, is clearly indicative of the growing feed shortage, aggravated by the record high level of animal numbers created by the very favorable prices for Good, Choice, and Prime varieties throughout the last year and the winter and spring months of this year. To induce purchase of this feeder cattle in the face of the unfavorable feed conditions required a sharp drop in prices. No doubt this drop in prices is also in part responsible for the slightly weak undertone of Choice and Good prices during the summer and fall.

Against these forces making for lower cattle prices—abnormally large numbers, shortage of feed, and a very heavy run of cattle to slaughter—the favorable position which most slaughterers enjoyed as a result of the subsidy payments was insufficient to maintain choice and good grade prices at their full previous highs. Competition among sellers was such as to bring the price down despite the fact that slaughterers could, under the price regulations and with the aid of the subsidy, have paid somewhat higher prices. It was for this reason that it was decided to buttress the subsidy program with the minimum support mechanism embodied in the new program recently announced.

The new program provides an effective technique by which the subsidy funds will hold up the level of live prices. By imposing upon the packer a loss of subsidy funds whenever prices fall below floor levels, it has been made reasonably certain that prices will be held above those levels. Subsidy funds will, therefore, not accrue to the advantage of the packer.

The floor arrangement has other very great advantages. It will provide a sound basis upon which the operation of the grower and feeder can go forward. It will provide a steady market, the advantages of which are, of course, general. Without a floor any fall in prices is likely to stampede the market. With a floor, on the other hand, any fall in prices toward that floor creates a situation in which prices are much more likely to rise than they are to fall further. The grower or feeder will, therefore, hold back cattle as prices approach the floor, thereby strengthening the market.

TABLE I.—*Prices per hundredweight of beef steers sold at Chicago out of first hands for slaughter*

[Monthly averages, 1943]

	Choice	Good	Medium	Common
January	$16.05	$15.05	$13.66	$11.79
February	16.44	15.53	14.11	12.36
March	16.98	15.92	14.61	12.91
April	16.96	15.91	14.70	13.12
May	16.58	15.59	14.31	12.70
June	16.35	15.50	14.35	12.78
July	15.98	15.06	13.78	12.12
August	16.13	15.29	13.87	11.69
September	16.24	15.27	13.58	10.99
October	16.05	14.92	12.58	10.37

Office of Price Administration, Division of Research, Nov. 9, 1943.

TABLE II.—*Average price of beef steers sold at Chicago out of first hands for slaughter*

[Dollars per 100 pounds]

Week ending—	Choice and prime	Good	Medium	Common	All grades
1943					
Jan. 2	15.89	14.90	13.47	11.29	14.03
Jan. 9	16.10	15.00	13.65	11.62	14.86
Jan. 16	15.93	14.88	13.46	11.80	14.75
Jan. 23	16.08	15.17	13.77	11.89	14.87
Jan. 30	16.11	15.12	13.75	11.88	14.91
Feb. 6	16.24	15.33	13.95	12.14	15.00
Feb. 13	16.45	15.55	14.15	12.34	15.17
Feb. 20	16.60	15.69	14.27	12.67	15.27
Feb. 27	16.69	15.51	14.03	12.20	15.12
Mar. 6	16.92	15.77	14.46	12.77	15.29
Mar. 13	16.94	15.99	14.68	12.92	15.50
Mar. 20	16.85	15.70	14.51	12.88	15.67
Mar. 27	17.11	16.01	14.66	12.88	15.67
Apr. 3	17.18	16.13	14.89	13.22	15.79
Apr. 10	17.45	16.11	15.01	13.59	15.83
Apr. 17	17.25	16.02	14.69	12.77	15.73
Apr. 24	16.88	15.81	14.49	12.81	15.71
May 1	16.72	15.73	14.46	12.69	15.61
May 8	16.60	15.56	14.28	12.75	15.37
May 15	16.46	15.54	14.30	12.74	15.42
May 22	16.63	15.56	14.18	12.39	15.44
May 29	16.67	15.67	14.44	12.89	15.51
June 5	16.61	15.63	14.51	12.62	15.64
June 12	16.48	15.62	14.46	13.06	15.56
June 19	16.14	15.19	14.02	12.74	15.31
June 26	16.48	15.60	14.37	12.85	15.77
July 3	16.20	15.34	14.26	12.43	15.53
July 10	16.18	15.30	13.95	12.27	15.53
July 17	15.90	14.97	13.72	12.41	15.25
July 24	15.91	14.88	13.70	12.13	15.26
July 31	16.01	15.10	13.77	11.75	15.32
Aug. 7	16.19	15.29	13.92	11.83	15.38
Aug. 14	16.26	15.51	13.93	11.81	15.35
Aug. 21	16.65	15.16	13.62	11.61	15.28
Aug. 28	16.07	15.20	13.87	11.58	15.42
Sept. 4	16.14	15.29	13.93	11.34	15.35
Sept 11	16.23	15.39	13.74	11.27	15.43
Sept. 18	16.32	15.42	13.87	11.35	15.65
Sept. 25	16.30	15.25	13.36	11.19	15.40
Oct. 2	16.14	14.93	12.58	10.42	15.28
Oct. 9	16.15	15.02	12.82	10.54	15.61
Oct. 16	16.04	15.00	12.98	10.74	15.38
Oct. 23	16.15	14.90	12.51	10.79	15.20
Oct. 30	15.89	14.81	12.14	9.99	15.09

Source: Livestock, Meats, and Wool; Market Review and Statistics published by F. D. A.

TABLE III.—*Number of beef steers sold at Chicago out of first hands for slaughter*

Week ending—	Choice and prime	Good	Medium	Common	All grades
1943					
Jan. 2	5,433	9,238	3,664	135	18,470
Jan. 9	4,309	9,707	5,438	386	19,840
Jan. 16	5,396	9,264	6,033	379	21,072
Jan. 23	3,499	11,444	7,177	340	22,460
Jan. 30	4,430	8,437	6,229	357	19,453
Feb. 6	3,808	8,292	6,998	636	19,734
Feb. 13	3,183	9,830	8,104	422	21,539
Feb. 20	2,105	10,654	7,341	574	20,674
Feb. 27	1,698	8,321	5,989	268	16,276
Mar. 6	1,947	7,151	8,203	504	17,805
Mar. 13	2,056	7,563	8,327	417	18,363
Mar. 20	3,304	9,825	7,248	480	20,857
Mar. 27	2,202	10,700	7,548	308	20,758
Apr. 3	2,092	8,975	6,959	372	18,398
Apr. 10	1,587	9,458	6,275	679	17,999
Apr. 17	1,753	8,064	5,141	336	15,294
Apr. 24	3,728	9,335	4,989	192	18,244
May 1	4,765	11,107	6,204	362	22,438
May 8	3,968	10,917	6,707	478	22,070
May 15	4,058	13,096	5,850	205	23,209
May 22	2,254	15,048	3,726	218	21,246
May 29	2,952	14,467	5,940	226	23,585
June 5	2,678	10,038	2,577	99	15,392
June 12	3,648	17,929	4,589	139	26,305
June 19	5,052	10,362	2,459	228	18,101
June 26	5,287	7,989	1,926	146	15,348
July 3	6,520	8,938	2,265	227	17,950
July 10	6,369	8,182	1,589	137	16,277
July 17	9,508	11,475	2,428	180	23,591
July 24	10,465	7,945	2,434	538	21,382
July 31	8,228	9,760	2,789	196	20,973
Aug. 7	7,557	11,223	3,342	505	22,627
Aug. 14	5,151	11,231	4,674	304	21,360
Aug. 21	7,305	8,944	2,899	269	19,417
Aug. 28	9,135	8,790	2,863	208	20,996
Sept. 4	7,740	10,847	4,138	262	22,987
Sept. 11	6,842	9,311	3,112	233	19,498
Sept. 18	10,394	10,205	2,813	222	23,634
Sept. 25	8,214	9,523	2,588	544	20,869

TABLE III.—Continued

Week ending—	Choice and prime	Good	Medium	Common	All grades
Oct. 2	9,198	8,347	1,433	672	19,650
Oct. 9	11,122	7,917	542	144	19,725
Oct. 16	9,471	6,826	1,445	310	18,052
Oct. 23	7,565	7,847	1,432	593	17,437
Oct. 30	12,021	10,975	1,401	983	25,380

Source: Livestock, Meats and Wool Market Review and Statistics published by Food Distribution Administration.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I would now like to discuss the consumer's stake in the stabilization program, of which the subsidy program, as I have shown, is a vital element. There is no question but that the savings to the consumers of the Nation are far in excess of the cost of the program. As I indicated a while ago, if the consumers of the Nation were to pay for their goods and services during this war on the same basis as they had to pay during World War No. 1, the additional cost to them, conservatively figured, would be $22,000,000,000.

One of the methods by which costs to the consumers can be restrained is by preventing pyramiding through the distributive system, by means of reducing prices at the early stages of distribution by a subsidy payment, as I pointed out earlier in my remarks. For instance, take a commodity like canned snap beans, or in fact any canned vegetable where support prices for the raw product are necessary to sustain production. Canners sell their product to the Commodity Credit Corporation for a price which reflects the support price fixed by W. F. A., and then the Commodity Credit Corporation sells this commodity back to the canners at a lower price, from whence it is sold through the regumitted to be inflated by the higher prices lower than those which reflect the amount paid for the commodity by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The mark-up for the middleman is not permitted to be inflated by the higher prices growers receive for their canning crops, and in that way the consumers benefit.

Another form of direct saving for consumers is secured by not having to raise the price of whole supplies to get products from remote sources, as is the case with transportation subsidies, commonly known as freight equalization payments.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a short exhibit as follows:

CONSUMER SAVINGS PER DOLLAR OF GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURE ON SUBSIDY

For each dollar spent by the Government, consumers save in lower prices:

Sugar	$2.30
Petroleum	3.65
Apples	8.50

If the subsidies were eliminated today, the following would happen immediately, as was pointed out by Judge Vinson some time ago: Each loaf of bread would cost at least a penny more; each pound of butter at least 5 cents more; the cost of a quart of milk would rise at least 1 cent; each pound of bacon, cut of beef, pork chop, ham, and every ounce of ham

sausage would advance at least 10 percent; each can of vegetables would advance at least 25 percent; each pound of cheese would advance at least 4 cents; each pound of sugar will go up 1 cent; each pound of potatoes will go up from 2 to 3 cents; prices will also advance on prunes, raisins, peanut butter, upon which the agencies of government have programs under way or contemplate transportation or other subsidies to obtain stable and uniform prices. In short, the cost of food as a whole would rise more than 7 percent, and the cost of living as a whole would rise by about 3 percent, before any repercussions are considered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator said the price of bread would go up. About how much does the Senator anticipate the price of bread would go up?

Mr. ELLENDER. About 1 cent. Of course, the increased cost to the baker would be about one-half cent, but, as a rule, the price does not go up a half cent on a loaf of bread. It would go up a cent.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator mean that if the price of wheat goes up to parity—and that means about 9 or 10 cents a bushel more—that that will mean a half-cent increase to the baker?

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. AIKEN. Why should it?

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, there is today a price squeeze between the price of wheat, what the millers have to pay for it, and what they have to sell the flour for.

Mr. AIKEN. How can anyone blame the farmer for that price squeeze? If the Senator will inquire at the Bureau of Agricultural Economics he will find that the farmer gets about 2 cents for his share out of a loaf of bread, so what justification is there in raising the price of bread 1 cent or 2 cents when all the farmer gets out of it anyway is just 2 cents? There is no justification for it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the Senator received any complaints from any bakers at home or from any millers at home?

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator will find that the increased cost is due to other causes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator may have his own opinion, but I think I am entitled to mine. The millers are crying that the rising price of wheat squeezes them, and the higher price of that wheat goes back to the farmer. The bakers claim they cannot absorb higher flour costs. They may be wrong, but I could not say that they are.

The question arises, could consumers easily absorb this increase? I would say that many could. You and I probably could, Mr. President. But a vast number could not. Only a small part of our working population have received the wage increases which some workers in our war plants have enjoyed. For many, rising wages have not offset the present rise in living costs. For example, the percentage change in average hourly real earnings between January 1941 and May 1943 for different nonagricultural laboring groups, which is computed by deflating the increase in average hourly money earnings during that period by the rise in the cost of living, is as follows:

	Percent
All nonagricultural establishments	−1.0
Manufacturing	12.4
Durable goods	13.0
Nondurable goods	5.0
Nonmanufacturing	−9.3
Mining	−0.1
Construction	−5.4
Transportation and public utilities	−9.3
Trade	−1.5
Government	−21.0
Finance, services and miscellaneous	−5.1

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there be incorporated the table entitled "Money and Real Average Hourly Earnings, by Major Nonagricultural Industry Groups, for Selected Dates."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 14.—*Money and real average hourly earnings, by major nonagricultural industry groups, for selected dates*

MONEY

Industry group	Amount					Percentage change from—									
						August 1939 to—				January 1941 to—			May 1942 to—		September 1942 to May 1943
	August 1939	January 1941	May 1942	September 1942	May 1943	January 1941	May 1942	September 1942	May 1943	May 1942	September 1942	May 1943	September 1942	May 1943	
All nonagricultural establishments	$0.660	$0.699	$0.785	$0.811	$0.859	5.9	18.9	22.9	30.2	12.3	16.0	22.9	3.3	9.4	[1] 5.9
Manufacturing	.624	.683	.835	.892	.953	9.5	33.8	42.9	52.7	22.3	30.6	39.5	6.8	14.1	6.8
Durable goods	.688	.749	.925	.997	1.050	8.9	34.4	44.9	52.6	23.5	33.1	40.2	7.8	13.5	5.3
Nondurable goods	.576	.610	.712	.743	.796	5.9	23.6	29.0	38.2	16.7	21.8	30.5	4.4	11.8	7.1
Nonmanufacturing	.675	.706	.756	.763	.795	4.6	12.0	13.0	17.8	7.1	8.1	12.6	0.9	5.2	4.2
Mining	.833	.848	.988	1.004	1.052	1.8	18.6	20.5	26.3	16.5	18.4	24.1	1.6	6.5	4.8
Construction	.892	.945	1.050	1.067	1.110	5.9	17.7	19.6	24.4	11.1	12.9	17.5	1.6	5.7	4.0
Transportation and public utilities	.742	.765	.838	.846	.863	3.1	12.9	14.0	16.3	9.5	10.6	12.8	1.0	3.0	2.0
Trade	.600	.606	.678	.696	.741	1.0	13.0	16.0	23.5	11.9	14.9	22.3	2.7	9.3	6.5
Government	.671	.732	.700	.684	.718	9.1	4.3	1.9	7.0	−4.4	−6.6	−1.9	−2.3	2.6	5.0
Finance, service, and miscellaneous	.652	.685	.716	.725	.807	5.1	9.8	11.2	23.8	4.5	5.8	17.8	1.3	12.7	11.3
REAL [2]															
All nonagricultural establishments	$0.660	$0.684	$0.668	$0.679	$0.677	3.6	1.2	2.9	2.6	−2.3	−0.7	−1.0	1.6	1.3	−0.3
Manufacturing	.624	.668	.710	.746	.751	7.1	13.8	19.6	20.4	6.3	11.7	12.4	5.1	5.8	0.7
Durable goods	.688	.733	.787	.834	.828	6.5	14.4	21.2	20.3	7.4	13.8	13.0	6.0	5.2	−.7
Nondurable goods	.576	.597	.605	.622	.627	3.6	5.0	8.0	8.9	1.3	4.2	5.0	2.8	3.6	.8
Nonmanufacturing	.675	.691	.643	.638	.627	2.4	−4.8	−5.5	−7.1	−6.9	−7.7	−9.3	−.8	−2.5	−1.7
Mining	.833	.830	.840	.840	.829	−.4	.8	.8	−.5	1.2	1.2	−.1	0	−1.3	−1.3
Construction	.892	.925	.893	.893	.875	3.7	.1	.1	−1.9	−3.5	−3.5	−5.4	0	−2.0	−2.0
Transportation and public utilities	.742	.750	.713	.708	.680	1.1	−3.9	−4.6	−8.4	−4.9	−5.6	−9.3	−.7	−4.6	−4.0
Trade	.600	.593	.577	.582	.584	−1.2	−3.8	−3.0	−2.7	−2.7	−1.9	−1.5	.9	1.2	.3
Government	.671	.716	.595	.572	.566	6.7	−11.3	−14.8	−15.6	−16.9	−20.1	−21.0	−3.9	−4.9	−1.0
Finance, services and miscellaneous	.652	.670	.609	.607	.636	2.8	−6.0	−6.9	−2.5	−9.1	−9.4	−5.1	−.3	4.4	4.8

[1] According to the National War Labor Board, the increase in basic wage rates authorized by the Board during this period amounted to 0.4 percent in manufacturing and 0.2 percent in other private nonagricultural employment. Other adjustments authorized by the Board, such as shift bonuses, incentive-pay plans and vacations with pay, resulted in additional increases in rates o. 0.4 percent in manufacturing and 0.2 percent in other private nonagricultural employment. It is clear therefore that most of the increases in basic wage rate earnings was due to factors other than increases in basic wage rates. The most important of these are increased overtime pay and the relatively greater expansion of the employment in the high-wage industries.

[2] Money earnings deflated by the cost-of-living index as developed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (August 1939=100).

Source: Office of Price Administration series based on data obtained from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, U. S. Department of Labor, the Civil Service Commission the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Bureau of the Census, U. S. Department of Commerce, and other agencies.

Mr. ELLENDER. Now let us take the fixed income groups, who have already suffered heavily. Conservatively, these total 14,000,000 recipients, not counting their dependents, and not counting the low-paid white-collar workers in industry, and those who live on interest, mortgages, and royalties. These fourteen millions include two and nine-tenths millions who receive public assistance, three and two-tenths millions who are school teachers and State and local government workers, almost five millions who depend on military allotments, about one million dependent on veterans' pensions, and others.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there be printed in the RECORD a table entitled "Recipients of Fixed Incomes, by Type of Payment."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Recipients of fixed income, by type of payment [1]

Type of payment	Number of recipients (millions) [2]
A. Public assistance	[3] 2.94
1. Old age assistance	2.17
2. Aid to dependent children	.31
3. Aid to the blind	.08
4. General relief	.38
B. Government salaries	[4] 4.58
1. Federal (excluding military) [5]	[4] 1.34
2. State and local (excluding public education)	1.92
3. Public education	1.32
C. Military allotments [6]	4.75
D. Veterans' pensions	.86
E. Old age and survivors' insurance	.69
1. Lump sum payments	.01
2. Monthly payments [3]	.68
F. Railroad retirement [5]	.16
G. Civil service pensions [3]	.07
Total	14.05

[1] Excluding interest, rents, and military pay; exclusive also of life insurance payments, which are not available.

[2] Only recipients are indicated. Reliable data on the total number of persons dependent upon fixed incomes (i. e., recipients and their dependents) are not available. It may be conservatively estimated that at least one-fourth of the total population are in this category. In addition, it is estimated by the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor that approximately 6,000,000 workers are currently receiving wages of less than 40 cents an hour.

[3] May 1943.

[4] Represents total civilian employees exclusive of Army and Navy employees connected with an industrial activity. These total 1.78 million and include some salaried employees; the figure shown here is therefore an understatement of the number of Government salaries.

[5] Latest monthly data.

[6] Army, October 1943; Navy, August 1943.

Sources: Public assistance and old age and survivors' insurance: Social Security Board; Veterans pensions: Veterans' Bureau; Federal employment and Civil Service retirement benefits: U. S. Civil Service Commission; State and local government employment: Bureau of Census; Public education: Constants used by Bureau of Census; Military allotments: War and Navy Departments; Railroad retirement: Monthly Review of Railroad Retirement Board—Includes retirement operations and lump-sum death benefits.

Office of Price Administration, Division of Research Oct. 9, 1943.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, let us now turn again to the Government's stake in the food-subsidy program—that is, to the taxpayer's stake. I believe that the subsidy payments can best be viewed as an insurance premium to protect the taxpayer against immense losses. To grasp the magnitude of this stake, it is necessary to keep only two facts in mind:

First, that the Government—that is, the taxpayer—buys for war purposes about 50 percent of the total output of the economy. This means that the Government pays, directly or indirectly, about one-half of the cost of all materials and of all labor, right through the whole production and distribution system.

Second, keep in mind that one price rise begets others; that rising prices beget wage increases; that one wage increase begets others, and that wage increases raise prices to the Government, as well as to others.

These are the two reasons why subsidies are very cheap insurance, from the standpoint of the taxpayer. The indirect effect of the estimated 3 percent rise in cost of living, were the subsidies to be removed, would be to cost our Government, the taxpayers, billions of dollars. Since wages are sensitive to a rise in the cost of living, there would be little that could be done to prevent wage increases; and for every dollar of wage increase, 50 percent of it would have to be borne by the taxpayers.

Even if wages rise only eight-tenths of 1 percent for each 1 percent rise in living costs, which is very conservative, and assuming that prices moved up by only the amount—not the percentage—which this increased wage cost would add to total costs of doing business, the Government's war costs would increase by at least $2,000,000,000 within a year, as a result of this 3 percent rise in living costs. This is the initial—only the initial—cost which would be entailed by the elimination of these food subsidies which cost the Government only about $800,000,000.

The above calculations, of course, follow the inflation spiral only a very short distance. We all know how the spiral grows on itself once it is well started. If it really gets going, the cost to the taxpayer will be tremendously higher than already indicated. If subsidies are removed and inflation sets in, I would not be at all surprised if our war costs would double next year, or over the few years to come in which this conflict may last. In other words, if our war cost is $100,000,000,000 for this year, it may grow to as much as $200,000,000,000 next year, or the year after, should the dam break. It is amounts of this magnitude with which we are dealing when we question whether it is wise to spend a few hundred millions to hold back the tremendous inflationary forces which are now pent up in our economy.

There is no use fooling ourselves that labor will be satisfied with a mere 3 percent rise in order to offset the removal of subsidies. Some say it would be simple and harmless to withdraw the food subsidies and give compensating increases in wages. Since withdrawal of the subsidy would raise the cost of living by 3 percent, they argue, an increase in wage rates of only 3 percent would be sufficient, and the anti-inflation program would not be broken.

Mr. President, this contention is based on two main fallacies:

First, it overlooks the fact that the cost of living, even with the subsidies, is more than 5 percent above the level at which it was to be stabilized under the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, and approximately 7 percent above the level of May 1942, the stabilization base under the Little Steel wage formula. The removal of the food subsidies would raise the cost of living to 8.4 percent above the September 15, 1942, level and 10.1 percent above the level of May 1942. It is this substantial rise in living costs which has been primarily responsible for the difficulties on the wage front since the Stabilization Act was passed. Workers are not going to be satisfied with a 3-percent wage increase which simply offsets a further rise in living costs of 3 percent, especially since the removal of the subsidies at this time would indicate pretty clearly that the price stabilization line was being abandoned and that workers must therefore take care to protect themselves against future cost of living advances.

The second fallacy arises from the common failure to consider the repercussions of rising wages upon prices, and of further rising prices upon wages. If general wage levels are increased by even 3 percent, price ceilings on a number of important cost-of-living commodities will have to be raised. Rising industrial wages will also tend further to raise wages of agricultural labor, and put more pressure on food prices. The additional purchasing power created by higher wages will add its pressure to the inflationary tendencies. Hence prices will rise again, wages will again have to be readjusted, and the inflationary spiral will be under way.

No, Mr. President; the proposed solution of the inflationary problem is naive and illusory. The only way to avert the inflationary spiral, which will end in disaster for farmers as well as for others, is to hold the cost of living where it is, and continue to work with all our strength to hold it there, if not lower. This can only be done if the food subsidies are retained.

Mr. President, it is my firm conviction that the true and real friends of the farmers of our country should be for the subsidy program. What the subsidy program does, essentially, is to give the War Food Administrator and the Price Administrator freedom to make sure that farmers' food prices are adequate, without plunging them into the wild—and losing—gamble inflation is. I contend that prices to the farmers will not necessarily be any higher if subsidies are removed. They might even be lower, for the subsidies permit higher prices to be fixed for raw agricultural products, without upsetting retail price ceilings. Is it not to the advantage of the farmers of the country that their prices be so fixed that they can make reasonable profits without disturbing the whole fabric of our society? As I indicated earlier in my remarks, inflation would destroy our ability to produce, both in war

and for the post-war period. I contend that it would also destroy the free enterprise system. Better a little regulation now than dictatorial regimentation after our free economy has been shot to pieces by inflation and deflation.

Let us look at the farmer's interests more directly, in dollars-and-cents terms. Is there any question in the mind of any Senator present that if our stabilization program would come to an end the cost of what the farmer buys will not rise, will not skyrocket? I am sure that they would, because as I have indicated a bit ago, the prices of the materials which the farmers need on the farm as a rule keep pace with—and sometimes more than keep pace with—the prices which the farmers receive for their products. The fact that prices farmers pay have been held down so much below prices they are receiving for their products constitutes a large part of the explanation of the present favorable position of the farmers. The farmers' friends should protect this position, by fortifying, and not destroying, the stabilization program.

On the other hand, Senators, we have heard the plight in which the farmers of our Nation have been with respect to labor and labor costs. All of them have complained to us of the increased cost of labor. Farm wages will be pulled much higher than they now are if industrial wages rise further, as they certainly will if the cost of living rises. Of that there can be no doubt.

Let us look to the post-war period, Mr. President. If inflation sets in, our war debts will be crushing after the inflation has run its course and deflation ensues. All of us will suffer, but particularly the tillers of the soil, as they did after the last war.

If inflation comes and deflation follows, as it will, the prices farmers pay for goods and services will not fall as much as farm prices will fall. The last war shows how "sticky" industrial prices are after inflation has burned itself out, whereas farm prices fall quickly and much more sharply. For the welfare of the farmers the thing to do is to hold the retail price line, so that industrial prices and wages will not skyrocket.

In short, Mr. President, the whole country will lose by the elimination of the subsidy program; but the farmers themselves, taking the long view, have more to lose than any other group, except possibly the dependents of soldiers and the recipients of public assistance. I earnestly urge each and every Member of this body, and particularly the members of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, who will consider H. R. 3477, to give this problem their most serious consideration. I plead with members of the Committee on Banking and Currency not to permit the elimination of subsidies unless a better plan can be presented by them. For the future of America as we have known it, inflation must be stopped at all costs.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield. I was about to yield the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not wish to disturb the distinguished Senator from Louisiana in making his final remarks on subsidies; but in order to clarify the record I wish to refer him to the hearing which was held on November 15 before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. On page 50 of the transcript of the hearing I asked Joe G. Montague, general counsel of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association, of Fort Worth, Tex., this question:

Senator WHERRY. Judge Montague, would you say that the subsidy is getting back to the producers?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No; it is not.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, Judge Montague is a big lawyer from Texas. I doubt if he knows much about cattle raising, because when I tried to examine him he would not answer any questions. He tried to interrogate me.

Mr. WHERRY. I also inquired of Frank S. Boice, president of the American Live Stock Association, who is a cattleman and rancher. He owns thousands of acres of land and many cattle. I asked him the same question. He gave the same answer. I asked the same question of Mr. P. O. Wilson, secretary of the National Live Stock Producers' Association. I believe he is the meat man whom the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] was quoting a few moments ago.

Mr. AIKEN. No; he is a representative of the livestock marketing association. I was referring to the representative of the packers' association.

Mr. WHERRY. I asked him the same question, and he said that the $16 price was the outside price that could be paid unless the packer took it out of his own pocket. That testimony is found at page 91 of the transcript.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is under the last ruling.

Mr. WHERRY. I asked Mr. Wilson the following question:

Senator WHERRY. In other words, there is no chance for the producer to get anything out of the packer at all above the $16 a hundred? Is that right?

Mr. WILSON. No; the packers could pay more than $16.

Senator WHERRY. But, if he does, he takes it either out of his pocket or the Government says they take it out of the subsidy, but the subsidy goes to the consumer as a rollback.

Mr. WILSON. If he pays more than $16, not on one load but the average purchases——

Senator WHERRY (interposing). For the month.

Mr. WILSON. For the month, on double A cattle he loses that much off of his subsidy. He loses the amount that he goes over the $16 outside of the subsidy. If he pays under $15, he loses that much out of his subsidy. But don't forget, gentlemen, if he pays under $15, he loses the subsidy but he gains in price by buying lower than the $15 price.

Senator WHERRY. In other words, he uses the subsidy proposition to beat down the cattleman, in order to make his sales average $16.

Mr. WILSON. Exactly.

Senator WHERRY. And that applies to both cattle and hogs?

Mr. WILSON. Both cattle and hogs, and sheep.

That has reference to the question I asked, as to whether or not they ever paid more than the $16 top. He said that the packers use the $16 tops to beat down the price, so that the cattle producer, instead of getting $16, receives as little as $14 for double A beef today.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not arguing with the Senator. I think he believes what he is saying, but I simply cannot agree with him. I asked every witness who appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry when I was present the specific question, If you do not want stabilization, what is the remedy? The answer was "Higher prices."

I warn the Senate today that if we do have higher prices for cattle it will mean higher prices for every commodity consumed by the American people; and once the dam is "busted" we cannot possibly stop inflation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The dam has already been "busted" in connection with some of the salaries being paid, has it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is a doubt as to that.

Mr. WHERRY. What about the wages of miners? There is no question about them.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is arguable. I am not thoroughly familiar with that question. However, let me say this to the Senator: If the President had abided by what John L. Lewis desired when he first started his fight for a wage increase—that is, an additional $2 a day for the same number of hours—it would have broken the Little Steel formula. As I understand, the miners must work 48 hours a week to receive $54 pay.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. They were given an increase of $1.50 a day. The only difference is the difference between $2 and $1.50.

Mr. ELLENDER. That $1.50 is for overtime for an additional hour worked at $1 an hour. They are entitled to it under the law; but their basic wage has not been increased.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator seems to take the position that I am interested in the testimony of Mr. Montague, general counsel of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Asscciation, because he is not a cattleman. I have referred to Mr. Boice. I wish to refer to the testimony of Mr. Wayland Hopley, of Atlantic, Iowa, president of the Iowa Beef Producers' Association. He is a farmer with 3 sons in the service. He testified that he had been a cattle feeder for years. He had been forced to reduce his feeding operations to practically a third. He made this statement about the corn situation.

Senator WHERRY. If corn goes up in price, which is anticipated, and cattle remain at the ceiling of $16 in Chicago, do you feel

there will be more beef produced or less beef produced between now and next June?

Mr. HOPLEY. Senator, we are having a tough time getting something to eat now. The Lord only knows what will happen if that goes into effect.

* * * * *

Senator WHERRY. Referring to this lot of cattle that you sold for $15.40 and $16.50, have you marketed any cattle in the last 18 months of the same quality, and did they bring a higher price? What did they bring? Do you remember?

Mr. HOPLEY. I might be off a little bit; but, as I remember it, they brought around $17.30 or $17.40.

Senator WHERRY. Was that Chicago?

Mr. HOPLEY. That was Chicago. All the prices I have quoted are on the Chicago basis.

Senator WHERRY. So the same class of cattle at one time after this price law went into effect brought $17.35 or $17.40 a hundred, but you have since taken $15.40?

Mr. HOPLEY. In my particular case it might be greater, if you take into consideration that I had this load of cattle that brought the top price. I took my best cattle off first.

In other words, the feeding ratio is too narrow. Mr. Hopley says that it would not make any difference if the ceiling on corn were lifted, because they had to have a probable market in order to increase the supply of beef. That statement, coming from a producer who has been feeding for nearly 50 years, ought to be convincing evidence that the way to cut down inflation is to get a surplus, and the way to get a surplus is to cut out the subsidy and go to the profit-motive basis.

Mr. ELLENDER. I fail to see that the way to keep down prices is to let prices keep on going up. In answer to a question, Mr. Hopley replied, as I recall, that it was less profitable to feed cattle with corn, and more profitable to feed it to hogs. As I further recall, Mr. Hopley stated that one of the chief reasons why there are not more cattle fed today than in the past is the feed shortage, which has caused the price of feed to go up. The Senator remembers that testimony, does he not?

Mr. WHERRY. I remember very distinctly that the witness——

Mr. ELLENDER. Not only Mr. Hopley——

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment. He testified that the reason for decreased cattle-feeding operations was that the feeding ratio was too narrow, and that, regardless of where the ceiling on corn was placed, or the abundance of corn, there would be no difference unless the feeding ratio were broadened. That is the point I am making. Under the subsidy program we now have, with the $16 top, we have absolutely driven replacement cattle out of the feed lots. The program has not increased production. It will not increase production. Instead of a meat surplus we shall have a scarcity. Inside 6 months the meat problem will be so acute that there will be a famine of double A prime beef on the meat counters of this country. Instead of retarding inflation, it will promote it. Instead of driving prices down, it will drive them up. We want to get a surplus of meat in the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understood the Senator a while ago, the way he would remedy the situation would be to allow the price of cattle to rise. Is that true?

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have the prices reestablished, as the witness, Mr. Hopley, of Atlantic, Iowa, has asked, on the basis of the Little Steel formula as of September 15, 1942, when prime beef cattle were bringing at Chicago $17.80 a hundred. If we would do that, instead of operating under the subsidy roll-back plan, then we would get replacement cattle back into the feeder yards.

Mr. ELLENDER. If that were done, how would it affect the price ceilings?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not think it would affect the retail prices at all.

Mr. ELLENDER. How about the squeeze on the processors?

Mr. WHERRY. That is one of the things which must be worked out by the Food Administrator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator think it can be made profitable?

Mr. WHERRY. I know that if the sources of supply are cut off it will not make any difference what happens to the processor. The processor then will not have any meat to process or sell.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I simply desire to say in behalf of the cattle raisers in the eastern part of the United States that I think they would be very happy if they received a price anywhere near the ceiling price set by the O. P. A. today. I do not know the situation west of the Mississippi River, but in the East, where cattle raisers receive from 4 to 6 cents a pound, I think they would be very happy to receive prices anywhere near the ceiling price. That is the situation today.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator attributes all the blame for the low price to subsidies; does he?

Mr. AIKEN. No; I attribute it to this: When the subsidy and the roll-back program were put into effect, it forced cattle to be rendered through certain processing channels. If the farmer has two or three or four beef cattle to sell today, he cannot say he will sell them merely because the rules and regulations allow him to do so, and he certainly will not get the $1.10 subsidy if he does sell them.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bridges	Butler
Austin	Brooks	Byrd
Barkley	Burton	Capper
Bilbo	Bushfield	Caraway
Chavez	Lucas	Smith
Clark, Idaho	McClellan	Stewart
Danaher	McFarland	Thomas, Idaho
Davis	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	Maybank	Tobey
Gillette	Mead	Truman
Green	Millikin	Tunnell
Hatch	Moore	Tydings
Hawkes	Murray	Vandenberg
Hayden	Nye	Van Nuys
Hill	Overton	Wagner
Holman	Pepper	Wallgren
Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	Walsh
Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb	Wherry
Kilgore	Robertson	White
Langer	Scrugham	Wiley
Lodge	Shipstead	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, because the Appropriations Committee and other committees are in session and, therefore, only a small number of Senators are present, suggestion has been made with respect to having the vote go over until tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. May I ask what the statement of the Senator from Illinois was?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Illinois was about to agree to have the Senate go over until tomorrow in view of the fact that so few Senators are present. It is now past 4 o'clock.

Mr. WHITE. We have arrived at the voting stage on this particular amendment. Can we not dispose of it and then go over until tomorrow?

Mr. LUCAS. It will be all right to have a yea-and-nay vote. I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BRIDGES. This is a yea-and-nay vote on my amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WALLGREN (when Mr. BONE's name was called). The senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is absent, convalescing from an illness. It is my understanding that if present he would vote "nay" on the pending amendment.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that if present he would vote "nay." I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who would if present vote "yea." Therefore I am permitted to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. STEWART. I have a general pair with the Senator from Kansas (Mr. REED). I transfer that pair to the Senator from Utah (Mr. MURDOCK), and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. VANDENBERG. The junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is

out of the city in connection with business of the Senate. On this vote he is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY]. If present, the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea," and I am advised that the Senator from Pennsylvania, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent on public business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is confined to his home with a cold.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of the death of his sister.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are detained in various Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained in committee meetings. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] is absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has a general pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY].

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—33

Aiken	Davis	Revercomb
Austin	Gillette	Robertson
Bridges	Hawkes	Shipstead
Brooks	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Tobey
Bushfield	Langer	Tydings
Butler	Lodge	Vandenberg
Byrd	McClellan	Wherry
Capper	Millikin	White
Chavez	Moore	Wiley
Danaher	Nye	Wilson

NAYS—33

Barkley	Ellender	Johnson, Colo.
Bilbo	Green	Kilgore
Caraway	Hatch	Lucas
Clark, Idaho	Hayden	McFarland
Eastland	Hill	McKellar
Maloney	Radcliffe	Truman
Maybank	Scrugham	Tunnell
Mead	Smith	Van Nuys
Murray	Stewart	Wagner
Overton	Thomas, Okla.	Wallgren
Pepper	Thomas, Utah	Walsh

NOT VOTING—29

Andrews	Downey	Murdock
Bailey	Ferguson	O'Daniel
Ball	George	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Gerry	Reed
Bone	Glass	Reynolds
Brewster	Guffey	Russell
Buck	Gurney	Taft
Chandler	La Follette	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	McCarran	Willis
Connally	McNary	

So Mr. BRIDGES' amendment was rejected.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should like to address an inquiry to the able Senator from Illinois in connection with the particular point upon which we have just so closely divided.

In spite of the fact that the able Senator believes that the war ballot commission would have no substantial policy responsibility, the fact remains that it is generally recognized that the war ballot commission would be the root source of the entire program for collecting perhaps eight or nine million votes, which might control the next Presidential election.

It has been very frankly—and I think with extreme fairness—recognized across the aisle that the two Republican members of the commission should be satisfactory to the Republican side of the Senate. That is no reflection on the President of the United States, or his appointive power, or the method in which he would exercise it. It is merely a frank recognition of the fact that elections are partisan, and that partisan divisions should be fairly and effectively protected when elections are held.

In view of the fact that the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the able Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and I think one or two others, assured the Senator from Vermont a day or two ago that if any Republican commissioner were nominated by the President who was unsatisfactory to the Republican side of the Chamber they would join in rejecting his nomination, it seems to me that we are in complete agreement regarding the propriety of protecting the character of these minority appointments.

Therefore I am going to ask the Senator from Illinois whether he would object to amending section 101 on page 16, at line 21, so that when the Senate advises and consents to these nominees two-thirds of the Senators present shall be required for confirmation, so that we may have in the text of the law the assurance of the protection, in respect of these particular nominees, which has been offered to us informally and unofficially by the distinguished Senators in charge of the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator propose that as an amendment?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes. I am proposing in line 21, after the word "Senate" to add the words "provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur," which is the language of the Constitution.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. May I earnestly ask the Senator from Illinois to accept that amendment? I hope he will. I think that should be done by all means, and I hope it will be agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the Senator from Illinois agrees to that I should like to propound an inquiry to both Senators. Of course, that proposal is not in harmony with the constitutional provision that the Senate may confirm Presidential appointments by a majority vote. Is it the Senator's contention that we have a legislative right to go beyond the constitutional requirement, and to require that two-thirds vote must be had for confirmation of all officers nominated by the President?

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is certainly no constitutional provision that I know of against requiring any sort of formula that affects us with respect to our function.

Mr. BARKLEY. That may be true, but it might be subject to a possible exception, and—I now simply use the Senator's familiar language—I am exploring the thing for the purpose of satisfying my own mind. Suppose that in any case an appointee received the constitutional majority of the Senate vote; without regard to the fact that we had in the law said he must receive a two-thirds majority, would he have a right to insist upon his confirmation under the Constitution, so as to be entitled to the appointment regardless of any legislative requirement we might insist upon for a two-thirds majority?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I decline even to attempt to pose as a constitutional authority, Mr. President, but I am unable to believe that the situation which the Senator describes could arise.

Mr. BARKLEY. That raises this question: Have we any more right by legislation to increase the number of Senators required by the Constitution for confirmation of Presidential appointees, than we have to reduce the number? Of course, we cannot by legislation provide that where two-thirds of the Senate is required, action can be taken by a majority. The question is whether we can actually change the constitutional provision with respect to confirmation, which says that a majority vote can confirm appointments by the President, by requiring a two-thirds vote, because under the Constitution any appointee receiving a majority vote would be entitled to the office, regardless of our legislative requirement for a two-thirds majority. I think that that is something which appeals perhaps to the legalistic mind, but it is a matter which may trouble us if we are not sure of the results.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, a few moments ago when the vote was taken on the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], I was necessarily absent on official business. I

therefore move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). The motion will be entered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if we must have another vote on that question because of the absence of one Senator, it may turn out that many Senators who are absent perhaps would like to have voted on the question. If there is to be another vote on the question I think it ought not to be had at this moment. The Senator can enter his motion, but I should like to have the vote postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is pending. The motion made by the Senator from Indiana may be entered, but it cannot be acted upon at this time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Michigan in respect to the amendment he has offered, that it is a novel proposal, to say the least, and I should like to have it go over until tomorrow in order that some of us may give it a little more consideration before we make any agreement of the kind suggested by the Senator. It does not change my position, which I took when I started, with respect to clothing the ballot commission with all the confidence that is necessary from the standpoint of the American public. I want that confidence, as every other Senator wants it. At the same time I want to look into the proposal in view of what the able majority leader has said with respect to the question involving the Constitution.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to speak upon that point for a moment I wish to read from section 2 of article II of the Constitution, which covers the point raised by the able majority leader:

He—

The President—

shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law.

I call the able Senator's attention to the fact that while two-thirds majority is specifically provided with respect to treaties, no specific majority is required with respect to nominations, and I can see that it is wide open to the Senate's own jurisdiction.

Mr. BARKLEY. That may not be the proper interpretation. The Constitution made a very distinct difference between treaties and nominations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. BARKLEY. It requires two-thirds for the ratification of treaties, and of course by implication and by its terms requires only a majority for the confirmation of nominations by the President. The point that I raise is whether we can by legislation require a larger majority of the Senate for confirmations than the Constitution itself requires, and whether if any appointee receives a constitutional majority he could insist upon his confirmation by the Senate under the terms of the Constitution, and whether we by legislation can require a larger number than the Constitution requires in the matter of appointments.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the amendment offered to the bill have precedence over the motion to reconsider?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment does have precedence over a motion for reconsideration.

Mr. AIKEN. So long as an amendment can be kept pending then a motion to reconsider can be held off until it is too late to reconsider?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; as soon as the amendment is out of the way and voted upon, then the motion to reconsider will be in order.

Mr. AIKEN. Suppose it is not out of the way for a couple of days?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is like any other question which is not disposed of for 2 days.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Chair somewhat anticipated what I was going to ask the Senator from Michigan. If the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire is adopted, after reconsideration of the vote, I was wondering whether then the Senator from Michigan intended to press his amendment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. No.

Mr. TYDINGS. My understanding was that the Senator offered it only in the event the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire was rejected.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. I therefore suggest, if I may, that if the Senator from Michigan would withdraw his amendment, we would be in a position to vote upon the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, and if that amendment were rejected, the Senator from Michigan could offer his amendment again. Some of us are in the same position he is in. We would rather vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire first before passing on the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am quite willing to withdraw my suggestion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make it clear, in reference to the suggestion, that I desire that the vote be postponed until tomorrow, if we are to vote on the motion to reconsider.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is a matter out of my jurisdiction.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator. If the Senate should adjourn this evening, would that put an end to the motion to reconsider?

Mr. BARKLEY. No, indeed; a motion to reconsider can be made at any time within 2 days; and when it is voted on, that is the end of it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. When the Senator from Michigan first made his suggestion I thought he wanted to have the members of the Commission confirmed in the usual way, after appointment, by a simple majority vote of the Senate. I am a great believer in the constitutional provision relative to Senate confirmation; and, as the Senator knows, I am the author of a bill, which the Senate passed some time ago, providing that all officers receiving salaries of $4,500 or above shall be confirmed by the Senate. I think that it is a very wise thing to do. I thought that was what the Senator's amendment would do, until I went to his desk and read his amendment. I then found that the Senator's amendment would require a two-thirds majority.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, that is the whole point. I am endeavoring to write into the law the assurance which has been given us, and which is perfectly satisfactory to me; and yet I think it should be textually in the act itself that we on this side of the aisle are to have a veto as to those who are to represent us on this all-important Commission.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. I can see that from the viewpoint of the Senator from Michigan that would be all right. From my viewpoint, I do not believe such a provision would be in accordance with the Constitution, and I will have to withdraw the statement I made a few moments ago; because if there is one earthly instrument of which I am in favor it is the Constitution of the United States. I want to live up to it, whether it is in accord with my views or whether it is not in accord with my views. So long as it is the Constitution of the United States I am under oath to support its provisions.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Of course. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to say so, I deny totally that there is any collision between the amendment and the Constitution.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator may be correct; but, so far as I am concerned, I think there is a difference between his amendment and what he desires his amendment to provide.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; I yield the floor.

Mr. HATCH. I am one of the Senators who gave the Senator from Michigan assurance that we were perfectly willing to do anything we could do to

see to it that the minority party had representation which was truly representative of it. However, I am wondering—and I am not speaking of the Constitution—whether the Senate of the United States desires to establish the precedent, and wishes to write it into the law, that we are placing these election commissioners upon a basis which transcends in importance that of our Ambassadors, our Supreme Court justices, all the other members of our judiciary, and all the general officers of the Army and the Navy. Should we say that these particular officers are of such importance that they should be placed on a plane elevated above that of all others? How does that suggestion appeal to the Senator. So far as I am concerned, I will give the Senator my written assurance, but I doubt very much whether such a provision should be written into the law.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, my answer to the Senator is that I quite agree that the provision is an unusual one, but it is equally an unusual situation with which we are dealing. We are dealing with perhaps 9,000,000 votes which may determine the next Presidential election in the United States, and may affect the history of this country for the next 50 years. All of us want those in the armed forces to have a maximum opportunity to register their preferences in the election. The only thing in the world which interests me is to be perfectly sure that the election is a totally fair one. If in the establishment of the United States war ballot commission the text were to read, "There is established a United States war ballot commission which shall be composed of four commissioners, who shall be appointed by the next Republican nominee for President," it would be absurd; and yet, as the situation stands today, since the bill reads "who shall be appointed by the President," it virtually reads that they shall be appointed by the next Democratic nominee for President. It is no reflection upon the President, and certainly I intend none, to call attention to what I believe is an anomalous situation as a result of the actual conditions we confront. It is for that reason that it seems to me there is no extreme to which we can go to be too sure that we have totally protected the wellsprings of this undertaking to poll the absentee soldiers.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the reasons the Senator from Michigan has just given are the reasons which moved me to agree in the first instance, in the committee, to have Senate confirmation of these officials. I believe that to be the regular and constitutional way, and I believed it to be an ample method by which the minority party could protect itself, if any protection were needed. In addition to that, expressions were made on the floor of the Senate that we would join in the effort to make certain that the appointees would be satisfactory.

I desire to say to the Senator from Michigan that what he says about the 9,000,000 votes as possibly affecting the election of the President of the United States is true; but the officials I named a moment ago affect every branch of Government, every branch of human endeavor in this country, the lives, liberties, and property of every citizen of the United States; and yet those officials are confirmed by majority vote of the Senate. I doubt whether we desire to establish the precedent of saying that these election commissioners are of higher rank and of greater importance than other constitutional officers. I doubt it very much.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in order to clear the track, I withdraw my amendment for the time being, so that the issue may rest squarely on the question of reconsideration.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the motion to reconsider is debatable, but I do not care to debate it. I prefer that the vote be taken tomorrow, rather than at this time; and I am going to take the liberty of requesting unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and then recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to have the vote taken now. I think we had better decide the issue.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. WILLIS. I was recognized by the Presiding Officer.

Mr. BARKLEY. I had not yielded the floor.

Mr. WILLIS. Pardon me.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator desires to make a speech, I shall yield the floor to him.

Mr. WILLIS. It will be very brief.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well.

Mr. WILLIS. I desire to call up the motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, Mr. President, the Senator knows that the vote on the motion can be delayed. The motion is debatable. The Senator can force some of us to discuss his motion this afternoon, or he can agree to let the matter go over until tomorrow. The Senator rushed in, after the vote, and gave as his reason for moving to reconsider the fact that he was absent at the time when the vote was taken. Many other Senators were absent. The Senator from Indiana had a perfect right to make his motion. If one-third of the Senators were absent, and were not expecting the vote at this hour, I think, in fairness to other Senators, as well as to the Senator who has come into the Chamber and has made the motion to reconsider, that the vote should be postponed until tomorrow.

Mr. WILLIS and Mr. PEPPER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Indiana, if I have the floor.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I wish to state to the majority leader that I gave as my reason the fact that I was necessarily absent on official business.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true; I am not questioning that.

Mr. WILLIS. And I gave it at a time when nearly all Senators were present.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator gave his reason, and I accepted it. Of course, I do. However, there are other Senators who were absent for the same reason and who have just as much right to be present and to vote as the Senator from Indiana had to rush in and make a motion to reconsider.

Mr. WILLIS. Other Senators have the same right to vote at this time as I had to vote formerly, and I have the same right to make the motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course; but other Senators may not have had the same notice the Senator from Indiana had, and they may not have had the opportunity to get here.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I shall ask for the yeas and nays on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator from Indiana that the motion to reconsider does not automatically come up. A motion must be made in order to bring it before the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to take advantage of the Senator from Indiana or any other Senator, and I do not intend to let him take advantage of me if I can avoid it. I think it is perfectly fair at this late hour, in view of the suddenness of the motion, that the motion should go over until tomorrow.

I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business. If the Senate wishes to vote that motion down, it can do so.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Radcliffe
Andrews	Hawkes	Revercomb
Austin	Hayden	Robertson
Bankhead	Hill	Scrugham
Barkley	Holman	Shipstead
Bilbo	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Brooks	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lucas	Tobey
Byrd	McCarran	Truman
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Caraway	McFarland	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Wagner
Danaher	Moore	Wallgren
Davis	Murray	Walsh
Eastland	Nye	Wherry
Ellender	O'Daniel	White
George	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Gillette	Overton	Willis
Green	Pepper	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). Announcing my pair, and its transfer as on the previous vote, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is absent because of the death of his sister.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are detained on public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are detained in Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] is absent on official business.

Mr. VANDENBERG. My colleague the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent on official business. He is paired on this question with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY]. If the Senator from Michigan were present, he would vote "nay," and I am advised the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

Mr. WHITE. My colleague the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is confined to his home with a cold.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—43

Andrews	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hill	Scrugham
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bilbo	Kilgore	Stewart
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McClellan	Truman
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Tydings
Eastland	Maloney	Van Nuys
Ellender	Murray	Wagner
George	O'Daniel	Wallgren
Gillette	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Green	Overton	
Hatch	Pepper	

NAYS—29

Aiken	Hawkes	Shipstead
Austin	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Tobey
Brooks	Langer	Vandenberg
Burton	Lodge	Wherry
Bushfield	Millikin	White
Butler	Moore	Wiley
Capper	Nye	Willis
Danaher	Revercomb	Wilson
Davis	Robertson	

NOT VOTING—23

Bailey	Ferguson	Mead
Ball	Gerry	Murdock
Bone	Glass	Reed
Brewster	Guffey	Reynolds
Buck	Gurney	Russell
Chandler	La Follette	Taft
Connally	McNary	Wheeler
Downey	Maybank	

So Mr. BARKLEY's motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations in the Public Health Service, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Elmo Pearce Lee, Sr., of Louisiana, to be United States circuit judge for the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, vice Rufus E. Foster, deceased.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc, and without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc, and without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 30, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 29 (legislative day of November 18), 1943:

The following-named assistant dental surgeons to be passed assistant dental surgeons in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the date set opposite their names:

Kenneth A. Haines, October 16, 1943.

Vernon J. Forney, November 4, 1943. (Dr. Forney is now serving under temporary commission issued in accordance with the provisions of the First Deficiency Appropriation Act of March 18, 1943.)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 29 (legislative day of November 18), 1943:

APPOINTMENTS BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO THE SIGNAL CORPS

Second Lt. Robert Elwood Kimball

TO THE AIR CORPS

First Lt. Rufus Hardy Holloway
First Lt. Channing Stowell, Jr.
Second Lt. George Eugene Bostwick
Second Lt. Jack Wesley Streeton
Second Lt. Isaac Owen Winfree

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE COLONEL, COAST ARTILLERY CORPS

John Henry Cochran

TO BE COLONEL, FIELD ARTILLERY

Carl Cönrad Bank

TO BE COLONELS, INFANTRY

Vernon Evans
Roscoe Barnett Woodruff
Lewis Clarke Davidson
Harold William James

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Frank O'Driscoll Hunter
Morrison Clay Stayer
Frederick Lewis Anderson, Jr.
Westside Torkel Larson
Howard McCrum Snyder
William Willis Eagles
Spencer Ball Akin
Robert McGowan Littlejohn
William Edward Raab Covell

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Frederic Harrison Smith, Jr.
William Albert Matheny
James Albertus Bethea
Charles Bertody Stone 3d
Charles Wesley Sullivan
Frank Dorn

Ray Tyson Maddocks
Charles Loomis Booth
John Fuller Davis
Eugene Harold Beebe
John Walton Lang
Wilbur Reece McReynolds
George McCoy, Jr.
Alden Rudyard Crawford
Willard Gordon Wyman
Reuben Columbus Hood, Jr.
Donald Frank Stace
Orval Ray Cook
Malcolm Fraser Lindsey
Charles Augustus French
Frank Dow Merrill
Carl Brown McDaniel
Leonard Henderson Sims
Ridgely Gaither
Zim E. Lawhon
Charles Trovilla Myers
Thomas Jeffries Betts
Leon William Johnson
Theodore Leslie Futch
Frank Needham Roberts
James Wrathall Spry
Oliver Lincoln Haines
Paul Clarence Paschal
Samuel Egbert Anderson
Tristram Tupper
Kenneth Claiborne Royall

POSTMASTERS

KENTUCKY

Milton Tackett, Pikeville.

OKLAHOMA

Hal Files, Talihina.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord of life and love, we would wait and look unto Thee for direction. Down through the centuries, through the difficulties of this bewildering world, amid the blunderings of men, the multitudes have looked to Thee with audacious hopes. Thou art ever ready with earth's unlocked riches for all; O, may we come wondrously into the deepest ministries of Thy spirit.

Our assignment means service, self-denial, and devotion as exemplified by Him who gave all until there was nothing He had not given. Enable us to confront these days with voluntary self-abnegation of our individual rights, thus making our realm of service most glorious. Let us be deaf to the hoarse appeals of bias and personal claims in which there is not a shadow of reality. We pray that we may scorn the sins which tempt us and that our country may have unity not only in war, but also in peace and thus be an inspiration to those brave men and women who art writing the most gallant epic of history. Be unto us a voice that we cannot forget, an unseen companion and a breath of sweet fragrance against the storm. In this, the world's evil days, be Thou with our President, our Speaker, and the Congress, and give strength to all anxious hearts and expectant minds. In the name of our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, November 26, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3070. An act to repeal the chinese exclusion acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

Department of Agriculture.
Department of Commerce.
Department of the Navy.
Department of War.
Federal Trade Commission.
Federal Security Agency.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include some excerpts from an analysis of the pending civil aviation bill made by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the disposition of business and other special orders I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after other special orders today, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Dallas News on lend-lease and reverse.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow my colleague the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes, after the disposition of business and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINTER. Also, Mr. Speaker, after the other special orders today, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include three letters received by me from the chamber of commerce at Glens Falls, N. Y.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

"HAWG" HOCKS AND THE CAMPAIGN FOR CONGRESS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a little package mailed to me by one of my good constituents addressed:

"Hawg" hocks. For Congressman "PIGGY" F. L. (Win the War) CRAWFORD.

Mr. Speaker, the campaign for mailing Congressmen hog hocks is promoted by another of a long line of ex-Government economists named Faught, of Detroit, and formerly a so-called information specialist for the War Food Administration.

Economist Faught apparently envisions himself as a modern Samson, using the inflation-scare propaganda to damage agriculture as the strong man of old set fire to the foxes to destroy the crops, and then he hopes to use hog hocks instead of the jawbone of an ass hoping to slay Michigan Representatives in Congress who voted against subsidies. Newspaper publicity indicates Faught is modeling his campaign after the "Bundles for Congress" drive.

Subsidies as proposed further hock our future, and perhaps Mr. Faught has picked an appropriate symbol.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Indianapolis Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and extend my remarks by including a letter that I have received, and the text of a resolution which I propose.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, correspondents in foreign theaters of war and home newspaper commentators have been forecasting within the last 24 hours that the next move of the United Nations probably will be along psychologi-

cal lines to try to induce the suffering nationals of Axis-ridden countries to see the necessity of overthrowing their tyrannical rulers and joining in creating a peaceful world of self-governing peoples.

This psychological effort which the commentators assert is in the immediate offing and which is heralded as an approaching event of the most portentous importance, may be the means of ending the war.

An expression now by the Congress of the United States, representing the people of America, might be of tremendous assistance in putting this psychological effort across to successful consummation.

This suggests the propriety and wisdom of adopting House Concurrent Resolution No. 50 which I have introduced to welcome the people of Italy to the family of liberated nations and expressing our sincere sympathy for all Nazi-ruled victims everywhere.

The State Department and the Office of War Information have both endorsed my resolution. For the State Department, Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Under Secretary of State, advises that he concurs in the sense of the resolution. He says:

> The resolution has been carefully read and I find no conflict with the foreign policy of this Government. It embodies the spirit of the Atlantic Charter with respect to the people of defeated countries and also reflects, I am convinced, the attitude of the great majority of American citizens toward the unfortunate Italian people.

The Office of War Information is anxious to secure the adoption of the resolution for propaganda use, believing it would be very valuable for psychological purposes.

The resolution has been pending in the House Foreign Affairs Committee since September 21. I hope that all Members of the House will take note of it and express their interest and approval to the Foreign Affairs Committee. I hope that Congress, which has a great responsibility to our people, as well as to the world will express the people's will in this matter. I appeal to Congress to adopt this resolution so that we as the representatives of the people of America may do our part toward bringing to a successful conclusion the war which is consuming in its flames the lives of many of our precious boys, breaking millions of hearts and drenching the world in blood.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 50 is as follows:

> Whereas the Congress of the United States, democratically elected by the people, is in a position to convey to the people of Italy, the victims of Fascist rule, and to downtrodden, oppressed peoples everywhere, our Nation's sympathy and friendship for them: Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States, speaking in behalf of the people who elected it, welcomes the people of Italy to the family of liberated nations. We congratulate them on the overthrow of the horrors and slavery of fascism. We sympathize with them in the struggle that is before them in reclaiming their country from the Nazi invader and in reconstructing their nation. In the cosmic evolution that is going on the might of America is pledged to support, by all reasonable and constitutional means, the freedom, peace, and security of all right-thinking and right-doing men. We hail the overthrow of fascism in Italy as the dawn of freedom for all of the Axis-ridden countries and as pointing the way to the final consummation of a peaceful world of self-governing peoples.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by two insertions on the civil aviation bill, in one instance by inserting a resolution, and in the other a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial that appeared in the New York Times of Sunday, November 28, 1943, by Edwin L. James.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business and other special orders I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include therein a set of resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Ottumwa, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a letter from the Secretary of State on the circumstances pertaining to the shipment of certain rubber to Sweden; and, secondly, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an article that appeared in a magazine of the South Dakota State Penitentiary, proposing a plan for the use of inmates of penitentiaries in the armed forces.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the regular business on the Speaker's table today and the special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after the regular business on the Speaker's desk and the special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

O. P. A. AND THE CHURCH, BUSINESS, AND UNION ORGANIZERS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point. I understand there is no legislative business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a reference to the Appendix of the RECORD of March 19, pages A1307–A1308, will show that union organizers living in Detroit seeking to compel men driving their own equipment, and others who did not own their own equipment but driving delivery trucks, all seeking to deliver milk to customers, including stores, in Port Huron, Mich., received almost unlimited gasoline to enable them to drive from Detroit to Port Huron and to, in Port Huron, follow milk trucks about the city. These so-called union organizers, some of whom had been convicted of various offenses, made a practice of following milk trucks about the city of Port Huron calling upon their customers to whom deliveries were made and endeavoring to intimidate them.

They called upon storekeepers and, it is reported, threatened to picket the stores if they continued to take milk from men who refused to pay tribute to the union.

Of the so-called union organizers, three were allocated gasoline sufficient to enable them to travel 3,000 miles per month. Several others received a sufficient allotment to travel 2,000 or 1,000 miles each.

You will find the figures set forth on page 3259 of the RECORD of April 10, 1943.

HOLLAND, MICH.

In Holland, Ottawa County, Mich., for many, many years members of the Harrington family maintained a coal business. The widow of one of the older Harrington's, Mrs. Austin Harrington, two of the sons, Harry and Carl, still maintain that business and prior to April 5 of this year they supplied about 80 percent of the industrial coal tonnage used in the city of Holland. The industrial plants to which they supplied coal were working, to a large extent, on Government war contracts.

Around about the first of April representatives of the teamsters union came in from Grand Rapids—some 20 miles away—and attempted to organize the Holland drivers. There was no dispute as to hours, wages, or working conditions and the drivers working for the Harringtons did not wish, in fact, they refused, to join the union. The union picketed the Harrington yard but they had no effect, the men still refused to join so the pickets transferred their activities to the industrial plants which purchased coal from the Harringtons.

They threatened to picket incoming material, the outgoing finished products, and so Harrington customers, many of them of long years' standing, quit purchasing coal of Harrington and Harringtons have lost the business.

Here is an illustration of how the "four freedoms" do not work in Holland, Ottawa County, Mich. Here is an illustration of how the President stands behind his political allies, refuses to permit legislation which would end sympathetic strikes, correct the abuses which are carried on under the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and outlaw attempts to create monopolies.

Why, just why should Harrington's business be destroyed or damaged because free-born American citizens working for him, do not choose to pay racketeers from Grand Rapids, Mich., for the privilege of earning a livelihood? The hypocrisy, the complete insincerity of the administration, which is carrying on a war to, as it says, carry the "four freedoms" to every benighted people in the world, is demonstrated by these two incidents which can be multiplied thousands of times throughout the country.

The unions are collecting millions of dollars from men who do not want to pay, whose only desire is to work at the job which they have found, for the wages they can obtain under the conditions which satisfy them. Yet, the union politicians yell their heads off about the roll-back in the cost of living.

They might start the roll-back by ending the practice of levying tribute of around $1 and $1.50 a month on workers who want no truck with them. That $12 to $18 per year which every union man is compelled to pay in addition to his initiation fees and special assessments, would help out on the grocery bill.

Now, for a moment take a look at another side of the picture, these union organizers, so-called, have been getting all the gasoline they need, to drive from Grand Rapids to Holland, traveling at least 50 miles a day on a useless, unnecessary, destructive errand. They drive around town following loads of coal that leave the Harrington yard to make certain that it does not go to Holland industrial plants.

But when a minister of the Gospel wants gasoline to get to his people, or to preach a funeral sermon, or bring a parishioner to the cemetery, that is something else again.

In the Pontiac Daily Press of Friday, on the front page, I find a picture captioned "Gasless pastor and followers picket O. P. A. office." It shows a line of pickets protesting the denial of gasoline to their pastor.

Detroit papers carry similar information stating there are 50 pickets in the line. According to the press, the pastor, Rev. Dr. Leland L. Marion, represents one of the largest churches in Pontiac. He also represents other congregations in the State.

In July 1943, he claims he applied for gasoline and that under the rules he, as a minister, should have been issued a C book. A Mr. A. J. Diebel said to be the head of the Pontiac local O. P. A. office ruled that he was only entitled to a B book. Not satisfied, the minister called upon Diebel and reported that he was told "Your work, Dr. Marion, as pastor of a church is not fundamental to the war effort. I am not concerned about the churches. I am concerned about getting gasoline for the men who work in shops. In 60 days there will be no gasoline for churches and similar enterprises, and the quicker the churches close up the better it will be anyway."

The pastor continued his efforts, going he says, seven times to the O. P. A. headquarters but so far he has been unable to even get a definite reply from the board or a conference with Diebel.

The pastor writes:

> What has been the result of this red tape, arrogance, stupidity, and anti-Christian attitude on the part of the O. P. A.? Not only have I been deprived of my gasoline ration, but in order to bury the dead and preach the Gospel and call on the mothers of newborn babes and comfort the loved ones of wounded and killed men in the armed services, it has been necessary for me to violate the rules and accept the generosity of my parishioners as respects gasoline.

What a contrast. O. P. A. gives rationed gasoline to men who drive day after day in an effort to force those working in defense industries to pay tribute for the privilege of working therein. They drive hundreds of miles to take from the workingmen's pay checks dues to further their own activities, their own political ambitions, but when a minister asks for gasoline to hold Divine services, to attend the sick, to assist in burying the dead, his request is denied and he is told, according to his statement, that the quicker the churches close up, the better it will be anyway. What cheering news to the men on the battle front.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday and Friday next, upon the conclusion of the legislative business, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE PRICE OF COAL

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the Administrator of Economic Stabilization has just announced an increase in the price of coal. Of course, that increase was necessary following the increased wages that were recently approved for coal miners. Possibly these wage increases were justified. I do not claim to know, but I do know that the miners were receiving $1 per hour before the increase and that even with 20-cent cotton the average cotton farmer is realizing only one-fifth that amount for his labor.

The truth is that the wages of agricultural workers were so much lower than the wages of any other workers that even a small daily increase has resulted in more than doubling the total cost of labor in farm production. You can no more make a crop without labor than you can dig coal without labor. Why should not the producer of food products be given the same treatment that is accorded the producers of coal? This House has passed a bill to include farm labor in the calculation of parity. No one dares challenge the justice of this bill, but we are told that it is inflationary. What about the inflationary effect of the increased coal prices?

Mr. Speaker, the farmers of America are entitled to fair treatment. They ask no more, but insist that they be given the same treatment that is accorded to others.

JOHN W. PRESTON AND ANNETTE ABBOTT ADAMS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that H. R. 2508, a bill for the relief of John W. Preston, and Annette Abbott Adams, be restored to the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ABSENTEE SOLDIERS' VOTING

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it seems that the Communist Party has secured the assistance of Walter Winchell in trying to browbeat the Congress into taking the election machinery away from the various States.

Last night he tried to mislead the American people to believe that the bill we are offering as a substitute would prevent soldiers from voting by absentee ballots when, in fact, it would have the very opposite effect.

This morning's issue of PM, the uptown edition of the Communist Daily Worker, comes out and accuses the Republicans and southern Democrats of trying to deprive American soldiers of the right to vote; whereas what we are trying to do is to make it possible for them to vote and to retain the voting machinery in the hands of the various States.

My God, does the American soldier have to look to this Communist publication for protection against red-blooded Americans in Congress in their right to cast an honest ballot?

The men in our armed forces are not deceived by such "bunk." They want the election machinery retained in the hands of their respective States. That is one of the things they are fighting for and that is what we propose to do.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire whatever to enter into a debate between the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and Mr. Winchell. I think each is equally able to care for himself, regardless of the possession of facts or otherwise. I would like to say however that so far as I am personally concerned, I would like to see the States handle the entire matter of soldiers' voting. Sev-

eral months have been spent, not only by myself, but by representatives of the War and Navy Departments in an effort to work out provisions whereby the men overseas will be permitted to exercise the God-given right to vote. We have not yet been able to work out any satisfactory solution which will permit them to fully exercise their right of sufferage.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. I will yield if I have time later on. I do not question the sincerity of the gentleman from Mississippi and I would like to go right along down the line with him, but I would like to quote on that point an official communication from the War Department which will show the practical impossibility of the plan advocated by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The Army alone is now carrying by air some 700,000 pieces of mail a day, in addition to some 620,000 V-mail letters a day (average figures based on a recent month).

Even with the use of air mail and air priority, the State absentee balloting procedure as provided by existing State laws would not allow any substantial number of votes cast by servicemen overseas to be counted in State primaries and elections.

It is not a question of desires on our part. It is a question of the physical impossibility of getting the State absentee ballots to the men in Guadalcanal, north Africa, and other places overseas.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. You can get those ballots to the men in the service quicker under our bill, the Rankin-Eastland-McKellar-McClellan bill, than you can under the Lucas-Worley bill.

In addition, ours will take the ballots to cover State and county officials and bring them back without a Federal Commission interfering with them, and more servicemen would vote as a result. We would get more ballots to the soldiers and get them back quicker under the Rankin-Eastland resolution than you would under this long drawn-out 21-page document that they are trying to bring out here to turn the election machinery of the country over to a Federal commission.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a statement from the War Department relative to overseas balloting.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. Members may insert their remarks at this point in the RECORD, if they desire today, as there is no legislative program.

There was no objection.

The statement referred to is as follows:

STATEMENT BY COL. ROBERT CUTLER BEFORE THE MEETING OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, AND REPRESENTATIVES IN CONGRESS NOVEMBER 16, 1943

(Present: Messrs. WORLEY, RANKIN, MANASCO, GIBSON, HOCH, LESINSKI, GAMBLE, LECOMPTE, ELLSWORTH, VURSELL, GAVIN.)

After the introduction of the joint report of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy November 13, 1943, on House Concurrent Resolution 49, which was read to the committee by the chairman, Colonel Cutler, in response to question from the chairman, stated (in behalf of the Army and Navy) as follows:

"The services' position in regard to the air-mail carriage proposed under title I of the Green-Lucas bill is that, in regard to one election, it may be possible, subject to military necessity, to bulk carry blank air-mail ballots to almost all servicemen and to bulk carry executed air-mail ballots back to the United States.

"Such an undertaking is entirely different from the air carriage of individual applications for State absentee ballots and individual State absentee ballots (a total of at least three separate carriages for each serviceman) in respect to 46 State primaries and a general election, held on more than 26 different dates over a period extending from April into November. The burden on air-mail facilities under this latter procedure would not only be three times as heavy but it would be diffused in an infinity of individual carriages spread over a long period of months. Such a burden could not be sustained by air-mail facilities.

"What makes the procedure proposed under title I of the Green-Lucas bill a reasonable possibility is that it involves one bulk carriage overseas at a time selected at the service's convenience, and one bulk carriage back to America. Any procedure more onerous than this would, for overseas carriage, if it involved any considerable volume, raise the greatest difficulties for the services and interfere with their primary duties.

"There is another difficulty with the State absentee balloting procedure under State laws now in effect. (The figures which I am using are, I believe, reliable, but owing to the great diversity of State laws, should be checked up to date). Seven States apparently do not permit absentee voting for Federal candidates in primaries. Three other States apparently permit absentee voting only if the absentee is within the United States (as to two of these States, only if the absentee is physically within the State itself). Eleven States apparently allow only 20 days or less between the date when an absentee voter's application may be formally received by the State officials and the date on which his executed ballot must be received back by the State officials. Thirty-three States apparently allow an interval of only 30 days or less. Some 14 of these States appear to require that a particular form of application for absentee ballot, furnished by the State, be used by the absentee voter and do not recognize as an adequate application the post card form of application provided by the Ramsay Act. Such States, on receiving such a post card, would send to the absentee, not the desired ballot, but merely a form of application to be made out and sent back by the absentee before the absentee ballot will be sent. And, in addition, many States which will formally receive the absentee's application an adequate number of days before the election, will not dispatch the ballot itself to the absentee (because the candidates will not be known and the ballot accordingly will not be printed) until a more limited number of days (in some instances 15 or less) before this election. All of these restrictions tend effectively to negative the possibility of servicemen outside the United States voting in State primaries and elections by use of the existing State absentee voting procedure.

"I have obtained information from the proper Army authorities as to the time of air-mail carriage from various points overseas, where considerable bodies of our troops are now located, to a central point in the United States (Springfield, Ill.). For obvious reasons, I cannot here state where these overseas points are. But I can give instances of the respective time of carriage to illustrate the difficult problem involved. In stating these times of carriage, I am giving the average time of carriage based on a long period of experience. Obviously for one particular emergency carriage, weather and military conditions permitting, the time of carriage could very materially be shortened. I emphasize the words "one particular emergency carriage." Such a special short-time carriage could not practicably be repeated at frequent intervals.

	Days
From an oversea point in the North American area to Springfield, Ill	6
From an oversea point in the European theater to Springfield, Ill	11
From an oversea point in the Pacific theater to Springfield, Ill	13
From an oversea point in the Far East area (longest carriage) to Springfield, Ill	16

"I wish to repeat that the foregoing are average times of air-mail carriage, based on actual experience over a long period of time, and are the carriage times which are properly applicable in considering the individual carriage by air mail of State absentee ballot applications and ballots over a period of 6 to 7 months. These are not the carriage times to be considered in relation to one particular emergency carriage of ballots in bulk, where the carriage time could reasonably be halved or, under favorable conditions, be made even more short.

"It is to be remembered, however, that the State absentee balloting procedure involves at least three carriages for each serviceman (and in 14 States, apparently, 5 carriages). The minimum carriages involved are: The post-card application from the serviceman to the State; the blank ballot from the State to the serviceman; the executed ballot from the serviceman to the State. Relating this triple carriage to the times of carriage I have stated above in regard to four points overseas, and allowing four additional days for action by the servicemen and the State officials—which is certainly an irreducible minimum—the following carriage times, plus four added days, would be involved through use of the existing State absentee balloting procedure.

	Days
Overseas point in North American area	22
Overseas point in European theater	37
Overseas point in Pacific theater	43
Overseas point in Far East area	52

"In such States as require the use of a particular State application form, and hence five carriages, the times stated would be increased by 40 percent at least.

"It should also be observed that, as regards any servicemen overseas, the only address available to a secretary of state will be the overseas serviceman's organization and A. P. O. number. For reasons of security, the Army cannot identify to any secretary of state the geographical location of an overseas A. P. O. number. Accordingly, a State forwarding to any serviceman overseas the State absentee ballot would have to assume that the longest carriage time (52 days, or in States where five carriages must be made, 73 days) may be applicable.

"Furthermore, it should be observed that air priority refers to priority in space on a regularly scheduled flight. That is, air priority means that material other than that given priority will be taken off the carrying plane to make room for the material having such priority. Air priority does not imply that the service can or will furnish special planes to carry priority material in some more expeditious time than the regular air-carriage schedules provide.

"The Army alone is now carrying by air some 700,000 pieces of mail a day, in addition

to some 620,000 V-mail letters a day (average figures based on a recent month).

"Even with the use of air mail and air priority, the State absentee balloting procedure, as provided by existing State laws, would not allow any substantial number of votes cast by servicemen overseas to be counted in State primaries and elections."

In answer to a suggestion that applications for State absentee ballot applications and State absentee ballots might be sent by the services direct to each serviceman, Colonel Cutler stated in substance as follows:

"The Army cannot, in view of its wartime responsibilities, undertake to furnish as of a given date or dates a roster, by States, of the names and military addresses of all men in the service.

"Such an undertaking would be precluded, in many cases, by the requirements of military security.

"Apart from security, it would not be practicably possible under war conditions to make such a roster."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in extending the remarks I have made, I may include certain excerpts from this bill, and also a table showing the flying hours between points in this country and points where our servicemen are situated.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Richmond Banner.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD twice, in one to insert an address by Charles E. Wilson and in the other to insert an address by Ralph Bard.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio speech I made recently.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LEGISLATION IN ORDER ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order tomorrow for the House to consider District of Columbia bills under the Rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE SOLDIERS' VOTE

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at the conclusion of my remarks the so-called Lucas-Worley bill which has been mentioned and also House Joint Resolution 190.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I secured this 30 minutes' time this afternoon for the purpose of provoking thought in an exchange of ideas among the Members of the House in an effort to find the best possible course the Congress should take in attempting to give the men and women of our armed forces an opportunity to vote in the November election of 1944, believing that it is the duty of this body so far as it lies within our power to try to legislate in a sound, practical, and legal manner to that end.

Mr. Speaker, being a Member of the Election Committee of the House, with others of my colleagues, I would like to say that we have spent many days hearing a great deal of testimony in an effort to determine whether the so-called Lucas-Worley bill is the proper and sound approach to this matter and whether it can be legally enacted into law to this end. I would like to further report to the Members of the House that after a great deal of painstaking care, and listening to testimony by all of the proponents of the bill, including testimony given by high ranking officials of the Army and Navy, a substantial majority of the committee believe the Lucas-Worley bill is not a sound, proper, and workable answer to this most difficult question. Finally being convinced that the bill referred to is not the proper approach to the subject, by a substantial majority, our committee has offered a different approach and are now perfecting House Joint Resolution 190, which, we believe, when further implemented, will provide a means for the soldiers to vote through the operation of the various State election laws through the absentee ballot systems now established in the various States, which will make it unnecessary to allow the Federal Government to step in establishing a Federal bureaucracy of election machinery as proposed in the Lucas-Worley bill. When we have perfected this resolution which is now before our committee, we believe that it offers the greatest opportunity, and the only opportunity, for the soldiers to make use of the ballot in deciding this election referred to without violating the Federal Constitution and in a manner that will obviate the necessity of violating any of the constitutions or laws of any of the several States. We are confident that this second approach to the matter is sound and workable and will make it possible for the men and women of the armed forces to vote by the absentee-ballot method, vote the whole ticket with all of the names on it from the lowest office to the Presidential candidates, secretly, legally, with little or no opportunity for fraud or coercion.

First, I would like to point out what seems to me some of the important barriers to the enactment of the Lucas-Worley bill. Every Member of this House, in taking his oath of office, has sworn to uphold the Constitution. For my part, I want to live up to that oath—I intend to do so. There is little question but that the Lucas-Worley bill would violate the Constitution of the United States, usurp powers, and violate the Constitution and the laws of many of the States of the Union. If you will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where this bill is still under consideration in another body, and read the very able debates which have occurred there, you will find that even the proponents of the bill there appear to be not certain that the bill is constitutional. Further reading of the debates will disclose that many able Members of that body raise grave doubts as to its constitutionality.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. VURSELL. I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. It unquestionably violates or attempts to wipe out section 2, article I of the Constitution of the United States, the very first provision written into the Constitution relating to Government policy. It states:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

That same provision was written into the seventeenth amendment 130 years later. All the great judges and statesmen we had during that time have agreed that it was a most salutary provision; yet the Lucas-Worley bill would wipe that provision out and not only set up a separate qualification, but would force us to go to the double expense of sending two separate ballots or deny to the soldiers the right to vote in State and county elections.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. WORLEY. I have no desire to take all the gentleman's time arguing with the gentleman from Mississippi, but I would like to ask if he would object to having inserted at the beginning of his remarks a copy of the committee print which the committee has been considering, in conjunction with the original bill. Would the gentleman object to that?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, the gentleman

from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] has permission to insert that in his own remarks.

Mr. WORLEY. I am asking for permission to put it in at the same point the gentleman puts his in so that a comparison can be made between the original bill and the draft which the committee is considering. That point of doing away with the necessity for registration and the payment of a poll tax are questions which were passed on by the last session of Congress and overwhelmingly agreed to; is not that correct?

Mr. RANKIN. But that crazy law has not been passed on by the courts. The chances are that the courts will throw it out, and then if this Worley-Lucas bill were attached to it, the soldiers might have no authority to vote by absentee ballot at all.

Mr. VURSELL. Replying to the request of the gentleman from Texas I may say that I prefer that he extend it in his own remarks because it does not fit into mine.

There has been testimony before our committee from Members of this body, and I refer particularly to our colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL], a former secretary of state of Wisconsin, who is very familiar with the State election laws of Wisconsin, who testified before our committee that it would be practically impossible for the State of Wisconsin to comply with the Lucas-Worley bill.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. That same view is held by Mr. Jordan, secretary of state of California, with reference to the application of the Lucas bill and its effect on the California election machinery.

Mr. VURSELL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Aside from the legal objections to the bill, our committee found most serious objections to the form of the ballot. Let us keep in mind that the purpose of this bill is to give the soldiers a right to vote and make their choice for Federal officials including the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives. I think it will interest the Members of Congress to know that the ballot provided for under this bill does not contain the single name of a candidate.

I wonder just how much the men, who are fighting on the battle fronts of the world for the freedom of this country and who are expecting to receive a ballot from their home precinct and county, will be disappointed when they receive this abbreviated and anonymous sheet of paper wherein they are to express their choice for these offices and to their great surprise they will find that there is not a single name on the ballot. The bill provides that if you know who is running for President you may write in his name or, if you do not, you may signify your choice by writing in the name "Republican" or "Democrat" in the space where the name should be and which the soldier may not know. I ask you, is this an intelligent approach to the question? Likewise, if he knows the name of the Senator of either party he shall write in the name if he chooses, or if he does not know who is running for Senator in his State, he indicates his party preference by writing in the name of "Republican" or "Democrat," and the vote is so counted for the Senator of his choice.

When it comes to voting for candidates for Congressmen at Large or for Members of the House of Representatives from the various congressional districts, if the soldier knows the name of the candidate for Congress he should write in the name—if he does not know the name his only chance to make a selection is to write in his party preference.

Clearly, this so-called ballot is not a real ballot in any sense of the word. Notwithstanding the sentimental boasts of some of its proponents of their desire to give the soldier an opportunity to vote, it may deceive the relatives and friends of the soldiers at home in their belief that the proponents of this bill are trying to give the soldiers a chance to vote the entire ballot and creates the false impression that we who oppose the measure and who are trying to get the whole ballot to the soldiers are opposed to the soldiers voting.

The proponents of the bill have not once told the public that it is really not a real ballot and that not a name of a candidate will be on the slip of paper sent to the soldier which they refer to as a ballot.

I want to ask the Members of this body, if, in their opinion, 1 soldier out of 10, unless he receives letters giving him the information from his folks at home, will know the name of the candidate for Congress from his district. A great many of the citizens at home at this coming election, unless they are familiarized with the name of the congressional candidate on the ballot would not remember the name so he could write it in. This being the case, how do you expect these young men and women, thousands of miles away from home who have been in the military service and out of the United States for a year or two to appreciate such a ballot and to be able to vote with sufficient knowledge to make a proper choice?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to show what this Worley bill the gentleman from Texas has talked so much about does. I call attention particularly to subparagraph (d) of section 117 which reads:

(d) In certifying the appointment of the electors of President and Vice President under section 2 of the act of May 29, 1928 (U. S. C., title 3, sec. 7a) the executive of each State shall also certify that there has been substantial compliance by officials in such State with the provisions of this title. If the executive of the State does not make such certification or if the United States War Ballots Commission certifies—

And this might be by a vote of 3 to 2—

that there has not been substantial compliance by officials in such State with the provisions of this title, the Senate and House of Representatives, acting separately, shall concurrently decide whether the noncompliance so affected the appointment of electors in the State as to require such appointment to be treated as invalid.

In other words, it authorizes us to go ahead and set aside the election of any State in the Union if perchance it is contended that all of the orders of this Federal election commission have not been complied with.

Mr. VURSELL. I think the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has put his finger right on one of the objections to the bill I referred to previously.

Mr. WORLEY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WORLEY. Again I apologize for taking up the gentleman's time, but in answer to that point, is it not a fact that the Congress has always assumed its right and power to pass upon the returns of any State so far as the election of Federal officials is concerned since the time of the Tilden-Hayes contest? There is no question but what the Congress has that power. That language in the bill is surplusage.

Mr. VURSELL. That is true. So far as I know, the gentleman's statement may be correct, but in this act we are setting up an opportunity for the Congress to declare this election null and void, or throwing it into the House of Representatives or into the Supreme Court.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois that in the Hayes-Tilden contest it was decided that the Congress did not have the right to go behind the election returns. There were two sets of returns from the States of Louisiana and Florida and the question was which set of returns would be recognized.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the majority of our committee has taken the position that with the cooperation of the Army and Navy to expedite and speed up the delivery of the ballots, with the proper cooperation of the States under existing laws—and in this connection I may say that doubtless several of the States will further implement their local elections laws in order to assure the soldier of an opportunity to vote—that under existing State laws with such cooperation we can send the soldier the ballot direct from his precinct, the whole ballot containing the names of all the candidates from the county officers to the President of the United States. It will be to him like a letter from home—it will give him a chance to help to make the democracy work that he is fighting to preserve—it will greatly encourage his morale.

On the other hand, being thousands of miles away from home and expecting to receive a ballot where he can vote for his friends and neighbors from his county, for his Congressman, and for his choice for President, if and when he does receive this blank and anonymous ballot, undoubtedly it will be a great disappointment to him.

Now in a few words let me tell you what we propose to do under House Joint Resolution 190. There has been prepared 11,000,000 post-card applications. During the past few months these post-card applications have been impounded on the various battle fronts of the world. Some 60 days prior to the election these post cards, under our plan, will be distributed to the men and women in the armed forces.

On one side of the post card is a request for an absentee ballot for the soldier to sign giving military address. On the other side is printed, "Secretary of State" with a blank space in which he shall write in the State in which he votes before mailing. These cards will be carried by air mail to the various secretaries of state of the several States. The secretary of state will immediately forward them to the various county clerks or election officials whose duty it is to send him an absentee ballot. In order to beat the time element the cards will be distributed on the battle fronts in time for them to reach their destination in the various precincts as early as the ballot is obtainable by the election official who will mail to him the ballot and enclose therewith an oath of qualification for the voter to sign, which oath of qualification is set out in our resolution.

The envelope carrying the ballot out to the soldier will have printed on the outside "Official election ballot." This will afford expeditious and free air-mail transportation to the soldier. After he has voted the ballot, signed and sworn to the qualification blank, he places them in the enclosed envelope upon the outside of which is printed "Official election ballot" for the purpose of designating that this official election ballot is entitled to air-mail service free, and it is returned to the county or city official, to be distributed to his precinct, where it will be counted on election day.

The only difficulty in the soldier making use of the absentee ballot voting laws of the States is the time element. You will note by our plan we reduce the time element by one-third with the postal-card application. We have left only one round trip from the precinct to the voter and back to the precinct. There are only 15 States in the Union whose primaries are held as late as September 15, with Louisiana and Utah early in October. All of the others are held from 2 to 4 months earlier, so you see these late primaries would give over 30 days in which to make this round trip with the ballot. In that connection, and to show you why we think it is possible to overcome this time element, I want to give you some figures which have been furnished me by the War Department, and these figures do not provide for speeding up the mail, but represent the average length of time to make such a round trip, even allowing the soldier 2 days in which to vote and the clerk 2 days in which to place the ballots with the proper precincts.

Location of soldier desiring to vote:	Days
(a) Alaskan area:	
Nearest	14
Farthest	17
(b) Pacific area:	
Nearest	18
Farthest	30
(c) Canal Zone	13
(d) Caribbean area:	
Nearest	12
Farthest	16
(e) South Atlantic area:	
Nearest	14
Farthest	16
(f) Middle East area:	
Nearest	18
Farthest	20
(g) Persian Gulf area	22
(h) Far East area:	
Nearest	30
Farthest	46
(i) Mediterranean area:	
Nearest long haul	21
Nearest short haul	18
Farthest long haul	26
Farthest short haul	22
(j) North Atlantic area:	
Nearest	14
Farthest	24

Our resolution calls for the cooperation of the Army and the Navy in expediting the transportation of these ballots. Certainly they can cut these time limits, in some instances, to a considerable extent.

In this connection I want to give you a practical example of the speed with which air mail travels from Australia to the United States.

On Thanksgiving morning, November 25, I received this letter from Corp. George W. Emmett, from somewhere in Australia; on the outside of the envelope, which I hold in my hand, the postmark shows it passed through the Post Office in Australia on the 20th of November. Think of it—4 days by air mail from Australia to Washington, D. C. I am willing to admit that generally the time would likely be longer.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. On that point, I consulted the Bureau of Civil Aeronautics and I was informed that they have a thumb rule to the effect that, counting all stops, commercial planes can travel to any of the principal points on the globe at the rate of 150 miles an hour. They sent me this table showing the number of hours it would take to go to different places:

To Fairbanks, Alaska, 13 hours; London, England, 13 hours and 48 minutes; Lima, Peru, 14 hours and 48 minutes; Rio de Janeiro, 19 hours; Moscow, Russia, 19 hours and 12 minutes; Honolulu, 20 hours and 12 minutes; Santiago, Chili, 21 hours; Buenos Aires, 21 hours and 36 minutes; Cairo, Egypt, 21 hours; Bombay, India, 32 hours, Cape Town, South Africa, 34 hours; Aukland New Zealand, 37 hours and 36 minutes; Manila, 37 hours plus; Sydney, Australia, 42 hours; Singapore, Malaya, 43 hours; Hong Kong, China, 44 hours.

That is under normal conditions. As a matter of fact, military planes fly much faster than do these commercial planes, and at the same time they are not handicapped by stops on the way. I submit to the gentleman from Illinois that under our bill, House Joint Resolutions 190 and 196, and the McKellar-Eastland-McClellan substitute over in the Senate, these ballots from the various States could get to any soldier anywhere in the world and back in less than 2 weeks.

Mr. VURSELL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. In my judgment, there is no question whatever but what the Army and Navy can and will help to expedite under this plan of ours as provided in the resolution and it will result in getting more ballots to the men and getting them back, thereby giving the men a real chance to vote, rather than under this monstrosity, this cumbersome bill that would require thousands of tons of freight to be sent over in envelopes, as would be the case under the bill that is now being discussed over in the other body known as the Lucas-Worley bill.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the ballots sent out under House Joint Resolution 190 be the ballots provided by the various State laws? I must plead guilty that Connecticut has a very poor absentee-voter law. Our ballot has no names of candidates either. Would the law have to be amended?

Mr. VURSELL. It would probably have to be amended. I should like to submit to the Members of this House that the Governors of the States, the men and women of the various States of the Union, are interested in the soldiers voting. May I say that many of the State legislatures will be convened early in 1944. We hope and we believe that if we lay down a pattern in this resolution that many of the States will try to conform with it and it may be that some of the States will call a special session of the legislature. It is not too much to call a special session of the legislature because, after all, the people of the various States of this Nation are going to have to pay a tremendous cost in money in order to finance this colossal plan under their war balloting commission bill, and it will be cheaper and less drain upon the taxpayers if some of the States deem it wise to call a special session of the legislature in order to give these boys who are out fighting for our country a chance to vote.

Mr. MANASCO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. The same Constitution that preserves control of our elections in the hands of the States also insures freedom of speech and freedom of the press; is that true?

Mr. VURSELL. Yes.

Mr. MANASCO. If in carrying out our war effort we suspend the provisions of the Constitution that protects our election laws and preserves those to the State, could we not at the same time take

away freedom of speech and freedom of the press?

Mr. VURSELL. Yes; and in addition to that we open up the opportunity for considerable fraud, in my judgment, under the proposed war ballot commission.

Mr. MANASCO. If the Congress sets up the machinery to enable the States through their regular functions to send these ballots to the boys on the far-flung battle fronts, have we not discharged our obligation as Members of Congress and is not the responsibility for failure to comply with the act then shifted to the States?

Mr. VURSELL. The gentleman from Alabama is exactly correct. He has stated the problem in a sound manner. I believe the States generally will attempt to comply, and we can settle this proposition. We can give the soldiers a chance to vote within the framework of the Federal Constitution and the laws of the various States.

Ever since the beginning of this Republic it has been the duty of the States to provide for the holding of elections. Why should we usher in a bureaucracy now to override the interests of the States, when it will not give the soldiers a real ballot and will not give them an opportunity to vote in any greater numbers than under our resolution?

Mr. MANASCO. The gentleman will recall that in the election of 1864, when the country was engaged in a terrible civil war, the people who were interested in the elections then still respected the Constitution, and they provided for machinery to make it possible for the soldiers to vote under the State laws and not under Federal law.

Mr. VURSELL. May I point out that there is more involved in this proposed bill that I am speaking against today than the votes of the soldiers, unless it has been amended in the other body, and if it has I have not been so informed. It takes in all of the American citizens all over the world. You harness them in with the soldiers who are fighting and dying for this country. You take in Mr. Curran and the merchant marine and the employees of the O. W. I., who are over in India sowing discord there, even between our Government and one of our allies. You give them all a chance to come in and vote by this short and anomalous ballot. I am not in favor of harnessing this crowd up on the same footing with the soldiers of this country.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WORLEY. I think in all fairness to the Members of the House the gentleman should say that the committee bill, certainly my bill in the House, does not take in anyone except members of the armed forces.

Mr. VURSELL. In reply, I may say that I have read the committee bill this morning from over in the other body, and there is no indication as far as I know that it is stricken out. I am speaking particularly against the bill introduced in the other body.

Mr. WORLEY. The gentleman is speaking of the Senate bill, not the House bill. I think the House should be permitted to have the information as to what is contained in the House bill.

Mr. VURSELL. If the gentleman is correct, I shall be very glad to accept the correction.

Mr. WORLEY. I appreciate the gentleman's kindness.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will yield, that is merely a committee print that the gentleman from Texas had printed as a substitute for his own bill, but that committee print cannot be obtained in the document room. Therefore, the Members do not have access to it.

Mr. WORLEY. That is especially why the Members should have the benefit of that information, I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. If that is agreeable to the other Members who have special orders. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further for a suggestion?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. They are trying to make the gentleman believe that it is the Army that is wanting to make this change. With all deference to Colonel Cutler, he is a Boston lawyer and a graduate of Harvard, and probably has a different slant on holding elections from that of our people down in the fork of the creek.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so I may answer that one point?

Mr. VURSELL. Yes, briefly.

Mr. WORLEY. As the gentleman from Illinois knows, there have been two members, one from the Navy Department and one from the War Department. The gentleman representing the Navy Department has just come from about 8 or 10 months in the Pacific area and was in four major scraps, if that will give any comfort to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Soldiers and sailors have come to our offices who have been all over the world. Practically every one of them said that this Worley-Lucas bill ought not to pass, that if we did anything we ought to pass the Rankin-Eastland substitute, to leave this election machinery in the hands of the States.

Mr. WORLEY. I think the gentleman is slightly prejudiced.

Mr. VURSELL. I cannot yield further, Mr. Speaker.

In fairness to officers of the Army and Navy, they express the belief that it will be very difficult to handle the transportation on account of the time limit.

Let us admit, for the sake of argument, that due to bad flying weather, which could happen and in some instances may happen, that on the farthest reaches some of the men in our services may not get their ballots returned in time to be counted. Would it not be better to give those we can reach the whole ballot and a real chance to vote? I submit that it would.

Unfortunately, one of the proponents of the bill from my State is quoted in the press last week as stating in an interview he gave out "that the Republicans were not in favor of the soldiers voting and were trying to defeat the bill." That statement may indicate he is trying to use it as a political vehicle for his reelection even before it has been voted upon. In this enlightened age such charges will not pump any new life into his fast failing political fortunes in Illinois.

The very opposite is the case. Speaking for myself, and I believe for all of the Members on both sides of the aisle, I am anxious for all the soldiers to vote.

He doubtless wants the friends and relatives of the soldiers to believe that he is more anxious than some of us to give the soldiers a right to vote. He does not tell them that his plan does not give the soldiers a real ballot. He does not tell them that the blank ballot form he wants to send them does not have the name of a candidate on it.

And in this connection may I point out that three Democrats have joined in another place in introducing as a substitute to the Lucas-Green bill an amendment almost identical to the joint resolution we will recommend to this body. I am informed many able Members on both sides of that body are supporting it. This refutes the charge and proves our position is clearly nonpartisan.

No, the Republicans and Democrats who oppose this bill are not doing it to prevent the soldiers from voting. We are opposing it because we have sworn to uphold the Constitution and in an attempt to work out a plan that will give our men and women in the armed services a chance to vote a real ballot, the kind they want to vote and will appreciate.

Mr. Speaker, there is less glamor, less sentiment, and less political possibilities in this final thought I want to bring to this debate, but it is of transcending importance. It is this: Let us not overlook our responsibility to the 120,000,000 people here at home. It is our duty to preserve for them an orderly, legal election so that when the votes are cast in November 1944, and counted, we will know then who is elected and will not have to run the risk possibly of the election being thrown into the Supreme Court or into the Congress, with months of delay which would bring chaos to the entire Nation. The soldiers who are fighting for this Nation would be the last ones to want us to take a chance on such a situation.

This election naturally will be decided by the great majority of the voters who yet remain on the home front. It is my opinion that aside from the question of the constitutionality of the Lucas-Green-Worley bill that the people of the Nation will not approve the extension of the

Federal Government into this election by setting up a new bureaucratic Federal ballot control commission, overriding our present election laws of the various States.

House Joint Resolution 190

Joint resolution to facilitate absentee voting, under the laws of the several States, by members of the armed forces of the United States in time of war

Resolved, etc., That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring, and recommends to the several States the enactment of, appropriate legislation to enable each person absent from the place of his residence and serving in the armed forces of the United States, who is eligible to vote in any election district or precinct, to vote by absentee ballot in any general election held in his election district or precinct in time of war.

SEC. 2. It is further suggested and recommended, so as to facilitate such absentee voting by members of the armed forces—

(a) That the several States, in order to avoid expense, duplication of effort, and loss of time, honor applications for absentee ballots by absent voters in the armed forces made by the use of post cards printed pursuant to section 3 of the act of September 16, 1942 (Public, No. 712, 77th Cong.), of which some 11,000,000 have been prepared and are available for such purpose, notwithstanding that such cards refer to the ballot being applied for as an "official war ballot."

(b) That the secretary of state of each of the several States, upon receipt of any such post cards, promptly forward it to the proper county, city, or other election official or officials in order that the request for an absentee ballot may be acted upon as expeditiously as possible.

(c) That the several States cooperate to the end that county, city, or other election officials be authorized and instructed, upon receipt of an application made upon such a card, to mail promptly to the voter making the application, if legally permissible under the laws of the State, a suitable absentee ballot, including therewith a self-addressed envelope for the use of the voter in returning the ballot and any instructions to govern the use of such ballot and envelope.

(d) So that the envelope in which the ballot is sent to the voter, and the envelope supplied for the return of the ballot, may be identified by Post Office Department and other authorities as carrying an election ballot, that there be printed or stamped in a conspicuous place on each such envelope the words "Official election ballot." In the case of States in which no provision is made for sending with the absentee ballots a printed form to be used by a voter for the purpose of establishing his legal right to vote, that appropriate action be taken to have printed and enclosed with absentee ballots mailed in response to applications received on the post cards hereinbefore referred to, a form for the signature and oath or affirmation of the voter; and it is suggested that a form substantially as follows would be appropriate for such purpose:

OATH OF ELECTOR FOR VOTING IN THE GENERAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN 194__

I do hereby swear (or affirm) that:

(1) I am a citizen of the United States;

(2) The date of my birth was _____;

(3) For _____ years preceding this election my home residence has been in the State of _____;

(4) For _____ years preceding this election my home residence has been in the (city, town, or village, if any) of _____ in the county of _____ at (street and number, if any, or rural route) _____ _____;

(5) I am in the armed forces of the United States;

and that I have not voted and do not intend to vote in this election at any address other than the above; and that I have not received or offered, do not expect to receive, have not paid, offered or promised to pay, contribute, offered, or promised to contribute to another, to be paid or used, any money or other valuable thing as a compensation or reward for the giving of a vote at this election, and have not made any promise to influence the giving or withholding of any such vote; and that I have not been convicted of bribery or any infamous crime, or, if so convicted, that I have been pardoned or restored to all the rights of a citizen, without restriction as to the rights of suffrage.

_____

(Voter must write his usual signature here and oath must be administered and attested)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____, 194__.

_____

Commissioned, noncommissioned, or petty officer not below the rank of sergeant (or its equivalent) shall write his name here.

_____

Officer signing above shall print his rank or rating clearly here.

SEC. 3. (a) It shall, wherever practicable and compatible with military operations, be the duty of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make available to members of the armed forces, at appropriate times, the post cards referred to in section 2, and to cooperate with appropriate State officers and agencies in the distribution, execution and attestation, collection, and return of such absentee ballots, and envelopes to be used in connection therewith, as may be provided under the laws of the several States for the use of persons in the armed forces in time of war.

(b) Such ballots and envelopes, and communications in connection therewith, including post cards, shall be transmitted free of postage, including air-mail postage, in the United States mails, and shall, so far as practicable, be transmitted by air mail.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the information contained in the following letter will show the absolute fallacy of trying to make the Lucas-Worley bill fit into our State elections:

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Madison, November 24, 1943.

HON. MERLIN HULL,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HULL: Mr. Zimmerman asked me to write you a supplementary letter in answer to your question as to what changes are necessary in the Wisconsin statutes before the Federal war ballot law, S. 1285 or H. R. 3436, can be given effect in this State. You probably have in mind sections of our statutes as cited in (a), (b), and (c), below.

(a) Section 6.25 (1), under which the county clerk is to print and distribute all ballots for county-wide use at Presidential, State, congressional, legislative, and county elections.

Under subsection (2) of this section, ballots not provided by county clerks are not to be cast or counted in any election.

(b) Section 6.41, under which ballots voted in person and not endorsed by ballot clerks or by the issuing town, city, village, or county clerk, when voted by mail, are void, and the penalty of $250, or 1 year in the county jail, is enforceable upon all election officials who receive and vote them.

(c) Section 11.62 forbids any absent voter's ballot, not endorsed by the issuing town, city, village or county clerk, to be accepted and counted at the polls, under penalty of $100 in fine or 30 days in the county jail.

It would seem, therefore, that the war ballots if printed and distributed by the Army and Navy or by a Federal election commission, as provided in bill S. 1285, would be null and void in Wisconsin, though millions of dollars in tax money were spent in printing, distributing, and transporting them to the polls.

This bill, we understand, after a hearing, has now been returned to the Senate committee for a thorough overhauling.

Will it not, therefore, be wise at this point to pause and inquire through the highest legal or judicial sources as to the jurisdiction of Congress over:

1. The qualifications of electors;

2. The right of Congress to take over and conduct State elections in distant places of the earth;

3. The right of Congress to repeal State registration, as a convenient form of evidence of domicile in a particular municipality, as to members of the armed forces and at the same time to leave registration in force as to all other electors voting for Federal offices?

It appears to have been settled as early as 1874 and 1875 that the right to vote comes from the State and protection as to opportunity and equality in voting comes from the Nation. (*Minor* v. *Happersett* (1874), 21 Wall. 162; *United States* v. *Cruikshank* (1875), 92 U. S. 545 (556), cited by Norton's Constitution of the United States, p. 276.)

If you have other questions in mind which we have not answered, this department will be pleased to hear from you.

Very truly yours,
FRED R. ZIMMERMAN,
Secretary of State.
By GEO. BROWN,
Division of Records and Elections.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a copy of the committee print of the bill H. R. 3436.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The committee print of the bill is as follows:

A bill to provide a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the armed forces absent from the place of their residence

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I

SPECIAL METHOD OF VOTING IN TIME OF WAR

UNITED STATES WAR BALLOT COMMISSION

SEC. 101. (a) There is established a United States War Ballot Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Commission), which shall be composed of four Commissioners, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to serve a term which shall not exceed the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter. Two Commissioners shall be members of the political party casting the largest popular vote, and two Commissioners shall be members of the political party casting the second largest popular vote, for Presidential electors in the most recent Presidential election. No Commissioner shall hold or be a candidate for any elective public office. The Commission shall elect from among its members a chairman and a vice chairman. Each Commissioner so appointed shall receive as compensation $25 for each day in which he

is actually engaged in performing the duties of his office and shall also be reimbursed for any necessary expenses incurred in the performance of his duties. In the event of a tie vote in any matter before it, the Commission shall notify the President, and the President shall request the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court to designate an Associate Justice (other than a retired Justice) of such Court, or a circuit judge (other than a retired judge) of the United States, or a justice (other than a retired justice) of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, to serve on the Commission for purposes of disposition of such matter, and the justice or judge so designated shall have power to act as temporary chairman of the Commission, with power to cast the deciding vote.

(b) The Commission is authorized to appoint, without regard to the Civil Service Act, rules and regulations, an Executive Director, and such other officers, employees, or agents as may be necessary for the performance of its duties under this act. The Commission may receive assistance from other Federal departments and agencies in carrying out the purposes of this act. The Commission may delegate such of its powers or duties under this act as may be necessary to carry out the purposes thereof.

(c) It shall be the duty of the Commission, acting so far as practicable in consultation with representatives of the War and Navy Departments and the other agencies and officials charged with the performance of duties under this act, to formulate such plans, make such arrangements, and adopt such measures not inconsistent with the purposes of this act as it may deem appropriate to further the purposes of this act and facilitate its administration. The Commission is authorized to investigate any alleged neglect, misconduct, or irregularity in the administration of this act, except that when the Commission becomes cognizant of any alleged neglect, misconduct, or irregularity in the administration of this act on the part of persons serving in the armed forces, the Commission shall report to the Secretary of War or to the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, who shall make investigation and report thereon to the Commission. As soon as practicable after any election to which the provisions of this title apply, the Commission shall report to the Congress on the administration of the act, including the number of ballots received by the Commission and transmitted to the secretaries of state of the several States, the reports received by the Commission from the secretaries of state and any neglect, misconduct, or irregularity found pursuant to this section. Any Commissioner disagreeing as to the contents of the report may set forth his separate views.

VOTERS ELIGIBLE UNDER THIS TITLE

SEC. 102. (a) As used in this act—

(1) The term "members of the armed forces of the United States" means members of the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, the United States Marine Corps, the United States Coast Guard, or any of their respective components.

(2) The term "United States" used geographically includes only the territorial limits of the several States of the United States and the District of Columbia.

(b) In time of war, notwithstanding any provision of State law relating to the registration of qualified voters, every individual who is a member of the armed forces of the United States, and who is absent from the place of his voting residence but otherwise eligible to register and qualified to vote under the law of the State of his voting residence in any election for electors of President and Vice President of the United States, United States Senators, and Representatives in Congress, shall be entitled to vote for such officers in accordance with the provisions of this title.

PAYMENT OF POLL TAX NOT REQUIRED

SEC. 103. No member of the armed forces of the United States shall, in time of war, be required, as a condition of voting in any election for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, to pay any poll tax or other tax or make any other payment to any State or political subdivision thereof.

OFFICIAL FEDERAL WAR BALLOTS, ENVELOPES, AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR VOTING PROCEDURE

SEC. 104 (a) The commission shall cause to be prepared and printed for use in voting in general elections under this title an adequate number of official Federal war ballots. Each ballot shall be printed in the following form insofar as the officers enumerated are appropriate to the particular election:

OFFICIAL FEDERAL WAR BALLOT FOR USE IN GENERAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN 19__

Instructions: To vote, write in the name of the candidate of your choice for each office, or write in the name of his political party—Democratic, Republican, or other.

ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

(A vote for President includes a vote for Vice President of the same party)

Write in the name of your choice for President or the name of his party----------

UNITED STATES SENATOR

(Only if a Senator is to be elected in your State)

Write in the name of your choice for Senator or the name of his party ----------

REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FOR YOUR DISTRICT

Write in the name of your choice for Representative in Congress for your district or the name of his party----------

REPRESENTATIVE AT LARGE IN CONGRESS FOR YOUR STATE

(Only in the States entitled thereto)

(Vote for one or two, as the case may be)

Write in the name or names of your choice for Representative at Large or the name of his party ----------

A vote by party designation shall be deemed to be a vote for the candidate of that party by name. A vote for a Presidential candidate by name or by party shall be deemed to be a vote for the candidates for Presidential and Vice Presidential electors of his party. No ballot shall be invalid by reason of mistake or omission in writing in the name of the candidate or his political party where the candidate or party intended by the voter is plainly identifiable. Where, because of any defect in marking, a ballot is held invalid as to any particular candidate for office, it shall remain valid as to the other candidates for office.

(b) The commission shall also cause to be prepared and printed an appropriate number of official inner envelopes for use in enclosing and sealing the official Federal war ballots. Each such envelope shall be gummed ready for sealing. Upon one side of the envelope shall be printed:

OFFICIAL INNER ENVELOPE FOR OFFICIAL FEDERAL WAR BALLOT, FOR USE IN GENERAL ELECTION

Name of voter ----------
(Print your name plainly here)

Home residence:

Street and number (if any) or rural route ----------
(Print street and number or rural route plainly here)

City or town (if any) ----------
(Print city or town plainly here)

County ----------
(Print county plainly here)

Upon the other side of such envelope shall be printed the following oath at the top of which shall be set forth the date of the election:

OATH OF ELECTOR FOR VOTING IN THE GENERAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN 19__

I do hereby swear (or affirm) that:

(1) I am a citizen of the United States:

(2) The date of my birth was ----------

(3) For ------ years preceding this election my home residence has been in the State of ----------

(4) For ------ years preceding this election my home residence has been in the (city, town, or village, if any) of ----------
in the county of ----------
at (street and number, if any, or rural route) ----------

(5) I am in the armed forces of the United States; and that I have not voted and do not intend to vote in this election at any address other than the above; and that I have not received or offered, do not expect to receive, have not paid, offered or promised to pay, contributed, offered, or promised to contribute to another, to be paid or used, any money or other valuable thing as a compensation or reward for the giving of a vote at this election, and have not made any promise to influence the giving or withholding of any such vote; and that I have not been convicted of bribery or any infamous crime, or, if so convicted, that I have been pardoned or restored to all the rights of a citizen, without restriction as to the rights of suffrage.

(Voter must write his usual signature here and oath must be administered and attested.)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this ------ day of ----------, 194__.

(Commissioned, noncommissioned, or petty officer not below the rank of sergeant (or its equivalent) shall write his name here.)

(Officer signing above shall print his rank or rating clearly here.)

(c) The commission shall also cause to be prepared and printed an appropriate number of official outer envelopes for use in returning to the commission official Federal war ballots and official inner envelopes. Each such envelope shall be gummed ready for sealing. Upon such outer envelope the following shall be printed:

Free of all postage, including air mail (official Federal war ballot).

To the United States war ballot commission:

For transmission to the secretary of state of the State shown below:

Voter's home address:

Street and number (if any) or rural route----------
(Print clearly)

City or town (if any)----------
(Print clearly)

County ----------
(Print clearly)

State ----------
(Print clearly)

(d) Ballots and envelopes for use under this title shall be suitable for air mailing.

(e) The Commission shall also cause to be prepared and printed an adequate number of copies of instructions for voting procedure for use in accordance with the provisions of this title.

(f) Where the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy determines that the transmission abroad of any material required to be prepared and printed by the provisions of this section is inexpedient because of transportation difficulties or for other reasons arising from the conduct of the war, the Commission is authorized to arrange for such material to be printed outside the United States.

BALLOTING

SEC. 105. (a) Any person voting under the provisions of this title shall privately mark

the ballot, place it in the official inner envelope, and securely seal such envelope. He shall then fill in and subscribe the oath printed upon the official inner envelope. After the oath has been duly attested, the voter shall then place the official inner envelope in the official outer envelope, shall fill in and securely seal such outer envelope, and shall deliver it to a person designated by proper authority to receive executed ballots for transmission to the Commission.

(b) Any commissioned, noncommissioned, or petty officer not below the rank of sergeant (or its equivalent) in the armed forces of the United States is authorized to administer and attest such oaths as are required by this title. All such oaths shall constitute prima facie evidence that the voter is qualified to vote, unless the statements contained in such oath indicate the contrary.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 106. The Secretaries of War and Navy shall be responsible for the administration of this title with respect to members of the armed forces entitled to vote under this title.

TRANSMISSION OF FEDERAL BALLOTS, ENVELOPES, AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR VOTING PROCEDURE

SEC. 107. (a) In each year in which a general election for Senators and Representatives in Congress is to be held, the Commission shall furnish to the Secretaries of War and Navy, well in advance of the election, an adequate number of ballots, official inner envelopes, official outer envelopes, and instructions for voting procedure.

(b) The Secretaries of War and Navy shall, wherever practicable and compatible with military operations, transmit to the various units of the armed forces, in ample time to insure balloting under this title in such general election, an adequate number of ballots, official inner envelopes, official outer envelopes, and instructions for voting procedure, as furnished by the Commission.

LISTS OF CANDIDATES

SEC. 108. The secretary of state of each State shall furnish the Commission such information as the Commission shall request for compiling a list of candidates and their parties in any general election for President and Vice President or for Senators and Representatives in Congress. The Commission shall transmit to the Secretaries of War and Navy, at such times as it deems to be appropriate for balloting under this title, lists of candidates compiled from the information so received, even if incomplete. The Secretaries of War and Navy shall, in ample time for balloting under this title, transmit such lists to all units of the armed forces to the extent that such transmission is practicable and compatible with military operations. However, incomplete lists of candidates so furnished, or failure to furnish such lists, shall be no bar to balloting under the provisions of this title. No such list of candidates shall contain any information with respect to any candidate other than his name and address, his party affiliation, and the office for which he has been nominated.

DISTRIBUTION AND COLLECTION OF BALLOTS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

SEC. 109. (a) The Secretaries of War and Navy, insofar as practicable and to the fullest extent compatible with military operations, shall cause ballots, official inner envelopes, official outer envelopes, instructions for voting procedure, and lists of candidates to be distributed to members of the armed forces in ample time to insure an opportunity to vote in general elections under this title and shall cause executed ballots to be collected and transmitted to the Commission.

(b) Wherever practicable and compatible with military operations the appropriate commanding officer shall be required—

(1) To designate a balloting day for voting in general elections which shall be, wherever possible, after he has received a list of candidates from all States, but which shall not be later than the date which the Commission may fix for the area in which his command is located;

(2) To cause lists of candidates to be posted and otherwise made available at conspicuous and convenient places prior to and on the balloting day and to cause copies of instructions for voting procedure and all other necessary information to be furnished to members of his unit;

(3) On the designated day, to cause official Federal war ballots and officials envelopes t· be distributed, to provide a convenient place for marking such ballots in secret, and to cause executed ballots to be collected and delivered for transmission to the Commission;

(4) to assume general responsibility for assuring that every voter in his unit has an opportunity to vote; and

(5) to destroy, as soon as practicable after the balloting day, all official Federal war ballots in his custody remaining unused.

PRIORITIES

SEC. 110. The Secretaries of War and Navy shall take all steps necessary to give to the transmission and delivery of official Federal war ballots, official envelopes, instructions for voting procedure, and communications under this title priority over all unofficial communications and priority over official communications except where, in the judgment of the appropriate military and naval authorities, such priority would interfere with the effective prosecution of the war. Ballots cast outside the United States shall, wherever practicable to expedite their delivery, be transmitted by air.

TRANSMISSION

SEC. 111. (a) The Commission, upon receiving any ballot cast under this title, shall promptly transmit it to the secretary of state of the State of the voter's residence, who shall at an appropriate time transmit it to the appropriate election officials of the district, precinct, or county or other voting unit of the voter's residence. No person other than such appropriate election officials shall open any official outer or inner envelope purporting to contain a ballot cast under this title.

(b) In order to expedite the transmission of ballots cast outside the United States to the appropriate election officials, the Commission may establish such regional offices as may be necessary to receive such ballots, sort them out, and forward them to the appropriate secretaries of state.

REPORTS

SEC. 112. (a) The Secretaries of War and Navy shall report to the Commission on balloting under this title, including the number of ballots distributed, received, and transmitted to the Commission, together with any comments thereon or explanation thereof.

(b) The Commission shall prepare a statement of all ballots received and transmitted to the various secretaries of state. Each secretary of state shall prepare an account of all ballots received by him and transmitted to the various election officials, who shall prepare accounts of all such ballots received and of all such ballots counted, and return such accounts to the secretary of state. Within 30 days after the last day for counting absentee ballots in any election in which ballots are cast under the provisions of this title, each secretary of state shall report such accounts to the Commission, together with any comments or explanation thereof.

VALIDITY OF BALLOTS

SEC. 113. (a) Votes cast under the provisions of this title shall be canvassed, counted, and certified in each State by its proper canvassing boards in accordance with the laws of such State in the same manner, as nearly as may be practicable, as the votes cast within its borders are canvassed, counted, and certified.

(b) No executed official Federal war ballot shall be valid if—

(1) The voter has also voted in person or by absentee ballot in accordance with the procedure provided by State law; or

(2) The date of the oath of elector is later than the date of the holding of the election; or

(3) Such ballot is received by the appropriate election official of the district, precinct, county, or other voting unit of the State of the voter's residence later than the closing of the polls on the date of the holding of the election, except that any extension of time for the receipt of absentee ballots permitted by State laws shall apply to ballots cast under this title.

(c) All official ballot envelopes received by a secretary of state at a date or time too late for proper delivery, and all official ballot envelopes not delivered, to polling places or to the proper officials shall not be opened but shall be endorsed with the date on which they were received by such secretary and shall be retained by him until the time has expired for contesting the election, when they shall be destroyed under his supervision without examination.

(d) In certifying the appointment of the electors of President and Vice President under section 2 of the act of May 29, 1928 (U. S. C., title 3, sec. 7a), the executive of each State shall also certify that there has been substantial compliance by officials in such State with the provisions of this title. If the executive of the State does not make such certification, or if the United States War Ballot Commission certifies that there has not been substantial compliance by officials in such State with the provisions of this title, the Senate and House of Representatives, acting separately, shall concurrently decide whether the noncompliance so affected the appointment of electors in the State as to require such appointment to be treated as invalid.

VOTING SAFEGUARDS

SEC. 114. Every individual concerned with the administration of this title shall take all necessary steps to prevent fraud, to protect voters against coercion of any sort, and to safeguard the integrity and secrecy of ballots cast hereunder.

PENALTIES

SEC. 115. (a) Whoever willfully and without justification deprives any voter of any right or privilege provided for in this title, or interferes or attempts to interfere with the right of any person to vote, or to vote as he may choose, under the provisions of this title, or willfully refuses or fails to count any ballot validly cast under the provisions of this title, or whoever does or attempts to do any fraudulent act in connection with the casting of ballots under this title shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not make criminal any act done in good faith by a member of the armed forces of the United States in the exercise of his judgment as to what was practicable and compatible with military operations.

(b) All existing provisions of law prohibiting offenses against the elective franchise shall apply with respect to elections and voting pursuant to the provisions of this title.

APPROPRIATE STATE OFFICIALS

SEC. 116. Wherever, in any State, an official other than the secretary of state is the appropriate State official to carry out any function

vested in the secretary of state under this title, the term "secretary of state" shall mean such other official.

OFFICIALS AND AGENCIES TO ACT FOR SECRETARY OF STATE

SEC. 117. Each secretary of state may utilize the services of such State and local officials and agencies for such purposes and to such extent as he may deem appropriate in the exercise of his powers and duties under this title.

ACT TO BE LIBERALLY CONSTRUED

SEC. 118. No mere informality in the manner of carrying out or executing the provisions of this title shall invalidate any ballots cast under it or otherwise be permitted to defeat its purposes. The provisions of this title shall be construed liberally in order to effectuate its purposes, and substantial compliance with its requirements shall be deemed to be sufficient.

TITLE II

VOTING UNDER STATE LAW FOR STATE AS WELL AS FEDERAL OFFICERS

POST CARDS

SEC. 201. In order to afford an opportunity for members of the armed forces to vote for State officials and to utilize State absentee balloting procedures to the greatest extent possible, the Commission shall cause to be printed and delivered to the Secretaries of War and Navy an adequate number of post cards for use in accordance with the provisions of this title. The Secretaries of War and Navy shall, wherever practicable and compatible with military operations, cause such post cards to be made available, at appropriate times, upon request, to members of the armed forces located within the United States, and, where State procedures can be effectively employed, to members of the armed forces located in other places.

Upon one side of the post card shall be printed the following:

Secretary of state of _____.

Being in the armed forces of the United States, I hereby request an absentee ballot to vote in the coming _____ (primary, general, or special) election.

(1) I am a citizen of the United States.

(2) The date of my birth was _____.

(3) For _____ years preceding this election my home residence has been in the State of _____.

(4) For _____ years preceding this election my home residence has been in the (city, town, or village) of _____, in the county of _____, at (street and number, if any, or rural route) _____.

Please send the ballot to me at the following address:

_____.

_____
(Print your name clearly above)

_____
(Write your usual signature above)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____, 194__.

_____
(Commissioned officer writes here his name and rank)

Upon the other side of the post card shall be printed the following:

Free of postage, including air mail (war ballot).

Secretary of state of _____,

_____,
(City)

_____.
(State)

FUNCTION OF POST CARDS

SEC. 202. Such post cards may be used, if State law permits, as applications for ballots under State absentee balloting laws, as application for registration under State absentee balloting laws, or as sources of information to implement State absentee balloting laws. No voter shall be precluded from voting under the provisions of title I of this act by reason of any post-card application made under this title, unless such voter casts an absentee ballot.

INFORMATION REGARDING ELECTIONS

SEC. 203. The Commission shall, at appropriate times, furnish the Secretaries of War and Navy with any information received from a secretary of state as to the dates of elections in such State, including general, special, and primary elections. The Secretaries of War and Navy shall cause, wherever practicable and compatible with military operations, such information to be made available to members of the armed forces.

TITLE III

MISCELLANEOUS

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 301. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

TRANSMISSION FREE OF POSTAGE

SEC. 302. The transmission of all communications under titles I and II of this act shall be free of postage, including air-mail postage, in the United States mails.

VOTING UNDER STATE LAW PERMITTED

SEC. 303. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to restrict the right of any member of the armed forces of the United States to vote in accordance with the law of the State of his residence, if he does not elect to vote in accordance with the provisions of title I of this act.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 304. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provision to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

REPEAL OF ACT OF SEPTEMBER 16, 1942

SEC. 305. The act entitled "An act to provide for a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence," approved September 16, 1942 (Public Law 712, Seventy-seventh Congress), is hereby repealed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. MAAS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] over the radio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter received from Gen. Frank T. Hines, Veterans' Administrator, with certain enclosures.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McLEAN] is recognized for 40 minutes.

TAXATION

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Morgenthau appeared before the Finance Committee of the Senate this morning and advocated the same tax program as he did before the House Ways and Means Committee several weeks ago. The program had the full and deliberate consideration of the Committee on Ways and Means, which was unable to justify it and, instead, reported the measure passed by the House last Wednesday.

The attitude of the Secretary would indicate that the administration is not going to be satisfied with the recommendations of the Ways and Means Committee and the action of the House, and, what is more important, this difference of opinion would indicate that we still have a tax problem. That problem goes beyond thoughts of the amount of money that should be raised and involves matters which ought to have the thoughtful consideration of Congress.

The remarks made on Wednesday during the debate were directed more particularly to the provisions of the measure before us. My purpose today is to supplement the thoughts expressed at that time with some general observations as to the effect of increased Federal taxes.

REVOLUTION BY TAXATION

It is apparent that a revolution is occurring in Federal taxation. This revolution carries with it, unfortunately, the clear implication of a vast social revolution, unless recent trends are checked. After World War No. 1, Federal taxes declined from a peak of $6,700,000,000 in the fiscal year of 1920 and were continued during the 1920's at a level of $4,000,000,000. When, in 1938, tax receipts again ran close to $6,000,000,000, the country thought it was paying very heavy taxes. In the fiscal year of 1939, Federal taxes amounted to $5,200,000,000. During the fiscal year 1944 they may rise to $45,000,000,000. Now the Treasury has proposed to saddle the taxpayers with $10,500,000,000 in new taxes as a modest reminder that we are engaged in World War No. 2.

Of course, taxes may be reduced after the war. But, to maintain the military and civil expenditures which now loom up as necessary in the years following the war, it may be imperative to raise $20,000,000,000 or more annually in taxes for many years. Our tax payments after this war may be four or five times our tax payments before the war, and to our Federal tax payments we must add payments of $10,000,000,000 or more in taxes to our State and local governments. The revolution by taxation threatens the existence of our free enterprise system of business, the existence of our middle class, and the existence of our States.

TAXATION AND FREE ENTERPRISE

First, consider the tax threat to our enterprise system. Under our free-enterprise system, the owners and managers of

business undertakings have supplied the capital and managerial ability to conduct business efficiently, producing vast quantities of goods and services for the customers who have been eager to satisfy their wants for automobiles, radios, telephones, and a myriad variety of articles. Those who assumed the risks of promoting new inventions and producing these and staple articles, who ventured their capital and their abilities, knew that if they were successful in supplying the consumers they would reap economic rewards. The system provided incentives to work and save, to produce at ever lower costs, and to assume all the risks entailed in business. In producing for the consumer, work was provided for the masses so that they would earn the higher incomes they wanted in order to purchase the expanding stream of goods and services flowing into the markets.

The system of free enterprise did not always operate perfectly and the reformers sought to destroy it and to establish in its place a Government-controlled economy. No doubt Government must cooperate with business, must at times regulate and aid it, if business is to function most effectively for the whole society. But when Government supplants private business, the incentives to thrift and work, to saving and risk taking, to efficiency and low costs, are weakened. Government control of industry need not come directly by outright condemnation and purchase. It may come indirectly through confiscatory taxation and a multitude of stringent regulations which deaden the spirit of free enterprise and drain off its resources.

Our corporate taxes are now imposed at terrific rates. The normal and surtaxes are graduated up to 40 percent and the excess-profits tax may rise to 90 percent, except as it is reduced by the inadequate 10-percent credit for debt payment and post-war needs. These taxes together may take as much as 80 percent of a corporation's income and remove virtually all incentive to assume the added risk of new and greater production. Now the Treasury would go further and increase the combined normal and surtax to a maximum of 50 percent.

What would the effects of this drastic step be? Contrary to popular opinions, corporations have not enjoyed large profits after their taxes have been paid, they have not been paying out great dividends, and they have not been piling up huge surpluses. Our corporations urgently need funds for conversion to post-war production. They urgently need funds to provide the equipment and materials required to meet the accumulating reservoir of consumer demand which will break in a flood of buying after the war.

But the tax rates have been so high that corporations have been unable to save the funds they will need after the war. Everywhere business enterprises are seriously concerned over the inadequacy of funds for financing their post-war requirements. The universal demand everywhere in the world of business for deductions from taxation to permit the laying away of funds is a convincing demonstration that corporate tax rates have passed the point of danger.

At the height of prosperity in the year 1929, Federal corporation taxes amounted to $1,181,000,000 and the profits remaining after taxes were $7,972,000,000. Dividend payments were $5,778,000,000.

In the year 1942, although corporate profits before taxes were $18,784,000,000 as compared with $9,153,000,000 in 1929, taxes had increased over 10 times and were $11,900,000,000. Profits after taxes were $6,884,000,000, or $1,088,000,000 less than in 1929. Dividend payments were $3,983,000,000, or $1,795,000,000 less than in 1929. These are all Department of Commerce figures. At this stage it is still uncertain if 1943 will not present an even less favorable picture for corporations than 1942.

In the period 1929 to 1942, while corporate profits after taxes and dividends were declining, wage and salary payments were increasing from $52,000,000,000 to $78,000,000,000. The net income of farmers has also been rising during the war and the workers and farmers have, in general, enjoyed real increases in their purchasing power. Meanwhile the owners of corporations were not enjoying larger profits and dividends, after taxes had taken their heavy toll, and their purchasing power has been declining.

Corporations have recently been saving out of their earnings about $3,000,000,000 annually, a relatively small sum when their post-war capital requirements and their increased risks are considered. Individuals have increased their savings phenomenally, however. They put aside nearly $27,000,000,000 in 1942 and may save $36,000,000,000 in 1943, according to the Department of Commerce.

Of course these are aggregate figures and they do not tell the story of particular corporations. But the general trend is clear. The take of Uncle Sam out of corporation earnings has multiplied from a little over $1,000,000,000 in 1929 to nearly $12,000,000,000 in 1942, and may rise to $14,000,000,000 or more in 1943. Two-thirds of total corporate earnings are now being taken in taxes and the Treasury wants still more.

The answer invariably given by the proponents of higher taxes to the suggestion that present taxes are already an oppressive weight on corporations is that the corporations, if they lack capital after the war, can obtain it from Government-regulated banks or from Government-regulated capital markets. The critics of free enterprise also say that corporations should not be allowed to plow back their earnings but should be compelled to come to the Government or Government-controlled financial sources for funds.

Thus confiscatory taxation would be employed to choke the spirit of free enterprise and remove the cheapest and most accessible source of funds. Thus by taxation the Government would become the virtual owner of business and industry. Thus by taxation state socialism or fascism would be inaugurated.

THE THREAT TO THE MIDDLE CLASS

I have spoken of the threat of crushing taxation to private enterprise, which we have long regarded a typical American institution. Another democratic institution, the great middle class of skilled and white-collar workers, of small enterprisers and professional people, of prosperous farmers and others with moderate incomes, is now threatened by the menace of regulatory taxation which would squeeze out of existence those with incomes above $2,500.

At first our tax policies were directed against those with incomes above $1,000,000. Then the $100,000 class was bludgeoned by taxation, and more recently the $25,000 group. Now we have the Treasury tax proposals to strike at those with incomes above $2,500 and to soften the load on those with lower incomes. This is class legislation pure and simple—an open bid for the votes of the masses with lower incomes. In time the attack will be directed toward the $2,000 class, and eventually, perhaps, the $1,500 incomes, until all families have equal shares of the national product.

Now I have no brief for soaking the poor with heavy taxes. They should be spared from excessive burdens. So should the great middle class, which has always been the stabilizing influence in American society. Our goal should be the raising of the incomes at the bottom until all of our families are in the middle class, rather than tearing down the middle class and lowering all family incomes to the poverty level.

The Treasury income-tax proposal would take little in higher taxes from family incomes below $2,500, and that would largely be refunded, or more than refunded, after the war. Disregarding the effects of the 12.5-percent tax rate increase arising this year from the enactment of the Current Tax Payment Act, a married man with two children would have left, after paying his income tax, the following, according to Treasury estimates:

A $2,000 net income, $1,919.
A $3,000 net income, $2,616.
A $5,000 net income, $3,837.
A $10,000 net income, $6,445.
A $25,000 net income, $11,250.

Of course, there would have to be paid the 12.5-percent rate increase due this year and next, which the Treasury has forgotten to mention, and any income taxes imposed by State and local governments.

I have recently read a very interesting article in the United States News of October 15, 1943. I commend that article to you. It shows how the middle class is being wiped out by Federal taxation.

It may not be possible in the future for the middle class to have insurance beyond the very modest pensions provided by the Government. It may not be possible to send the children to college. It may not be possible to leave a small estate for the dependent sur-

vivors. It may not be possible to contribute to churches and to charities, to hospitals and educational institutions.

Certainly, after the Federal Government has taken its taxes and the State and local government taxes are paid, those with income above $2,500 will have little enough left, and the Treasury would take a large part of that small residue.

Of course, if you look to an era when all individuals will be working for the Government, and will depend upon the Government for their care in sickness, old-age, and death, you will not be concerned over the survival of the great middle class. But if you hold faith in American democracy, you will not want to destroy that large group which, neither rich nor poor, has provided our democracy with leaders in the past and has contributed so much to its cultural and religious life—to its system of free enterprise.

I ask you to avoid the liquidation of the middle class by taxation. The fixed incomes are being hard hit by rising living costs and by taxes which are now oppressively heavy. It would be fatal to American democracy to undermine the middle class further by confiscatory taxation, which would leave us a race of peasants and factory workers.

CAN OUR STATES SURVIVE?

Finally, I mention the threat to our States in the recent taxing and spending trends of the Federal Government. By our vast expansion of Federal taxation we are depriving the States of their vital revenue sources. We have invaded the inheritance, gasoline, and income-tax fields, and we might as well invade the retail sales-tax field directly as by the indirect method of excise taxes. We used to think that property taxation was safely preserved for the State and local governments, but now we have a Federal use tax on automobile and motorboats which is, in effect, a tax on a certain kind of property. We have learned from the levy of the Federal estate, gift, and use taxes that we can, in the disguise of an excise, tax property by taxing its transfer or its use. In Congress there have also been proposals to place an excise upon intangible property. What is left for the State and local governments?

With Federal taxes taking forty or forty-five billion dollars from income of individuals and corporations, consumption, and other sources, it is very difficult for the State and local governments to maintain their revenues. After the war, when Federal taxes may amount to twenty or twenty-five billion dollars annually, the pressure upon these governments to lower their taxes will be tremendous.

How can these governments survive without independent revenue sources? Many view the situation with no alarm. They would centralize all taxes at Washington and share the proceeds with the States. Living on a dole, the States would, indeed, be political paupers which had been sold out to the Federal Government.

Federal grants to the State and local governments have increased tremendously. The centralizers are crying for new and bigger grants for education, health, highways, welfare, and many other services. Federal authority is growing apace and State authority is weakening. If we wish our States to survive, and I believe they are indispensable elements in American democracy, we must call a halt upon centralized taxation and spending.

CONCLUSION

I have spoken of three threats in the flood of Federal taxes to fundamental American institutions. If free enterprise, the middle class, and our States are to continue to exist, Federal taxes must soon recede and must certainly not rise higher.

If we want to introduce communism, I see no quicker and more effective way than confiscatory taxation which will wipe out our corporations, place a low ceiling on incomes, and bleed the States.

If this is what we are fighting for, our crusade for democracy is a sorry spectacle indeed. While our boys are crushing fascism abroad, we are inviting it at home. While they are fighting centralized authority in Germany and Japan, we are opening our doors to social revolution and a centralized dictatorship in America.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the 15 minutes allotted to me be transferred to the end of the day, after all other special orders, and that I may proceed at that time for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered by myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper clipping.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in three different particulars, and to include an article appearing in the Boston Globe; also a letter from the Touchdown Club of Washington, and a letter from the American Taxation Clinic.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

ELEVEN WEEKS OF DEMOCRATIC LETHARGY

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, we are now starting into the twelfth week of the sessions of the House of Representatives since we came back from our recess which ended on the 14th day of September. But the Democratic leadership of this House, in 11 long weeks, has only had 166 hours in which the House of Representatives has been in session, and less than one-third of that time was devoted to the consideration of matters brought to the floor of the House of Representatives by the Democratic leadership. It is no wonder, therefore, that we felt it necessary to organize our Drive-for-Action Committee, in an effort to compel the Democratic leadership to take off the brakes so Congress can act on the issues upon which the country is calling for action. You can look in the RECORD and find just exactly how much time we have spent in session. Here is the record:

The Fulbright resolution has been passed by this House. House joint resolution 159, which provides for the care of wives of enlisted men and some of their dependents. An amendment to the National Housing Act. House Concurrent Resolution No. 38. This was a good one, providing for additional copies of House Resolution 30 which authorized an investigation regarding the progress of the war.

Then we have passed H. R. 3381, relating to the Victory tax credits.

H. R. 5363, extending the time that applications might be made under the excess-profits tax, and renegotiation of contracts.

We repealed the Chinese Exclusion Act.

We passed a slight amendment to the Selective Training and Service Act.

We passed the deficiency appropriation bill.

We passed a resolution paying for the expenses of members of the Foreign Affairs Committee who are attending the United Nations Food and Relief Conference.

We passed a resolution extending the term of office of the President of the Philippines.

We passed H. R. 3356 increasing the compensation rates and pensions of disabled veterans and H. R. 3377 increasing veterans' pensions.

We passed the Commodity Credit legislation banning consumers' food subsidies and the tax bill. That is the complete record of so-called major legislation passed by this House in 11 weeks. That is all there is—there is not any more. It is no wonder, therefore, that the Democratic leadership, which is directly responsible for this sorry showing, becomes nettled and ill-tempered when it is challenged by our Drive-for-Action Committee.

We have just begun to fight. We shall continue to insist that the Democratic

majority, which exercises complete control over this Congress and its committees, take action to permit the duly elected Representatives of the people who sit in this House to pass upon all necessary remedial legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER] has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

INVESTIGATIONS BY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I was quite disturbed this morning when I picked up a copy of today's Washington Daily News and read an article entitled, "Effect May Hamstring Loyalty Inquiries. Civil Service Bans Check on Workers' Red Activities."

This is an article by the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance. This article is of such great importance at this time that I am going to take the time of the House to read it.

It reads as follows:

CIVIL SERVICE BANS CHECK ON WORKERS' RED ACTIVITIES—EFFECT MAY HAMSTRING LOYALTY INQUIRIES

United States civil-service investigators conducting "loyalty investigations" of Government employees and applicants for Federal jobs are now forbidden to ask them any general questions regarding their political philosophy or their belief in capitalism, it was learned here today.

Furthermore, an order issued November 3 by the Civil Service Commission specifically bans questions concerning activities in Communist unions or in any of the Communist-front organizations.

The order, which went out to some 800 investigators throughout the country, drastically curtails the procedure for determining whether Federal employees are Communists.

Its effect, according to some investigatory agencies here, will be to hamstring the investigators in their loyalty inquiries for the War and Navy Departments, the O. W. I., and all other branches of the Federal service.

LOCAL GROUP NAMED

The order specifically forbids inquiries about the Abraham Lincoln Brigade "or any other of the many Spanish relief groups," the Lawyers Guild, the League of Women Shoppers, and the Harry Bridges Defense Committee. Most of these are pro-Communist or Communist-controlled.

Instruction No. 4 says: "Do not ask any question about membership in the Washington Book Shop or any book shop in any city similar to the Washington Book Shop."

In a confidential memorandum issued last year to aid Federal department heads to determine the loyalty of their employees, the Attorney General included the Washington Book Shop among 12 organizations he found to be Communist-controlled.

WARNED OF DISCIPLINE

Order No. 6 forbids the Government investigator to ask any question of an applicant or jobholder which might show that his wife or husband, as the case may be, or the members of his family are Communists.

Order 12 forbids inquiring about the applicant's favorite reading matter "especially the Daily Worker and all radical and liberal publications."

The order concludes: "From time to time you will receive additional instructions as to what to do and what not to do in the course of investigation of loyalty cases. The foregoing instructions are to be rigidly observed and any deviation therefrom will be cause for disciplinary action."

The order was signed by L. A. Moyer, executive director and chief examiner for the Commission, and initialed by Alfred Klein, a Commission attorney.

BARRED FROM PAY ROLLS

Under the Hatch law, Communists as well as Nazis and Fascists are barred from the Federal pay rolls. But Communists scarcely ever admit they are such. Hence, the practice of Federal investigating bodies is to show an over-all picture of activity in Communist fronts.

One of the few ways in which Communists show their hand is by their leadership of Communist unions or Communist factions within unions. Instruction No. 1 of the Commission's order declares, however:

QUESTIONING RESTRICTED

"Under no circumstances should any question be asked of an applicant or a witness involving union membership, union associations, or union activities. Not only should the applicant not be asked about membership in a union but any question should be avoided which might elicit from the applicant or from a witness union membership or activities."

If "witnesses say that a certain person is a Communist because he has associated with certain persons in a union known or said to be Communists," order No. 2 says, the investigator should inquire no further into the subject.

"In other words," No. 2 concludes, "the question of unionism should not be brought up in any way in an investigation, either directly or indirectly."

Regarding Spanish relief groups in America, order 3 says: "The whole matter of the war in Spain should be scrupulously avoided by the investigator as having any bearing on pro-communism."

No. 15 says: "Do not ask general questions regarding the political philosophy of the applicant, such as whether he believes in capitalism or what his opinion is regarding certain events of a current or historical nature."

LIST NOT COMPLETE

In forbidding questions about the Harry Bridges Defense Committee, the Lawyers' Guild, and the League of Women Shoppers, the order includes two non-Communist groups—the Socialist Party and the American Civil Liberties Union. But order 14 points out, "This is not a complete list of organizations about which no questions should be asked. * * * If the investigator is in doubt, the best policy is not to ask the question."

Questions about color, race, creed, or religion and those "under the category of 'snooping'" are specifically banned also.

Spokesmen for the Commission today admitted the existence of the November 3 order but declined to make it public officially.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is there anything in any of those instructions which prohibits those investigators from asking whether or not an applicant belongs to the D. A. R., to the America First Committee, or the Veterans of Foreign Wars, or any other patriotic organization?

Mr. BUSBEY. The organizations to which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] refers are not listed in this article.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just wondered. Because of the investigations being carried on by some of the Government snoopers, it seems that if you belong to America First, or the D. A. R., or the Loyal Dames, or any of those organizations, you are condemned and deprived of a job. Did the gentleman find out anything about that?

Mr. BUSBEY. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his observation, and, in my opinion, it is particularly true in the Office of War Information.

I am a firm believer in free speech. I have never in my life tried to prevent anybody from voicing his opinions on any subject, regardless of what it might be. But the restrictions and regulations such as those issued by the Civil Service Commission under date of November 3, absolutely destroy the very purpose for which the Civil Service Commission was established. If we have this condition to contend with, how are we going to be able to find out whether a man is connected with the Nazi Party, the Fascist Party, or the Communist Party?

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Civil Service Committee of the House of Representatives should make a very exhaustive and extensive study and survey into this question and find out who was back of these instructions by the Civil Service Commission. Where did the pressure come from, and why were these instructions issued? Let us stop and think for a moment what the effect will be on the investigators in the field. First of all, with many of the best investigators of the Civil Service Commission in the armed forces of our country, they have had to recruit many investigators who are not schooled in investigating work.

The work load of the Civil Service Commission has been terrific. Some of these investigators have been very diligent in going through an investigation to find out a man's background and affiliations, then when they receive these instructions are going to say: "Oh, what the hell's the use anyway?" It will discourage these investigators in the field from ascertaining who are loyal, patriotic Americans, and who are the individuals on our pay roll who are against this constitutional republican form of government of ours.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman let me propound this question? Is it not equally true that in the laxity that may be in effect in obtaining investigators, if you get one who may be allied with the organizations we are excluding from interrogation here, that by his very knowledge, having been on the inside, he could fill the Civil Service Commission rolls with that type of individual?

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The Members will remember the trouble we went through during the past year trying to take three individuals off the Federal pay roll, men who were found guilty of subversive activities by the Kerr committee. This, to me, appears to be just another one of

the obstacles thrown in the way by the administration, of thorough investigation to find out who are the disloyal employees on the Federal pay roll. It is hard enough now to get them off; in fact, almost impossible. But if these instructions are allowed to remain, there will be no possible chance of ever getting a subversive off the pay roll.

These instructions, if allowed to stand, will be cause for great rejoicing among the Communists of this country, because it is exactly what they have been talking, hoping, and praying for, for a long, long time. I do not hesitate to say that the pay rolls of our Government now have hundreds of known Communists, or fellow travelers on there who should be removed, but who never will be eliminated if the investigators are not allowed to thoroughly investigate their loyalties.

We have a duty to the men and women in the armed services of this country. They are depending on the Congress of the United States to see to it, after the war is over and they return, that they have returned to the same constitutional republic we had when they left. If we do not do it, who will? I appreciate the fact that it is just as bad to go clear over to the right and be a reactionary as it is to go clear over to the left and be a Communist. Fortunately, however, our forefathers saw to it that this Constitution of ours was a golden mean between the two extremes. Let us keep it so, for if we permit things like this to go on we shall find this Government going to the left a great deal faster than it is even now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman know any way to stop this matter except by an act of Congress?

Mr. BUSBEY. I think, as I said, that the Civil Service Committee should make a thorough investigation and that some action should be taken, and taken now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But in view of the fact that our request that certain named men be stricken from the pay roll was disregarded, what good will an investigation do unless we pass a positive act, unless we pass legislation nullifying this or any similar order?

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The issue before the people of this country today is simply this: Are we going to let these long-haired New Deal bureaucrats continue on their road and make a completely collectivist, Marxist, regimented, totalitarian, dictatorship out of this country, or are we going to be red-blooded, patriotic Americans and continue to fight to restore constitutional representative government to the people of this country? That is the challenge that faces us here today.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What are we going to do with a particular situation like this, where we have legislation with reference to the three employees who have been mentioned, yet where a Cabinet member takes the position in advance of the case ever being submitted to a court, that the act we passed was unconstitutional, therefore he is not bound in any way to pay any attention to the act of Congress and proceeds to tell these people to stay on the pay roll, as in the case of a certain gentleman who now occupies a certain position in the Virgin Islands at the present time operating under the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes?

Mr. BUSBEY. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that the only thing we can do is to bring these matters to the attention of the people of the country and then pray to God they may remedy it next year.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It seems to me we can go a little further than that: We can cut that department off from access to any funds. If they then wanted to keep those three individuals at the expense of everyone else that would be their responsibility. It is our business to appropriate money. If they do not spend it the way we direct that it be spent then let us not give them any more.

Mr. BUSBEY. The Civil Service Commission is the only investigating agency we can get any information from regarding the loyalty of Government employees. Reports of the F. B. I., G-2 of the Army, and of the Office of Naval Intelligence are not made available to anyone.

So if these gag instructions are allowed to stand, we will not be able to get any information from a single Government agency regarding these subversives, and we will never have a chance of exposing them to the people of this country in their nefarious activities. I hope the Civil Service Committee will take immediate action to correct this situation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after all other special orders heretofore entered have been disposed of, I may have the privilege of addressing the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know how many special orders there are for tomorrow but there are quite a few. The Democrats want to have a caucus on the adjournment of the House tomorrow.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, if I may, I will change that request to Wednesday to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]?

There was no objection?

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, by this time we are all aware of the fiasco known as the Canol project in northern Canada where the United States Government has spent in excess of $100,000,000 for the purpose of developing a field of questionable possibilities, and which has proven to be definitely a very costly and unsatisfactory venture. There are other implications, which have nothing to do with the oil situation, but which are important and one is the attempt by friends of Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell to place the blame on some subordinates, but I think the record will definitely prove that no oil man of any creditability has recommended this field to General Somervell. So, therefore, the blame should definitely rest upon the man in charge of this Department, General Somervell.

Rather than have this a fault-finding episode, it is my recommendation that we salvage from this great mistake as much as possible and turn our efforts toward something constructive, the development in American territory of an oil reserve which leading oil experts recognize has a far better geologic setting than an untested oil area either in Alaska or on the North American continent. This fact was known before the Army's venture in Canol.

Now, let us briefly review what has been said on this floor, and what information has been brought out concerning this oil reserve, and also what correspondence has been transacted between myself and the Navy. On February 26, I made my maiden speech by asking the Navy Department what it was doing about the naval oil reserve in northwestern Alaska. I called attention to the fact that Japan knew about this because she had flown in an emissary of good will to Nome, which is only 400 miles from this reserve, back in 1939. I also included a report made for this specific purpose by W. T. Foran, a geologic engineer with adequate experience.

Mr. Foran, following his 2 years spent in study of the naval oil reserve in northwestern Alaska spent the next 12 years in the employ of the foreign staff of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey as an oil geologist and explorer. Most of this was spent in the Argentine and Bolivia. The following 4½ years, he spent in the Middle East in the employ of both the Standard Oil and Shell. I am merely mentioning this to show his capabilities and background, which place him in a position to give counsel and advice as to the potentialities and possibilities of this oil area comprising the Alaskan Naval Reserve.

In this report, Mr. Foran points out the fact that the climatic conditions compare with Montana and Alberta oil producing regions; that this Alaskan reserve is not situated in a region of past or present glaciation. He also points out how equipment can be flown in or taken in by marine transportation. He also gives the geological details.

On April 8, I wrote the Navy inquiring as to what is being done toward the development of this naval reserve, and received a letter from them on April 12. I wish to quote the following paragraph from this letter:

> The matter of the possible use of the Alaskan reserve has been considered seriously for the past several years by the Navy Department and is now being investigated by the Army and Navy Petroleum Board on which Brig. Gen. Walter Pyron represents the Army and Capt. A. F. Carter represents the Navy.

The Navy also went on to state that Mr. Coghill, of the Bureau of the Budget, had visited California, and had contacted Mr. Foran. In this letter, they included a statement of the entire prospective oil areas of Alaska and adjacent regions. I included that statement in the RECORD when I addressed the House on October 11 on the Canol oil project, at which time I was the first one to officially call attention to this Canol episode. Here is a significant point: this report was handed to Mr. Coghill during March of this year, and Mr. Foran at this time made this statement about the Canol project, which is technically known as the Fort Norman area.

> 1. The entire production of the Fort Norman area does not exceed at capacity 3,000 barrels of oil a day. This volume is from a system of some 20 wells located in an area well over 500 miles from tidewater. Normally production of such volume is considered of minor importance and, except under stress of great necessity, would never warrant the construction of a 500-mile pipe line over extremely mountainous terrain.

Remember, this statement in itself should have caused some questioning by Mr. Coghill, of the Bureau of the Budget, because I am quite sure testimony will bear out that no competent oil man of experience has recommended this Canol project.

Now, this much can be said in defense of the Army and that is that the Canol was the only developed area in existence at the time; however, it was only producing 300 barrels a day and had been operating over 20 years. It must also be borne in mind that conditions have changed in this war. Now the Army finds it necessary to use as much, if not more, oil than the Navy, and will do so in future wars. Heretofore, the Navy has been the chief user of oil, and as a result it was always given the advantage of any oil reserve discoveries. At this time, I think the Navy is responsible because it has not developed the Alaskan field, and it knows that the Army has been spending money in territory which did not compare with the territory held by the Navy.

This is a war of the United States and not of the Army or of the Navy, and it is high time that the Army and the Navy cooperate rather than do as they have in the past. The point that I want to bring out is this, that the Navy, which at the present time possesses the cream of American oil industry in its personnel known as the Seabees, could do a most efficient job of testing and developing this oil reserve. As a real test of cooperation, the Army should turn over immediately to the Navy any excessive wildcatting equipment which it now has available in the Canol area to be used in the testing and development of the Alaskan naval reserve. Legislation can easily be accomplished to allow this transfer.

If the Navy does not choose to test and develop this reserve immediately, let it say so, and then legislation should be introduced to declare this a military reserve where either the Army or the Navy can cooperate in this development. Let us quit these Pearl Harbor tactics of noncooperation between Army and Navy. I am sure the Army will be glad to redeem itself by testing and developing this area if the Navy wants to continue its dilatory tactics.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman recommend that the equipment at Canol be transferred from the Army to the Navy to develop some naval reserve in Alaska?

Mr. POULSON. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. How about taking that same equipment and developing the naval reserve in Elk Hills? Does the gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. POULSON. The transportation back would be excessive. The distance between the Norman field and the Alaskan reserve is much shorter.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman knows, as a matter of fact, that under this so-called contract between the Standard Oil Co. and the Navy, the Navy and the Government of the United States are not to get a drop of oil nor a nickel out of the Standard Oil Co. for 5 years, or until the end of the war?

Mr. POULSON. Of course, that is another problem by itself. I am not disputing the facts, however.

Mr. WHITE. If the Navy cannot develop its own oil in the United States, what does the gentleman expect it to do in Alaska?

Mr. POULSON. It has the best engineers at the present time in the Seabees, taken from the oil industry, and it has the personnel to do it.

Mr. WHITE. Why is it not logical for the Navy to go into Elk Hills and pump its own oil?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I say to the gentleman from Idaho that the Naval Affairs Committee is now holding a series of hearings on the matter of the Elk Hills reserve. I have no doubt, I may say to the gentleman from California, that the committee and the Navy Department are going to decide all points in dispute in favor of the conservation of the Elk Hills reserve. If the gentleman will permit me further, I may say that the Navy is in process also of attempting to find out just what we have in the so-called Point Barrow reserve—the Alaskan reserve—not for the purpose of developing it, because, as yet, we do not need it. The time may come when we will need it, but we are going to keep it for the Navy. I do not think there will be any dispute as to whether the Army or Navy shall have it. We are going to keep it for the military use of the American people. In my opinion, the gentleman's point on the other project is well taken.

I am glad the gentleman suggested that we might take some of that equipment over to Point Barrow because it will help what we have up there. We have about 25,000 square miles and in some cases oil is seeping out of the ground, but it belongs to the people of this country and it is going to stay there as long as we gentlemen are here in Congress. We are going to keep it that way.

That Canol project was probably ill-advised. The Army did a lot of things. The gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from Oregon and myself thought they were ill-advised when they selected the route of the Alaska Highway up in that area, but they just went ahead without consulting anybody. The suggestion of the gentleman from California may be the answer to this thing—take it over there to Alaska, our own Territory, and see what we have up there. In the meantime we are going to keep it all as a reserve.

Mr. POULSON. I thank the gentleman from Washington. I definitely want to bring out that we shall keep it for the people of the country.

Mr. WHITE. May I ask the gentleman from Washington this question: If the Committee on Naval Affairs is dealing with it, why does it come to the Public Lands Committee of this House that has jurisdiction over that matter?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Public Lands Committee made an exhaustive study of this matter, and a very able study. The Committee on Naval Affairs has the transcript of the record over there and we are relying on it a great deal in determining this question. It is an exhaustive study. They went into that matter fully.

Mr. WHITE. This naval oil reserve was reserved for an emergency for the Navy. If we are not in an emergency now in fighting a global war, how long will it be before we will be in an emergency?

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I think the gentleman from California is to be commended for his suggestion. If we are going to engage in any oil development in the Northwest at this time, it ought to be at the point nearest its potential military use—that would be in Alaska if possible.

The only justification for any oil development by either the Army or Navy at this time would be to make available any reserves that we may have for the military needs of the time. Certainly there is no justification for going out to develop a new oil field for the fun of it or as a general development proposition.

Mr. POULSON. I may answer that by stating that they are paying around $35 a ton for coal shipped from Colorado and Utah to the coast line and as high as $60 inland where they use it for mines and other activities up there.

Exorbitant price of fuel has retarded development of Alaska. I thank the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] who has very ably added to what should be done in the particular reserves.

Mr. CASE. Of course, the gentleman from California and every man who gives the matter any thought, as the gentleman has, will realize that the value of an oil development, either at Norman Wells or Point Barrow, or any other part of that northwest country, rests upon the location of the oil and its suitability for critical military uses. It is all very well to talk about the reserve at Elk Hills or some place else, but oil in any part of the Northwest country for use in that particular part of the world may be worth a great deal more than oil in Kansas, Florida, or California. A usable oil supply at Dutch Harbor or Salamaua or Salerno is worth more than one deep in the heart of Texas.

Mr. POULSON. The gentleman has brought out a very good point. In fact, with our global warfare today and aviation, it seems to me that it is very important that we have some reserves tested and developed and kept, of course, for the United States in territory such as Alaska, especially since it is the short air route to Asia.

Mr. CASE. As to the Canol project, if there were any justification for it, it would be that the military needs were such that we had to get gasoline and oil at a point that would be relatively safe from attack and somewhere near the possible theater of action. Even that would not excuse waste or excessive costs in the project. However, if the Point Barrow field offers a better opportunity of having a reserve on the ground where we do not have the problem of transport and the time involved in transport, the Point Barrow field ought not merely to be investigated but it ought to be brought to such a stage of development that it could be used if the military and naval authorities determine that we need a supply in Alaska. I hope the gentleman pursues his study of this possibility further and I am sure he will. He is doing a real service to the country.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to ask this question for my own personal information. Would the gentleman have had any objection to the Canadian project had it been obtained at reasonable cost?

Mr. POULSON. It is much easier to make a statement after you know what has happened than it would be before, but let us take into consideration the known facts at the time they went in there. All of the geological reports and the testimony of experts showed that Canol field was in extremely inaccessible territory, and that our reserves were in a territory which has never, past or present, been a glaciated territory. The highest point over which you would have to transport oil in pipe line in our territory would be 3,000 feet, whereas it would be 4,500 feet at the Norman Wells project or Canol. The temperature there during the winter is around 70° below zero. The project is in a territory where they had explored for oil and the most they had had was 300 barrels of oil. Further, it was in territory which was controlled by Imperial Oil Co. of Canada, and they and the Canadian Government were the ones who would really get the benefit out of it as far as monetary benefit is concerned. It is true we had to have oil, but there were many things to be taken into consideration which I think should have been given more consideration.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I submit my question in another way, and I think it will make it clearer? Does the gentleman have any objection to our obtaining petroleum or petroleum products from any other country on earth than the United States for the prosecution of this war as long as we obtain it at a reasonable price, in preference to using our own oil?

Mr. POULSON. I would be in favor of getting oil from other countries at a reasonable price, but this situation is not comparable to what the gentleman suggests.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understand.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman mentions a fair price. It is a matter of fact that after spending $130,000,000 to develop that field we must pay the Canadian Oil Company $1.65 a barrel for the oil. Is not that what the record discloses?

Mr. POULSON. I had heard more than that. The money we spend up there we do not get back in retaining any of the property or the rights. We still buy the oil.

Mr. WHITE. Would it not have been the logical thing, if we were going to develop that field, to have gone in and developed the ground and then own the oil we develop, rather than to develop the ground for a Canadian company, a foreign company, and pay $1.65 a barrel for the oil after we had spent all that money to develop it?

Mr. POULSON. I would think so.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand the gentleman's point is that if the Army had examined this matter more closely and consulted the able Secretary of the Interior, for instance, on the matter, or men who knew, they might not have gone ahead.

Mr. POULSON. That is right.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not believe it is all lost. We are going to need all the oil we can get. By intelligent action by the Congress and by the Army in admitting a mistake, if they have made a mistake, taken in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior, we might still have good use for the Norman Wells oil. Apparently they had some pretty good salesmen in the beginning, including one Vilhjalmur Stefansson, the Arctic explorer.

Mr. POULSON. Yes, evidently. In addition, what I wanted to bring out is that we should salvage this mistake as much as possible and not hold just a fault-finding episode but try to take that equipment and use it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is right. The oil is there and we will need the oil and Canada will need the oil.

Mr. POULSON. Whether it is the Army or the Navy, it all belongs to the United States.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman from Washington states that we could get some good from this $150,000,000 investment. I should like to know, when the Canadian company owns the oil and owns the land and owns the pipe line, how we are going to get anything out of it except taking off some second-hand equipment that we put in there.

Mr. POULSON. It is my understanding that there is some equipment they have not used yet which can be utilized.

Mr. WHITE. All we are going to salvage out of it is just some equipment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the gentleman from Idaho that after all when the spigot is turned on down at one end it may be very close to some of our military forces and be at a place where we can use it.

Mr. WHITE. I call the attention of the gentleman from Washington to the fact that instead of being a bung it is a spigot. It will make only a trickle. It would not charge one ship.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I should like to say in the first place that it certainly seems to me, as the gentleman himself and the gentleman from Idaho have indicated, that if a lot of money is going to be spent on oil development we ought first to acquire the basic oil rights in the name of the American people. But I wish the gentleman would explain, if he has not done so heretofore, as nearly as possible just what the terms of this contract are whereby the Canadian oil company, or the Imperial Oil Co. of Canada, I believe it is, which I understand is partially owned by Standard of New Jersey, gets ownership of this whole business under the terms of this contract. How does that work?

Mr. POULSON. I think that has been brought out on the floor, and the understanding is that all right and title to the equipment and the wells and everything will be retained by the Imperial Oil Co. and the Canadian Government after we have completed it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will they repay the United States in oil for the money the United States has expended? Is that the way it works?

Mr. POULSON. We were going to buy the oil. We have a right in the fact that we have the opportunity to purchase that oil. It is all rather involved.

Mr. WHITE. At $1.65 a barrel.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to know how the investment of the United States is supposed to be recouped, or is it supposed to be recouped under the terms of this contract?

Mr. POULSON. It will not be recouped.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course we own the pipe line, and the Norman oil fields are of no value unless they use the Government pipe line to get the oil out. That pipe line happens to be on Canadian territory. In order to say that we will not get any value out of it, we have to assume that the Canadian Government will say to us, "You have no interest in this pipe line at all." I do not assume that in any way. Canada has always been fair with us on many things, and I assume that Canada will be on this, and that we will own the pipe line, and also, there might be a great amount of oil there. It will be coming out over our pipe line anyway.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the close of business on Wednesday, and all other matters on the Speaker's desk, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix, and include an outline of a plan for the postwar period adopted by the National Council of the American Veterans Organization.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FOOD AND ITS HUMAN VALUE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there are three points that I want to bring out today. The first one is the importance of meat as a food. The second is the necessity of having our Government fulfill its obligations to the pork producers of this country. I think the Government should do this because it is only a just procedure for it to follow. Another is that if we do not, we are liable to see a very serious effect upon the future food production of our country. Number 3 is meat versus grain consumption by our people. I would hesitate when I first came here to stand up and discuss vitamins and calories and such complicated names. If I do mention A, B, C, and D, I don't want anyone to think that I have a New Deal alphabetical agency, but I call attention to the fact that the world food conference, U. N. R. R. A., that is meeting in Atlantic City, has publicly announced that they are going to furnish 2,000 calories per day to the people of the liberated countries after the war. In normal times in this country our nutritionists claim we need 2,600 calories per day. It may or may not make a difference whether a person is working or not. I wish to read at this time a few paragraphs from an article published by the Wisconsin Medical Society. We are supposed to need fifteen-hundredths of a pound of protein per day. The heading is "Meat, a body builder." I might say that one of the authors of this article is working very diligently on an experiment to try to show the relationship of vitamins and meat to infantile paralysis. The article is as follows:

MEAT, A BODY-BUILDER

(By H. A. Waisman, R. W. Bray, and Iva Mortimer, University of Wisconsin, Madison)

Meat analysis, meat production, and meat in the family food supply are all represented in this author group. Mr. Waisman handles the field of meat analysis, Mr. Bray is an authority on meat production problems, and Mrs. Mortimer is well acquainted with all the home economics angles in the use of meat in the diet.

As recently as 10 years ago, science was unable to prove that meat is a dietary necessity. As short a time ago as 1932 there was no evidence to deny that man could keep healthy on a plain vegetarian diet.

But things have happened swiftly in the last 10 years. Nicotinic acid, which appears in quantity only in meat, has been revealed as the key to the cure for pellagra. Riboflavin, thiamin, and other B-complex vitamins have showed up richly in meat. Studies of protein have made it clear that meat is one of the nutritionally complete protein foods.

And in all, the last decade has made the vegetarian diet as ridiculous as the whisky cure for snake bite. Good health demands a balanced diet, and a diet isn't balanced if it doesn't supply meat.

MEAT IS IMPORTANT FOR MANY REASONS

Why is meat so important? Principally, as mentioned before, because it supplies the B-complex vitamins, those accessory food substances which can hardly be obtained in proper variety and amounts from other types of food. As for vitamin A, liver is a good source, though other meat products are much weaker in this respect. Meat is important as a source of protein, energy, and minerals.

But it might be wise to study systematically the vitamins and other elements in meat.

In vitamins, first on the list is vitamin A. An average, reasonably active man needs 5,000 international units of this vitamin. Four ounces of liver ordinarily supply about 7,000 units. Other types of meat contain far less of this vitamin, but samples of liver may even run as high as 20,000 I. U. to a quarter of a pound, so liver is an easily adequate source. Kidneys are of some importance here, too, for a quarter of a pound supplies 743 I. U. of the first vitamin.

Meats are inadequate in supplying vitamin D. Liver is the only meat form which contains vitamin D in any appreciable amount, and the vitamin content in this respect is variable and therefore not to be depended upon.

Vitamin C, the antiscorbutic vitamin, appears in meats in small amounts. It shows up in the adrenal glands and in some other tissues, though fruits and most vegetables are still the best practical sources.

IN B-COMPLEX VITAMINS, MEAT LEADS

But in the B-complex vitamins, meat steps out in front.

Take thiamin for an example. Thiamin (vitamin B_1) is important for health of the nervous system, and has been publicized in recent months as the vitamin of whole grain foods. Four slices of whole-wheat bread contain 160 I. U. of thiamin, but the same size helping of pork loin contains over 500 units. Heart meat is also high, with about 225 units in a quarter pound, and kidneys are equally good. Poultry and beef supply about 50 units in a quarter-pound helping, and so may help to supply the 600 I. U. which a healthy, moderately active man needs each day.

Nicotinic acid was mentioned earlier as the food element which cures pellagra. It appears in substantial amounts in all kinds of lean meats, but liver leads the parade. A 100-gram serving of beef liver contains 17.5 milligrams of nicotinic acid.

Analyses of foods for the presence of nicotinic acid were originally carried on by experiments with dogs, for dogs must have the vitamin to prevent blacktongue, an animal manifestation of the pellagra symptoms. Later chemical analysis was used, and still later microbiological tests were employed. Every study verified the conclusion that meat, supplying nicotinic acid as it does, is necessary to the prevention of pellagra.

EAT LIVER FOR VITAMINS

Riboflavin, which started out to be vitamin G, later was named vitamin B_2, and then ended up with its present chemical name, is a growth-promoting and nerve-stabilizing vitamin. Liver is one of the very best sources of that substance, and lean meats of all kinds do their part in supplying riboflavin. A quarter pound of liver contains up to 3,350 micrograms of riboflavin, where an adult needs only 2,700 micrograms.

Kidney follows along with 2,050 micrograms in 100 grams (less than a quarter pound), and heart is next with almost 900 micrograms. Even lamb, which trails with about 320, is still substantially a good source, and poultry, which offers only about 150, can even be used profitably for riboflavin needs in menu planning.

For vitamin B_6, beef liver, ham, and veal are all important sources. For pantothenic acid, liver, kidney, heart, beef round, and ham all rank high in content. Exact values for biotin, another B-complex vitamin, are not yet completed, but kidney and liver are excellent sources. Liver, kidney, and lean beef and pork all supply adequate amounts of choline, the final member of the B-complex, which is important to normal functioning of the liver and kidneys in the human body. Vitamin K, which helps promote blood clotting and prevents hemorrhages, is found abundantly in liver, though it does not appear to any considerable extent in any other meats. It was in liver, in fact, that the presence of vitamin K was first recognized.

Meat is important in many other respects, but in supplying the B-complex family of vitamins the necessity of serving meat in the daily diet makes itself apparent.

PROTEINS

That roughly outlines the vitamin content of meats.

Now for a look at proteins. How important are they? The 1939 issue of the United States Department of Agriculture Yearbook puts it this way, "If there were any one 'secret of life,' protein might be considered to be at the heart of it, since protein is the essential stuff of which all living tissue is made."

Meat is one of the most prolific sources of protein and at the same time it is one of the best sources. Those two statements sound like a duplication. In actual fact they are not.

Proteins are made up of a number of essential amino acids. Some proteins supply all these necessary amino acids, while others offer only a few. Thus a food can supply a great amount of protein, but unless that protein is made up of the right constituents, the food is not a superior protein source.

Meat fills both needs. It supplies protein abundantly and it supplies the right form.

LIVER OFFERS PLENTY OF GOOD PROTEIN

Of meats liver is the best protein source and lean meats come next, followed by fowl and fish. General cuts of lamb and pork follow in line, then heart and kidneys, and then general cuts of beef.

All these are complete proteins. They are on a par with other complete proteins—cottage cheese, eggs, milk, and cheese. Peas and beans come into the picture as important sources of supplementary protein, but they do not supply all the essential amino acids which the body calls for.

Energy, measured in heat calories, is the next need of the body. Fat meat, of course, is one of the most productive sources of energy. But ordinary cuts of meat, too, supply relatively high energy requirements.

Here are the approximate caloric values offered by a 4-ounce helping of each of the following normal foods:

	Calories
Pork	300
Lean beef	170
Fish	135

Such energy foods as butter, of course, far surpass ordinary meat cuts in caloric value. But for the backbone of the body's energy supply, the staple part of the diet, meats are unequaled.

MINERALS COME IN MEATS

Meats are not exceptionally rich in calcium, milk and cheese being the best sources of that mineral. However, fish in particular and meats in general, supply a small amount of available calcium for better teeth and stronger bones.

For phosphorus in the diet, meats, fish, and poultry are at the head of the list, and for iron and copper they are again exceptionally high.

In the light of these figures, no room remains for dispute about the food value of meat. Where science could neither confirm nor deny, science now can assert that meat is one of the best foods that can go on the family dinner table.

THE RULES FOR MEAT COOKERY

There's no question, then, that meat is healthful. Now how about tastiness? Well, a thick, juicy, carefully cooked steak is one of the finest dishes ever planned, and the less expensive meat cuts can be just as tasty. What's more, they are as nutritious.

Two simple cooking rules insure good vitamin retention and good flavor in almost any kind of meat. The first: Cook all meats at low temperatures. If they are roasted, the temperature should be 300° to 350° F. If they are cooked on top of the stove, they should be simmered. The reason for the low temperature is that meats shrink and lose more of their juices under high heat. That destroys or drains off much of the thiamin, takes away a lot of the flavor, usually cooks the meat unevenly, and reduces the total number of servings a piece of meat will yield.

The second rule: Use dry heat only on tender cuts, and cook with moisture on the less tender pieces. Dry heat will not make meat more tender, though if you have a cut which needs no tenderizing it can be tastily prepared by broiling or roasting in an uncovered pan. But to make a cut of meat more tender, braise, stew, or simmer, either adding liquid or cooking in a closed dish to obtain moist heat.

In point of food value loss, roasting is the most costly cooking process. There is a 20 to 40 percent loss in thiamin and a somewhat smaller loss of riboflavin in roasting except under low temperatures, and even here there is a minor loss of thiamin. Thiamin is the only B-complex vitamin in great danger of destruction by high heats. Riboflavin is more stable, and nicotinic acid goes almost unaffected by high temperatures.

Meat is an easily digested food, and a good food for people of almost any age. There is no evidence that any of the meats produce difficulty of digestion, because experiments show that pork, beef, poultry, fish, veal, and lamb are all from 86 to 90 percent digested.

I also call attention at this time to the feed needed to produce 2,600 calories for human use. If anyone is particularly interested in this, he will get all of the details on page 44 of Bulletin 670.

The table is as follows:

	Unit	Milk cows	Hogs	Laying flocks	Chickens raised	Sheep and lambs	Beef cattle
Feed used to produce 2,600 calories human food—(1) of all feed including pasture	Feed unit	9.31	7.66	21.94	29.92	74.47	71.65
Feed used to produce 15 pounds of protein	Feed unit	4.76	11.58	7.05	7.50	38.73	28.68
Expressed in another way: Human food produced by 10 feed units of all feed except pasture:							
Calorie and protein index	----------	2.54	1.16	.99	.92	1.04	.56

The above facts prove (1) that the hog is the most efficient producer of calories; (2) the the hog is third in the efficient production of protein; (3) that the hog is second only to the dairy cow in producing calories and protein combined.

The fact I wish to point out from the above table is that, first, the hog is the most efficent producer of calories; second, the dairy cows is by far the most efficient producer of proteins and the most efficient producer when proteins and calories are combined; third, why ration pork when it is more efficiently produced than some nonrationed foods? fourth, why is it patriotic to eat chicken when it should be more patriotic to eat ham?

The O. P. A. never seemed to pay much attention to the scientific facts discovered by our agricultural colleges and experiment stations.

The time has come when we should approach these things from a factual standpoint. I would just like to know why a person is not just as patriotic if he has been eating ham and other pork products for the last 2 years as if he has been eating poultry. If I am wrong, I want to be corrected.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I would not ask the gentleman to yield to offer any explanation for the odd opinions of the O. P. A., but in measuring the relative merits of feed in relation to calories and protein produced, comparing hogs with beef cattle and dairy cattle, it seems to me if the gentleman points out more manpower is required to take care of dairy cows, he should also point out that less manpower is required to take care of beef cattle and that a full consideration of what is the most economic production of calories and proteins should take into consideration manpower and the natural character of the country in producing feed. Obviously there are many parts of the West where beef cattle can be produced where hogs cannot be produced, and obviously you can produce beef cattle with a great deal less manpower than you can produce hogs or dairy cattle.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. In answer to the gentleman from South Dakota I will say he anticipated me by a few minutes and he is absolutely correct. We must have a practical application in connection with these food-production facts. We want to be careful of any step we make in connection with what is happening now in relation to the hog business and the corn prices.

There has probably been a reason why a third of the pork of the Nation is produced in Iowa and Illinois. They have the facilities and they have the ability to go ahead and step up their pork production as they have so much in the last couple of years. We know there are hundreds of millions of pounds of beef being produced where you cannot raise chickens, or you cannot have dairy cows. We realize that. But we are getting to the point today where we must do two things: First, we must look at it in terms of the amount of feed we have; and, second, we must make the best use we can make of this feed.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. I thought I understood the gentleman to say in his remarks that a condition of rest or inactivity had something to do with the requirement based on 2,600 calories per day. Am I correct in that?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. ROWE. I would quote for the RECORD at this point from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 7, wherein there is quoted what purports to be a pamphlet issued by the Food and Nutrition Board

of the National Research Council, entitled, "Recommended Dietary Allowances." It says:

> According to these eminent authorities, the protein requirements of sedentary and very active men are identical. The caloric requirements differ, and the inference is that very active men require more sugar, starches, cereals, and fats.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am familiar with this statement.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman has been suggesting some questions, and seems to want some answers to them. I suggest that you submit those questions to Mr. Millard C. Faught, Detroit War Food Administration economist, who heads the "'Move Over Hawgs, You're Spilling the Swill' Club." I think he can answer all of those questions. He seems to be well informed. He is on the pay roll of the Federal Government. He surely must have the answers to all those technical questions.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. He may have the answers, but I want the real facts. I do not know the gentleman, but I will be very glad to write to him if I thought he could give the answers with reference to it. If you think he can tell why it takes points to buy pork but none to buy poultry, I will gladly write him.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I take it the gentleman is somewhat of the opinion, at least, that I have been forced to come to during the last few years; that is, that we cannot always depend upon the accuracy of the information received from the different bureaus of the country, and the representatives thereof. In other words, the information which comes to us frequently we have reason to know is colored in a way that does not reflect the truth.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will answer the gentleman by saying that I have received colored information but not very often. We should not be getting any colored information in regard to the pork situation. I fear we are.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman has made an excellent statement.

I would like to ask the gentleman this question: What are we going to come to in the hog situation when we have the condition that exists today. I am informed we have at least a flooding of the markets. In fact, I think they refer to it as a glutted market, very seriously affecting the immediate future situation, and the food situation of next year. If the gentleman will permit me, we have the further situation where we now have one of the departments going about and regulating protein feeds, which will not only affect hogs, but chickens and all of those things in the food situation. I know the gentleman has given a lot of thought to it. I wonder if he can help me in this situation.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is the serious situation. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] a few days ago told us how he tried this summer to ask them to anticipate what was going to happen. The thing that disturbs me about it is the lack of keeping faith with the men that are asked to produce. Someone in authority should assure or reassure the pork producers of America that they will receive the federally guaranteed price. I have in my hand a letter I received today. It comes from a man in my district connected with the Department of Agriculture program, a man who has spent a quarter of a century working with these subjects. He is not writing any political letter. He says:

> DEAR REID: There are many things developing this fall that I would like to see you about. One is the thousands of pigs that are being sold unfinished. Also about the fact that dairy prices have been frozen but feed prices are going sky high.

He also sent me a copy of a telegram giving them instructions as to how to make adjustments in hog-support prices.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may place this telegram in the RECORD at this point. It is so confusing.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The telegram referred to follows:

> WASHINGTON, *November 22, 1943.*
> *To All F. D. A. Regional Directors.*
> *To All Livestock and Meat Market News and Grading Offices.*
>
> If you are asked how requests are to be made for adjustments in hog support price from $1 under the ceiling, advise they should be directed to War Food Administrator, Washington, and full statement of facts on which appeal is made should be submitted, including the following:
>
> 1. Statement as to specific adjustment desired substantiated by (a) statement showing differential from Chicago by months for last 3 years for those months for which adjustment is requested; (b) statement as to whether current marketing situation differs from historical pattern and, if so, how.
>
> 2. Statement showing how fixed support price works hardship and interferes with the present marketing of hogs and how adjustment would correct situation.
>
> H. E. REED.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Can any Member here answer and tell what this is all about. It will need a follow-up for instructions.

I just wish that the War Food Administrator would explain in language an ordinary man could understand.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. What the gentleman has explained to us with reference to the decision of the U. N. R. R. A. on a 2,000-calorie minimum diet for the people of the occupied countries will in itself create a great demand for a food supply of exactly the caloric and other content the gentleman has showed us is in pork. The gentleman knows that ration points on pork are high, apparently with a view to restricting the sale of pork. The thing that disturbs me is the announcement by O. P. A. that in spite of the increased production there will be a 17-percent shrinkage in the amount available. What can we make out of this confused situation?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It reminds me of an employer who finds himself with too many hands; he begins to look them over to see which ones he can let go. I believe they are trying to do that now, especially with reference to the hog producer at this time. They have the pork and now they give the pork producer the rough treatment.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE] the other day called attention to irritating practices and abuse of power. I have been through the same thing. I have here a letter from which I will read just one sentence:

> You are hereby notified that unless you take immediate action to remedy this situation your permit will be suspended within 10 days.

They toss power like that around recklessly, power to put people out of business, toss it around like a basketball in a basketball game. I took the trouble to look up the qualifications of the individual who wrote this letter and found that he did go to high school for 3 years. The best job he ever had was one at $150 a month as a beverage investigator; but here he is up there in Wisconsin as an authority on war foods, writing letters such as this threatening to put people out of business within 10 days unless they do what he says. The Food Distribution Administrator tells me this man had no authority to send out any such letter. Orders like that should come out of Washington. They are tossing this power around most recklessly, and to pretty inexperienced operators when they do as they did in this instance.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it not their very purpose to create a scarcity? They want less of this, less of that, and less of the other. The gentleman has had a world of experience, practical experience. Does the gentleman believe for one moment that any organization could be so efficiently inefficient as this group down here?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Without a deliberate purpose back of it?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not like to question anyone's motives unless I am compelled to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What does the gentleman think they are up to? The gentleman has been telling "the heck" they have been raising. What does he think they are doing?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Their motives may be all right, but they have not followed a very desirable procedure at times.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman does not think they are so foolish as not to know what they are up to?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not know.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would like to know whether the gentleman is so gullible as to believe those fellows down there do not mean what they are doing nor intend the result that they are bringing about.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would not want to indict everyone under one blanket.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then does the gentleman think there is one of them down there who does not mean good?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I may say I do not have too much respect for the political agriculturists down there.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What does the gentleman mean?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Those with a political background but with no agricultural background. They never were inside of an agricultural college; they just get those jobs, and pretty responsible jobs, too. That is the reason why I have been wondering why the Appropriations Committee has been appropriating money for so many years to the agricultural colleges and experiment stations of the country, because the Government does not use the men in key positions after they graduate anyway.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Let us talk confidentially, as though there was not anyone here at all. These gentlemen here are not listening, just you and I, we will assume. Does the gentleman think that those folks down there are up to any good?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think most of them are; yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman mean some of them who do not hold office?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think a few of them are more interested in the political crop of 1944 than they are in the food crop of any year. This is not a blanket indictment, however.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There must be one or two good ones somewhere along the line, but, generally, does not the gentleman realize their purpose down there is to create a scarcity of everything so that everyone will have to go to the administration for their daily bread?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Well, I do not want to subscribe to that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am glad the gentleman has so much faith in humanity. He is charitable.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am glad the gentleman thinks I am. There is one more paragraph to show you how these lead pencil agriculturists get these things figured out for us:

> About 12 to 15 pounds of grain must be fed to livestock to produce enough meat and other livestock products to feed a man for a day, whereas 2 or 3 pounds of grain eaten daily will support a man for a day.

That shows you the avenue in which they are proceeding. If I had the time I could show you the influence that the World Food Congress had when held down here in Virginia. I spent a day with a gentleman who was a delegate down there, a fine man. I have just watched what he was telling me unfold here in this country since that time. It is a blueprint. I see it coming and in just exactly the same way he told me as to the things we ought to do. We are eating too much meat, we are eating too much dairy products, we could and should eat more fresh vegetables. He told me we should use more vegetables, more grains for human food here in this country. I asked him why canned goods were not as good as fresh vegetables. I told him that all our experiments showed there is very little loss of the vitamins when properly canned. As I spent the whole day with him and I got a good picture from him as to how agricultural things should be run in the whole of the United States. The present food program of the United States seems to be following his blueprint pretty well. We are headed in his direction.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman just stated that someone advised us to eat more. The gentleman knows with butter at 16 points a pound butter is piling up, with beef points where they are beef is piling up, and pork consumption has gone down because they have the points on pork so high that the folks cannot buy it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I may say to the gentleman I would take the points off of pork. We can agree on that anyway.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next I may address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 4½ minutes and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Paul Winkler, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter which I received from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROWAN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes at the conclusion of the address of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, my only reason for taking this time is to refer to the remarks of my good friend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]. The gentleman from Wisconsin is a big man physically, he is a big man intellectually; his greatest and best characteristic is his charity, because I do not understand, I cannot see how he can look at what these fellows down here are doing to the people, the consumers and the farmers, and not come to the conclusion that their actions are not deliberate and for a purpose. They know their way about, they are smart. They have seen the result of their policies in the years that have gone and they know what will follow if they continue.

Way back in 1935 when our good friend from Michigan, Mr. Mapes, was with us, the beet growers of Michigan had a meeting over in Mr. Mapes' office. All the Republican Michigan Congressmen were there, as I recall. The then Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. WALLACE—he of the "do-gooder" fame—sent two men up there. We wanted an increased acreage of sugar beets so that our beet factories over there in Holland City and over in St. Louis, Mich., could operate at a profit, could continue in business and manufacture sugar. They told us flatly that because Colorado could produce sugar beets with a greater sugar content per ton than we could, ultimately we would have to go out of business; that later, because Florida and Louisiana could produce sugar cheaper than Colorado, Colorado must go out; and that still later, because the offshore areas could produce sugar cheaper than Louisiana and Florida, they would have to go out of the sugar-beet and sugarcane business.

When we asked why, we were told that their plan was to produce things wherever in the world they could be produced the cheapest, at less cost, and that wherever in the United States our workers, our industries, came in conflict with those in foreign lands who could produce whatever it was that was wanted at less cost our workers would have to quit their jobs, our factory doors would have to close. That may have been good for the rest of the world, but it was ruin for America and its workers. That was thinking of America last, a policy which still seems to prevail with the New Dealers.

That was the philosophy down there in 1935. It has been their philosophy ever since.

The gentleman will remember that before the recess from the floor here and from the Well many of us were asking for corn, for poultry feed, for dairy feed,

and we did not get it, although there was plenty of it. The gentleman knows that now some 235,000,000 pounds of butter are held by the Army and that much of that butter is becoming tainted, if not rendered absolutely unfit for human consumption. The gentleman must know that there are 1,700,000 cases, I think, of canned goods that are about to spoil because they have bought them and are holding them out.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Canned goods about to spoil?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would say to the gentleman from Washington that we have canneries in our community. We know something about canned goods. In fact, I recall going down here to Fred Vinson last summer when we wanted to increase wages 10 and 15 cents an hour to hold the people in the canneries so they could take care of the coming crop, when we wanted to increase the cost half a cent a can, which Vinson's men said would only cover the cost of the increased wages and increased price to the producer, and he said he would take it up with the President the next day, which was a Sunday, how we waited more than a week and then were told that we could not get the concessions that we asked, although we had told Mr. Vinson that the crop would not go into the cans unless those increases were granted, not because the canners did not want to can the crop but because they could not do it at the price named.

So in 1944 there may be a shortage of canned goods. Oh, no, my friend from Wisconsin, the plan is deliberate. They know what they are about, and they intend to wreck our small industries, our small businessmen—make our independent farmers come to the Government to avoid bankruptcy.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time only to point out something that it seems to me always is neglected to be pointed out in all this discussion on food. Sure, I will say to the gentleman from Michigan, there are canned goods stacked up in lots of places in the world where our boys are fighting. There is some butter that may spoil some place and has spoiled, and there is probably some meat stacked up in a refrigerator some place down in the South Pacific that we may never use; but we brought it down there because we did not know whether we were going to use it—to have it if we need it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I decline to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is misstating what I said.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did not quote the gentleman.

All of these things are stacked up on all the fighting fronts. It all sums up to this one thing, and it should be brought out in every debate along these lines. The American Army, the American Navy and the American marines are the best fed of any troops, of any fighting men, in the entire world and of our entire history; and that is what it should be, thank God.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think that was an excellent statement, and I do not believe there is anybody in Congress who disagrees with it. What I want to know is why we should not have a food policy which increases and maintains production and which gives us some sort of assurance that there will be all this food next year that the gentleman is talking about this year, which we, who come from the farm areas, do not think there will be.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know that there is any curtailment on the part of a farm to produce. We can produce all we want. We have some trouble getting supplies. There has been a shortage of a lot of things. I merely want to point out that in all of these discussions we should base a premise that our fighting men are the best fed of any men in the entire world, and they will continue to be. There will be some spots where there will be some canned goods that might spoil—I do not know how they will spoil in the can—there might be some butter that might melt in the South Pacific, and there might be some meat we will never use in Persia, but I would hate to think what would happen to this Congress or anybody else if we did need it in those places and it was not there. Attacks on that program are not well taken.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DILWEG, from December 1 through December 6, 1943, on account of official business.

To Mr. GIBSON, from December 1 through December 6, 1943, on account of official business.

To Mr. JUDD, for remainder of week, on account of illness of father.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 30, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m. on Wednesday and Thursday, December 1 and 2, 1943, for consideration of a post-war bill, to be held in room 1324, New House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Foreign Affairs will resume public hearings on House Resolutions 350 and 352, providing for the creation by the Executive of a commission to effectuate the rescue of the Jewish people of Europe, at 10 a. m. Thursday, December 2, 1943.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

942. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to relieve former postal employees who performed postal duties after induction into the military service; to the Committee on Claims.

943. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill further defining the number and duties of criers and bailiffs in United States courts and regulating their compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

944. A letter from the Vice Chairman, Board of Investigation and Research, transmitting report on rate-making and rate-publishing procedures of railroad, motor, and water carriers (H. Doc. No. 363); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies. Third intermediate report pursuant to House Resolution 102. Resolution establishing a select committee to investigate acts of executive agencies beyond the scope of their authority; without amendment (Rept. No. 898). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1488. A bill to provide a right-of-way for an oil pipe line over the Ogden Ordnance Depot Military Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 899). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3605. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in tents used as quarters by members of the Twelfth Naval Construction Battalion, Long Island, Alaska, on December 26, 1942, and May 26, 1943, respectively; without amendment (Rept. No. 900). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3606. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire at the Outlying Degaussing Branch of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., on December 4, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 901). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3607. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in tent L-76 at the Amphibious Training Base, Camp Bradford, Norfolk, Va., on March 15, 1943; without amendment (Rept. No. 902). Referred to the committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1410. A bill for the relief of Dale Mc-

Neal; with amendment (Rept. No. 903). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1839. A bill for the relief of Ruth E. Studley; with amendment (Rept. No. 904). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MURPHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1847. A bill for the relief of Richard Zielinski and his parents; with amendment (Rept. No. 905). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2189. A bill for the relief of Kenneth E. Shepard; without amendment (Rept. No. 906). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2772. A bill for the relief of Edwin Foley; without amendment (Rept. No. 907). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2875. A bill for the relief of Adelard Demers; with amendment (Rept. No. 908). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3661. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 909). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3729. A bill for the relief of Anna Mattil and others; with amendment (Rept. No. 910). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3747. A bill for the relief of the Marden Construction Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 911). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3748. A bill to authorize and direct the sale of Moore air field; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3749. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building B. O. Q. O-3 at the United States Naval Construction Training Center, Davisville, R. I., on March 27, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3750. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the third circuit, and to permit the filling of the first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 3751. A bill providing for veterans' rehabilitation, preventing unemployment, chaos, and confusion at the end of the war and promoting individual, productive enterprise by enabling the returned veterans to engage in such enterprises and employ themselves in place of asking for jobs that do not exist; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCANLON:

H. J. Res. 198. Joint resolution to authorize the equitable adjustment of the wages and salaries of employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolution were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 3752. A bill for the relief of Second Lt. Clyde L. Gillam; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 3753. A bill for the relief of Howard McMillan and Dorothy McMillan, individually and as the legal guardians of Virginia McMillan, a minor, and for Virginia McMillan; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3789. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of sundry citizens of Fairfield, Iowa, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3790. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Forrest H. Millikan and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3791. Also, petition of Alex Thomann and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3792. Also, petition of Paul F. Regnier and 99 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3793. Also, petition of the employees of the tool room, Carter Carburetor Corporation, of St. Louis, Mo., and signed by 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3794. Also, petition of Frank Braun and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3795. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of employees of the White House Department Store, El Paso, Tex., advocating freezing present rate of pay-roll deductions under the Social Security Act at the present level of 1 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3796. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of the City Council of the City of Chicago, adopted at a regular meeting held on November 17, 1943, requesting Congress to construct certain works in the St. Clair River for control of the levels of Lakes Michigan and Huron; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

3797. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communication from the Rosiclare Lions Club, at Rosiclare, Ill., and signed by Thomas Rose, secretary, opposing House bill 2861; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3798. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the national secretary, the Propeller Club of the United States, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging the lifting of any ban on American steamship companies that precludes them either by law or general administrative ruling from the ownership and operation of aircraft in overseas commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3799. Also, petition of the chairman of the T tunnel committee of the San Pedro Civic Council, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of the so-called T tunnel bill, H. R. 3455; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3800. Also, petition of the secretary, the Bar Association of Dallas, Dallas, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to House bill 7, with regard to poll tax; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1943

(Legislative day of Thursday, November 18, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Father of our spirits who hearest prayer, to whom all flesh shall come, breathe upon us now, we beseech Thee, the benediction of Thy holy calm; lift the burdens of drab duty from our jaded hearts, changing stern statutes into glad songs; soothe the anxieties of our baffled minds so that with the shield of Thy peace and the sword of Thy truth we may face whatever tests this day may bring, free and fearless. Kindle on the altar of our hearts a flame of devotion to freedom's cause in all the world that shall consume in its white heat every grosser passion.

Serving here in the homeland, make us knights of the holy crusade worthy to be reckoned with those who on land and sea and in the air have sacrificed their mortal life to roll back the tide of violence from the souls of men and who, having fought for peace on crimson fields, for ordered government, just laws, and the sacredness of home and altar, have found the peace unshaken by time forever. We here remember them and bless Thy holy name, and pray that to us strength may be given to follow in their train. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, November 29, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Pepper
Andrews	Green	Reed
Austin	Guffey	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Barkley	Hawkes	Robertson
Bilbo	Hayden	Scrugham
Bone	Hill	Shipstead
Brewster	Holman	Smith
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Buck	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lodge	Tobey
Butler	Lucas	Truman
Byrd	McCarran	Tunnell
Capper	McClellan	Tydings
Caraway	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chavez	McKellar	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wallgren
Danaher	Mead	Walsh
Davis	Millikin	Wheeler
Eastland	Moore	Wherry
Ellender	Nye	White
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wiley
George	O'Mahoney	Willis
Gerry	Overton	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are detained on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is confined to his home with a cold.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent due to a death in his family.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR BARBOUR

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a telegram from Johan J. Smertenko, director of Organization Emergency Committee to Save the Jewish People of Europe, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *November 23, 1943.*

Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE:

Please communicate to the Senate our profound sorrow and condolences at the sudden death of Senator Warren Barbour. In his passing the Jewish people of Europe have sustained a great loss. He recognized their great tragedy and he did what he could to alleviate it by introducing Senate Joint Resolution 85, to provide for the admission to the United States of aliens who are religious and racial refugees.

JOHAN J. SMERTENKO,
Director of Organization Emergency Committee to Save the Jewish People of Europe.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

RELIEF OF CERTAIN FORMER POSTAL EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to relieve former postal employees who performed postal duties after induction into the military service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

RATE-MAKING AND RATE-PUBLISHING PROCEDURES

A letter from the Board of Investigation and Research (under the Transportation Act of 1940), transmitting, pursuant to law, its report on rate-making and rate-publishing procedures of railroad, motor, and water carriers (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

PETITION

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Pittsburg, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the advertising of alcoholic beverages by press and radio, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

SUBSIDIES AND PARITY PRICES—STATEMENT BY MEMBERS OF JEWELL COUNTY (KANS.) FARMERS UNION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached, a statement which I have received from members of the Jewell County Farmers Union of Kansas with respect to their stand in the matter of subsidies on agricultural products.

There being no objection, the statement was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached, as follows:

MANKATO, KANS., *October 14, 1943.*

We, the undersigned members of the Farmers Union and residing in Jewell County, do hereby state that we are against subsidies but favor parity prices that will guarantee cost of production.

W. G. DECKER,
J. F. PLATT,
TOM HOWELL
(And sundry other members of the Farmers Union, Jewell Co., Kans.).

RESOLUTION BY INDEPENDENT FARMERS, RILEY COUNTY, KANS.—HOG PRICE LEVEL

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a resolution submitted to me by the independent farmers of northern Riley County, Kans.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To our sorrow we learn at this troublesome hour that the administration's hog price floor has holes in it which they expect the farmer himself to remedy while the administration is busy upsetting the procedure with a continuance of their old nefarious schemes.

1. The administration asked for these hogs.

2. The administration discourages the processing of surplus hogs by wage regulations which do not interest the packers (overtime wages).

3. The administration discourages the consumption of this war food which is guaranteed to stick on the ribs of the defense worker by restricting the sale of same through ration stamps.

4. The administration is moving right up the ladder with organized labor's wage, while at same time they release a few words from Washington which stampedes the unorganized farmer to rush his hogs to market and then the Government will guarantee to support the $13.75 Chicago floor price—just as long as farmers do not ship enough hogs to market to bring the market price below the support price level.

From here on we could go on picturing to you the groups, pay-rollers, deceptive set-ups (F. S. A.) which feed upon the farmers' plights, such as above.

How long will it continue to receive the support of our Congress?

VICTOR E. HAWKINSON,
Secretary.

PRINTING OF REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Printing, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 215), which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Forty-sixth Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1943, be printed as a Senate document.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1553. A bill for the relief of J. M. Miller, James W. Williams, and Gilbert Theriot; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1554. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to change the name of Conduit Road in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1555. A bill authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Lt. Gen. Thomas Holcomb, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BONE:

S. 1556. A bill relating to the assignment of personnel from the executive branch of the Government to congressional committees in connection with certain investigations; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1557. A bill for the relief of Joel A. Hart; to the Committee on Claims.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES—AMENDMENT

Mr. TAFT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO THE REVENUE BILL—TERMINATION OF PERCENTAGE DEPLETION FOR CERTAIN MINERALS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3687) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 32, strike out all of subsection (d), including lines 4 to 17, inclusive, and reading as follows:

"(d) Termination of percentage depletion for certain minerals: The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) and the amendments made to section 114 of the Internal Revenue Code by section 145 of the Revenue Act of 1942 (providing percentage depletion for fluorspar, ball and sagger clay, and rock-asphalt) shall not apply with respect to any taxable year beginning on or after the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war. For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'date of the termination of hostilities in the present war' means the date proclaimed by the President as the date of such termination, or the date specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress as the date of such termination, whichever is the earlier."

REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION (S. DOC. NO. 134)

On motion by Mr. WAGNER, a letter from the Chairman of the War Production Board, transmitting the eighth report of his operations under the act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business (laid before the Senate by the Vice President on the 22d instant and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency), was ordered to be printed as a Senate document.

WAGE SCALE OF CERTAIN RAILROAD EMPLOYEES

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on November 1 the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] introduced Senate Joint Resolution 91. I was appointed by the Committee on Interstate Commerce to be chairman of a subcommittee to consider the joint resolution. The subcommittee voted favorably on it, and issued a press report relative to the merits of the resolution, and somewhat in explanation of it. I have been asked to request unanimous consent to have the press release printed in the RECORD of today, and I request unanimous consent that it may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The subcommittee of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, to whom was referred Senate Joint Resolution 91, recommends that it be reported out favorably. At public hearings on the resolution, representatives of railroad management and labor presented their views with considerable documentary evidence. All of this was submitted to Judge Vinson, Director, Economic Stabilization, and his comment thereon was solicited and received.

We find it necessary to point out that, contrary to the statement of Judge Vinson, the passage of this resolution will not disturb the Little Steel formula nor will it express directly or indirectly congressional disapproval of that formula. The subcommittee favors the stabilization of wages as required by the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, and subsequent Presidential orders authorized by that act.

The gross misinterpretation of this act has caused so much confusion that congressional clarification seems necessary. That is all Senate Joint Resolution 91 attempts to do.

There should be no unsettled dispute with reference to the wage increase here involved since this was the product of a Presidential emergency board recommendation which was accepted in an agreement between the carriers and their employees on August 7, 1943. Administrative approval of the agreement should not have been withheld.

Out of the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, came the "hold the line" order (No. 9328). The Little Steel formula was only one of the bases laid down by the President upon which wage increases were to be permitted. The railway wage agreement and the Board report were justified not under the Little Steel formula but under other principles specifically written into the Stabilization Act and maintained by the President. Approval of the wage increase agreement of August 7, 1943, therefore in no way violates or even modifies the Little Steel formula.

Director Vinson, apparently realizing that nonoperating railway employees are underpaid, has suggested a sliding-scale wage increase of from 4 cents to 10 cents per hour. If 8 cents does violence to Little Steel, what does 4 to 10 cents do to it? The pay roll under Judge Vinson's proposal would differ by less than 10 percent from the pay roll, if the wage agreement which he disapproves were made effective. Obviously the railroad industry wage agreement is not inflationary since Judge Vinson maintains that his substitute is not inflationary.

The unsettling effect of Judge Vinson's proposal is plain to all practical railroad men. The arbitrary sliding-scale proposed by Judge Vinson would destroy existing wage differentials, and would be contrary to sound industrial practice and in violation of the directive of Justice Byrnes on which Judge Vinson claims to rely. The folly of creating new inequities, by introducing this sliding scale, is evident.

The President's Emergency Board in recommending the 8-cent wage increase followed the principle and requirement written into the Stabilization Act that wage adjustments should be made when necessary to correct gross inequities and to aid in the effective prosecution of the war.

The subcommittee finds that this is the fundamental principle involved in this dispute between Judge Vinson on the one hand and other Government officials plus the railroad industry on the other.

Advice from every competent and informed source assures us that approval of the wage agreement is necessary to remove gross inequities and to aid in the effective prosecution of the war. Such approval will not weaken but will fortify the hold-the-line policy of the President.

EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Chairman.
HARRY S. TRUMAN.
ROBERT F. WAGNER.
HENRIK SHIPSTEAD,
CLYDE M. REED.

Senator REED concurs in the action of the subcommittee in report Senate Joint Resolution 91 favorably. He will submit his individual views in a separate statement.

THE GLOBAL ALPHABET—PETITION OF HON. ROBERT L. OWEN (S. DOC. NO. 133)

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, former Senator Robert L. Owen is working on a world-wide language termed by him the Global Alphabet. I ask unanimous consent that the petition of Hon. Robert L. Owen, which was laid before the Senate by the Vice President on October 18 last and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, relating to the subject of English as a world language through the global alphabet, be published as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMERICA'S NEED FOR DEEPER FAITH—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BURTON

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "America's Need for Deeper Faith," delivered by him at the Unitarian Ministry for Students, Cambridge, Mass., November 1, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PATTON INCIDENT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LANGER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the Patton incident delivered by him in Washington, D. C., November 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THREE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST HOLDING OF LAW COURTS AND TRIAL BY JURY IN PENNSYLVANIA—ADDRESS BY ASSOCIATE JUSTICE JACKSON

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Robert H. Jackson, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, at a meeting of the New Sweden Historical Association and the Philadelphia Bar Association, at the Hotel Warwick, Philadelphia, Pa., in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the first holding of law courts and trial by jury in Pennsylvania, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORT—ARTICLE BY FORMER SENATOR JOSH LEE

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "International Air Transport" written by Hon. Josh Lee, former United States Senator, and published in the Foreign Commerce Weekly of October 23, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

LIBERATION OF ASIATICS BY ALLIES—ARTICLE BY WILLIAM L. SHIRER

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Why Should Asiatics Be Enthusiastic Over 'Liberation' by Allies?" written by William L. Shirer and published in the Washington Post of November 28, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATES' RIGHTS—EDITORIAL BY TOM LINDER

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "States' Rights," by Tom Linder, from the Market Bulletin of November 24, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

RACIAL DISUNITY AND PREJUDICE—ARTICLE BY WESTBROOK PEGLER

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Westbrook Pegler regarding racial disunity and prejudice, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHERE STANDS RUBBER?—EDITORIAL BY WILLIAM JEFFERS

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Where Stands Rubber?" written by Hon. William Jeffers, former Federal Rubber Director, and published in the Oregon Daily Journal of November 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. BARKLEY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the motion of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] to reconsider the vote taken yesterday the pending question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not the pending question. A motion is required to bring that question before the Senate.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider the motion made by me to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] was rejected yesterday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the motion briefly. I am not a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and never have been, but I feel that that committee is entitled to the commendation of the Senate and the support of the Senate and the country for seeking to work out a fair and nonpartisan method by which those who are serving in our armed forces may express their choice in the election of President, Vice President, and Members of the Senate and House of Representatives.

While I do not credit everything I see in the press, I like to feel that what appears in the newspapers is founded on a sound basis of fact. It has been stated in the newspapers that there are those in this country, and that there are some in the Congress who, in their hearts, do not desire that our soldiers and sailors shall be accorded the right to vote while they are away fighting for the very right we enjoy, to cast our ballots and share in the privileges of democracy.

Mr. President, it seems incredible to me that that can be the fact, so incredible that I do not believe there is any appreciable number of responsible men in public life or in private life who do not desire that these men and women shall be allowed to cast their votes. It would be a travesty upon the great cause in which they are engaged, and for which they are willing to sacrifice their lives, if through any technicality, or overcaution, even, the result should be that they would be denied the right to vote.

I have received a letter or two from young men not yet in the service, but who will be in the service shortly because they have reached the age of 18, asking whether the pending bill makes any provision to allow men to vote who have reached the age of 18 years, who are subject to the draft but who are not eligible to vote under the laws of the States, upon the same theory that men 21 years of age and older are to be allowed to vote while away in the service of their country and asking why, if the requirements for registration, and other requirements under the laws of the States, are to be waived, we should not waive the age limit, and allow men and women who have reached the age of 18 years to cast their votes. As we know, there is no such provision in the bill.

Mr. President, I have not discussed with members of the committee the reason why the question of the age limit was not dealt with in the bill, but I have a right to assume that the committee gave consideration to it. I assume the age limit upon the right to vote is a qualification, in the constitutional sense, and not merely a regulation, as registration has been held to be in the discussions which have heretofore taken place in the Senate in regard to any effort on the part of the National Government to regulate the qualifications of voters. It has been maintained that the age limit goes to the very heart of qualifications, just as does residence within the State for a certain length of time, and within the county for a certain length of time. I think there is only one State which has modified that age limit, and that is the State of Georgia, which recently reduced the voting age to 18 years.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I merely want to observe in connection with what the Senator from Kentucky is saying that to my mind there is quite a distinction between the matter of age limit and regulations, if there be regulations, or qualifications, if there be qualifications, such as payment of poll tax or registration. One distinction, at least, in my mind—whether it is a good one or not, it appeals to me—is that registration and the payment of the poll tax are matters with which the man who is now a soldier and away from home, perhaps overseas, could comply and could qualify himself were it not for the war. Age is something different. War or no war, the age is the same. By our action in taking these men away from their places of residence where they could qualify by registering and paying the poll tax, and sending them perhaps into foreign lands, we have made it impossible for them to meet those requirements. That is not so with regard to age limitations.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that, and I recognize the validity of that distinction. I did not bring the subject up for the purpose of raising any controversy over the question of age limit, and the fact that the bill does not deal with that subject, but merely to show that men who are in the service, and men who are subject in the immediate future, or before another election, to be called into the service, are giving serious consideration to the exercise of this right on their part, and, in my judgment, they are not going to be indifferent toward any technicalities we may throw into this situation which are calculated to deprive them of the right to exercise the privilege of suffrage as American citizens.

As I said a while ago, it seems to me that the committee, in framing the bill, went a long way—as far as it could have gone, probably, with the information it had—to make possible the casting of votes by service men and women wherever they may be in the world, and in order to make the process as free from partisan consideration as possible. There is no way to guarantee by law that any man who happens to occupy the position of President of the United States, no matter what party he belongs to, will not exercise his authority and his jurisdiction in such a way that somebody who is oversuspicious would charge to politics.

Yesterday the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] said that it might happen that under the provisions of the bill as they now stand the Republican nominee for President of the United States would be deprived of the right to suggest names of men to serve on the ballot commission, whereas the President of the United States, if he were a candidate for reelection, would, under the law, have the right to name the members of the commission. There is no way to avoid that. We cannot take away from the President the right to make appointments, whether he is or is not a candidate for election.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Kentucky has not stated the position I took. I was not complaining that the Republican nominee for President would be deprived of any right to be consulted or to name members to the commission. He has no such right. I was asserting that it would be utterly absurd for the law to give him any such right, and I was suggesting that this philosophy carried over the implication that it was equally questionable for the Democratic nominee for President, even though he be the incumbent President, to name the members of the commission controlling the casting of perhaps 9,000,000 votes in the Presidential election.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator's position was that because the Republican candidate for President had not been, and might never be, elected President of the United States, it would be utterly ridiculous to give him the power to control these appointments, and equally ridiculous to give the President of the United States, who is under the Constitution given the sole appointive power, the right to do it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; I am sorry. I was attempting to indicate that I thought it was improper for any Presidential candidate to have anything to do with the effective determination of the personnel of a ballot commission which might determine who should be the next President of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think now I gather the Senator's meaning. It would be ridiculous for the Republican candidate to do so, and improper for the Democratic candidate to do so.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think we could reverse the words or apply them either way to either candidate.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is nothing improper in the President of the United States appointing the members of the commission.

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; but I have sought to provide a method by which the commission should be nonpartisan.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think we have gone as far as we have a constitutional right to go by requiring that the names of the members of the commission be submitted to the Senate for confirmation, and to require that before any decision on any appeal can be made by the commission it must be made by three members out of the four appointed to the commission.

Mr. President, I am sure everyone will agree that the committee was trying to be fair and nonpartisan in its original provision that the Chief Justice of the United States should be brought into this situation, and he was eliminated only, I presume, because he notified the Senate, through the Senator from Michigan, that he would not serve or function on such a commission. It was then

that we went even further than had been gone before in the law, by saying that of the four members three must concur, and that there could not be more than two members of the same party on the commission. I do not see how we can go any further than that to guarantee impartiality.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I should like to have the opinion of the distinguished majority leader regarding the character of the office of the commission we are creating in the pending measure if it shall become the law. Is this an independent office? Are the holders of the office independent of the Chief Executive in the performance of the duties of the office? That is the first question. If that question should be answered affirmatively, I should like to ask whether the Senator from Kentucky regards these officers as subordinate to and responsible to the President, or as subordinate to and responsive to the Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me answer the first question, if I may, as to whether these officers would be independent of the President.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think they would be independent of the President, except that they would have to be appointed by him. But after they had been appointed and were confirmed by the Senate, they would be independent, just as independent of the President, in my judgment, as is the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, who must go through the same process in order to arrive at the office of Chief Justice, or just as independent as any other similar officer. They would not be subject to orders from the President, and I do not think they would be subject to influence by him. I think I should say that I do not think the President of the United States—any President of the United States—would undertake to influence them in respect to the administrative duties which they are to be called upon to perform.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question for information?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will yield, but first I should like to say that, as to the other question the Senator asked me, which was whether they would be subordinate to the President or subordinate to the Congress, there is always a twilight zone, I suppose, between subordination of inferior officers. Of course, these officers would be subordinate to the President in rank.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is not the question.

Mr. BARKLEY. I presume that is not the question the Senator meant, but they would be subordinate. They would be congressional officers; they would be, of course, congressional agents, in a sense, just as members of the Interstate Commerce Commission are congressional agents to carry out the powers of the Congress, under the Constitution, to regulate commerce. But they are not subordinate in the sense that the President can tell them what to do. I do not know whether I gathered all the implications of the Senator's meaning in his use of the word "subordinate."

Mr. AUSTIN. My question affects our judgment as to which part of the Constitution we would be acting under if we should adopt the motion which was made yesterday by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]; because, as I have envisioned this matter—and I studied it long before it came to the Senate—I think of this commission, as does the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky, as an independent organ or commission. Therefore, I regard it as not subordinate, or inferior to, not made up of officers inferior to the executive departments, and as not responsive to the President, but responsive to its creator, namely, the Congress of the United States.

On the point here at issue, it strikes me that if we are correct in the assumption that these officers are to be independent, then there is only one way, in view of the proposal, to have them appointed, and that is by the combined action of the President and the Senate. If, however, they were conceived by Congress to be inferior to the President or to any executive department, then Congress could, under the Constitution, by law, vest their appointment in one person—the President alone, or the head of a department, or any similar person. I go one step further in my reasoning, and say that if they were not independent, but were solely officers inferior to the Congress—that is, set up by the Congress solely as a legislative agency—then Congress could appoint them. In other words, I consider that when the Constitution says that Congress may delegate the power of appointment to the President, the Constitution assumes that Congress itself has the power to do the thing which the Constitution says it may delegate, and therefore that as to an officer inferior to the Congress, designated to perform its functions and to be its ministerial agency, Congress might make the appointment.

But we did not start that way. Although I, myself, favored that idea in committee and endeavored to have it agreed to in committee, yet the committee overruled me and took the other view of the matter, the view expressed by the senior Senator from Kentucky. I feel that way now. The committee having decided on that point, the proposal states to me as clearly as it can that the commission is created as an independent agency, as to which, it seems to me, to be necessary that we follow through in accordance with the theory of the Constitution that the power of appointment is vested jointly in the President and in the Senate; and if in the Senate, then it means, according to my present view, that the Senate acts by majority, that the voice of the Senate is the voice of the majority of the Senators and no other voice.

If we could only reduce this provision to the status of a parliamentary rule and disregard the constitutional provision, then perhaps we could change the rule from day to day and could make one-third of the Senate the voice of the Senate. Of course, we would do that if we made it possible for slightly more than one-third of the Senate to negative an appointment by the Chief Executive.

I ask the Senator to excuse me for taking so much time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's comment. Of course, he knows we all have great regard for his legal ability and his intellectual honesty in dealing with questions of this kind. While the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is not now before the Senate, it brought forth yesterday, while it was pending, comments on the part of myself and other Senators which may be elaborated if it should be again proposed; but inasmuch as the Senator has brought it forward in his observations, I should like to say that yesterday I felt—and in thinking the matter over since yesterday, I am even more firmly convinced now than I was yesterday—that when the Constitution provided in the identical section read by the Senator from Michigan that in the ratification of treaties two-thirds of the Senate must vote to ratify, must agree, must consent, and that in the following language the Senate also has the right to confirm, the inevitable conclusion is that it is just as binding upon the Senate of the United States to regard that as a vote by a majority of the Senate as if the language had read "but by a majority may confirm the appointment of officers."

I still retain the belief that if Congress should by any legislation undertake to increase that requirement to a two-thirds vote, in a case in which the President sent to the Senate the name of any nominee—and if we have the right to do it in regard to this case we have a right to do it in regard to judges, district attorneys, United States marshals, and ambassadors—if we undertake to do that with regard to any of the appointive officers which the framers of the Constitution had in mind, by passing a law requiring more than a majority vote of the Senate in order to confirm, if the President should send to the Senate the name of a nominee who, in spite of any such legislative requirement, obtained a majority vote in the Senate, a quorum being present, he would be entitled to the office, under the Constitution, regardless of our effort to make the requirement two-thirds instead of a majority. However, that is not the question now pending before the Senate. I wish to discuss the pending question for just a moment. The matter to which the Senator and I have just referred is a very fertile field for speculation and thought, and the proposal which has been submitted is an interesting one.

The pending motion is to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] yesterday was rejected. That amendment would restrict the President in the field of his selection. It would require him to send to the Senate nominations selected from a list submitted to him by the Democratic and Republican organizations.

I do not wish to assume that in offering that amendment the Senator from New Hampshire desired to be understood as reflecting upon the President of the United States. He said he had no such intention. Of course, we like to accept statements from our colleagues as being made in good faith, although sometimes we make them with our tongues in our cheeks to such an extent that it makes us look as though we had the mumps. [Laughter.] I would not assume, however, that the Senator from New Hampshire had any such idea when he said that he did not wish to reflect upon the President of the United States. But, of course, automatically it is a reflection, not necessarily upon his partisanship but upon his wisdom, good faith, and intelligence in looking over the whole field of the people of the United States and making the selections.

As I recall, the amendment provides that the commissioners shall be appointed from lists of not less than six nominees submitted by the national committees of the respective political parties. It is just as fair to assume that the chairman of the Republican National Committee would submit to the President an undesirable list as it is to assume that the President himself, acting under his responsibility as President, would appoint an undesirable person to the commission; and if the Republicans were in power instead of the Democrats, and we had a Republican President, and we offered such an amendment as that from this side of the Chamber, it would be just as fair to assume that our Democratic chairman, in submitting six names to the President, would be partisan, unfair, and unwise in his choice as to assume that the President, if he were a Republican, would select undesirable men. So any way we look at it, it is automatically a reflection, either upon the President's intelligence, his good faith, or his wisdom and nonpartisanship in making these appointments.

In the appointment of inferior officers, Congress has provided, especially under the civil-service law, for appointment from the first three on any eligible list to the position of postmaster, and other positions in the executive departments. I presume that such appointments are truly regarded as appointments of inferior officers under the constitutional provision cited by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]. No question has been raised about the right of Congress to make such provision. But whether these officers are to be regarded as inferior in the sense that Congress itself could provide for their selection by designating some other person to make the appointment is a question to which I do not wish to give a categorical answer at this moment. I do not think they are. I do not think these officers come within that category, because their function is important, even though it be administrative, even though it has nothing to do with policy making, even though under the law they would not be permitted to propagandize—and they could not do it anyway unless three out of four agreed even if they had the power to do it. Certainly three out of four would not agree to any such method of administering the law. I think the fairness of the election, and the integrity of the right to vote on the part of men and women in the service, involving the exercise of the right of democracy in such a high degree, make the function of the commission of such importance that the American people, without regard to politics, would rise up and unanimously condemn any effort on the part of any such commission to stultify itself, its office, or its function by engaging in any such unworthy practice.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am convinced that the word "inferior" as used in the Constitution with reference to officers does not relate to the dignity or importance of the work of the office, but is a relative term having to do with the question of whether the office is an independent one, or is an office beneath a superior officer. I should like to give a citation, if the Senator would care to have it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall be happy to have the Senator do so.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have other cases, but the case I wish to cite contains a good definition of the term "inferior."

Mr. BARKLEY. To what section of the Constitution does the Senator refer?

Mr. AUSTIN. Article II, section 2, of the Constitution.

I read from the case of *Collins* v. *United States*, 14 Court of Claims Reports 568. I read from page 574:

> The word "inferior" is not here used in that vague, indefinite, and quite inaccurate sense which has been suggested—the sense of petty or unimportant; but it means subordinate or inferior to those officers in whom respectively the power of appointment may be vested—the President, the courts of law, and the heads of departments. It is a word having definite relation to a superior; and "subordinate," "lower in place, station, or rank" are the principal significations given to it by lexicographers (Worcester, Webster, etc.); Bouvier defines it to mean "one who, in relation to another, has less power and is below him; one who is bound to obey another." (Bouvier's Law Dictionary.)
>
> Mr. Justice Thompson, speaking for the Supreme Court, in *Ex parte Hennen* (13 Peters 258, and 13 Curtis, ed. 137), said:
> "The appointing power here designated in the latter part of the section (art. II, sec. 2, Constitution) was no doubt intended to be exercised by the department of the Government to which the officer to be appointed most appropriately belonged."
>
> The Constitution contemplates that Congress will provide how all such inferior officers shall be appointed, and requires them to be nominated by the President and appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate only when Congress omits to make any other provision therefor.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Such an act can only be passed with the concurrence of the Senate; and it is the Senate alone that becomes thereby deprived of further participation in the appointing power which it would have but for its own consent, and which it voluntarily waives in the manner pointed out by the Constitution.

There is a very fine discussion of that relationship in this case. That is why it is important to me, in trying to decide what my position will be, to know whether we are creating independent offices or whether we are creating offices beneath someone, that is, beneath the President, perhaps. I got an answer from the distinguished leader that it was not his opinion that this commission would be subordinate to the President, and inferior in that sense, but that he believed it would be an independent body. So do I. Of course, if we take that ground, we must be consistent and go through with it. That requires in the appointing power concurrence of the President and the Senate. The next step requires the voice of the Senate, and the voice of the Senate is a majority.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator seems to be very clear on that subject. It might be well to read the second paragraph of section 2 of article II of the Constitution:

> He—

The President—

> shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur—

That is the end of that—

> and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for—

That is, not otherwise provided for in the Constitution—

> and which shall be established by law; but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law or in the heads of departments.

In other words, we may say to the President alone that he shall nominate inferior officers, or we may designate the courts of law—that is, the Federal courts—to appoint such inferior officers; or we may delegate to the heads of departments, that is, Cabinet officers, the right to make such appointments. Nowhere does the Constitution give Congress itself the right to make the appointments.

Mr. AUSTIN. There is the point where I have difficulty. Offhand I should say that the Constitution does not give the power; but the power must exist. The Congress must be assumed to have that power, when the Constitution says it may delegate it. It cannot delegate something it does not possess. Therefore, if the Congress requires an operative agency, I see no reason why that particular clause of the Constitution does not recognize the power of Congress to provide its own instrument.

Mr. BARKLEY. I must disagree with the Senator on that point because the Constitution itself designates to whom we may delegate the appointment of inferior officers, namely, first, the President himself; second, the courts of law; and, third, the heads of departments.

Mr. AUSTIN. Those are only officers who are subordinate to those three named branches of government. Such construction as we have had judicially on the subject shows clearly that that

has been interpreted to mean that in the judicial department the head of the department has the power to appoint, and in the executive departments the heads of the departments have the power to appoint inferior officers in their respective branches of the Government. In respect to departments, the head of a department cannot be regarded as having power to reach out of his department and appoint someone for another department. The Constitution refers only to his own department in giving him the power to appoint. That is one reason why I feel that the most important branch of the Government was not overlooked. The legislative branch is the most important branch of the Government. It was not the idea of the founders of this Government to leave it helpless.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, in my view that is an academic question, because I do not regard these appointees as being inferior.

Mr. AUSTIN. We agree on that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. I think they are not inferior in any sense of the word, either as to their importance, the performance of their functions, or in a constitutional sense.

Mr. President, allow me to conclude what I have to say about the pending matter. I hope the motion to reconsider will not be agreed to. It is difficult to divest the motion itself from some invidious reflection, however absent it may have been from the mind of the author of the amendment itself. I do not think we should say to the President of the United States that in the performance of a great function, in a great crisis, in the performance of a high duty on the part of men and women who are fighting for their country, he shall be limited to 6 Democrats and 6 Republicans—which is the effect of the proposal—and that he cannot survey the whole field, that we are so afraid of his unfairness, of his partisanship, and of his lack of wisdom in making these appointments that we have to tie his hands, and that only 12 men can be considered by him in making the appointments.

It is proposed that the names of 12 men must be submitted by the chairmen of political committees. I certainly believe that the record of the President of the United States in dealing with the war situation, during which he has called outstanding Republicans—whom I could name if necessary—the service of the Government, is an excellent one. We all know to what extent partisanship has been absolutely banished by the President in his appointments to the executive departments by calling into the service of the country in this great crisis outstanding men of an opposite poliltical faith. It seems to me we ought not to say to the President and to the world that in this matter we cannot trust him to make appropriate appointments from the whole citizenship of the United States. If there is any Senator, or any Member of the other House, or anyone in the country who feels that the President ought not to be trusted in this regard, certainly the Senate ought not to say that it does not trust him. I do not believe any Senator wants to say that. I do not believe any Senator would admit by his vote that he would say it. But it seems to me that there are implications applicable to the situation which many persons might interpret in a contrary way.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope that the motion to reconsider the vote of yesterday will not be agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I wish to say a brief word on the pending proposal.

I can sympathize very earnestly with the thought voiced by the majority leader that we do not wish to do anything by inference which will reflect in any way upon the President. I do not believe the pending proposal in any way reflects upon him. If I did believe so, I would vote against it.

All elections are exceedingly partisan by nature. There is no way by which to hold a fair election completely under the supervision of one of the parties to the contest. The proposed legislation is something which in peacetime we would not dare to consider. We are all stretching the rubber band of constitutional sufficiency in order to support the pending measure.

It would be idle to assume that no matter how carefully we design the pending measure, Senators are not closing their eyes to a great many possibilities of unconstitutionality. But because the men in the service are the victims of circumstances, because most of them have been drafted into the armed services, because 10,000,000 of them are in the armed services, and because they, more than any other citizens of this Republic, ought to have a voice in the election of those who will make the laws, conduct the war, and administer the peace, we have tried, in spite of all the impediments in the way, to find some means to give them the right to vote. However, even though we have devised such a means we know that, in respect of the constitutional limitation, we have not put together the proposed law with the care, precision, and consideration which we would use if we were putting together any other act of the American Congress.

I do not know whether the President will be a candidate for reelection. Some persons say that he will, and some say that he will not. I believe that by adopting the proposal offered by the Senator from New Hampshire we shall be doing the President an inestimably good service. No matter how carefully he might select the members of the commission to supervise the taking of the vote, it would be a miracle—politics being what it is—if someone did not charge that this, that, or the other thing was being done at the President's instigation because the members of the commission were his appointees, and that therefore the election was not on the square. In an election held in the middle of the war, one thing ought to make it stand out above every other consideration, namely, that not the slightest undue influence, unfairness, or political chicancery should be present in the taking of any number of the 10,000,000 votes. The process of taking the vote should be, like Caesar's wife, above suspicion, or as nearly so as any human agency can make it.

I conceive if the Republican National Committee and the Democratic National Committee nominate trustees to hold this election that it will not lie in the mouth of a single Democrat or in the mouth of a single Republican to charge that either party has an undue advantage in the canvassing of the soldier vote. If it is not done in that way, on the contrary, in my humble judgment, charges, whether true or not, will continue to be uttered by irresponsible people for partisan advantage and make a farce of this very difficult undertaking, even under the best of circumstances.

I wish there was some other way it could be done. Even if the President himself should announce tomorrow morning that he would not be a candidate, I do not know that that would relieve us from the irresponsible partisans who would charge anyway that he wanted to have succeed him in office someone who was friendly or favorable to his beliefs and philosophy, and, therefore, he selected a commission which would bring about that result. I do not think that would be putting the President in the right position; I do not think we would be fair to him if we let him be put in that position; and I certainly have no intention, so far as I can read my own mind and heart, of reflecting on the President in the slightest way in voting for the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire. It is my opinion it is only a safeguard which, instead of wishing that it had not been provided, the President would want included in the bill so that he would not be subject to any charge that might be made reflecting on the taking of the soldier vote.

Mr. President, in my judgment, Congress can define the qualifications for any office in the gift of the Republic. First of all, it can fix the age, and does fix it. It says when a man can begin to serve and when he shall cease serving because he may be either too young or too old. It can require that he shall have had certain experience. It can surround any office with any number of restrictions provided they do not weaken the safeguards thrown around the appointment to any office already created by the Constitution. We can require qualifications of any character that we deem wise and that fulfill the purposes of the Constitution and the execution of the laws. The appointive power, however, rests with the President. We are giving him that power; no one would think of taking it away from him; but we are presenting it to him in the peculiar circumstances that exist, in my judgment, so as to eliminate him from any charge that might be raised that he did not set up the most impartial commission which human beings could devise.

Let us suppose, for a moment, that this amendment shall be defeated; let us suppose that the President can appoint four men; let us suppose that he picks the

two best Republicans in the whole country, from the standpoint of public confidence; yet, in my judgment, in the heat of the campaign, when there will be some piece of information or propaganda uttered here or there or some other place, against which protest is made to the war ballot commission, and the commission says it has no authority to deal with the matter, but that it is under another branch of the Government, it will be said that the palace guard tipped off the ballot commission not to do anything about it. That illustration could be multiplied by thousands more.

How, then, can we obtain the kind of trusteeship over the taking of this canvass of the men far away from the United States in such a way as to protect the President, who may himself be a candidate, from any charge, direct or implied, that the taking of the soldiers' votes is not being done in an impartial manner? As I view the situation, there is only one way it can be done, and that is to make the qualification for the office so exact that the opposition to the President, so to speak, will be forever estopped from criticizing the work of the commission that they themselves have created. If that shall not be done, mark my words, as soon as the Presidential contest gets under way every kind of charge will be hurled at this commission; it will be said that it is under the domination of the White House that it is giving some partisan advantage here or there in some manner; and such now is public nervousness and sensitivity, which will be accentuated by the coming on of the Presidentical campaign, that people may believe such accusations, even if they are not true. Therefore, I think it good democratic policy, if anyone wants to put it on partisan grounds, to surround the war ballot commission with such safeguards that no finger of suspicion, even by the evil-minded, can be pointed at the high character or fairness of the commission.

I imagine if this amendment shall be adopted that those who are named by the Republican National Committee, while they will be good men, will be intensely partisan, as they should be, and those named by the Democrats will be good men and intensely partisan, as they should be. Therefore, there will be eliminated any question about the complete impartiality of the commission. But if the amendment shall not be agreed to, as it may not be, in my humble judgment, we will find that any little advantage we might have gained, if any there be, will be far offset by the inculcated and superimposed idea that the election on behalf of the soldiers is not being conducted in a high-minded manner.

I agree with the majority leader, that we do not want to do anything here to reflect on the President. Certainly, if I am capable of reading my own mind, that is the last thing in my thought in supporting the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire. I believe it is in the President's interest, occupying the position of Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy which he does, to remove him from the accusation that may flow from some evil-minded partisan who would say that the commission was "stacked" even though it were not "stacked" and would not be "stacked," and, therefore, the election was not a fair one.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish simply to make one observation which I overlooked a moment ago. The Senator from Illinois and the Senator from New Mexico and other Senators have stated that if the President in making these appointments should send to the Senate the names of two Republicans who were unsatisfactory to the Republican Members of the Senate they would vote to reject the nominations. I wish to associate myself with that same idea.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I think the Senator should have included the chairman of the committee [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; the chairman of the committee should have been included; I did not mean to overlook him. I will go even further and say that if the President should send to the Senate the names of two Republicans either one of whom would be unsatisfactory to a majority of Republicans or if the minority leader would advise me that the names were unsatisfactory, I would feel myself under the obligation and the duty to ask the President to withdraw any such names from the Senate, and, if he failed to do so, I would feel it my duty to vote against confirmation.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I wish to thank the distinguished leader of the majority for that statement, and to say to him that when I made the inquiry of the authors of the bill and of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, who has been the author of legislation for purity in elections, in which I joined him, for I was then on the same subcommittee with him, I wanted to ask the leader of the majority that question, but did not desire to embarrass him in his position. So the fact that he has volunteered the statement he has made here today is very encouraging, and I thank him.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. What the Senator from Kentucky has just so generously said I think was prompted by the colloquy of yesterday between him and others and the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. The Senator from Michigan being momentarily absent, I would very much appreciate the Senator from Kentucky making that statement either to the Senator from Michigan personally, or repeating it when the Senator from Michigan is in the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should be glad to do either, or both. I have no reservation in making the statement, and I am very glad to make it voluntarily, as the Senator from Vermont has put it. I did not know that he had had it in mind to ask me, but I am glad that it turned out that I made it myself without having it drawn out of me.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, the ballot is the most sacred responsibility and at the same time the most sacred privilege that belongs to a citizen of the United States. It is our duty to respect that sacredness, and to give every possible assurance to every voter that his ballot cannot be nullified and cannot be perverted, and that no shadow can be cast upon it in any way whatsoever.

More than ever, it is our obligation to perform this service to the men who are in the armed forces across the seas. We owe it to these men to give them every assurance that the ballots which are presented to them, and which they cast as a part of their duties as citizens, shall be registered at the ballot boxes in the manner in which they intended.

I agree that the able Senator from Kentucky has made a very gracious and a very high-minded statement, as was the statement made by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], when they said that they would feel it to be their duty, in case the President of the United States should submit some nomination for election commissioner which would not be agreeable to the minority party, to vote against the confirmation of such person. But why should we place that responsibility upon those Senators? Why not make the law so plain and so clear that they would not have to be bothered with the weight of that responsibility as the months go by?

By the adoption of this amendment, we shall be performing a great service to the Chief Executive of the United States when this law shall come to him for enforcement. We shall remove every chance of suspicion being lodged against him that some ulterior purpose was being served in the nominations he might send to the Senate.

I, too, agree that all the Members of the Senate are anxious to give to the soldiers the right to assume their full privilege and responsibility as American citizens in the coming election; but that question is not at issue. The question before the Senate is whether we shall give to these soldiers the assurance, the sacred and solemn assurance, that their ballots shall be protected and surrounded by all the safeguards which we as Senators can provide. That is all that is asked for.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. What would be the functions of the ballot commission which would deny the soldier the protection the Senator is discussing?

Mr. WILLIS. I think that has been very thoroughly discussed. The Senator

from Illinois himself has discussed it. But back of all the protection which seems to be provided in the proposed law, the feeling and suspicion lurk that some insecurity might attend the ballot when the ballot commissioners are appointed by a member of one party, without the recommendation or approval of the party organization.

Mr. HOLMAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. What augments that feeling of insecurity more than the resistance of the majority to adopting every safeguard?

Mr. WILLIS. Sometimes methinks the gentlemen of the majority protest too much.

Yesterday I was reluctant, because for good and sufficient reasons I was absent when the vote was taken, to require the Senate to give attention again to the pending amendment. However, much benefit has come out of this motion. We have had able discussion on the floor of the Senate today, the thought-provoking colloquy between the senior Senator from Kentucky and the senior Senator from Vermont, and the very brilliant address by the able Senator from Maryland. All the discussion that has ensued has served to enlighten us and give us confidence in the action we shall take here today.

More than this, however, when I look over the list of Senators who voted yesterday, I find that only 66 Senators cast their votes on this very important question, a bare two-thirds of the Senate.

Senators, this is a matter of such grave importance that it should be decided by as large a number of the Members of the Senate as it is possible to assemble. Therefore, I am glad that I asked for reconsideration of yesterday's vote.

There came to me, from my personal standpoint, the desire that I should register my protest against anything which might in any way impinge upon the freedom of the ballot of any soldier across the seas. I want every Democratic soldier, every soldier who owes allegiance to the Democratic Party, to feel that his ballot comes back across the waters and into the ballot box in his own community safeguarded by the people who he believes will have a sympathetic interest in giving his ballot protection. I want the same right extended to every Republican soldier, that the ballot which he casts and which is brought across the sea shall go into his own community safeguarded by those who he knows will be loyal to the principles in which he believes.

Therefore, Mr. President, I have asked for a reconsideration of the vote. In view of the fact that only 66 Senators were present when the vote was taken yesterday, I believe the request has been justified. Therefore, I urge that all Senators give their most earnest consideration to this question, and cast their votes as their consciences may guide them.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, there is just one comment I should like to make on this illuminating debate. It seems to me the question is whether the people of this country would have more confidence in a commission selected by the President and confirmed by the Senate, under the circumstances under which the commission would be confirmed as provided, than in a commission selected by the heads of two partisan bodies from which the President would have to sift out a third, and they in turn be confirmed by the Senate. Under which circumstances are we most apt to get confirmed politicians of both parties?

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the very distinguished Senator from Rhode Island mean to say that in his judgment we would get more politicians on the commission nominated by the political parties than we would with the master politician of all time in America, Mr. Roosevelt, making the appointments?

Mr. GREEN. We must not leave out of account the master politicians on the other side of the aisle, one of whom is now addressing us.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will ask the Senator from Rhode Island, from this side of the aisle, how Presidents of the United States are elected—as a result of nomination by political parties, or on their own individual initiative?

Mr. GREEN. They are elected by the electoral college.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does the electoral college have the right to elect a President who is not nominated by a political party?

Mr. GREEN. I think so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does the Senator from Rhode Island tell the Senate now that if the President we now have had not been nominated by the Democratic Party in Chicago in 1932 the electoral college would have had a chance to vote for him?

Mr. GREEN. No; certainly not.

So, Mr. President, it is a question of weighing the advantages and disadvantages, so far as the confidence of the people of the United States is concerned, in the commission as appointed. It seems to me that whatever valid argument there might have been against proposing the names of the members of the commission by the President and confirmation of the nominations by the Senate is eliminated by two facts which have come out during the course of the debate. One is that the number of the commission was gladly reduced from five—the odd number usually chosen—to four, so that both parties, the majority and minority parties, will have equal representation and rights on the commission, and so that if one member of either party does not agree with two members of the other party, no action can be taken.

The second fact is that when the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] asked me when I was on the floor whether I would agree to opposing the confirmation of any nominee whose name was sent in by the President, I said without hesitation that I would vote against any such nominee with respect to whom the leader of the minority party, speaking for the members of his party in the Senate, objected. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], who is now in the chair, and the coauthor of the bill, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], agreed in making the same statement, and today the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the majority leader, has made the same statement on the floor of the Senate.

If we take those four Democratic Senators, and add to them the five Democratic Senators, including the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who voted for the Bridges amendment yesterday, we find nine Democratic Senators already on record as being in favor of such action. I have no doubt there are other Senators who are willing to make the same sort of statement, which would bring about the same result as though the Bridges amendment were agreed to.

Mr. President, the argument is made, "Why not place such a provision in the law rather than have a gentleman's agreement?" We do not wish to place the provision in the bill for two reasons. In the first place it is a reflection on the President of the United States to place such an unusual provision in the bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I should like to set forth the second reason.

In the second place, I think such action would be a reflection on the Senators who have given this assurance, because if their assurance is made in good faith and is lived up to there would be no occasion for the amendment.

I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator think that it would be any more of a reflection on President Franklin D. Roosevelt to put restrictions in the law on the appointments to be made from a list of nominees selected by the political parties than similar restrictions placed in the law have been on previous Presidents?

Mr. GREEN. I do not think there have been any similar restrictions placed on previous Presidents under similar circumstances. The reason for the demand for the restrictions to be placed in this bill is because of the fear, which is openly expressed, of partisanship. There have been no other occasions that I know of when similar provisions have been placed in the law because of any such suspicion of partisanship or any suggestion of partisanship.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The reason for the amendment is to make sure of writing into the law a provision which will assure fair representation, so that the people of the country will have faith in the integrity and fairness of the commission.

Mr. GREEN. I have done everything I can to make sure that the people of the country will have faith in the commission, and that the commission will be worthy of their faith.

Mr. BRIDGES. If the Senator from Rhode Island means that, then all he has to do is to vote for my amendment.

Mr. GREEN. And if the Senator from New Hampshire means that, all he has

to do is to withdraw his amendment. That is my argument.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I have been somewhat interested in the discussion, and particularly the statement of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] that he wants a large number of Senators present when the vote is taken. As I understood the statement of the Senator yesterday, he was trying to help in forcing a vote when he knew that many Senators were absent.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes.

Mr. WILLIS. If the Senator had observed the Senate at the time I asked for the vote yesterday he would have seen that nearly all the seats were filled.

Mr. TUNNELL. I notice that 72 votes were cast at the time the Senator was present, and that 66 votes were cast when he was not present. The Senator was greatly distressed over the number of absentees when there were 66 Senators present, and tried to force a vote when there were 72 present.

Mr. WILLIS. Seventy-two Senators voted on the motion to proceed to executive business.

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes; and only 72.

Mr. WILLIS. But there were many Senators within close call who could have come in to vote on the question of reconsideration of the vote.

Mr. TUNNELL. There might have been some partisan arrangement by which there were several Senators just outside the Chamber, but I have serious doubt if there were many so situated, because I went outside myself during that period.

Mr. President, when the matter was suggested of some arrangement for the members of the armed forces to vote I thought there was a real demand and a sincere desire upon the part of the American people that they be given the right to vote. I believed that there was such desire when the Committee on Privileges and Elections met. I was not a member of the special committee which prepared the bill, but when I knew that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], representing, as they did, entirely opposite political views, had agreed on this bill, I was satisfied with it. I was satisfied, as I usually am, with the fairness of the Senator from Vermont, and certainly no one can deny his intelligence or his ability as a lawyer. It will compare favorably with that of those who are criticising the bill.

When the matter was suggested I think the desire was as I have stated it, and I think it is lamentable that the people of the country are getting the idea that this is entirely a political or antiadministration fight. I think that Senators on the other side of the Chamber are affording an opportunity for the country to think so.

A couple of days ago, I listened to a news commentator who by implication stated that the Democrats, or the administration, wanted the soldiers to vote, and that those who were opposed to the administration did not want the soldiers to vote, because, as the commentator said, it was believed that the soldiers would vote for the reelection of the President. He then went on and presented the other view, that there are many who believe that since each soldier would have a pocketful of kicks and objections, that perhaps the vote might be entirely, or very largely, against the administration. There was not even a suggestion on the part of the commentator that anyone wanted to be fair to the boys who have been taken from their homes and sent to foreign countries at a time when they would otherwise be entitled to vote. He never suggested that, and he never suggested that either the Republicans or the Democrats in this body had that in view.

I speak of that matter because I think it indicates the feeling which has gone out over the country that this fight is a partisan and political one; that if the boys get the vote, it is a Democratic victory; that if the boys do not get the vote, it is a Republican victory. I think that is unfortunate. I do not know who would benefit by the passage of the bill, and I do not think anyone else does. I, for one, have never had the slightest idea of voting for or against the bill for partisan purposes or for factional purposes, either because I favored the President or was opposed to the President. I am interested from the standpoint of being fair to the boys who have been taken, in thousands of instances, without their consent, and have been placed where they cannot perform their constitutional functions. In this matter I believe there is a duty which is broader and wider than a partisan one.

Let us come right down to the suggestion itself of whether the commission will be fair. I do not believe the commission would have any power actually to cast a single vote. If the ballots are taken, I do not believe the commission will have the power to aid either party. I have read the bill and I have heard the debate in the Senate, and I think there is a good deal of partisan discussion which is unfortunate under existing conditions. If the ballots are taken, the boys are going to vote the way they please, and they should, whether for or against the present administration. But when it comes to the matter of unfairness, the greatest danger, as I view the situation, is in having a commission which will not want to take the ballots. I do not know. I have some recollection of an electoral commission once before which did not want to be fair, did not want to be honorable, and did not want the people of the United States to say who should be the President. They wanted a partisan and an unfair decision. I do not know, but if a commission is named by the President, I believe the commission will want to take the vote. That is all I understand the members of the commission will have control of. I understand they will not have anything to say with reference to how the boys vote, and will not have an opportunity to influence the vote, even if they were to try to do so. Two members of the commission might say they did not want to take the vote at all; I do not know. If a partisan advantage could be gained by not taking it, perhaps it would not be taken, and especially since it would require three out of four of the commissioners to agree to any particular move.

I think it will be a reflection on the Senate of the United States, if it fails to arrange for these boys to vote, and to vote as they please. I think the partisan jockeying is a reflection on the Members of the Senate rather than on the President or on those who would be appointed to the commission. As I look at some of the amendments, one of them apparently would attempt to prevent the President of the United States from being a candidate if he appointed the commission. All sorts of petty, political, sniping efforts seem to be presented at this time—efforts which to my mind are for no other purpose than to have an effect on the people of the United States.

If undesirable amendments are added to the bill, let the boys know who placed such undesirable amendments in the bill. They will know. It seems to me that is important. Either we want them to vote or we do not want them to vote. If we want them to vote, the method can be speedily arranged. If we do not want the boys to vote, all sorts of jockeying can be resorted to, and Senators may leave the impression that they wanted the boys to vote. I do not think Senators will succeed in leaving such an impression.

The partisan line-up yesterday showed about how the Members of the Senate then in the Chamber stood. Of the 29 votes which were cast against the motion to have the Senate proceed to consider executive business, not one was a vote of a Senator who favored this bill, so far as we were able to understand.

Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. CHAVEZ addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, does the Senator feel that the statement he has made is a fair one, that not one of the 29 Senators who voted against having the Senate proceed to consider executive business was in favor of the principle of the bill—of giving the soldiers the vote?

Mr. TUNNELL. I did not say the principle of the bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. O Mr. President, the Senator has been saying all along that on this side of the aisle a great many Senators were against giving the soldiers the right to vote.

Mr. TUNNELL. I said against "this bill," and I used the plain language "against this bill." This bill was prepared by both Democrats and Republicans; and I think it is fair; I think it is intelligent, and I think those who prepared it, both Republicans and Democrats, were intelligent. I think the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN],

who is representing the party of the Senator from New Hampshire, knew what he was doing when he recommended this bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, does the Senator think the Senator from Vermont is fully satisfied with the present form of the bill?

Mr. TUNNELL. I do not know. I know what he said when he was in the committee. I was present at that time.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator said he believes in nonpartisanship, that he resents the partisan jockeying which is going on.

Mr. TUNNELL. I never said I favored nonpartisanship.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad the Senator recognizes that.

Mr. TUNNELL. I certainly would not talk about nonpartisanship to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I hope the Senator would not, because I do not think there is a more partisan Member of this body than the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. TUNNELL. And I know there is none more partisan than the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG and Mr. CHAVEZ rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. TUNNELL. I am not being asked to yield, Mr. President.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. Am I to understand from what the Senator has said that he implies that no amendments offered to the bill have been offered in good faith?

Mr. TUNNELL. No; I did not say that. Some of the amendments which have been offered have been accepted, and have been accepted in good faith. I think they were offered in good faith. But I do not believe that some of the amendments were offered in good faith.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does the Senator from Delaware feel that the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire was in good faith?

Mr. TUNNELL. I do not think it is a fair one; no. I do not know whether the Senator from New Hampshire intended it in good faith or not. That is not for me to say.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does the Senator from Delaware mean to imply that any Senator who may have favored the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire might have been acting in bad faith?

Mr. TUNNELL. I imply that I think he was wrong.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Well, Mr. President, we are human.

Mr. TUNNELL. But it seems to me——

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware does not yield. The Senator from Delaware has the floor, and may proceed.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, under these circumstances it seems to me we ought to vote either for the bill in principle or against the bill in principle. If there are Senators who want the bill passed in some form, if they will make any suggestion they desire to make to the chairman of the committee or to the senior Senator from Vermont, I think there will be no trouble in having the Senate agree to any reasonable amendment which will protect the voters or the Republican Party or the Democratic Party. I think we all want to do it; but I do not think that the idea of a general protest against the bill, and jockeying even against holding an executive session, indicate a desire to have an honest and full vote of the soldiers of the United States.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I have sought recognition as one who is strongly in favor of the proposed legislation. I intend to vote for it. I am also one of those on this side of the aisle who voted for the Bridges amendment yesterday. I voted for it for reasons which I consider to be strong enough to be controlling with me. This afternoon I have been strengthened in the position which I then took.

There is no question whatever that in the naming of a commission as envisioned by the bill, there would be criticism of the composition of such a commission. Whether the criticism were just or unjust, there would be criticism. It is my belief that a suggestion such as presented by the Bridges amendment would relieve the President of the United States from the possibility of being charged with discrimination, unfairness, or inequity. If the selections were made from lists presented by the respective dominant parties, there could properly be no criticism whatever of the selection from such lists.

Today I have listened to a statement made by the majority leader. Yesterday a similar statement was made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and a statement in somewhat different form was made by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. Those statements were to the effect that if there should be submitted to the Senate a name which in the opinion of the minority seemed to be unacceptable, they would join in a request to withdraw it. That statement is just what we might expect from those Senators, as we know them. We might expect them to do that, because they are eminently fair, just, honest, and sincere. I know they would do so, even though they had not made such a statement.

But can anyone conceive of any greater reflection on the President of the United States than a request from the majority leader of this body, supported by the request of other Senators, to withdraw a name which had been sent to the Senate? Such a request could be predicated on nothing else than the definite statement that the President had abused his discretion and sent to the Senate a nomination which was inequitable, unjust, and unfair. That is the very thing we are trying to avoid. I am a Democrat, and I do not wish to place the President of the United States in that unenviable situation, in which the majority leader, supported by his party, would say to the President, "Mr. President, you have submitted a nomination which is unacceptable. You have laid yourself open to the charge that you have abused your discretion and have been unfair." Talk about reflecting on the President. Can anyone conceive of anything that would be more insulting than that to the Chief Executive of the United States?

It is for that reason, Mr. President, that I voted, as a Democrat, for the amendment which would permit the two dominant parties, the machinery which is set up under the laws of the United States for the handling of party affairs, to submit a list to the President and let the President, in his discretion, make the selection from that list. Under such an arrangement no one could be heard to object or to say that the President had abused the confidence placed in him. I voted for that proposal as a Democrat for that reason.

I voted for the motion of the majority leader to hold an executive session, because I thought it was unfair to take advantage of the situation. The Senate ought to have an opportunity to vote on the question on its merits.

Today, if I am permitted to do so, I expect to vote for reconsideration of the Bridges amendment. If it is reconsidered, I expect to vote for its adoption, to aid a Democratic President of the United States, and certainly not to reflect on him.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am afraid we are losing sight of the objectives of the bill. No one doubts the sincerity of purpose of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. I am satisfied that it is the desire of the people of the United States and of Members of Congress to give soldiers the right to express their opinion on election day. I wish to go along with that idea. I wish every soldier, wherever he may be, to vote; and I want him to vote as he pleases, irrespective of party politics. If he wishes to vote for a Republican candidate, I wish to see his vote safeguarded. I say this in all sincerity. I happen to have a boy in the armed forces. I wish his vote to be counted, and I wish him to vote for whomever he wishes to vote for.

Every mother's son in the armed forces anywhere should have the opportunity to express his opinion.

The idea seems to prevail that honesty of purpose can be found only in certain quarters. I deny that. I never was for personalities. I am for law and order, and the ideals and traditions of the American people.

What is wrong with the proposal to safeguard the right of the soldier to express his opinion as to whom he wants for President? What is the matter with

the Republican Party, or with the Democratic Party? Every Member of the Senate was elected as the result of nomination by a political party. One must first be nominated by some political party before he is elected to the office of Senator, or the office of President. What is wrong with our system, which has prevailed for 160 years, and has made this country what it is today? Do we have individual responsibility in Government, or do we have party responsibility in Government? What is the American system?

If we want to give soldiers the right to vote, why are we not fair about it, if we do not want to be partisan? I do not care how the soldier votes. I have a pretty good idea how he is going to vote, but that is his business. If we are sincere and wish to give him the vote, let us give it to him with all the safeguards possible, whether he votes for us or against us. We seem to be afraid. A doubt has arisen because there happens to be a Democratic National Committee and a Republican National Committee. I notice that the Democratic National Committee has called a meeting for January. For what purpose? With the idea in mind of a political campaign to nominate and elect a candidate. I intend to support that candidate, whoever he may be. I am a Democrat; but I also believe in fair play. I believe that the Republicans of this country are entitled to representation. That is in keeping with our system.

So if we really wish to be fair, if we really wish to give soldiers the right to express their opinions, what is wrong with the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Pepper
Andrews	Green	Reed
Austin	Guffey	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Barkley	Hawkes	Scrugham
Bilbo	Hayden	Shipstead
Bone	Hill	Smith
Brewster	Holman	Stewart
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Lodge	Tobey
Butler	Lucas	Truman
Byrd	McCarran	Tunnell
Capper	McClellan	Tydings
Caraway	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chavez	McKellar	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wallgren
Danaher	Mead	Walsh
Davis	Millikin	Wheeler
Eastland	Moore	Wherry
Ellender	Nye	White
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wiley
George	O'Mahoney	Willis
Gerry	Overton	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

CONDITIONS IN YUGOSLAVIA—STATUS OF SMALLER NATIONS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have before me two articles which I clipped from two local newspapers some days ago. One of the articles is by Mr. William Philip Simms who writes daily for the Washington News. It is entitled "Dangerous Situation." I wish to read but one paragraph of the very able article. It reads as follows:

Here, then, is a job for the "big three" who met in Moscow. Unless the Yugoslav and similar situations can be cleaned up soon, American troops may find themselves shedding their blood in ideological revolutions they know nothing about instead of maintaining order while free people decide their way of life at the polls.

I ask that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DANGEROUS SITUATION

(By William Philip Simms)

The fires of a situation highly inimical to the United States and Great Britain are being fed by groups, in this country and abroad, seeking to use the war as a lever to overthrow European governments-in-exile and install regimes of their own.

Unless, therefore, the United States, Britain, and Soviet Russia soon find a way to implement the decisions of Moscow, American and British soldiers may be fired on by the very peoples they have crossed oceans to liberate.

The spirit of the Moscow pacts was first to defeat Hitler, then to provide peace and order in which the enslaved peoples of Europe could go to the polls and set up democratic governments of their own choosing.

What is happening right now is that within several of the occupied countries revolutions are either under way or about to start, with a view to facing the Allies with a fait accompli—a government in being and on the spot to take the place of the one now recognized. That is to say, a government imposed by force—perhaps by a minority.

Yugoslavia offers perhaps the best example of what I mean. King Peter II, the legitimate ruler and one of our allies, is in exile in Cairo. His cabinet is there with him—all save Gen. Draja Mihailovich, his Minister of War, now fighting in Yugoslavia. The general is under the Near Eastern command of Gen. Sir Henry Maitland Wilson.

Another group of guerillas, under Gen. Josip (Tito) Brozovich, is also in the field. It is strongly backed by Moscow and is obviously bent on smashing Mihailovich's Chetniks and preventing the return of King Peter.

All of which, of course, would be none of our business, here in the United States, but for one important fact. Yugoslavia is one of the United Nations. She is an ally. One of these days Anglo-American troops will almost certainly be landing in the Balkans, fighting and dying to free the people of Yugoslavia from the Axis. When they land, they are going to have to fight alongside the guerillas, among others General Mihailovich and his Chetniks. And when they do, the Communist and leftist followers of "Tito," as likely as not, may turn their weapons against them.

One of Tito's principal spokesmen in the United States is Louis Adamic, author of a number of books on Yugoslavia. He was born there and presumably knows the country and its people pretty well. Here is what he says in My Native Land, his latest volume:

"They (the people) will not tolerate any * * * Darlan or Giraud. They are Balkanites and they will kill them. If the Anglo-American forces come into the country with the wrong approach and protect Darlan so no one can get at him, someone will be apt to kill the highest British or American officer he can get at."

Mr. Adamic was not writing carelessly when he wrote that. It is clear that unless something is done meanwhile we will be running into an utterly impossible situation when we land in the Balkans. It is significant that he includes Giraud along with Darlan and the context of his book is such as to make it plain that almost any leader associated with Peter will, in his opinion—and in the opinion of Tito's partisans—be regarded as a Darlan or Giraud.

Here, then, is a job for the "big three" who met in Moscow. Unless the Yugoslav and similar situations can be cleaned up soon, American troops may find themselves shedding their blood in ideological revolutions they know nothing about instead of maintaining order while free people decide their way of life at the polls.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the remaining article to which I refer was published in the Washington Evening Star of November 18, 1943, from the pen of Constantine Brown, whose column I read regularly. He writes under the heading This Changing World. The article also discusses the European situation. I do not wish to take the time of the Senate to read the entire article, and consequently I shall read but one paragraph in which he states as follows:

Since it is evident the Russian armies will be in Poland and in the Baltic states long before the Americans and British, and there is already a Soviet-created force—the Partisans—in Yugoslavia, the representatives of these governments feel that the death knell of their political independence has been sounded.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

Intense gloom prevailed yesterday in the embassies and legations of the smaller European nations which had hoped that their claims to sovereignty would be upheld by the British and American Governments at the Moscow Conference.

The atmosphere of gloom followed Secretary of State Hull's press conference of Tuesday in which he said the countries which soon will be liberated from the German yoke will be policed by whatever army reaches any particular area first.

Since it is evident that the Russian armies will be in Poland and in the Baltic states long before the Americans and British and there already is a Soviet-created force—the Partisans—in Yugoslavia, the representatives of these governments feel that the death knell of their political independence has been sounded.

It also is considered significant that although Gen. Henri Honore Giraud officially is strongly supported by the American Government and the Allied commander in chief in the Mediterranean, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, he is on the way out.

LESSON OF DE GAULLE

Gen. Charles de Gaulle, who has the backing of the Soviet Government, has flouted the Washington and London Governments and is now by way of obtaining full control over the

French land, air, and sea forces, which we have insisted must remain under the exclusive control of General Giraud until the war in Europe is over.

The diplomats of the countries which believe that henceforth they will be compelled to accept Russian domination ask how will the Americans and British be able to defend the sovereignty of the smaller states bordering or near-bordering Russia if they have not had enough power to maintain their own nominee—an excellent fighting man like General Giraud—at the head of the French forces.

If we cannot exercise our influence with the Algiers administration, which depends on our equipment for its newly created armies, how can the small nations hope to be saved from the domination of Russia?

When it was disclosed that Secretary Hull would head the American delegation at Moscow there was jubilation among the representatives of the smaller states. In their frequent conversations with the Secretary they gained the full conviction that Mr. Hull was a very stubborn man as far as principles were concerned.

It was confidently expected that he would rather leave in abeyance all matters concerning the future of the European states than permit some desecration of the Atlantic Charter.

GREEN LIGHT GIVEN MOSCOW

Realists in Washington had no illusion as to the fate of the nations bordering Russia. But it was not expected that the Moscow conference would actually turn on the green light and tell Moscow, by implication, to go ahead and occupy these countries and discuss their future status later.

It was hoped that for form's sake, at least, a suggestion would be made that all the territories from which the Nazis were to be expelled should fly the flags of Russia, the United States, and Great Britain.

It also was hoped that the Russians might agree that the administration of the liberated countries would be in the hands of the three major powers until a plebiscite could be held.

The American and British Governments were quite willing to have Soviet representatives participate in the administration of the territories in the west. The Mediterranean Council, which was to include the Russians, should have paved the way for such an understanding. In fact, it may have meant little, but it would have given the impression that no individual power but the United Nations as a whole were taking care of their weaker wards.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I take the time of the Senate for a selfish motive in one sense in that I desire to make my position clear to the American people as to why I, as one of the five Members of this body, voted against the Connally resolution. At that time I felt that if we adopted that resolution without any amendment it really meant the death knell to Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and perhaps Finland, and certainly a part of Poland and other portions of Europe. I wanted to see those peoples, for whom today our boys are bleeding and dying on 72 fronts of the world, become possessed again of their respective liberties. Accordingly I submitted an amendment to the Connally resolution providing for the guaranty of the freedom of those countries and the guaranty thereafter of their political and territorial integrity. So I have asked that these articles be published in the RECORD.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. What is the question pending before the Senate at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The parliamentary situation is such that there now pends before the Senate the motion of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] to proceed to the consideration of the motion made by him on yesterday to reconsider the vote by which the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] was rejected.

Mr. LUCAS. I have no objection to proceeding to consider the motion to reconsider the vote had on yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will suggest to the Senator from Illinois that, without objection, the Senate may proceed immediately to the consideration of the motion to reconsider. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The question now pends on the motion of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] was rejected yesterday.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let us have the yeas and nays.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate for only a moment. I merely wish to make one observation in connection with the debate on this proposal. I want all Senators who have made speeches either for or against the amendment offered by the able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] to know that I have the utmost confidence in them and that I realize that they are presenting their views in good faith. The mere fact that we disagree on this amendment is a privilege, of course, we have in the Senate. Whatever may be said with respect to one's views as to the effect the proposal may have upon the President of the United States, I, for one, know that the Senators themselves do not feel that it is a reflection upon him, but I know what the entire antiadministration press of the country is going to say with respect to the amendment in the event it shall be adopted.

No harm of any kind can come to a soldier of this country through the failure to adopt the Bridges amendment. Once again I say that the ballot commission is purely administrative in its function; it has no real decisions to make. The responsibility for getting the ballots to the boys at the front is on the Army and Navy. The ballot commission is nothing more nor less than a clearinghouse for the ballots as they go from the commission to the soldier's ballot box, from the soldier's ballot box to the commission, from the commission on to the secretaries of state, and on down to the officials in the various election precincts. If there is going to be any political abuse or any chicanery, as has been intimated here might happen in respect to the ballot commission in connection with the voting by soldiers, it will not be on the part of the ballot commission; it will be the place where chicanery usually takes place in connection with political corruption and irregularity.

I ask for a vote on the pending motion, and I ask that the vote be taken by the yeas and nays.

Mr. BRIDGES. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire was rejected yesterday. On that question the yeas and nays are demanded.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Pepper
Andrews	Green	Reed
Austin	Guffey	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Barkley	Hawkes	Scrugham
Bilbo	Hayden	Shipstead
Bone	Hill	Smith
Brewster	Holman	Stewart
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Lodge	Tobey
Butler	Lucas	Truman
Byrd	McCarran	Tunnell
Capper	McClellan	Tydings
Caraway	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chavez	McKellar	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wallgren
Danaher	Mead	Walsh
Davis	Millikin	Wheeler
Eastland	Moore	Wherry
Ellender	Nye	White
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wiley
George	O'Mahoney	Willis
Gerry	Overton	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, am I correct in assuming that an affirmative vote is a vote to reconsider, and that a negative vote is a vote not to reconsider?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has correctly stated the situation. The motion of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] is to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] was rejected yesterday. A yea vote is a vote for reconsideration, and a nay vote is a vote against reconsideration.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GILLETTE (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the junior Senator from Montana

[Mr. MURRAY]. I am informed that if he were present he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that if present he would vote "nay." I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], who would vote "yea" if present and voting, and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. BRIDGES (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who, if present, would vote "nay." I transfer that pair to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and allow my vote to stand. If the Senator from South Dakota were present and permitted to vote, he would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to his State.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay" and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have a general pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is confined to his home with a cold.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] has been called from the city on important matters. He has a pair on this question with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE]. If present, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea." I am advised that the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent because of a death in his family. If present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—40

Aiken	Ferguson	Reynolds
Austin	Gerry	Shipstead
Brewster	Hawkes	Smith
Bridges	Holman	Taft
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Tobey
Buck	Langer	Tydings
Burton	Lodge	Vandenberg
Bushfield	McClellan	Wherry
Butler	Millikin	White
Byrd	Moore	Wiley
Capper	Nye	Willis
Chavez	O'Daniel	Wilson
Danaher	Reed	
Davis	Revercomb	

NAYS—38

Andrews	Hatch	Overton
Bankhead	Hayden	Pepper
Barkley	Hill	Scrugham
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Bone	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Lucas	Truman
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Van Nuys
Eastland	McKellar	Wagner
Ellender	Maloney	Wallgren
George	Maybank	Walsh
Green	Mead	Wheeler
Guffey	O'Mahoney	

NOT VOTING—17

Bailey	Glass	Radcliffe
Ball	Gurney	Robertson
Chandler	La Follette	Russell
Connally	McNary	Thomas, Idaho
Downey	Murdock	Thomas, Utah
Gillette	Murray	

So Mr. WILLIS' motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion to reconsider having been agreed to, the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 17, line 2, in the committee amendment, after the period, it is proposed to insert the following: "Such commissioners shall be appointed from lists of not less than six nominees submitted by the national committees of the respective political parties. Vacancies in the commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments, that is, from lists of not less than three nominees for each such vacancy submitted by the national committees of the respective political parties."

Mr. TAFT. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. DAVIS (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that if he were present he would vote "nay" on this question. I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], who, if present, would vote "yea," and let my vote stand.

Mr. BRIDGES (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who, if present, would vote "nay." I transfer that pair to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] and allow my vote to stand. I am informed that if the Senator from South Dakota were present and at liberty to vote, he would vote "yea."

Mr. BANKHEAD (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to his State.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is confined to his home with a cold.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] has been called from the city on important matters. He has a pair on this question with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE]. If present the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea." I am advised that the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent because of a death in his family. If present he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—40

Aiken	Ferguson	Revercomb
Austin	Gerry	Reynolds
Brewster	Gillette	Shipstead
Bridges	Hawkes	Taft
Brooks	Holman	Tobey
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Tydings
Burton	Langer	Vandenberg
Bushfield	Lodge	Wherry
Butler	McClellan	White
Byrd	Millikin	Wiley
Capper	Moore	Willis
Chavez	Nye	Wilson
Danaher	O'Daniel	
Davis	Reed	

NAYS—39

Andrews	Hatch	Overton
Bankhead	Hayden	Pepper
Barkley	Hill	Scrugham
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bone	Kilgore	Stewart
Caraway	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Truman
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Tunnell
Eastland	McKellar	Van Nuys
Ellender	Maloney	Wagner
George	Maybank	Wallgren
Green	Mead	Walsh
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Wheeler

NOT VOTING—16

Bailey	Gurney	Robertson
Ball	La Follette	Russell
Chandler	McNary	Thomas, Idaho
Connally	Murdock	Thomas, Utah
Downey	Murray	
Glass	Radcliffe	

So Mr. BRIDGES' amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be now reconsidered.

Mr. TOBEY. I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

Mr. BARKLEY. On that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that if the junior Senator from Kentucky were present, he would vote "nay." I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], who I understand would vote "yea"; and I will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have a general pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is confined to his home with a cold.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] has been called from the city on important matters. He has a pair on this question with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE]. If present, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea." I am advised that the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent because of a death in his family. If present he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—42

Aiken	Ferguson	Revercomb
Austin	Gerry	Reynolds
Brewster	Gillette	Shipstead
Bridges	Hawkes	Smith
Brooks	Holman	Taft
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Langer	Tobey
Bushfield	Lodge	Tydings
Butler	McClellan	Vandenberg
Byrd	Millikin	Wherry
Capper	Moore	White
Chavez	Nye	Wiley
Danaher	O'Daniel	Willis
Davis	Reed	Wilson

NAYS—38

Andrews	Hayden	Pepper
Bankhead	Hill	Scrugham
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Bilbo	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McCarran	Truman
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Van Nuys
Eastland	Maloney	Wagner
Ellender	Maybank	Wallgren
Green	Mead	Walsh
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Hatch	Overton	

NOT VOTING—15

Bailey	George	Murdock
Ball	Glass	Murray
Chandler	Gurney	Radcliffe
Connally	La Follette	Robertson
Downey	McNary	Russell

So the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I offer several amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments offered by the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment it is proposed:

On page 19, to strike out lines 13 to 19, inclusive, and in line 20 strike out the figure "3" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "2."

On page 20, to strike out lines 10 to 14, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof:

Members of the armed forces of the United States.

On pages 22 and 23, in the form of oath following line 12 on page 22, to strike out the letter "(a)" in paragraph (5) of such form and strike out all of subparagraphs (b), (c), and (d) in paragraph (5) in such form.

On page 25, line 11, beginning with the word "and" to strike out down through the word "thereunder" in line 17.

On page 26, lines 1 and 2, to strike out "and to any other agencies designated to administer this title."

On page 26, line 9, beginning with the word "Any" to strike out down through line 12.

On page 27, line 1, beginning with the word "The" to strike out down through the period in line 4.

On page 28, beginning with line 16, to strike out through line 5 on page 29; and change succeeding section numbers to conform with this amendment.

On page 30, lines 9 and 10, to strike out "and the heads of other agencies designated to administer the act".

On page 37, line 14, to strike out "or of any other person."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments offered by the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment will be considered en bloc.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, the purpose of my amendments is to make the bill conform to the arguments advanced in favor of it, namely, that it is a bill to provide special privileges and rights of voting to men and women in the armed forces, and those in the armed forces alone. Subsection (c) on page 20, beginning in line 7, provides as follows:

The following individuals, if otherwise eligible under subsection (b), shall be entitled to vote in accordance with the provisions of this title:

1. Members of the armed forces of the United States and members of the merchant marine of the United States.

2. Civilians outside the United States who are attached to and serving with the armed forces or are officers or employees of the United States.

I proposed to eliminate members of the merchant marine of the United States, and all civilians now included in the language of the committee amendment.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to the various arguments in favor of giving soldiers the right to vote. No Senator is more strongly in favor of affording such a right than am I. I was not privileged to vote when I served abroad in the armed forces in the last war, and I believe that the privilege should be provided now.

I would go further than do the authors of the bill. I would provide that soldiers selected and drafted from their homes at 18 years of age be given the right to vote. I believe that if they are old enough to fight and die for their country, they are old enough to cast a vote to determine under whose command they are to fight and die. According to the best minds I have been able to consult, that is not possible under the present Constitution. Since the pending bill constitutes a special provision during wartime for those who are serving the Nation in the war, it should be confined to those who have given up their civilian liberties and privileges and are now under the orders, restrictions, restraints, and rules of the military and naval authorities of our country.

I understand from the authors of the bill that they are willing to accept these amendments, and I hope they will be adopted.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, my colleague correctly states the situation. These amendments deal with members of the merchant marine and civilians. A very excellent case was made out by Admiral Land and others who testified before the committee in behalf of the right of members of the merchant marine to vote, and a very good case was made out for civilians voting. However, I have discussed this question with a number of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, and in the interest of a speedy determination in getting a bill which we can tell the country the Senate has passed, I have agreed to the amendments offered by the junior Senator from Illinois. The amendments would eliminate members of the merchant marine, totaling about 100,000, and also about 100,000 civilians who are attached to the Army and Navy at the present time.

It is difficult to say just how many might have the opportunity to vote. I know it is pretty difficult to eliminate members of the merchant marine when we consider the marvelous record of their service to their country. They are civilians, it is true, but they are doing a great job in behalf of freedom's cause. As General MacArthur expressed it recently, members of the merchant marine are not only bringing lifeblood to the soldiers on

every front but they are giving their lifeblood in so doing.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am not quite sure that I understand just what is proposed. I read from page 20 of the bill which is on our desks. I see that those permitted to take advantage of the bill are enumerated as follows:

1. Members of the armed forces of the United States and members of the merchant marine of the United States.

2. Civilians outside the United States who are attached to and serving with the armed forces or are officers or employees of the United States.

What is the proposed amendment?

Mr. LUCAS. The amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Illinois would strike out the following language:

And members of the merchant marine of the United States.

2. Civilians outside the United States who are attached to and serving with the armed forces or are officers or employees of the United States.

That is the main effect of the principal amendment offered. The remaining amendments are merely perfecting amendments, because from page to page in the bill we had used language dealing with civilians and members of the merchant marine, which language had to be deleted.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I hear with great regret the concession of the able author of the bill with respect to the elimination of members of the merchant marine from those entitled to the advantages of the bill. As it stands, the committee amendment provides that civilians outside the United States who are to receive the benefits of the bill must be attached to and serving with the armed forces, or be officers or employees of the United States. However meritorious their case may be, they are in the category of civilians.

In my opinion, for the Senate to exclude from the privileges of the bill members of the merchant marine, in which service has occurred the largest number of casualties, in proportion to the number involved, in any of the services, would be a repudiation of the heroism of those men who are valiantly serving their country.

Mr. President, at the instance of a great many persons who are interested in the subject, some months ago I introduced a bill to extend the privilege of absentee voting to members of the merchant marine, and I was highly gratified when provision was made in this bill by the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections for members of the merchant marine to vote.

What possible reason can there be for excluding from the benefits of the proposed act members of the merchant marine? They are essential in the service of their country. Most of them are actually hazarding the perils of the sea. As I have said, a larger percentage of their number have already given their lives in this war than is true of any of the armed and uniformed services engaged in the war.

Mr. President, they have always been the forgotten men of our country's service. It has been only recently that they have been adequately covered by insurance provisions. They were not given the privilege of absentee voting under the last law which Congress passed extending that benefit to the servicemen. I do not know why the able junior Senator from Illinois wishes to discriminate against that body of men who are so gallantly serving their country. I should like to ask the Senator why they are to be picked out when they are on the seven seas as an integral part of our fighting forces and actually hazarding their lives in the perils of combat. Why does the Senator wish to deny to them the privilege of participating in the election of next year, or any other election which may take place during the war, while affording to the soldiers, sailors, and other servicemen covered by the pending bill the right to participate in elections?

Mr. BROOKS. Was the Senator addressing the question to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to have the able Senator give the reasons why he is distinguishing the group to whom I have referred and discriminating against them.

Mr. BROOKS. Because I believe the pending bill provides exceptionally broad, unusual, and unprecedented opportunity for absentee voting during the war. It would extend to men in the armed services the privilege of voting because they were drafted, volunteered, or otherwise gave up their civilian rights and civilian liberties, and placed themselves under orders, discipline, and rules of the military service in armed conflict wherever they were ordered to go.

The merchant seamen are civilians. They are working under union orders. They are following the occupation of their choice, and are at liberty while ashore. Under the provisions of the pending bill, they would not need to be in active service but only enrolled under the War Shipping Board.

They are privileged to do just what 40,000 men are threatening to do on the west coast at this very hour. At the moment we were reading this morning about our marines engaged on a little island in one of the most bloody combats in the history of warfare, 40,000 men of the merchant marine were threatening to go on strike because they were required to take a physical examination in order to insure that they would not take vermin and venereal diseases on the ships where they might pollute the food of our soldiers.

They have not submitted to any kind of restriction. They still have the privilege of striking against any conditions which they do not like. They have the same right to vote as does any other civilian. Those are some of the reasons for my position.

If the Senator desires a further reason, I will say that it is because the members of the merchant marine are and have been under the domination primarily of two men in this country who have been determined to destroy our form of government. I refer to Harry Bridges on the west coast and to Joe Curran on the east coast.

I shall be glad to put in the complete records in my own time if my answer in this instance does not suffice.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, because of his political disagreement with what the leaders of some of the seamen's services have done, it is apparent that the able junior Senator from Illinois is willing to disfranchise every merchant seaman in the service of his country. I did not know that we were going to make this bill a means of punishing those whom we did not like politically. I did not know that the Senator would hold against meritorious seamen the sins of someone else. What about the men who die on the high seas in flaming oil? Are they not entitled to some respect and consideration? What about others who go out to sea to suffer perhaps the same fate?

They, too, go where they are ordered to go, Mr. President. They do not choose the sea lanes where they encounter the submarines. They do not select the hazards of the sea which they are called upon to brave. They are enrolled in seaman's service, and they go where they are ordered to go. They, too, are in the service of their country, and because they happen to possess a sort of civilian status should not detract from the indisputable fact that in proportion to the number of men enrolled, more men in the seaman's service have gone to the bottom of the sea to find watery graves than have the marines, soldiers, or sailors wearing uniforms of their country. In the face of such a record would the Senator castigate the entire number of merchant seamen as unworthy of the franchise, merely because he does not like Harry Bridges, or because a reference was contained in the newspapers relative to some strike? We should not cut off the heads of others, or deny them their civilian rights, Mr. President, merely because they have manifested some disposition to disagree with what some agency or employer has prescribed for them.

I believe that if the Senate were to pick out and discriminate against this group which is serving so gallantly its country's needs it would be to put the stamp of ignominy and contumacy upon every honorable seaman in his country's service. It would be an unworthy act, Mr. President, for the Senate not to recognize the gallantry and heroism of these brave men of the sea.

If Senators had gone along the coast of Florida a few months ago they would have seen there bodies of men washed ashore. Those men did not strike when the torpedoes hit. They did not stay off the merchant ships because they would be required to go through and transit passages which were infested by submarines with their torpedoes. Many times merchant seamen have given their lives on tankers engaged in their

country's service in order that civilians or the armed forces might have the gasoline which the tankers were carrying.

It is now proposed to castigate them as being unworthy of the franchise while they may be on one of the remote seas of the world. Of course, if they were here at home so that they had access to their precinct voting places, no one would object. But when a seaman is subject to attack by submarine and aircraft in some remote part of the seas, on a ship bearing to our men in the service guns, ammunition, equipment, food, and medicines, braving the terrors of the ocean and attack by our enemies, to say to him that he cannot vote, while allowing that privilege to the man in uniform, is a discrimination which I do not believe any Senator would propose against a group of men so deserving of their country's esteem and gratitude.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Florida will remember that, when the tankers were being sunk off the shores of Florida, the junior Senator from Illinois twice advocated on this floor that we set an umbrella of airplanes over the tankers in order to protect them.

I am not in control of the administration. I am sorry that so many tankers were sunk within view of the Florida shores; but I did try to have the administration utilize civilian planes for this purpose. I suggested a plan, which is a part of the RECORD, and which was presented twice on the floor of the Senate, to utilize civilian flyers with the planes available, to fly over the pleasant shores of Florida and save those men. I paid my tribute to those men then, and I pay my tribute to them now; but I assert again that that which is being proposed is a special privilege.

I am not proposing to disfranchise anyone; I am merely saying to you sir, and to the Nation that if we are going to give the soldiers the vote, let us limit it to them. If we want to give the vote to everybody who is in this war, let us tear down the election laws; let us say we are going to write new laws under which anyone who serves in any capacity may vote by a special ballot. It is an unusual procedure to provide a ballot of this kind. I have never seen such a ballot in my entire life as the one proposed here. It has no name on it, but the voter must write in a party name, without having a list, perhaps, from which even to make a choice, although he may be climbing the hills of Italy or fighting in the insect-infested jungles of India. If that is the best kind of ballot we can provide for them, I want it to be furnished to the men and women in the armed services. So far as I am concerned, they stand apart, sir, and they will stand apart in my estimation so long as I live.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois says he would not disfranchise them, he merely says they cannot vote. If they are sent upon foreign service and are unable to reach their polling place, he merely says they cannot vote because they have a civilian status, although they go where they are ordered to go. He says they cannot vote because he does not like Harry Bridges. Mr. President, I think the reason the Senator does not want them to vote is because he thinks they will vote against his party and his candidate.

Mr. President, if the armed services were to say they do not think that the merchant seamen are entitled to the respect of their Congress and the gratitude of their country, that their status in this matter is not similar to that of the men wearing the uniform. I would gladly accept what they have to say, but when Admiral Land, who is an admiral of the Navy, a man of the sea and of the service, pleads that these men may be recognized by at least being accorded the right to vote, and when I know of no opposition that occurred—I will ask the Senator from Illinois was there any opposition in the committee to the merchant seamen voting?

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the Senator from Florida that there was no opposition whatsoever from any witness or from the committee itself.

Mr. PEPPER. Was the provision in the bill when the hearings were held?

Mr. LUCAS. It was.

Mr. PEPPER. As I suspected, this matter comes up for the first time on the floor of the Senate when the able Senator from Illinois offers an amendment to delete and to eliminate the merchant seamen from the franchises and privileges of this bill. They have not been notified, so far as I know; it was not a matter of public knowledge that they were going to be excluded, and, at least, the proposal should have been made in the committee, so that there could have been a hearing on it; but now, on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, when there is not a full attendance, Mr. President, I feel that if we were to adopt the amendment it would cause the men of the merchant marine out there upon the sea to wonder whether or not the country appreciates the hazards they are undertaking.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the Senator from Florida that one of the prime reasons that caused the Senator from Illinois to agree to this amendment was what happened in the House of Representatives with respect to the bill which is now before the Senate. In other words, the same provision was considered in the other body before the committee handling a similar measure, and the committee struck from the bill both the civilians and the members of the merchant marine. In the committee we put such a provision in the bill in the hope that we could convince a sufficient number of Senators on the floor that it should remain in the bill, and that we would then take it to the other House, in the hope that we could convince them.

However, I will say candidly to the Senator from Florida that, after I canvassed the situation on this side of the aisle, and realizing that there is a strong Republican bloc on the other side that is going to vote for any amendment proposed by any minority Member, I concluded that it was the better part of wisdom to agree to the amendment, because several Democrats on this side would vote for the amendment and a solid bloc on the other, and it would mean the adoption of the amendment.

I appreciate that sometimes, perhaps, it is better to fight than it is to compromise, but, on the other hand, if we are going to engage in a losing fight and stay here for a day and a half arguing this question, as we have done with the Bridges amendment, I conceived it to be better procedure for one who happened to be cosponsor of this bill to agree to this compromise. I have no objection and will not be embarrassed should the Senator from Florida seek to defeat the pending amendment.

I am still for the principle. I agree with everything the Senator from Florida has said. I know the kind of record the merchant seamen have made; it is a marvelous record, and they should be included in this bill; but I fear the temper of the Senate; I saw it a moment ago in connection with the Bridges amendment; and if we cannot get Democrats on this side of the aisle to go along with us, and we face the fact of a solid bloc on the Republican side, I fear what may happen to any amendment offered by the minority.

Mr. PEPPER. The able senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] knows there is no Senator on this floor for whom I individually have greater respect and affection than I have for him, and the same statement applies to the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], to whom I am particularly devoted. I do not wish to be obstreperous, but, as one Senator on this floor, I do not agree to the amendment, and I am individually going to do what I can to defeat it if I will not thereby be embarrassing the two authors of the bill, and I shall ask, at least, for a quorum call and a roll call vote on this amendment. We are entitled to that and the seamen are entitled to it.

I do not care to speak further, but we are entitled to a record vote at least, and a quorum call if men who have offered their blood and their bodies to their country's service are to be excluded and to be castigated in the Senate of their country. Therefore I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. GREEN rose.

Mr. PEPPER. I withhold the suggestion if the chairman of the committee desires to address the Senate.

Mr. GREEN. I simply wanted to supply the Senator with some facts to back up his eloquent defense of the merchant seamen, but I will wait until after a quorum has been called.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Pepper
Andrews	Green	Reed
Austin	Guffey	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Barkley	Hawkes	Scrugham
Bilbo	Hayden	Shipstead
Bone	Hill	Smith
Brewster	Holman	Stewart
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Lodge	Tobey
Butler	Lucas	Truman
Byrd	McCarran	Tunnell
Capper	McClellan	Tydings
Caraway	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chavez	McKellar	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wallgren
Danaher	Mead	Walsh
Davis	Millikin	Wheeler
Eastland	Moore	Wherry
Ellender	Nye	White
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wiley
George	O'Mahoney	Willis
Gerry	Overton	Wilson

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, although the pending bill has been referred to constantly on the floor of the Senate during the debate, and in the press, as the soldiers' absentee voting bill, I should like to read from that portion of the bill entitled "Voters Eligible Under This Title," subsection (c), on page 20, as follows:

(c) The following individuals, if otherwise eligible under subsection (b), shall be entitled to vote in accordance with the provisions of this title:

1. Members of the armed forces of the United States and members of the merchant marine of the United States.

2. Civilians outside the United States who are attached to and serving with the armed forces or are officers or employees of the United States.

Paragraph 2 of section 102 provides—

2. The term "members of the merchant marine of the United States" means persons employed as officers or members of crews of vessels documented under the laws of the United States and persons enrolled for such employment with the United States War Shipping Administration, but does not include those in service or enrolled for service on the Great Lakes or the inland waterways.

Thus it will be seen that in the same paragraph and in the same sentence the merchant marine of the United States, composed of civilian seamen, is included and classified for the purposes of this measure the same as the members of the armed services, except that the members of the merchant marine need not be serving, according to the language of this bill; they only need to be enrolled for such employment with the United States War Shipping Administration.

Mr. President, the reports in this morning's newspapers prove the irony and the ridiculousness of such a comparison. It is common knowledge that the recent battle of the marines at Tarawa was one of the most bloody and the most costly battles in the history of the marines. Of that fight three veteran marines make these comments:

Lt. Col. Evans F. Carlson said:

Guadalcanal was something, but I never saw anything like this.

Col. Merritt A. Edson said:

Nothing in any previous war or this one compares with it.

Maj. Gen. Holland McTiere Smith, commanding general, said:

The Tarawa fight was tougher than Guadalcanal or Belleau Wood or anything in Marine Corps history.

Thus we learn how our fighting marines won another battle, this time perhaps at the highest cost of human life ever paid by the Marine Corps, per square yard of territory taken, in its 168 years of existence.

Mr. President, I digress for a moment to call attention to the fact that it was said on the floor of the Senate not many weeks ago that if we had bases made available to us in Russia at the proper time, it would save a million lives. The battle on Tarawa may be a forerunner of what is to come in taking islands one by one.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KILGORE in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I assume that the able Senator in referring to a million lives is referring to a statement made upon the floor of the Senate by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] in executive session. Is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS. No, I was not referring to any statement made in executive session.

Mr. PEPPER. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. BROOKS. I was not referring to anything that was said in executive session.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask the Senator if he recalls that three Senators of the five who made the trip around the world stated to their colleagues that they never understood from any commanding officer anything to that effect, and that another Senator stated that it had been expressed by the Chief of Staff of the Army that if we had those bases we could hold them exactly 2 weeks.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I do not care to get into a discussion with the able Senator from Florida about those bases. All I stated was that it was said that if we had them at the proper time such a saving of life would result. Certainly I do not believe that any Member of the Senate who was on a trip of that kind, and certainly not the junior Senator from Massachusetts, would advocate that we have the bases until the time comes when we can hold them. He so qualified his statement, and was misrepresented constantly afterward. He never at any time advocated that we have them until the proper time, and he said then that he did not advocate it at this time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator for clearing up a point which has caused considerable confusion in the country. If what the Senator now says is the correct version of the statement of the able Senator from Massachusetts, as I am willing to take the able Senator's statement that it is, then no culpability is to be attached, for example, to Russia for not having let us have those bases earlier, because since we would not have been able to hold them in the past Russia was under no obligation to give them to us at that time. I am glad that matter has been cleared up Mr. President.

Mr. BROOKS. In the same newspapers, however, we learn that 40,000 seamen threaten to strike on the west coast because they do not wish to submit to newly required physical examinations. Capt. Edward Macauley, Deputy Shipping Commissioner, stated that the Shipping Administration has received many complaints that seamen with venereal diseases have been in charge of food or that others with contagious ailments have been shipped by the unions, and that the program is designed to weed out merchant sailors with venereal diseases who are a threat to other crew member food handlers aboard ship and to troops in transport.

I think, Mr. President, that this demonstrates more clearly than any words of mine how utterly ridiculous it is to try to blanket into a bill of this kind anyone except those serving in the armed services of America.

The amendment I offer to Senate bill 1285, which is a bill to provide a method of voting in time of war for members of the land and naval forces of the United States absent from their places of residence, is designed to limit the application of the bill to the members of the armed services of the United States. I have always felt that there should be no loss of the opportunity or right to vote on the part of men and women who have given up their civilian liberties to serve in the defense of their country. So strongly did I feel this, that when the bill providing for the opportunity for soldiers to vote was under consideration last year, I offered the amendment which provided that:

No person in military service in time of war shall be required, as a condition of voting in any election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, to pay any poll tax or other tax or make any other payment to any State or political subdivision thereof.

I would be willing to go further in this bill than its authors have proposed and provide that anyone who, through Selective Service or by voluntary action is serving in the armed forces of the United States, shall be allowed to cast his vote regardless of age. I am one who believes that an 18- or 19-year-old boy, if he is old enough to fight and die for his country, is old enough to cast his vote. However, I would limit any such special considerations and privileges of voting to those who are serving in the armed forces, to those who have given up their civilian liberties, to those who are subjected to the orders of military or naval commanders; and it is with that in mind that I offer this amendment.

The authors of the bill, although talking mostly about the soldiers' right to vote and about the rights of the men and women in the armed services, strangely enough include in the same section and same sentence members of the merchant marine of the United States with the members of the armed forces of the United States, and in the following subsection provided the same privileges to

civilians outside the United States who are attached to and serving with the armed forces or are officers or employees of the United States.

First, let me discuss civilians. There might be some justification for extending certain privileges to civilians outside the United States who are actually attached to and actively serving with the armed services. However, since they are not under military direction, discipline or orders, they should not be classified with or considered the same as the members of the armed services who have given up their civilian status and liberty; and certainly these privileges should not be extended to those who are merely officers or employees of the United States who are completely and totally dissociated from the dangers, disciplines and disadvantages of military service. I do not know how many hundreds of thousands of civilian employees this administration has outside the United States, under Lend-Lease, Embassy employees, O. W. I., Bureau of Economic Warfare, and the countless other agencies all over this world. There is an unprecedented number. Certainly they have no claim to the special privileges which we wish to extend to the members of our armed forces who fight and face death so that we may live in safety. These civilian employees already have full rights to vote by absentee ballot.

Secondly, I want to discuss inclusion in this bill of the merchant marine of the United States, in the same sentence and classification as members of the armed services. Notwithstanding the dangers faced and the heroism displayed by many members of our gallant merchant marine, they are still civilians.

The merchant marine has many heroic members who have covered themselves with glory and have earned the appreciation of a grateful nation. I have many times paid my tribute to them, and I pay my tribute to them now. They are, however, following the career of their own choice, continuing as free citizens, and receiving additional benefits incident to the dangers involved. They are guarded, convoyed, and protected by members of our armed forces who have given up special benefits and are living under the rigid rules and regulations of the armed forces of America. The merchant marines work, move, and live as civilians. Most of them work union hours, draw union pay, and have many special benefits such as increased compensation and special bonuses away beyond anything ever received before by men in the merchant marine. They are not subjected to military discipline or military orders when they are ashore. They are at liberty to come and to go as they see fit.

Under the terms of this bill a merchant marine would need only to be enrolled for employment with the United States War Shipping Administration in order to be entitled to the same rights of special privileges in absentee voting as would be extended to a member of the United States Marine Corps fighting at Tarawa or a member of the United States Army storming the strongholds in the hills of Italy.

The vast majority of the merchant marines are under the guiding influence and control of two men—Harry Bridges, on the west coast, and Joseph Curran, on the east coast, where Curran heads the National Maritime Union.

The inclusion of civilians serving in the merchant marine under the direction of these two individuals in the same category and with the same special voting rights as would be provided by this bill for the soldiers, sailors, and marines of the United States indicates clearly to me that this is not a bill solely to extend the special voting rights to the servicemen. It has all the earmarks of an attempt to gather all the predetermined fourth-term votes under the pretense of extending rights to the gallant men of our armed services. I believe that this bill should be definitely limited to the men and women in the armed forces as a war measure, and that it should then be as liberal as it is possible to make it.

Much has been said during the debate about the necessity for the people of the United States having absolute confidence in the United States war ballot commission set up by the pending bill. What is of equal importance to me is that we should have the men and women of our armed forces and their families have every confidence in us. I want them to know that when I say I want the soldiers to have special opportunities to cast their vote, I am not trying to include a lot of communistic fellow-travelers and a horde of Federal pay-rollers whose only claim to special privileges in voting is that they are already on the Federal pay rolls, and therefore can be counted on to contribute and vote to perpetuate themselves and the New Deal in power.

I want to read into the RECORD the official reports concerning Harry Bridges and Joseph Curran, who, as I said before, control the largest groups of merchant marines in the United States. It was under the authority of law and orders of the Congress that the Attorney General of the United States proceeded to investigate Harry Bridges; and on May 28, 1942, these were the findings of fact:

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. That Harry Renton Bridges is an alien, to-wit, a native and citizen of Australia;

2. That said alien entered the United States at the port of San Francisco, Calif., April 12, 1920, as a member of the crew of the barkentine *Ysabel;*

3. That the Communist Party of the U. S. A., from the time of its inception in 1919 to the present time, is an organization that believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States;

4. That the Communist Party of the United States of America, from the time of its inception to the present time, is an organization that writes, circulates, distributes, prints, publishes, and displays printed matter advising, advocating, or teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States;

5. That the Communist Party of the United States of America, from the time of its inception to the present time, is an organization that causes to be written, circulated, distributed, printed, published, and displayed printed matter advising, advocating, and teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States;

6. That the Communist Party of the United States of America, from the time of its inception to the present time, is an organization that has in its possession for the purpose of circulation, distribution, publication, issue, and display, printed matter advising, advocating, and teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States;

7. That the Marine Workers' Industrial Union was a part of the Communist Party, dominated and controlled by it;

8. That the Marine Workers' Industrial Union was an organization that believed in, advised, advocated, and taught the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States;

9. That after entering the United States the alien has been a member of the Communist Party;

10. That after entering the United States the alien has been affiliated with the Communist Party;

11. That after entering the United States the alien has been affiliated with the Marine Workers' Industrial Union.

ORDER

I therefore order that the alien, Harry Renton Bridges, be deported to Australia at the expense of the Government.

I have been informed by the Attorney General's office that this order was appealed to the district court at San Francisco, and was upheld by that court on February 8, 1943. The order and the decision were then appealed to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, Ninth District, San Francisco, where it is now pending. However, Harry Bridges is out on bond and is operating as a leader of merchant marines at the present time, on the west coast. Notwithstanding this official finding under orders of the Congress by the Attorney General of the United States, and sustained already by one court, we find an attempt being made to provide the same special voting rights for men under such domination and control as we would extend to the gallant sons and daughters of our armed services who would lay down their lives to defend their country, their Constitution, their homes, and their loved ones.

Mr. President, in 1941 there was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the Honorable MARTIN DIES, of Texas, a speech in which he said:

I have just received reliable information that the leaders of the National Maritime Union have definitely agreed to call a general strike in the event that Harry Bridges is ordered deported. Because of the seriousness of this threat, I desire to place in the RECORD the record of the National Maritime Union, a completely dominated Communist organization.

This organization, perhaps the largest of all the maritime organizations, is headed by Joseph Curran. Representative DIES had inserted in the RECORD a list of a series of events which he charged proved conclusively Curran's affiliation with and cooperation with the Communist Party in the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the Dies report be included at this point of the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL MARITIME UNION

(Speech of Hon. MARTIN DIES, of Texas, in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, March 25, 1941)

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I have just received reliable information that the leaders of the National Maritime Union have definitely agreed to call a general strike in the event that Harry Bridges is ordered deported. Because of the seriousness of this threat, I desire to place in the RECORD the record of the National Maritime Union, a completely dominated Communist organization.

The National Maritime Union has its roots in the Marine Workers Industrial Union. The Marine Workers Industrial Union was one of the affiliated organizations in the Trade Union Unity League, which was an out-and-out Communist affiliate. The T. U. U. L. was headed by William Z. Foster and was affiliated internationally with "red" international labor unions, with headquarters in Moscow.

In this statement I give you the leaders of the National Maritime Union and their records, which they cannot deny; and again I call upon the administration and upon responsible labor leaders and upon industrialists to take immediate action to expel from their ranks and their employment those who are no more nor less than the agents of foreign powers determined to sabotage our national defense. [Applause.]

MARINE WORKERS INDUSTRIAL UNION

Mr. Speaker, the National Maritime Union had its roots in the Marine Workers Industrial Union. The M. W. I. U. was one of the affiliated unions in the Trade Union Unity League which was an out-and-out Communist Party federation of labor organizations. The T. U. U. L. was headed by William Z. Foster and was affiliated internationally with the Red International of Labor Unions with headquarters in Moscow.

The Marine Workers Industrial Union never sought to conceal its connections with the Communist Party and other Communist-controlled groups. (See exhibit No. 1.)

CURRAN'S CHARGES

In the early days of the National Maritime Union, Joe Curran was among those who frankly charged the N. M. U. with domination by the Communist Party. In letters addressed to Peter Innes, Jr., Curran made his position clear on this matter. In his own handwriting, on August 23, 1936, Curran wrote to Innes, as follows:

"I frankly do not believe there is anything here as I believe the C. P. have broken all our chances up."

Again, with reference to the Communist Party in the National Maritime Union, Curran wrote to Innes, as follows:

"They think they are big shots now the C. P. have about got control of the outfit now with Tommy Ray director of operations here in New York."

(See exhibits Nos. 2A, 2B, 3.)

Tommy Ray, according to the testimony of several witnesses before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, is the Communist Party's dictator in the National Martime Union.

CURRAN SWITCHES TO COMMUNISTS

It is the testimony of Peter Innes, Jr., and others that Curran switched from his critical position on the Communist Party to a position of complete following of the party line. This occurred late in 1936 when, according to Innes and others, Curran joined the Communist Party.

The evidence of Curran's subsequent closeness to the Communist Party is overwhelming. Instances of his connections with the party's organizations are listed below, as follows:

1. Curran's autograph on the delegate's card of Kenneth Goff at the eighth national convention of the Young Communist League. (See exhibit No. 4.)

2. Curran speaking for the American Youth Congress along with Harry F. Ward and Max Yergan. (See exhibit No. 5.)

3. Curran's article in the Champion Labor Monthly for September 1938, a publication of the Young Communist League. (See exhibit No. 6.)

4. Curran's article in the Fraternal Outlook for June 1939, official publication of the International Workers Order, which is completely controlled by the Communist Party. (See exhibit No. 7.)

5. Curran's speaking at a mass meeting of the International Workers Order. (See exhibit No. 8.)

6. Curran's signing, along with many avowed members of the Communist Party, of the golden book of American friendship with the Soviet Union. (See exhibit No. 9.)

7. Curran's membership on the progressive committee to rebuild the American Labor Party which is the alleged Communist Party faction in the American Labor Party. (See exhibit No. 10.)

8. Curran's speaking at the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, a gathering where such outstanding members of the Communist Party as Elizabeth Gurley Flynn also spoke. (See exhibit No. 11.)

9. Curran's sponsorship of the American Relief Ship for Spain, one of the several Communist Party front organizations which raised funds for Loyalist Spain. (See exhibit No. 12.) The acknowledged Communist Party member, Marcel Scherer, was also a trade-union sponsor of this organization.

10. Curran's signing of the Call to the Mexican and Spanish American People's Congress, an out-and-out Communist Party affair. (See exhibit No. 13.)

11. Curran's article in Fight magazine, the official publication of the American League for Peace and Democracy. (See exhibit No. 14.)

12. Curran's signing of the letter to Attorney General Robert H. Jackson in the name of the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights. (See exhibit No. 15.)

13. Curran's membership on the Murray Defense Committee, along with the representatives of numerous other Communist-controlled groups. (See exhibit No. 16.)

14. Curran's speaking at a mass meeting in Madison Square Garden on an occasion when the Communist Party paid for the use of the building. (See exhibit No. 17.)

COMMUNIST PARTY PAYS THE BILL

According to a communication from the president of Madison Square Garden Corporation, the Communist Party of New York, through its treasurer, paid the corporation the sum of $3,500 for the use of the Garden when Harry Bridges was the featured speaker. (See exhibit No. 18.) The money was paid by certified check, drawn by D. Leeds, who was at that time the treasurer of the Communist Party of New York. (See exhibit No. 19.)

CHARLES L. KEITH

The educational director of the National Maritime Union of America is one Charles L. Keith. (See exhibit No. 20.)

Keith is an avowed member of the Communist Party. At the recent New York State convention of the Communist Party, Keith placed the name of Al Lannon in nomination for Congress. Lannon has long been active in the affairs of the National Maritime Union and its predecessor, the Marine Workers Industrial Union, and is a member of the national committee of the Communist Party of the United States. (See exhibit No. 21.)

CORBY PAXTON

The editor of the Pilot, official publication of the National Maritime Union, is Corby Paxton. (See exhibit No. 22.) A letter from Paxton to Mike Quin shows that Paxton was a member of the Communist Party in San Francisco, unit F, No. 9. (See exhibit No. 23.)

BEN RISKIN

A letter from the People's Press, signed by Ben Riskin, deals with the support of the seamen's strike of 1936 by this Communist-controlled publication. (See exhibit No. 24.) Riskin was formerly on the editorial board of the New Order, official publication of the International Workers Order. (See exhibit No. 25.)

MARINE TRAINING SCHOOL

For several years, the Communist Party conducted a marine training school in which party workers were trained for organizing among seamen. (See exhibits Nos. 26A–28B.)

MAY DAY PARADES

On May 1, 1940, the National Maritime Union was in the front of the march in the Communist-controlled May Day parade. The N. M. U. has participated in these parades for several years. (See exhibits Nos. 29, 30A, B, C.)

COMMUNISTS ABOARD THE SHIPS

The Daily Worker recounted how Communists threw the ship's library overboard in order to compel the crew to read only Communist literature. (See exhibit No. 31.)

Witnesses before the Special Committee on un-American Activities have pointed out the dangers of sabotage which even a few Communists among the crew are able to commit.

CHANGE IN LINE

The seamen's unions under the control of the Communist Party have, like all party-controlled organizations, changed their "line" in conformity with the shifting policies of the party itself. The evidence touching this single question is set forth in large volume in the publications of the Communist Party and of the affected unions.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, it has long been a trick of the members of the Communist Party to deny affiliation with that party but to cooperate secretly and wholeheartedly with it. It is also a trick of some men holding public positions to deny any association with the Communist Party but to accept its support at election time and to aid it in many ways in return.

Joe Curran has never wished to serve in the armed services of this country. In 1937 at the N. M. U. convention Joe Curran warned dramatically:

If we don't wake up * * * we will find that we have been legislated out of business or into the Navy.

In 1943, although subject to the draft and having satisfactorily passed his physical examination, he was classified II–A at the request of his union. He subsequently applied for a passport to travel around the world visiting various ports. The State Department declined to issue or delayed issuing a passport, whereupon Mr. Curran left the country on a seaman's passport as a working member of a crew without notifying his draft board. However, he was not permitted even to leave the ship at any foreign port, presumably under orders of the State De-

partment. In the meantime, the appeals board, by a vote of 4 to 1, reclassified Mr. Curran I–A. This was appealed by him through his union, and he has since been reclassified II–A "by authority of the President." Since then he has already proven his desire to show his gratitude, for on the front page of the Pilot, the official magazine published by the National Maritime Union, which he heads, in a prominent box we find his picture with the heading:

IS LABOR ON A NATIONAL BASIS?

We are already on our way with the election of candidates endorsed by the C. I. O. in New York City to the city council. Here in the greatest city in the world, Mike Quill, president of the Transport Workers' Union, C. I. O., was elected with the highest number of votes in the Bronx as a progressive labor candidate backed by the C. I. O., rather than elected by any political machine, Mike won his place through the rank-and-file activities of the C. I. O. members of this city.

If labor on a national basis in 1944 does the same kind of job which has been done for Mike Quill, we will then have the kind of government that we can depend on to support the win-the-war program and post-war plans of C. I. O., our own union, and, above all, of President Roosevelt.

He continues on page 4:

Seven hundred thousand dollars has already been pledged and paid by the various C. I. O. unions in support of the program of the political action committee.

Mr. President, I am sure that every loyal American is anxious for every possible provision to be made to provide special opportunities, with relaxed restrictions, for soldiers to vote. Certainly that is my desire, but it should be confined to the armed services themselves, and not extended to a group among whose members are proven associates of organizations which would destroy and overthrow our form of government, and others who are contributing huge campaign funds to participate in the coming elections. The inclusion of special privileges of voting to this second group with its vast contributions of money and its civilian privileges of participation in campaigning, which are denied to the soldiers, might very well defeat the desire of the soldiers themselves.

I offer my amendments in the hope that every soldier, sailor, marine, and member of the armed forces will have an opportunity, freely and secretly through his ballot, to express his will concerning the future progress of the Nation he is willing to die to defend.

This bill should not be encumbered by provisions with respect to members of the merchant marine, civilian employees of the administration, and other elements to be used only to perpetuate the administration in power.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bankhead	Bone
Andrews	Barkley	Brewster
Austin	Bilbo	Bridges
Brooks	Hill	Reynolds
Buck	Holman	Scrugham
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Butler	Kilgore	Stewart
Byrd	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Caraway	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Idaho	McClellan	Tobey
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Truman
Danaher	McKellar	Tunnell
Davis	Maloney	Tydings
Eastland	Maybank	Vandenberg
Ellender	Mead	Van Nuys
Ferguson	Millikin	Wagner
George	Moore	Wallgren
Gerry	Nye	Walsh
Gillette	O'Daniel	Wheeler
Green	O'Mahoney	Wherry
Guffey	Overton	White
Hatch	Pepper	Wiley
Hawkes	Reed	Willis
Hayden	Revercomb	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

REHABILITATION OF DEMOBILIZED VETERANS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we are today confronted with many serious problems. None of them, however, is more pressing than the matter upon which I addressed the Senate yesterday, namely, the problem of readjusting our men who are returning from the fighting fronts of the world to the routine of everyday normal life.

I was very much elated to receive a letter today from Mr. F. M. Sullivan, executive director, national legislative committee, of the American Legion. I wish to read the letter into the RECORD at this point.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have read with a great deal of interest the address delivered by you in the Senate on November 29, 1943.

You recommend, in effect, that all Government employment and reemployment activities, pertaining to veterans, be coordinated and placed within the Veterans' Administration. The American Legion heartily endorses this proposal. * * *

It is our hope that the proposed coordination of all veterans' employment and reemployment activities within the Veterans' Administration will meet with prompt and favorable action by the Congress. Not only would such a coordination bring about a more efficient Government employment service, but it would also effect economy within the Government and, in one instance, release Army officers for other duties.

The employment or reemployment of veterans returning from World War No. 1 was a problem largely ignored by the Government and industry in the early post-war years. As you know, from experience, this caused a deplorable condition for veterans and their families. The Legion hopes, therefore, that the Congress will take early and favorable action on your proposal.

Sincerely yours,

F. M. SULLIVAN,
Executive Director, National Legislative Committee.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there was one sentence in the letter which I omitted reading. It reads as follows:

The American Legion heartily endorses this proposal inasmuch as it is in accord with the resolution adopted by our national executive committee at Indianapolis, Ind., on November 18 and 19, 1943. A copy of that resolution is enclosed herewith.

I ask unanimous consent that the copy of the resolution be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved by the national executive committee of the American Legion, at its meeting in Indianapolis, Ind., on November 18 and 19, 1943, That the American Legion emphatically reaffirms its position that all governmental functions concerning or affecting veterans should be unified and placed under the exclusive control of the Veterans' Administration; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Legion emphatically reaffirms its position that all legislation concerning or affecting veterans should be considered by a single committee of the House of Representativese and a single committee of the United States Senate; and be it further

Resolved, That the national legislative committee is instructed to use every effort to cause the introduction and passage of bills, and to endeavor to procure appropriate changes in the rules of the House and Senate to carry out the sense of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the national commander be and he is hereby given authority to call the national executive committee into special session, at such time and place as he shall determine and designate, to further the carrying out of the provisions of this resolution, and for any other desirable and proper purposes.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, until just a few hours ago I was unaware that the American Legion had taken such steps. It is gratifying to know that they are in accord with my thoughts on this subject. It will be noted that the resolution adopted by the national executive committee of the American Legion is all embracing, while the proposals made by me in the first instance before the Senate yesterday were concerned chiefly with the development of a bureau under the auspices of the Veterans' Administration.

World War No. 1 should have taught us many things, among them that the returning servicemen, fresh from the grimness of battle and death, must not be expected immediately to adjust themselves to the normal quiet channels of everyday life. They have lived each day for the moment, and those periods during which they touched civilian life while on leave were days which were carefree and happy, days when they were not held under disciplinary restraint, and when the dollar in their pockets was only for the moment's pleasure. Such responsibilities as they had assumed in civilian life were taken from them and automatically transferred to the Government or to their commanding officers.

Mr. President, our failure to provide now for the rehabilitation of men returning from military service will result in putting them on the streets. Recently I was talking with the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], who called my attention to the fact that in one city in Ohio 126,000 men were inducted into service. But 7,000 of those men have been returned to that city, and 35 or more are returning there every day.

We propose to give the soldier a pocket full of money, and have him sit down and carefully budget his needs as he returns to civilian life. Mr. President, he will not do that, first, because it is not his military nature to do so; and, second, because to a large extent he does not know how.

It is for these reasons that I wish again to invite the attention of the Senate to two major points which to me are paramount in the consideration of any plan for the rehabilitation of our returning servicemen.

Mr. President, this is not a plan for the future; it is a plan for right now, the present time. Somewhere within the boundaries of this country at this very hour 100, 200, 300, or perhaps 500 men are doffing the uniform which they have worn for months or for years. It may startle the Senate to learn that at this very moment more than 423,000 discharged servicemen are back in civilian life with little if any aid from us in their readjustment. The figures which I have given are as of the 15th of October, 1943. How many more men have been discharged since then I do not know, but the number may now approximate 500,000. Thousands of men have been discharged since the 15th of October. More thousands will be discharged before Christmas. Many of them are returning disheartened, dejected, and unemployed. That is the situation which we must consider.

We are asked why the serviceman is returning dejected. It is because the home which he left is not adjusted to him. He is not adjusted to return to his friends, his wife, or his girl. Why is he not adjusted? Because he has no plan. He has no objective. Why has he neither of these? Because he finds the patriotic public which patted him on the back now wants to know why he is not in uniform.

The War Department is to be complimented on overcoming this situation by issuing military discharge pins. But we in the Houses of Congress are not as yet to be congratulated on the plans we are making for these boys who, after all, are but the forerunners of returning millions.

My proposal for the remedying of this situation is basically simple. I may say, parenthetically, that the trouble with a great deal of our thinking is that we make it too complicated. If we make it simple, we may find a solution to almost any problem.

Before I submit the bill in its final form I wish to have the advice of every experienced man available to me. I hope to have the bill ready for presentation in the immediate future, but in the meantime I ask the Congress to consider these two simple points which are the fundamentals of the final plan:

First. Before his discharge from the service prior to or after the armistice each veteran is to submit his qualifications and desires for future employment. His questionnaire is to contain a complete dossier of his preservice and his service record. It is important that this be done while he is still under military jurisdiction and discipline.

I would stress here again the importance of having each man's desires as to employment and locality of employment established. We cannot turn these young men onto the streets without some concrete objective for their future. Demobilization pay is important only if there is a definite plan as to where they are going and what they are going to do. That plan should be executed immediately upon their discharge. If not, there will be countless numbers of unemployed veterans in every large city and community of the country, resulting in the beginning of another bread line.

Second. Acting upon the information contained in the questionnaire, paragraph 1, an employment expert of the Veterans' Administration will personally consult with each of the veterans about to be discharged. Through the facilities of other organizations, such as the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Red Cross, State and Government employment services, the United States Employment Service, and so forth, the expert will have at his disposal recorded lists of jobs and of qualifications for employment therein. After discussion with the veteran, through his experience and training, the representative of the Veterans' Administration will be in a position to determine the man's qualifications for the job best suited for him. He will know the locality to which the young man wishes to return, and why. He will not act arbitrarily, but will attempt to guide the veteran through the confusion of the readjustment period, return him to the section of the country which he desires to go, with a definite appointment for trial at the job he wants.

Mr. President, I may say that to prevent confusion that comes to the returning soldier is the principal objective. I have seen on the streets of big cities in the East and have talked to many men who have been inducted into the service, who have felt the impact of something strange in their lives of which they never conceived before, and then, all at once, found themselves discharged. I tell you, Mr. President, the country cannot let them down as it did after the last war, not simply for the sake of the boys, though, God knows, they are entitled to all the care and consideration that can be given to them, but for the country's sake. We are talking now in terms of millions, and the strength of this country is dependent upon the morale of the individuals composing it.

It is my hope that I shall be able to present to the Senate a more complete picture of what has happened to the hundreds of thousands of young men who have already been returned to civilian life before I ask support for this measure. In the meantime I should like to ask the earnest consideration of my colleagues—not as Senators but as citizens and fathers—of the proposals I have already made to the members of the Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association, which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as of today. Certainly the great States which other Senators represent offer equal opportunities for the rehabilitation of our young men.

I ask Senators to consider it as if it were their own personal problem; and in so considering it, I ask them, as representatives of their constituents, to consider it as a problem of each and every one of them, and as a problem of the Nation at large, for the readjustment of these young men to our society concerns that society as vitally as it does the young men themselves. Let us think of this readjustment as the decompressing chamber between military and civilian life.

Mr. President, this is a great problem—to my mind, the most pressing one of the moment. It is not a political problem. It strikes too near to home for that. We all have sons, nephews, or the sons of friends in the services. I challenge Senators to ask them what they want when they return from the wars. Or, better still, stop any serviceman on the street and ask him what he wants when he returns from the wars.

I say again, Mr. President, ask him. If you will ask him, you will receive the answer. This problem is so near to the hearts of Americans, it is so close to the hearts of American mothers, it is so fundamentally tied up with the future prosperity and the health, economically and otherwise, of this country that I appeal to the Senators to make it their concern in the immediate future.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, if we may return to the matter before the Senate, I should like to make a few brief comments on the amendments proposed by the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS].

Listening to him, I gather that the main objection he has to the language of the bill to which his amendments are directed is that relating to the merchant marine. He seeks to amend the bill by striking out the provision to include the merchant marine with the Army and Navy, the United States Marine Corps, and the United States Coast Guard.

That matter was fully discussed in the committee, and it was thought that it was only fair to include the men of the merchant marine, that their duties were analogous to those of the men in the Navy, that they were subjected to similar dangers, that they made the same sacrifices, and that the reasons which kept them from the polls were the same as those that applied to the men of the Navy.

I have received a number of letters from men in the merchant marine. This very morning I picked out of my mail two letters which I thought I could read to the Senate as examples of the kind of letters which I suppose all other Senators are receiving. I will omit the

names because the letters were privately written, but will read the body of each letter. The first one is from the wife of a man in the merchant marine and reads as follows:

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: I am very much interested in your bill, S. 1285. I sincerely believe that those men fighting and dying to preserve our democracy can best insure it by their own participation.

I am deeply concerned, however, at the omission of the merchant seamen and earnestly urge that your bill be so amended as to include them. As the wife of one of these 200,000 men delivering the goods to our far-flung battle fronts, I feel to exclude these men from the right to vote along with the rest of our armed forces is to again, as Admiral Land so aptly stated had been an insulting attitude in the past, consider them as second-rate citizens.

In the hope the situation may be remedied, I remain,

Respectfully yours.

The other letter is from a man who himself is in the merchant marine. He says:

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: Being a merchant seaman, I necessarily get to see a great many countries and meet people of all races, creeds, etc. This traveling around has made me appreciate more and more the democracy we have here at home. Because of this I want the right for myself as well as for all citizens to partake in our government. Therefore, I urge you to include merchant seamen with the soldiers and sailors in S. 1285, which extends the absentee ballot to these groups.

Mr. President, most of the speech made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] in supporting his amendment was devoted to the labor unions, including seamen. All those remarks are beside the point. The unions are not included. If Senators will read the language of the bill itself, they will find it defines members of the merchant marine on page 19, line 13:

The term "members of the merchant marine of the United States" means persons employed as officers or members of crews of vessels documented under the laws of the United States and persons enrolled for such employment with the United States War Shipping Administration, but does not include those in service or enrolled for service on the Great Lakes or the inland waterways.

The last exception is made because it seems unnecessary to give them special privileges when they are not on the high seas, and presumably are in a position to vote, either in person, or under the absentee ballot laws of their States.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Then from what the able chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, who is in charge of the bill, says, the members of Mr. Harry Bridges' union, who, as I understand, are the dock workers, would not come within the scope of the bill at all?

Mr. GREEN. Exactly; it has nothing to do with them one way or another. The Senator from Illinois stated his interest in the merchant seamen, and his admiration for them, but almost all his address was taken up in showing up a lot of crooks, and denouncing them.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. As I understand the bill, then, as reported by the able committee, the only merchant seamen who would get the benefit of the bill are those who are either actually upon vessels upon the high seas or enrolled for service upon the high seas.

Mr. GREEN. The Senator is correct; and it does not include those enrolled with the labor unions.

The shipping lists of the War Shipping Administration include only a part of the available manpower pool. Persons registered with union organizations are not technically enrolled with the War Shipping Administration, though they are counted as a part of the available manpower pool.

I doubt whether the Senator from Illinois or any of the other Senators realize to what extent the merchant seamen have suffered casualties in the war. I have never before seen the figures, and I wish to present them to the Senate now for the first time.

Up to October 31, this year, 5,335 merchant seamen were listed as dead, missing, or prisoners of war, divided as follows: 655 dead, 4,133 missing, 547 prisoners of war.

Senators understand that most of the 4,133 listed as missing are really dead. At least the United States Government has regarded them as dead, because it has paid the insurance money which goes to the heirs in case of death. In other words, almost 5,500 merchant seamen have suffered casualties. Yet it is said that they are entirely different, a lower class, from the men in the Navy; and, listening to what has been said, one would suppose that these men sail in safety, like passengers on pleasure vessels, while they are surrounded by other vessels of the Navy which bear all the sacrifices, and that those on naval vessels are the only ones who risk themselves to danger or injury.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

It seems to me this list of casualties, which I believe to be accurate, though I have not the comparative figures actually to corroborate the statement, since they are not available, shows a larger percentage of losses in the case of merchant seamen than is shown in the Navy itself.

Many men in the merchant marine are dissuaded from entering the Navy because it is represented to them that the service in which they are engaged is an essential service, as essential as that in the Navy itself.

I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Are the casualties the Senator mentions among sailors of the United Nations, or are they Americans?

Mr. GREEN. They are Americans.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is the Senator positive about that?

Mr. GREEN. As the Senator doubtless knows, there is an agency which lists all the casualties in the Navy and the merchant marine, and those I have mentioned are the casualties listed by that agency. I assume they are all Americans. At any rate, they have been sailing as merchant seamen on American vessels.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator may be correct, but I have seen those figures, and I have seen it stated that the casualties are not all Americans. I was merely wondering whether the Senator was accurate in his statement.

Mr. GREEN. I wish I could answer the question more definitely, but it is not to the point exactly, because the point is that, if they were not citizens, they could not vote anyway, and we are making the argument as to why these men are included.

I confess frankly that this question does not go to the essence of the bill. We want the bill enacted giving the men in the armed services the right to vote anyway, but it seems to me, and it seems to the other members of the committee, regardless of party, that the position of these men is analogous to that of men in the Navy for the reasons I have already stated.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not wish to argue with the Senator, but I do think that it is important to know whether these sailors are of the general United Nations, or are American sailors, or are a combination of Americans and other nationals sailing under the American flag.

Mr. GREEN. I do not think that is to the point, because my point is that the danger in their service is equal to that of service in the Navy. That is the point.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is true, but if we make comparisons, we should have comparisons of similar things.

Mr. GREEN. I have not the figures even as to the Navy. It is only round figures I am using. I do not like to see the service of these merchant seamen minimized.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator a question about the merchant seamen. Can the Senator tell me whether they are under any military discipline on shore?

Mr. GREEN. I believe not, but they are liable to serve when called.

Mr. MILLIKIN. As distinguished from ship discipline, are they under military discipline while they are on ships?

Mr. GREEN. The discipline is very similar, as the Senator knows.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think there are some points of distinction.

Mr. GREEN. Oh, there are many points of distinction. I merely say that the dangers of the service are analogous, and that the reason the men in the merchant marine are kept from voting is the same as that which applies with respect to the men in the Navy.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Can the Senator say what is the average wage of the merchant seamen?

Mr. GREEN. No.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Can the Senator tell us what the wage of a Navy man is?

Mr. GREEN. No; and I do not think that has anything to do with the point, because there are many other circumstances which affect the financial rewards we are looking to, apart from the actual wage.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I do not for a moment wish to disparage the hazards our merchant seamen confront. As a member of the Veterans' Subcommittee of the Committee on Finance, I have heard some testimony on that subject, and I will say that the hazard is very great. I would not mean to intimate that that hazard can be fully satisfied with money, but those men do receive much more pay than a man in the Navy receives.

Mr. GREEN. That is correct, but there are other compensations they do not receive.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I do not know what the pleasure of the Senate is. It is my purpose to suggest the absence of a quorum and to ask for a record vote on the amendments offered by the Senator from Illinois. It is now nearing 4:30 o'clock, and many Senators have retired to their offices for the day. There may be some reluctance on the part of all of us to request them to come back to the Senate this late in the afternoon. I was wondering if it might be agreeable to the able Senator from Illinois, the proponent of the amendments, to allow the matter to go over until the convening of the Senate tomorrow, and then at any time, so far as I am concerned, after the Senate convenes—I should say at least by 12:30—that a vote might be had upon the pending amendments.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, we have taken all of 2 days this week on the bill, and have made relatively slow progress. As I understand, we have now reached a point where we may vote on the amendments of the Senator from Illinois and dispose of them. It seems to me it would be appropriate to have a quorum call, and then vote finally on the amendments. I think we should do that this afternoon.

Mr. PEPPER. Whatever the pleasure of the Senate is. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Caraway	Hayden
Andrews	Chavez	Hill
Austin	Clark, Idaho	Holman
Barkley	Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.
Bilbo	Danaher	Johnson, Colo.
Bone	Davis	Kilgore
Brewster	Eastland	Langer
Bridges	Ellender	Lodge
Brooks	Ferguson	Lucas
Buck	George	McCarran
Burton	Gerry	McClellan
Bushfield	Green	McFarland
Butler	Guffey	McKellar
Byrd	Hatch	Maloney
Capper	Hawkes	Maybank
Mead	Shipstead	Van Nuys
Millikin	Smith	Wagner
Moore	Stewart	Wallgren
Nye	Taft	Walsh
O'Daniel	Thomas, Idaho	Wheeler
O'Mahoney	Thomas, Okla.	Wherry
Overton	Thomas, Utah	White
Pepper	Tobey	Wiley
Reed	Truman	Willis
Revercomb	Tunnell	Wilson
Reynolds	Tydings	
Scrugham	Vandenberg	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I merely wish to say a few words. The question involved, of course, I say to Members of the Senate who have just entered the Chamber, if they will not think it presumptuous of me to tell them, is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] proposing to strike out the provision for the voting of merchant seamen who, under the language of the committee amendment, would be given the advantage of the opportunity to vote, as proposed to be conferred by the committee amendment. The chairman of the committee, the able junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], has pointed out that the measure would apply only to those seamen who are enrolled for service upon the high seas or actually are in service upon the high seas, not to longshoremen and others who are not in the category of those employed for service upon the high seas.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I think it should be added that the amendment would not only strike out the provision for voting by members of the merchant marine, but would strike out such provision as to civilians of all types, and would limit the measure so that it would apply solely to members of the armed services of the United States. That would mean, according to the definition on page 19:

> 1. The term "members of the armed forces of the United States" means members of the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, the United States Marine Corps, the United States Coast Guard, or any of their respective components.

That means that we are now to decide whether as a war measure, we shall extend these unusual and unprecedented opportunities to vote to the members of the armed services of America, and to them alone.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. Are the amendments making distinction as between members of the merchant marine and civilians subject to debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate agreed, a short while ago, to vote on the amendments en bloc.

Mr. PEPPER. Then I understand the amendments are not subject to division, as between members of the merchant marine who will be affected and civilians who are not members of the merchant marine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They are not now, inasmuch as the Senate has by unanimous consent agreed to vote on the amendments en bloc.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, believing it to be only fair that Members of the Senate have an opportunity to distinguish in their vote between civilians and members of the merchant marine, if such an agreement were entered into by unanimous consent, I request unanimous consent that the amendments may be divided, and that the Senate may be permitted to vote first upon the application of the measure to the members of the merchant marine, and second, upon its application to civilians.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as the Chair has just announced, there has been a unanimous-consent agreement as to how the amendment shall be treated. As to the various parts of the amendments, the Senate, acting by unanimous consent, agreed that the amendments should be considered en bloc. I think the unanimous-consent agreement of the Senate should be respected.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well, Mr. President.

A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. Then the amendments of the Senator from Illinois are subject to further amendment, are they not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They are.

Mr. PEPPER. I offer an amendment to the amendments of the Senator from Illinois. At the appropriate place, I move to strike out all parts of the amendments which pertain to civilians, so as to allow to remain the parts which refer to the merchant marine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida to the amendments of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BROOKS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KILGORE. I have felt that the amendment to the amendments might have been misunderstood. I believe the amendment of the Senator from Florida to the amendments of the Senator from Illinois was to strike out from the amendments all parts pertaining to the merchant marine, and to leave in the amendments all parts pertaining to other civilians employed in Government outside the United States. Let me ask whether my understanding is correct?

Mr. PEPPER. If my amendment to the amendments is agreed to, it would, as I understand it, be an effort to strike out from the measure only the provision as to members of the merchant marine, as they are now provided for in it. In other words, it would be a means of dividing the amendments of the Senator from Illinois, and shearing off from them

provision as to civilians who would be affected by them.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. I am a little confused about the vote which is about to be taken. I have no objection to the elimination from the measure of the provision regarding civilian employees. I should like to have the privilege of voting extended to the members of the merchant marine, eliminating the civilians. Frankly, under the present parliamentary situation, I do not know just how the pending vote would accomplish my purpose.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. I invite the attention of the Senator from New Mexico to this question: Would it be clearer, in view of what we have in mind—and my sentiments are the same as those of the Senator from New Mexico—if I modified my amendment to the amendments, and simply moved to strike out that part of the amendments which relate to the merchant marine? Then there would be a clear-cut vote on that part of the amendments. In other words, if my amendment to the amendments is rejected, then the merchant marine part would remain in.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in my opinion, I say in answer to the Senator from Florida, he has now clarified the situation. However, I desire to be sure. If the Senator from Florida modifies his amendment to the amendments as just suggested, and if his modified amendment to the amendments should be agreed to, then the members of the merchant marine would remain within the provisions of the measure, and would be entitled to vote; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment to the amendments to that effect; and I move to strike out from the amendments of the Senator from Illinois all parts pertaining to the merchant marine.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHITE. In view of the unanimous-consent agreement that the amendments of the Senator from Illinois should be voted on en bloc, I ask whether the amendments now being offered are in order, because, Mr. President, in their effect, whatever may be their terms, they are a repudiation of the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the opinion of the Chair that it was not the intent to shut out all amendments to the pending amendments.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, let me inquire whether it is possible to offer further amendments restoring certain groups to the numbers included within the provisions of the measure. I have in mind the members of the American Red Cross, who certainly should be entitled to vote with the members of the armed services, and who could easily be supervised by the same agencies which supervise the members of the armed services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments may be either restricted or enlarged.

Mr. AIKEN. If the amendments of the Senator from Illinois are agreed to, it still would be in order to offer amendments which would restore certain groups under the provisions of the measure; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To other parts of the measure not touched by the Brooks amendments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the amendments offered by the Senator from Illinois would exclude from the right to participate in the benefits of the proposed legislation those young men of America who now are serving in the merchant marine. I desire merely to say that every boy who is serving on an oil tanker which has carried the oil of democracy to the South Pacific and to the Philippine Islands, and has run the gantlet of attack by German submarines and airplanes, would be denied a vote, by the amendments. It is impossible for me to believe, Mr. President, that any Member of the Senate is willing to say that these young men shall not participate in the right which we desire to extend to the members of the fighting forces. I know something about the sufferings these boys have endured. I know that tankers have gone down in flames, and that boys have been burned to death upon the breast of the ocean. In a number of instances, many of them have been rescued from that hell of fire by their associates. Now, we propose by the amendments to say that those associates shall not be given any consideration.

O Mr. President, the men of the merchant marine have endured the hardships and sufferings of this war in convoys on every ocean of the globe. They are the ones who have carried the materials of war to our fighting forces and the fighting forces of our allies. Are we to say that because of some suspicion, some narrow partisan motive, we shall withhold from them the right which we propose to extend to soldiers and sailors? Mr. President, I cannot believe that that is the intention of the Senate of the United States. There is no service in this war that is more meritorious, more dangerous, or more necessary to the victory that we are to win, than the service which is being rendered by the men of the merchant marine. I certainly hope that any provision of these amendments which would bar them from participation in the benefits of this measure will be eradicated.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. We all know that millions of our servicemen are taken to the scene of battle across the Atlantic and across the Pacific by ships in the merchant marine, which are being manned by the very men to whom the Senator refers. So the effect of the amendment would be that the men who are being carried on the ships would be permitted to vote, but the men who are carrying them over on ships would be denied that right.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Precisely.

Mr. BARKLEY. It seems to me incredible that we should do such a thing.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It seems to me that before any such injustice is visited upon the men of the merchant marine we should have a yea and nay vote on this proposal. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, may I ask the able Senator from Florida to explain his amendment?

Mr. PEPPER. I shall be very glad to do so.

As I understand the parliamentary situation—and, of course, I am subject to correction—the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] offered an amendment which, in an appropriate way, would eliminate from the benefits of the bill the merchant seamen and the civilians who are described in subparagraph 2 of subsection (c) on page 20. In view of the unanimous-consent agreement which had been entered into previously, the amendment of the Senator from Illinois was not subject to division. Therefore the only way to give the Senate an opportunity to vote separately on whether it wished to eliminate members of the merchant marine, as well as civilians who might benefit from it, was to move to strike from the amendment of the Senator from Illinois any reference to members of the merchant marine. If I correctly understand, an affirmative vote by the Senate on my amendment would mean that members of the merchant marine would receive the benefits of the bill which are provided in the language reported by the committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Florida with respect to separating those who should vote from those who should not vote. Personally, I believe that civilians should not be permitted to vote.

The distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has just spoken of the great work which has been performed by the young men on oil tankers. I remember that in 1941 and early in 1942 we did not have sufficient hospitals in Charleston, S. C., to take care of the young men from tankers and merchant ships which were torpedoed off the coast of Florida. The situation off the Atlantic coast became so serious that the hotels of our community had to be utilized. I hope that those who demonstrated their bravery and determination in 1941 and early in 1942 may have an opportunity to vote.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, this is not a question of sentiment. There is no Senator who does not fully agree with the plaudits which have been heaped upon members of the merchant

marine. They have rendered a gallant service to our country. But we are engaged in a most doubtful venture at best, as we undertake to override State laws in an effort to create a manner of voting. We have sought to recognize the existence of the law and the limitations upon us, by very carefully delineating in the pending measure our attempted action with reference to voting for Federal officers, as distinguished from an attempt to permit the same persons to vote for State officers. We realize at that very point a definite limitation upon our power. The Senate has already agreed to an amendment, recognizing that under article I, section 4, of the Constitution, we are permitted to decide something with reference to the manner of voting for Members of Congress. That much is established. We have already agreed to that by an amendment.

We have also recognized the fact that there is very serious doubt as to whether or not we have the right to extend the privilege of voting by absentees so as to include voting for others than Members of Congress, and hence have created a separate section with reference to Presidential electors. We have thought, in other words, that whatever power we had should be exercised in favor of members of the armed forces. If our power extends beyond that, Mr. President, then by all means let us extend it to include war workers who are away from their States and producing munitions of war in other States. Let us extend it to Red Cross workers, stevedores, Seabees, and everyone else who may or may not be a part of the armed services, but none the less is rendering efficient and valuable service in time of war.

Obviously enough has been said to justify our drawing the line somewhere. If the proposed legislation is to prove successful, we must establish some predicate for it. The basis for it will not rest on the type of service. It will not rest upon the degree of danger. If we extend the privilege to members of the armed forces, we shall be going as far as we are permitted to go under the wartime powers which are used as the justification for such action.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator draw a distinction between men who are at sea in the performance of a duty which is obligatory upon them if our fighting forces and their equipment are to be transported overseas where they must go, and men who are in the United States working in war plants, and who, at least theoretically, can leave their plants for a day or two to go home to vote if they desire to do so? There is no law which prevents them from doing so. In many States the laws require employers to give their employees an opportunity to vote on the day of election.

I would not favor granting the privilege of voting by mail to those working in war plants. I am not concerned about civilians in the merchant marine having that privilege, but I do not see any difference between the young men who are out on the ocean, no matter where, who cannot get home to vote, and who are carrying our soldiers and their material and equipment to the fields of battle, and the men whom they are transporting to the field of battle. Does not the Senator see a distinction between a civilian in the United States who is working in a war plant, and a member of the merchant marine who may be on the ocean 3,000 miles from home?

Mr. DANAHER. Of course, there is a difference in the type of service being rendered; but let me ask the Senator from Kentucky if he does not recall the fact that thousands of civilians are constructing war bases all over the world, many of them actually under fire. They are civilians.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true; and, of course, they are excluded from the benefits of the bill, but that is no reason for excluding everyone who happens not to be wearing a uniform.

Mr. DANAHER. By the same token, the Senator's logic would apply in favor of the inclusion of all civilians who are rendering wartime services beyond the boundaries of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. I would not enlarge the privilege to that extent.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator's logic applies equally.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am glad the Senator admits there is some logic in what I say.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator has never heard me belittle his logic. It is his judgment which I contend is so often in error. [Laughter.]

We are talking about extending the absentee voting privilege to those who are absent from the place of voting residence, but otherwise eligible to register and qualified to vote in any election for electors of President, and so forth.

Mr. President, for all I know there may be thousands of men who during their entire adult lifetime have had the opportunity to register and qualify under the laws of their respective States and who have never done so. They have voluntarily gone into these services abroad, and yet the proposed measure would purport to say that despite whatever the requirements of the State law may be, we would give to them the power to register and to vote, so to speak, by suspending the State law requirements in those particulars.

It seems to me that this is a very important distinction between the members of the armed services who are abroad and perhaps, against their wills, having been drafted into the service, and those who are volunteers in service, no matter how dangerous their duties may be, or how great the appeal which they have to us may be.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I should like to propound to the Senator a question. If the amendments offered by the Senator from Illinois should be adopted they would exclude all the men about whom the Senator has been talking?

Mr. DANAHER. There is no question about it. As I understand the opportunity to vote would be limited to the members of the armed services, and I will say to the Senator from New Mexico that my own view of the matter is that that is as far as we can go in this respect.

Mr. HATCH. But if the amendment now offered by the Senator from Florida is adopted all those men would be excluded except the members of the merchant marine?

Mr. DANAHER. As I understand the Senator's explanation, that is correct.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I feel bound to express my view concerning this matter, not only because I sat on the subcommittee which considered the bill, but because, in the course of its consideration, the very question concerning which we are now debating was discussed.

Forgetting for the moment the element of sentiment and considering only the true basis of legislation such as is being proposed, what would this bill do which we may regard as raising and supporting armies? By giving the vote to the armed forces we do not transmit weapons, food, shelter, drugs, or anything which contributes in a material sense to raising and supporting the armies of the United States. What we undertake to do is to give that higher value, that more important weapon, namely, the morale which the men in the armed forces must have in order to go forth and face death night and day while we sit here in comfort debating the constitutionality of our act.

I shall not enter upon a discussion of the constitutionality of the proposal. The one particular thing which we aim to do here, if I understand correctly our purpose, is to raise and support our armies by giving to them morale. How long would our armies last without morale? How long would their morale last were it not for the bridge of ships which, against all kinds of terrors of the sea and of warfare, take to them the supplies which are absolutely necessary to wage and carry forward this great battle all around the world?

To me it is perfectly clear that one of our objectives is to furnish the men who are carrying these supplies across that bridge in order to maintain our armies, the same type of support here at home which we give to those who consume the goods and fire the weapons which they take overseas. On a cold-blooded basis there is no reason in my view of this matter for discriminating against the men who go out to sea and encounter all the hazards which men crossing the sea must encounter during the time of war. Discrimination against them in a bill which has for its express objective the affording of morale to our armed forces—one of the most important elements in supporting our armies—is something to which I cannot agree. So I assert that I shall try, so far as I may, to keep the seamen of the merchant marine within the scope of the privileges which would

be granted by the pending bill if it shall become law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] as modified, to the amendments of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS].

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DAVIS (after having voted in the negative). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] to the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and permit my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] are detained in Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea," and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent due to a death in his family.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is confined to his home with a cold.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] has a pair on this question with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE]. If present the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay." The Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—40

Aiken	Clark, Idaho	Hill
Andrews	Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Colo.
Austin	Ellender	Kilgore
Barkley	George	McCarran
Bilbo	Gerry	McFarland
Bone	Green	McKellar
Caraway	Guffey	Maloney
Chavez	Hatch	Maybank
Mead	Thomas, Okla.	Wagner
O'Mahoney	Thomas, Utah	Wallgren
Overton	Truman	Walsh
Pepper	Tunnell	Wheeler
Scrugham	Tydings	
Stewart	Van Nuys	

NAYS—35

Brewster	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bridges	Holman	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Buck	Langer	Taft
Burton	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	McClellan	Tobey
Butler	Millikin	Vandenberg
Byrd	Moore	Wherry
Capper	Nye	White
Danaher	O'Daniel	Willis
Davis	Reed	Wilson
Ferguson	Revercomb	

NOT VOTING—20

Bailey	Gillette	Murdock
Ball	Glass	Murray
Bankhead	Gurney	Radcliffe
Chandler	Hayden	Robertson
Connally	La Follette	Russell
Downey	Lucas	Wiley
Eastland	McNary	

So Mr. PEPPER's amendment to the amendment of Mr. BROOKS was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

MILLIONS FOR PROPAGANDA AND SMEAR

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I hesitate taking any of the time of the Senate at this hour to do what I am about to do, but there is a spreading of insidious poison by newspapers such as the Communist Daily Worker, PM, the Chicago Sun, the Chicago Daily News, the New York Post, and individuals such as Edgar Mowrer, Dorothy Thompson, Walter Winchell, and other radio and newspaper commentators, which makes it impossible for me to ignore a recent undertaking of theirs without seeming to give acquiescence to their accusations and insinuations.

At Chicago on the 17th of this month I granted a newspaper interview to 8 or 10 newspaper correspondents in my hotel room. What has grown out of that interview is a tribute to those who reported the interview so falsely as to give base for the sort of thing writers have chosen to produce and print.

Edgar Mowrer works himself into a lather that lets him allude to what President Roosevelt said about the munitions manufacturers in his message to Congress of May 18, 1934, but makes Senator NYE the "rider" of munitions manufacturers. Mowrer renews his attack upon the Wheeler-La Follette-Nye "head-under-the-bedclothes policy" that went by the name of isolationism. He charges:

Senator NYE was not averse to Bundists and became downright popular with Fascists, both native and foreign.

Mowrer lies about my being "well paid" for a speech for which I was paid nothing and for which I expected no pay. He charges with his mad pen that I "publicly champion fascism," and broadly insinuates that I withhold from one like Secretary Hull "constant and sufficient support." Then comes the grand climax by Mowrer:

The Nyes have not disarmed, not yet given up their fight for a world in which Fascist nations, purring that they "are not aggressive," can again make war on the weak whenever their "peoples are fit."

All of this, mind you, Mr. President, grows out of Mr. Mowrer's reading a report of a newspaper interview.

About this same interview the Chicago Sun editorializes that my argument is "typical demi-Fascist," and goes on to quote me falsely as saying that fascism is not essentially militaristic, and stating that I demanded an isolationist platform for the Republican Party. Other editorials call these alleged utterances of mine "insidious." I could quote other references which have been founded upon the Chicago interview as reported.

But it remained for Dorothy Thompson to do the No. 1 job of deceiving her readers on this whole smear effort. Big Dotty buckled on her shooting pistols and really went to town in her column. What this pistol packin' mama did not do to my thin skin is not worth mentioning. Listen to her:

Senator NYE made a statement sinister in its impertinence. * * * It reveals Senator NYE as the world's leading hypocrite, cynic, and whited sepulcher. * * * The first thing they—

Meaning the international Fascists—

must do is to whitewash their black record, and Senator NYE has started this process. * * * Our civilization—

Screams D. T.—meaning Dorothy Thompson—

is threatened, not only from without, but also from within.

Dorothy is not averse to letting into her column from which I have been quoting a gust of breeze intended to fan to flame those minds which see in every shadow a will to breed racial strife and trouble. She somehow sees in the reported interview with me a very positive will on my part to combine antiracial agitations and the destruction of personal freedoms. Says Miss Thompson:

In this country there are thousands of people who do not see the connection between antiracial agitations and the destruction of personal freedoms. Senator NYE, I believe, does see the connection.

This, she says, is a trick of the Fascist movement being transplanted from Europe to America. To this sort of blabber I can only say, "Shame on those of you who keep appealing to the racial fears and prejudices of your readers and driving for an hour which ought never come to America, and never will come except for the encouragement which you, the Thompson kind, keep lending."

But I have not finished quoting from Dorothy Thompson's column about one Senator NYE. She insists I am either "pleading for * * * victory" for "Fascist enemy countries," or that I do "not want fascism outlawed elsewhere in the world" because I do "not want it outlawed here. It is as simple as that," declares Miss Thompson.

Dorothy Thompson made a field day of it while she swung her pistols at the shadows of what I had not ever said or even insinuated.

Senator NYE's remarks—

She says—

will be printed in full in the German newspapers as soon as they get there. * * * Senator NYE knows, of course, that he is giving aid and comfort to the enemy.

Well, if it is the Thompson-Mowrer-Chicago Sun-Chicago Daily News-Daily Worker report of the interview with me that gets to Germany it may lend aid and comfort to the enemy; but in that event it will be the Thompson-Mowrer and others combination that gets the credit for aiding the enemy, not me.

I have never known such libelous reports and representations to flow from a single interview as have resulted from this Chicago interview of November 17. I shall not dare to hope that the Sun, Daily Worker, Daily News, or PM correspondents covering this interview will bear me out in just what I did say then and there in answer to their own questions. But there were still other correspondents present who I know will bear true testimony concerning my declarations respecting fascism and its future as a form of government.

Confident am I that my colleagues here in the Senate will need no assurance from me that I did not say what I am reported to have said. They have too many times heard me declare my utter detestation of fascism as a form of government. If I say now that I detest fascism and communism with a firmness and conviction as deep as is my love and solicitation for the future of our American form of government, then I am only found repeating what Senators have heard from me before. But I do want the RECORD to carry precisely what I did say at Chicago, and what I said voluntarily, mind you, but in answer to prodding correspondents, who now are recognized as having sought for chance to report a "smear" rather than what I actually did say.

In answer to questions concerning fascism and its future, I said precisely this, and in direct language that could not be misunderstood by those who would have wished to be fair and to report all that was said, not just a part of what was said, not something that had not been said at all. Asked if fascism was not essentially militaristic and aggressive, I responded with these exact words:

Not more essentially aggressive and militaristic than have been other forms of government we have known in this world.

I believe then came an inquiry as to whether fascism would endure after we had won this war, and my response was to this effect, if not in these exact words:

If Germany and Italy want that form of government, then under our policy of self-determination they should have fascism. It is hard for me to believe that the people of Germany and Italy would tolerate more of it after what fascism had brought to them. Maybe the United Nations will have to afford safeguards that will insure the people of Germany and Italy an honest chance to express their choice in reaching their determination.

I was tempted to suggest at this point in the interview that we were once as determined to destroy kaiserism as we now are determined to destroy fascism, and that perhaps our reward for our destruction then was not too fortunate. But had I said that, I should under the circumstances have drawn, no doubt, not only fire but brimstone as an alleged friend not only of Hitlerism but of kaiserism as well. So it is well I kept this dirty, subversive thought to myself.

That was the sum and substance, the total of what I said that would seem to have afforded the rank misrepresentation which has been reported and which I have been quoting at length. I let the record stand right here.

If this sort of reasoning of mine threatens our civilization, makes me a Fascist, gives aid and comfort to the enemy, constitutes a whitewash of fascism or an advocacy of fascism for America, then of course I am guilty of all that has been charged against me.

I suppose I have no right to be surprised that my Chicago interview should have been treated by some writers and commentators as it was treated. When I see the millions that are being spent to break down the spirit of nationalism, when I see the expensive jobs of propaganda and foot work that have been done to purge men who have dared to stand up for their own country, then I suppose I ought to be ready for and expect this artistic smear job that was done at my expense during the past week. However unpleasant it is to have to work in a world where a few unmitigated liars and truth twisters await the slightest excuse to go forth and discredit what one says and does, I am ready to bet everything I possess that the American people are not so easily fooled as some well-rewarded propagandists think. And, after all, the popular verdict is with the American people, not with a few columnists, book writers, and commentators. What will be the final verdict of popular thought and history on these days and the events of these days I have not the slightest doubt. Sometimes I think I see developments that would indicate that popular thought is already reaching a conclusion which is entirely out of step with what the propagandists are wanting and working for.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I can very well understand how the Senator from North Dakota may feel concerning the criticisms which have been made by various columnists of his public career in the United States Senate, and I can very well understand how such criticisms, oftentimes repeated, finally result in the Senator who is so criticized taking the floor in his own behalf.

I desire to say to the Senator from North Dakota and to the country at large that insofar as the Senator from North Dakota is concerned this body needs no vindication or justification of his patriotism and that he enjoys the high respect and esteem of every Member of the United States Senate. Senators may differ with him as to some of the policies he advocates, but there is no one who can truthfully question his patriotism. There is no one who can correctly call into question his sincere advocacy of what he conceives to be true Americanism.

I have had the pleasure of serving with the Senator from North Dakota on the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. He has voted for every appropriation which would help us in the immediate prosecution of the war in which we are now engaged. He has offered no stumbling block to any appropriation, whether for the Army or the Navy or for any other part of the war effort. He has been of great aid to all the members of the Appropriations Committee with his advice and his well-informed counsel, and this advice and counsel have always been toward overcoming the enemy and bringing victory to the Stars and Stripes.

I desire to say this of and to the Senator from North Dakota: History, in spite of what various ephemeral columnists may say, will give him his proper place in the United States Senate and in the body politic of our country, and that is a position which many may very well envy.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2207, Calendar 393, an act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2207) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I I should like to make an explanation.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to hear an explanation.

Mr. MALONEY. The bill passed the House, and many months ago I reported it from the Committee on Immigration. Consideration of the bill was objected to, on the call of the calendar, by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN]. His unwillingness to have the bill considered and passed at that time was based upon an objection by the American Legion. I discussed the matter with the Senator from Oregon, as a result of a prodding by an officer from the War Department, which is very much concerned about the bill. The Senator from Oregon told me that if the American Legion withdrew its objection, he certainly had none.

Once or twice since then I have had calls from an officer in the War Department pointing out that the measure was of considerable importance to a few men.

I will state what the bill would do. Perhaps I had better read the bill:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 401 (g) of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1169; U. S. C. 8, 801g), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"(g) Deserting the military or naval forces of the United States in time of war, provided he is convicted thereof by court martial and as the result of such conviction is dismissed or dishonorably discharged from the service of such military or naval forces: *Provided*—

This is the important part of the bill, let me say; in fact, this is all the bill:

Provided, That notwithstanding loss of nationality or citizenship or civil or political rights under the terms of this or previous acts by reason of desertion committed in time of war, restoration to active duty with such military or naval forces in time of war or the reenlistment or induction of such a person in time of war with permission of competent military or naval authority, prior or subsequent to the effective date of this act, shall be deemed to have the immediate effect of restoring such nationality or citizenship and all civil and political rights heretofore or hereafter so lost and of removing all civil and political disabilities—

And so forth. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is obvious. These young men, guilty of the offense of desertion, with the loss of rights attached thereto, go back into the armed services and into the war; and if they are captured or lose their lives, they then are without status of citizenship. I think it all important for this reason, to give proper protection to such servicemen now in the armed services. Therefore, it seems to me that the Senate should, in keeping with the wishes of the Army, pass the bill.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understood the Senator to say the bill is a House bill. Is that correct?

Mr. MALONEY. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. I also understood the Senator to say that the only objection raised was one raised by the junior Senator from Oregon. Is that correct?

Mr. MALONEY. That is correct. The junior Senator from Oregon is now on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. Has the junior Senator from Oregon withdrawn his objection?

Mr. MALONEY. He has; and let me say that the American Legion, which caused the objection of the junior Senator from Oregon, has withdrawn its objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have no objection.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut a question.

Mr. MALONEY. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. What classes of individuals lose their citizenship by reason of desertion?

Mr. MALONEY. I think that some do under certain circumstances. I am not familiar with the details of the matter in that respect; but I understand the bill is one which was drafted by the War Department, and I assume it makes provision for all situations which need to be cured, and I assume that some deserting servicemen in certain instances lose their citizenship.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to ask one more question. It has been suggested to me that the Senator's colleague the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] had an amendment which he desired to offer to the bill. Is the Senator advised as to that?

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, it is so long ago that my mind is not clear on that subject, but it does seem to me, since the Senator from Maine has mentioned it, that the junior Senator from Connecticut had some matter, not pertaining to this particular situation, which he thought would be proper to offer as an amendment to this bill. I hope consideration and passage of the bill will not be delayed for that reason.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I should not want the Senate to pass the bill at this time unless someone could assure me definitely that the junior Senator from Connecticut had no objection to it.

Mr. MALONEY. I can assure the Senator that my colleague the junior Senator from Connecticut has no objection to it.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, then, I repeat that I have no objection.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to pursue this line of questioning, if I may do so, as to the class of persons who would lose their citizenship by reason of desertion. Does the bill apply to naturalized aliens who may be taken into the service and subsequently lose their citizenship by reason of desertion, or can an American citizen lose his citizenship by reason of desertion?

Mr. MALONEY. I can only refer to the language of the bill. I assume it applies to a naturalized American citizen who had lost his citizenship as a result of the offense referred to.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, Mr. President, I assume there is nothing in the bill—and I should like to address a question on this phase of the matter to the Senator—which would make possible the conferring of citizenship on aliens who might be enrolled in the armed forces; is there?

Mr. MALONEY. I think we almost do that automatically now, quite apart from the provisions of the bill. Certainly the bill does not do so.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LODGE. I do not have the floor; I am simply endeavoring to obtain information.

Mr. WHITE. I have twice indicated, I think, that I have no objection to the bill; but each time I have done so, something has been suggested to me. Just now I have been handed a printed amendment intended to be proposed by the junior Senator from Connecticut to the bill. Unless the Senator can give me very definite assurance that the junior Senator from Connecticut has indicated he has no purpose to offer the amendment, I shall feel compelled to object to present consideration of the bill.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I certainly cannot give the Senator that assurance. I have already given him the assurance that the junior Senator from Connecticut has no objection to the bill. I did say that I recalled that he intended to offer the amendment which the Senator has in his hand. It has no particular relationship to this subject or the purpose of this bill. I think he saw this bill as a convenient vehicle on which to pass a very worth-while amendment.

Mr. WHITE. May we have the understanding that if the Senator from Connecticut voices objection, this matter may be reconsidered tomorrow?

Mr. MALONEY. By all means I would be the first to urge such a step.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to ask another question. Can the Senator from Connecticut furnish any information as to the number of persons to whom the proposed action migh apply?

Mr. MALONEY. I have not the slightest idea. I did not draft the bill. There was no hearing on the bill before the committee. It passed the House, I assume unanimously. In the closing days of the session a representative of the War Department urged the passage of the bill for the protection of these particular soldiers. I have no idea whether there are 10 or 10,000 such men in the Army. My interest arises from a desire to cooperate with the War Department and to give the soldiers to whom the Department refers every possible protection. In my judgment the number affected would not be very large.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2207) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, which had been reported from the Committee on Immigration, with an amendment, on page 2, after line 10, to insert:

SEC. 2. Section 1420 Revised Statutes (21 Stat. 3, 34 U. S. C. 163) as amended, is hereby amended as follows: Strike out the period at the end of the section, and insert the following: ", except that in time of war such deserters may be enlisted in the naval service, upon permission of competent naval authority thereunto authorized by the Secretary of the Navy."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill, H. R. 2207, was read the third time and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will

state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Elmo Pearce Lee, Sr., to be United States circuit judge for the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 1, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 30 (legislative day of November 18), 1943:

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Elmo Pearce Lee, Sr., to be United States circuit judge for the fifth circuit.

POSTMASTERS

OHIO

Zoe S. Garinger, Bloomingburg.
Rachel I. Beal, Brady Lake.
Kenneth L. Burley, Bridgeport.
Effie L. Kinder, Casstown.
Phyllis Hawley, Cheshire.
Willard A. Sawyer, Lockbourne.
John L. Bolin, Monroe.
Viola M. Murphy, Negley.
Bruce J. Mentzer, Phalanx Station.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose glorious name is Love, we bless Thee that now is the heroic, the chivalric time for us to see the vision of a better day. Grant that our fervor may be increasingly earnest, that every impulse of our souls may be unleashed for that hour in which all men shall be brothers and shall seek the coveted privilege of a generous share of the world's burdens. Fill all hearts with happiness, with enjoyment of the good and with thanks that love made the world, guides it, and will be triumphant in the end.

Heavenly Father, we praise Thee for all the sacred influences of life, for home with its memorable benedictions, for the counsel and fellowship of those who are wise and faithful. Blessed Lord, we would not walk alone, but would find strength in others, in those unforgotten spirits which weave a charm about our souls. The hills will vanish like shadows, and the earth only a dim memory, but Thy love will be real and sure, as true and strong as the long reality of the Great Unseen. Dear Lord, we come to Thee in a most obstinate world; forbid that it should be to us a partial eclipse of doubt and dueling, but a resounding call for us to be unafraid and deeply confident in complete victory. O let the solemn shadow of the cross lie broad and challenging across this sick and sorrowing earth. In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a short editorial from the New York Times and a letter I have written to the editor of that paper on the subject of aviation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix by printing a summary by a regional forester, Mr. Joseph C. Kircher, of the southern region of the Forest Service, of the work of that region for the fiscal year 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a very fine editorial which appeared in the Boston Globe of November 12, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, also I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article that appeared in the Boston Sunday Globe of November 28, 1943, by James Morgan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, Wednesday, after the disposition of the regular business on the Speaker's table, and all previous special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SUBVERSIVE INFLUENCES IN THE CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped under special order to speak for 30 minutes on the situation in the Civil Service Commission, disclosed by the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance. However, I know the Democratic Members of the House have a caucus scheduled immediately following adjournment today, and in deference to my colleagues on the Democratic side I have postponed my request until tomorrow.

While I propose in my speech tomorrow to expose the United Federal Workers of America as the pressure group behind the recent instructions of the Civil Service Commission, let it be understood that my remarks are not to be construed as being antilabor or antiunion in any respect. In fact I was a member of a union for many years, long before the days of the closed shop.

The guiding hands in the United Federal Workers' Union have a tremendous bearing on this Civil Service Commission picture, that I believe the Members of the House should know about. The order of November 3, hamstringing the investigators, has far-reaching effect, much more than appears on the surface. I sincerely trust the House Civil Service Committee, with their investigating staff and available funds, will start an investigation of this situation at once. Open hearings should be held to prove to the public there is no desire on the part of the committee to hide anything or protect anyone.

The policy of the Civil Service Commission in the past has been altogether too wishy-washy about the loyalty of our Federal employees. The Civil Service Committees of Congress should write very specific legislation for enactment here and now, under which there can be established a very definite policy, and then there will be no question as to the specifications for our Federal personnel, as to their allegiance to their Government. Never in the history of our country have we needed such legislation as now.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], I be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes, Thursday afternoon, with respect to a matter of historical importance, when I shall undertake to produce the proof substantiating the denial that Henry Clay, of Kentucky, anywhere, at any time, ever undertook to defend Aaron Burr against the charge of treason.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an account of the heroic exploits of a son of a Member of this House, Hon. DAVE E. SATTERFIELD, Jr., of Virginia, recounted from a hospital in the Territory of Hawaii.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

[Mr. FARRINGTON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a brief announcement that the caucus of the Democrats to fill the vacancy that exists on the Ways and Means Committee will be held at 3:30 p. m., this afternoon.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next after the special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a broadcast made by me last Sunday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

INDUSTRY HOARDING LABOR

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WEISS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ALCOHOL FROM SULFITE WASTE LIQUOR

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, it is my desire to call to the attention of Congress the fact that while cattlemen are complaining of a shortage of grains to fatten their stock, hundreds of millions of bushels of wheat and corn are being consumed annually in the production of industrial alcohol.

It is common knowledge that the sugar contained in practically all forms of vegetable growth is convertible to alcohol. In fact, sugar, in one form or another, is our main source of alcohol supply. Careful estimates show that the pulp mills of the United States are pouring into the rivers, lakes, and shore waters approximately 900,000,000 pounds of sugar per year in the form of waste sulfite liquor, which is easily and readily convertible into alcohol.

Shortly after Pearl Harbor, the Puget Sound Pulp & Timber Co., of my State, which operates the largest pulp mill in this country, and probably the largest in the world, filed with the War Production Board a proposal to convert some of this sugar into alcohol at a cost of from 18 to 20 cents a gallon.

In the meantime, Canada has installed a conversion plant of this type, and for several months past has been producing alcohol for 16 cents a gallon. But our Alcohol Division of the War Production Board has done nothing whatever about it. It is still considering the question of policy. In the meantime, we have been paying as high as 80 and 90 cents a gallon for alcohol, and consuming countless millions of bushels of grain that is now badly needed, not only in our domestic economy as cattle and fowl feed, but shortly will be needed to feed ourselves, and to meet our obligations to feed the starving people of Europe.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a short editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of Veterans' benefits, World Wars Nos. 1 and 2, and to include therein some data, which I have had compiled on that subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PARAPUPS

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks and include therein an article written by Mr. Corey Ford and Alastair MacBain.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. FLANNAGAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

WASTE OF FOOD

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday attention was called to the food situation here on the domestic front. Following my remarks, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] said:

> There is some butter that might spoil some place and has spoiled. There is probably some meat stacked up in the refrigerators some place down in the South Pacific that we would never use.

Listening to the gentleman and reading his remarks, one would gather the impression that I was criticizing the amount of food that had been sent to the armed forces. There was no justification for any such conclusion in anything I said. No one would deprive the fighting forces of anything needed; of anything they thought they needed. My remarks were directed, as the gentleman, had he listened, would have known, to the waste here at home; to the inefficiency here at home; to, for example, a policy which keeps 2,700,000 cases of grapefruit until it deteriorates from grade A to a lower grade. That was what I was talking about.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD by including therein an address recently made by Rear Admiral Thomas L. Gatch.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article on Congress and the war by David Hinshaw. I may say that this exceeds the limit permitted under the rule. I have an estimate. It will cost $225. I ask unanimous consent to extend this article notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an interchange of correspondence between the War Department and myself on the subject of the rotation of troops in foreign service, together with an editorial from the Shreveport Times entitled "Rest These Heroes," dealing with the same subject.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE REMINGTON ARMS PLANT, LOWELL, MASS.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks, and to include therein a letter written by the Remington Arms Lowell plant to the people of Lowell, thanking them for their cooperation and help in running that plant, and also a letter from General Campbell, of the Ordnance Division of the War Department, expressing appreciation of the wonderful work done by the Remington Co.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short clipping.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a certain wire addressed to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; also an article from the Gardner News. I also ask unanimous consent to extend two speeches delivered by me recently.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the requests are granted.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders I may address the House for 30 minutes in order to speak of our relations with South America.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RICHARD P. BEALE AND EVA M. BEALE

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 247) for the relief of Richard P. Beale and Eva M. Beale, with a Senate amendment and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of the estate of Richard Dodge Beale, deceased."

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MITTIE PEARL NANNY

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 937) for the relief of Mittie Pearl Nanny, with Senate amendments and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Mittie Pearl Nanny" and insert "the estate of Luther Clyde Nanny."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of the estate of Luther Clyde Nanny."

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARGUERITE R. McELROY

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2190) for the relief of Marguerite R. McElroy, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$150" and insert "$98.75."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. McGEHEE]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALBERT FERGUSON AND OZELLE FERGUSON

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1973) for the relief of Albert Ferguson and Ozelle Ferguson, with Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,500" and insert "$3,500."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. McGEHEE]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

W. M. HURLEY AND JOE WHITSON

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2299) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of W. M. Hurley and Joe Whitson, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, lines 6, 7, and 8, strike out "shall be determined upon the same principles and measures of liability for negligence as in like cases between private individuals" and insert in lieu thereof "in order to recover must be established by evidence of legal liability for negligence according to established principles of law governing the rights of riparian owners along navigable waters where there have been damages claimed because of alleged failure of the Government to maintain public improvements in good order."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. McGEHEE]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND USE OF CERTAIN PIPE LINES FOR STEAM-HEATING PURPOSES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 3691) to permit the construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for steam-heating purposes in the District of Columbia, and I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to grant permission to the Mayflower Hotel Corporation, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware and doing business in the District of Columbia, its successors and assigns, and the owner of lot 88, square 162, on the south side of De Sales Street NW., between Connecticut Avenue and Seventeenth Street, and lot 12, square 162, on the north side of De Sales Street NW., between Connecticut Avenue and Seventeenth Street, to lay down, construct, maintain, and use a pipe line for the carriage of steam heat, together with a necessary return pipe line, from a point within said lot 88, square 162, across De Sales Street NW., to a point within said lot 12, square 162.

SEC. 2. The construction and use of such pipe lines shall be under such regulations and rentals as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may prescribe and all plans and specifications for such construction shall be subject to their approval. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall have the authority to designate the location and to direct such repairs or relocation of such pipe lines as the public necessity may require, any such repairs or relocation to be at the expense of the Mayflower Hotel Corporation, its successors or assigns. Any repairs to streets, highways, or other public property necessitated by the construction or alteration of such pipe lines shall be made in a manner approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia at the expense of Mayflower Hotel Corporation, its successors or assigns.

SEC. 3. No permission granted or enjoyed under the provisions of this act shall vest any right, title, or interest in or to any land within De Sales Street NW.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 15, strike out "direct" and insert "cause."

Page 3, after line 2, insert the following:

"SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, there is no necessity for an explanation of this legislation. I may say to the House, however, that it follows the general procedure which we must of necessity follow in allowing for the construction and maintenance of certain pipe lines and other facilities in the District of Columbia.

I take this opportunity to say to the House that there is legislation pending before the District Committee which would delegate authority to the Commissioners to act on matters of this kind rather than to bring such legislation repeatedly to the House in one form or another. In these days, particularly, may I say that although the Congress of the United States has the responsibility for jurisdiction over the National Capital City, in matters of this kind which are regulatory, the Commissioners should exercise a certain authority and it should not have to be brought to the Congress for approval.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] has devoted a great deal of time to legislation involving the District of Columbia for which he receives practically no credit from his constituents. He has performed an excellent job. Somebody has to do it. We owe the gentleman a debt of gratitude.

The gentleman from West Virginia says that there is pending before the committee a measure that will delegate certain functions to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. When we delegate such functions we should let the Commissioners know we want them carried out.

I may say to the gentleman and to the House that I have been greatly disturbed recently by some articles I read in the Washington newspapers. They are separate and in no way connected.

The first thing that disturbs me and should disturb every Member of this House is the report on juvenile delinquency in the District. It is an absolute disgrace to the city of Washington to have such conditions existing and such newspaper articles going all over the United States. They were printed in my home city papers, 800 miles away from here. If there is anything that this Congress, that is responsible for legislation involving the activities of the District of Columbia, can do to alleviate this terrible condition which exists according to statistics we should do it. We are spending our time making investigations here and there, yet here is something that affects children—children I say—of the District of Columbia, and I hope that if the gentleman can find some time his committee will go into that matter. It is a challenge to the Congress and the Commissioners.

I want to call attention to another matter which is not related in any way to juvenile delinquency—it is receiving plenty of newspaper publicity all over the United States. I refer to the condition in Washington having to do with the liquor traffic. Here is another challenge to the Congress and the District Commissioners. More liquor has been sent into Washington than any other big city in the United States. I know what I am talking about when I say too that that liquor has been diverted—taken to various States. It comes in here and it goes out and unless somebody violated the ceiling prices it would not go out. If it remained here there would be no shortage. I am told that there are two States in this Union not far from Washington, I do not mean Maryland or Virginia, where State officials have told those who are enforcing the liquor laws in those States to "go out and get liquor, bring it in here no matter from where, get it and supply the people of our State with it." They have the State dispensary system.

Just imagine State officials violating Federal regulations. They come to Washington, pay a higher price for the liquor than it can be sold for in Washington and take it out in trucks.

I want to say that a citizens committee has been organized here in the last 2 weeks or 10 days, of which one of the most outstanding citizens is chairman, Mr. James Colliflower, whom everybody knows.

They are in no way interested in the liquor business other than to see as citizens it is conducted properly according to law and regulations. They are interested in the city of Washington. I wish I had a list of the personnel of that committee.

There is a Catholic priest, there is a Protestant minister, there is a leading rabbi, there is the president of the board of trade, and other civic leaders among the members. They want to help out the District Commissioners. They went to the District Commissioners, and it is my understanding that the Commissioners refused to have anything to do with them. These men simply wanted to help better this situation. I do not believe it is a proper way for the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to act, if the information is true. They should welcome such cooperation.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. What did this committee want the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to do? Did they want them to recommend some legislation on which we could pass to alleviate the situation?

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not know what they had; they wanted to help. They wanted to cooperate with the Commissioners to help alleviate the terrible conditions that exist in the District of Columbia, and to lend them such aid as they could, I assume, to appear before the Congress, if necessary; in fact, do anything to help. Undoubtedly, as citizens they do not like to see their city receive unfavorable advertising.

Mr. STEFAN. What the gentleman has to say regarding the liquor situation in the District of Columbia is absolutely true. The gentleman to whom the gentleman refers, Mr. Colliflower, and these other gentlemen are men of high standing in the District. They have been endeavoring to do something about it. I am amazed that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia would not give them an audience or give them some assistance in alleviating the situation.

If these citizens want some help, if they think we Members of Congress who are charged with appropriating funds for carrying on the business of the District of Columbia, and the members of the Legislative Committee, should give them some help, why do they not come before us and give us some information by which we can help them. I should like the country to know that the Members of the House of Representatives are endeavoring to do everything possible to help alleviate any bad conditions here. We want to help Washington. As our leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], stated on the floor of the House of Representatives some time ago, we here in Congress are eager to help the people of the District of Columbia. I am very happy the gentleman from Missouri has brought up this question of liquor, because I have heard many Members of Congress express their concern over the situation.

Mr. COCHRAN. Liquor is bad enough, but the other subject, juvenile delinquency, is worse, and more important, and means more to the good name of the District of Columbia than liquor does. Some way should be found to better this situation. If legislation is needed it can be had for the asking.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The observations made by the gentleman from Missouri and concurred in by the gentleman from Nebraska are valuable to a discussion of this type. I believe the citizens' group in the District of Columbia concerning itself particularly with one problem which is paramount at the present time will do a worth-while job. It has ever been the announced procedure of your District of Columbia Committee to welcome the suggestions, the recommendations, and the petitions not only of individual District of Columbia residents but of those groups who form themselves into bodies to present certain material. There is no desire on the part of either the District Committee on legislative matters or the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia to do other than cooperate fully and hear the complaints of those who desire an improvement in District of Columbia regulations.

Mr. COCHRAN. Of that I am assured. You have always cooperated.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. I was impressed by the statement of the gentleman from Missouri with reference to juvenile delinquency in the District of Columbia, but we find that juvenile delinquency is not confined to the District of Columbia or to the city of Washington. It seems to be prevalent throughout the country. Therefore, I have some doubt as to whether or not the capable chairman of the District Committee is going to be able to propose and suggest legislation that will correct a situation that exists throughout the Nation.

Juvenile delinquency is not an accident; it is not due to the operation or lack of a Federal law; it is not wholly a product of the war; the extent of its reflection upon the social and moral life of the Nation did not appear within the last few weeks or the last few months; it is a matter that has been growing for the last several years. It is a matter that was so pronounced, so conspicuous, and so much regretted that this last spring when we had before our committee the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, he submitted to us figures showing the extent to which juvenile delinquency was increasing, the age at which the increased number of crimes committed was shown to lower and lower as the years pass, particularly crimes

in which women are involved. Feeling that the Director had given the matter a great deal of study and had had long experience in the apprehension of persons charged with having committed a crime and the underlying causes of the increased number of crimes, I inquired of him what he considered the basic reasons or causes for delinquency and what remedy he would suggest to correct this increasing disability in our society. He stated definitely that he had given the matter a great deal of thought and study and had tried to arrive at the underlying causes of increased delinquency, and he could reach but one conclusion—that there was more or less of a break-down in the rules or regulations or standards of disciplines demonstrated in the homes of the American people. He was of the strong conviction that this situation cannot be corrected by legislation in the States or in the Congress, but the only way it could be remedied was by the reestablishment of fundamental, basic, moral principles in the home, supported by the churches of the Nation.

I therefore take the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to express the hope that in this day of propaganda, in this day of unsurpassed opportunity for disseminating information and crystallizing sentiment, there may be a more determined inclination, increased effort, and increased determination to emphasize the functions of the home, the school, the church.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In support of the very fine observation made by the gentleman from South Carolina as to the importance of the spiritual and moral law and the strengthening of the home in connection with this trying problem, I call attention to the fact that some years ago a great man in Wisconsin, Judge Backus, adopted the policy with reference to the children, young men, and girls coming before him, of putting them in charge of their spiritual adviser, whether priest, minister, or rabbi.

In line with the great work that man did, I call attention, not because it involves a particular religion, but because it is something that addresses itself to all of us, to a news item I have read within the past few days stating that the Archbishop of Detroit had appointed a priest and sister to follow up in the home. As a result of that, there has followed a reduction in delinquency, so far as communicants of the Catholic Church are concerned, and I think of other creeds, in that diocese, of at least 50 percent. That has been brought about because of the influence of the moral or spiritual law, followed up by the work of the spiritual leaders, and the kind sisters in the homes, appealing to the reason of the parents, and their duty in respect to the guidance of their children, and also to the young men and young women. These are the constructive results that followed. Mr. Speaker, I have referred to that in support of what I consider to be one of the finest contributions I have heard in this House, through the profound observations of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

The SPEAKER. The Chair states that Members should recall that we are operating under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, this whole matter of juvenile delinquency is something which all of us surely must realize is not a matter of the last few years. It is something that has been growing in this country for many years. Much as one would like to deny it, I fear that it is our homes that are primarily responsible. So many homes have become little more than places to hang one's hat when it is convenient. Unfortunately, there has been less and less discipline in the home; there has been less and less allegiance to the church, regardless of creed or of religion; there has been less and less observance of "the moral virtues," as we used to call them. Lack of discipline has extended itself into the schools. Teachers are no longer permitted to discipline children. Lack of discipline has been projected even into the reformatories, where the directors are not permitted to discipline those who are really in great need of discipline. How in the world can we expect to control juvenile delinquency or any other form of delinquency if we may not discipline? I happen to have disciplined my children, and I believe in it.

I believe education should be preparation for life and the living of life. I know, as you do, that life itself is a discipline from start to finish. The unkindest thing that we can do for children is to remove all forms of discipline from them. Certainly that is what is being demonstrated on every hand.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMICK] have well emphasized both the need for emphasis upon spiritual values and certain fine results emanating from such emphasis. We do need propaganda of the deeper spiritual values, but we need to have those values translated into practical daily action in discipline. We need to teach the child that he is indeed a part of the living, breathing being of Deity, that his body is a temple of the Holy Spirit, which he should keep ordered and beautied. We need to show him his need of being disciplined in body, in mind, and in soul.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express the appreciation of the House, sitting here considering this legislation, for what has been said. There are other Members here, who would speak in terms that have been referred to, and I express my appreciation particularly to the last speaker, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], for her contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to. The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

BOUNDARY LINE BETWEEN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND VIRGINIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 3664) to establish a boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 3664, as I read the bill and the report, is an attempt to settle the question of long standing—that is, the matter of the boundary between the District of Columbia and the State of Virginia. If this legislation is passed in its proposed form, it seems to me that it would give legislative sanction virtually to a cession of a portion of the District of Columbia to the State of Virginia. In reading the report I fail to find any consideration whatsoever given to the effect of that cession upon the tax revenues or the potential tax revenues of the District. The letter from the Department of Justice and several other letters seem to pertain exclusively to the question of jurisdiction so far as the enforcement of the criminal law is concerned. For that reason I feel that the bill should not be considered without having the full membership of the House here to consider it. It should be considered in all of its limitations from the standpoint of revenue, as well as from the standpoint of the criminal jurisdiction.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. As a member of the House subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia, I concur in what the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has to say. As a member of that committee I feel that this legislation is too important to pass on lightly. It changes State lines, and it turns over a valuable airport to the State of Virginia, among other things which I feel are constitutional in their nature.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, it certainly is the intention of the Committee on the District of Columbia to have comprehensive debate of the subject matter. Consequently, in deference to those who think a full membership should be present, I withdraw the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia withdraws the bill.

EXTENSION OF VALIDITY OF OPERATORS' PERMITS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up H. R. 3621, a bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the regula-

tion of motor-vehicle traffic in the District of Columbia, increase the number of judges of the police court, and for other purposes," and I ask unanimous consent to consider the same in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 (a) of the act entitled "An act to provide for the regulation of motor-vehicle traffic in the District of Columbia, increase the number of judges of the police court, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1925, as amended, be, and the same is hereby, further amended by adding at the end of said section 7 (a) the following:

"Any person who is a member of the military service of the United States or of any foreign nation with which the United States may be allied in the prosecution of any war and is entitled to any of the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, or who serves in the merchant marine as defined in the act entitled 'An act to provide reemployment rights for persons who leave their positions to serve in the merchant marine, and for other purposes', approved June 23, 1943, and who at the time of his entry upon such service was the holder of a valid permit to operate a motor vehicle in the District of Columbia, notwithstanding the subsequent expiration of such permit, shall be entitled to continue to operate a motor vehicle without obtaining a new permit therefor, subject to the conditions herein imposed. Such person shall, while operating a motor vehicle under the provisions of this act, carry upon his person the last permit to operate a motor vehicle issued to him, which shall have been valid at the time of his entry into one of the services enumerated herein and shall not have been revoked or suspended subsequent thereto, and shall also carry upon his person conclusive evidence of the fact that he is a member of one of such services.

"Any person applying for a new permit to operate an automobile who presents conclusive evidence to the Director of Vehicles and Traffic that he is physically qualified to operate an automobile, that the last permit issued to him has become invalid solely by expiration of time, that he is a member of one of the services enumerated herein or was a member thereof within 3 months of the date of his application for a new permit, and pays the fee required by law, shall be issued such new permit without examination. If any permit is lost, misplaced, or stolen, a duplicate shall be furnished by the Director of Vehicles and Traffic free of charge upon application and presentation of conclusive evidence that applicant is a member of one of the services enumerated herein."

SEC. 2. This act shall cease to be in effect 6 months after the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war as determined by the President or upon such earlier date as the Congress, by concurrent resolution, may designate.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this legislation would authorize members of our military services to operate their motor vehicles within the District of Columbia under a permit which would have otherwise expired because of failure to renew it. Of course, they have to show they are members of the armed services and present certain other data. I believe that it is being done in other jurisdictions and particularly in the District of Columbia. It is felt it is valuable during wartime.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, that completes the legislation for the District of Columbia Committee today.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FOOD PRODUCTION AND FARM MACHINERY

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the American farmer has produced an immense amount of food in 1943, in spite of a severe shortage of manpower and farm machinery. Working longer hours than any other industry or group, agriculture has proved its patriotism and shown by its determination that the one thing that counts today with farmers of America is to produce an abundance of the food that is needed for the winning of this greatest of all wars. There have been no strikes in agriculture and never will be. Farmers do not believe in such tactics and consider strikes reprehensible while we are at war. It is too much like stabbing their own sons in the back.

Today, however, with their manpower at a low ebb and with their farm machinery and implements further worn out by another hard year's usage, the farmers of our Nation need the help of Congress—not tomorrow or next spring but now, if a crop even approximating that of 1942 or 1943 is to be produced. We must help them so they will be able to do their job without the terrific handicaps with which they are today faced.

On November 12, I protested to the House against the allotment for export of 19,565 farm tractors to Canada during the coming year at a time when our own farmers have been sorely in need of this additional farm power. When only 125,000 farm tractors, in addition to 30,700 units previously allocated, are all that our own farmers will have access to this coming year, surely it does not seem right that any tractors, let alone 19,565, should be sent to a foreign nation. This is carrying the good neighbor policy altogether too far.

I also question the good judgment used in allocating in addition nearly 21,000 farm tractors to lend-lease. Please remember that military requirements are not included in these figures. God knows that our farmers will gladly do without tractors before depriving our military machine of any it might need. Hundreds of thousands of farm boys are at the front today fighting for our country. What I do refer to today, however, are farm tractors only and just why Canada, with ony one-tenth of our farm population, should receive from our own factories over one-eighth of the number of tractors our own farmers receive is beyond my comprehension. Canada should only receive farm tractors from our factories when and if our own farmers are adequately supplied. Charity begins at home.

Please allow me to quote to you, Members of the House, from a few of the hundreds of letters received following the short statement I made to this body on the 12th concerning the need for liberality in farm machinery allotments.

Mr. L. P. Szarzynski, of Taunton, writes:

The machinery situation here is very bad. We can get only about 30 percent of the tractors that we received in 1940, when most of the boys were home and we could, if necessary, use horses. We are also badly in need of corn planters, corn pickers, and grain binders. I hope that you will be able to help increase the output of machinery, especially corn pickers.

Please note the frequency in the following letters concerning the need for corn pickers. Why? Because just two weeks ago a half-picked crop of corn, millions of bushels throughout portions of four States—Minnesota, Iowa, South Dakota, and Nebraska—was covered by snow. You people from the East who need corn so badly can help us prevent a repetition of this near catastrophe by aiding the great corn-producing area obtain the machinery necessary to get our crops off next year before the snow flies. My farmers were unable to do that this year, when normally 90 percent of our corn is in the crib by November 1. Lack of manpower and lack of power machinery has destroyed millions of bushels of corn our country needs badly.

Mr. Frank Decock, of Ghent, writes:

I ordered a tractor last June from one of the largest dealers in our county and he says I will be lucky if I can get one by next spring. This dealer tells me he was allocated only one tractor of that type in 6 months. I also want a grain binder and a corn planter. If I don't get a binder by next harvest I don't know how I'm going to harvest my crop.

Keep in mind that low prices for years have kept farmers such as this from buying new machinery. Many grain binders have been used for 30 years.

Mr. William Scheffler, of Morton, writes:

As I am running my farm with the help of my 13-year-old daughter, I must have power machinery. I have 3,000 bushels of corn yet to pick.

That was November 23.

I have tried to get neighbors to help but everyone has more than he can do. I want a corn picker, grain binder, mechanical hoist cultivator with power lift.

For his daughter.

I have ordered these but it depends on priority whether I get them. Sixty percent of the corn in our township is in the fields. The boy I raised has been a Jap prisoner since Corregidor. I sold my dairy herd and have cut my work as much as possible as help is 70 cents per hour with five meals a day when I can hire it. All farmers are in need of machinery and rubber through here. We need a 1-ton truck as we can get no one to haul. My neighbor runs 240 acres with help

of his 15-year-old son who goes to high school.

Think of this, Members of the House. A 13-year-old girl on the one farm and a 15-year-old boy on the other are the only help these two farmers have. Do you wonder that this man, with his 13-year-old daughter in his mind, resents the over liberality of the New Deal philanthropic good neighbor policy, the sending abroad of the farm machinery which would lighten this load? We have heard much of child labor and we feel sorry for other nations' children. Let us look to the welfare of our own first. That is our duty.

Mr. Frank Skorczewski, of Ivanhoe, writes:

I can't farm if I don't get a tractor and power drill. I have 200 acres of land and if I don't get machinery the land will lie idle.

Mr. Harry Van de Linde, of Belview, writes:

Have ordered a corn picker 3 years ago. Got permit but no picker. So result is 20 acres of corn left in the field. When one thinks of spring work and no help it's hard to see how one is going to get work done.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, let us put ourselves in the position in which these farmers are today. This man has 1,000 bushels of good corn under the snow. If this snow does melt, he must get out perhaps in 20° below zero weather to try to get some of it home. If he waits until spring, how can he get it done with no extra help on hand? Do you wonder that some of them are discouraged? Do you wonder that these men, as patriotic as any American, are beginning to feel that they are licked when they have to fight foreign competition for their meager farm machinery as well as fight against the blizzards of the Midwest?

Mr. Selmer Anderson, of Cottonwood, farming 1,660 acres, writes:

We need three combines, three tractors, two elevators, two plows, two hay loaders, two side-delivery rakes, two power mowers, two swathers, and two corn pickers, one corn binder, two tractor cultivators, and a lot of other machinery. How do we get along without these? The answer is simple. We don't. Much of our crop is lost, such as hay being caught in too much rain, and corn fields get too full of weeds. Plowing drags out too late.

Yes; those of us who have farmed realize what being backward in your work does to a crop.

And—

Continues Mr. Anderson—

help is out of the question. Hundreds of men are needed, a dozen or so are available. One of our worst gripes is the repair parts situation. Here is what I mean. I needed a repair part for my corn binder. I ordered it 6 weeks before silo-filling time, which comes about September 15. Parts arrived March 20.

We do not expect to get all the machinery we need and we certainly shall do our best with what we have. But even 2 or 3 of the 24 implements we need would help us save hundreds of dollars and save tons of food.

Commenting on additional handicaps to farming, Mr. Anderson further stated:

A neighbor who did not have electricity on the farm had to drive to Marshall to apply for some kerosene. His application got mixed up and he had to go again. A few days later his stamps came. What did he get. One coupon, good for two gallons of kerosene. He lost 1 day on these two trips, traveling 60 miles, burning up at least 3 gallons of gas for 2 gallons of kerosene. However, we still live in the best country on earth and we shall give it our best until this war is won and my boy is home.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to estimate the tonnage of food in America which has not been produced the past 2 years because of the unbelievable stupidity of regulations which have compelled farmers to make countless trips to ration boards in search of necessary fuel and essentials with which to do their job. We in Congress can help eliminate much of this red tape, and if we do not, a year from now, when food will be more precious than it is today, there may actually be people in our Nation, in this great United States, suffering from hunger.

Mr. Howard Lee, of Dawson, writes:

We surely need a new tractor and many of my neighbors need corn pickers. Many hundreds of acres of corn still in the field because of lack of tractors and corn pickers. It is terrible how disappointed farmers are everywhere. They have put in long hours, machinery hard to work with, and many are quitting.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, where are the great profits the eastern press seem to think that our farmers are making? Can you imagine any farmer talking about quitting if farm conditions were half as glorious as this mistaken and uninformed press assumes? Who is going to pay the farmers of these four States for the corn that will be lost under this snow? We do not have a 10-percent cost-plus guaranty.

Yet, some people in high places call the farmer a profiteer for asking for a parity price for his products in the market place. These same high placed individuals have perhaps themselves done nothing that requires more strenuous exercise than to chase golf balls down a fairway. Let them try to pick corn in the snow and we might be surprised at the resultant change in attitude toward a parity price for farmers.

Mr. Francis E. Smith, of Browns Valley, writes:

We need a corn picker badly. A large percentage of the corn is unharvested and is now under the snow. We also need a tractor.

Mr. P. E Walhof, of Edgerton, writes:

My John Deere implement dealer has orders for the following machinery: 23 tractors, 11 two- and three-bottom plows, 20 two-row tractor cultivators, 42 disc harrows, 12 grain elevators, 6 grain drills, 12 manure spreaders, 24 corn planters, 23 power mowers, 12 hay loaders, 6 grain binders, 24 corn pickers, 5 ensilage harvesters. Due to shortage of corn pickers about one-half of the corn in the Pipestone and Rock Counties is still in the field. If no warm weather comes soon so snow will go down, it will stay in the field until spring and a great loss will result. And how can we get this picked in the spring with regular work coming on and no help available?

And—

Continues Mr. Walhof—

the International dealer here has the following orders for machinery: 6 corn binders, 2 grain drills, 20 disk harrows, 20 grain binders, 8 engines, 1½ horsepower, 50 sections of tooth harrow, 14 cream separators, 2 ensilage cutters, 6 combines, 15 tractor cultivators, 4 ensilage harvesters, 12 hay loaders, 12 mowers, 6 land packers, 12 milking machines, 15 tractor plows, 15 corn pickers, 12 corn planters, 6 hay rakes, 20 seeders, 12 manure spreaders, 3 threshing machines, 30 tractors, 10 wagons.

Mr. P. M. Hendrickson, of Montevideo, writes:

The farm machinery situation is deplorable. I have tried for 2 years to purchase a corn picker without success. Only half of my corn crop is harvested and now we have too much snow to think of saving the other half. If I can't get needed machinery some of my land must lie idle.

Mr. J. H. Paulsen, of Hatfield, says:

We have had in an order for a hay loader since August 1942. In this community there is 1 corn picker. The owner of this picker had 12 farmers to pick for. Three have their corn out. The other 9 farmers' corn is in the field. Now we are picking by hand in the snow trying to get feed for large herds of stock. It is impossible to hire help. Our hardware store cannot even get husking mitts. Better give our own farmers machinery first instead of allowing it to go lend-lease.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad commentary that W. P. B. allocates 19,565 tractors to Canada and about 21,000 to lend-lease, when our farmers, who are working 12 hours a day and more, cannot even secure the necessary power machinery. Their boys have gone to war, thousands of them, and the least Congress can do is to help them secure good machinery to aid in replacing this lost manpower.

Mr. C. P. Putnam, of Tintah, writes:

I tried to buy a corn picker this fall but could not. Two new pickers came into the county and the ration board had 22 applications for them.

Mr. T. B. Jenks, of Montevideo, tells me:

It is the consensus of opinion that the farm-machinery manufacturers are doing so well on the manufacturing of other war materials they are not inclined to revert back to the manufacture of the required equipment necessary to carry on production. On account of shortage of corn pickers there are thousands of acres of corn standing in the field at the present time. This means a heavy loss of food as there is about 2 feet of snow in the fields. I am listing the requirements of farm machinery for the Montevideo, Minn., trade territory, to wit: 40 tractors, 50 cultivators, 30 drills, 40 corn planters, 24 tractor disk harrows, 18 grain binders, 10 corn binders, 50 corn pickers, 18 side delivery rakes, 24 hay loaders, 40 power mowers, 12 combines or threshers, 30 spreaders, 40 hammer mills, 28 plows, and 15 grain elevators. With normal labor conditions our farmer would not require the equipment he does at the present time with the labor shortage. In haying time a farmer always hired additional help; this applies to harvesting and threshing time. But with power equipment I have known farmers to cut grain during the day and shock at night. I have a 240-acre farm and

up to last year have had my corn picked by hand. This year my corn is still in the field, as pickers are not available to take care of the requirements of the community.

Mr. E. L. Meyer, of Wilmont, writes:

I had a visit with one of our local implement dealers, who had just attended a meeting of dealers at Sioux Falls. He gave us a very grave picture on the shortage of machinery in this territory. There will be about only 1 piece of machinery for each dealer in the territory, of 106 dealers around Sioux Falls. The fact that the figure of 80 percent is used is very misleading to the public, as it means 80 percent of the 1940 raw material used. Inventories were high that year and thus very little machinery was made compared to previous years. Out of this 80 percent the companies must make repairs as well as machinery. And the repair bins are all empty over the territory. So the repair situation is also getting very grave. Of course, the use of old machinery is at fault for this, as farmers are repairing their old machinery, which in many cases should go to the scrap heap. The area around Wilmont is short on tractors, and especially on disks. The manufacturers are not making any disks to speak of, so this will be a serious shortage. I believe grain binders and corn pickers are also becoming very short.

Mr. R. R. Buchanan, of Graceville, says:

The allotment of tractors is downright stupid. The implements we need most to increase production are the tractor, cultivator, and corn picker. Due to lack of pickers, there are thousands of acres of corn under the snow in this Northwest, much of which will be lost.

It is becoming more difficult every day to get certain repair parts. As the war will likely draw to a close in the next year or so, especially in the European area, we should now look to an increase of food production more than ever. This can only be secured by furnishing the farmer more machinery and a fair price for his products as a stimulus.

We have been recently assured by responsible officials of W. P. B. and other agencies that there were going to be ample repair parts and that 200 percent of the 1940 production of repair parts would be provided for this coming year. I question very much after reading such letters as these, if this program in reference to repair parts is anything but a scrap of paper or a promise which cannot be taken seriously.

Mr. JENNINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. I am glad you are hitting that particular nail on the head. I was home the other day and went into a business place of a produce dealer who owns three farms in an adjoining county. His truck was broken down. He could not get repair parts and he could not run it and could not get to his farm. He had an automobile that had only three tires, and they just laughed at him when he asked for the fourth tire. He said, "Where can I make a contribution to get rid of this sort of thing?"

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman expresses an altogether too common and well-justified criticism of our present theoretical bureaucrats who today wield tremendous power in this Nation.

Mr. JENNINGS. Everybody who came to the store sang the same song.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. You can multiply your example by the thousands throughout the United States of America. It is a pity that this is so.

We have on file now more orders for tractors and all kinds of machinery than we can possibly fill in the next 2 years. Furthermore, our farmers are getting pretty well fed up on all the unnecessary red tape and useless trips they have to make to rationing boards in order to operate. Many are quitting. There never were known so many farm sales as we had in this community this fall.

Mr. W. A. Grunert, of Montevideo, writes as follows:

We in Minnesota have had a wonderful fall to harvest our corn crop all through September and October up to November 7. As you know, then the weather changed suddenly, with a repetition of the November 11, 1940, snowstorm, and, unfortunately, from 20 to 33 percent of the good 1943 corn crop is still standing in the fields, with so much snow that at this writing there is no hope to harvest the crop until spring.

Our farmers, with their shortage of help, have made the best of a bad situation. Corn picking has been done by machines of limited number, and it has worked out similar to shock-threshing runs. With the machines at hand, some of the folks had their corn all picked and cribbed, while others have their entire crop out in the field because there were not enough machines available. I can name you a half dozen cases at this writing where farmers have practically all of their corn out in the field through no fault of their own. I am now thinking of the three Hutchison boys; each is a bachelor and farms a half section for himself with limited help. There must be at least 100 acres of standing corn unhusked on each farm. They have applied and tried every way to get a corn-picking machine but received no cooperation. Alfred A. Hilden, north of Montevideo, has 115 acres of corn in the snow. Two-thirds of my own corn, which will be between 50 and 60 acres, also got caught in the same snow, so you see I have a personal interest in this matter. Now we hear, of course, that the W. P. B. or some Government agency has authorized more farm machinery to be built; on the other hand, we hear from dealers that their manufacturers have a permit but they have no success in getting raw material to fabricate these machines.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I have heard a number of descriptions of what is wrong on the food production front. I think the gentleman's description is the most vivid because it deals with actual occurrences in his own district. I think the gentleman deserves a lot of credit for the fact he has brought these instances to the attention of the House and it certainly is not going to be his fault if his prognostication which he made a short time ago, that the country will lack food in another year, comes true.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman. He has always tried to help his farmers and deserves much thanks from them for his untiring work in connection with the shortage of corn and means by which to obtain feed for his district.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I just want to join in complimenting the gentleman from Minnesota for the very interesting and exhaustive report on the farm-machinery subject. I want to advise the House, if the gentleman will permit, that along with a shortage of farm machinery and parts, wintertime is just coming at a time when we have reports from the State of Nebraska where automobiles were stalled in the snow as a result of a blizzard, where a defense plant had to close down for 24 hours because of the blizzard, because we were unable to secure trucks and snow-removal machinery. I predict if something is not done immediately farm-to-market roads, in all of the States which are subject to severe blizzards and heavy snows, will be blocked and food from the farms to the market will not arrive there. Something must be done immediately to relieve the situation as to trucks, as to plows, and other machinery, road machinery, along with our efforts to get more machinery to produce the food. I want to give a note of warning here that winter is coming and there will be less than 50 percent of snow-removal operations in our country as compared with last year if something is not done immediately.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska. I believe he understands the situation back in that country as well as any man in the House and he is entirely right in his comments on winter conditions back in the great food-producing area he and I represent.

Mr. Speaker, may I in all sincerity offer a few suggestions which would immeasurably help in the present precarious situation that exists relative to food production.

First. Food should be considered a critical material and designated by Congress as such.

Second. Implements for the production of food should now be given just as high priority as munitions of war.

Third. No farm machinery should be exported for the duration of the war with the exception of a limited quantity to reoccupied countries where their facilities for producing food have been destroyed.

Fourth. At least 3 percent of our steel production should be definitely allocated to farm-machinery production. Today, scarcely 1 percent is so allocated.

Fifth. It must be kept in mind that the production of food should be increased as much as possible to aid in feeding the starving nations of Europe and Asia following hostilities.

Sixth. We must eliminate all hindrances to production and irritating regulations that do no good whatsoever to further the war effort.

In conclusion, may I state that it is my intention to introduce shortly a joint resolution to forbid, with certain reservations, the exportation of farm machinery. Give the tools to our farmers and they will produce the food.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUSSELL] is recognized for 1 hour.

REGULATION OF INSURANCE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to discuss a bill that may come before this House soon for action. It is a bill of far-reaching effect, more so perhaps than was ever intended or expected by its sponsors. It is a bill that should not pass and, above all, it ought not to be passed by this Congress. I am firmly convinced that if this Congress fully understood this bill and its far-reaching effect, and especially the reasons behind this bill which has been brought before this Congress, the same would not be passed. If the bill is passed, the effects of it will be to the injury of 130,000,000 American citizens for years to come. In fact, from now on, unless and until it be repealed. If this bill is fully understood, and this Congress will not be swept off its feet by the propaganda now being circulated, and through the efforts of the largest lobby that I have ever witnessed in behalf of this measure, this Congress will not pass this bill, especially if the Members will take the time to study the bill in an unbiased and unprejudiced way and look beyond the scenes and view the reasons for the bill being here in Congress. In order to discuss this bill fully, it will not be amiss for me to discuss with you the history of the bill as viewed by myself from the time I first heard of it. Some time in October of this year I picked up a daily paper which is published in my district, the Abilene Reporter-News, and in reading the paper I read an article with reference to this bill. This was the first information I had ever had of such a bill being introduced in Congress and, of course, I read the article. This article is as follows, and I quote:

[From the Abilene (Tex.) Reporter-News of October 2, 1943]

INSURANCE LOBBY

What promises to be the most powerful lobby Congress has seen in decades has been quietly mobilizing behind the scenes, ready for a fight on an innocuous-appearing bill which bears the letter S. 1362.

The bill is less than two pages long, and no one would dream that around $700,000 is being collected to put it through Congress, yet that is the sum already reported for this fund. All of this will bring a string of chronic denials and denunciations, but, nevertheless, the fire-insurance lobby has really gone to work.

The bill is very simple. It merely specifies that the Sherman Antitrust Act shall not apply to the insurance companies. What is left unsaid is that if the law passes, the fire-insurance companies can get together to hike or adjust rates, without competition, at the expense of the public.

It also means that the Justice Department will be powerless to stop them.

To get the full significance of the story you have to understand the facts that led up to the insignificant-appearing S. 1362, quietly dropped into the legislative hopper by Senators VAN NUYS, of Indiana, and BAILEY, of North Carolina, 1 day after Congress convened.

The story begins when the Justice Department cracked down on Kansas City's Big Boss Pendergast and sent him to jail for income-tax violation. Simultaneously it cracked down on Missouri's insurance commissioner, Emmett O'Malley. They had tucked into their pockets about $447,000 paid them by insurance companies.

The insurance companies had changed their rates, and the difference between the old rates and the new was impounded to the tune of about $10,000,000 waiting for the State of Missouri to decide whether this amount should go to the insurance companies or be turned back to the policyholders. In the end, with the connivance of Commissioner O'Malley and Boss Pendergast, the insurance companies were permitted to keep 80 percent of the $10,000,000; the policyholders got only 20 percent.

But though Pendergast and O'Malley were jailed, Missouri's attorney general, Roy McKittrick, could not reach the insurance companies. These were the chief offenders, but they escaped prosecution.

Subsequently, McKittrick appealed to the Federal Government, and later the Justice Department brought the biggest antitrust suit in history, indicting 196 fire-insurance companies at Atlanta on November 5 last. Since then Judge Underwood has dismissed the case and it is awaiting appeal before the United States Supreme Court.

It was at about this point that the fire-insurance companies began to organize their lobby. Apparently they do not believe in the Supreme Court. Suddenly they have begun to talk States' rights. Hartford, Conn., insurance center, where States' rights were little heard of before, has now blossomed forth as the greatest champion of States' rights in the United States of America. Each State must have its own insurance laws, exempt from the Sherman Antitrust Act, runs the new argument.

Meanwhile the Insurance Executives Association for the first time has elected a non-insurance man as its president, Edward L. Williams of the Wall Street law firm of Wright, Gordon, Zachry, Parlin & Cahill, of which Franklin Roosevelt, Jr., was a member. Williams is being paid a salary of $125,000, made up by the National Board of Underwriters, the Factory Association, the Fire Patrol and the Insurance Executives Association. Plans have been laid very quietly, but with deadly seriousness. The fire-insurance lobby is all ready to go into high gear.

It was just a few days after I read this newspaper article until I began to realize fully that the lobby mentioned in the article was at work. My office was besieged with letters addressed to me by insurance agents all over my district, as well as from all over my State. These letters were in the form of what we call canned letters, in that the substance and the wording was practically the same in all the letters, with very few exceptions, most of them, in referring to the bills giving the numbers and the names of the authors. Mind you, this was before I knew the numbers of the bills and the names of the authors. The letters stated in substance that if either of these bills became a law, it would not only preserve the particular States' rights involved but would stop the Government from prosecuting insurance companies and would prevent the setting up of another bureaucratic control in Washington to further harass and hound the people; that the States had always regulated the insurance business, and they wanted the States to continue doing so; and that support of these bills would be in favor of this.

As stated, I had not seen the bills at that time, and I did not know who the authors were. I answered about 50 letters, stating that the doctrine of States rights was traditional with me, and also, that the antitrust laws were traditional with the people of my section. I observed that the doctrine of States' rights and the antitrust laws had a basic principle in common, each having for its purpose the prevention of the centralization of power. I told these insurance agents I could not support any bill that would immune any competitive business from the antitrust laws, because these laws meant much to the people.

Soon after this some of my good friends from Texas who were in the insurance business came to see me and wanted me to support these bills. Their argument was that the Supreme Court had for 79 years upheld the rights of the States to regulate insurance by holding that the business of insurance was not commerce; and they were afraid that the Supreme Court, in passing upon the appeal of the cases that were pending before the Court, would reverse their rulings and hold that the insurance business was commerce. My friends said that if the Supreme Court so held, they would destroy all State regulation and place in the hands of bureaucratic control the business of insurance, to be administered out of Washington, and that it would be a holding that all of the State regulations were, within themselves, violation of the antitrust laws. I listened to my friends patiently, thinking perhaps I had made a mistake, which of course I did not want to do; and for my information and enlightenment on the subject my friends left the briefs that were filed in the trial court in the case at Atlanta, Ga., and marked the places they wanted me to read.

My friends made a mistake in doing this; I mean, by leaving the briefs, because I read not only the portions marked but I read all of the briefs, and after doing so and studying the question, it was clearly illustrated the intentions of the insurance companies, with their lobbies and sponsors of these bills, which was to the effect to mislead the public and mislead the Congress as to the effect of a possible decision by the Supreme Court and the effect of these bills.

Now I will say for the insurance agents of my district and for the entire State of Texas, so far as I know, that they are a high type of gentlemen, and most of them, if not all, in my district, are my good friends. In performing my duty in respect to this bill, H. R. 3270, I do not in any way cast a reflection upon them or upon the business of insurance. I believe insurance to be a necessary and vital industry, and like all other industries that are operated by corporations, unless regulated, we all know of the injury that might result to the people. I commend the insurance business as performing a very valuable service to the people, as well as to themselves and to the country as a whole. But by reason of my feeling toward them, it does not mean that I shall

favor them in the carrying on of an industry, to the extent of an injury to the people of this country, and especially the policyholders. The policyholders are the people who have made the insurance business a success. It could not operate unless the policyholders would buy insurance contracts. It is this group of people that I feel the Congress should take into consideration, along with the corporations operating the insurance business. Certainly there could be no insurance business without the policyholders who have furnished most of the money to begin with and are still furnishing the money which has made this industry the most powerful, the wealthiest industry within our country. I believe the insurance companies should be interested in the welfare of the policyholders. Do you not think it to be the duty of the National Congress to look to the interests of the policyholders, especially when legislation is involved, and see that the policyholders get protection and a square deal? That is the way I feel, and that is the way I intend to work, and it is for that reason that I stand here today with all the powers, mental and physical, that I have, to protest the passage of this ill-timed, unfair, and deceiving piece of legislation.

As I stated, not all of the insurance agents wrote in the terms I have heretofore stated. There was one exception, one insurance agent that failed to follow the old routine instructions of the home office, and I want to read you that insurance agent's letter. I shall not give you the name of the town the agent lives in or the name of the agent. To do so, I know that he would soon cease to be an insurance agent and could not, if his name were divulged, ever represent any insurance company again. This attitude itself is sufficient to show that there is a monopoly in restraint of trade in the business of insurance. The letter is as follows:

———, TEX., *October 12, 1943.*

Mr. ———, *Member of Congress,*
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ——— ———: I am enclosing a copy of a bill which I suppose you will vote on sooner or later and wish to give you my views as an insurance man.

This bill has been espoused by the big New York companies, but for the life of me, I cannot see why the companies should not come under the antitrust laws like any other business. To make insurance companies subject to antitrust laws would not mean that State regulation would be in any way affected; it would merely mean that violation of Federal antitrust laws would bring retribution. If such laws are good for any other business, it stands to reason that they would be good for the insurance business—not necessarily for the companies, but for the public, which should be your and my major concern.

I have been deluged with letters from my various companies and several of my special agents have come in to urge me to write to you and TOM CONNALLY and O'DANIEL about this matter and I am sure there will be lots of heat at your end.

Then he went on to write about other things not pertaining to this bill—

Hope you are well and give you my
Best regards,

———.

This insurance agent happened to know more than his employers thought. He is a typical American, with the mental capacity to see through this special interest lobby. He was independent enough to speak from his own heart and mouth his thoughts for himself—not the words and thoughts of his employer; and in doing so he states the facts as every man ought to do, and upon mature study and consideration should know, which is, to make insurance companies subject to antitrust laws would not mean that State regulation would be in any way affected. This letter proves the heat turned on by the insurance companies and the truth of the newspaper article with reference to the lobby engaged in by such insurance companies. I have also received letters from agents who, after receiving my letter in which I stated that I could not support legislation to immune insurance companies from the antitrust laws, commending me upon my stand. Their names will be withheld for the same reasons as heretofore stated.

The bill, H. R. 3270, introduced by our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] is the bill that will be considered by this House if it comes before us. The bill is identically the same bill as introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] and Senators VAN NUYS and BAILEY over in the Senate.

Each of these bills is exactly like the others. That is, one is an exact copy of the other, and like the lobby of the insurance companies and the propaganda that they put out, this bill is misleading and has a camouflaged front whereby, if we do not look beyond this camouflaged front, we will not be able to see the real purposes and intents of the bill.

Unlike most other bills, this bill has seven preambles, or "whereas" clauses, in place of the title and explanation of the bill. The first paragraph or preamble starts out by stating:

A bill to affirm the intent of Congress—

I will stop here for the purpose of discussing that phrase. To affirm the intent of Congress, I am at a loss to know which Congress; whether this Congress, or some other Congress. Undoubtedly, it means to affirm the intent of a previous Congress, and it is not clear whether it is to affirm the intent of some session of this body that passed some insurance laws, or to affirm the intent of the Congress that passed the antitrust laws. To me that seems to be going a long way, for this Congress now to try to legislate what the intent of a Congress was 40, 50, or 90 years ago. It is about as clear as mud and similar to the legislation that declared a white horse to be a black horse. This is mind reading by far too remote control to satisfy my conscience and to satisfy the people of our great country. While as stated this first preamble goes on and says:

To affirm the intent of Congress that the regulation of the business of insurance remain within the control of the several States, and that the acts of July 2, 1890, and October 15, 1914, as amended, be not applicable to that business.

It is clearly seen that these acts and the amendments thereto constitute the antitrust laws of our country, and it is not the intent to explain the mind of some Congress of many years ago; but the real intent and purpose of the bill, as shown by this first preamble, is to take the insurance business out, or rather immune such business from prosecutions under the antitrust laws of this country.

The second preamble to the bill, which starts off with a whereas, reads:

Whereas, prior and subsequent to the acts of July 2, 1890, and October 15, 1914, the business of insurance was and has been and is now regulated by the several States.

This preamble, perhaps, is in part correct, in that the insurance business at that time, at least when the first antitrust law was passed, was in a state of infancy and had not grown to the enormous proportions it has at this date. Naturally, prior to the enactment of the antitrust laws, the insurance business, like others, was regulated by the States. What regulation they had at that time, if any, would have had to be in the States, and since that time it is true that the regulations of intrastate insurance business has been within the States wherein insurance companies operated, and this meets with my approval. It is my desire and my wish that the regulation of insurance companies be left within the States; that is, that each State be permitted to regulate business within its borders. Some of the States have been doing this, and will continue to do so, whether this bill is passed or not, and regardless of how the Supreme Court of the United States acts on the cases on appeal now pending before it. I shall discuss this matter more fully hereafter.

The next preamble to this bill begins, and I quote:

Whereas, as a matter of local concern, the several States, respectively, each as it deems for the best interest of its citizens, to regulate all acts of insurance companies performed within their respective borders—

Here I repeat for the purpose of emphasis—

within their respective borders.

To this preamble, again I agree. It meets with my wholehearted approval. But this preamble nowhere gives the States the authority to handle or regulate matters pertaining to the insurance business or matters necessarily connected with the insurance business, without the borders of the respective States.

The next preamble reads, and I quote:

And whereas it has not been nor is it now the intent or the desire of the Congress to invade the rights of the States or to assume to itself functions which have long been accepted as best performed by the States—

And to that statement I adhere fully. As stated heretofore, the doctrine of State rights is traditional with me. It is one of the basic principles of the political party of my choice; one that I have lived by, and the party that has done so much for me in my life, but here again, so far as the purposes of the bill to be considered are concerned, this section or preamble is misleading and confusing and

utterly incorrect, in that, regardless of whether this bill is passed or not, and regardless of what the Supreme Court says or does with the cases now pending before them, these conditions, unless the Congress sees fit to change them in their wisdom—and this I hope will never occur. This section of the preamble of the bill is put in here for the purpose of misleading the Members of this great body.

The next preamble to the bill reads:

And whereas there is now no need through a Federal bureau or otherwise for the Congress to displace or encumber the regulation by the States of the business of insurance.

Again I state that this section of this preamble is misleading and is put in here to confuse the minds and arouse the prejudices of this Congress against the Federal Government and its constitutional functions. This preamble even, by implication, admits that if this bill was not passed, and regardless of what the Supreme Court does with the cases on appeal before them, would not change altogether the regulation of the States by using the term "or encumber the regulations by the States of the business of insurance"; and this preamble also carries an implication that there is to be a Federal bureau set up by the Congress to administer the insurance business. No one has heard of this, and this Congress would not consider the matter, in my opinion, for one moment. The term can be used to bring about a prejudice and arouse a prejudicial hysteria on the part of Members of this Congress to vote for legislation that they otherwise would not vote for. The only way that a Federal bureau could be set up for the purpose of controlling or interfering in any way, in any business, is by an act of Congress, provided it would be constitutional to do so; are the sponsors of this bill afraid of this Congress? It is evident they are or they would not have put such language in this preamble.

The next preamble to the bill states:

And whereas it has not been, nor is now, the intent of the Congress that the acts of July 2, 1890, and October 15, 1914, as amended, be construed as applying to the business of insurance or as impairing the regulation of that business by the States.

Again this section is not only trying to read the minds of a previous Congress but is trying to tell you in the preamble the intentions of the present Congress, and I do not agree with them in either respect. The intent of this Congress can only be established by their conduct, acts, or words, and by their actions as taken. I do not know all that was in the minds of the Congress that passed the first antitrust law and neither do the sponsors of this bill; and again, without this bill, there is no way to impair the regulation of the business of insurance by the States, even should the Supreme Court hold adversely to the contentions of the insurance companies, unless this Congress should pass a law decreeing it so; and again, I am not afraid of this Congress, or any Congress for many years to come, of setting up any additional Federal bureaus. This is only a straw man put up to knock down and to arouse the passion and prejudice of the Members of this body.

The last preamble to this bill, or perhaps I should say title, reads as follows:

Whereas it is in the public interest that Congress affirm its intent and desire to safeguard the States in the regulation of the business of insurance.

With the principle in this section I do not complain. However, the fact is that unless the Congress acts otherwise and passes legislation not heretofore introduced, the safeguard to the States in the regulation of the business, insofar as the States regulate the insurance business at this time, is assured and complete.

After reading all of the preambles, seven in number, whereas clauses and titles to this bill, then we come down to the legislative part of the bills which we will pass upon, and this legislative part includes six lines reading as follows:

That nothing contained in the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, or the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, shall be construed to apply to the business of insurance or to acts in the conduct of that business or in any wise to impair the regulation of that business by the several States.

The latter part of this could just as well be left off. I mean by this, that part beginning "or in any wise to impair the regulation of that business by the several States," because it is surplusage, and has no place or function in this bill; as to immune insurance companies from prosecutions under the antitrust laws, would, within itself, certainly leave all the regulation there is or could be of the insurance business, within the respective States. It adds no weight to the bill so far as the regulation is concerned. Taken altogether, it leaves a wide gap that would not be covered by any regulation, in that it would permit the insurance companies to combine and form trusts in at least 47 other States wherein the functions of the combinations and trusts would only be established and put into effect in the one remaining State, because there would be no law to touch them for such acts, for the reason that all acts would be done, all agreements entered into—which is the gist of the offense of violation of the antitrust laws—without the borders of this one State. If you will stop and consider this question just as stated to you, you can readily see the fallacy of this legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I wonder if the gentleman has noticed a table which was inserted in the RECORD yesterday at page 10054 by Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, showing the average rate of premium per hundred dollars paid in each State; the losses per $100 insurance in each State; the percent loss paid to premiums in each State; the average rate of premiums per $100 in each State; the losses per $100 of insurance in each State; and the percent loss paid to premiums in each State.

The table is as follows:

Fire-insurance premiums and fire losses by States—Stock companies

[10-year average 1931-40]

State	Average rate of premiums per $100	Losses per $100 insurance	Percent loss paid to premiums	Descending order of—		
				Average rate of premiums per $100	Losses per $100 insurance	Percent loss paid to premiums
Alabama	$0.99	$0.47	47.0	17	16	21
Alaska Territory	1.59	.75	47.2	1	1	20
Arizona	1.22	.57	46.8	3	4	22
Arkansas	1.18	.65	55.4	4	3	1
California	.81	.31	38.8	29	37	42
Colorado	.84	.28	32.9	25	41	49
Connecticut	.66	.24	36.3	42	46	44
Delaware	.59	.22	38.4	48	49	43
District of Columbia	.43	.10	24.5	51	50	50
Florida	1.00	.35	34.4	14	31	47
Georgia	.99	.51	50.9	16	8	8
Hawaii	.81	.07	9.2	30	51	51
Idaho	1.11	.50	44.8	8	10	31
Illinois	.67	.31	45.7	40	38	28
Indiana	.68	.29	42.2	39	40	38
Iowa	.66	.36	53.6	41	30	3
Kansas	.72	.37	50.8	36	29	9
Kentucky	.79	.39	49.7	32	24	14
Louisiana	.90	.42	46.5	24	20	25
Maine	1.02	.51	50.2	12	6	13
Maryland	.63	.27	42.7	46	43	36
Massachusetts	.73	.39	53.0	35	25	5
Michigan	.60	.30	50.5	47	39	11
Minnesota	.74	.35	46.7	34	32	23
Mississippi	1.37	.73	53.3	2	2	4
Missouri	.77	.42	53.9	33	21	2
Montana	1.16	.50	43.1	6	9	34
Nebraska	.65	.32	49.4	44	36	15
Nevada	1.17	.47	40.2	5	15	40
New Hampshire	1.11	.57	51.7	7	5	6
New Jersey	.66	.23	34.9	43	48	46
New Mexico	1.08	.44	40.6	9	19	39
New York	.57	.24	43.1	49	47	35
North Carolina	.81	.40	48.9	26	23	17
North Dakota	1.06	.46	43.3	10	17	33
Ohio	.54	.25	46.7	50	44	24
Oklahoma	.81	.37	46.0	27	28	27
Oregon	1.02	.49	48.2	11	11	19
Pennsylvania	.69	.24	35.0	38	45	45
Rhode Island	.69	.32	46.4	37	35	26
South Carolina	1.01	.51	50.6	13	7	10
South Dakota	.93	.37	39.8	22	26	41
Tennessee	.96	.49	51.2	19	12	7
Texas	.98	.48	49.2	18	13	16
Utah	.80	.34	42.6	31	33	37
Vermont	.95	.46	48.7	21	18	18
Virginia	.81	.37	45.6	28	27	29
Washington	.96	.48	50.4	20	14	12
West Virginia	.91	.41	44.9	23	22	30
Wisconsin	.63	.27	43.8	45	42	32
Wyoming	1.00	.33	33.4	15	34	48
Average	.72	.32	44.4	-----	-----	-----

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not, but I will say to the gentleman that further on in my remarks I have some revealing evidence that will open your eyes along those lines if I get the time to put it in.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not want to take up the gentleman's time, but I want to say that this is the most significant table of its kind that I have read since I have been in Congress. It shows that the State of Mississippi pays the highest rate per $100 of any State in the Union, yet its percent loss paid to premiums is only 53.3 percent. There is something wrong about this whole insurance business when they come rushing in here with these facts staring them in the face, and asking us to forestall the Supreme Court decision by an act of Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will say to the gentleman that is the very reason they wanted this bill passed, to stop such cases

coming to light by the indictment returned at Atlanta, Ga.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I just want to compliment the gentleman. I think he is rendering a very great service. I might say to the gentleman that I spoke against this bill myself a couple of weeks ago, and the letters I have received from a number of insurance agents, since I made my speech, are very, very encouraging, because they bring out precisely the points that the gentleman has dwelt upon.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I ask the gentleman this question: Is it not true that if any industry is anxious to escape Federal regulation, the most important thing in the world for that industry is to have the monopolistic practices prevented within it?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Therefore, the better the antitrust laws are enforced, the less necessity there will be for Federal protection.

Mr. RUSSELL. And the greater the protection the people will have.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman object to inserting this short table in his remarks?

Mr. RUSSELL. I will be glad to do it. At the suggestion of the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that that table be inserted in my remarks at the point where the gentleman from Mississippi interrupted me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is directed specifically toward ousting the Supreme Court from jurisdiction to entertain an appeal which is now pending in the case of the United States against South Eastern Underwriters Association. The bill is not limited to fire insurance. It covers all insurance, including life, casualty, and marine, and would grant total immunity to all insurance companies with respect to practices intended to eliminate competition or create a monopoly, and its passage would have an effect far more drastic and far beyond that at which it is aimed. It would establish a dangerous precedent, throwing the door open to other special-interest groups, to come in and apply for immunity from the antitrust laws, and would, in doing so, destroy the protection given to the people of our great country.

Another purpose and intent of this bill is to slap the United States Supreme Court in the face, as well as the President of the United States, because they do not like the present personnel of the Supreme Court. This has been admitted by some of the sponsors of this bill. To me this is going a long way—to pass legislation to slap the Supreme Court in the face, because they are dissatisfied with at least a part of the personnel of the Court. To me such action would be reckless, because we may not have—we will not have—the same personnel on the Supreme Court at all future dates, and it might set a precedent in the way of passing legislation that would in the future tie the hands of a Supreme Court whose personnel was to our liking. Again, it is going a long way in order to slap the Supreme Court in the face, to bring about legislation with as far-reaching effect and with the precedent established, as this legislation would have, should it be passed by this Congress.

This bill or the other bills would have never been heard of if that indictment had not been returned by a grand jury in the Federal court at Atlanta, Ga. Let us look for a few minutes into the background for the reasons that brought about this indictment.

The first circumstance was the uncovering of the little Teapot Dome scandal down in the State of Missouri, notwithstanding the fact that Missouri is supposed to be one of the States that have regulations. In the year of 1930, as I recall, the insurance companies got together and ordered an increase of 16⅔ percent in fire-insurance rates. The State insurance department refused to agree to this raise and challenged the same, and the matter went into the courts. Upon application by the fire-insurance companies, an injunction was granted, in part, which permitted the companies to collect the increased rate but impounded these funds brought about by the increased rates, to be deposited in the custody of the court, to await the final outcome of the suit. The refund impounded reached the aggregate of $10,000,000. I believe it was in the year of 1935 when a compromise settlement was agreed upon by the then insurance commissioner, which gave the insurance companies 80 percent of the funds, and the policyholders received 20 percent. It developed that this was a bought compromise settlement, wherein Boss T. J. Pendergast and his State insurance commissioner, R. E. O'Malley, had been paid $447,000 for this settlement. These gentlemen forgot to include this money in their income-tax reports and were caught up with by the Department of Justice, and had to serve a term in the Federal penitentiary for income-tax evasion.

Attorney General McKittrick, of Missouri, brought suit to oust these insurance companies from the State, charging them with bribery and also violating the State's antitrust laws, which, in my opinion, he had evidence to support. But being confronted with evidence that many of these acts were brought outside of the State boundaries, he called upon the Department of Justice for assistance. This Department interested itself in the matter, having had some of the evidence by reason of the income-tax evasion suits they had brought against Pendergast and O'Malley. This Department had been, at the request of many citizens including many insurance agents in the territory of Southeastern Underwriters Association, making an investigation of these companies with reference to monopolistic actions and acts which the Department believed to be in restraint of trade, and these investigations resulted in the indictments found by the grand jury at Atlanta, Ga. It will be well to note that the indictment was against 116 of the stock fire-insurance companies that were in the suits in Missouri which were settled by bribing the insurance commissioner of Missouri, Mr. O'Malley.

I have had an opportunity to study a part of the evidence the indictment in Atlanta was based upon, and in my opinion, which I base upon my experience of 10 years as a prosecutor and 12 years as district judge of a State court, having general jurisdiction, the evidence is sufficient to show a monopolistic action in restraint of trade on the part of the Southeastern Underwriters Association. With the facts of the background and basis for the indictment, I am firmly convinced that for the protection of the people equity, justice, and the principle of fair play demands that the Department, as a representative of the people, be permitted to have their day in court.

The Department of Justice is the only agency whom the people can look to for protection from the ravages of interstate monopolies and trusts. If the people were familiar with the evidence this Department has accumulated in this case, they would rise up and demand action. Yes; I say it is unfair to the people to cut the Department off now and prevent them from doing the things they were commanded by Congress in the passage of the laws sought to be annulled by this legislation. Yes; I say it is not fair under all the facts and circumstances to prevent the Department from having its day in court, which is guaranteed to the people of our country by the Constitution and the law of the land. Let us see that they get their day in court, and then they will stand or fall on the merits of their case. That is the American way.

The sponsors of this bill very readily tell us that the Supreme Court for 79 years has upheld the regulation by State control and that insurance was not commerce and for that reason, was not subject to the antitrust laws of the Federal Government. If that be true, then why pass this bill? If that has been the law for 79 years, then in my humble opinion it will continue to be the law until this Congress acts on legislation changing that law. If the contentions of the sponsors of this bill are correct, this bill is unnecessary.

The truth of the matter is that the insurance companies are afraid of their horses, because all of the decisions they cite in support of their contentions that the Supreme Court for 79 years has held insurance without the antitrust laws, has been against their contentions all down through the years, and each decision they cite was brought about by the actions of insurance companies in attacking State regulation and contending

that insurance was commerce and subject to Federal control.

To become more familiar with this question—while as I see it, it has nothing in the world to do with this piece of legislation—I want to discuss the main cases the insurance companies put forth as their authority for holding insurance companies without the antitrust laws of the Federal Government.

The first case they cite is the case of *Paul* v. *Virginia* (8 Wol. 168), which arose in May 1866 in the State of Virginia. Samuel D. Paul, a resident of Petersburg, Va., was appointed agent to carry on the business of fire insurance for several companies, all incorporated in the State of New York. Paul complied with all the requirements of the State law prerequisite to the granting of a license to act as an agent within the State for those companies, with one exception, and that was he refused to deposit certain bonds required by the Virginia statute. He undertook to act without a license, and issued a policy to a citizen of the State of Virginia, for which he was indicted and convicted in the State court for acting as an insurance agent without a license. The New York insurance companies appealed his conviction to the Supreme Court, financing all the litigation. According to the records of the National Board of Fire Underwriters at their second annual meeting, which was held in New York in February of 1868, the committee on legislation and taxation reported on the first duty assigned to it, which was to propose some practical plan to rid the country of unfair State legislation, and of securing, if possible, one general law for the governing of insurance companies throughout the Union. This association at that time sponsored a bill which was before the House Judiciary Committee and the Senate Committee on Commerce, for the creation of a national bureau of insurance, whose primary purpose was to secure the relief to which the business of insurance, as they stated, was entitled. They also urged the necessity of a test case, to test out the State laws, and so in their appeal in the case of Paul against Virginia the primary purpose was to destroy the State regulation of the insurance business within the State of Virginia at that time, and to carry the process on to other States. The Supreme Court, in upholding and affirming the decision of the State court, held in substance that the regulation was within the police power of the State, and they were authorized to make the requirements by statute which Paul was convicted for violating. In that opinion, in a dictum statement which was unnecessary to the decision of the case, the Court stated that the issuance of a policy of insurance was not a transaction in commerce; that policies do not take effect, are not executed contracts, until delivered by the agent in Virginia. And upon this dictum statement rests the theory now advocated by the proponents of this bill, as well as the insurance companies, that insurance is not commerce and is not, therefore, subject to the antitrust laws.

The next case the sponsors of this bill cite is *Hooper* v. *California* (155 U. S., 648), decided in 1895, wherein Hooper was prosecuted for violating a California statute by procuring insurance for a resident of California in an insurance company not qualified under the law of that State to do business in California. The Court held that the insurance company was doing a business in California without a license, and contrary to the statute. It involved a single transaction, of payment of premiums and delivery of the policy in California, and all acts, conversations, and so forth, were done in the city and county in the State of California and did not raise the question of interstate commerce; and the only question decided by the Court was to uphold the State statute, and in doing so, drew no distinction between fire and marine insurance.

The next case cited by the sponsors of this bill is the case of *New York Life Insurance Co.* v. *Cravens* (178 U. S. 389), decided in 1900, which involved the application of a Missouri statute. The Supreme Court upheld the statute against a contention that among other things, it was an attempted regulation of interstate commerce. Now mind you, this was the contention of the New York Life Insurance Co. The company claimed that the State's acts in Missouri were an attempted regulation of interstate commerce. This is contrary and contradictory to the views they take today. In deciding this case, among other things the Supreme Court said:

> According to *Paul* v. *Virginia*, insurance is not commerce.

But further stated:

> We omit the reasoning by which that is demonstrated and will only repeat, the business of insurance is not commerce.

While it was not unnecessary to the decision in this case to raise that question it was raised by the insurance companies of New York, which contended that the regulation of insurance was the regulation of interstate commerce.

The next case cited by the proponents of this bill, as well as the insurance companies, is the case of *New York Life Insurance Co.* v. *Deer Lodge County* (231 U. S. 495), decided in 1932, and this case as well as the others, involved only the validity of State legislation, or regulation.

A Montana statute levied a tax on all insurance companies, computed on the excess of premiums over losses and ordinary expenses, and was levied in the county where the agent conducted his business. Such taxes were imposed on the plaintiff, a New York corporation, which brought a suit to recover, claiming that the State was without jurisdiction to levy or collect such tax which it levied, and I emphasize these words, "laid a burden on interstate commerce." Who do we hear claiming that insurance is interstate commerce? It is a New York life insurance company. The State court upheld the statute, and the Supreme Court affirmed the State court's judgment, with Justices Hughes and Van Devanter dissenting. The last case cited by the sponsors of this bill and the insurance companies we discuss is *Western Livestock* v. *Bureau of Revenue* (303 U. S. 250), wherein they quote the line used in the opinion in that case, and I quote:

> That the mere formation of a contract between persons of different States is not within the protection of a commerce clause, at least in the absence of congressional action, unless the performance is within its protection is a proposition no longer open to question.

Undoubtedly, the sponsors of this bill would not stake their claim on this quotation. Its full import will furnish them no consolation. It illustrates that the Court was passing upon the contract, or the nature of the contract, and not upon the manner of conducting the business, and distinguishes the so-called insurance cases between an action under the antitrust laws. No one could logically contend for a moment that the issuance of a contract of insurance, within itself, would constitute interstate commerce.

Perhaps there are a few more cases which have been quoted and relied upon by the sponsors of this bill, but each and every one of them, in a measure, follow the dictum statement set out in Paul against Virginia, when really the question of whether or not the insurance business as it exists today is commerce, or is not commerce, it would be well to look now for a few minutes as to what some other authorities say and what the insurance people have said with reference to whether or not they believe insurance is commerce as it is transacted today; and in that connection I want to reiterate that it is the most powerful, most wealthy industry in our country today. This business has increased many hundreds of times over what it was at the time the opinion in Paul against Virginia was written. An eminent English author and writer and Chief Judge in Equity of New South Wales, in a discussion before the English Bar as printed in the Forty-Eighth American Law Register, 717, stated:

> The logic employed in Paul against Virginia is that the insurance business consists in an exchange of a contract for money and that as a contract, is not an article of commerce The exchange is not commerce. The insurance business as transacted at present day is something more, if it is not in substance the exchange of money for a contract, but consists in what is contemplated by the contract, irrespective of the manner in which the contract is executed. The case of Paul against Virginia has no further application.

Mr. Henry E. Hess, manager of the New York Fire Insurance Exchange, in September 1904, in an address to the insurance section of the International Congress at St. Louis said, after discussing Paul against Virginia, and I quote:

> The fact that today practically every chance of business life is protected and guarded against by some form of insurance makes the argument reasonable that insurance should be recognized as commerce.

Remember, this is the head of the New York Fire Insurance Exchange making this statement.

John F. Dryden, president of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America and United States Senator, on the 22d of November 1904, in an address to the Boston Life Underwriters Association, after discussing Paul against Virginia, stated:

I believe all America today understands the word "commerce" to comprehend insurance.

Senator Dryden was the president of a large insurance company, and on January 18, 1906, in an address before the New York Board of Trade stated that on the date of September 11, 1905, he sent out a letter of inquiry to some 8,000 associations and individuals throughout the United States. Included in this number was the entire membership of the American Bar Association. In that inquiry he submitted question No. 3, reading as follows, and I quote:

As a matter of personal opinion, do you hold the business of insurance to be commerce or an integral and indispensable element of commerce, in the sense in which this term is used in every-day language.

Out of 7,454 answers to that question, 5,300, or 71.1 percent, were in the affirmative.

Mr. A. I. Voorhis, president of the National Association of State Insurance Commissioners, in an address in 1904, reported in Moody's magazine, and I quote:

The now broad, intimate, and necessary connection of insurance with commerce furnishes ample reason for the belief that Federal supervision of interstate insurance will be adopted, and that it will be sustained upon all of these grounds; that insurance is commerce; that it is an instrumentality of commerce; that the transportation from State to State of insurance policies not authorized by Congress may be forbidden by Congress as a protection to the commerce that concerns all States.

In Twenty-eight American Bar Association Reports, page 1905, in a discussion on this subject by the committee on insurance law of the American Bar Association, after referring to the decision in Paul against Virginia and the other insurance cases, the committee states:

In none of these cases was there involved the validity of an act of Congress. In none of these cases did the decision hinge upon the constitutional classification of the business of insurance; in none of these cases was there apparently in the record, any accurate and detailed statement of facts with regard to the character and conduct of the business and the uses made of insurance; but the decisions are based upon the misconception of the facts touching the conduct of the business as they are recited in *Paul* v. *Virginia*, and upon the theory that the business of insurance involves only the making of a contract between a citizen of one State and a corporation of another. The question depends then upon regulation of the business of interstate insurance is whether the thing itself bears to the business of life of the Nation that intimate and vital relation which other conceded instrumentalities of commerce bear to it.

Mr. S. S. Huebner, instructor of insurance and commerce, University of Pennsylvania, and later an expert in insurance to the United States Shipping Board and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, stated in his article "Federal Supervision and Regulation of Insurance," Twenty-six Annals, American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, 1905, pages 681, 701, 703:

It requires little argument to prove that insurance fundamentally underlies all business, and that it is inseparably interwoven with our whole commercial life. * * * In the case of fire insurance, the usefulness of the business to trade and industry can scarcely be comprehended. * * * In general, then, insurance in its various forms turns out to be the foundation of credit, and the protector of all commerce, rather than the mere incident of commerce that the Supreme Court has declared it to be.

Mr. Edwin Maxey, professor in the law department, West Virginia University, writing on Federal control of insurance stated:

Practically every man who thinks of the insurance business as it exists today, thinks of it as one form of commercial activity, thinks of its relations as commercial relations. This is true of the jurist as well as the businessman.

Mr. Sylvester C. Dunham, president, Travelers Insurance Co., in an article in Moody's Magazine, asserted:

Insurance has outgrown State lines and has become national in its scope. It has not been adequately controlled by State authority for years.

Mr. Nat Tyler, authority on insurance legislation, writing on Federal Supervision in Interest of Policyholders, Moody's Magazine, stated that insurance was commerce. Mr. Miles M. Dawson, actuary, New York Legislative Committee, stated in an article entitled "A Case for National Supervision," Moody's Magazine, to the effect that insurance was commerce. Mr. Dawson also said:

The fact now appears to be that insurance is one of the most important commercial enterprises in the world, and a more vital part of the commercial structure than many other handmaids of commerce which might be mentioned that have received recognition long ago.

David K. Watson of the Ohio bar, in his book The Constitution of the United States, states in effect that insurance is interstate commerce.

Mr. George F. Seward, president, the Fidelity and Casualty Co., of New York, stated in an article, Insurance as Commerce, in 1910:

When the Constitution gave to Congess the control of interstate commerce it acted with a degree of wisdom not then appreciated. When the Supreme Court decided that insurance is not commerce it laid down a proposition that has so far nullified the interstate commerce clause. Commerce, meaning the interchange of merchandise, does not go on without insurance. Insurance, in fact, is a vital factor in all commerce. Interstate insurance has become one of the greatest interests in the Nation.

Mr. Henry Evans, president of the Continental Insurance Co., the Fidelity Fire Insurance Co., and the American Eagle Fire Insurance Co., who by the way are all defendants in the Atlanta suit, testified on marine insurance before a House subcommittee, House of Representatives, Subcommittee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Sixty-sixth Congress, first session, 1919, and in answering a question Mr. Evans stated:

I think insurance is commerce.

A subcommittee member, Mr. Hedge, asked:

In spite of the Supreme Court?

And Mr. Evans replied:

The Supreme Court has ruled the other way. But today a cotton buyer in Texas, for instance, a part of his contract is to deliver his cotton in Liverpool, and to cover the insurance. Now, the insurance is a part of that contract, and I believe if the matter came before the Supreme Court, if you could properly frame up such a case, they would change their ruling.

Mr. E. W. Sawyer, attorney for the National Bureau of Casualty and Insurance Underwriters, stated this year in an address before the Risk Research Institute in New York City, that:

If we assume a complete reversal of *Paul* v. *Virginia* and a holding that insurance is commerce, or a decision that insurance is such an aid to commerce as to bring it within the scope of recent Supreme Court decisions. * * * Such a decision would not of itself subject insurance to Federal control. The authority of Congress to regulate commerce between the States is a permissive power. The Constitution states that Congress may control it. Until Congress enacted legislation, States would have the right to control insurance, and presumably the rights of the States would be abrogated only so far as Congress assumed control.

Mr. Bernard C. Gavit, noted author and authority on the United States Constitution, stated:

Commerce includes more even than business. The insurance business is certainly commerce.

Time forbids the stating of many, many other authors and text writers who all state that the business of insurance is commerce, and I will have to refrain from stating them because I do not have time to name these other authors and text writers and state to you what they have said.

The insurance companies themselves in every suit they rely upon in support of this bill, contended that insurance was commerce. One of their pleas which the writ of error was granted on in Paul against Virginia was an argument by the insurance lawyers that "the business of insurance is commerce." These lawyers contended that the State of Virginia was interfering with the commerce clause of the Constitution. Likewise in all of the other cases that they now rely upon the insurance companies contended that the business of insurance was commerce.

The States of this Union, and especially all of those who have antitrust laws, have said by their actions in those antitrust laws, wherein they are applicable to insurance, that insurance was commerce. My native State, as well as all other States with which I am familiar with respect to antitrust laws, said laws are based on trade and commerce, and these States include the business of insurance within their antitrust laws, thereby stating that insurance is commerce. My native State, by special legislation, has said this.

For your information there are 16 States in the Union who have no laws covering rating agreements or rate-making organizations. There are 12 States who have made membership of stock fire-insurance companies in rating bureaus mandatory. There are 6 States prohibiting rate-fixing combinations. There is 1 State which makes and fixes rates as a function of government. That is my native State, Texas. There are 6 States permitting the operating of rating bureaus, but prohibiting combinations to fix and control rates. There are 6 States who permit rating bureaus. There is 1 State that permits the joint employment by insurance companies of experts to compute rate schedules. If you take insurance out of the antitrust laws, what protection will these States have which at this time do not have laws covering rating agreements or rate-making organizations?

The insurance companies and the sponsors of this bill have put out the report that if this bill is not passed, and if the Supreme Court should hold that the business of insurance is commerce, it will bring about chaos and destroy all State regulations, and force upon the people another bureau in Washington to control the business of insurance. Such representations are misleading and incorrect. This would not be the case at all. With an unbroken line of decisions the courts of this land have held to the contrary. Text writers and teachers have written and taught to the contrary. The States now are and always have been regulating corporations engaged in interstate commerce. The Supreme Court has upheld the States' rights to do this numerous times, with an unbroken line of decisions dating back to Paul against Virginia.

This straw man was put up to arouse prejudice in the minds of the people and to stampede this bill through Congress. Let us see what the authorities say about it.

In the *Minnesota Rate cases* (30 U. S. 352, 402), the *Missouri Rate cases* (230 U. S. 474 (1912)) the Supreme Court upheld the right of the State to regulate railroads in interstate rates and fares for passengers.

In the case of *Hall* v. *Geiger-Jones Co.* (242 U. S. 359 (1917)) and in *Binderup* v. *Pathe Exchange* (263 U. S. 291–311 (1923)), the Court upheld the right of the States to regulate commerce within their borders.

In *Dickson* v. *Uhlman Grain Co.* (223 U. S. 188 (1933)) on this same question the Court said:

> Since there is nothing in the State law which is inconsistent with, or could conceivably interfere with, the operation or enforcement of the Federal law, the statute of Missouri was not superseded.

Minnesota v. *Blasius* (290 U. S. 1 (1933)) held the same thing. *California* v. *Thompson* (313 U. S. 109 (1941)), in a case far stronger than any insurance regulation, upheld the State law. In *Duckworth* v. *Arkansas* (314 U. S. 390 (1941)), which should be of interest to the Arkansas boys, the Court said:

> While the commerce clause has been interpreted as reserving to Congress the power to regulate interstate commerce in matters of national importance, that has never been deemed to exclude the State from regulating matters primarily of local concern with respect to which Congress has not exercised its power even though the regulation has some effect on interstate commerce.

In *Northern Securities Co.* v. *United States* (193 U. S. 197) the Court said:

> There is no reason to suppose that Congress had any purpose to interfere with the internal affairs of the State, nor, in our opinion, is there any ground whatever for the contention that the Antitrust Act regulates their domestic commerce. By its very terms the act regulates only commerce among the States and with a foreign state.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Other special orders have been entered the Chair would remind the gentleman. If there is no objection to the gentleman's request, the gentleman may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GWYNNE. Is it not true that under existing court decisions the States have complete authority to regulate every insurance company that operates within a State?

Mr. RUSSELL. In matters in reference to intrastate affairs and business—intrastate, not interstate.

Mr. GWYNNE. For example, my State of Iowa. Can we not lay down the terms on which insurance companies may do business in Iowa?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; but you cannot keep them out if they comply with the terms.

Mr. GWYNNE. But we can make the terms.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; if you do.

In *Hartford Indemnity Co.* v. *Illinois* (298 U. S. 155 (1936)), the Court upheld a State regulation as not an infringement of interstate commerce.

Savage v. *Jones* (225 U. S. 501), and *Shafer* v. *Farmers Grain Co.* (268 U. S. 189) the Court upheld State regulations even though they incidentally affected interstate commerce. *Parker* v. *Brown* (317 U. S. 341) upheld State regulations. And many other cases which I could cite, if time would permit. However, with the cases I have cited there should be no doubt about State regulation, regardless of the outcome of the cases now on appeal.

The insurance companies state that if insurance is held commerce, all State regulation will be held to be a violation of the antitrust laws, and especially in establishing rates. And in this they are as wrong as they are in their other contentions. The Supreme Court has held against them every time the question has been presented to the Court. The Minnesota Rate Cases, the Missouri Rate Cases heretofore cited, have held against their contention. In *Parker* v. *Brown* (317 U. S. 341), the Supreme Court held against their contention. It was so held in California against Thompson, and in many other cases.

When did the insurance companies decide they would rather have State regulation exclusively? I will tell you when. It was when that indictment was returned at Atlanta, Ga., and not until then. "By their acts ye shall know them," and the only reason the companies prefer exclusive State regulation now is to save their hides.

What is their past with reference to this matter, besides all the cases they have brought to the Supreme Court, trying to get every State regulation held illegal? They have gone into the States with their lobbies and fought every regulatory measure before the State legislatures, trying to defeat the measures always, making the same howl they have made here—that if the State law was passed, chaos would reign; it would mean ruination to the insurance companies; that if the legislation was passed the companies would have to withdraw from the State, and this "would bring financial and industrial collapse to the State."

I remember when my native State passed the Roberson insurance law, our regulatory law that we now operate under. The companies made all these claims and threatened to leave the State if the law was passed. They even carried it into political campaigns, and tried to get favorable candidates elected. After the law passed, the companies stayed on in the field, but they did not give up here. They fought the law through all the courts of the land, and lost, of course.

The law did not bring chaos. It did not ruin the State, as the companies predicted, and it did not break the companies, as they predicted. The law was not unconstitutional, which is contrary to their position here. In fact, the companies stayed on until Texas has become one of the most fertile fields for the insurance business in the United States. The city of Dallas stands fourth in the cities of the United States in the insurance business today. So you see, it is the same old howl, the same old camouflage, the same deception, the same unfair means.

During my 12 years' experience as a trial judge on the district bench in Texas, many suits were filed against insurance companies. And to show you that the insurance companies are not sincere in their desire and claim to prevent Federal regulation in behalf of insurance, I do not remember a single case where the amount in controversy exceeded $3,000, wherein the insurance company, which was almost always the case, was a foreign company—that is, their headquarters was in some State other than Texas—but what they filed their motion and affidavit to remove the case to the Federal court. I was informed, and I am now informed, that these insurance companies—and I will reiterate, that 90 percent of the business done in my State is done by insurance companies who are chartered and incor-

porated and whose principal office is in some other State—it was the rule in Texas in other district and circuit courts, for the insurance company to follow this procedure; and I am informed that this procedure is followed by foreign insurance companies within every State in the Union. If these companies are now sincere in not wanting any Federal regulation with regard to their business, is it not peculiarly singular that at every opportune time, they remove their suits from State courts to Federal courts? It occurs to me that by their actions, which are universal in this respect, they had rather have Federal regulation than State regulation.

Mr. Speaker, I am unable to say all I wanted to say, because time will not permit. But in conclusion, I do want to say, in the words of the insurance agent I have heretofore quoted, "For the life of me, I cannot see why the insurance companies should not come under the antitrust laws like any other business," or why they should be made a special class in this special-interest legislation. If we are going to immunize the insurance companies from such laws, why not immunize the little grocerymen, the one running the feed store, the dry goods store; in fact, all other businesses and concerns, which have just as much right to be immunized as the insurance business? And then we would not be showing special-interest favors. Certainly all types of businesses named above have just as much right to be immunized from this law as the insurance business.

It is the little policyholders that need the protection. It is their money, often paid under hardship and great sacrifice; it is their money paid into the corporations that have enabled this industry to grow as it has. It is their money that has made the insurance business the most powerful, the wealthiest industry on the face of the earth; it was for their protection that the antitrust laws were passed, and I cannot believe that this Congress wants to destroy that protection.

The fact that through policyholders' money the insurance business has become so powerful is conclusive evidence that policyholders need this protection. This law against monopolistic actions and restraints of trade helps to hold down the rates so they will not be in a confiscatory amount and will in the end inure to the benefit of the insurance companies. The fact that the insurance business has become the wealthiest business, is evidence that the rates somewhere have been too high.

The Capital Times, a daily newspaper of Madison, Wis., in an editorial against the passage of this act, set up some figures with reference to rates, including losses which, as the paper states, were during the 6 years from 1936 to 1941. The fire-insurance companies collected in premiums more than $128,700,000, while the losses for the same 6 years were $52,575,000, a difference of $75,-125,000. This shows a profit of approximately 145 percent. This suggests that the rates are too high, and that something should be done about it. The same article gives the figures for the city of Madison, Wis., for the year 1942—there were $400,000 paid to the fire-insurance companies in premiums, while the losses paid by the companies that year amounted to $80,000. There was a difference of $320,000 between premiums and losses in this one city. There is something wrong with the rates in Madison. While I stated above, the increase in premiums paid over losses, you cannot figure the percentage of profit, because the policyholders paid in the money for the losses as well as the excess money over the losses, and the only expense or money put up by the insurance companies was the expense of carrying on the business. Therefore, the excess is all profit, less the smaller expenses of the companies in carrying on the business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. In 1941, the 10 largest fire-insurance companies reported to the States an aggregate statutory underwriting profit of about $2,500,000. According to Best's Insurance Reports, the earnings on underwritings of these companies was approximately $19,0 0,000, a difference of $16,500,000. Of course this report made to the States was for the purpose of deceiving such States and thereby getting a higher premium rate for the next year. Does this not convince you that it is the policyholders, the ones who pay in all this money, the ones who furnish it, need protection and consideration by this Congress? To pass this bill you will aid, comfort, and assist the fire-insurance companies in the furtherance of their deception to the States and to the people.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe this Congress wants to do that. I cannot believe Congress will be deceived and stampeded into passing this iniquitous legislation.

The letters that have been written out about this legislation are misleading, and by them the sponsors have received favorable replies. But I tell you, if they had explained the full import and effects of these bills, they would not have received many favorable replies.

They most usually carried the implication in the question: "Do you favor State rights and State regulation of the insurance business as it has always been regulated, and are you opposed to further bureaucratic control by setting up a bureau in Washington to regulate the business of insurance, and further harass and hound the people?" This implication is unfair and incorrect.

As I have stated, I favor States' rights. The doctrine of States' rights is traditional with me. I favor this principle now. I favored it on the 25th of May of this year. On that occasion, where were the sponsors of this legislation? They certainly have had a change of heart since the 25th of last May.

While the doctrine of States' rights is traditional with me, likewise, the antitrust laws are also traditional with me. Each has the same basic principle—the prevention of the centralization of power. Centralized government is always opposed to States' rights. Monopolies and trusts operating in restraint of trade are twin brothers to centralized government. They work hand in hand, each depending upon the other as its coconspirator, and there is now as there has always been, an alliance between those who would centralize the government and the backers of monopolies and trusts. They are not only close, but are essential to each other. Thus hand in hand they would walk as they have always walked—the strong centralized government protecting the monopolies and trusts, hand in hand, compacted and organized, one creating the necessity, the other meeting it; consolidated and organized wealth stripping the people of their rights, striking down local self-government.

To vote this bill down is preserving States' rights and preserving the protection of the people against monopoly and restraints of trade. And when this bill is stripped of all its false colors, the people will see it, and the Congress will see it, as it is. And when they do, I feel that they will do the right thing.

It may be true that in recent years Congress itself has gone too far in permitting encroachment upon the rights and powers of the several States. But the remedy for that is not to single out a special-interest class of citizens which may or may not be engaged in interstate commerce and subject to the law, depending upon how the Supreme Court shall finally determine these questions, which it is their right and duty to do. At least, the representatives of the people, as well as the Supreme Court, should have the opportunity to consider all relevant facts in regard to the cases now pending on appeal. The Congress should not exempt any business from the law in advance of a judicial decision as to their liability.

Mr. Speaker, I am candid and sincere about this matter, and I feel that this Congress should not deprive the people and the holders of insurance policies of that protection they are entitled to. That protection will be destroyed if this bill is passed. I do not know what effect my attitude in this case will have upon my future and neither do I care. I know the powerful interests, financial, and otherwise, of the insurance companies; I know what they could do if they saw fit, if this power were to be pitted against my pitiful 15 cents. Neither do I care about that. I have spoken in behalf of the people because I think it is right, and to that end I will work; that is, in the interests of the people, as long as I am permitted to represent them in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me say that the insurance companies remind me of the little colored boy down in Texas who was tried in county court for theft of a suit of clothes. The Negro boy hired

a good lawyer, and the case was tried on a charge of petty larceny for stealing a suit of clothes. The jury came in with a verdict of not guilty. The Negro boy stood up when the judge said, "The defendant is discharged," looked at him, and said, "What does that mean?"

"Well," said the judge, "the jury has found you not guilty; you are discharged; you are free; you can go where you please; the jury has turned you loose; you can go whenever you get ready."

The little Negro boy turned, started out of the place, looked around at the judge, and said, "Does that mean I gets to keep the suit of clothes?"

The insurance companies have been caught up violating the law, but now they come to this Congress and ask the Congress to pass legislation that will let them keep the suit of clothes.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. I have listened to the gentleman's address with a great deal of interest, because, after all, we are interested in insurance companies, especially life insurance, and the gentleman has given the matter a great deal of research study. I should like to ask the gentleman if he has determined the amount of these premiums that go back into the several State treasuries and thereby go to the people in services? I am under the impression that it is an enormous sum of money and that those States would probably lose that money if State jurisdiction were deprived.

Mr. RUSSELL. You are not depriving the State of jurisdiction of anything by the failure to pass legislation.

Mr. NORRELL. But if you beat the rates down too much, it necessarily does deprive the States of this revenue.

Mr. RUSSELL. We have State regulations to protect policyholders. This State regulation is a protective measure, not a discriminatory measure, and that is one of the reasons the Supreme Court upholds State regulations.

INCREASE IN POSTAL RATES

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, since my remarks of last Wednesday, I have become all the more convinced that title IV of the revenue bill providing for an increase in postal rates, now being considered by the Senate Finance Committee, should be stricken. You will recall that no hearings whatever on this subject of increase in postal rates were had by the Committee on Ways and Means. You will also recall that the entire revenue bill, including title IV was disposed of in the House in the 1 day's debate of last Wednesday.

I have just received figures showing the effects of changes in post-card rates of postage during the last war, which point out the fallacy of increasing postal rates. The figures available relate to Government printed postal cards sold or requisitioned by post offices; the Post Office Department states that privately printed cards may be assumed to be equal in volume of sales. You will note that in 1917 1,112,337,760 cards were sold. The increase in rate from 1 cent to 2 cents caused a reduction in volume in 1918 to 707,111,300 cards and in 1919 a reduction to 466,924,490 cards. Then Congress wisely reduced the rate to 1 cent and the volume picked up to 986,156,087 for 1920. You will note that although the rate was reduced on February 24, 1919, it required the better part of a year to reeducate the public to the use or advantages of the lower rate. For fiscal years the figures are:

	Cards
1916	1,047,894,800
1917 (new rate in effect on Nov. 3)	1,112,337,760
1918	707,111,300
1919 (rate reduced on Feb. 24)	466,924,490
1920	986,156,087

If the proposed rates become effective, there will be an immediate repetition of loss of volume.

It should also be remembered that third-class mail is the creator of first-class mail. A firm sends out 100,000 catalogs. They receive orders from 10,000 customers, who send their orders first class. The firm, in turn, sends out invoices to 10,000 customers by first-class mail. At postage of 4 cents on the catalogs, the postage would be $4,000. This expenditure would create 10,000 first-class letters at 3 cents each, or $300 postage, plus 10,000 invoices at 3 cents each. You can multiply this figure because the customers repeat three or four times a year, using first-class postage. I am informed that the experience of firms in the mail selling field is that for every dollar expended in third-class postage there is created $2.70 in first-class postage.

A business firm that budgets $10,000 a year for postage for catalogs and merchandising price lists—third-class mail—cannot automatically increase its postage budget to $20,000 without seriously affecting its cost of doing business and under price ceilings cannot increase selling prices. The result will be a reduction in normal profits, which will reduce Treasury Department revenues, or the only other alternative—a curtailment in the distribution of catalogs. In either case the anticipated tax revenues will not be forthcoming.

As one constituent writes me:

> In 1942 our expenditure for catalog postage, third-class mail, was $225,000; if the rate increase of 100 percent becomes effective, we would be required to pay $450,000 postage. There is only one place to charge this increase of $225,000, and that is out of profits, and being in the 80-percent bracket it will thus reduce our income tax to the Treasury Department in an amount almost equivalent to the postage increase. The result is the Government fails in its effort to secure the increased taxes anticipated by the Ways and Means Committee's endeavor to increase postal rates.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Great Falls Tribune, and another from the Mining Association of Montana.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE O. P. A.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, under the New Deal, coming in on the waves of a depression, emergency followed emergency, bureau followed bureau, rules and regulations ran riot.

Then came war. Destruction and conflagration enveloped the globe.

With war came opportunity, excuse, and cover for more rigid regulation. Boards and agencies were created with such rapidity no one person could keep them classified. Some sort of hysteria infected these agencies. They seemed possessed with a mania that war had suspended all laws—even the Constitution itself; that American citizens no longer had rights which must be respected; that they, the bureaucrats, were clothed with supreme authority; and that regimentation and bureaucratic control must be the order of the day.

In fact, no magic feat of memory is required to recall claims that a mandate had been received from the people to do certain things. Whether or not receiving 70 percent of the votes cast in a recent special election is a mandate is beside the point. But my district did give me a job to do. That job, in part, if possible, was to eliminate or eradicate the O. P. A., or, finding that impossible or impractical, then to bring its practices within legal and constitutional restrictions and thus abrogate its dictatorial decrees and its supersnoopers.

If the people of America in general, and those of the Second District of Kansas in particular, were not fundamentally sound, loyal, law-abiding citizens, infinitely patient, open rebellion against O. P. A. would now exist.

There is not a Member of this House who does not receive almost daily some complaint about ruinous requirements or obnoxious orders of the O. P. A.

At this point it is suggested that you make a thorough study of the recent report made by the Smith committee, which covers some of the matters hereinafter mentioned, and many which are not discussed.

As you all know, the O. P. A. is the child of Congress, conceived and created by the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942. But this child has not stayed in the legislative yard; it has broken through the legislative fence and is running wild. The Price Control Act was intended to be all-inclusive and all-exclusive. The recited purposes of the act were, among others, to stabilize

prices, to prevent unwarranted and abnormal increases in prices, to prevent profiteering, to prevent undue impairment of living standards, to permit voluntary cooperation between Government and producers and processors, and to prevent hardships to persons engaged in business.

Further, section 2 (b) limits the powers under these general purposes, by providing that granted powers shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in business practices, cost practices, or established means of distribution.

Ask any businessman in your community if he has had to change his business practices or his distribution methods; whether he has suffered any hardships in conducting his business.

There was no rhyme or reason in the arbitrary classification of businesses by which retail prices to be charged were based on gross volume of business, for this did not take into consideration any trade practice, method of doing business, manner of distribution, or type of services rendered.

Few American businessmen are chiselers, yet all are looked upon with the fishy eye of suspicion.

Just this week the manager of a wholesale grocery business, operated cooperatively by retail merchants, members of the Kansas Service Grocers, wrote me in detail telling how two O P. A. snoopers, one formerly a tire man and the other a former dry-goods merchant, disrupted the entire business for 2 days going over prices and checking compliances, all at the expense of taxpayers. They discovered one error, a mistake of 1 cent in a freight charge, and found that one item was being sold for 2 cents less than the ceiling price.

Like examples can be multiplied a thousandfold.

So the question naturally arises, "Is there no help for our citizens? Is there no remedy?" Oh, yes; section 204 of the act of 1942 sets out the manner in which they can attempt to get relief: Within 60 days after the issuance of a regulation or order the aggrieved citizen can file a protest. With whom? With the issuing authority, the O. P. A. Within 30 days after the filing of the protest, or 90 days after the issuance of the protested regulation, order, or price schedule the Administrator shall take one of three actions:

First. Grant or deny such protest, in whole or in part;

Second. Notice the protest for hearing; or

Third. Provide opportunity for presenting further evidence.

How many of these protests have been filed, and how many or how few have been resolved in favor of the protesting citizens, we have not learned, although such information has been requested, and has been promised within the next week.

Further relief is offered if the citizen is denied his protest, in whole or in part. He can, within 30 days, file an appeal or complaint with a specially created court—the Emergency Court of Appeals.

This court has been functioning under rules covering 22 typed pages and, according to a letter from its presiding judge, Hon. Albert B. Maris, its record is as follows, up to November 24, 1943: Ninety-eight complaints have been filed; 26 withdrawn or dismissed by agreement; 44 now pending, 17 of which have been heard and are under submission and 27 not yet heard; 28 complaints have been decided, 24 were dismissed and 4 were sustained.

Of these 28, 7 were decided within 90 days of filing, 17 within 6 months, 3 within 9 months, and 1 within a year. The average time for the 28, between filing and decision, is 4 months.

As far as time is concerned that record is not subject to very great criticism, but the record shows the complaining citizen has one chance out of seven for redress on appeal.

However, it must be remembered that the little businessmen cannot afford the expense or the time required for this relief. By the end of a few months their businesses are gone.

Very few, denied relief in the Emergency Court of Appeals, can afford the time and expense of a further appeal to the Supreme Court.

But the foregoing procedure, by section 204 (d) of the Price Control Act, is exclusive. All other Federal courts are barred from considering the validity, legality, or constitutionality of any regulation, order, or decree, and from restraining or enjoining any provision of this law or any regulation, order, or price schedule issued pursuant to it.

Oh, yes. Mr. John Q. Public can go ahead believing he is right and await criminal prosecution, and face a year in jail and $5,000—fine, not subsidy—if he is unsuccessful in establishing his claim that the order is invalid. This relief is expensive and quite nerve-wracking, yet many have thus met the challenge—and successfully.

Or, he may go ahead doing the best he can and be harassed by civil suits, such as the one called to your attention on November 19 by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON]. In that case a respectable, essential businessman, under duress, by threat of suits filed and to be filed, far from home, paid an arbitrary sum in compromise. Rather than face further harassing by the O. P. A., he has decided to quit business on January 1.

Thousands of other citizens have been whipped from pillar to post in the kangaroo courts of the O. P. A., which, according to one of their deputy administrators, Mr. Emerson, are not set up under the Price Control Act but under the Second War Powers Act, which jurisdiction, Mr. Emerson claims, is fully within the intention of Congress. But a study of that statute does not sustain Mr. Emerson's contention.

Since when have O. P. A. officials been commissioned to don judicial robes and interpret the intent of Congress?

Surely O. P. A. cannot seriously contend that they do not have sufficient tribunals for enforcement requirements. The act itself provides that O. P. A. may enjoin violations or obtain orders enforcing compliance in courts of appropriate jurisdiction; that willful violators may be criminally prosecuted, in the discretion of the Attorney General; that civil action for treble damages may be filed; and that licenses, after a warning order has been issued, may be revoked in any court of competent jurisdiction, including State courts.

To a recent date O. P. A. had issued 14,000 warning orders; it has instituted over 3,000 injunction proceedings, more than 400 treble damage cases, and in excess of 4,000 criminal cases. Only 11 cases for suspension have been instituted in the courts as carefully and fully provided by the law, and more than 5,000 suspension proceedings have been instituted before unauthorized and illegal kangaroo courts. Included in these were the cases of 2 Pennsylvania women who were ordered to forfeit their ration books and face starvation. It is true that they were put on probation, but the power to starve citizens by illegal orders must be revoked, if in fact it ever existed. Even had these women been criminally prosecuted and convicted, they would have been well fed—and without points.

Why does the O. P. A. avoid authorized courts? Are they afraid of the merit of their claims, or do they prefer to continue to act as investigator, prosecutor, and judge—the unholy 3-in-1?

Mr. WINTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. WINTER. The gentleman is making a very fine statement and is to be commended on the research he has made in connection with this part of the O. P. A. work he has looked up. I was wondering if the gentleman had remembered that out in Kansas when some cases were filed against the Government in the Federal courts and the late Richard J. Hopkins was judge the Government, through O. P. A. and other agencies, moved to get the cases out of that court back into their original set-up within the O. P. A. organization itself. Does the gentleman have anything in mind along that line? Does he remember what that case was?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I may say to the gentleman from Kansas that those cases arose under prosecutions against certain landlords, three of whom were widows. The first notice that any of those defendants had that they were to be prosecuted was when they read in the paper that warrants had been issued for their arrest. Three of those cases, in which the judge was particularly careful to see that there could be no possible prejudice claimed, went to the jury, and the defendants were acquitted.

In the fourth case the judge was preparing his instructions, and at the noon hour, just before he was to return to the chambers to charge the jury, he died of a heart attack, and the O. P. A. prosecutor was heard to exclaim, in substance, the prayer of thanks, "Thank God; we can now get a judge we can depend on."

The judge who came in to supersede or take the place of the dead judge was from Oklahoma, and had been appointed about 3 years ago. On the retrial of that case he did not even go so far as to charge the jury but directed a verdict of acquittal, and the same result took place as in the others. Thereafter in Wichita other cases similar to these also resulted in verdicts of acquittal by the jury.

There is a venerable old document, formerly revered, now occasionally remembered, but too frequently, in later years, forgotten. It is the Constitution of the United States of America. Remember?

Read, if you will, article III, section 1, which vests all judicial power in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as Congress may establish.

Article III, section 2, states that this judicial power shall extend to all cases in law and in equity arising under the Constitution or the laws of the United States. Does not that section clearly forbid usurpation of judicial power?

Where is there anything in the Price Control Act or the Second War Powers Act setting up courts with the jurisdiction exercised by the "kangaroo courts" of O. P. A.?

What then must we do to end this unconstitutional usurpation? What relief can be given our patient, patriotic citizens?

The answer is simple: Bring this child of ours back into the yard and rebuild the legislative fence so he cannot run away again.

On the clerk's desk is petition No. 13 to bring out for consideration H. R. 2705, which will, among other things, restore our Federal courts to their rightful places so that they protect the people from the un-American practices of power-crazed bureaucrats by repealing section 204 of the Price Control Act of 1942.

Sign petition No. 13. Bring out the bill. Enact it or one similar, and let our courts, not some O. P. A. hireling or commission, determine the legality of orders, decrees, and regulations; let the courts again enjoin enforcement of such orders as may be illegal and restrain enforcement of others until their legality is determined.

Our citizens expect us to restore and maintain constitutional government. They plead with us to reconvert this into a nation governed by laws enacted by their chosen representatives; they no longer want to live under a dictated economy where they are ruled by the whims, fancies, caprices, or arbitrary edicts of socialistic dreamers and despots. They are tired of being kicked around.

Congress is their only hope for relief—relief which they need now.

What will your answer be to their pleas, prayers, and petitions?

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman is a distinguished lawyer in the district from which he comes and has undoubtedly talked to the people of his district about the situation of which he has spoken. Would the gentleman agree with me upon the situation that the people do have a confidence, and a great confidence, in our judicial system, that if we had a system of appeal from these orders, from these rulings, from these decisions, and if they were reviewable by the courts, the people on the whole would have greater confidence that our form of government was being sustained, would have a greater comfort in the fact that a court has decided upon the issues, whichever way the court may decide, and that it is imperative for the confidence of the people to have this right of appeal? Does the gentleman agree with me in that statement?

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is absolutely correct. The people, however, are confused. They assume that these forums in which so many of these hearings are held, where ration books and licenses are revoked, are in fact courts. They do not know the difference. It may be that my views taken on some of these matters as far as the Constitution is concerned are, because I happen to have attended the University of Kansas where our Constitution is served to us without mustard, if you know what I mean, and I think you do. The result is we have been trained and taught and have been raised to have the highest respect for the Constitution and for our constitutionally organized courts. These unofficial, these illegal, these star-chamber sessions of O. P. A. hearing commissions have done more to tear down the confidence of the people of this Nation in our courts than anything else that has ever happened, which is one of the reasons why this condition should be remedied without any further delay, and the only place it can be remedied is in the Halls of the Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an article from the Egyptian Mail, of Cairo and Alexandria, Egypt, dated November 12, which I have received from a soldier in the American Army.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BENDER, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PROBLEMS BEFORE THE SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, since reconvening on the 14th of last September Congress has written a most commendable record in the development of a foreign policy. This House took the initiative by adopting overwhelmingly the now famous Fulbright resolution, expressing the opinion of this body that we should aid in the creation of international machinery to establish and maintain a just and leasting peace among the nations of the world and that we should participate in such machinery. The House vote expressed clearly the desire of the country. The action in this Chamber on September 21 hastened, I feel certain, the consideration and final passage by the Senate of the Connally resolution. This measure as adopted consists of the original resolution plus amendments resulting from the impact of the Moscow Conference. In fact, section 4 of the four-power declaration agreed to at Moscow is included in the Senate resolution. The acceptance of the Connally proposal by the decisive and overpowering vote is a new departure in international affairs for this Republic. November 5, the date of the Senate vote, will be recorded by historians of the future as the inception of a move by the United States to effectuate world unity. We now have stated our intention to cooperate, to collaborate, and to work with the other nations of the world in establishing an "international organization based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security." This is one of the most important acts by the Congress in our time. It marks a turning point in our foreign policy.

It afforded me deep gratification to vote for the Fulbright resolution. On March 12, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 14, which contained the same idea as we accepted in September, but in addition my resolution would have placed congressional approval upon the Atlantic Charter. I cherish the hope that some day Congress will accept the charter. When the Senate had the Connally resolution under consideration an attempt was made to write this document into the resolution. Although this effort failed success may come at another time. An endorsement of the Atlantic Charter would have a most salutary effect upon international relations. In connection with this matter may I refer you to an address by Marshal Stalin delivered on November 6 in which he said:

> Together with our allies we must, first, free countries subjected by the Fascist invaders and give assistance for the establishment of national states that were dismembered by the Fascist oppressors. The peoples of France, Belgium, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Greece, and other countries under the Fascist yoke must recover full

rights of freedom and independence. Second, the liberated countries of Europe must receive full right and freedom to decide for themselves their form of state.

The leader of Russia in this speech approved some of the points included in the historic declaration formulated by Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt on the Atlantic in August 1941.

For several years I have been an outspoken advocate of a world organization to keep peace among the nations. The construction of such an organization is the only alternative to international anarchy, to a global war of catastrophic proportions every two or three decades. I believe that the creation of appropriate international machinery to prevent aggression is the only hope for the future. The Seventy-eighth Congress is meeting at a time of world dislocation and unrest. Decisions affecting the future of civilization are being made by the men who are serving in this body. We have already consummated a historic departure in the field of international relations. To be a Member of this august body is a privilege and an honor that comes to only a few men. Being a Member of the Seventy-eighth Congress, which has taken such a momentous step in the direction of laying the foundations for a better world order, will remain to me a source of profound satisfaction as long as I live.

PENDING MEASURES

We have recently passed with a heavy majority the Commodity Credit Corporation bill banning the general use of food subsidies. A revenue measure increasing taxes by over $2,000,000,000 has just been voted by the House. Two hundred and eighteen Members, a sufficient number, have signed a motion to discharge the Banking and Currency Committee from consideration of the Disney bill, a measure designed to increase the production of crude oil. This activity by the House is most laudable and I for one hope that much more will be accomplished before the Christmas recess. I mention only a few resolutions which, in my opinion, need immediate attention: The Wolcott bill, H. R. 2705, providing for judicial review of O. P. A. decisions; the Fulmer bill, H. R. 2837, to provide for central responsibility for the production and distribution of the Nation's food by establishing a War Food Administration in the Department of Agriculture; the Monroney bill, House Concurrent Resolution 54, to create a joint committee to study means for improving the organization and effectiveness of Congress; and the Kefauver bill, House Resolution 327, to amend the rules of the House to provide for a question period at which heads of executive departments and independent agencies are requested to appear and answer questions.

In the legislative committees of this House there repose hundreds of bills. Many of them, of course, should be killed but there are dozens of meritorious measures which ought to be passed. Is it not our duty to discuss these resolutions and to act upon the issues involved? I realize that I speak as a new Member, but it seems to me that Congress could strengthen itself immeasurably in the public mind by disposing of the many pending bills and by acting upon several of the measures now lying around in committees. It ought not to be necessary to resort to discharge motions to bring needed legislation to this floor. It would be much better if the committees would report bills without being forced to do so. Were the measures presented with a minimum of delay we would have the opportunity to vote on important matters which have been ignored during the past weeks.

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. WINTER. The gentleman is making a very fine statement. I commend him on his statement as to the facts in regard to what bills should be brought before Congress for consideration. I am just wondering if the gentleman is familiar with the fact that there are some 17 discharge petitions on the Speaker's desk at this time, which shows the inaction of the Democratic leadership as to bringing bills before the House for consideration?

Mr. MERROW. Someone mentioned that to me a few moments ago. I thank the gentleman for bringing it out at this point.

PRICE ADJUSTMENT

The Republican Congressional Food Study Committee has conducted public hearings in several of our large cities. At each hearing statements were presented by representatives of food industries, by men and women with practical experience in the production, processing, wholesaling, and retailing of various foods. They gave a clear analysis of the manner in which the excessive Federal regulations are hampering production and distribution. One thing above all else was pronouncedly apparent at these hearings. An adjustment of prices for certain commodities is absolutely necessary. O. P. A. and other Government agencies fail to recognize that it is imperative to adjust prices if production is to be stimulated and distribution facilitated. Pleading with administration officials is useless. They often refuse to accept the suggestions offered by the people who are familiar with the industries the Federal Government is trying to regulate. With little concern for practical procedure, deaf ears have been turned upon entreaties to change prices. The time has come when Congress must act or the policies of the Federal bureaucracy may disrupt beyond repair our national economy. The issue has been clearly drawn. The bringing out of the Disney bill on oil is evidence that we intend to tell the departments what to do and that the will of the Congress must be heeded.

OIL

I call your attention to the oil problem because in this situation is involved a principle which we find in the issues of milk, corn, and other commodities. Those who are familiar with the oil industry have asked repeatedly for an adjustment in the price of crude oil to increase the production of this substance so vital to the industrial life of the Nation. Oil men and representatives from oil States have adduced evidence to establish beyond doubt that a higher price will stimulate the drilling of new wells. Economic Stabilization Director Fred N. Vinson was requested to change the price but in a 19-page report declined to do so. Attempts to secure a price adjustment on milk and corn to date have failed. This further illustrates the determined refusal to adopt a policy to facilitate production and distribution. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 23 is printed the names of Members who signed the motion to discharge the Committee on Banking and Currency from the consideration of H. R. 2887, entitled "A bill transferring certain functions of the Price Administration, with respect to petroleum and petroleum products, to the Petroleum Administrator for War." If the Petroleum Administrator for War is by Congress placed in charge of petroleum and its products there will be an increase in the price of crude oil. The motion to discharge the Banking and Currency Committee from consideration of the Disney bill will, according to present schedule, be acted upon by the House on the 13th of December. From sentiment expressed by those who signed the motion it appears that the committee will be discharged and the legislation finally enacted.

In the consideration of oil, milk, corn, and even other commodities we find the same trouble. Price adjustment is essential. This, the administration does not care to recognize. Congress has accepted the challenge of the bureaucrats. I hope that the solution of the oil problem is only the beginning and that if it is necessary this House will drastically act on the question of milk and on the problem of securing feed for not only the Northeast but other sections of the country. We are facing a show-down. Congress is reasserting itself. It is time that the departments follow the intent of the laws passed by the National Legislature instead of proceeding to suit themselves.

MILK

According to information obtained from personal contacts, letters, and newspaper accounts, the milk situation not only in New Hampshire but all over New England is critical. Recently reports appeared on the front pages of leading newspapers in the Granite State calling attention to milk shortages in certain areas. The secretary of the New Hampshire Milk Control Board, Martyn Kenney, in a letter to me dated November 2, states:

> The dairy industry of New Hampshire is entering on the darkest days of its history, principally caused by ill-advised and unwarranted Federal regulations. Shortages of fluid supply are prevalent in many communities, even in New Hampshire, where usually there exists a surplus. Milk for manufacturing fluid cream supplies has entirely disappeared. Production has recently dropped much lower than is seasonably usual.

The present cost of milk production is not reflected in the retail price. Higher production costs have resulted from the rise in grain prices, the high wages for labor, the scarcity of farm machinery and the deterioration of both feed and labor available. A price adjustment taking into account the production cost is absolutely essential, but the Office of Price Administration declines to follow such a simple procedure. On Wednesday, November 17, Governor Blood, of New Hampshire, stated that a failure on the part of the Federal agencies to allow an increase of 2 cents a quart in the retail price of milk is costing the farmers of the State about $135,000 a month. On November 18, the Governor further stated before the New Hampshire section of the New England Council in Boston:

I think it is fairly well agreed that the ceiling price of corn in the West should be allowed to increase sufficiently to offset the increased value, if fed to hogs in that area, and that a proper adjustment be made in the producer milk price.

The New England commissioners of agriculture recently made the following recommendation to their Governors:

We feel that the average of farm prices of 1943 has been reasonably satisfactory, but there are some glaring inequalities, chief of which is milk. The price of milk should reflect the cost of production, therefore, we recommend an increased price of 93 cents per hundredweight at the farm level. Such action is imperative if reasonable consumer demands are to be met in 1944.

On November 18, the New England Governors at a meeting in Boston adopted a resolution on milk which is as follows:

It is the considered judgment of the New England Governors that in order to secure an adequate supply of milk in the future and to stop the present dangerous trend of decreasing production, the milk producers must be at once guaranteed a better return than they are now receiving in order to meet the increased cost of feed and labor.

On Tuesday, November 23, I inserted in the RECORD a letter from C. W. Swonger, research economist, New England Milk Producers' Association, on the milk shortage in the New England States. Swonger stated in this letter that—

Prices of milk have not kept pace with the rising costs of labor and feed.

On November 24, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I included a resolution on milk, adopted by New England commissioners of agriculture, representatives of milk-control boards, and principal cooperative milk producer associations of New England. This resolution contains these words:

Resolved, That an immediate increase of at least 93 cents per hundredweight in the price paid to producers for fluid milk in New England is necessary to cover the increased cost already incurred in producing milk, and to maintain the supply of fluid milk in New England.

The New Deal steadfastly refuses to make a proper adjustment in the price of milk. Despite pleas and suggestions from men with long years of practical experience in the milk business, the Federal Government holds to a course that is resulting in a growing disruption of the industry.

CORN

In the Northeast farmers are experiencing increasing difficulty in obtaining sufficient corn for poultry and dairy feeds. Although the corn crop this year is large—approximately 3,000,000,000 bushels—corn is not moving the way it ordinarily would because of an unreasonable price ceiling. The United Dairy Farmer of November 20 in a comment on feed made reference to Austin W. Carpenter, a member of the New York State Emergency Food Commission, in these words:

Some 67,000,000 bushels of corn or corn equivalent in other grain feeds are needed to maintain milk and egg production in the 13 Northeastern States according to Mr. Carpenter.

From reports which I receive every day the feed shortage is becoming more acute in New England. In an effort to secure relief for the Northeast, Members of Congress have had several conferences. I have attended meetings with Fred N. Vinson, Director of Economic Stabilization; Mr. J. B. Hutson, President of the Commodity Credit Corporation; Mr. Grover B. Hill, Mr. Mark Upsom, and Mr. C. C. Farrington, of the War Food Administration. As far as I have been able to learn there is nothing definite concerning a change in policy. Meanwhile the feed shortage in the Northeast continues to grow worse and dairy herds in many instances are being liquidated. At this point may I say that I recently noticed in the press a report that O. P. A. is contemplating a change in the ceiling price on corn. I hope that subsequent action will prove this to be true. It is indeed gratifying to perceive this glimmer of common sense.

The poultrymen and dairymen of my section report dire need for immediate relief. T. B. Charles, head of the department of poultry husbandry at the University of New Hampshire, wrote to me, as follows:

Very little corn is reaching this area and it is quite clear that with the present price on corn and hogs little corn will move into this area.

Charles asserts that the feed situation is really critical and that something must be done at once to afford assistance.

The New England Commissioners of Agriculture have made the following recommendation to their Governors:

In consideration of the best information obtainable, there would seem to be two choices in this feed situation:

1. The total grain deficit for the Northeast during the coming winter totals 66,995,000 bushels. To meet required necessities, one solution that we can see to this problem is to follow the recommended program of the reduction of livestock. We believe that should be as follows: Sharp reduction in (a) broilers; (b) hogs; (c) beef-type cattle; (d) if and when found necessary laying hens; and, lastly, dairy cows.

2. The second alternative is to maintain our reasonable livestock population in New England and to be assured of sufficient feed for this population we recommend a change in feed price ratios—i. e., either a lower support price on hogs, or an additional discount on heavy hogs, or an increase in price of corn, or a combination of these. This would establish a reasonable corn-hog price ratio, the result of which, we believe, would allow the release of corn for our New England area and have a salutary effect on the price of oats and barley.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman know that at the present time there is not enough corn available to make the common old hominy grits in the South, that we cannot find them here in Washington in the chain stores or anywhere else—common grits, breakfast food—due to the shortage of corn? I wonder why it is that we cannot get any grits or any corn meal at the present time, if corn is so plentiful?

Mr. MERROW. I thank the gentleman. Corn is not moving as it should to the East because of the present price ceiling.

The New York State Emergency Food Commission was recently appointed by Governor Dewey, of New York, to study the feed situation. The commission reported:

There is no hope for the Northeast to get the corn it needs from the Corn Belt under present policies of the War Food Administration.

Action is being awaited by the Federal Government. Either the price of corn must be increased or the Government will have to buy corn at higher than ceiling prices and sell it to dairy farmers, which would be a subsidy. The second alternative we do not want.

On Tuesday, November 23, when the commodity-credit bill was being debated on the floor of this House the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] offered an amendment which had as its purpose the relief of the dairy and poultry industries in the Northeast. I was in complete accord with his objective. I would be pleased to support my colleague in a move to force the administration to make a price adjustment on corn. This is, I believe, the proper way to bring about a movement of the much-needed grain. The corn-hog price structure is the crux of the feed situation. Until we obtain a proper price adjustment we will experience nothing but trouble. Corn cannot be secured for dairy and poultry use as long as it is more profitable to feed it to hogs.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. If conditions continue as they now prevail, when points restrict the sale of pork, to which most of the corn is being reduced, as feed, and in addition the ceiling on corn remains at a place where the farmer cannot get rid of his corn at a profitable price, does not that in its very nature tend toward the philosophy of scarcity and prevent the farmer from raising what appears to be

the most needed food product for cattle and poultry?

Mr. MERROW. It certainly does. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

A SINGLE FOOD HEAD

One of the first suggestions made by the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, of which I am a member, appeared in the Jenkins bill introduced on May 18. This bill provides for the appointment of a single food administrator. The idea was acceptable to the members of the Agricultural Committee and appears in the Fulmer bill which ought to be made a law. Such an administrator would have full responsibility and complete control over the many food agencies now in existence. There is even greater need for a single food head at the present time than when the Jenkins bill was first introduced. Action on this important matter is imperative. We should bring the Fulmer resolution to the floor by a motion to discharge, if it is not soon reported by the leadership.

The lack of coordination and integration among the Federal bureaus having control of food is appalling. There is colossal confusion, unbelievable muddling and a degree of bungling that defies description. The manner in which the New Deal has handled the food question will, in my opinion, stand out for years to come as a glaring example of inefficient administration and inability to solve some of our most pressing problems. The New Deal bureaus have succeeded in erecting a monument to inefficient and incompetent administration.

MUCH WORK TO BE DONE

Much is expected of the Seventy-eighth Congress. The proposals I have been talking about are but a few of the questions which have been discussed on this floor and are but a few of the problems in which individual Members are interested. There is endless work to be done. Ours is the struggle on the home front. The men in our armed forces are fighting along far-flung battle lines. They are working both day and night, Sundays and holidays, in an effort to save the democracy of which the American Congress is such a vital part. They are bleeding and dying that the institutions which have made this Nation great may endure to enrich the lives of multitudes who will live in this country in the future. They are working to win this global war. They are struggling without thought of rest no matter what the day or the hour may be. We, as legislators, must labor with commensurate diligence. It is our responsibility to develop the policies and make the laws necessary for the guiding of a great nation during war and in the years of peace that are to come. No matter how long the hours, how difficult the problems, how tedious the tasks, how heavy the work, it is, as I see it, our business to legislate, to dispose of the questions before us and to see to it that we give the action this Nation is clamoring for from one end of the United States to the other. Let us act boldly in meeting the challenge of these hectic days.

REGULATIONS

The administration in many instances has tried to circumvent, bypass, and ignore the intent and will of Congress. Thousands of absurd regulations have been heaped upon our people. Hundreds of decisions generated without the employment of reasonable intelligence have emanated from the bureaucrats. There are far too many Government agencies and far too many Federal employees as the Byrd committee has so conclusively shown. Regimentation of agriculture and industry is apparently the objective of theorists and impractical men in responsible Government positions.

Accumulating evidence points to the underlying desire of the Federal bureaucracy to completely control the economic life of this country. Indescribable bungling characterizes the administration of domestic affairs. It is the duty of Congress to control the bureaucracy, to cut the red tape, to eliminate the hampering regulations, to end government by directive and to preserve the opportunity for free enterprise. We have been forced to give broad powers to the bureaucrats to wage an all-out war, but I for one shall demand that with the coming of peace these powers be returned to Congress.

THE NATION EXPECTS ACTION

In recent months I have had personal contacts with hundreds of people in my State. New Hampshire is a small part of the country, but the attitude in the Granite State is, I believe, similar to the sentiment from east to west and north to south. From the speeches I have heard on this floor and from the information given to me by my colleagues, people in every State are as anxious to see action by this Congress as they are in the State of New Hampshire. They look with great confidence upon this body. We are their Representatives and their voice. We must make certain that the administration, in executing the laws which we enact, follows the intent of Congress. The time has come to cease asking the New Deal agencies. The time has come for us to tell them. The public wishes leadership. This Congress has a heavy responsibility not only to this generation but to succeeding generations. We must fearlessly decide the questions confronting us and assume the leadership which the people are so insistently demanding.

Both in foreign affairs and on the home front there is much to be accomplished. We should work for the development of a sound foreign policy, clean up the administration of domestic affairs, and formulate policies to preserve our economic structure and ensure freedom of opportunity in the future. By coming to grips immediately with the vexing problems of this era, the present Congress can well be recorded as the body which had the courage to act decisively in the battle to save democracy and the courage to restore the Government of the United States to the people.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, December 1, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m. on Wednesday and Thursday, December 1 and 2, 1943, for consideration of a post-war bill, to be held in room 1324, New House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold an open meeting in Room 304 Old House Office Building on Wednesday, December 1, 1943, at 10 a. m. for the purpose of hearing Hon. Arthur J. Altmeyer and other Social Security Board executives relative to the condition of social-security funds.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Foreign Affairs will resume public hearings on House Resolutions 350 and 352, providing for the creation by the Executive of a commission to effectuate the rescue of the Jewish people of Europe, at 10 a. m. Thursday, December 2, 1943.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

945. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the executive director, national legislative committee, the American Legion, transmitting the proceedings of the twenty-fifth annual national convention of the American Legion, held at Omaha, Nebr., September 21–23, 1943 (H. Doc. No. 364), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 861. An act to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 917). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2232. A bill to amend section 44 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 918). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 919. An act to expedite the payment for land acquired during the war period; with amendment (Rept. No. 919). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 544. A bill for the relief of Rev. C. M. McKay; with amendment (Rept. No. 913). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3173. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Lorraine Novak, a minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 914). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. S. 1282. An act for the relief of Eric W. Rodgers; without amendment (Rept. No. 915). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. S. 1290. An act for the relief of William Carroll Knox; without amendment (Rept. No. 916). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 3754. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Apple River, Jo Daviess County, Ill., with a view to control of floodwaters; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 3755. A bill to amend section 4, subchapter 1, chapter 227, of act of June 4, 1940 (41 Stat. 760), and provide for the appointment of major generals of the line and for the retirement of certain officers in the grade of major general; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3756. A bill to amend Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, and Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to make provision for payment of compensation to certain unemployed World War No. 2 veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3757. A bill to amend section 4, subchapter 1, chapter 227, of act of June 4, 1940 (41 Stat. 760), and provide for the appointment of major generals of the line and for the retirement of certain officers in the grade of major general; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WINTER:

H. R. 3758. A bill to establish additional standards and to declare the policy of the Congress with respect to the abandonment of railroad lines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 370. Resolution authorizing that House Document No. 351, being the press releases of the Department of State containing the declaration of four nations on general security, pledging themselves to united action for the prosecution of the present war against their enemies, which was signed at the conference held at Moscow, Russia, together with other papers relating thereto, be reprinted with corrections conforming to the official texts now on file in the Department of State; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GIBSON:

H. R. 3759. A bill for the relief of Colquitt Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3760. A bill authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Lt. Gen. Thomas Holcomb, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerks' desk and referred as follows:

3801. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of M. C. Steffen and 76 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3802. Also, petition of James L. Turner and 24 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3803. Also, petition of Frank Wilhelm and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3804. Also, petition of Mr. O'Leary and 39 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3805. Also, petition of C. Carroll and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3806. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition of the employees of the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad in Sioux City, Iowa, urging support of House Resolution 187; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3807. By Mr. NORMAN: Ninety-two petitions signed by 1,848 citizens of the city of Olympia, Wash., and additional petitions to the number of 200 signed by 1,906 citizens residing at Shelton, Elma, Aberdeen, Hoquiam, Raymond, South Bend, Tenino, Chehalis, Centralia, Kelso, Longview, Vancouver, Camas, Pacific Beach, Moclips, Westport, Ocean City, Rochester, Montesano, Morton, Randle, Packwood, Winlock, La Center, Yacolt, and Washougal, Wash., protesting against consideration or enactment of House bill 2082 and Senate bill 860, or any other legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition by direct or indirect means, for the duration of the war or for any other period, and requesting their Senators and Representatives to vote against all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3808. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition signed by Mrs. Henry Olsen of Riceville, Iowa, and many other citizens of northeastern Iowa, urging the passage of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3809. By Mr. KING: Petition signed by 41 members of the Church of the Nazarene, Redondo Beach, Calif., Rev. Milton E. Poole, pastor, urging the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3810. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Luella Stauff and 316 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3811. Also, petition of Mrs. Charles F. Higinbothan and 78 other citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3812. Also, petition of Mrs. Stanley E. Dayton and 158 citizens of Washington, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3813. Also, petition of Rosalie Jones and 24 other citizens of Swayzee, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3814. Also, petition of Mrs. F. E. Kapp and 121 other citizens of Tidioute, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3815. Also, petition of Mrs. Fred J. Quinn and 540 other citizens of Marion, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3816. Also, petition of Harry O'Bush and 69 other citizens of Uhrichsville, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3817. Also, petition of Bertha B. Temple and 10 citizens of Harrisville, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3818. Also, petition of Mrs. A. N. York and 93 other citizens of Marion, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3819. Also, petition of Mrs. Theodore Barks and 40 other citizens of Iron River, Mich.,

urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3820. Also, petition of Nannie Eklof and 15 other citizens of Flemington, Mo., uring enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3821. Also, petition of Robert Shannon and 27 other citizens of Wellsville, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3822. Also, petition of J. D. Edgar and 30 other citizens of Chicago, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3823. Also, petition of Rev. R. A. Germany and 118 other citizens of Gordon, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3824. Also, petition of Miss E. Pearl Hendershatt and 21 other citizens of Detroit, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3825. Also, petition of S. Deborah Hames and 42 other citizens of Norman, Okla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3826. Also, petition of Mrs. J. W. Purves and 12 other citizens of Friendship, Wis., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3827. Also, petition of Fred Gapp and 34 other citizens of Wilmot, S. Dak., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3828. Also, petition of Walter Ford and 93 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3829. Also, petition of Rev. L. F. Ulmer and 40 other citizens of Converse, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1943

(Legislative day of Thursday, November 18, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, by Thy mercy, through sleep and darkness safely brought, in our keeping has been placed the priceless gift of another day; upon its untrodden field lies the bright dew of Thy grace, sparkling in wonder and in beauty. May the greatness of our spirits match the challenge of the morning. May golden hours be filled with quest and conquest. Create in us the splendor that dawns when hearts are kind.

Deliver us this day from marring our record as public servants, with cynicism which sears the very image of God, with disguises which mask the face of sincerity, and with irreverence which stalks with rude tread on holy ground. In these creative days when destiny is being molded and the glare of burning systems and the glory of the dawning world both light the sky, give us prophetic eyes which see the coming of the glory, and ears which hear the voice of that One who from a white throne of love is declaring above the din of battle, Behold, I am making all things new. We ask it in the Name above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, November 30, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 247. An act for the relief of Richard P. Beale and Eva M. Beale;

H. R. 1973. An act for the relief of Albert Ferguson and Ozelle Ferguson;

H. R. 2190. An act for the relief of Margueite R. McElroy; and

H. R. 2299. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of W. M. Hurley and Joe Whitson.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 937) for the relief of Mittie Pearl Nanny.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3621. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the regulation of motor-vehicle traffic in the District of Columbia, increase the number of judges of the police court, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3691. An act to permit the construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for steam-heating purposes in the District of Columbia.

ARMED SERVICES HONOR DAY—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 135)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying joint resolution, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, Senate Joint Resolution 59, authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim Armed Services Honor Day for the recognition and appreciation of the patriotic devotion to duty of all members of all branches of the armed military and naval forces of the United States of America.

The measure designates December 7, 1943, as Armed Services Honor Day and authorizes and requests the President to issue a proclamation commending the observance of that day in honor of all men and women who have served or are now serving in any and all branches of the military and naval armed services of the United States. The measure further requests the Governors of every State to invoke the peoples' cooperation and urges local governmental units to make plans and hold appropriate ceremonies for proper observation of the occasion in every community.

I consider the commemoration of the day fixed in the measure to be singularly inappropriate. December 7, 2 years ago, is a day that is remembered in this country as one of infamy on the part of a treacherous enemy. The day itself requires no reminder, and its anniversary should rather serve to cause all the people of the Nation to increase their efforts contributing to the successful prosecution of the war.

Furthermore, it seems to me premature to establish at this time a day to be set aside to honor and commemorate all who have served in the armed forces of the United States during the course of

the present war. I think that a more suitable date can be selected for this purpose, and that future events will ordain the proper date for such a commemoration.

For the foregoing reasons, I am constrained to withhold approval of this resolution. This joint resolution was presented to me on November 25, 1943.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 25, 1943.*

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Joseph Conte, of New York City, praying for the approval of the food subsidy program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the commanding officer of the Nine Hundred and Ninety-first Field Artillery Battalion, Tennessee Maneuver Area (in bivouac), expressing on behalf of the officers and men of that command their thanks to Congress for making an appropriation which enabled the serving of "A delightful Thanksgiving Day dinner"; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A petition of sundry citizens, employees of the Alexander Milburn Co., of Baltimore, Md., praying that the Senate approve the Moscow agreements; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SIMPLE TAX LEGISLATION: PERMANENT AND CONSISTENT TAXATION POLICY—PETITION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution in the nature of a petition adopted by the board of governors of the Maine Society of Public Accountants praying that Congress establish a qualified nonpartisan commission composed of Members of Congress and others to be charged with the task of writing a simple revenue law which will express a permanent and consistent policy of Federal taxation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution presented by the Senator from Maine will be received and referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. HOLMAN, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 1323. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret M. Ross; with an amendment (Rept. No. 549).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 1232. A bill to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior; with an amendment (Rept. No. 550).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 1000. A bill to reserve certain public-domain lands in the State of Arizona for addition to the Havasupai Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 551);

S. 1488. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to Jose C. Romero all right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain described tract of land within the Carson National Forest, N. Mex.; with amendments (Rept. No. 552);

H. R. 1388. A bill to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the construction of a scenic parkway to provide an appropriate view of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park from the Tennessee side of the park, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 553); and

H. R. 3428. A bill to amend sections 6, 7, and 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741, 743; 48 U. S. C., secs. 440, 441, 442); without amendment (Rept. No. 554).

By Mr. ANDREWS, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

H. R. 2641. A bill to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain lands for addition to the Sequoia National Park; without amendment (Rept. No. 555)

STUDY OF MOBILIZATION OF THE NATION'S RESOURCES — LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 216), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures of the subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee authorized and directed to study the mobilization of the Nation's resources, including the technological resources, pursuant to Senate Resolution 303 of the Seventy-seventh Congress and Senate Resolution 107 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, is increased by $10,000.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 1558. A bill to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to certain officers and employees of the Smithsonian Institution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. GUFFEY:

S. 1559. A bill authorizing the appointment of an additional judge for the Third Judicial Circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. GUFFEY also introduced Senate bill 1560, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BILBO:

S. 1561. A bill for the relief of Bertha Stephenson Hale; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1562. A bill to regulate the practice of professional engineering and creating a Board for Licensure of Professional Engineers in and for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS IN AID OF THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to encourage voluntary contributions to the Treasury of the United States to aid in prosecuting the war. The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to supplement the revenues and to provide additional funds to be used for the prosecution of the war, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to encourage voluntary contributions to the Treasury of the United States by means of special certificates to be issued as hereinafter provided, beginning not later than January 1, 1944.

SEC. 2. Such certificates shall be in the denomination of $2, which shall be indicated on the face of the certificates. Each such certificate shall consist of a stub and a detachable coupon, each of which shall have the same serial number and a place for the name and address of the donor. Such certificates shall be of such size as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe, and shall be bound in books of 10 certificates each.

SEC. 3. Such certificates shall be made available for distribution to the public through charitable, fraternal, philanthropic, church or other religious, and choral organizations and societies, and through such public agencies as the Secretary of the Treasury may designate. The stubs of any certificates which are issued may be returned to the Treasury Department at any time, together with an amount equivalent to the face value of the certificates represented by such stubs: *Provided,* That in the case of distributions made by organizations or societies other than public agencies the distributing agency may retain 2 percent of the face amount of all certificates distributed. All amounts so returned shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury to be known as the Voluntary Fund, and shall be used in prosecuting the war in such manner as the Congress shall by law provide.

SEC. 4. (a) Such certificates shall be distributed in series, a new series to begin on the first of each second month, beginning with January 1, 1944. The distribution of certificates shall take place during the 50 days next succeeding the date the certificates of each series are made available for distribution to the public, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall designate a date during the 10 days following the expiration of such 50-day period on which a public drawing shall be held of the stubs of certificates of the then current series which have been returned to the Treasury Department.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury shall provide for the payment of rewards to the persons whose names and addresses appear on the stubs which are drawn and recorded pursuant to subsection (e), as follows, depending upon the order in which such stubs are drawn, for each million dollars of certificates distributed:

First, 1 reward of $50,000, payable in bonds as hereinafter provided.

Second, 2 rewards of $25,000 each, payable in bonds as hereinafter provided.

Third, 5 rewards of $10,000 each, payable in bonds as hereinafter provided.

Fourth, 10 rewards of $5,000 each, payable in bonds as hereinafter provided.

Fifth, 100 rewards of $1,000 each, payable in bonds as hereinafter provided.

Sixth, 200 rewards of $500 each, payable in bonds as hereinafter provided.

Seventh, 1,000 rewards of $100 each, payable in bonds as hereinafter provided.

Odd amounts over even millions received from the distribution of certificates in any series shall be carried over into the succeeding drawing or drawings for the purpose of payment of rewards as above provided, so that drawings in any series shall be based upon even millions of dollars.

(c) All such payments shall be made in bonds of the United States, of distinctive character, which shall be issued under the authority and subject to the provisions of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, except that (1) such bonds shall mature 20 years after the date of issuance, and (2) interest on such bonds shall accrue at the rate of 2 percent per annum from the date of issu-

ance to the date of maturity. Such payments shall be made only upon the presentation of the coupons corresponding to the stubs drawn.

(d) Inasmuch as amounts payable under this act are in effect tax-paid by virtue of benefit to the Federal Treasury from contributions, no amount payable under this act, no bond issued under this act, and no proceeds of any such bond shall be regarded as income for the purposes of taxation by the United States, any State, or any of the possessions of the United States or by any local taxing authority, except that interest upon such bonds shall be subject to taxation as in the case of War savings bonds of series E issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended.

(e) At each such public drawing the serial numbers of the first 1,318 stubs drawn for each $1,000,000 shall be recorded, the drawing shall then cease, and the stubs not drawn shall be destroyed. Each person whose name and address appear on any stub so drawn and recorded shall then be notified of the amount of the reward to which he is entitled under subsection (b).

SEC. 5. Whoever falsely makes, forges, counterfeits, or alters, or causes or procures to be made, forged, counterfeited, or altered, or willfully aids or assists in falsely making, forging, counterfeiting, or altering a certificate issued under authority of this act, or whoever passes, utters, publishes, or distributes, or attempts to pass, utter, publish, or distribute, any such false, forged, counterfeited or altered certificate, with intent to defraud the United States or any person, or whoever has in possession any such falsely made, forged, counterfeited, or altered certificate, with intent to unlawfully use the same, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 and imprisoned not more than 15 years. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to direct and use the Secret Service Division of the Treasury Department to detect, arrest, and deliver into the custody of the United States marshal having jurisdiction any person or persons violating any of the provisions of this section.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Treasury shall report to the Congress in January of each year the amounts which have been deposited in the voluntary fund during the preceding calendar year.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of the moneys in the voluntary fund, such sums as may be necessary to administer the provisions of this act.

SEC. 9. No certificates shall be distributed under authority of this act after the expiration of 6 months following the cessation of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President.

Mr. President, if the bill is passed, I think it will raise the sum of $5,000,000,000 and will make unnecessary the consideration of a sales tax or of the Government profiting further from the race tracks. The bill is not a revenue-producing measure and does not have to be originated by the House. I ask that it be referred to the Finance Committee and be printed, and that copies of it be placed on the desks of Senators tomorrow morning and also that copies be sent to each member of the Senate Finance Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and printed, and copies will be distributed as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The bill (S. 1560) to encourage voluntary contributions to the Treasury of the United States to aid in prosecuting the war, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 3621. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the regulation of motor-vehicle traffic in the District of Columbia, increase the number of judges of the police court, and for other purposes"; and

H. R. 3691. An act to permit the construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for steam-heating purposes in the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENTS TO THE REVENUE BILL

Mr. HATCH submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3687) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES—AMENDMENT

Mr. ANDREWS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REHABILITATION OF DEMOBILIZED VETERANS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday I spoke on the floor of the Senate in relation to a problem which is giving concern, I believe, to every thoughtful American. That is the problem of how best to take care of the soldier lad who is discharged from the Army. My remarks went forth to Mr. Omar B. Ketchum, national legislative representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; and he has written a letter which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent to have a copy of my letter which is in reply to his letter of November 30, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Kansas City, Mo., November 30, 1943.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have read with interest your letter of November 29, together with the statement which you were to deliver in the Senate on the same date.

This office and the membership of the Veterans of Foreign Wars are in accord with your belief that gainful and satisfactory employment should be the No. 1 objective in planning for the demobilization of our armed forces at the close of the war. We have given considerable thought to this problem, the same as many other groups in the Nation, and while we have and are advocating specific measures which we feel will be helpful, nevertheless no one can safely predict what the employment situation will be when the Nation converts from wartime to peacetime production.

I am not yet prepared to go along with you on your idea of a chain of State-wide camps in which returning soldiers may be employed and housed after the war. This may be necessary, as a last resort, but to the veterans' organizations such a plan smacks of the old Civilian Conservation Corps as a relief measure, rather than as a permanent employment organization.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars have adopted a 10-point post-war veterans welfare program which we believe, if adopted, will go a long way toward making the readjustment from military to civilian economy. A copy of that 10-point program is attached herewith. It occurs to us that first the returning veterans should be given a continuation of pay for a reasonable period, and, second, Federal educational aid in all cases where education has been prevented or interrupted by reason of military or naval service; and, third, effective workable veteran preference on all city, county, State, and Federal jobs. This, of course, is in addition to our demands that the disabled shall be rehabilitated and compensated adequately for their disabilities, and if they are or become unemployable they shall be adequately pensioned for the remainder of their lives.

Your plan to have the Veterans' Administration interview personnel of the armed forces before discharge and to assist them in finding employment would, I am sure, meet with the approval of our organization. On the other hand, the administration will contend that the same thing has been planned and is being done by the Reemployment Division of Selective Service in cooperation with the Veterans' Employment Service and the United States Employment Service. For some reason, unknown to us, the administration insists on setting up various agencies to deal with veteran problems when there is already in existence an independent agency known as the Veterans' Administration, which should be the only agency to handle all problems affecting veterans, including employment, as well as compensation, pensions, and hospitalization.

The major veteran organizations have been battling for the past several years to prevent the Federal Security Agency from taking over veteran problems which should be referred to the Veterans' Administration. There seems to be a tendency to destroy the identity of veterans as a special class and to include them with all other groups in the Nation under the jurisdiction of the Federal Security Agency. We will continue to oppose all such efforts because we firmly believe that veterans of the armed forces are a special class of American citizens and should be solely under the jurisdiction of an agency which devotes its entire time and resources to the problems of veterans and their dependents.

Thanking you for giving me an opportunity for a preview of your proposed program and assuring you that we deeply appreciate your sympathetic interest and concern as a Member of the United States Senate, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
National Legislative Representative.

TEN-POINT POST-WAR VETERANS WELFARE PROGRAM ADOPTED BY THE FORTY-FOURTH NATIONAL ENCAMPMENT, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, NEW YORK CITY, N. Y., SEPTEMBER 28, 29, 30, 1943

1. Continuation of pay, within certain limits, for a period of 6 months after honorable discharge at the close of the present war for

all persons serving in the armed forces of the United States.

2. Educational aid by Federal Government to honorably discharged veterans of the present war whose educations were interrupted or prevented by military or naval service.

3. Adequate Veterans' Administration hospital facilities for medical treatment and hospitalization of honorably discharged veterans of any recognized war, campaign, or expedition, who have had at least 90 days' service.

4. Pension and compensation payments to be established and maintained on a fair and reasonable cost-of-living index.

5. Effective, workable veteran preference in employment on Federal, State, county, and municipal jobs.

6. All supply and construction contracts between the Federal Government and private firms or contractors to contain clause that 3 employees of every 10 or major portion thereof of said private firms or contractors, shall be honorably discharged veterans.

7. Pension entitlement to widows and orphans of honorably discharged deceased veterans of any recognized war, campaign, or expedition, where said veteran had at least 90 days' service, regardless of service-connected disabilities.

8. Pension entitlement to honorably discharged veterans of any war, campaign, or expedition, who had at least 90 days' service and who are: (1) Unemployable; (2) unable to secure gainful and sustaining employment; and (3) disabled to a degree of 10 percent or more regardless of service connection of said disability.

9. Special recognition for honorably discharged veterans of any recognized war, campaign, or expedition who served on foreign soil or had sea duty in hostile waters, by a special allowance of 20 percent above standard rates for compensation, pension, and retirement pay, and a five-point addition above standard additions in veteran preference on classified civil-service-examination grades.

10. Continuation and expansion of the Veterans' Administration as an independent Federal agency with full jurisdiction over vocational rehabilitation for service-connected disabled veterans; medical treatment, hospitalization, pensions, and compensation for all eligible veterans; and continuation and expansion of the Veterans' Employment Service to render special assistance to all honorably discharged veterans in need of or seeking employment.

MR. OMAR B. KETCHUM,
National Legislative Representative,
Veterans of Foreign Wars,
Kansas City, Mo.

DEAR MR. KETCHUM: I am indeed grateful for your letter of November 30, 1943. The various points enumerated therein will be of great value in preparing presentation of the plan for veterans' rehabilitation. I should like to discuss them chronologically.

(1) I am heartily in agreement with your statement that no one can safely predict what the employment situation will be when the Nation converts from wartime to peacetime production. It is with that thought in mind that I am proposing the establishment of a bureau under centralized authority to determine exactly what the requirements of industry and the requirements of the returning war veterans might be.

(2) The 10-point post-war veterans welfare program of the Veterans of Foreign Wars follows almost in detail the plan which I am now introducing. It is because many of the activities outlined are already under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration that I have advocated placing a bureau for the employment of veterans under the control of that same organization. I believe it of particular importance that the affairs of veterans be coordinated under one parent jurisdiction.

(3) I am delighted that you approve of the thought of interviewing personnel of the armed forces before they are discharged. Undoubtedly, as you say, the administration will contend that the same thing has been planned and is being done by the reemployment division of Selective Service and the United States Employment Service. I might add that it is being done by a number of other organizations. Thus far, each has divided authority and responsibility. As I pointed out before the Senate on November 29: "Within the bureaus established for the care of our servicemen there are many who might do something on this problem, but their plans and their operations are diversified. There is no cooperation. There are many who could do something—but there is not one to do it. There is no one to get jobs for our veterans."

It is this very confusion that I believe my proposal will obviate, and to my mind there are numerous reasons why the Selective Service Board should not be continued in existence at the end of the war, particularly as a rehabilitating group, their organization having been set up originally for entirely different purposes.

We are thoroughly in accord—your organization and myself—in the necessity and importance of unifying all activities on veterans' behalf under a single centralized department.

Yours for victory,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

Thanks again for your letter. I look forward to further cooperation from your organization in forwarding the purposes of this legislation.

ISOLATIONISM IN THE SENATE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on October 28, 1943, on the subject Isolationism in the United States Senate, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER AT AMERICAN-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP MEETING, NEW YORK

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the American-Soviet friendship meeting at Madison Square Garden, New York City, on November 8, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER AT AMERICAN-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP MEETING, BALTIMORE, MD.

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an address delivered by him at the American-Soviet friendship meeting at Baltimore, Md., on November 18, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BREWSTER ON THE PETROLEUM POLICY

[Mr. WHITE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Petroleum Policy of the United States" delivered by Senator BREWSTER at the dedication of the "Baltimore Giant" 100-octane plant of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey at Baltimore, Md., December 1, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ELECTIONS IN WARTIME—ADDRESS BY HON. FRANK C. WALKER

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Elections in Wartime" delivered by Hon. Frank C. Walker, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, on November 30, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY UNDER SECRETARY OF WAR PATTERSON AT WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON COLLEGE

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson at Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa., November 20, 1943, together with a citation by Governor Martin, of Pennsylvania, which appear in the Appendix.]

LETTER ADDRESSED BY THE PRESIDENT OF DARTMOUTH COLLEGE TO DARTMOUTH'S SONS AT WAR

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed by President Ernest M. Hopkins, of Dartmouth College, to Dartmouth's sons at war, which appears in the Appendix.]

WARNING OF FUTURE—ARTICLE BY RAYMOND CLAPPER

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Warning of Future," by Raymond Clapper, published in the Washington Daily News of Friday, October 15, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE YUGOSLAVIAN SITUATION—ARTICLE BY WESTBROOK PEGLER

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Westbrook Pegler on the Yugoslavian situation, appearing in his column entitled "Fair Enough," which appears in the Appendix.]

RISE IN LIVING COST IN OREGON—ARTICLE FROM SALEM (OREG.) JOURNAL

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "State Finds Living Cost Taking Sharp Upswing," published in the Salem (Oreg.) Journal of November 20, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

A CALL FOR LEADERSHIP—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Call for Leadership," published in the New York Herald Tribune of December 1, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

A MILLION A DAY RUNS THE VOTERS AWAY

[Mr. O'DANIEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD letters written by him to Hon. Fred M. Vinson, Director of Economic Stabilization, and Hon. Leon Henderson, on the subject of the price of Texas crude oil, which appear in the Appendix.]

ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY IN COSTA RICA—ARTICLE BY W. EUGENE SHIELS

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Economic Democracy in Costa Rica," written by W. Eugene Shiels, and published in the Catholic weekly America of November 20, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CONSTITUTION AND THE FUTURE

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, nowadays we hear much regarding what is constitutional and what is not. We hear a great deal about States' rights and allied subjects. Only recently I read an address by Smith L. Multer, president

general of the National Society of Sons of the American Revolution, which was delivered recently at Williamsburg, Va. The subject of his address was The Constitution and the Future. I ask unanimous consent to have the address published at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I do not know of any spot upon the soil of this fair land where it is more fitting to meet upon this Constitution Day. Here centered to a marked degree the great traditions and historic events that led up to and made possible the formation of the American Union. Just out of sight was the first permanent English settlement in this country at Jamestown; and there representative government in America was born. And through the years the ships bore to the tidewater men who had suffered oppression, within whose souls burned the fires of human freedom.

And so the spirit of human liberty was cradled along your watercourses and in your mountain valleys. This spirit gathered strength here in this historic city, the capital of the Colony for 80 years up to the open break with the mother country. Here in the House of Burgesses assembled your leading men opposing the tyrannical acts of the royal governors and the crown, and building up a public sentiment that would brook no further encroachment upon their rights. And not far away upon that great day in October 1781, the patriot cause was crowned with triumph at Yorktown.

We meet, indeed, upon historic and hallowed ground.

After independence was achieved, the weaknesses of the old confederation became so apparent that it was evident that a new and stronger government must be formed; or the Continental soldier would have fought and died in vain. Wise and far-seeing men assembled for that purpose upon May 15, 1787, in Philadelphia in Old Independence Hall.

It was a great delegation that came from the Old Dominion. At their head was Washington, the father of his country, the commander of the armies of freedom in the struggle for independence, the President of the Constitutional Convention, the man who thrust aside the proffered crown, first President of the United States, and retiring from his public duties, left as a priceless legacy his Farewell Address to his countrymen. With him were George Mason who wrote in the Constitution of Virginia the greatest exposition of the rights of man penned up to that time; John Blair, able lawyer, and afterward an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court; James Madison, twice President of the United States, whose keen, analytical mind and profound knowledge of the science of government caused him to be called "The Father of the Constitution"; Edmund Randolph, a great lawyer, "The Rose and Expectancy" of the Randolphs of Virginia, later on Attorney General and Secretary of State in Washington's Cabinet; George Wythe, profound jurist, chancelor of Virginia, and founder of the first law school in America at the old college of William and Mary.

There were other great men in that Convention from the narrow fringe along the Atlantic coast: Langdon, of New Hampshire; King, of Massachusetts; Ellsworth and Sherman, of Connecticut; Hamilton, of New York; Franklin, Wilson, and the Morrises, of Pennsylvania; Rutledge and the Pinckneys, of South Carolina; and many others—all of them the flower of mankind.

These framers of our Constitution were, no doubt, the most remarkable and able men ever assembled together for a like purpose in the history of the world. With all our boasted progress, their equals could not be found in this broad land today; indeed, not among the nations of the earth. And when their names are mentioned, in the face of so much greatness, integrity, and honor, the cunning and crafty, those who chafe under constitutional restraint, those who sneer at what we have accomplished, and who would gather all power unto themselves, are forced to admit that these men sleeping in their honored graves dealt fairly well with the problems of their day; but they speak of the problems of our day, as they will in the days to come, and the contention is made and will be made that it is folly to be governed by the opinions of men who lived under entirely different conditions; that life was simple then and now it is complex; that we are living in a new world of great inventions and amid affairs of great magnitude. And yet had they been familiar with or could they with prophetic gaze have beheld all the inventions, all the modern forms and methods of business, they would have kept on their steadfast way and the great charter would have been the same.

The great and vital fact is overlooked in the discussion of these things that they were not making laws nor formulating policies. They were laying down certain great principles of government, by which all laws and policies are to be tested. All the problems that arise from changes due to new methods and new discoveries are subject and will be subject to statutory laws and rules for their proper guidance and regulation. And so these laws change and must change; while the principles of government, like the Ten Commandments, are immutable and unchangeable.

The one controlling and continuing feature in government is human nature itself, with its weakness and its strength, its thoughts and its dreams, its insatiable thirst for power, the same then, now, and forever. All the centuries before them had been a stage whereon these base and noble qualities of mankind had played their part, and that was the source from which the fathers drew their wisdom.

What kind of a government were they attempting to create? The answer is found in the Constitution and in the Declaration of Independence, well called the Soul of the Constitution. You all recall the stately words of the immortal Declaration: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.—That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Thus there was announced the bold and unqualified assertion of unalienable rights; rights inherent in the dignity of human life itself; rights that existed before governments were formed; rights for the protection of which governments are instituted; rights which governments cannot take away.

And so with independence achieved, the task of the convention at Philadelphia was to formulate a constitution for a Union of the States, within whose framework certain great unalienable rights and principles of individual freedom would remain safe and inviolate, protected from assault by any department of government or by any man.

Their own experience and all the history of the world told them that the only government wherein men could permanently retain their freedom was a government of laws and not of men. Knowing that the ambitions of designing men could only be curbed in a government of checks and balances, they divided it into three great coordinate departments, each independent of the other—the legislative, to make the laws; the executive, to enforce the laws; and the judicial, to interpret the laws.

The grants of power and limitations imposed were national in scope and were such as were deemed necessary for the proper functioning of a national government. They were carefully drafted and set forth in the Constitution and the first 10 amendments known as the Bill of Rights, ratified soon after, and which may be considered part of the original document. And then it was provided in article X of the Bill of Rights "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States or to the people."

And so while certain specific delegated powers were given to the Federal Government, the great residuum of power was reserved to the States and to the people. They were very careful that the people retain control over their own local affairs in their own States. They recognized then, what, with the vast expanse of the national domain, is even more true today that the ordinary affairs of life, the laws necessary to regulate and prescribe for the conduct of the daily life of the citizen, would best be determined in each individual State; that these States presented wide differences of climate, of soil, resources, and occupation; that their own affairs are not alike and cannot be made so by compulsion of law; that the people behind their own State boundaries are better able to know and are better informed as to their own local needs and affairs than a bureaucracy far away in the National Capital; that no man or set of men are yet born endowed with sufficient wisdom to run the individual affairs of 135,000,000 people.

With the States now being shorn of their powers centered in the Federal Government, we see the wisdom of the fathers in attempting to guard against the confusion, turmoil, and ineptitude that now obtain with the bureaucrats, termites, and snooping commissions boring into the constitutional structure, piling up regulations without end, issued without notice and endeavoring to invest their edicts with the force of law, without appeal to the courts, all to the confusion, dismay, and disturbance of the people.

So well did those men at Philadelphia do their work that during the 154 years of the matchless growth of this Republic, unparalleled in the history of the world, under an ever-advancing and changing civilization, all the emergencies and problems both in peace and in war at home and abroad, have been successfully met; and there is no problem that can arise down through the future years but can be solved within the framework of the Constitution of the United States.

Under our form of government, the liberties and rights of men have been preserved. Neither the mob in its surging passions nor any majority, however ruthless or large, are permitted to trample upon the rights of the humblest citizen beneath the flag. Free speech, a free press, free assembly, freedom of religious belief and protection to life and liberty and to the fruits of our toil, these are our common heritage.

Our form of government has not failed in its social service, with comforts and standards of living higher than in any other land and where despite all our troubles, and they have been many, human happiness, security, and well-being have existed as nowhere else since time began.

All this did not happen just because here was a great continent to be subdued. There are other portions of the earth as fair as ours with resources in mine and forest as great, with soil as rich, able to provide for the wants

and needs of men; and yet they have lagged far behind; because the liberties of men were throttled and their energies enthralled. And so it follows that what has been done here has been done by freemen and free enterprise, protected in their rights under the supreme law of the land. And so we have remained steadfast to the American way of life, the American system which, whatever its faults may be, has worked as has no other system in the history of the world.

For the protection of this Constitution and all that it safeguards we are engaged in this devastating world-wide war. But we can survive all the devastations if our form of government be preserved. We know that if our cities go down in ruins and in ashes, they will spring up again. We know that the deep and ugly scars and furrows of war plowed through the landscape will soon be covered by nature's kindly hands. We know that the ranks of the living thinned by the dead will be filled in a generation or two. But if our form of government goes down, then in the words of the immortal Lincoln, there "will be lost the last best hope of earth."

And so our boys are in the camps, on the far-flung battle fronts and upon the distant reaches of the seas, believing this is a land worth fighting for and worth dying for. In all this our society has contributed its full part, in all of which we have a right to feel proud. However, it would be one of the tragedies of the ages to win liberty abroad and lose it here at home. During the war, it is necessary to give up some of our constitutional rights. Indeed, the Constitution may be strained. Our sovereign States may yield to Federal control necessary to the winning of the war. But when the smoke of battle clears away, we must see that our constitutional rights are restored, and that our American system is not replaced by some form of state socialism.

And so it is well that on this day, Constitution Day, even amid the clash of arms, we should speak for a moment of our Constitution and to it pledge anew our allegiance and our faith.

And in this connection we recall with pride that it was the Society of the Sons of the American Revolution that instituted Constitution Day.

In the words of Churchill, we begin to "see the mellow light of victory." There is a widespread discussion as to the terms of peace and upon what basis, peace can be maintained. As members of this society we are deeply interested and it is our duty to our country to give these problems our most earnest thought. Here we enter into the field of controversy and debate. There are many and divergent views, nearly all of which are urged with enthusiasm and certitude. Some think now is the time, while the war is raging and passions are running high, for the United Nations to get together and agree upon the terms of peace. This seems to me a dangerous procedure. It is not as simple as all that. Broad outlines can with safety and with some intelligence be discussed. But at the peace table there are bound to be conflicting views over many things that will be urged with heat and with fervor, and which would lead to disunity in a time of war, but which can be ironed out in a spirit of give-and-take in the councils of peace.

Even the outlines of the Atlantic Charter, which is really only a statement of broad principles, afford an opportunity for controversy in their application in a case of disputed facts. The question as to the exact boundaries of western Russia might be enough to disrupt the unity of the United Nations to such an extent as to lose this war. And yet after the war is over, some arrangements can be arrived at, perhaps not to the satisfaction of all, but yet in a way that will not disturb the future peace of the world.

One way to lose this war would be to arouse the people in acrimonious disputes, and there is a war yet to be won. No doubt Hitler has lost this war if we all remain united. Nevertheless, he retains tremendous military power with millions of seasoned and trained troops, most of whom are imbued with a fanatical devotion to his cause. The President of the United States is aware of all this, and in his latest talk to the Nation on July 28, he said: "This is not the time to engage in an international discussion of all the terms of peace. We must not take time out to define every boundary and settle every political controversy."

There are plans being proposed for the post-war world that would wipe out our national existence and destroy our liberties. They are dangerous in that they have an emotional appeal, for their ostensible object is a durable peace. These are schemes for a world superstate, supreme over the Republic of the United States and other nations. Typical of these is the Humber resolution and the declaration of the federation of the world, which, according to the terms of the resolution, is made a part of the resolution itself.

This resolution and declaration call for a world government "capable of discharging all the functions of sovereignty in the executive, legislative, and judicial spheres." It provides for a world government, with each nation joining "suppressing its military, naval, and air forces, retaining only a constabulary sufficient to police its territory." It provides that a territory be selected for a seat of government for the federation of the world over which the federation of the world would have complete sovereignty. The sponsors of this Humber resolution and declaration are endeavoring to influence the Congress of the United States by having the legislatures of the different States approve the same, and then a copy of such approval is to be sent to every Representative and Senator of the approving State in the Congress of the United States.

What voice would the United States have in this federation of the world? This is not openly and definitely stated, but the unmistakable conclusion is that it would be determined on the basis of population. It is laid down as a basic truth in the declaration "that all human beings are citizens of this world community, which requires law and not treaties for its government." It is also stated that "if democracy wins, the nations of the earth will be united in a commonwealth of free peoples and individuals, wherever found, will be the sovereign units of the new world order." If all human beings are citizens of this world community and individuals, wherever found, will be the sovereign units of this new world order, then certainly it follows that no person can be ignored because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. It follows that the representatives in the world government would be chosen on the basis of population, the same as Mr. Streit proposes in his plan for union now.

Based on population, Africa would have the same representation as the United States. India, with 350,000,000, would have over double the number of our representatives in this federated state; China, with 450,000,000, three times our number; Asia would have nearly eight times our representation. Simple arithmetic shows that Asia and Africa would overwhelmingly control this world state. No formula or representation can be devised which can avoid the conclusion that the United States and the rest of the world would be governed by backward and oriental peoples.

Being in a hopeless minority in the supergovernment, all our political and economic freedoms will pass from our control. The majorities of other nations would soon cast covetous eyes on our resources.

Here at home we have built up the greatest market in the world by free trade between the States, safeguarding the same by tariffs which, in theory at least, cover the difference in the cost of production here and abroad. Regardless of the arguments for or against, the fact remains that our domestic economy has been built up around this system, which can be disturbed only with great care and caution. While we are desirous of lowering these barriers, as inventive genius and managerial skill cheapen the cost of our products, and as the standard of living of other peoples rise, the fact remains that the opening of our markets to the cheap labor of the world, as no doubt would soon be decreed by this supergovernment, would result in disaster and ruin to all classes of our citizens.

We now have the power to "coin money and regulate the value thereof." Let this power be transferred to the federation of the world with 75 percent of the gold now in our possession, we would soon find out who is to furnish the gold and who is to furnish the credit under the international monetary system that would be devised.

All immigration laws would be repealed so that the citizens of the world could move about and locate where they please the same as citizens of the United States can change their residence from State to State. It requires no imagination to foresee that millions would come here to enjoy "the more abundant life" rather than to stay home to build up and struggle amid the ruins and desolations of war. Indeed, people from all over the earth would hasten here to the land, where, they are told, the streets are paved with gold. As a consequence our standards of living, whether in the factory, on the farm, or in commercial pursuits, would soon go down to the level of the Hottentot. And so we might go on.

In the face of all this, the observation naturally will be made, we will not submit to this; we will at once withdraw from an organization capable of such monstrous injustice. But it is provided otherwise. When we become part of this superstate there is no retreat. We are so firmly prevented from seceding as is one of the States from the Federal Union, for we have surrendered our independence and our sovereignty.

This is clearly stated in the declaration of the federation of the world. Speaking of the task of this supergovernment, the declaration says: "Only a government capable of discharging all the functions of sovereignty in the executive, legislative, and judicial spheres can accomplish such a task." Speaking of federation, it says: "It apprehends the entire human race as one family, human beings everywhere as brothers, and all nations as component parts of one indivisible community." Therefore, any attempt on our part to withdraw would bring upon our heads the military power of the supergovernment.

It has already been noted that we are to be disarmed only with a constabulary to maintain order. The "have-nots" under the guise of legislation would pillage the "haves," and the only way out for nations thus looted would be to build up surreptitiously military power, and so another world war would be in the making. Therefore, this ill-advised scheme sows the dragon teeth of future wars.

This scheme of world federation involves a surrender of sovereignty more drastic than would be inflicted upon us by our enemies if they won the war. How can we face our boys when they come triumphantly marching home and tell them that we have given up

our independence and constitutional liberties, for the preservation of which they fought and won?

In the face of such an abject surrender, they will be at a loss to understand why we did not yield to the Axis Powers and avoid all the blood and desolation. No wonder the advocates of the Federation of the World are in a hurry for action while the war is raging, before the men wearing the uniform of our country can be heard.

The advocates of this Federation of the World assure us that it will work well by pointing out the success of our own Federal system of government, wherein the States have surrendered like powers to the Nation. Nothing could be more fallacious. The thirteen States fringing the Atlantic coast were situated in a small area, contiguous to each other, united by common purposes and common aims, speaking the same language, springing from the same stock that brought with them the Anglo-Saxon principles of Freedom that had "slowly broadened down from precedent to precedent" from Magna Carta for 600 years. And here for 150 years the evolutionary process in self-government went on during the colonial period, until at the time of the formation of the Federal Union, ordered liberty and love of freedom became the very warp and woof of their being. It was their children who crossed the Alleghenies and followed the covered wagon on to the sunset seas, laying the foundations of States whose stars crowd the field of blue upon our flag.

While millions of immigrants came to our shores, the great majority came to enjoy the blessings found under our form of government and became imbued with the spirit of our free institutions. It is true we closed the gates, when later on there began an influx of those whose ideas and customs and hereditary instincts were inimical to our way of life; and we intend to keep the gates closed. But they did not come in sufficient numbers to weaken the strength and vigor of our thought and action. And so we have grown strong and great, 135,000,000 people, bound together by a common heritage and love of freedom.

Quite different is the picture of the federation of the world. We are asked to throw in our lot with the rest of the inhabitants of the globe, the majority of whom are strange peoples, with strange customs and modes of life, speaking strange languages, dreaming strange dreams, a polyglot combination in all stages of development or with no development at all, with no background of freedom, with age-long smoldering discords and torn by racial and religious hates and distrust, among whom are the teeming Asiatic hordes and the denizens of the jungles of Africa who would rule the world.

And to become part of this motley aggregation, we are asked to tear up the Declaration of Independence, apply the lighted match to the Constitution of the United States, and pull the old flag down. We should exert all our influence to defeat the Humber resolution in the legislature of every State where it may be presented.

This does not mean that our country should not do its full part after this war is over in joining with our associates among the United Nations to preserve the peace of the world. We realize that we are living in a shrinking world; and that another such catastrophe as the one through which we are passing in another quarter of a century would wreck civilization. No right-thinking person upon this planet wants war. The methods devised to prevent war must, however, be worked out on a realistic basis, taking the world as we find it and not as we would wish it to be.

There are certain things to remember. We are in this war because we were wantonly attacked and had war thrust upon us. We entered into this war to save ourselves, and in so doing we are saving other peace-loving peoples. We did not enter into this war to start on a crusade to impose our form of government or way of life on nations or peoples who do not want it. The signatories to the Atlantic Charter said this. Speaking of themselves, they said: "They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live, and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

And so if the Netherlands want their queen restored and Belgium and Norway their kings, according to the declarations of the Atlantic Charter, it is not for us to intervene. We cannot object to the King of Greece again mounting his throne, even if he is far from a flower of democracy. I do not understand that we are to intrude ourselves in South America among our good neighbors and unhorse the presidents of some countries who are nothing more or less than dictators; and we do not intend to go into Russia and compel Joseph Stalin to adopt the Constitution of the United States. Russia does not want our form of government and we do not want hers; but that is no reason why we cannot live in the same world and join in preserving the peace.

When the nations of the earth are assured that, as free and independent states, they will be permitted to work out their own destinies and follow their own way of life, then, and then only, will they wholeheartedly join in an agreement to act together to preserve the peace of the world. Their self-interest and self-preservation will compel them so to act. It has evidently taken this World War to teach the lesson that nations must join together and come to the rescue of each other when attacked by aggressors, or they will go down one by one. That lesson has been written across the skies of this planet in colors of blood that will not fade.

Good intentions and conduct are not enough to protect nations in the world in which we find ourselves. The outlaws must be met by force.

We know that the four nations that will emerge forth, after this war is over, as the most powerful upon the earth, will be the United States, the British Empire, Russia, and China. With honesty of purpose and the will to peace, they together with other nations who will join them can prevent aggression on the part of any nation and prevent another world war for generations to come. And in the face of that will and power, no criminal nation or people will dare to venture forth on conquest.

At the same time we know that we are living in a somewhat wicked world, more wicked, I dare say, than some of us thought it to be. And we know that human nature will remain the same, with all its weakness, selfishness and grasping for power. We know that human frailties are reflected in the conduct of nations.

Therefore, whatever may be the scheme, no matter how plausible may be its terms, no matter how loud or long the signing parties affirm their eternal allegiance to it, now that we are prepared, we should maintain sufficient armament on land and sea and in the air to command respect and be prepared for any emergency. We should maintain all this at least until we take a good and a long look over the world that is to be.

In so doing we will not only preserve our liberties here at home, but we will resume our historic role as an inspiring example to all mankind. We will be again the great stabilizing force of the world; for the eyes of the distracted and distraught peoples, as they emerge from their charred ruins and their ashes, will be turned toward the great Republic of the West and learn once more the lesson that man will find his highest happiness, prosperity, and strength under that constitutional form of government given to the world this day at Old Independence Hall long ago.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting in time of war by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. I withhold the suggestion.

Mr. EASTLAND. On behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] I offer an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring, and recommends to the several States the enactment of, appropriate legislation to enable each person absent from the place of his residence and serving in the armed services of the United States, who is eligible to vote in any election district or precinct, to vote by absentee ballot in any general election held in his election district or precinct in time of war; and in order to afford ample opportunity for members of the armed forces to vote for Federal, State, and local officials and to utilize the absentee balloting procedures of the various States to the greatest extent possible, it is recommended that each State cause to be printed and delivered to the Secretary of War and to the Secretary of the Navy an adequate number of postal cards for use by such absentee voters in the armed forces in making application for absentee ballots, and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall, wherever practicable, and compatible with military operations, cause such postal cards to be delivered to members of the armed forces located within or without the United States, as expeditiously as possible in order to enable such members of the armed forces to secure, execute, and return said ballots in ample time to be recorded for such election.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall, wherever practicable and compatible with military operations, be the duty of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to cooperate with appropriate State officers and agencies in the distribution, execution, collection, and return of such absentee ballots, and envelopes to be used in connection therewith, as may be provided under the laws of the several States for the use of persons in the armed services in time of war.

(b) Such ballots and envelopes, and communications in connection therewith, including postal cards, shall be transmitted free of postage, including air-mail postage, in the United States mails.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VANDENBERG. First, may I ask the able Senator from Mississippi if he

is asking for present consideration of his amendment?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. My parliamentary inquiry is whether or not the amendment is in the nature of a substitute and whether its presentation will preclude further amendments to the pending measure?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is in the nature of a substitute, and amendments to the pending committee amendment would take precedence over the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should not care to interfere with the program of the able Senator from Mississippi. I merely wanted to be sure if his amendment should be considered now, since it is in the nature of a substitute, that we would not be foreclosed from further amendments to the committee bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Alabama has the floor.

Mr. HILL. I think the Senator from Mississippi really has the floor. I yielded to him in order that he might offer his amendment; but if I have the floor, I yield, of course, to the Senator from Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that the amendment in the nature of a substitute may be pending; but if the Senate should adopt it, the original committee amendment would then be killed and no further amendments to that amendment would be in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield if I have the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator from Mississippi yield in order that I may make a statement?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I sincerely hope that the Senator from Mississippi will not press his proposed substitute at this time. It would seem to me that the orderly procedure in connection with the pending measure would be to debate and dispose of all amendments which may be offered to the bill, and then if there are any amendments in the nature of substitutes to be offered for the bill as it has been written and perfected, if we reach that point, to consider such amendments. It would seem that that would be the appropriate time to offer substitutes for the bill. I hope the Senator will withdraw his amendment, as the Parliamentarian says that amendments to the bill are in order rather than the substitute. I inquire of the Chair if I am correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It makes no difference. If the amendment is pending, other amendments which might be offered to the committee amendment would have the right-of-way.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not questioning the fact that the amendment is pending before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The fact that it is pending does not interfere with the offering of other amendments which would have the right-of-way.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the point I wanted to make. In other words, even though the Senator should insist on now debating and discussing his substitute, if I understand the parliamentary situation correctly, pending amendments to perfect the measure before the Senate would be in order in preference to the substitute. Am I correct in that?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not want to make a point of order, I will say to the able Senator from Mississippi, but I think we should go through with the amendments which have been offered, and a number which are yet to be offered before we take up the Senator's amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. I will say to the able Senator from Illinois that this amendment is a perfecting amendment; it makes the bill constitutional; and I should like to press its consideration at this time. We are in accord in that the able Senator and several Senators on this side who are the authors of this amendment desire to give the soldier the right to vote.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not questioning that.

Mr. EASTLAND. We are merely perfecting the bill with this amendment, and think it should go into the measure.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not in any way denying the statement made by the Senator from Mississippi, but the Chair has ruled that his amendment is a substitute for the entire bill, and that is exactly what it is. It is an amendment in the nature of a substitute. If the substitute offered by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi were agreed to, it would mean, as I see it, that that would be the end of the discussion of the important measure before us. Various amendments have been proposed to Senate bill 1285 which should be disposed of before we take up the Senator's amendment. I hope he will agree.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am sorry; I cannot agree.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the substitute is not in order at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. LUCAS. I understood the Parliamentarian to say that any perfecting amendment to the original bill was in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Any perfecting amendment to the original bill would have right-of-way at any time. No perfecting amendment has been offered, and the Senator from Mississippi has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. A great number of amendments have been proposed from the minority side. There is the Taft amendment, the Danaher amendment, there are divers and sundry Bushfield amendments. I hope that some Senator on the other side will make a start in offering the amendments, in order that we may dispose of them in an orderly way.

Mr. EASTLAND. I have the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. LUCAS. I regret that I took the time of the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is perfectly all right, but my amendment is merely a perfecting amendment. It perfects the bill, makes it constitutional. It permits the soldiers to vote in a constitutional manner. I should like to discuss it at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator yield in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Reed
Andrews	Guffey	Revercomb
Austin	Hatch	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hawkes	Russell
Barkley	Hayden	Scrugham
Bilbo	Hill	Shipstead
Bone	Holman	Smith
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Brooks	Kilgore.	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lucas	Tobey
Byrd	McCarran	Truman
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Caraway	McFarland	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wagner
Danaher	Mead	Wallgren
Davis	Millikin	Walsh
Eastland	Moore	Wheeler
Ellender	Nye	Wherry
Ferguson	O'Daniel	White
George	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Gerry	Overton	Willis
Gillette	Pepper	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are detained on public business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is confined to his home with a cold.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent from the city on important matters.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, one of the fundamental safeguards placed around human liberty by the Constitution of the United States is the State control of elections and the State control of the qualifications of voters who participate in elections. At the present time the Senate is asked, under the guise of permitting the members of the armed forces of the country to vote, to tear down that fundamental safeguard. I favor the right of suffrage for those members of the armed forces of the country who are qualified to vote; and I have, in conjunction with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute which would give the right of suffrage to the members of the armed forces of the country, but which would not destroy the Constitution of the United States. My substitute would protect the liberties of the people of the country, as provided in the Constitution of the United States.

The pending bill violates the Constitution of the United States. It violates the election laws and destroys the election machinery of more than half the States of the Union. It would in particular violate the election laws of the State of Florida; it would violate the election laws of the State of Maine; it would violate the election laws of the State of Mississippi. In reading yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I observed that the secretary of state of the State of California has said that the bill would violate the election laws of that State, that the State of California could not participate in the proposed system; and I read further therein that the bill would violate the election laws of the State of Wisconsin.

The Senate of the United States owes to the 130,000,000 people of this country the duty to see that there is held an orderly and a legal election. If the pending bill were enacted into law, it would be bound to go into the courts of the country. My prediction is that, because of the bill's unconstitutional nature, the soldiers in the armed forces of the country will not be permitted to vote, because the pending measure is totally unconstitutional.

Article I, section 2, of the Constitution provides:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

The pending bill would violate that section of article I of our Constitution, and, furthermore, it would violate the second paragraph of section 1 of article II, wherein it is said:

> Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress.

The pending bill is in violation of that paragraph of section 1 of article II of the Constitution, because it would go behind the State legislatures, and would tell the legislatures of the States who in the States are qualified to vote for electors for President of the United States. The bill would further violate that section of the Constitution because many of the States of the Union hold that no person can vote for a party name, in voting for Presidential electors; and the pending bill would give that right.

It is the law of the State of Mississippi, and, my information is, of over half the States of the Union, that in the election of Presidential electors, the names of candidates must be voted, not the names of parties or a ticket. Since the foundation of this Republic it has been recognized by every court, by every authority, by the men who wrote the Constitution of the United States, that all control of the elections of this country was placed in the States, and that the legislatures thereof should define the qualifications of those who vote. I heard it said on this floor a number of times yesterday that the Congress of the United States could give the right to vote to the members of the armed forces, to the members of the merchant marine, to civil employees of the Government, and to members of the American Red Cross. I submit that the Congress of the United States does not now have, and never has had the power to confer the right of suffrage on a single human being within the borders of this country. Yes, Mr. President, the pending bill violates the Constitution.

In an attempt to make the bill constitutional, reliance is placed upon a vague something which the sponsors of the measure denote as the war powers of the Congress—that the Congress of the United States has the authority to declare war, to raise and support and govern armies of the United States, and to pass laws which will promote the war effort.

The leading case on the subject of the war powers of the Congress, the war powers of the Executive, and the war powers of the Government of the United States is *Ex parte Milligan*, reported at Seventy-one United States Reports, page 125, wherein the Supreme Court of the United States said this:

> This Nation, as experience has proved, cannot always remain at peace, and has no right to expect that it will always have wise and humane rulers, sincerely attached to the principles of the Constitution. Wicked men, ambitious of power, with hatred of liberty and contempt of law, may fill the place once occupied by Washington and Lincoln; and if this right is conceded, and the calamities of war again befall us, the dangers to human liberty are frightful to contemplate. If our fathers had failed to provide for just such a contingency, they would have been false to the trust reposed in them. They knew—the history of the world told them—the Nation they were founding, be its existence short or long, would be involved in war; how often or how long continued, human foresight could not tell; and that unlimited power, wherever lodged at such a time, was especially hazardous to freemen. For this, and other equally weighty reasons, they secured the inheritance they had fought to maintain, by incorporation in a written constitution the safeguards which time had proved were essential to its preservation. Not one of these safeguards can the President, or Congress, or the judiciary disturb, except the one concerning the writ of habeas corpus.

The Supreme Court says that not one of the fundamental safeguards placed around the liberties of the people of the United States can be disturbed in time of war except the one concerning the writ of habeas corpus. Admittedly this bill does violence to the very fundamental thing on which this Government is founded, and that is the sovereignty of the States and the control by the States over elections and electors, and of their own electoral machinery. If the Congress of the United States can abolish one of those safeguards, then, in the name of war, it can abolish any of them. As the Senator from Ohio has said, if we can disturb one safeguard, and set up Federal qualifications for electors, then we can call off an election.

I submit that we can go further than that in the name of war powers. If under some alleged war powers we can deprive the State of the right of control over the election and the qualifications of its electors, then the Congress has the power and authority to waive the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution and say that a Negro cannot vote, or that a white man cannot vote. There is just as much reason to support that argument as to support the argument which underlies this bill.

We can go further than that under alleged war powers. If we can waive the sovereignty of the States, if we can destroy State sovereignty and control by the State over its election system and the qualifications of its voters, then we can most certainly waive the first amendment to the Constitution under the name of war powers. Let me read that amendment:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof—

Who would say that the Congress of the United States, in time of war, could abridge that fundamental principle of human liberty? Of course Congress cannot do so. The Supreme Court says that the Congress cannot abridge any of them. We have before us a bill which admittedly would destroy one of the great fundamentals, the sovereignty of the States.

The first amendment goes further—

> or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Those are all great powers of human liberty. If one of them could be destroyed by an act of Congress, then they could all be destroyed and human liberty would go by the board.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has the Senator heard any Senator argue that the bill is constitutional? Has the Senator heard that argument made on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; I have heard that argument made on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. That it is constitutional?

Mr. EASTLAND. Under the war powers.

Mr. McKELLAR. A day or two ago I asked one of the most distinguished lawyers in the Senate if he considered it constitutional, and he did not reply. I did not know that anyone claimed that the bill was constitutional.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I think I recall the inquiry to which the Senator from Tennessee is referring. He propounded an inquiry to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. While the Senator from Vermont perhaps did not reply directly to the question of the Senator, I think if the Senator will read the entire address which the Senator from Vermont made on that occasion, he will be convinced that he does think the pending bill is in accord with the powers impliedly conferred by the Constitution.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator from New Mexico think that the pending bill is constitutional?

Mr. HATCH. I do.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am astounded.

Mr. HATCH. I have not discussed the question of its constitutionality, but perhaps later during the debate I shall do so. I made one distinction yesterday. The reason I did not care to discuss the constitutionality of it was that I have heard constitutional questions discussed so many times in the Senate, with no way of reaching a final decision here. I have seen the Supreme Court declare the A. A. A. law unconstitutional, and I saw the same Court, in an opinion written by the same judge, I think, declare the Soil Conservation Act constitutional. I do not derive much pleasure out of discussing constitutional questions.

Mr. EASTLAND. We are the judges of our own duty. If a measure is unconstitutional in our judgment, regardless of what we think a court might say, it is our duty to vote against it.

Mr. HATCH. Perhaps the Senator from Mississippi did not intend to lecture me as to what my duty is.

Mr. EASTLAND. No; I did not intend to lecture anyone.

Mr. HATCH. I myself will be the judge of my own duty.

Mr. EASTLAND. I agree with the Senator. The Senator is very able and very intelligent, and is a great constitutional lawyer. He is better qualified than I am.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. Let me ask the Senator if the question of the constitutionality of this measure has not constantly been evaded in this discussion? As the Senator has said, the position is taken that under war powers we can justify this measure. I will ask the Senator if it has not also been said on the floor of the Senate that because of the importance of the soldiers being given an opportunity to vote, we can appeal to a higher law than the Constitution of the United States. If the Senator has heard that argument, I should like to have him discuss that phase of it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I heard that statement, and it is not the first time that the statement has been made on the floor of the Senate that there is a higher law than the Constitution. It has been made by some of the ablest men who have ever sat in this body. I have always said that my support of the bill is embraced within the powers which lie within the Constitution.

Let me say to the Senator from Mississippi, while we are discussing the constitutional provisions, that I sat here yesterday and saw the Senate adopt an amendment which in my humble opinion is clearly unconstitutional. I saw the Senate vote to destroy the constitutional right of the President of the United States to nominate officials.

Mr. EASTLAND. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. I saw the Senate vote for that amendment in the name of partisanship, in the name of party. That amendment takes from the President of the United States a power which is expressly conferred upon him by the Constitution, the power to nominate officials.

Mr. EASTLAND. Let me say to the Senator from New Mexico that I thought that amendment was unconstitutional, and I voted on the amendment as did the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did the same thing. I am quite sure it is unconstitutional. I am quite sure the whole bill is unconstitutional.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. Let me ask the Senator from New Mexico a question. Would he vote for the bill as it now stands, with the unconstitutional amendment in it?

Mr. HATCH. Yes; I intend to vote for the bill with the unconstitutional amendment in it. A majority of the Senate has said that it is constitutional.

Mr. EASTLAND. I cannot lecture the Senator on his duty.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I voted for the amendment in question, and I do not claim to be a constitutional lawyer. I think it is well within the legislative power conferred on Congress by the Constitution to define the qualifications of the person who shall fill an office which Congress creates. Therefore, in supporting such a proposal I felt it was well within the legislative constitutional powers. I am referring to the Bridges amendment. I felt that the only one who could decide the question ultimately would be the Supreme Court of the United States. So long as the subject is in the arena of discussion, I think the precedents will abundantly show that Congress can write reasonable restrictions about the qualifications of any officer whom the President of the United States shall appoint.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I agree with everything the Senator from Maryland has said. It has been said—I believe in connection with the Civil Service Act—that Congress can prescribe qualifications of officials. The pending bill itself, in compliance with such constitutional authority, contains a provision with respect to the qualifications of the men to hold office. Two of them must be Republicans; two of them must be Democrats. In my opinion that is clearly constitutional. It is my opinion only, and I freely admit that there is ample room to disagree with the thought I am now expressing, just as there is on every other constitutional question.

In reply to the Senator from Maryland I would point out that in requiring the submission of six names by each political party there is no reference to the qualifications of the men who are to hold office. The qualifications are already set forth that each of them shall be a Republican or a Democrat. When we transfer the nominating power to two major parties, which, in my humble judgment, we did in the amendment, requiring them to furnish not only a list of names from which the President could choose under his constitutional authority, but limiting it to six, I cannot help but feel that it is beyond the power of Congress to make such provision. I may be entirely wrong about it, and on questions of this nature the dividing line is very narrow. Frequently I have heard the ablest lawyers in this body argue points involving questions of constitutionality, taking the position that proposed measures were unconstitutional, and I agreed with them. Later I found the courts disagreeing with us and deciding that the acts were constitutional. Therefore I cannot take much delight or pleasure in arguing a constitutional question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico is a distinguished and profound constitutional lawyer.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator from Mississippi, but I am not inclined to agree with him.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not think we are even in the twilight zone. I cannot conceive of a measure more palpably in conflict with the Constitution than the pending bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree with the Senator from Mississippi that any judicial interpretation coming from the Senator from New Mexico, he having been a judge on the bench, is worthy of the serious consideration of everyone. I say that without any regard to flattery.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me——

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator, I am afraid, is going to anticipate what I was about to say.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from New Mexico said a few days ago that in his judgment the bill was constitutional. I have such profound confidence in his legal judgment that his statement confounded me and I read some law on the subject. I say that very frankly.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I would point out that the State constitutions are in many respects similar to the National Constitution. It is a very time-honored and accepted constitutional prerogative of the heads of the political parties of each State to fix the time and place for the holding of an election without reference to the legislature or the Governor. The legislatures of the respective States have conferred upon the heads of the Democratic and Republican Parties the right to meet and say when a primary election shall be held.

I might give other illustrations. There is an abundance of them.

One reason why I was constrained to support the Bridges amendment was that the bill relates to nothing more nor less than an election contest between two great political parties. By the precedent established in every State of the Union, so many judges and so many clerks are selected from the two leading political parties. They are appointed by the party machinery. The legislature and the Governor have nothing to do with the appointment of the election officials by the boards of election supervisors in the respective counties. So that philosophy of election has been woven into every election contest which has been held. I respect the Senator's views, but I do not believe that the pending bill is unconstitutional.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator believe that the Bridges amendment is constitutional?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes. But if we are going to hunt for constitutional authority to sustain the bill now pending before this body, permit me to say that what we did yesterday was a mole hill compared to a mountain, because no sensible man with any regard for constitutional interpretation would vote for this bill without many misgivings as to whether or not he was voting for an act which would be within the Constitution. I will not say that many Senators will not support it with a great deal of reluctance, for I believe they will. I myself have serious doubts that Congress has the authority to override the State laws in the fashion now proposed. The situation with which we are confronted is extraordinary; we are faced with an unusual condition. We may not have any constitutional authority to do so, but every man who supports the measure will be streching the rubber band as far as he can without breaking it in order to give the men in the armed services the right to vote.

Mr. EASTLAND. I will say to the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland that we have before us the opportunity to adopt a substitute for the bill which would permit the soldiers to vote in a legal way, and not do violence to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I recognize that, and I am not at all out of sympathy with the Senator's philosophy; indeed, it appeals to me, because I believe that anyone who has known me considers me to be a man who has been a proponent of local self-government and local responsibility as a fundamental part of our whole constitutional system. While the proposal would permit the States to act, I am afraid some States would give their soldiers the right to vote and other States would not. If that gap could be bridged, leaving aside any question of law in the matter, I think I would be an enthusiastic supporter of the Senator's proposal.

Mr. EASTLAND. By absentee voter laws all the States but one having already granted to soldiers the right to vote. I believe, in fact, I know, that the States will cooperate with the Federal Government. The boys have parents at home who want them to vote. I know that they will see that the ballots get to the boys in a legal way. The only reason I have heard advanced for the bill is a time element. I have some figures showing the ballots could get to the soldiers and be returned within the time allowed.

Mr. TYDINGS. I appreciate the Senator's approach, but I think there is one State only which does not provide for absentee voting by soldiers.

Mr. EASTLAND. Only one.

Mr. TYDINGS. Leaving out other technicalities, assuming there is only one, it is perfectly possible for a national election to turn on such a narrow margin that the elimination of the votes of soldiers from a single State might conceivably throw it into one column, whereas, if they voted, the election might be thrown into the other column.

Mr. EASTLAND. I will tell the Senator that if this bill which the Senator says is unconstitutional passes——

Mr. TYDINGS. I did not say it was unconstitutional.

Mr. EASTLAND. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. TYDINGS. What I did say was that I would not argue that it was constitutional.

Mr. EASTLAND. I will say that this bill is unconstitutional, and that if it passes the next election will be void and will be thrown into the courts. As a result there will be turmoil and confusion in this country in time of war.

I will ask the Senator this question: Suppose this bill passes, and after its passage the Supreme Court of the United States should hold it to be unconstitutional, where would we be in this country?

Mr. TYDINGS. I should not want to take my seat and leave anyone under the impression that I am arguing that we are about to pass a constitutional measure. Frankly I have grave and very sincere doubt about its constitutionality.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator think it is more important to assure the holding of a legal election, an orderly election, than to pass a bill that would give the soldiers in 1 of the 48 States—for in the other 47 States they already have it—the right to vote?

Mr. TYDINGS. I think a good point can be made in support of the Senator's statement, but, with the Supreme Court of the United States being composed of its present membership, it is my thought that almost anything we may pass that is readable in the English language has a fair chance of being upheld; and, after all, the Constitution is what the Supreme Court says it is.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I hesitate to interrupt again, and I do not care to argue the matter, but the Senator from Maryland has mentioned the fact that election officials are chosen by political parties. It is quite true that in the beginning of this country almost the entire election process, including the printing and distribution of ballots, and even the appointment of clerks and judges, were conducted on a partisan basis by party officials, but the constant evolutionary process in this country has been to dispense with party control of elections and to place all elections under the control of duly elected officials.

Mr. EASTLAND. In the States.

Mr. HATCH. In the States; that is quite true. I wish to say to the Senator rom Mississippi that, as the Senator from Maryland has stated, there is ample room for the argument he is making. I know there is one particular clause in the bill which offends his sense of constitutionality, and, without regard to the war powers, I agree with the Senator from Mississippi as to that particular provision. I have so voted, and I intend so to vote on permanent legislation which will not give the Congress any power evoked by the emergency of war conditions.

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator not only disagrees with me but he disagrees with the Supreme Court of the United States, because the Supreme Court has said that Congress cannot waive a single one of the fundamentals of the Constitution.

Mr. HATCH. As I have stated, I do not want to argue these questions, for I do not think they get us anywhere; but there lie dormant in the Constitution powers which cannot rightly be exercised in normal times, the exercise of which would be clearly unconstitutional in normal times, yet a great emergency, even such as a depression, merely an economic crisis, may bring into existence powers which have been lying dormant and which can only be exercised in times of

great emergency. I am practically quoting the Supreme Court of the United States. Those are not my words.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator think the Congress, by an act passed by it, in the name of its war powers of which the Senator speaks, can waive the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution?

Mr. HATCH. Not at all, because there is no connection between that and war.

Mr. EASTLAND. There is no connection between this bill and war.

Mr. HATCH. But when, in the exercise of its constitutional war powers, Congress has literally taken young men of this country from their homes and placed them in foreign lands or in other States where they cannot exercise their constitutional right to vote, a constitutional right which is just as precious to them as it is to the Senator from Mississippi by the same power that the Congress deprives them of their right to the privilege of ordinary citizens who are not facing bullets, the Congress ought to give them ballots with which to vote; and I think clearly, under the Constitution, that Congress has that power.

Mr. EASTLAND. The authority Congress has is to cooperate with the States to give the soldiers the ballots. That can be done; they can have that right without destroying the Constitution, and they will have that right if the substitute amendment is adopted.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HATCH. I had not finished my sentence, but, as I said, I did not really want to argue the point, and I am sorry I have taken so much of the Senator's time.

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to ask a few questions, if I may, in connection with the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi. Is the Senator able to tell us how many States now have absentee voting laws?

Mr. EASTLAND. My information is that 47 States have such laws.

Mr. MALONEY. So there is only one State without such a law?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is my information. That is the State of Kentucky, the legislature of which will meet in January.

Mr. MALONEY. Then, is there any reason why Kentucky cannot pass an absentee-voting law?

Mr. EASTLAND. None that I know of, if their constitution will permit it; I do not know about that.

Mr. MALONEY. I notice in the Senator's amendment recommendation is made to the several States. Why is that when Kentucky is the only State without an absentee-voting law?

Mr. EASTLAND. Some States may desire to make some alterations in their absentee-voting laws. I am sure that my State will make some alterations when the legislature meets in January.

Mr. MALONEY. Does the Senator know of any reason why any of the States would be hampered in such an undertaking if they desired to proceed along that line?

Mr. EASTLAND. I know of none.

Mr. MALONEY. Has the Senator's view in that respect been challenged on the floor by the sponsors of the bill?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; my view was challenged by one of the authors of the bill, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who disputed some figures I had received from the ranking member of the House committee which had a similar bill under consideration. The figures had been received by the member of the House committee from the War Department and related to the time it would take to get ballots from Springfield, Ill., to the different theaters of war and back to Springfield, Ill.

Mr. MALONEY. Is that the most serious opposition the Senator has encountered?

Mr. EASTLAND. That was the only question raised.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not know whether I shall support the Senator's amendment, but I am wondering if he would be willing, on line 2, page 1, just before the word "enactment", to insert the word "immediate."

Mr. EASTLAND. Personally, I would have no objection to that, but I would have to discuss it with the other authors of the substitute.

Mr. MALONEY. The other authors are on the floor, and I wonder if I might make the inquiry of them. It seems to me such an amendment would strengthen their proposal.

Mr. McKELLAR. What is the page and line where the Senator would suggest the amendment?

Mr. MALONEY. On page 1, line 2, preceding the word "enactment", to insert the word "immediate", so that it would read:

That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring and recommends to the several States the immediate enactment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I not only think that such an amendment would be timely, but I think it would be very desirable.

Mr. EASTLAND. I agree.

Mr. MALONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think it would be a very wise amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. A question was raised a while ago as to the reply the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] made to my question. I find it in the RECORD. This is what he said:

Mr. President, I am trying to make it clear and unequivocal that my position is not that of passing on the constitutionality of this measure. I approve it without passing upon that question, because today, in time of war, a higher law than the Constitution commands us. In my opinion, there is a binding obligation on me to afford to the soldier on the battlefield the opportunity to exercise the vote for which he is giving his blood, and I will do all that legislation requires in order to see that he gets the opportunity to vote. If he is denied that opportunity, and deprived of it by my opinion with respect to the constitutionality of this or that feature of legislation which is designed to do this extraordinary thing, to make possible an election day on the battlefield in a condition of world war, the effect on his morale will be profound.

I wanted to call attention to the fact that the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont, one of the great lawyers of this body, answered the question, and said that he was acting under a higher law than the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In order to keep the RECORD straight, the Chair would like to inquire of the Senator from Mississippi whether he has modified his amendment by the insertion of the word "immediate" before the word enactment on page 1, line 2.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has so modified the amendment?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. Under the pending bill a voter in the armed forces would be permitted to vote for a candidate for President, for a candidate for Vice President, for a candidate for the Senate, and for a candidate for the House of Representatives. Those are the only officers for whom, under the bill, he would cast his vote. If the substitute should be agreed to, there would go to the voter from his home precinct a full ticket, whereby he could cast his vote not only for the electors for President of the United States, for the Vice President, a candidate for Senator, and one for Representative, but he could also cast his ballot for every local official whose name appeared on the ticket in his home.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will the Senator yield to me to propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Has section 116 of the pending bill been in any way amended?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not been amended.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to invite the attention of the Senator from Mississippi to section 116 of the pending bill, which is a penalty section, and provides for a penalty of a $5,000 fine, or imprisonment for not to exceed 5 years, if any election official violates the mandate of the bill by refusing to permit any soldier to vote, or to count his vote if it is cast, if the bill shall be enacted into law.

I ask the Senator whether in his State—it is true in my State, and in others—the same officials who hold the elections would also be under a penalty for permitting a man to vote, or for counting votes cast, if the voters did not possess the requisite qualifications fixed by the State?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from Arkansas is exactly correct. If a State election manager should permit one of the votes authorized under the pending bill to be counted, he might be subject to indictment and a jail sentence in the State courts, and if he did not count the votes, he would be subject to indictment and a sentence of up to 5 years in a Federal penitentiary, or a $5,000 fine, or both. In other words—and I say this with all due deference—it would make a criminal of every election manager in

the United States. In my State it would not be possible to hold an election. We could not get men to hold an election there, because they would not run the risk of going to a Federal penitentiary or going to the State penitentiary. An election manager would be foolish to sit as an election manager, because he would be a criminal if he did, if the pending bill should be enacted into law.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I merely desired to call that matter to the attention of the Senator and of the Senate. If the pending bill should be enacted, we would simply be setting up dual control of elections, Federal control in addition to State control, giving the Federal Government superiority and superior jurisdiction over the State election control.

Mr. EASTLAND. I disagree with the Senator as to its being dual control. I think it would be Federal control, or bureaucratic control. I will say further to the Senator that the bill would lead to the extension of the power of Washington bureaucracy, which today is despised by every segment of the American public, and by the citizenship of every section of this country. As it is written, the bill gives the bureaucracy of Washington absolute and utter control—and I shall discuss that in a moment—of the election machinery of this country, and affords it the opportunity which it desires to perpetuate itself in power.

Mr. President, the right of suffrage does not go hand in hand with national citizenship. There are many citizens of the United States who cannot vote. The States grant and deny suffrage as they desire under the fifteenth and twentieth amendments to the Constitution. We have no right in the United States in time of war to vote away, or to attempt to vote away, the fundamental safeguards placed around human liberty by the Constitution of the United States.

We have no right to go into uncharted seas and gamble with the liberty of the people and with the fundamental principles of the American Republic. If we do that, the loss to this country in the long run will be far greater than any momentary gain, regardless of the laudable purposes of those who introduced the pending bill, and who have worked so hard for its enactment.

The only reason that has been cited for the enactment of the pending measure is the time element, the argument being that there was not time to get the ballots from the various States to the theaters of war and have them returned in time. I placed in the RECORD a few days ago figures from the War Department which show the length of time it takes to get ballots from Springfield, Ill., to various theaters of war, and for their return. I shall read again to the Senate the figures, which were prepared by the War Department:

Alaskan area: Nearest, 14 days; farthest, 17 days.

Pacific area: Nearest, 18 days; farthest, 30 days.

Canal Zone: 13 days.

Caribbean area: Nearest, 12 days; farthest, 16 days.

South Atlantic area: Nearest, 14 days; farthest, 16 days.

Middle East area: Nearest, 18 days; farthest, 20 days.

Persian Gulf area: 22 days.

Far East area: Nearest, 30 days; farthest, 46 days.

Mediterranean area: Nearest, long haul, 21 days; short haul, 18 days.

Farthest Mediterranean area: Long haul, 26 days; short haul, 22 days.

North Atlantic area: Nearest, 14 days; farthest, 24 days.

Mr. President, these figures as to the number of days refer to the air-mail schedules. The War Department has indicated that with priority rights for the ballots, the time limit might be kept down considerably.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. One question has occurred to me in the course of the able Senator's splendid argument. Suppose that the general assemblies or the legislatures of the several States should not act under the mechanics suggested by the Senator from Mississippi; suppose, to make the case specific, that 30 States should act pursuant to the authorization which we would extend to them and in answer to our invitation, and that 18 States should not act; would we not then be confronted with the situation of the postal cards having elicited the votes of the absentees from 30 States, but in 18 States such mechanics would be denied? Would we therefore not be confronted with a failure of our proposal to grant equal protection of the laws to the absentees who otherwise would have been comprehended within the Senator's intendment?

Mr. EASTLAND. I understand the able Senator's argument, and I wish to say that in my judgment every State in the Union will gladly qualify to give the soldier the vote. I make that statement in utter good faith. The legislature of my State—and my State is put down by the press as one of the poll-tax States—nearly 2 years ago, or in January 1942, adopted an absent voters' law, and waived the requirement of the payment of a poll tax and waived the registration requirement therein, to give the soldier the right to vote.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I know that the Senator is speaking from the heart when he says he hopes and expects that every State will take action. I am suggesting——

Mr. EASTLAND. No. I said I believe every State would, and I believe that to be so.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes; but suppose they should not? That is what we have to consider. Suppose that a dozen States should fail in furtherance of the Senator's expectation to extend the privileges of his proposal. What would the situation then be?

Mr. EASTLAND. I will say to the Senator from Connecticut that I think we should suppose and consider within reasonable limits. The States will gladly cooperate. Forty-seven of the forty-eight States have already adopted absent voters' laws, which shows what their intention is, and I think we need have no fear that all the States of the Union will not cooperate. The legislature of the forty-eighth State will meet next month.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND. As I understand, that State has a newly elected Republican Governor and a legislature the majority of whom are members of the distinguished Senator's party.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. Would the Senator from Mississippi care to express an opinion as to what would be the legal effect if a State, or a dozen States, should fail to avail themselves of the mechanics suggested by his amendment?

Mr. EASTLAND. I will tell the Senator that I think that is the affair of each State.

Mr. DANAHER. And the Senator thinks that that would not invalidate the ballots of the States which would accept the mechanism?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not.

Mr. DANAHER. I appreciate the Senator's consideration. I thank him.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to interrogate the Senator from Connecticut, if I may have his attention for a moment. The Senator raised a point in which I was interested. I understood the Senator from Connecticut to ask the Senator from Mississippi, assuming his amendment were adopted and became law, and certain States availed themselves of it and carried through the purposes of the act and others did not do so, if the Senator from Mississippi would consider that such failure on the part of some States would have any effect on the ballots in the States which availed themselves of the provisions of the proposed law. What is the Senator's opinion about that? Does the Senator have an opinion or an idea, meaning by that, has the Senator from Connecticut investigated the question, and would failure on the part of some States to participate affect the ballots in the States which take part under the proposed act?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in the time of the Senator from Mississippi, and with his permission, I will make reply that I have not explored the question. I have simply raised a problem which the very able argument of the Senator from Mississippi suggests. I know that I received a communication from officials of the State of New York, who intimated to me that last year, under their absentee-voting law, they sought to gain the very sort of assistance and cooperation which is sought by the Senator from Mississippi, but they did not obtain it. I understand from the Senator from Illinois

[Mr. LUCAS] that only 28,000 absentee servicemen's votes were cast in the entire Nation from among the 47 States which have absentee-voters' laws. I know that in my own State the percentage of the absentee servicemen who were permitted to vote, and did so, was practically infinitesimal. I therefore say that there is certainly a question as to what might be the effect on the absentee ballots cast in the 30 States which avail themselves of this mechanism if 18 States do not avail themselves of it. I therefore asked the Senator whether it could be said that the equal protection of the laws had not been afforded by all the States, and would the fact that that is so militate against the validity of the ballots cast by absentees from those States that might avail themselves of this mechanism? It is a rather important question, the Senator will agree.

Mr. STEWART. It is, indeed, and I was interested in it. It all would get back, I take it, from the legal standpoint, to the fundamental question of the right of control over elections—whether it is a State matter or a Federal matter.

In my State last year the absentee balloting under the act passed by Congress in 1942 was very light. I am not now sure what the actual total was, but it was very small. It was so small as to be, as the Senator from Connecticut said, almost infinitesimal compared with the total vote.

I am very much interested in the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi. I am a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections which considered the bill, and I voted to report the bill. There have been many questions raised with respect to the constitutionality of the so-called soldiers' voting bill, Senate bill 1285, which we are considering. I shall not ask the Senator what he thinks about the matter of the constitutionality of the measure unless he cares to express himself; but I feel that there is some question perhaps with respect to its constitutionality. However, in my own mind, I have reconciled the feeling of a question with respect to its constitutionality with the thought and the idea that it is a matter which goes to the morale and well-being of the boys in the armed services, the men whom we, by reason of the fact that we are involved in war with many nations, have taken from their homes and from their places in civil life and placed in a spot where they cannot avail themselves of many of their civil rights. I have justified my feeling with respect to the pending bill on that theory, I will say to the Senator from Connecticut.

I thank the Senator from Mississippi for yielding.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The able Senator from Connecticut referred to a statement I made before the Committee on Privileges and Elections as a witness with respect to the number of applications which were made by the men in service in 1942 and the actual number who voted. In view of that fact I call the attention of the Senate to a statement entitled "The Soldiers' Vote in 1942," which was prepared by the Census Bureau, which is an arm of the Commerce Department. On page 2 of the pamphlet I find the following:

EXTENT OF PARTICIPATION

As brought out in table 1, the outstanding fact about the use of the war ballot by members of the armed forces in the fall elections of 1942 is that it was exceedingly limited—minute in terms of the 29,000,000 voters who went to the polls.

Of the 29,000,000 voters who went to the polls—

only 137,000 applications for war ballots were made to secretaries of state in 43 States. New Jersey accounted for 58,000, which figure includes ballots sent out on the initiative of the State—

That is a very important point—and I repeat—

which figure includes ballots sent out on the initiative of the State rather than on application of members of the armed forces. The number of applications is not a satisfactory measure of the extent of voter participation by members of the armed forces, because a much smaller number of electors received war ballots and cast them in accordance with the laws. As shown in table 1, only 28,000 valid war ballots were cast in the 40 States reporting, 7,000 of these being cast in the one State of Ohio.

I will say to the Senator, while I am on my feet, that an investigation through the various secretaries of state of the States of the Union will disclose that ballots came in for weeks after the election was over, due to transportation difficulties. As every Senator knows, letters received from servicemen in the Southwest Pacific or in the Asiatic theater of war sometimes will be delayed as long as 30 or 40 days. I even received today one letter which was dated 4½ months ago. All that is an indication of the tremendous difficulties a ballot would have in finally reaching the election precinct, under the State voting system as it is constituted today.

I thank the Senator for calling my attention to the matter, because it is important in connection with the measure which is before us. It was for that primary reason, after I made a study of what happened under the 1942 election law passed by Congress with the hope that servicemen would vote, that I reached the definite conclusion that the basic law is most ineffective. It does not operate in the interest of the serviceman. Those boys are willing to lay down their lives, if necessary, in order that Senators may continue to remain here and vote their convictions on matters. They are willing to fight in order that we may uphold free government in this country. Those men did not have the opportunity, under the present law, to cast a vote in 1942, and they would not have it under the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the able junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

Mr. President, I thank the Senator for giving me this much of his time.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I will say in response to what the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois has said, when he spoke of remaining in the Senate, that I certainly hope he will remain in the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I did not have that in mind at all.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is what the Senator said.

Mr. LUCAS. No, Mr. President; I said that the servicemen ought to have the right to say whether you and I shall continue to serve in the Senate. Seven million men cannot be disfranchised in time of war, but that is exactly what will be done if we do not give them some semblance of legislation which will be simple and uniform, like the measure now pending before the Senate. If we do not do so, we might just as well revert to the old situation, and have no Federal law at all upon this subject. As I understand the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi, it would not even repeal the present law. It would be only a substitute for what we now have, and the present law would still be in effect. Of course, the present law is a most innocuous measure.

Mr. EASTLAND. Would not the pending bill repeal the present law?

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, no; not the one the Senator is offering.

Mr. EASTLAND. I think it would.

Mr. LUCAS. No, Mr. President; it would be a substitute for it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois that soldiers' voting is not an issue here; but the sole issue, as between the pending bill and the pending amendment, is whether we are to turn the election machinery of the country over to an aggregation of power-crazy bureaucrats in Washington, whether we are to turn America's elections over to Washington bureaucrats, whether we are to permit expanding Federal power to destroy the States of the country. That is the issue.

The Senator spoke of the 1942 election. Of course, Mr. President, for many reasons, the 1942 election is not a criterion for what would happen in 1944. In the first place, the election in 1942 was an off-year election. Not many votes were polled. There was no candidate for President. In many of the States of the Union there was no candidate for United States Senator. There were no local candidates; and everyone knows that local candidates get out the vote. Furthermore, in 1942, the United States did not have, as it has now, sufficient planes which could be made available for the transportation and delivery of the ballots. Today the time element is nothing. I shall read to the Senate figures prepared by the Civil Aeronautics Administration relative to the time now required on the commercial air lines to fly to various parts of the world. In this connection, let me say that the time stated will be greatly reduced by the use of military planes; and my amendment would make available this substantial air power, and would give the voters'

ballots priority, and would provide that they should be taken to the various fields of war and delivered by airplanes, without charge:

From New York to Bermuda, today, 2 hours and 40 minutes.
From New York to Mexico City, 8 hours and 12 minutes.
To the Canal Zone, 9 hours and 12 minutes.
To Fairbanks, Alaska, 73 hours.
To London, 13 hours and 48 minutes.
To Lima, Peru, 14 hours and 48 minutes.
To Paris, 15 hours.
To Berlin—

And, Mr. President, we might have an Army in Berlin next year——

Mr. LUCAS. I hope so.

Mr. DANAHER. I hope so, too.

Mr. EASTLAND. I believe we will—

From New York City to Berlin, 16 hours.

From New York City to any part of the United States is just a matter of a few hours.

To Rio de Janeiro, 19 hours.
To Moscow, 19 hours and 12 minutes.
To the Hawaiian Islands, from New York, 20 hours and 12 minutes.
To Santiago, Chile, 21 hours.
To Buenos Aires, 21 hours and 36 minutes.
To Cairo, Egypt, 23 hours and 12 minutes.
To Tokyo, Japan—

And I hope we have an army there; in fact, I hope Tokyo is not there this time next year. But today, from New York, it is just 27 hours and 36 minutes.

To Bombay, India, 32 hours.
To Capetown, South Africa, 34 hours.
To New Zealand, 37 hours and 36 minutes.
To the city of Manila, in the Philippine Islands, 37 hours and 36 minutes.
To Sydney, Australia, 42 hours.
To Singapore (Malaya), 43 hours.
To Hongkong, China, 44 hours.

Mr. President, what is the necessity for the pending bill? We have the State laws. The Federal Government has sufficient air power available, so the committee was told, as I understand, to transport the ballots and to deliver them, and all that could be done in a period of a few hours.

Why is it that we are asked to destroy the States, and to set up a Federal bureaucracy which will reach into every precinct in the United States and control and dominate the elections, and take from the American people the liberties which were bought by blood during 7 years of gruesome war?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has been talking about bureaucratic control——

Mr. EASTLAND. And I will tell the Senator that I shall speak further about it. Before I conclude, I shall have several other things to say about it.

Mr. LUCAS. I imagine the Senator will do so, and I shall have no objection to having him talk about bureaucratic control, because we hear frequent references to bureaucracy in Washington. I do not remember a time when there were not bureaucrats in Washington, whether under the present administration or under a Republican administration.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, if my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, will kindly take a suggestion from me, let me say that when he runs for reelection next year, I think he would make a serious mistake even to discuss bureaucracy, on that basis, before the voters of the State of Illinois. I will say to the Senator that I am willing to go to Illinois and make speeches for him. I think he is a great Senator, and I should like to be able to vote for this bill, if it would help the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I will accept the Senator's offer to come to Illinois and make speeches for me should I be a candidate to succeed myself. I appreciate his statement very much.

Speaking of bureaucrats in connection with the proposed commission, the Senator does not for a moment think that the Republicans on the commission—and there would be two of them—would be bureaucrats, does he?

Mr. EASTLAND. What do I think?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes. Under the terms of the amendment which the Senate adopted yesterday, two Republicans and two Democrats would operate the commission. The Senator would not, in the wildest stretch of imagination, say that there would be bureaucratic control of the commission, with two Republicans to be approved by the national chairman of the Republican Party. I just cannot think of Republicans as bureaucrats. I should like to have the Senator's reaction.

Mr. EASTLAND. I disagree with the Senator about Republicans being bureaucrats. We have thousands of bureaucratic Republicans, and thousands of bureaucratic Democrats. Regardless of the political affiliations of members of Federal commissions, their sole object is to expand their authority without regard to law, and without regard to congressional intent. There is a blind desire to regiment the American people. Regardless of the composition of the commission, that is what would happen in this case.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not agree with the Senator. If there was ever a time in the history of this country when a commission was called upon to perform its duty in line with its conscience and in line with fairness and equity, it is now. The eyes of the American people will be on this commission from the time it is appointed.

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator has changed his mind since yesterday. I voted with the Senator on the Bridges amendment yesterday, because it was my judgment that the Senator was afraid that if that amendment should prevail there might be politics in the commission.

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, no.

Mr. EASTLAND. I took the Senator's judgment. I am sorry. Otherwise I might have voted for the Bridges amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator misunderstood me. Sometimes a vote is the result of a misunderstanding. I regret that the Senator misunderstood me. I would not attempt to gain a vote on the floor of the Senate on any different basis than that of fact. The Senator knows that my chief argument with respect to the amendment was that it was a reflection on the President of the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. I agree that it was a reflection on the President of the United States, and I voted against the amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, in all seriousness, the election commission is authorized to employ as many employees and as many agents as it desires and to send them over the country to dominate and control elections. I say that that is what will be done, without regard to law and without regard to the intent of Congress, but to fulfill the desire of the commission to expand its own power. That has been the history of bureaucracy in this country.

The other day I read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the Office of Price Administration had sued a legitimate businessman of southern Georgia for infraction of O. P. A. rules, not at his home in Georgia, where it should have brought the suit, but 1,300 miles away, in the city of Boston, Mass. It was charged in the House that the O. P. A. sent to Georgia a lawyer, who attempted to intimidate this businessman, who told him that if he did not compromise the case he would be sued in various sections of the country and put in bankruptcy by this agency of the Government.

Mr. President, this, if true, is not Americanism; it is bureaucracy at work.

The same situation would arise in connection with the proposed commission. Its agents would go about the country telling election managers, "If you do not do what we say, we will have you indicted in the Federal courts. We will put you in jail."

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the bill provides for regional offices, and also provides for securing the cooperation of any other agency of government.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

The bill further places duties on the secretaries of state of the various States. What right has the Congress of the United States to place duties and responsibilities on a State official? In addition, what right have we, as this bill provides, to tell the local election managers that they must make a report to the secretary of state of the State and that the secretary of state must make a report to the Federal election commission? On the basis of the report of that bureau to the Congress, the Congress, as the bill originally provided, would make the decision as to whether or not to count the electoral votes of the State, or whether or not Congress, being the judge of the qualifications of its own Members, would seat the Senator or Representative elected in that election.

Mr. President, who is gullible enough to believe that once this bill is passed it can easily be repealed? Who is gullible enough to believe that when this emergency is over we shall part company with this Federal election commission? Everyone knows that every one of its employees would become a walking lobbyist, scheming and conniving to hold his job, and to expand the powers of the commission. The commission would offer innocent amendments, as do all bureaus, to expand its duties and its powers. The most difficult task we have to face is that of abolishing a useless bureau of the Government after it takes root.

Mr. President, we are treading on dangerous ground. We are proposing to set a precedent which would gradually destroy the control of the States over their election machinery and the qualifications of their voters. It is proposed to establish a precedent for Federal qualifications for electors.

A great committee of the United States Senate reported the bill containing a provision that the Federal commission might report to Congress that a State had not obeyed the law, and that it would then be up to the Congress, taking the word of that bureau, to decide whether or not it would seat the Senator or Representative elected, or whether or not it would count the electoral votes of the particular State. The commission was authorized to investigate secretly, without giving the State or the individual involved the right to face the accusers, without the right of cross-examination, and without the right to call witnesses to rebut the accusation. Under that provision the Congress would take the word of the commission, as the result of an investigation.

Mr. President, this bill is the high-water mark in Federal bureaucracy. I am afraid of the drift. I know that the obnoxious provision which would place a Federal commission above a sovereign State of the Union, was removed from the bill on the floor of the Senate, but a committee recommended it; and I know full well that once such a commission takes root, it will come back to Congress for more power. It will be back for this power. It will seek authority to recommend whether or not the electoral votes of a State shall be counted, whether or not the Senate will seat the Senator elected by allegedly illegal ballots or whether or not the House of Representatives will seat a Representative elected by such ballots.

I know that the step being proposed is a wrong one. I know that the sole issue involved is not the right of the soldier to vote, because my proposed amendment would give him that right. It would protect that right in a legal and constitutional way. It would prevent an illegal election and resultant confusion in this country. It would preserve States' rights and the principles of Americanism in the country.

Mr. President, I submit that the amendment should be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] for himself, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], as modified.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Reed
Andrews	Guffey	Revercomb
Austin	Hatch	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hawkes	Russell
Barkley	Hayden	Scrugham
Bilbo	Hill	Shipstead
Bone	Holman	Smith
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Brooks	Kilgore.	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lucas	Tobey
Byrd	McCarran	Truman
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Caraway	McFarland	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wagner
Danaher	Mead	Wallgren
Davis	Millikin	Walsh
Eastland	Moore	Wheeler
Ellender	Nye	Wherry
Ferguson	O'Daniel	White
George	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Gerry	Overton	Willis
Gillette	Pepper	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask that it be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont to the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 20, after line 11, it is proposed to insert:

(2) Persons serving with the American Red Cross and the American Society of Friends outside the United States who are attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. Has the Senator any particular reason for selecting alone the two organizations mentioned in the amendment? There are other organizations that I should like to suggest to him might well be included. One is the WAFS, so-called, the Women's Auxiliary Ferry Service, an auxiliary of the Air Transport Command, and another is the WASPS, the Women's Air Force Service Pilots, under the Air Corps, and last, but not least, the USO, United Service Organizations, all of which have representatives abroad, and, it seems to me, are equally worthy of inclusion.

Mr. AIKEN. I will say I had supposed that such organizations as the WACS, the WAVES, and other similar women's organizations were a part of the armed forces and were already covered by the bill.

Mr. GREEN. But the ones I have mentioned are not covered.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not understand that the USO serves to any extent outside the continent.

Mr. GREEN. I have been told that they, too, have representatives abroad.

Mr. AIKEN. I called this morning on the War and Navy Department to obtain the names of the organizations serving with the Army and Navy in the combat areas, and the two mentioned in the amendment were the only ones I could find.

Mr. GREEN. There are the three additional ones, and, I presume, the Senator does not wish to exclude them.

Mr. AIKEN. If they are not already covered, I should certainly hope that they would be covered in the bill, but it is my impression that the WAC's certainly are a part of the armed forces.

Mr. GREEN. I made particular inquiry of the War and Navy Departments this morning and learned that the WAFS are not now included.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the Senator be willing to offer that as a supplementary amendment?

Mr. GREEN. I merely submit it to the Senator, knowing that he does not wish to discriminate against them, or I hope that he does not wish to do so, and would it not be better to include them in the one amendment? In that event they could be stricken out if, on inquiry, it is found that I am misinformed, but I am particularly informed, and I checked it over this morning, and they are not included in the armed forces.

Mr. AIKEN. If they are not covered in the bill already, they certainly should be included, and I should be very glad to have the WAC's and—what was the other organization?

Mr. GREEN. The organizations are the WAFS, the Women's Auxiliary Ferry Service, who are auxiliary to the Air Transport Command, and the WASPS, Women's Air Force Service Pilots. I should certainly be glad to have them included in the amendment at the proper place.

Mr. AIKEN. I will be glad to accept the WAFS.

Mr. GREEN. And also the WASPS?

Mr. AIKEN. What organization is that?

Mr. GREEN. The Women's Air Force Service Pilots.

Mr. AIKEN. Very well. I take the Senator's word for it.

Mr. GREEN. And then the U. S. O., which is a very popular organization, and which has representatives in American camps abroad.

Mr. AIKEN. To what extent does it operate abroad?

Mr. GREEN. Not to so large an extent as the other organizations, but to a considerable extent.

Mr. AIKEN. As a matter of fact, if they do not operate abroad, they would not be covered by this amendment, anyway?

Mr. GREEN. They do operate abroad.

Mr. AIKEN. I have no objection to including all the organizations mentioned by the Senator. It was certainly

an oversight on my part that they were not included.

Mr. GREEN. That is probably so.

Mr. AIKEN. I called the Press Division, I think, of the Army, and very likely the Senator from Rhode Island contacted some other division.

Mr. GREEN. It may reassure the Senator when I say that I was first informed as he was, but afterward, pursuing my inquiry, I found that it was a mistake, and the organizations referred to are not yet included in the armed forces. The WAC's, the WAVES, and others, as will be recalled, were admitted by degrees and not all at once.

Mr. AIKEN. I will accept the suggestion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. President, I think the purpose of this amendment is clear. I suppose there is not a member of the Senate who is not familiar with the work of the Red Cross. The Society of Friends operates between four and five hundred ambulances in the combat areas, according to the information which I received this morning. I cannot see why there should be objection to letting the members of these organizations who are working with the Army in combat areas, vote at the same time and in the same manner as the soldiers. They would undoubtedly be supervised by the same officials who will supervise voting by the soldiers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will request the Clerk to state the amendment as modified.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I did not hear the Senator read all the amendment. What are the mechanics for the enforcement of the amendment insofar as the different organizations would be given the right to vote? Would enforcement be under the Army and Navy, as is now provided in the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. The amendment would come on page 26, subsection (c), and would take the place of paragraph 2, which, as I recall, was stricken out yesterday by the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. My amendment would read:

(2) Persons serving with the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends—

And then the two women's flier organizations referred to by the Senator from Rhode Island, and the U. S. O., that is, members of these societies or persons serving with them—

outside the United States who are attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont as modified.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION OF 1940

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an article and ask unanimous consent to have it read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

WILLKIE LINK TO NEW DEAL TOLD IN BOOK—EFFORTS TO BUY 1940 NOMINATION CHARGED

(By Walter Trohan)

The story of several colorful phases of the career of Wendell Willkie, a man who is anxious to be President, was published yesterday by an intimate friend so that the American people will not repeat the mistake made in 1940 and nominate the New York lawyer as the Republican standard bearer in 1944.

The volume, entitled "One Man—Wendell Willkie," has the same format as the popular edition of Willkie's account of his world tour, One World.

Its author is C. Nelson Sparks, former mayor of Akron, Ohio, who was intimately acquainted with Willkie for 10 years when the latter was practicing law in the Ohio city and who supported Willkie in 1940.

INSIDE STORY TOLD

The documented publication begins with a detailed account of the inside story of the Philadelphia convention, disclosing several new angles of the plot by which Willkie and his interventionist associates captured the Republican nomination in 1940.

The book tells how Thomas Lamont, head of the House of Morgan, international bankers, and others picked Willkie. It charges delegates were "bought" at the Philadelphia convention through the use of "a roomful of money," quoting the manager for another Republican candidate.

The book tells of a dinner party before the campaign at which Willkie revealed himself as an interventionist and pledged himself to get this country into war in the presence of the then British Ambassador, Lord Lothian, although he was against entrance into the war in campaign speeches.

THICK WITH HOPKINS

Sparks charges that Willkie is now working hand in hand with Harry Hopkins in his 1944 drive for the Republican nomination and quotes a letter from Hopkins to a potential candidate for the Senate in Texas, in which the White House intimate says he can promise Willkie's cooperation.

Sparks detailed Willkie's career as a personal injury lawyer for an Ohio insurance company, asserting that his "methods and manners as a lawyer were much the same as those of Willkie the politician and public figure." He charges Willkie professed to be a friend of the people, but was really the friend and tool of vested interests.

Sparks states there was consternation in the House of Morgan when former Gov. Harold Stassen came out for Thomas Dewey in 1940. Stassen as the Nation's youngest Governor, it was felt, could be an asset to Willkie.

TRIP TO NEW YORK

"Suddenly, it was suggested to Stassen that he go to New York and commune with the planners," Sparks wrote. "The 'suggestion' came from John Cowles, publisher of the Minneapolis Star-Journal and chairman of the board of Look magazine.

"Great events in American political life, when traced to their source, have more often than not the simplest of explanations.

"Thomas Lamont is a relative of John Cowles.

"Thomas Lamont at one time loaned or arranged a substantial loan to Cowles to complete purchase of his Minneapolis newspaper property.

"Cowles 'suggested' and Stassen left for New York.

"In a few days he returned to Minnesota all-out for Willkie, and all out of breath with excitement over the promise of Lamont, that he, Stassen, would be temporary chairman of the Republican convention, in which capacity he would deliver the all-important keynote speech. * * *

"In due course Willkie heard the 'call of the people' and announced he had decided to be a candidate for the Republican nomination. And where did he open his campaign? Why, in Minnesota, of course, as part of Stassen's reward, and recognition of John Cowles' service to the New York interests."

NOTABLES AT DINNER

Sparks tells of a dinner party a week before the convention opened, which was given by Mr. and Mrs. Ogden Reid, relatives of British nobility, who publish the interventionist New York Herald Tribune. Guests included the late Lord Lothian; Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Lamont; Mr. and Mrs. Willkie; Mr. and Mrs. John Pillsbury, the mining family; and Senator and Mrs. Robert A. Taft (Republican), of Ohio, also a candidate for the Republican nomination.

"The idle chatter which had accompanied mastication ended abruptly with the beginning of the digestive process," Sparks wrote. "The hostess, of a sudden, announced that a few remarks from Lord Lothian would not be amiss, and his lordship was not unwilling.

"The substance of his comment was to the effect that it was the duty of the United States to go all-out, and at once, in aiding Britain. (Keep in mind this was in June of 1940.) Pillsbury, called on in his turn, passed, but Lamont expressed himself as fully in accord with Lothian and added a few terse sentences of his own.

"Willkie was next called and he endorsed everything that both Lothian and Lamont had said. The reliable report—by the Tafts themselves, who had told the story on divers occasions—is that Willkie, who later on in his campaign was to challenge President Roosevelt for warmongering, on the occasion of the Reid dinner, went 'all-out for war.'"

Mr. LUCAS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Do the rules provide how long the clerk is compelled to read an article or magazine or newspaper sent to the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is nothing in the rules to limit the length of time to be taken.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, the clerk can read until he is out of breath?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Apparently that is true.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the article, as follows:

TAFTS RETURN TO WASHINGTON

"By this time the Ohio Senator was pretty well burned up. He knew by then he had been invited to the Reid home for the purpose of ascertaining whether he was willing to pay the 'price' for the Republican nomination, namely an all-out war declaration that would satisfy the international banking interests and the British Ambassador.

"Taft was called on in his turn. He knew that by mere endorsement of the remarks of Lothian, Lamont, and Willkie, he himself would be in equal favor with the powerful interests there represented.

"Retaining his calm, outwardly, Taft observed that he could add nothing to his remarks on the subject that he had not expressed on the floor of the Senate, and the Tafts, as graciously as they could, excused themselves and returned to Washington.

"The next morning, the New York Herald Tribune editorially announced itself unequivocally for Wendell Willkie. And the New York Herald Tribune is again advocating Willkie's nomination in 1944, and supporting his 'One World' foreign policy."

CITES NOMINATION COST

Sparks, who was campaign manager for Frank E. Gannett, New York publisher, at the Philadelphia convention, said he has been unable to tell how much money was spent in nominating Willkie, but "I know that the Willkie crowd spent too much and by far more than all the other candidates combined."

Sparks said that the head of the South Carolina delegation walked into his office in the Franklin Hotel and said: "Now let me talk turkey. I've been offered $19,000 for expenses, etc., for the delegation's vote on the second ballot and I am offering your candidate our votes under the same conditions and for the same money, half to be paid down today and the balance after the second ballot is cast."

The delegation voted for Willkie.

OFFERED CASH FOR ARIZONA

Sparks said that about the same time he was called on the telephone by a man in the Willkie headquarters and offered money for the Arizona delegation which was pledged to Gannett.

"I replied that I couldn't hear him very well," Sparks said, "and I suggested that we talk later when I returned to the Franklin Hotel.

"On my return to the hotel after the second ballot had been cast, I put a Washington newspaperman on the one phone extension and a former newspaperman from Minnesota on the other and then called Willkie headquarters and asked for the attorney who had previously called me.

"After apologizing for having to cut him short at the convention hall, I asked him to repea his offer. He again said that my candidate did not have a chance to be nominated, and that it would be worth a lot of money to Mr. Willkie to have the Arizona delegation break for him on the next ballot because of its high position on the roll call.

"I replied, 'What do you mean by a lot of money?'

"He said: 'You name your own price, because we have a roomful of money.'

"I told him there wasn't enough for me to sell out my candidate, and I wasn't at all complimented with the offer, and, further, that I believed that if Mr. Willkie were to be nominated, the Republican Party would be overwhelmingly repudiated by the American people."

Sparks devotes a chapter to the strange relations between the White House and Willkie.

"The relations between the White House, heart of the New Deal, and Wendell Willkie are singular, indeed," he wrote. "They have won praises from the New Dealers, who have pleaded that politics must be abandoned in time of war, but, of course, the call to 'abandon politics' inevitably comes from the party in power, never from the opposition.

"The motive for such a pious expression is readily understandable. It is merely a device to play politics under the cover of the 'emergency,' immune from criticism, inspection, or even comment. It has always been that way; it always will be—in State as well as national politics."

HOPKINS HELPED WILLKIE

Sparks alleges Harry Hopkins, commando of the White House palace guard, persuaded President Roosevelt to permit Willkie to make his world tour, and got a bomber for Willkie, which Willkie had not asked for, "when the shortage of bombers, petroleum, and flyers was a problem of our armed forces."

To support his contention, Hopkins and Willkie are dealing, Sparks cites a letter written by Hopkins to Dr. Umphrey Lee, president of Southern Methodist University. Sparks said the New Dealers hope to beat Senator TOM CONNALLY (Democrat), of Texas, with Lee in 1946, because CONNALLY is not a New Dealer.

The letter reads:

"DEAR UMPHREY: What has been done with the * * * matter? Will you write me, please? What developments in the other situation? Willkie is going to be the man, in my opinion, and I can promise you good cooperation from that quarter if you think it would be helpful."

Sparks said the letter can mean nothing more than:

"(A) The White House not only hopes but thinks that Willkie will be the Republican nominee in 1944.

"(B) Willkie is prepared to go along with the New Deal in the South, where Republican fortunes are inevitably trivial.

"(C) Harry Hopkins is 'sitting pretty' whether the next President is Wendell Willkie or Franklin Delano Roosevelt."

HOPING FOR "FAVORITE SONS"

Sparks declares Willkie is striking his hope for the Republican nomination on a split in the Republican Party on the international issue "hoping that the 21 States with Republican Governors will send their various delegations to the convention pledged to a half dozen or more 'favorite son' candidates, thereby creating the same situation which enabled him to 'blitz' the 1940 convention."

"If the Governors of these States, most of whom will control their own State delegations, permit this situation to recur in 1944 they will be doing the citizens of their State, who elected them in 1940 and defeated Willkie, a great disservice," Sparks concludes.

"Far worse, they will deliver the National Republican Party into the clutches of those in the United States that believe the Constitution has outlived its usefulness."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to read the dedication of the book written by the former mayor of Akron, Ohio, Mr. C. Nelson Sparks. It is as follows:

This book is dedicated to my 17-year-old son, Andrew Nelson Sparks, naval aviation cadet, and all others in our armed forces, with the hope that they will always remember that they are citizens of the freest nation on earth; that they will support the Constitution as handed down to them by the fathers of our Republic; that they will watch men—and oppose those who seek to destroy our national self-determination, and combat any and all demigods who seek to barter the sovereign rights of the American people for self-aggrandizement.

Mr. President, we have been engaged all this week in debating the pending measure and amendments thereto, to determine whether our soldiers and sailors are to be permitted to vote on election day. Very respectfully I ask, What good does it do to allow any soldier or sailor or anyone in our armed forces to vote if the same crowd puts up both candidates for President and when it does not make any difference to the citizen whether he votes for A or for B?

Mr. President, I believe the statement made in the Times-Herald, which has just been read at the desk, is true. I believe that the book written by the former mayor of Akron, Ohio, C. Nelson Sparks, is true. If the statement made in the newspaper is true, and if what is written in the book is true, then not only was the Republican Party of the United States of America, of which I am a member, "taken for a ride," but the entire electorate of the entire Nation was fooled by those who put over that contemptible deal in Philadelphia.

Mr. President, first of all I wish to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. It is self-evident that the Senator from Ohio would rather have lost the Presidency of this country than to stoop to what Wendell Willkie and some of his satellites stooped to. It is only a few years ago that the late distinguished Senator Robert M. La Follette, Sr., in a Republican National Convention, at Chicago, I believe, offered, if my recollection serves me correctly, 33 planks. At that time I had the distinguished honor of being one of his campaign managers in one of the States of the Union.

The only State which supported former Senator Robert La Follette, Sr., in that convention was the State of North Dakota. He was ridiculed. Some of the leading newspapers in the United States called him an anarchist. At the convention he was hooted. Yet, Mr. President, between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party, up to this time 32 of the 33 planks advocated by the late Senator Robert La Follette, Sr., have been adopted, first by one party and then by the other; and today those 32 planks are the law of this land. Only one plank failed to be adopted, and that was the plank which provided for the direct election of the President by the people of this country. Only 4 or 5 years ago former Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, failed to secure Senate approval of such a provision, and he failed by only one vote, as I presently recall.

Mr. President, I repeat, what good does it do for this body to debate for days and for weeks the question of whether the soldiers are to be allowed to vote, if in the final analysis five or six men representing the vested interests will meet in one room, and five or six other men representing the vested interests will meet in another room, one group representing the Democratic Party and the other group representing the Republican Party, and subsequently will say to the people of this country, "This is a free election. Take either one of these two gentlemen whom we have chosen for you."

At this solemn hour we are endeavoring to give a vote to the soldiers of our country who are shedding their life's blood for democracy in this Nation and, as they believe, for democracy all over the world. I believe the present time is a most opportune one to bring to the attention of the Senate and of the country a situation which, if it is true, as I believe it to be, is the very antithesis of all the common man in this country stands for. I believe the situation is so serious that I have prepared a resolution. I shall read it before I send it to the desk and ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee:

Whereas there have appeared in the public press charges to the effect that attempts were made at the Republican National Convention in 1940 to purchase the support of the Arizona delgation for the nomination of Wendell Willkie; and

Whereas such sources further allege that the nomination of Mr. Willkie was influenced by assurances privately given by him concerning his support of a foreign policy contrary to the principles of the Republican Party platform; and

Whereas the serious nature of such charges demands an inquiry into their accuracy: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of (1) the conduct of the 1940 National Convention of the Republican Party with a view to ascertaining whether there were irregularities in the selection of the candidate of such party for the office of President, and whether Harry Hopkins had a corrupt connection therewith, and (2) of the conduct of the 1940 national convention of any other political party if in the opinion of the committee such investigation is desirable. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

For the purpose of this investigation, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. President, I send the resolution to the desk and ask that it be received and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 217) was received and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let me say in conclusion that I personally am very proud of the attitude taken by the various candidates for the Presidency, at the Republican National Convention held in 1940, with the exception of Mr. Willkie. I well remember that some of the distinguished Members of this body were candidates at that convention. I was proud of the fine attitude taken by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who, if he had been chosen, would have made, I believe, an excellent President. I have already said I was pleased at the attitude taken by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] on that occasion. Happy as I was, I was even more delighted when the Times-Herald stated that at that dinner, with the Presidency dangling before him, or, if he did not get that, possibly the Vice Presidency, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] was so patriotic that he did not deign to sell out the truth to serve the purpose of the hour, but, instead, was a worthy son of a worthy father.

I hope the Committee on Privileges and Elections will make a thorough investigation. I believe the people of the United States are entitled to such an investigation. I believe they are entitled to know whether Tom Lamont, of the House of Morgan, or whoever it may be, goes into the convention, in view of the fact that the people of the country do not have a direct vote for President, and selects the candidate. The people of the country are the ones who are entitled to know about that, to know whether sinister influences get into the Democratic Party or the Republican Party and, by the use of money or other corrupt means, name the candidate.

Mr. President, one of the first committees I saw in action when I came to the Senate was one which met on the third floor of the Senate Office Building. It was presided over by the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. Before the committee appeared a witness who was charged, as I remember, with handling $300,000, a man who was the head of a big tobacco company, as I recall. When that man testified that day—and he testified very adroitly—in spite of all the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire could do, the witness ducked and evaded and evaded and ducked the questions asked him by the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire. It was only after the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire absolutely insisted that either the witness answer the questions or be sentenced for contempt of the committee that any intelligent answer at all was had from the witness. As I remember the matter, a day or two later the witness returned to the committee and changed his testimony, stating that he had made some mistake, that he had relied upon some clerk in his office, or something of that sort.

Mr. President, I wish to make it plain that I believe it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to insure the common people of this country honest elections. I am fully aware of the fact that some legislation along that line has been enacted, but apparently, if the reports of the various campaign committees are to be believed, the laws which have been enacted have not been very effective. As a matter of fact, in the last national election more money was spent in this country than ever before in the history of America. I ask the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire if that is not true?

Mr. TOBEY. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire says that is the fact. So I ask, what good is the Hatch Act? What good is any other act if the cold facts are as stated by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, who had charge of that investigation, that more millions of dollars were spent in the last election than ever before in the history of the country? That was after the candidates had been nominated. We shall never know how much was spent by the house of Morgan, or Mr. Lamont, or Mr. Willkie to beat the other candidates who were contesting for that nomination, which in this democracy they had the right to do.

So, Mr. President, I fervently hope that the resolution submitted by me will be approved by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and that a full and searching investigation will be made.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Idaho in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] as modified.

Mr. GREEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Reed
Andrews	Hatch	Revercomb
Austin	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hayden	Russell
Barkley	Hill	Scrugham
Bilbo	Holman	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Brooks	K'lgore	Stewart
Buck	Langer	Taft
Burton	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McClellan	Tobey
Caraway	McFarland	Truman
Chavez	McKellar	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Van Nuys
Danaher	Mead	Wagner
Eastland	Millikin	Wallgren
Ellender	Moore	Walsh
Ferguson	Nye	Wherry
George	O'Daniel	White
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Willis
Gillette	Overton	Wilson
Green	Pepper	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] as modified.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, may we have the amendment stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 20, after line 11, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert:

(2) Persons serving with the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Ferry Service, the Women's Air Force Service Pilots, and United Service Organizations outside the United States who are attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the

senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are absent on official business. I am advised that if present and voting, they would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are detained on public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky, the Senator from California, the Senator from Montana, and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent due to a death in his family.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is confined to his home by a cold.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent from the city on important matters. He has a general pair with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE].

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is detained on official business. He has a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER].

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is detained on business of the Senate.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official business. If present he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 21, as follows:

YEAS—52

Aiken	Hill	Reynolds
Andrews	Holman	Russell
Austin	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Bankhead	Kilgore	Shipstead
Barkley	Langer	Smith
Bilbo	Lucas	Stewart
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McFarland	Tobey
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Truman
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tunnell
Eastland	Maybank	Tydings
Ellender	Mead	Van Nuys
Gillette	O'Daniel	Wagner
Green	O'Mahoney	Wallgren
Guffey	Overton	Walsh
Hatch	Pepper	
Hayden	Reed	

NAYS—21

Bridges	Ferguson	Revercomb
Brooks	Gerry	Taft
Buck	Hawkes	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Lodge	Wherry
Butler	Millikin	White
Byrd	Moore	Willis
Danaher	Nye	Wilson

NOT VOTING—22

Bailey	Downey	Murray
Ball	George	Radcliffe
Bone	Glass	Robertson
Brewster	Gurney	Vandenberg
Bushfield	Johnson, Calif.	Wheeler
Chandler	La Follette	Wiley
Connally	McNary	
Davis	Murdock	

So Mr. AIKEN'S amendment, as modified, to the committee amendment, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], as modified, in the nature of a substitute for the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. The act of August 2, 1939, entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," as amended, is hereby amended by adding thereto the following new sections:

"SEC. 22. It shall be unlawful for any officer, or person employed in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, including the Army and the Navy, to deliver or cause to be delivered to persons in the armed forces of the United States any general communication, general order, Government magazine, Government newspaper, or other literature or material paid for in whole or in part with Government funds, or sponsored by the Government or any officer, agency, or department thereof, including the Army and Navy, or to make, or cause to be made, any broadcast to the armed forces of the United States, containing political argument or political propaganda of any kind designed or calculated to affect the result of any election for President, Vice President, Presidential elector, Member of the Senate, or Member of the House of Representatives, except as hereinafter provided:

"(1) Nothing herein shall prevent the distribution to members of the armed forces of books, magazines, and newspapers which have a general circulation in the United States, or of servicemen's magazines or newspapers, such as Yank and Stars and Stripes, but the selection of such books, magazines, and newspapers of general circulation shall be fair as between the different political partics, and the conduct of servicemen's magazines or newspapers sponsored or paid for by the Government shall be wholly nonpartisan and nonpolitical, unless an equal amount of space is allotted in each issue to editorials, columns, or other argumentative matter supporting each party concerned in the Presidential election.

"(2) Nothing herein shall prevent the sending of any letter, magazine, newspaper, or other literature by any individual, corporation, other than Government-owned corporation, or political committee to any member of the armed forces, addressed personally to such member of the armed forces, and paid for by him, or by the person or committee sending the same.

"(3) No communication, order, magazine, newspaper, or other literature, and no broadcast, and no selection of books, magazines, or newspapers, shall be deemed to be in violation of this section if it is first submitted to the United States War Ballot Commission, and found by such Commission not to be in violation of this section, but it shall not be compulsory to make such submission.

"SEC. 23. It shall be unlawful for any censor or other member of the executive branch of the United States Government to censor or interfere with any letter or communication addressed to an individual member of the armed forces for the purpose of removing therefrom political literature or political arguments or other matter sent to such indivdual member of the armed forces by any individual, corporation, or political committee, unless such literature or other matter contains information which may be of value to the enemy in their prosecution of the war.

"SEC. 24. Any person who violates the provisions of section 22 or section 23 hereof either within or outside of the United States shall upon conviction thereof be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the amendment which I offer is intended to prevent any partiality on the part of the Government.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am constrained to raise the point of order that the Senate is not in order. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio is, possibly, the most important amendment involved in the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is quite right; the point of order is well taken. The Senate will please be in order, and those desiring to confer will please retire to the cloakroom.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the election to be held next year will be one of the most extraordinary elections that have occurred because of the fact that we are in this bill proposing to give the ballot to four or five million men outside the United States who will not be able to hear the candidates speak, who will not be able, in many cases, to know even who the candidates are, and who will be wholly unable to read the ordinary newspapers of the United States or hear any arguments which are made on either side. Nearly every means of communication to the men serving abroad is controlled by the Government of the United States, and it is peculiarly important, therefore, that the Government and Government officials understand that their control of the means of communication shall not be used to conduct a campaign on one side against those who do not have equal facility to reach the men in the armed forces of the United States.

In trying to deal with this problem, which is not an easy one, I have proposed an amendment to the so-called Hatch Act dealing with partisan activity on the part of the Government, and propose that such an amendment be added to the pending bill. The amendment provides, in general, first that:

SEC. 22. It shall be unlawful for any officer, or person employed in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, including the Army and the Navy, to deliver or cause to be delivered to persons in the armed forces of the United States any general communication, general order, Government magazine, Government newspaper, or other literature or material paid for in whole or in part with Government funds, or sponsored by the Government or any officer, agency, or department thereof, including the Army and Navy, or to make, or cause to be made, any broadcast to the armed forces of the United States, containing political argument or political propaganda of any kind designed or calculated to affect the result of any election——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I desire to ask the Senator what is his interpretation of the provision regarding broadcasts. It is entirely possible that members of the armed forces scattered all over the world might be listening by means of short-wave radio facilities generally to whatever comes over the air. It might be possible that they would pick up speeches made in the United States to the people of the United States by members of the executive departments—I would not imagine by the War or Navy Department—but the Senator's amendment would prohibit any member of the executive departments to broadcast to the armed forces. Would it be regarded as in violation of that provision if someone in the executive departments were making a speech over the radio in the United States primarily designed for listeners in the United States, but which might be picked up by the armed services scattered over the world when it was not designed for them?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think that would be covered, if it were not broadcast primarily for that purpose, but I think it probably would be, because the Government controls all the short-wave broadcasting to Europe. Consequently, unless it were prohibited, they could broadcast all speeches on the one side and omit all on the other. Of course, as to some general broadcast in the United States which might be heard in Europe, I do not think there would be any prohibition.

Mr. BARKLEY. No one wants any one-sided propaganda to go to the Army or Navy, or to anyone in the armed services, but sometimes in the administration or enforcement of a statute people become very technical. It might be construed, possibly, that although not primarily intended to be heard by members of the armed forces, if in any large number they listened in on a broadcast, it would be a broadcast to them, because there is no way to control such matters.

Mr. TAFT. There is one way by which they can be controlled, for in section 3 of the amendment it is provided that anything may be submitted to the war ballot commission in advance, and if the commission finds that it is not in violation of the law, they may say so, and, so to speak, there would be a clearance. It is not required that the matter must be submitted to them, but it may be done if necessary.

Mr. BARKLEY. As the bill now stands, three out of four members of the commission would have to act.

Mr. TAFT. Exactly; so they could prevent political propaganda. That is one of the purposes of the amendment.

There are, however, a good many difficulties with the effort to prevent the soldiers being reached, because we do not wish to interfere with the transmission of material to the soldiers. My only purpose is to provide that the facilities of the Government of the United States shall not be used in a partisan manner. So a number of express exceptions have been made. The original amendment I offered, which was criticized by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] several days ago, did not contain all these exceptions, because I did not know of all the activities of the Government in connection with reaching the soldiers. The first exception is this:

Nothing herein shall prevent the distribution to members of the armed forces of books, magazines, and newspapers which have a general circulation in the United States.

It appears that today the Army is printing, at the expense of the Government, some 30 books every month, and in large quantities, from 50,000 up, and broadcasting information about them to members of the armed forces throughout the world. I have read the official lists for the last 4 months, and personally I have no criticism of the selection of the books. But what an opportunity, before an election, to flood the world with books which are all on one side and omit all the books which may be on the other.

Furthermore, the Government today is spreading throughout the world some 26 magazines which are selected by the Army, and in most cases paid for by the Army. I understand that some of the magazines, such as Life and Time, are donating a certain number of copies, which are printed in small editions, without the advertisements, and furnished to the Government at cost; but the Government pays for them. The Government selects those magazines and the Government distributes them. So there again is an opportunity to select magazines which favor one side and not select those which favor the other.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, the Senator knows that those magazines are now selected through reader popularity on the part of the soldiers themselves. In other words, as to all the magazines the Senator is now discussing, I understand the War Department takes a semi-referendum among the soldiers as to what they want to read.

Mr. TAFT. I did not know that. I certainly would approve that method of handling the matter. Personally, I doubt very much that any referendum has been taken among the soldiers. Inquiry among the soldiers will pretty well demonstrate that someone will be for any magazine the Government wants to send. However, I think that up to this time the good faith of the Army in selecting these books and magazines has been 100 percent. I have no criticism whatever to make of their selection of magazines, newspapers, and books. So far as I am concerned, it is satisfactory. This is an exception I am reading:

Nothing herein shall prevent the distribution to members of the armed forces of books, magazines, and newspapers which have a general circulation in the United States—

With one qualification, namely—

The selection of such books, magazines, and newspapers of general circulation shall be fair as between the different political parties.

I know that is a very general provision, but it is a laying down by Congress of the principles upon which we think books, magazines, and newspapers should be selected.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is advising the Senate on a very important feature of his amendment when he is discussing the paragraph which provides that the selection of magazines and newspapers of general circulation shall be fair as between the political parties. I should like to have the Senator answer this question: In looking through Time, Look, the Infantry Journal, Newsweek, the New Yorker, Esquire, Saturday Evening Post, and the other magazines which are now being sent to the boys as morale builders, how are the Army and the Navy to determine what is fair and what is unfair with respect to the political arguments or the political information contained in all such magazines going to members of the armed forces?

Mr. TAFT. They might ask the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Ohio. We could probably tell them whether they were fair or not.

Mr. LUCAS. I am serious about this matter.

Mr. TAFT. I am serious, too. Of course, as a matter of fact, the statement in the amendment is a general one. If there is any doubt, the question can be submitted to the ballot commission, under the third paragraph. If the selection of magazines represents a fair cross-section of the magazines of the United States, and if it can be shown that they are the magazines for which the boys are asking, I would say it would be a fair selection.

Mr. LUCAS. That is not what the Senator's amendment provides. It says,

"Shall be fair as between the different political parties."

The point I am making is that, under the present arrangement, which has been in existence almost since the beginning of the war, all these valuable magazines are being sent to soldiers in every part of the world by the thousands and millions. There would have to be someone in the Army to go through every one of the issues to determine whether or not any political argument or political propaganda or political statement in the magazines was fair to one party or the other.

Mr. TAFT. It does not say that; it says the selection shall be fair. If a cross-section of magazines is selected, what is said in a particular magazine does not have to be fair.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the Senator a further question. If the understanding of the Senator from Illinois, with respect to how the magazines are now being sent to the boys in the Army and Navy throughout the world, is correct, if the language contained in the amendment should be agreed to, would the Senator have any objection to the continuation of the sending of the magazines, irrespective of the political matter contained therein?

Mr. TAFT. I would be perfectly willing to do what is suggested by the Senator, and instead of using the words "shall be fair as between the different political parties," to say "shall be determined in accordance with the demands received from time to time from the soldiers in the armed forces," or something of that kind. That would put the whole thing up to the demand from the soldiers themselves. I should be glad if the Senator from Illinois would prepare such an amendment, and would be perfectly willing to have it adopted.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am against the Senator's amendment in its present form. One of the primary reasons for my objection to it, is the great administrative burden its provisions would place on the ballot commission.

Mr. TAFT. I may say that it is not proposed that a copy of every magazine is to be submitted to the ballot commission. If it is desired to be sure that there shall be no further criticism with respect to the selection of the books, magazines, and newspapers to be printed and sent abroad, a list of the magazines, for example, proposed to be sent, would be submitted, but not a copy of every individual magazine.

Mr. LUCAS. That may be true with respect to the ballot commission, but that does not get away from what is contained in section 22, in the first paragraph, with respect to all the material being submitted to the ballot commission. Under the provisions of paragraph 1, no one would dare to make a speech if it should contain any political argument of any kind, and if the speech were on the border line it would have to be submitted to the ballot commission for approval or disapproval. The very thing the committee started out to do was to keep the ballot commission from having any real power of decision. The Senator from Ohio now has practically made it a board of censorship with respect to everything that goes to members of the armed forces.

Mr. TAFT. No; I have provided that if an Army officer is doubtful, and some officers are very timorous, he may submit the matter to the ballot commission and obtain a clearance. He does not have to do so. If he wants to assume responsibility for saying that he has complied with the law, he can stand on that and proceed without going to the ballot commission. So far as the service magazines are concerned, they do not have time or cannot submit them to the ballot commission.

Mr. LUCAS. How many persons are going to take the chance with a penalty provided of a fine of $1,000 and a jail sentence if they fail to submit something to the ballot commission which might be on the border line of political propaganda? In other words, if there is any question about the matter at all, they are going to the ballot commission, and the Senator from Ohio is setting up another bureau, a procedure to which he is usually opposed. I undertake to say that it will require a thousand people working night and day to censor all the speeches and political material, and the arguments and the magazine articles which will be constantly before the ballot commission under the provisions of the Senator's amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there is not the slightest suggestion of anything of the kind in my amendment. The only requirement is that no Government order, no Government propaganda shall go out for one party. That is a perfectly simple thing. People know what is propaganda and what is not. If there is something which happens to be on the border line and those involved desire to be perfectly sure, they can submit it to the ballot commission. There is not any suggestion that individual magazines be submitted to the ballot commission. All that is required by the amendment is that the over-all selection of the magazines to be sent abroad shall be fair as between the political parties, and I do not think there is anyone here who will say that the selection should not be fair.

Again, when the list of magazines has been made, if anyone questions it, the matter should be taken to the ballot commission. If the selection of the list has been fair, if the selection simply follows the desires of the soldiers, as indicated in some referendum taken among them, it is not necessary to submit the list to the ballot commission. It is not required that it be submitted in such event. So far as I am concerned, if it is fair as between the political parties, if it is not objectionable, I am willing to base the selection on the reader interest of the soldier.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I understand the point raised by the Senator from Illinois, and I think there is a great deal to it. I also think there is a great deal to the suggestion made by the Senator from Ohio. The different magazines may support some party today and some other party tomorrow. Some of them may be representing both parties. I do not think we can attempt to keep political information from the soldiers. I think they are entitled to have whatever magazines of general circulation want to say, just as the citizens of this country are entitled to it and want to have it.

Mr. TAFT. I agree, and therefore I have excepted magazines of general circulation, and have simply provided that the selection must be a fair one.

Mr. HATCH. In the light of what the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Illinois have said, I wonder if this suggestion would meet the approval of the Senator from Ohio: In line 18, on page 2, appear the words "but the selection of such books, magazines, and newspapers of general circulation." Instead of the words used by the Senator in his amendment immediately following, "shall be fair as between the different political parties," how would it be to substitute the words—this is merely a suggestion and has not been clearly thought out—"shall be determined in accordance with the expressed desires of members of the armed services as determined by proper officials of the Army and Navy."

Mr. TAFT. The suggestion is to strike out the words "shall be fair as between the different political parties" and insert "shall be determined in accordance with the wishes of the members of the armed forces of the United States"?

Mr. HATCH. "As may be determined by proper officials of the Army or Navy." Someone has to determine the matter, and they are the ones who are doing it now.

Mr. TAFT. There may be other amendments proposed, and I will try to find something to take the place of the language the elimination of which the Senator suggests. I think the general thought of the Senator from New Mexico is entirely satisfactory to me.

Mr. President, another method which is a very obvious means of reaching the soldiers, which might be used, is that of the so-called servicemen's publications. There is of course Yank, which is I think a weekly magazine, of which some 825,000 copies are printed, and there is Stars and Stripes, of which a smaller number is printed, which is a daily publication distributed throughout the world. Those publications are in effect paid for by the Government. All the material is supplied by the Government. All the men who are working on them are paid by the Government. They are in effect Government publications.

The obvious possibility of using these publications is suggested in an item appearing in this morning's newspaper which Senators may have read. A dispatch from Naples is as follows:

A recent editorial in the service newspaper, Stars and Stripes, which asserted that American soldiers wanted to see Berlin before they saw their home towns again, has drawn a flurry of angry correspondence from combat

troops. One soldier inquired snappily, "Who in hell elected you to voice the opinion of the veteran?"

The paper printed two full columns of letters from soldiers, unanimous in sentiment. Sample statements expressed in them were:

"When a rear echelon Johnny says these boys don't want to go home and that they don't need a rest, I think of that old saying, war has no fury like that of a noncombatant."

"I have yet to see a piece of ground taken by the Stars and Stripes. I have yet to see a Stars and Stripes cemetery. When you say you don't want to go home, why don't you say you are speaking solely for the staff of the paper?"

The letters illustrated that the American soldier believes that the Army is big enough now to rotate divisions without loss of efficiency and, with some marked exceptions, he regards the war against Germany as a job, not a crusade.

Mr. President, the editorial in Stars and Stripes dealt with a controversial subject based on a suggestion incidentally advanced, I think most forcefully, by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE.] In fact I understand the editorial referred to the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts that furloughs be granted after men had been fighting for a certain length of time, and it was obviously an attempt to influence opinion in the Army. In this case it does not seem to have been successful. But certainly there is every possibility of the Government using these publications to influence the men. These men are all under orders from higher officers. Certainly there is a possibility of the publications being used by one side in an election. They contain practically the only current editorials the men are able to read. I have attempted to deal with that situation by providing that—

(1) Nothing herein shall prevent the distribution to members of the armed forces of books, magazines, and newspapers which have a general circulation in the United States, or of servicemen's magazines or newspapers, such as Yank and Stars and Stripes, but the selection of such books, magazines, and newspapers of general circulation shall be fair as between the different political parties, and the conduct of servicemen's magazines or newspapers sponsored or paid for by the Government shall be wholly nonpartisan and nonpolitical, unless an equal amount of space is allotted in each issue to editorials, columns, or other argumentative matter supporting each party concerned in the Presidential election.

That suggestion, I may say, I received from someone in the War Department itself, and I know that the War Department was considering the establishment of some such policy. But unless we prescribe it, we have no assurance that such a policy will be adopted.

For instance, Senators may remember that some months ago a column by CLARE LUCE, the Congresswoman from Connecticut, was removed from the Stars and Stripes—the edition in India, I believe—on the ground that it was a political article, but at the same time a column by Mr. Drew Pearson was retained in the same number. I very strongly believe that if these publications are to be controlled by the Government, a rule should be laid down that if they are going into political discussions at all, both sides should be represented and given equal space. That seems to me to be a very logical method of dealing with the situation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the last remark of the Senator from Ohio is very apt. Theoretically it would be easy to have a certain amount of propaganda or election material in support of each candidate appear in the service publications. However, practically it would be very difficult to have a fair exposition of the merits and demerits of each of the candidates inserted in the service papers, inasmuch as the service paper is the most widely read, perhaps, of any publication which goes to the members of the armed forces. I hope very much that if the bill is passed and becomes law and the men in the armed forces are given the vote, purely political matters by extraneous writers—that is to say, by columnists, whether for or against the candidates—will be excluded from such publications. Otherwise it occurs to me that the picture the soldiers would get would be a lopsided one.

I do not want to dictate the policies of the publications, but certainly if columnists are to be allowed to have the exposition of their ideas and political philosophies appear in those papers, there would be the possibility of a lopsided presentation of the respective merits and demerits of the two candidates, because it is obvious that some columnists are much more subject to certain ideas than are others.

Therefore I think it would be a rather good idea if the publications were permitted to carry the writings of civilians who are removed from politics, and if articles such as the ones referred to were removed from the Stars and Stripes until the election is over.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his remarks, but I think the soldiers probably want to hear about the forthcoming election. I have no desire to interfere in any way with anything which may contribute to the education or information of the soldiers, or anything which may give the soldiers some interest in domestic affairs. I rather think it is better to let both sides be presented. After all, I realize that a very general policy is involved. All we would really be asking Congress to do would be to set up a flag and to say, "This is the kind of conduct we expect of you when you are, at Government expense, taking information to the soldiers."

So far as the Army and the Navy are concerned—I shall speak later of the O. W. I.—I have no fear of them, for if we tell them what they are supposed to do, they will do it, and do it in good faith.

If we do not, if we take no stand on the matter at all, I am not so sure that there may not be persons who will express their individual opinions, who will use their individual positions or their power over others to influence the outcome of the election the way they would like to see it go. As we have seen in the Senate of the United States, men are naturally partisan, and it is impossible to keep from being partisan.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator may be entirely correct. I certainly do not want to deprive these publications of anything which is in the nature of proper information or matter which would create proper interest; but I make the humble prediction now that no one will be satisfied. In my humble judgment, if political columnists are to be allowed to contribute their columns to these publications, no one will be satisfied that the presentation is just, fair, or equal. Even the editors themselves, if they work at it, will have difficulty in keeping the soldiers from being propagandized, quite often by so-called facts which are not facts at all.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, of course the question relative to the Stars and Stripes is a very important one and a very large one. I suggest that what I think would happen if the amendment should become law is that the War Department itself, here in Washington, would decide what columns were to be printed. I have a suspicion that the War Department has already decided. I think the War Department probably would pick out two columnists, one pretty well committed to one side, and one to the other, and would go down to the war ballot commission, and would say to it, "Do you think this is a fair selection of columnists on both sides?" The war ballot commission would naturally reach the conclusion, "All right; we will let these two fellows speak for us." Probably they would very soon become the actual mouthpieces of the national committees.

Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. LUCAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I shall continue to yield to the Senator from Maryland until he concludes what he has to say.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to point out that the service magazine published in World War No. 1, which had a wider circulation in proportion to the number of men engaged abroad, I believe, than the circulation of the magazine published in the present war, as that circulation is indicated by the figures mentioned by the Senator from Ohio, so far as I remember never contained in its columns any political propaganda of any kind, shape, or form.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, in that war the soldiers did not at any time face a Presidential election. The forthcoming Presidential election will provoke far more interest. As a matter of fact, the men in the armed forces do not have much interest in elections other than the Presidential election, I should say. I think we face a unique situation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I was about to point out to the Senator from Ohio a very cogent

fact with respect to the magazines and newspapers which are serving the servicemen overseas and in this country. The men themselves have complete charge of those newspapers and magazines. All the Army does at the present time, as I understand, is to send daily a certain clip-sheet service by airplane, and a daily cable service giving news items which the editors of the various service papers throughout the world can either use or consign to the wastepaper basket. In other words, at the present time the service publications are controlled by the men in the armed forces; and the boys in the service buy those papers. The Army does not spend anything, with the exception of expenditures for the service which is rendered at the present time under the set-up in New York City, whereby daily clip sheets and daily cables are sent.

Let me point out to the Senator an interesting bit of information. A moment ago the Senator said there is a magazine known as the Yank. There are 13 different editions of the magazine known as the Yank, which are sent to all parts of the world. The magazine has a total circulation of 825,000. In addition to it, there is a daily newspaper, the Stars and Stripes, with a circulation of 200,000. Furthermore, Mr. President, 1,200 camp and station newspapers are published perhaps once a week, and those newspapers are read by 3,000,000 soldiers in this country. In addition, on every ship which sails the seas there is issued a weekly bulletin which gives the important news items received over the radio or information relative to what has occurred on the ship.

While I realize that these publications are sponsored by the Army and the Navy, on the other hand, what goes into them, so far as news is concerned, at the moment is controlled by the editorial staff of the particular newspaper or magazine involved. That is a very important point. Great numbers of the members of the armed forces are overseas, fighting for liberty, and I am not sure that it is not an abridgement of the constitutional right of freedom of the press for the Congress to attempt to tell the men in the armed services what they can write and what they cannot write in connection with such publications so long as it does not interfere with military operations.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I read from a memorandum sent, as I recall, to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] by the War Department, which contains the following statement about the service publications:

> These publications are in part paid for by Government funds, because the cost of the necessary office and publishing space, of air or other carriage of news material, and of the pay of the soldiers engaged in the work is, of course, borne by the Army. The War Department is the sponsor of these publications whose editorial staffs are subject to Army discipline.

It may be that at the present moment there is no control over the editorial writers; but certainly it is natural for editorial writers, enjoying rather nice jobs, and not forced to go into actual combat, to want to keep those jobs. It is natural that they should like to please the men upon whom their appointments depend. It seems to me inevitable that they will reflect the opinion of the commanding officers in the particular regions. I do not see how we can escape that, so long as there is this complete control over pay and appointment, and over every act of the men who conduct such newspapers. I think this editorial about how the soldiers wanted to go home probably represented what the commanding officer wanted the boys to be thinking, rather than the view of the man who actually wrote the editorial, although he may have been a member of the War Writers' Board, or among those who are extremely interested in carrying on the war with greater vigor. I do not think the Senator is correct in saying that there is any freedom of the press today, when someone else has the appointment of the men who conduct it.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator misunderstood me. I know that the Army is the sponsor of these newspapers. I know that the War Department contributes a certain amount of money toward expenses, so far as keeping up the New York office is concerned, and so far as the clip sheets and cables are concerned. Of course, the Army is paying the men for serving their country.

The point I was making is that, as I understand, whatever goes into the newspapers in the way of news or editorials is not and has not been censored by either the Army or the Navy. Of course, the Army and the Navy, under military discipline, could probably close them up tomorrow if it were desired, as a part of the military objective.

Mr. TAFT. A man in some division in Italy who is editor of a newspaper which carries editorials every day which his commanding officer does not like is not going to remain editor of that newspaper, if I know military men. That is not human nature.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that. If the Senator will further yield, I agree with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] in the statement which he made a moment ago, in connection with carrying a battle page in the newspapers which are now sponsored by the Army or the Navy. As I have pointed out, there are 1,200 camp and station weeklies. That is a tremendous burden to place upon the Army and Navy, because they become the absolute censors of each and every daily or weekly, with respect to what goes into those publications.

Mr. TAFT. All those difficulties could be avoided if we should do what the Senator from Maryland suggests, that is, keep out all propaganda. This prohibition says that the publications shall be wholly nonpartisan and nonpolitical. That is the prime requirement. Then there is an exception—"unless an equal amount of space is allotted in each issue to editorials, columns, or other argumentative matter supporting each party concerned in the Presidential election."

We can avoid all trouble if we cut out all politics. If they wish to run one side, they must run the other. That is all this amendment provides.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not objecting to that. The only point I am making—and I refer to it again—is that these men are in the field, and have been assigned to this particular duty. On their own responsibility, and upon their own initiative, they are publishing what they believe are newspapers which will best serve the morale of the particular camps or communities where the soldiers are located.

I continue to make the point that we should refrain from taking something away from them in this hour of trouble. In other words, it is proposed to say to them, "You must do this and that with respect to the news you print." So far as I am concerned, I am willing to take my chances on what will happen in the 1944 campaign with respect to any type of political propaganda which goes into the service newspapers, so long as it comes from the boys themselves. That is the way the newspapers are being operated at the present time. I do not think we can lay down a policy which will work if the battle page of every such newspaper is to be controlled or sponsored by the Army or Navy. It would not have the right kind of effect upon the boys themselves. They would know that such material is "canned" propaganda. They would have nothing to do with creating it. From the angle of the newspapermen who are operating these newspapers, we are taking away something really worth while when we take away from them all initiative and all control. That is the point I make.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. On page 2, line 23, after the word "political" and the comma, we find the following language:

> Unless an equal amount of space is allotted in each issue to editorials, columns, or other argumentative matter supporting each party concerned in the Presidential election.

Those qualifying words relate only to a magazine or newspaper sponsored or paid for by the Government. I suggest that the Senator might consider striking out the language beginning with the word "unless", leaving all Government-sponsored magazines and newspapers wholly nonpartisan and nonpolitical. I think he would obtain a fairer consideration of the question than he would by leaving in the language to which I have referred.

Mr. TAFT. I have no very strong feeling about it one way or the other. I rather think it is better the way I have it, but I am perfectly willing to abide by the decision of the Senate on that question.

Mr. President, the second exception which makes clear the question of propaganda is at the top of page 3:

> (2) Nothing herein shall prevent the sending of any letter, magazine, newspaper, or other literature by any individual, corporation, other than Government-owned Corporation, or political committee to any mem-

ber of the armed forces, addressed personally to such member of the armed forces, and paid for by him, or by the person or committee sending the same.

It seems to me that if I, for example, should wish to inaugurate a campaign among the boys in the armed forces, the only effective means by which I could reach them would be to locate the mothers and fathers in every precinct in the State of Ohio and persuade those who are interested in my success or the success of the Republican Party to send Republican literature or arguments to those men. This amendment makes it clear that that shall be permitted.

Section 23 makes it clear that it shall be unlawful to censor any such material. There have been several aritcles in the newspapers citing instances in which apparently harmless political statements have been censored out of letters sent to servicemen, probably by some over-officious censor. I do not know of any charge that such a practice is general, but I think it might be just as well to make it clear that if such material is sent, it shall not be taken out of the letters on the pretext that it is too big, or that the volume is too great, or because of some other objection which might be made.

The previous section provides that no such material shall be considered in violation of the act if it is submitted to the United States war ballot commission. So, if anyone is afraid, or thinks he might be violating the law, he can obtain approval from the war ballot commission, and absolve himself in advance from any further criticism.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I should like to ask for some additional information as to how far the amendment reaches. On its face it seems to me that the language with respect to broadcasting is so broad that it would prevent the President, the Vice President, or a Member of the Senate or House from making an address over the radio and having the address heard by any member of the armed forces without subjecting himself to a fine and other penalties.

Nowadays we hear stated in peacetime on the floor of the Senate that such an address is political. If it is not political in form, it is in spirit. I have heard Senators state on the floor of the Senate that when the President addressed a joint session of the Congress and recited all that had been accomplished it was political—that it was a build-up for himself as a candidate. It has been claimed that other messages and speeches which he has made were political, as, for example, when he sent the message urging Congress to prepare legislation for the benefit of our soldiers upon their return—when at last peace shall come. It has been said by some that such matters could be used as propaganda to win the votes of the men in the armed services. If such speeches and such messages can now be held to be political propaganda, what would be the situation during the midst of a political campaign?

Mr. TAFT. In my opinion, an official message by the President of the United States is not political propaganda under any definition of law. I am not at all sure that the President will not address both Houses of Congress during the week before election next year, and that it will not be broadcast throughout the world. I am not certain that that will not be done, or that it will not be political propaganda. It would not be such under the terms of my amendment, and he would have the right to use such means, or conduct that sort of a campaign, if he desired so to do.

Mr. GREEN. I would remind the Senator from Ohio that the language of the amendment is, "designed or calculated to affect the result of any election." Even if the persons involved are innocent of any political motive, there is nothing to prevent someone on the opposite side from saying that they were trying to influence the vote, and if anyone should take part in such a broadcast he might be subject to a fine of a thousand dollars.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it would have to be a broadcast to the armed forces of the United States. The only way by which we can broadcast to those abroad is by short-wave radios. Every short-wave radio is controlled by the Government, and we either have to prohibit such broadcasting altogether, which is suggested by the newspapers to which reference has been made, or set up some commission to decide who shall speak over the short-wave radio and who shall not. I think the only thing to do is to prohibit any talk being made over the short-wave radio.

Mr. GREEN. Where is there anything in this proposal which would limit broadcasts to short-wave radios?

Mr. TAFT. There is nothing.

Mr. GREEN. Then why does the Senator from Ohio limit his remarks to short-wave radios?

Mr. TAFT. I had that in mind when I drafted the bill. It is an instance of where the Government has complete control. I know of nothing which would prevent any private person, anyone not in the executive departments of the Government, from broadcasting as he chooses.

Mr. GREEN. What is there to prevent the claim being made that a speech by the Senator from Ohio is political propaganda, even if it is not meant to be such?

Mr. TAFT. It happens that I am not an officer of the executive branch of the Government. The amendment would not apply to Representatives and Senators, unless the Government were paying for the broadcast, or sponsoring it. Then it would apply to us as much as to anyone else.

Mr. GREEN. Will the Senator point out to me where any such limitation is imposed?

Mr. TAFT. A limitation on what?

Mr. GREEN. On the nature of the broadcast, or on who would pay for the broadcast?

Mr. TAFT. I believe the Senator is perhaps correct. I intended to include the words "paid for in whole or in part with Government funds, or sponsored by the Government or any officer, agency, or department thereof," to follow the word "broadcast." The Senator is correct. Those words are not in the correct place, and they should be employed as a modification of the provision covering broadcasting.

Mr. GREEN. That would provide a limitation to a certain extent.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. I had intended to make such provision, and I shall be glad to make the change.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator to another place in the amendment where I hope he will make a change. The idea back of the pending bill was that the ballot commission should be an almost purely administrative body, and should not have any judicial functions. It was called to our attention on the floor of the Senate that there were certain functions which might be construed as being judicial, as, for example, deciding whether there had been interference with the election, and whether under the election laws the commission should report such a situation to the Congress. So the provision as to that function was stricken out. Under the pending proposal there would be conferred upon the commission very broad judicial functions, such as deciding what is propaganda and what is not, and the power to settle such questions as might arise under a variety of circumstances.

Furthermore, the usual rule of law as to a party being innocent until he is found guilty would be reversed. The amendment reads:

> No communication * * * shall be deemed to be in violation of this section if it is first submitted to the United States war ballot commission, and found by such commission not to be in violation of this section, but it shall not be compulsory to make such submission.

It seems to me that in order to be fair, the language should state that no communication, so called, shall be deemed a violation of this section unless it is first submitted and found to be in violation of the section.

That is specially true in view of the concessions already made to the minority by the majority. The first draft of the bill provided for five members of the commission. At least two were to be of the majority party, two of the minority party, and the third unidentified. The contention was made that the number should be evenly divided. So it was agreed that it be divided between two Republicans and two Democrats. Then it was changed further by providing that the two members were to be selected by the national chairmen of the two political parties, and it was stated by Senators on the other side of the aisle that it was intended, and it was really hoped, that the selections by the chairmen would be strictly partisan. It is now proposed that every questionable piece of propaganda, where good faith is questioned at all, shall be submitted to this commission and that the party shall be held to be guilty unless the commission finds that the matter is not propaganda.

In view of the fact it has been agreed that the commission should be bipartisan, in the sense that two members of it shall come from the Republican Party and two from the Democratic Party, the commission is really considered as though it were nonpartisan. If the submission is to be made at all, the party should be treated as innocent unless the commission shall find him guilty. Under the amendment he would be treated as guilty unless it found him innocent. It is to be remembered that if he has acted in violation of the act, he may have to pay a $5,000 fine or be imprisoned, or both.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island, it seems to me, misconceives the purposes of this section.

Mr. GREEN. No; I do not misconceive the purpose——

Mr. TAFT. I do not yield further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio declines to yield further.

Mr. TAFT. I decline to yield until I answer the question.

Mr. President, in the first place, there is no requirement that anything be submitted to the war ballot commission. If the officer's conscience is clear he may go ahead and issue any order or send out any magazine or any newspaper he wants to send, but, because Army and Navy officers are timorous, there may be cases where something looks a little bit political and they may want to get a clearance. So I put this provision in the amendment so that they can go to the commission and obtain a clearance, if there is any doubt whatever of the character of the material. If there is a real question as to whether it is political propaganda, it ought not to be sent. Obviously, it is intended that the Democrats on the commission shall have a veto on the Republican propaganda and the Republicans on the commission shall have a veto on Democratic propaganda if there is doubt as to the character of the matter. Of course, if we should do what the Senator says we should and grant the right to send any political propaganda which was not disapproved by the men on whose side it was formulated, the purpose would be destroyed. I say that if there is any doubt at all it ought not to go out under Government sponsorship, paid for by the United States Government.

I do not intend by this means to make this a judicial question. It is merely a case where a man can go to the war ballot commission, and if he can persuade the Republicans that it is not Democratic propaganda he can send it, and if he can persuade the Democrats that it is not Republican propaganda he can send it. But that is the only condition of sending material concerning which there is any doubt as to whether it is political propaganda. That is the correct interpretation of the section.

Mr. GREEN. I think the officer would always have to apply to the commission, and a majority of the commission, that is all on one side and one on the other, as the case may be, must find that it is not propaganda. That is a negative finding, and is contrary to the usual rules of law.

Mr. TAFT. Not at all; if there is any doubt about it, it should not go out under Government sponsorship. If the Republicans say that it is Democratic propaganda, it ought not to go out, and if the Democrats say that it is Republican propaganda, it ought not to go out. It is not a question of judicial determination; we are not submitting something to a court to determine a question one way or the other; we are trying to provide machinery for securing clearance on matters which are obviously not propaganda but which someone may, in an imaginary way, think is propaganda. Suppose it could not go out, who would be hurt?

Mr. GREEN. I do not know what the Senator from Ohio means by judicial finding. Here is a group of four men who have got to determine whether something is a violation of the law, and if it is a violation of the law the man guilty is subject to a penalty of a thousand dollars and imprisonment or both. I should say the Commission certainly was given a judicial function. The trouble is that these judges, according to the way it was determined yesterday they shall be selected, are not going to have a judicial temperament and, therefore, it seems to me in line 11 the word "if" should be changed to "unless," and in line 13 the word "not," the second word in the line, should be stricken out.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator wishes, I will eliminate the whole of paragraph (3); I am not wedded to that paragraph; I am merely trying to help administrative officers who may be timorous for fear of subjecting themselves to criminal penalties when they are not subject to them.

Mr. GREEN. I had hoped that this language had been so carefully considered as to make unnecessary the conclusion which it seems to me to bear, but, apparently, I was mistaken and, that being the result that is intended, every doubtful case of propaganda shall be considered as such and subject to fine and imprisonment unless the Commission shall find the opposite.

Mr. TAFT. Oh, no; the Senator entirely misstates the situation. If material contains political propaganda, a man is subject to fine and imprisonment unless he has submitted it to the ballot commission and the commission says it does not contain such propaganda, in which case that forecloses the question for all time to come and he can never be convicted by any court.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. Would this amendment, if adopted, have any bearing upon broadcasts by the President of the United States or the Vice President?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I think it would have some bearing on broadcasts by the President of the United States to the armed forces. I make no particular reference to that except when the Government pays for it. Of course the President could, as I say, make an official speech before Congress or elsewhere, and I do not suppose it would apply to that, but I think the Senator has probably suggested a correct criticism, that this would apply to an officer or person employed in the executive branch who happened to be a candidate when it would not apply to a man who happened not to be in the executive branch and was a candidate. I think that perhaps is a proper criticism by the Senator. I had no intention of doing that. What I am hitting at is the Government sponsorship or the Government paying for broadcasts or the circulation of material.

Mr. MALONEY. I think I am in sympathy with what the Senator wants to do, but I do not want to take part in any effort to prevent broadcasts by the President of the United States and rebroadcasts to the soldiers unless it be admittedly political and at Government expense. I would not want a political campaign speech paid for by the Government broadcast especially to the soldiers, but I do not think there ought to be any doubt about the freedom of the President and the rebroadcasting of any speech he may make which is not purely political.

Mr. TAFT. Of course what is a political speech is a question. However, I do not think there should be any discrimination between one candidate who is an executive officer——

Mr. MALONEY. I quite agree.

Mr. TAFT. And one who is not an executive officer. I think that is a proper criticism of the section and that probably an exception should be made to cover such a case.

Mr. MALONEY. I do not think there should be any question about broadcasts by the President of the United States to soldiers. I do not think we ought to leave any doubt at all about that.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that it would be unfair to have the President broadcast every day to the soldiers while his opponent would be wholly unable to broadcast at all.

Mr. MALONEY. I quite agree, but I am not talking about purely political speeches. I can see where the President under all circumstances from now on would be charged with making political speeches. I cannot conceive of a speech he would make which the minority would not say was a political speech.

Mr. TAFT. Can the Senator conceive of any speech he would make that would not be a political speech?

Mr. MALONEY. I can.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator is willing, I hope this may go over until tomorrow, so that I may take into consideration the suggestions which have been made, and I will certainly try to consult other Senators to see if we cannot arrive at a satisfactory method.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. LUCAS. I thought the Senator from Ohio had yielded the floor.

Mr. TAFT. I have not yielded the floor.

Mr. President, we have been talking about the Army and Navy, but this amendment is aimed just as much at the propaganda of O. W. I. and other departments. We must not assume that there is any exclusive communication to the soldiers controlled by the Army and Navy. It is also controlled by the O. W. I.

It is true that Elmer Davis issued a statement the other day in which he said everything went through the Political Service Division of the O. W. I. He made that statement in reply to an article by Frank Kent. Mr. Davis said:

> By an agreement made last spring with Maj. Gen. Frederick Osborn, director of the Special Service Division of the Army, the Army itself supplies news and entertainment which our troops overseas may receive. All radio programs going to our troops overseas are prepared and produced by the Special Service Division, which shares our short-wave transmitters for this purpose.

However, that is directly contrary to the evidence given by the O. W. I. in the recent hearings before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HOLMAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. The Senator knows who General Osborn is, does he not?

Mr. TAFT. I know General Osborn, yes.

Mr. HOLMAN. He is not an Army man; he has never been in combat, never expects to be in combat. He is a civilian assigned to this task of propagandizing the Army.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in the hearing on October 15 before the House Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Robert Sherwood, who is director of overseas operations of the O. W. I., testified:

> We are inaugurating a 24-hour-a-day flash news service from New York to Algiers, Tunis, and Naples.

Certainly that flash news service is going to be picked up by all members of the armed services in Algiers, Tunis, and Naples.

Mr. Hamblett, the assistant director of the overseas operations, testified:

> We have the responsibility of providing the Army staffs in the field with all the news that reaches them.

Mr. Sherwood testified further:

> In considering the overseas operations of O. W. I., we divide the world into four main parts, representing different functions, rather than purely regional divisions. * * * The fourth group may be described as "military-base areas"—places where our own American troops are based, such as Iceland, north Africa, the Middle East, India, and Australia.

I do not know why we need propaganda at all in Australia unless it is to go to the American boys in the armed services.

Mr. GILLETTE. Will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. I wonder whether the Senator has carefully canvassed the effect of his proposal, if it should be adopted, in connection with the provisions of the present Corrupt Practices Act, whether or not it so changes it as seriously to affect the act?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think it affects the current act at all. The only part of the current act which I had thought of incorporating was the penalty section, but I finally decided that rather than incorporate that section, which applies only to certain sections of the Hatch Act, I would write a penalty section again in the proposed act.

Mr. GILLETTE. Let me suggest to the Senator, in that connection, that he give some attention to this matter. I have a conviction that the Corrupt Practices Act covers what the Senator is attempting to do, but there is an additional question which comes in quite definitely. The provision of the Senator's proposal relating to the dissemination of certain literature by the commission, which takes the action out of the penalty provision, is in my opinion in direct contravention of the penalty provision of the Corrupt Practices Act and might be construed to have the effect that the mere action of the commission would prevent one from coming under the obligations and penalties of the present Corrupt Practices Act.

Mr. TAFT. The section referred to merely provides:

> No broadcast * * * shall be deemed to be in violation of this section—
>
> Not of this act—
>
> if it is first submitted to the United States war ballot commission, and found by such commission not to be in violation of this section.

It has no reference to the other sections of the Hatch Act. I do not think it is capable of such an interpretation.

Mr. GILLETTE. Let me further call the Senator's attention to the fact that section 2 of the Hatch Act, which amended the so-called Corrupt Practices Act, provides:

"It shall be unlawful for any person employed in any administrative position by the United States, or by any department to use his official authority for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the election or the nomination of any candidate" for various Federal offices, and a penalty is expressly provided for violation. Does not the Senator think that meets the situation he is trying to reach?

Mr. TAFT. No; I do not think it covers the situation I am trying to meet. I do not say that a man who distributes propaganda to the armed forces might not be subject to the Hatch Act; I have not studied that question; but I am quite sure it does not cover the field I am trying to reach by this particular amendment, to control Government propaganda in the distribution of books, magazines, and so forth.

As a matter of fact, the O. W. I. is doing much propaganda work today and the O. W. I. is certainly subject to the charge of being directly partisan. It is headed by men who are partisan. We have had repeated examples of O. W. I. literature distributed throughout the country, to attack the course taken by Congress, for instance, on the inflation issue. We have repeatedly heard of the distribution of all kinds of literature by the O. W. I. all over the world.

I suppose every one has seen the first edition of Victory, with a tremendous picture of the President, and several other large pictures of the President, which Mr. Davis himself admitted to be very much overdone, and improper, and which he said would not occur again. We have now had three of these great Victory magazines, printed on very expensive paper, scattered throughout the world, the third one even after Mr. Davis' promise. As I go through it I find it contains three pictures of President Roosevelt and two pictures of Mrs. Roosevelt. The O. W. I. has distributed throughout the world some 561,000 copies of the Life of Franklin D. Roosevelt, written up in a very skillful and attractive form, with pictures illustrating the President's life. That has been distributed all over the world, and undoubtedly a great part of it has reached members of the armed forces.

The O. W. I. has distributed in some parts of the world at least these so-called lapel clips, containing the President's picture, with a flag on the back. I do not know how many thousand of these lapel buttons, but at least 50,000, have been distributed throughout the world, supposed to be going to the Arabs. Whether the Arabs want lapel buttons, or whether they have lapels upon which to put them, I do not know, but the only way in which they can be gotten to the Arabs is to send them to the soldiers and have the soldiers distribute them.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Those could be very easily converted into campaign buttons, could they not?

Mr. TAFT. They are campaign buttons. There is plenty of evidence that the O. W. I. is engaged in propagandizing the entire world in behalf of the President, making him the symbol of the United States, if you please, and I see no reason why they will not continue, unless we adopt some amendment of the nature proposed, which will prohibit that kind of propaganda.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Do the clips to which the Senator refers have on them mention of a candidate for reelection for his fourth term?

Mr. TAFT. No; they have something in Arabic, but I cannot read Arabic, and I do not know what may be said.

The O. W. I. itself seems to believe it has a mission to serve. Mr. Hamblett, an O. W. I. official just returned from Sicily, north Africa, and the Middle East, testified in the hearings as follows:

> We have the responsibility of providing the Army staffs in the field with all the news that reaches them.

One of the chief means of news transmission today is short-wave radio. Last spring O. W. I. officials testified that

80,000 words of news were broadcast every day to foreign cities, and that they had 3,200 radio programs a week. They said:

The division has two responsibilities for programs to American troops overseas:

1. To produce and broadcast via short wave from transmitters in this country news programs directed at the armed forces but which also have tremendous propaganda value to a large eavesdropping audience.

2. To cooperate with the Special Service division of the Army (a) by providing broadcasting time on Office of War Information transmitters for network programs and for troop entertainment shows prepared by the Army; (b) to arrange for distribution and broadcast at the outposts of transcriptions produced by the Army.

O. W. I. has testified that all short-wave broadcast facilities in this country are under their control. No private person or commentator can broadcast at all from this country.

Representative WIGGLESWORTH asked Mr. Sherwood:

If a soldier in Africa is to hear short wave, it is O. W. I. and nobody else?

Mr. Sherwood replied:

Yes; if it is from the United States.

Mr. President, it seems to me perfectly obvious that the Government has at its command the most complete campaign organization that can be imagined. It seems to me that unless we undertake to say to the Government and to the Government officials, "You shall eliminate all propaganda," we are not furnishing a free election to the people of the United States; we are simply giving the vote to men who are receiving all the information from one side and who will receive no information whatever from the other side.

I agree that it is difficult entirely to prevent propaganda. There may be even officials or men in the Government who may slip in some Republican propaganda here and there. But I believe Congress should firmly declare the policy of complete impartiality for everything which is controlled directly or indirectly by the Government, and that is the purpose of my amendment.

I am willing within reason to make any changes which may be suggested, to adopt anything which will actually assist in preventing propaganda, anything which will remove objections that may be made to the provisions of the particular amendment, but, Mr. President, I think it is vitally necessary, if we pass a bill of this kind at all, that we undertake to see to it that there shall be no partiality on the part of the Government or any facility controlled by the Government in reaching the men who make up the armed forces of the United States.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, has the Senator from Ohio concluded?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. I send to the desk an article published in the Baltimore Sun of Wednesday, December 1, 1943, entitled "Bennett Terms Government 'World's No. 1 Publisher,'" and ask unanimous consent that it may be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

BENNETT TERMS GOVERNMENT "WORLD'S NO. 1 PUBLISHER"

(By William Knighton, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, November 30.—The Federal Government has set out to find out how many publications it produces, and what they are.

A few days ago Representative BENNETT (Republican, Missouri), a freshman Member, after a one-man investigation into the matter, inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of 441 Government periodicals. He admitted that it probably wasn't complete, but reported that no one, including Elmer Davis, Director of War Information, or any agency had a complete list.

He was correct on both counts. His list, it was learned today, is far from complete and it was admitted by O. W. I. officials that there isn't a complete tabulation anywhere.

SIX HUNDRED SEPARATE PUBLICATIONS

But from what the O. W. I. does know, Mr. BENNETT's list was very conservative, for there are more than 600 separate publications printed by the various agencies and departments of the Government; but the O. W. I. proudly points out that before the war and before the Interagency Committee began to whittle away at the number there were around 1,000.

The old questionnaire technique—but this time in reverse—will be used by the committee to get a complete listing of publications. This time the agencies will have to do the answering of the questionnaire, instead of the general public being forced to fill out the agencies' questionnaires.

UNITED STATES BIGGEST PUBLISHER

Mr. BENNETT, who calls the United States the "world's No. 1 publisher," says he turned his list over to Mr. Davis at the latter's request, and the fact that no one agency had such a complete tabulation proved to him "the need for coordination and new management in Washington."

"The only purpose of many of them," he said, "is to advertise the agency which puts them out and to drum up public and congressional support for a continuation of the respective agency's particular brand of alphabetical bureaucracy."

He also noted the recent testimony of August E. Giegengack, Public Printer, before a House committee that in the last fiscal year the Government used 161,611 tons of paper, or 40 percent more than in the previous year.

PRIVATE PUBLISHERS SUFFER

"At the same time," he continued, "private publishers have suffered a 15-percent cut in paper supply, are now faced with a 23-percent cut, and the Nation is engaged in another scrap-paper-salvage campaign."

The Missourian does not maintain that all of these publications are nonessential. In fact, he admits that some are needed and required by law. He does say, however, that others are not.

"I seek only to indicate the magnitude of this Government enterprise and to submit that it needs review from the standpoint of wartime value and legitimate Government activity."

THOUSANDS EMPLOYED, HE SAYS

He said he has no idea how many persons are employed in publishing the periodicals, but he added it certainly took "thousands and thousands" of them, naming writers, editors, stenographers, copy readers, and statisticians as being necessary.

Here is a summary of Mr. BENNETT's list—and he is approximately 30 percent off on the conservative side:

Daily	9
Every other day	1
Weekly	48
Semimonthly	12
Monthly	241
Bimonthly	8
Quarterly	33
Semiannually	3
Annually	20
Biennially	2
Irregularly or seasonally	63
Three times a year	1

Mr. BENNETT added another to his list when he received 25 copies of Schools at War from a Pennsylvania school superintendent, who refused to issue them to his teachers.

FIVE MILLION PUBLISHED

The magazine, about the size of a tabloid Sunday supplement, printed on slick paper, is issued by the Treasury Department in the interest of the war-savings campaign. This is the fifth issue, and 1,000,000 copies of each issue have been printed at a cost, Mr. BENNETT said, of $18,000 per issue.

The Missourian reported the Pennsylvania superintendent said in a letter that he had distributed the earlier editions of the magazine, but he had found them useless. He declared the teachers were selling bonds and stamps because they are good Americans and not because they needed to be jacked up by Government propaganda.

Mr. BENNETT also pointed out a periodical called Indians at Work, started in 1935 by the Indian Bureau. The latest issue, which he said has been sent to troops abroad, shows a picture of a Blackfeet sitting under a palm tree reading Indians at Work, and making the following statement: "Gee, it is great to get Indians at Work over here in north Africa. Thanks a lot."

ESSENTIAL WAR AGENCY

Thus, the Congressman concludes, the Indian Bureau has found itself to be an essential war agency.

The O. W. I. spokesman said that in going over Mr. BENNETT's list he had found a few duplications. It was pointed out that the weekly Victory was included both under the O. W. I. and the Office of Emergency Management.

To further the work of the committee, Mr. Davis early this month issued new regulations looking to stricter economy in the Government publication field. The Interagency Committee was set up about a year ago to review all periodicals and to eliminate all those not directly connected with the war effort.

As a result, there has been a reduction of approximately 20 percent. In 1940 there were 226,000,000 copies of publications issued, but through the work of the committee there has been a reduction of 42,000,000 copies. The paper savings has amounted to 7,733 tons, the O. W. I. reports.

The Department of Agriculture was the hardest hit in this respect, but only because it was the largest publisher of all of the agencies. Its output was reduced by 16,000,000 copies, 229 publications being eliminated.

It was estimated that only about 10 percent of the paper used goes for the publication of what is called "informational" publications.

A clearance officer is to be named in each agency, who must file monthly with the interagency committee a report listing all informational publications which have been cleared, either tentatively or finally, during the preceding month, together with copies of all such publications which have received

final clearance by the agency and which have been printed or processed during the month.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, the debate on the pending bill to give the men in the armed forces the vote has been prolonged unduly, it seems to me. Like most other Senators, I am anxious to have all alternative propositions considered. I am anxious to have each one given its due weight. Several amendments have already been agreed to. The bill has been improved thereby. However, I desire to read a very penetrating editorial published this morning in the New York Herald Tribune. The editorial is entitled "The Service Vote." Since it relates to one of the amendments which has not yet been fully discussed, I think the editorial should be read at this time:

THE SERVICE VOTE

The Senate is now considering a bill which has most important implications, both for practical politics and American constitutional theory. This measure provides Federal machinery to assist members of the armed forces to vote in national elections, a matter which concerns some ten million American citizens and which may well be decisive in the next Presidential election.

The necessity of insuring a full and fair vote by men and women in service is almost universally acknowledged. But under the Constitution control of elections is left to the State, subject to some constitutional provisions, such as the broad guaranty of universal suffrage in the fourteenth amendment. There is almost no uniformity in the measures taken by the States to provide ballots for the absentee service men, and two States have done nothing at all in this respect. Moreover, State regulations are often extremely cumbersome, showing little recognition of such military necessities as secrecy and shipping space. There is room—if there is no longer much time—for extensive debate on the constitutional bearing of the present Senate proposal. But it is difficult for this newspaper to understand Senator VANDENBERG's confident prediction that almost all the Senate Republicans would support Senator DANAHER's plan of proxy voting "because it provides a way for the boys who are doing the fighting to vote with complete assurance and with expedition, yet without destroying the necessary State control of the election process."

Any scheme of proxy voting, while it might not conflict with the specific wording of the Constitution, would violate that secrecy of the ballot which is the heart of the American system of suffrage. It would be most difficult to avoid frauds and errors in practice and in principle would be a most vicious precedent. Moreover, while maintaining "State control of the election process," it would be a greater invasion of State prerogative than the bill now under consideration, since it would force on the States a system of voting which is inimical to American tradition.

The intervention of Senate Republicans in earlier debates on service voting showed a very real comprehension of the party's responsibility to safeguard the Nation against abuses of power or perilous innovations introduced into the electoral system under the color of war necessity. They cannot now abandon their stand to plump for a legislative monstrosity which, whatever its practical effect upon the forthcoming election, would be certain to raise a controversy that would make the Hayes-Tilden dispute seem tame by comparison.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a few moments ago the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] made mention of the fact that the Senate was taking a considerable length of time in debating the pending bill. I agree with him. I also fully realize the great responsibility upon all of us in connection with the passage of legislation of the kind proposed. I make a very sincere request of the Members of the Senate that tomcrrow they talk on the pending bill, and on nothing else. I would appreciate having Senators respect that request. I know that if a Senator obtains the floor he may speak on any subject but I believe that in the interest of expedition Senators should talk on matters directly germane to the pending bill, for the next day or two, so that we may promptly be able to vote either for or against it. I make the request in the best of faith, and I sincerely hope that tomorrow we may either have the bill passed or defeated.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, referring to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for November 30, page 10134 thereof, it will appear that my very able colleague [Mr. MALONEY] yesterday called up Calendar No. 393, House bill 2207. The bill was acted upon at a time when I was engaged elsewhere in public business. The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] agreed that I might make a motion today to reconsider the action taken on House bill 2207. I do so.

I am in accord with the objectives of House bill 2207. I wish to see it passed. It is a good bill. At the time it was placed on the calendar, however, I prepared an amendment to it. The amendment was sent to the Department of Justice by the Committee on Immigration. A report was submitted to the Committee on Immigration by the Attorney General.

I therefore move that the Senate reconsider the vote on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator that I am advised that the bill has gone to the House. The first motion would necessarily be one to ask the House to return the papers to the Senate, in order that the Senator may make his motion.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the House be requested to return the papers.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] will be entered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suppose there is no objection to that procedure. When the bill is returned from the House, the Senator from Connecticut may make his motion to reconsider. I understand that the motion to request the House to return the papers has been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, December 2, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 1 (legislative day of November 18), 1943:

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS

First Lt. Mathew Valois Pothier, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1937.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Lucius Kennedy Patterson, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from December 10, 1943.

Lt. Col. Charles Robert Mueller, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from December 11, 1943.

Lt. Col. Charles Fletcher Davis, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from December 12, 1943.

Lt. Col. Clarence Mansfield Reddig, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from December 15, 1943.

To be major

Capt. Clifford Gordon Blitch, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from December 10, 1943, subject to examination required by law.

To be captains

First Lt. Joseph Arthur Gautsch, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from December 4, 1943.

First Lt. Albert Robert Larchez, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from December 6, 1943.

First Lt. William Thayer Smith, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from December 18, 1943.

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. Daniel Sumner Lockwood, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from December 11, 1943.

To be captain

First Lt. Kenneth Cheney DeGon, Dental Corps (temporary major), with rank from December 21, 1943.

CHAPLAINS

To be colonel

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Claude Skene Harkey, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from December 28, 1943.

To be captain

Chaplain (First Lt.) Leslie Albert Thompson, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from December 2, 1943.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Humbert W. Ziroli, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as United States naval member with the Allied Control Commission, to rank from the 1st day of November 1943.

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Eden T. Preston, October 1, 1939.
Curtis L. Tetley, October 1, 1940.

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be ensigns in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Walter C. Dillard, October 1, 1939.
Francis J. Grisko, October 1, 1939.
Roy M. Isaman, April 21, 1941.
Robert M. Elder, May 5, 1941.
Charles S. Lane, May 12, 1941.
Raymond M. Reynolds, September 10, 1941.
James F. Trawick, September 22, 1941.
Dan Dopuch, October 8, 1941.
Warner Clark, Jr., October 10, 1941.

The following to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Elbert M. Cyrus, Jr., May 6, 1942.
Edgar P. Berry, May 19, 1943.
James T. Smith, May 19, 1943.
Robert J. McManus, May 19, 1943.
Frederick G. Grant, May 19, 1943.
Robert H. Bradshaw, May 19, 1943.
William M. Morris, May 19, 1943.
Kenneth C. Ling, May 19, 1943.

Ensign Ralph L. Hashagen, SC–V(G), United States Naval Reserve, to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the 19th day of November 1941.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Thomas W. Anderson, CEC–V(S), United States Naval Reserve, to be an assistant civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 18th day of November 1941.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, Thou who art the "Day Spring" from on high, we praise Thee for Thy wondrous gift to this sordid world. Through Him we have courage and aptitude for great things and growth at last into the very best. With the spirit of repentance in our souls, we would feel for the hand of God and be sure that He is our Father. O lead our minds into the marvelous deeps of Thy patience and forgiveness.

We rejoice that Thou art not angered by our frailties and stupidities. Along the pathway of uncertainty, grant that our light may not flutter, giving us a sense of helplessness. Allow us not to be cynical or worldly wise, but inspire us to be young with the old wonder and enthusiasm, with the old daring and with implicit faith. In the constant rush of life keep us ever seeking the guidance of prayer and meditation, thus avoiding a life empty of spiritual power. We beseech Thee that with firm steps and certain hearts, we may move resolutely forward with renewed life, eager to write a new chapter in the scroll of human freedom. If we have been stubborn and deliberate in our offenses, we pray to be forgiven and let our hearts beat out the chant: "Glory be unto Thee, O Lord, Most High." In our Saviour's Name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on November 22, 1943, the President approved and signed the bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 244. An act for the relief of Morris Leff;

H. R. 273. An act to authorize settlement of individual claims of naval personnel for damage to private property shipped from Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, to San Francisco, Calif.;

H. R. 400. An act for the relief of Sigurd J. E. Wallstedt;

H. R. 560. An act for the relief of the Farrell Argast Electric Co.;

H. R. 800. An act to provide for the issuance of a flag to the nearest relatives of certain persons who die in service in the land or naval forces of the United States;

H. R. 1049. An act for the relief of the estate of Hyman Wiener;

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Fred A. Flanders;

H. R. 1202. An act to amend section 36 of the Criminal Code;

H. R. 1206. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to dispense with unnecessary renewals of oaths of office by civilian employees of the executive departments and independent establishments," approved August 14, 1937;

H. R. 1435. An act for the relief of Lillian C. Ferreira;

H. R. 1498. An act for the relief of Charles W. Ruckman;

H. R. 1555. An act for the relief of Arkansas Power & Light Co.;

H. R. 1622. An act to provide for a general term of the District Court for the District of Alaska at Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 1666. An act for the relief of Helen Engell Thompson;

H. R. 1769. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ina Mae Shipman;

H. R. 1887. An act for the relief of Harold E. Dalton;

H. R. 1889. An act for the relief of Andrew Williams;

H. R. 1918. An act for the relief of Edward A. Silvia;

H. R. 1920. An act for the relief of Marcus O. and Faye D. Rowland, the parents of George L. Rowland, deceased;

H. R. 2182. An act for the relief of John E. Haas;

H. R. 2244. An act for the relief of Frank and Nancy Foglia, parents of Frank Foglia, a minor, deceased;

H. R. 2600. An act for the relief of M. C. Roberts;

H. R. 2675. An act providing for payment to Nellie Starr McCorkle of accumulated leave accrued and payable to her deceased husband, Capt. John Ray McCorkle, under the act of August 1, 1941 (ch. 348, 55 Stat. 616; 5 U. S. C., sec. 61a);

H. R. 2824. An act for the relief of Alice Stamps and Henrietta E. Stamps;

H. R. 2905. An act for the relief of Walter R. Jones, Mrs. Norman S. McKinney, and Mrs. Ella Swenson;

H. R. 2915. An act for the relief of the Pacific Construction Co.; and

H. R. 3331. An act for the relief of Harry L. Smith.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2207. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a resolution adopted by the Fourth District Conference of the Eighth District of the Order of Ahepa, at Worcester, Mass., November 14, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an interesting article that appeared in the Boston Sunday Post, last Sunday, November 28, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a communication from Dr. Clyde McKee, Director of the State Agricultural College at Bozeman, Mont., and also a communication from Dr. Jessie E. Richardson, of the Department of Home Economic Research of the same institution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order for 30 minutes today, granted to me, may be transferred to tomorrow, at which time I may address the House for 30 minutes, after the legislative business is disposed of, and any other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PULPWOOD

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable pride and satisfaction that I bring to the attention of my colleagues today the accomplishment of a great American who resides in West Virginia, in my district.

Mr. Sattis Simmons, publisher and editor of the Jackson-Herald of Ripley, W. Va., has recently been awarded the first prize of a $1,000 War bond by the War Activities Committee of the Pulpwood Consuming Industries. Mr. Simmons proposed and carried through a successful Nation-wide plan to cut a cord of pulpwood for every local boy in the armed service.

The campaign was opened about 3 months ago through over 1,600 weekly

and small daily newspapers in 27 pulpwood producing States. The result was far beyond expectations and has possibly averted a threatening pulpwood shortage.

In Mr. Simmons' home county of Jackson the people turned out to cut a cord of wood for each of their 1,700 boys in the armed forces. More than 2,200 cords have been cut, and additional thousands of cords have been pledged.

The free press of America has shown its ability to aid in overcoming the shortage of an essential war material. It is a demonstration that the genius of America will solve every problem, if given an opportunity to do so.

So today I ask the Members to join with me in saluting Sattis Simmons and the people of Jackson County, W. Va., on their great contribution to the war effort.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of December 1, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS NO. 3

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Chairman of the Committee on Elections No. 3, I ask unanimous consent that that committee be permitted to sit this afternoon during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted to me today to address the House for 15 minutes, be set over until Tuesday next, following the regular order of business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes, after the other business on the Speaker's desk and other special orders, tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, also I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes on Friday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADMIRAL KIMMEL AND GENERAL SHORT

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, it is now nearly 2 years since the devastating attack on Pearl Harbor. At that time I demanded not only from my friends, but publicly, the court-martial of Admiral Kimmel and General Short, in order that we may have the whole truth and the complete history of that disgraceful disaster. Instead of a trial in the natural and legal manner, a commission was appointed to investigate and later filed certain reports. It is a bit strange that these high-ranking officers are not free to tell fully their side of the story. Is someone else being protected by their silence? Recently the press has intimated that both General Short and Admiral Kimmel are willing to waive the statute of limitations and stand trial at a later date, but there is serious doubt in my mind whether or not it is possible, as a matter of law, for them or any one else to waive in advance that statute of limitations. For this reason I am introducing today a House joint resolution which will extend the law, rules, and regulations affecting the prosecution of any one, military or civil, who was derelict in his duty at Pearl Harbor or in connection with that catastrophe, up to and including one calendar year after the declaration of peace with Japan has been finally signed and ratified by the Senate of the United States. I cannot understand why any one concerned, the administration or the State, War, or Navy Department would object to the passage of this resolution, in order to make sure that the alleged culprits will eventually be brought to the bar of justice and that responsibility, blame and punishment be properly placed on all officials, civil and military, who are found guilty.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution is as follows:

House Joint Resolution —

Resolution to extend the time limit for immunity

Whereas the disastrous attack on Pearl Harbor by the Japanese on December 7, 1941, caused shock and humiliation to the people of the United States; and

Whereas said attack needlessly caused a tremendous loss of life, property, and prestige as well as immediately jeopardizing the security of the entire Nation; and

Whereas the ability of the Japanese to successfully execute such an attack was a serious and alarming reflection upon those civil and military officials responsible for the maintenance of our national security; and

Whereas a Commission appointed by the President to investigate the circumstances surrounding such attack has reported their findings, and such findings have been released in part, indicating a grave dereliction of duty on the part of those military and civil officials responsible for our defenses and national security at Pearl Harbor; and

Whereas as a result of said Commission's report certain Army and Navy officers have been removed from active duty and the public has been assured that as soon as the exigencies of war permit, these officers will be court-martialed; and

Whereas the period of time provided by statute, the Articles of War, Government and naval regulations, wherein such prosecutions must commence is about to elapse; and

Whereas the public has been assured also that such limitations will be waived by the officers already named and suggested as having been derelict in their duty; and

Whereas as a matter of law there is doubt that such officers and the departments concerned have any authority to waive any such limitations; and

Whereas there is just reason for believing that there are those persons other than the military officers already named in the Commission's report, who may also share in any dereliction of duty that resulted in the Pearl Harbor catastrophe; and

Whereas any statute, article, regulation, or provision of limitation would operate in any event to bar prosecution of any such person whether he be civilian or military; and

Whereas it is highly important and vitally necessary, as soon as war conditions permit, that full and proper inquiry be made respecting this disgraceful national calamity, that responsibility be fixed, and that guilty parties, whether military or civil, be adequately punished, and that this matter is too grave and serious to permit parties who may be equally or more guilty than the Army and Navy officers already named in the Commission's report to escape their full share of the responsibility and any just punishment they may deserve: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That all statutes, resolutions, laws, articles, and regulations, affecting the possible prosecution of any person or persons, military or civil, connected with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe of December 7, 1941, or involved in any other possible or apparent dereliction of duty, that operate to prevent the court martial or prosecution of any person or persons in military or civil capacity, involved in any matter in connection with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe of December 7, 1941, or involved in any other possible or apparent dereliction of duty, are hereby extended up to and including 1 calendar year after the formal declaration of peace with Japan has been officially signed and ratified by the Senate of the United States.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article by A. Q. Miller, Sr., editor and owner of the Belleville Telescope, Belleville, Kans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a short editorial entitled "Congressional Report on the War" from the Shreveport Times, making complimentary reference to a recent trip made by a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein an article written by Bob Coyne, appearing in a recent issue of the Boston Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

POLITICAL SECRET WEAPONS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, gentlemen on the other side of the aisle seem to be gloating this morning over an isolated election in Kentucky.

As I pointed out to you some time ago, we, the Democrats, have two secret weapons with which to whip you Republicans. One of them is Wendell Willkie and the other is the Republican stupidity which permitted his nomination at Philadelphia in 1940.

Now, since Willkie has been exposed, and has had time to expose himself, he seems to have been rendered practically useless for that purpose. But if the Republicans in the House and in the Senate support that monstrosity which we call the Frankfurter bill, and which others call the Lucas-Worley bill, to transfer the power over elections to the Federal Government, as against the bill which we are proposing as a substitute that would give the soldiers the right to vote by absentee ballot, give them free air-mail service, and at the same time leave the election machinery in the hands of your States—I say if you Republicans support that monstrosity against our substitute, then we might feel justified in again relying upon that stupidity as an effective weapon in the next campaign.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced, at the request of the nurses of the country, a bill to give Army nurses commissioned rank. This is long overdue. Lack of it has given rise to confusions that very definitely impair the service. In addition to this, it is well to remember that the Army Nurse Corps has been part of the Army since 1901 and that it has been the only corps without commissioned rank. Curiously enough, most people, and to my amazement including the Army itself, have been under the delusion that when nurses received relative rank in the last war, it was actually commissioned rank. The granting of relative rank at that time served a very good purpose. It gave time in which nurses have been able to demonstrate they can accept the responsibility that goes with commissioned rank. The temporary period, however, is very definitely over and the need for commissioned rank is felt on every side.

Another thing that is not generally understood, the regular Army Nurse Corps has a limitation of membership of 1,875. The new emergency nurses, 34,000 to 35,000 of them belong to the Army of the United States just as do the WAC's. It is only reasonable that just as the WAC's have commissioned rank, so should the Army nurses.

RELEASE OF INMATES OF PENAL INSTITUTIONS FOR THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, I introduced a bill that would deal with taking the sound-minded, able-bodied men out of prisons in preference to fathers for the armed forces. I believed then that it was a sound and good thing to do. My beliefs have been confirmed by reports I have had from many sources. I find that in the District of Columbia 400 men have been paroled from prison and taken into the Army. They have served a probationary period and only 1 has failed. The reason he failed was that he impersonated an officer one day.

Mr. R. E. L. Smith, executive secretary of the District Parole Board, says that in dealing with these 400 men their whole outlook on life has been changed and that some of them are working now outside the Army, making from $100 to $500 a month. One is working as a mechanic, making $700 a month.

Ex-Warden Lawes, who is an authority on this matter, has demanded immediate release of all sound-minded, able-bodied men, that they might be used in the war effort. I see no reason why the Military Affairs Committee of this House should not take favorable action on this measure at an early date.

The records show that a number of these 400 parolees are now sergeants, 1 has been offered a commission but declined, which verifies my recent statement that these men only want an opportunity to serve their country.

Even in confinement they are doing their bit to the extent that they are able. They recently paid for three bombers through War bond purchases. Participating in the Buy a Bomber Drive, their original goal was $300,000, but these prisoners came through with an oversubscription of $983,000.

There are now 18,000 former inmates of State prisons in the armed forces. Many have distinguished themselves in action. One ex-convict is now a colonel. Behind these are still 120,000 in prison, nearly all working on war contracts. Some prison authorities argue that they are needed there. My answers to that statement is, put the Axis prisoners of war and the Japs now in concentration camps in these essential jobs in the prisons and give our men in the penal institutions the opportunity to redeem themselves and thus reinstate themselves in civil life.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

FEDERAL AID TO STATE OR TERRITORIAL HOMES FOR DISABLED SOLDIERS AND SAILORS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 861) to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this is just to increase the amount that the Federal Government can pay for taking care of the soldiers who are inmates of Soldiers Home?

Mr. MAY. Yes, from $240 to $300 a year, or an increase of $5 a month.

Mr. McCORMACK. And it is for disabled veterans?

Mr. MAY. That is right.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States," approved August 27, 1888, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 24, sec. 134), is amended by striking out in the first paragraph thereof "$240 per annum" and inserting in lieu thereof "$300 per annum."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall apply to payments with respect to the care given to disabled soldiers and sailors on and after the first day of the month next following the month during which this act is enacted: *Provided*, That said payments shall be made regardless of whether said veteran may be receiving domiciliary care or hospitalization in said home and the appropriations of the Veterans' Administration for medical, hospital, and domiciliary care shall be available for this purpose: *Provided further*, That no payment to a State or Territory under this act shall be made for any period prior to the date upon which the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs determines that the veteran on whose account such payment is requested is eligible for such care in a Veterans' Administration facility.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPT. LELAND M. MOWER AND LT. PERCY K. MORRISON—VETO MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 365)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the

President of the United States which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 1155, an act for the relief of Capt. Leland M. Mower and Lt. Percy K. Morrison.

Upon full investigation, by a board of officers, of the circumstances under which the money was stolen, responsibility for the loss was placed upon Captain Mower and Lieutenant Morrison, and the War Department approved stoppages against their pay which resulted in a refund to the Federal Government of the entire amount stolen.

The Board found, in part, that on March 8, 1941, Captain Mower, Quartermaster Corps, was bonded; that on that date Lieutenant Morrison, Quartermaster Corps, was acting as assistant sales commissary officer, but was not bonded; that Lieutenant Morrison was authorized by Captain Mower, in violation of pertinent Army regulations, to handle money; that Captain Mower directed Lieutenant Morrison to deliver the public funds in question to the base finance office and obtain a receipt therefor; that Captain Mower violated Army regulations in delegating his responsibility to an officer not authorized to handle funds and in permitting funds to be delivered to an unauthorized person; that Lieutenant Morrison violated Army regulations in delivering funds to an unauthorized person; and that the loss of public funds in the amount of $477.18 was caused by the violations of Army regulations by Captain Mower and Lieutenant Morrison.

The record in this case, therefore, indicates clearly that the two officers for whom relief is sought were guilty of negligence, and that the loss of Government funds was a direct result of this negligence.

In these circumstances, the responsibility of the officers in question is apparent. This bill was presented to me on November 25.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 25, 1943.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal and the message, together with the bill and accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Claims and printed.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

SUBSIDIES

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of the record, today I wish to present some facts and material which I think have a great bearing on this question of subsidies and inflation. I hope to have sufficient time within which to yield, and I shall be very pleased to do so, if any of the Members wish to help me discuss this proposition.

When will inflation arrive? Suppose you answer this question. But just as a thought, large-scale trouble between us and Russia with Europe and possibly England going communistic, or with military reversals in either the Near or Far East prolonging the war, we may suffer deflation before inflation arrives. But, anyway, here are some factors worth your consideration in drawing your conclusions.

The November 22, 1943, statement of the United States Treasury shows gold stocks $22,000,000,000; gross debt $170,000,000,000; war expenditures since last July 1, thirty-three and six-tenths billions, with weekly war expenditures topping one and eight-tenths billions. That is distributing money.

The Treasury shows currency in circulation last September 30 as eighteen and eight-tenths billions, against five and seven-tenths billions on October 31, 1920; four and seven-tenths billions on June 30, 1929; five and seven-tenths billions on June 30, 1933; and only seven and eight-tenths billions on June 30, 1940.

The first 8 months of 1943, bank deposits and currency in circulation increased about thirteen billions, and about a $35,000,000,000 increase since Pearl Harbor.

The Comptroller of the Currency recently announced bank deposits to the credit of individuals, partnerships, corporations on books of 14,661 banks as of June 30, 1943, amounted to $82,700,000,000. As the Treasury disburses more war checks, these deposits rapidly mount. The Post Office Department informs me that the people of this country have to their credit in Postal Savings about $1,700,000,000 and that these deposits are increasing at the rate of $30,000,000 weekly.

You and your fellow citizens now hold $26,000,000,000 of savings bonds subject to conversion into currency from 60 days to 6 months from the date you acquired the bonds.

June 30, 1943, 14,661 banks owned $57,900,000,000 of Government bonds. Bear in mind title 12, section 412, United States Code reads:

Provided, however, That until June 30, 1945, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System may, should it deem it in the public interest, upon the affirmative vote of not less than a majority of its members, authorize the Federal Reserve banks to offer, and the Federal Reserve agents to accept, as such collateral security, direct obligations of the United States.

Here you have reference to the Federal law which permits Federal Reserve notes—currency—to be issued in exchange for direct obligations of the Federal Government when put up as collateral. Plainly speaking, should the people who have bank deposits in their favor call upon banks for payments of those deposits in currency, banks can, with the approval of the Board, place the direct obligations they hold as collateral and draw currency therefor and meet the dollar obligations of the banks running to depositors. You would then have currency to either spend; store away; or return to the bank and thus reestablish another credit in your favor and in form of bank deposits.

Since the "economic washout" in 1929–1933 our people have saved and hoarded. This is evidenced by their payment of mortgages and installment loans, additions to cash surrender value life insurance contracts, mounting demand and time deposits in banks, increased postal savings, accumulation of "currency in hand," acquisition of savings bonds and other equities. This saving and hoarding on the part of individuals was so general and of such volume it offset deficit pump-priming of 1931–40 sufficient to prevent our attaining the 1926 price level. All during that period we sought "reflation" back to 100 of the 1926 price level, instead of fearing inflation.

Then came July 1940. We moved into the war program. With acceptance of war orders from allies, vast appropriations by Congress for our own military operations, shifting of men and women away from "made work" and civilian production to the processing of war goods for ourselves and for export, the stream of dollar billions began to widen. Notice was served on our people that in due course consumers' durable and nondurable goods would become scarce. We then began to mildly bid up prices, moving the wholesale prices in 1941 back to about the 1937 level. Office Emergency Management and W. P. B. came into full operation 1940–42, with priorities. July 1941 O. P. A. was proposed. January 1942 O. P. A. law was approved.

June 30, 1940, money in circulation only $7,800,000,000, but by September 30, 1943, this had jumped to $18,800,000,000, evidencing confidence in currency, although Bombay and Cairo are paying about double our price for gold, evidencing lack of faith in dollar exchange. Go to your lockbox, your home, your tin can, and other hiding places and count the cash and feel the confidence you now have in your currency. You now have to your credit, own and hold—all redeemable in currency—demand deposits, postal savings, cash surrender value of life-insurance contracts, and savings bonds. Furthermore, direct obligations of the Federal Government held by the 14,661 banks are redeemable in currency upon majority vote of Board of Governors and offer of the bonds as collateral by the banks.

This confidence in currency heretofore and presently maintained and exercised by the citizens of this country constitutes the force that "held the line." You have on your own choice, as a free economic agent, willingly held currency, demand deposits, postal savings, War bonds, and other equities convertible into currency. You have exercised confidence through holding. You have not wildly stampeded into the market for any and everything that was for sale or could be bought, thus ridding yourself of currency and its equivalent. You have prevented inflation in the price level except in a rather mild form. You did this—not the Government.

If you continue your confidence in currency—by refusing to bid—and through adding to your possession of the national currency as such, and together with a further acquisition of savings call bonds, demand deposits, postal savings, and so forth, and by this act of yours do not speculate on farm land, city property, stocks, bonds, debentures, commodities, and so forth, and thus attempt to run away from the ownership of money and its equivalent into the ownership of things, then pray tell me how inflation in the price level is to become disastrous?

But when you—the millions of people who own these above-mentioned billions of dollars' worth of credits, currency, and evidences of equities convertible into currency—once make up your free economic minds to proceed—as individuals or collectively—to make this conversion from ownership of currency and its equivalent into the ownership of things, then pray tell me what power there is that can stop you from effectuating inflation in the price of things, and to a most disastrous degree.

Do you want Congress to make your savings bonds noncallable? Do you want your present currency called in and the new currency dated as it is released? Do you want your bank deposits frozen? Do you want to become a nonfree economic agent over your very own resources? I trust our behavior, the behavior of the American people, will never make it necessary for Congress to take such steps in the name of another great national emergency. When will inflation arrive? Draw your own conclusions. Your answer is as good as that of the experts, whether they be radio commentators, columnists, cartoonists, bureau administrators, or others.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman is making a very fine statement on inflation and the route that money takes. The gentleman is an authority on such matters. I should like to ask the gentleman this question: When all the people have a great deal of money and want to buy things that are not available then, of course, we have inflation, but if all these "gadgets" that we want to manufacture after the war are available will not the money in people's pockets sort of vanish like snow on a hot day, and the danger of inflation disappear if there are sufficient consumer goods to take up the money in people's pockets?

Mr. CRAWFORD. If we proceed to manufacture these things and thus make them available, wages and salaries will have to be paid to the "pay-rollees" who do the manufacturing and processing. I assume we will continue to pay a living wage. If this be the case the workers will not have to spend for living these currency items to which I am here referring; so the question is still up to us and the citizens of this country as to whether or not in that case we want to use the current wages with which to pay living expenses or whether in addition to that we want to save some of that money or use some of that money so earned for speculative purposes, adding to it that which we have already accumulated, and go into the market and help bring about the very thing we saw occur in this country between 1923 and 1929, and then precipitate another economic wash-out. Furthermore, merely having money or buying power does not constitute inflation. But if you begin bidding against each other for what there is for sale and keep buying and selling and pyramiding the prices on each sale, price levels advance.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does not the gentleman reach the conclusion that when the War Production Board and other Government-controlled agencies begin to allow the manufacture of electric irons, refrigerators, automobiles, and things people are now clamoring for that that will take up some of this cash and these deposits?

Mr. CRAWFORD. This is my opinion about that: First, any time the War Production Board and other agencies created by the Congress through emergency acts, and so forth, withhold from our people 1 ton of material subject to conversion into consumer's durable and nondurable goods which can be converted as to manpower and material without interfering with the war effort I say that that agency is committing an economic crime against the people of the United States and tending to break down our economy and destroy our institutions. Second, again let me point out that the manufacturing processes to which the gentleman refers will call forth the payment of wages incident to that manufacture and the workers will have that additional spending power at their disposal. By keeping down production and creating unemployment it would force many of those who now have excess spending power to absorb part or all of it for living costs. But we should not at any time hold back production which can be carried on if material and manpower incident to the war are available for that production. Such a procedure is contrary to our whole economic philosophy. That is about as plain as I can answer you.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to say that I have no patience whatsoever with any Member of this House or any Government agent or administrator from the President down who tries to make our people believe that unless the roll-back subsidy programs as promoted by the administration's policy is put into operation, this country is going to an economic hell. I just have not any patience with such philosophy. I have too much confidence in the 135,000,000 people of this country to believe that they will ever submit their actions and reactions to any such type of propaganda.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. There are two things that occur to me regarding inflation. No. 1 is the picture that the gentleman has just given us in regard to the psychology of inflation. Unless we have the psychology of inflation, I ask the gentleman if it is possible to have inflation? If I do not want to buy these goods, and I am speaking of myself as an average citizen, and if the people as a whole do not want to buy these goods that are scarce, how can we have inflation or a price increase on those particular types of goods?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Suppose there are no scarce goods, suppose we go back to the situation that prevailed from 1923 to 1929, during which time we had one of the most perfectly stabilized price levels in all our history. For 10 years, from 1931 to 1941, we followed the line back toward the 1926 price level. We did not during 1921 to 1931 have any scarcity of goods, we did not have any scarcity of workers or unemployment to a significant degree, but you did have a people who wanted to speculate, and they proceeded to do so. They pyramided everything they could get their hands on, and most everybody was doing it, from the bootblack and the elevator operator up to the top man. We prepared the way for that economic wash-out of 1929–33 which followed and contributed to this enormous suffering that has occurred since. We can do the same thing again, only we can do it four or five times worse. Why? Because you have more currency in circulation, you have more demand deposits, you have more savings saved up which could be converted to currency and directed into speculation channels. We have gone out and told some 38,000,000 or more nonagricultural "pay-rollees" that they should buy these call War bonds for the specific purpose of saving, so that in the post-war days the bonds can be cashed and the money used to buy things. As free economic agents, these bond owners can then go into the market speculatively or otherwise. It has all become a national philosophy which we are trying to build into their brains and bodies. This inflation move is going to be determined by the people, not by the Congress. You cannot legislate our people against inflation if you leave these kegs of inflation dynamite in their hands to be used by them as free economic agents and, if they will, to go speculate and thus inflate.

If we would come in here and impose a seventy-five- to one-hundred-billion-dollar tax bill and proceed to collect it, I think maybe that might, through creating fear and absorbing savings, have considerable to do with preventing inflation, but the Congress will not do that.

Mr. HILL. Does the gentleman not think it is important that the Congress and the executive department should insist that every one of us, every citizen, understand the great economic danger that faces this country in the expansion of our credit and the debt that this country faces? If they understand that, we will not have inflation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the purpose of my taking the floor at this time and getting this factual matter in the RECORD. This is not a political attack. I am trying to get the people of my district to understand the economic power which rests in their hands. I am not going to control the people of my district. They are going to do just as they please until Congress takes away from them their right to act as free economic agents; and if we have reached the hour in our history where this is necessary and where a Government bureau must determine the material status of our people by permitting them to act, produce, and sell instead of proceeding to conduct their affairs by reason of legal rights, we are indeed in a sorry mess.

Mr. KEAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. It is the gentleman's opinion that those like Walter Winchell and many other administration supporters who have been making these fantastic statements about what may happen if the subsidy program is stopped are doing probably more to bring about the inflation psychology than any other people in the United States?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think they are just as guilty as anybody can be.

I am going to venture into a legal field that I do not know too much about, and go back to the Dred Scott decision. Take the reasonings there with reference to Dred Scott, his wife and two daughters and notice how denying the privilege of citizenship, either as to State or as to the United States, and denying him birthright as a human being, his material condition was defined. On that question we went to war, and later amended our Constitution and gave Negroes legal rights. This subsidy proposal, in my opinion, proceeds in the direction of letting a man own a piece of land, acquire feed, fertilizer, machinery and repair parts, and to that combine his brain and brawn to produce, and then dispose of that production only by permission, not by legal right—but by permission. When you determine my material status only by permission you may just as well say to me: "CRAWFORD, you have no right to be. From here on we will dispose of you." I am just not interested in that kind of Government for our people whether it is sought under a "we must have a subsidy slogan" or otherwise. The farm people of this country have legal rights which extend to their productive action upon which they depend for existence I insist that these legal rights of our farmers be protected and that not one single word shall be written which will allow them to exist, only by permission.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Speaking of producing by permission, what is the difference between that and communism?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not think there is much difference, but we will stick to our own field, as covered in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States as it has been amended.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article which I wrote some years ago and which has present pertinence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Los Angeles Times and a telegram from Mr. Robert E. Gross, president, Lockheed Corporation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a personal letter and a short news story from the Osceola (Iowa) Sentinel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a list of crops produced in the Imperial Valley of California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include therein certain articles and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

HOARDING AND WASTING FOOD

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, housewives are being asked daily to sacrifice and save, and, in fact, everyone is being asked to save oil, gas, rubber, coal, and food because of existing shortages of critical supplies. Nevertheless, the New Deal philosophy of scarcity is still in existence according to the following newspaper headlines: "Food Scarcity Is Main Worry of Dietitian"; "Carloads of Spuds Dumped"; "Dairy Association Predicts Greater Shortage of Milk"; "Serious Shortage of Beef by Spring Is Meat Council Forecast"; "Onion Shortage Here"; "Food Dumped Daily Despite Rationing, Dealer Tells Court"; "Tons of Pears May Be Lost"; "6 Tons of Meat Said To Be Spoiling Here."

As chairman of the subcommittee of fruits and vegetables of the Republican Food Study Committee, I have investigated the source of the above headlines and I have found tons and tons of food wasted and hoarded by Federal officials. This year we lost 27,000,000 cases of canned fruits and vegetables due to delays and bungling of bureaucrats. The Government has held too much food from the civilian population and permitted it to spoil. Potatoes, butter, beans, skim milk, and rolled oats have been allowed to spoil.

To waste money is one thing and to waste food is another, but money is much more easily replaced than food, which takes a year to produce. The hoarding and wasting of food is criminal. Farmers, Victory gardeners, food processors, and distributors have done a splendid job in the food effort, notwithstanding the New Deal handicaps placed upon them. Yet, the sad fact remains, we are losing millions of dollars worth of food that has been extremely difficult to produce. The food situation in this country is one of our most important and perplexing problems. It is my sincere conviction that a food investigation should be started immediately in order that we can be assured of having ample food for our armed forces, our people on the home front, and our associates in this war.

To bolster my accusation that food is being wasted, I want to call your attention to a report from our Caribbean Area Director of the War Food Administration, which stated:

> It is safe to say that damage due to delays and confusion in distribution, however, was at least five times as much as it would have been had distribution been through normal channels.

The Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands report further states:

> There is a lot of Dominican butter still in existence of which the Food Distribution Administration have paid 10 fortnights storage and owe another of yesterday. Storage charges alone now total nearly 18 percent of its original value, but its condition now is such that it will not bring enough to cover storage charges. Officials have been advised exactly 14 times, officially, of the presence and the conditions of these goods.

The report shows the following losses in the Caribbean area: Loss by barrel lard shrinkage 310,000 pounds, $250,000; Dominican rice shrinkage, 13,000 bags; boneless Cuban beef, 3,250,000 pounds at 25 cents per pound, $812,500; salt pickled spareribs, 900,000 pounds at 27 cents, $279,000; dry salt fatbacks, 750,000 pounds at 16 cents, $120,000; evaporated milk, 21,800 cases at $4 per case; onions, 3,750 bags, worth $28,800.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few blundering examples of why I am demanding action on my resolution to investigate the wasting of food. Another thing we need today is an inventory of all food held by our Government, which

will give us a picture of the age of the foodstuffs on hand. Such an inventory will give us an idea what foods should be disposed of before they spoil. It will save the Nation tons and tons of food.

UNCLE SAM IN THE BEAN BUSINESS

The Food Distribution Administration is offering for sale a large quantity of beans totaling 109,633 bags. Almost 140 carloads of these beans are on sale at the following places: Boston, Mass.; Elizabeth, N. J.; Rochester, Batavia, Niagara Falls, Buffalo, and Brockport, N. Y.; Richmond, Va.; New Orleans, La.; Kansas City, Mo.; Cleveland and Toledo, Ohio; Detroit and Grand Rapids, Mich.

These beans are now marked "U. S. No. 3" and "U. S. substandard" grades, which prove that the overpurchase and the length of time these beans have been carried has resulted in their deterioration. Now, they offer these beans back to the American consumer, and I understand it takes as many ration points to buy these low-grade beans as it does to buy the choice hand-picked. The American public is being asked to consume a lot of off-grade foodstuffs which have been permitted to deteriorate through the carelessness of Government overbuying.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman might add that right this minute the Government is paying a 60-cents-per-hundred subsidy on beans.

Mr. LANDIS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Anyone in the bean business knows that beans are very apt to become full of weevils after being carried through the summer months.

Canners do buy lots of beans for canned pork and beans, but they are restricted now by the War Production Board. Every bag of these stored beans could have been canned and sold to the American people or shipped abroad to the starving people of Europe and Asia.

From a report in the November 20 issue of the Weekly Digest on Food Distribution, the Government purchased 290,000 bags of beans 2 weeks ago, despite the fact that they have over 100,000 bags, which they are now offering for sale. I hope they are not going to store them for a year or two and then offer the spoiled beans to the public.

About the middle of October I wrote a letter to the Office of Price Administration recommending taking the points off beans, and received this reply from Prentiss Brown, then Administrator of that Office, dated October 18:

While it is true that the 1943 dried-bean crop is the largest on record, we should like to point out that it is not as yet completely harvested. In the two important bean-producing States of Michigan and New York, where approximately 35 percent of the total national crop is anticipated, the harvest is late due to a cold, wet spring. The danger to the crop in these areas from frost and wet weather is great. If anything should happen to the yet unharvested crop in these States, the quantity of dry beans available to civilians would be directly affected. The progress of the harvest, as well as the distribution of dry beans actually on hand, is being watched very carefully.

May I point out that this happened 6 weeks ago, and today we have almost 140 carloads of beans for sale.

I should like to mention a few things that have been spoiled, according to the Commodity Credit Corporation chart. We have had dried beans and peas, moldy or weevil-infested, we have had rolled oats, evaporated apples, canned peaches, fresh onions, spaghetti, canned tomatoes, wheat cereal, canned salmon, potatoes, evaporated milk, dry skim milk, strawberry preserves, frozen beef, pork trimmings, and canned chicken.

I am asking for an investigation because we have wasted so much food and so many different kinds of food in the War Food Administration that there must be something done in the way of an investigation to stop this food waste. We had a case in Zanesville, Ohio, last month, where we lost 20 carloads of skimmed milk. Some of the cans of milk that were spoiled exploded. There should be some investigation as to why these cans of milk exploded.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman has made quite an exhaustive statement with reference to the terrible waste of food on the part of responsible officials in our Government. I am wondering whether or not the gentleman from Indiana has called this matter to the attention of officials in our Government dealing with the problem, and if so, what were the results.

Mr. LANDIS. We had a potato deal at Vincennes last summer. I notified them of the loss. They started to dump 37 carloads of potatoes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Who was notified of the dumping?

Mr. LANDIS. They dumped them in my district, and I was there and watched them dump them. I notified Marvin Jones. He helped correct that situation and stopped the dumping. They tried to whitewash the case and said only a carload and a half were reported lost, but a later report showed that they had lost 22 cars of potatoes in that one experiment.

I have my resolution before the Committee on Rules, and I have written to the committee and Members have sent them speeches.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In view of the gentleman's statement, if the facts he has given us are true, and they appear to be undisputed, there should not be any reason why this matter should not be examined and investigated.

Mr. LANDIS. There is no question about it, the longer we delay the more we shall lose. We are losing tons and tons of food every day.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It is a crime.

HEARING ON PROTEIN FEED SITUATION

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Members of the House to a hearing that is to take place at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning in the Department of Agriculture on the protein feed situation. This feed situation, much as we hear about it, must be of interest to practically every Member of the House. I take this time so that each and every Member will have an opportunity of attending that hearing if he so desires.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 2, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m. on Wednesday and Thursday, December 1 and 2, 1943, for consideration of a post-war bill, to be held in room 1324, New House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Foreign Affairs will resume public hearings on House Resolutions 350 and 352, providing for the creation by the Executive of a commission to effectuate the rescue of the Jewish people of Europe, at 10 a. m. Thursday, December 2, 1943.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Petroleum Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Friday, December 3, 1943. Business to be considered: To resume petroleum hearings.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be an open meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Tuesday, December 7, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., for consideration of H. R. 2001, relating to penalty mail, at which time the Postmaster General and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, or their representatives, will be heard.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

946. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 186. Joint resolution to provide for the proper observance of the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of the adoption of the first ten amendments to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights; without amendment (Rept. No. 920). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 3761. A bill to provide for full military rank for members of the Army Nurse Corps, dietitians, and physical therapy aides, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROWAN:

H. R. 3762. A bill to provide for the use of patents in the interest of national defense or the prosecution of war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3763. A bill to relieve former postal employees who performed postal duties after induction into the military service; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 3764. A bill to amend section 3 (a) of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, relating to exempted securities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 3765. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. J. Res. 199. Joint resolution to extend the time limit for immunity; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 3766. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to present a decoration of the Purple Heart and a silver victory button to Charles A. Pratt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCORD:

H. R. 3767. A bill for the relief of Carl Ledford; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3830. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Tony Moskus and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3831. Also, petition of Edward Tolve and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3832 Also, petition of Don Sickmon and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3833 Also, petition of Paul Kline and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3834 Also, petition of Julia Fillo and 40 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3835. By Mr. NORMAN: Petition of Nira Woods, of South Bend, Wash., and 15 other residents of South Bend, urging passage of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3836. By Mr. HALE: Petition of the Maine Society of Public Accountants, urging that Congress establish as soon as possible a qualified nonpartisan commission composed of Members of Congress, representatives of the Treasury Department and independent lawyers, accountants, and economists to write a simple revenue law which will express a permanent and consistent policy of Federal taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3837. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Newton P. Stipp and others of Neosho and Newton Counties, Mo., urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3838. Also, petition of Paul Fransham and others of Buffalo and Dallas Counties, Mo., urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 2, 1943

(Legislative day of Thursday, November 18, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God our Father, before ever our yearning needs have broken into speech Thou hearest even the secret sigh of our fainting yet aspiring hearts. Every heavenly virtue we possess, every moral victory we win, every thought of holiness which shames our uncleanness is Thine alone. Forgive us that we have sought, with fame and riches and worldly power before our eyes, to build the habitation of our souls on foundations which in these testing days, when the floods have come, are revealed as sinking sand. We have seen the morn with its fair promise turn to desolation and weeping noon as men who have lost their way have blindly destroyed the garnished treasures of the ages and have blackened the good earth upon which they might dwell as Thy royal children.

Restore unto us the years which the locusts have eaten, redeem our failures, pardon our transgressions. Make our weakness the throne of Thy power. In this anguished day grant us the vision and the strength, O Emanuel, God forever with us, to make a place for Thee to reign within our hearts, to build that city where Thou shalt dwell with men, and sin and darkness, pain and sorrow, shall be no more. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, December 1, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1494. A bill for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency; with an amendment (Rept. No. 556).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 977. A bill for the relief of Clare A. Miller; without amendment (Rept. No. 557).

By Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 636. A bill for the relief of C. J. Toole; with an amendment (Rept. No. 558);

H. R. 1344. A bill for the relief of Paul W. Busbey, Mrs. Paul W. Busbey, Paula Busbey, and Mrs. Louisa Busbey; with amendments (Rept. No. 559); and

H. R. 1379. A bill for the relief of Gerald Estell Proctor; without amendment (Rept. No. 560).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 470. A bill to implement article 28 of the convention signed at Geneva on July 27, 1929, relating to the use of the coat of arms of the Swiss Confederation for commercial or other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 561).

By Mr. WILLIS, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 866. A bill to fix the compensation of registers of the district land offices in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 562).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Education and Labor, reported favorably the nomination of Dr. Clarence Poe, of North Carolina, to be a member of the Federal Board for Vocational Education for the unexpired term of 3 years ending July 17, 1946.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. CONNALLY):

S. 1563. A bill for the relief of W. E. Dowdell and June Dowdell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1564. A bill to relieve former postal employees who performed postal duties after induction into the military service; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BANKHEAD (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND):

S. 1565. A bill to amend section 8 of Public Law 729, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved October 2, 1942, with respect to the rate of loans upon certain agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 1566, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1567. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in Glacier County, Mont.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 1568. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, with respect to the requirement that old-age assistance under title I of such act be paid only to needy individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENTS TO THE REVENUE BILL

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to the pending tax bill, which I ask to have printed in the usual form, printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance. The amendment will also be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. TRUMAN to the bill (H. R. 3687) to provide revenue and for other purposes, is as follows:

At the proper place in the bill insert the following:

"That section 710 (a) (1) (relating to rate of excess-profits tax) is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) General rule: There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year, upon the adjusted excess-profits net income, as defined in subsection (b), of every corporation (except a corporation exempt under section 727) a tax equal to whichever of the following amounts is the lesser:

"'(A) Ninety percent of the adjusted excess-profits net income; or

"'(B) An amount which, when added to the tax imposed for the taxable year under chapter 1 (other than section 102) equals the following percentages of the corporation surtax net income, computed under section 15 or supplement G, as the case may be, but without regard to the credit provided in section 26 (e) (relating to income subject to the tax imposed by this subchapter): On corporation surtax net incomes amounting to $25,000 or less, 40 percent; on corporation surtax net incomes over $25,000 but not over $50,000, 50 percent, or $10,000 plus 90 percent of the corporation surtax net income in excess of $25,000, whichever is the lesser; on corporation surtax net incomes over $50,000 but not over $75,000, 60 percent, or $25,000 plus 90 percent of the corporation surtax net income in excess of $50,000, whichever is lesser; on corporation surtax net incomes over $75,000 but not over $100,000, 70 percent, or $45,000 plus 90 percent of the corporation surtax net income in excess of $75,000, whichever is the lesser; on corporation surtax net incomes over $100,000, 80 percent, or $70,000 plus 90 percent of the corporation surtax net income in excess of $100,000, whichever is the lesser.'"

Mr. TRUMAN. I should like to have printed in the RECORD immediately after the proposed amendment submitted by me to the tax bill a letter from Henry A. Bundschu explaining the amendment.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILSON, BUNDSCHU & BAILEY,
Kansas City, Mo., August 13, 1943.

Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HARRY: Attached hereto is an amendment to section 710 of the Internal Revenue Code which I have prepared in accordance with our recent conversation.

This section now imposes excess-profits taxes at the rate of 90 percent of excess profits net income but limits such taxes to an amount which, added to other income taxes, shall not exceed 80 percent of the surtax net income, which means that the combined normal, surtax, and excess-profits taxes of a corporation shall not be in excess of 80 percent of its net income.

The proposed amendment would give relief to small corporations having a small invested capital and a poor earning experience in recent years by limiting their over-all taxes to a percentage considerably smaller than the 80-percent limitation fixed by the present law.

We have divided the corporations which have a net income of less than $100,000 into four classes giving more relief to the smaller corporations—thus, a corporation having a net income of $25,000 or less would have an over-all limit on their taxes of 40 percent; corporations between $25,000 and $50,000 net income would have an over-all limit of 50 percent; those between $50,000 and $75,000 net incomes would have an over-all limit of 60 percent; those from $75,000 to $100,000 would have an over-all limit of 70 percent.

To take care of the corporations having an income slightly in excess of the top limit of each bracket, a notch provision is added which would keep such a corporation from being penalized by a slight increase in income over the tax of the next lower bracket. For instance, a corporation which has an income of $26,000 would, if there were no notch provision, pay an income tax at the 50-percent rate, amounting to $13,000, while a corporation having a net income of $25,000 would have the advantage of the 40-percent rate and pay only $10,000. Thus, the corporation would be penalized $3,000 in taxes for making an additional $1,000 income. Under the notch provision the $26,000 corporation would be given the privilege of computing its tax at $10,000 (the tax on $25,000 at the rate of 40 percent plus 90 percent of the excess over $25,000 which would permit a computation of its tax at $10,900.

This method of computing taxes through a notch provision is one which has long been in effect in other portions of the law. For instance, it is now in effect in relation to both normal tax and surtax on corporations having an income of over $25,000.

This proposed amendment would avoid penalizing corporations having an income slightly in excess of $100,000 by an appropriate notch provision although such a provision is inserted only to avoid injustices and not to give relief to those corporations. For example, the corporation which has an income of $100,000 would have a tax of $70,000. Under the present law its over-all tax would be $80,000. A corporation having an income of $105,000 would, if there were no notch provision, be taxed in the sum of $84,000. It would thus pay an additional $14,000 for making an additional $5,000 in income. Through the operation of the notch provision its taxes would be limited to $74,500 thereby avoiding the injustice which would result if there were no notch provision.

While the relief given is substantial, it still leaves a fairly heavy tax. Thus a corporation having a net income of $60,000 would pay an income tax not to exceed $34,000, permitting retention of $26,000. Under the law as it now exists that corporation could pay as much as $48,000 leaving to the owners only $12,000 of the original profits.

This amendment could be restricted in its application, if Congress saw fit, to privately owned independent corporations but to define such corporations with the particularity necessary in a tax law is extremely difficult; and it would be even more difficult to attempt to relieve the injustices which would result where a given enterprise fell barely outside the limits as so defined. The proposed amendment would not reduce excess profits tax of a corporation that made in excess of $200,000 net and only a very slight effect on corporations making over $100,000. For example, a corporation making $250,000 would have the option of computing its over-all tax at the rate of 80 percent which would give a tax of $200,000 which is the same as the present law, or, under the proposed law it could compute its tax at $70,000, plus 90 percent of the excess over $100,000 which would give an over-all tax of $205,000. Obviously, it would use the 80-percent bracket of the present law. A corporation with a net income of $150,000 would receive a slight benefit—a benefit of $5,000 savings of tax as compared with a $10,000 savings which a corporation making $100,000 would have.

It is a well known fact that, particularly in the Middle West, a great many businesses suffered so greatly during the depression and had so slight a recovery prior to 1939, that the base period used in the excess profits tax law (the years 1936 to 1939) does not reflect a recovery to their real earning power as it existed before the depression. This is true even though compared to 1932 and 1933 these corporations had attained a small degree of prosperity during the base period. In other parts of the country 1936 and 1937 were almost "boom" years, while the Midwest was suffering a great drought disaster.

The proposed bill will give relief to these smaller corporations which are now greatly in need of it and especially to those corporations which are now doing business in the 90 percent bracket. Many have already reached a place in their 1943 incomes where they are paying 90 percent of their current profits to the Government. The effect of this on the morale of the management of small corporations does not need amplification.

The relief given to the small corporations by the proposed amendment should not greatly reduce the total amount of taxes collected by the Federal Government, for large corporations with greater earning power are not affected. It does not affect even small corporations if they had a favorable earning experience in the base years or had a large capital investment in proportion to their earnings. It should also be kept in mind that when the earnings of the corporations benefited by this amendment are distributed to the stockholders they will still bear the weight of the individual income taxes which will absorb a large part of what is left.

In the preparation of this amendment I have had the very valued assistance and cooperation of Mr. Elmer B. Hodges, who is a member of Mr. Gage's firm. He is one of the outstanding experts on taxation in Kansas City. I have also consulted with Mr. Perry Shrader, another tax expert, and I have collaborated with Mayor John B. Gage.

If you wish any additional information or have any questions about the matter or if there is anything in the measure which is not clear we will consider it a favor if you will give us the privilege of furnishing the information and answering your questions.

Respectfully submitted.

HENRY A. BUNDSCHU.

Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3687) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUTLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REGULATION OF INSURANCE BUSINESS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1362) to affirm the intent of the Congress that the regulation of the business of insurance remain within the control of the several States and that the acts of July 2, 1890, and October 15, 1914, as amended, be not applicable to that business, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

A SENATOR VISITS THE THEATERS OF WAR—ARTICLE BY SENATOR MEAD

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Senator Visits the Theaters of War," written by Senator MEAD and published in the Postmaster magazine for November 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY LOUIS JOHNSON AT AMERICAN LEGION DINNER, OMAHA, NEBR.

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Louis Johnson, former Assistant Secretary of War, at a guest dinner at the twenty-fifth national convention of the American Legion at Omaha, Nebr., September 21, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FINLAND AND RUSSIA—ARTICLE BY JOHN O'DONNELL

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by John O'Donnell under the headline "Capitol Stuff," from the Washington Times-Herald of December 1, which appears in the Appendix.]

ELECTION IN KENTUCKY—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Old Kentucky Home's 'Good Night'," by Arthur Krock, published in the New York Times of Thursday, December 2, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXEMPTION OF FIRE-INSURANCE COMPANIES FROM ANTITRUST LAWS

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Pointed Questions by O'MAHONEY," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of November 30, 1943, and an editorial entitled "O'MAHONEY Turns the Tables," published in the Chicago Sun of December 1, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

REPORT BY SENATOR BUTLER ON HIS TRIP TO CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICA

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I should like to make a motion that the report of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] on his trip to South America be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I have read the report, and it covers bureaus and matters that fall under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency. For that reason I move that the report be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska is not present at the moment. Is the motion of the Senator from Missouri agreeable to him?

Mr. TRUMAN. I am sure it is, because he is a member of the Banking and Currency Committee. If it is not, I shall be glad to put it in any way that is agreeable to him, but I am sure it is agreeable to him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Nebraska, I do not want to make a statement in regard to the motion made by the Senator from Missouri or the subject matter of the unilateral report made by the Senator from Nebraska in regard to his pan-American trip. He asked unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document. Personally, I think that was a mistake, because it has turned out that it has aroused much controversy. The facts ought to be settled and determined before any document is made a Senate document because when anything goes out as a Senate document it is presumed to be accurate; but the Senator from Nebraska obtained consent. As frequently happens here, as a matter of courtesy, we consent to things that ought not to be done. I have suggested to the Senator from Nebraska—and I shall not go any further into it until he returns—that a certain course be pursued. I will wait until he is present on the floor to discuss it.

In the meantime I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Revercomb
Andrews	Hatch	Reynolds
Austin	Hawkes	Robertson
Bankhead	Hayden	Russell
Barkley	Hill	Scrugham
Bilbo	Holman	Shipstead
Bone	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Brooks	Kilgore	Taft
Buck	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lucas	Tobey
Byrd	McCarran	Truman
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Caraway	McFarland	Tydings
Chandler	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh
Davis	Moore	Wheeler
Eastland	Nye	Wherry
Ellender	O'Daniel	White
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Wiley
George	Overton	Willis
Gerry	Pepper	Wilson
Gillette	Radcliffe	
Green	Reed	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are detained on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is confined to his home with a cold.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO SENATOR-DESIGNATE FROM NEW JERSEY

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, Hon. ARTHUR WALSH, appointed by the Governor of New Jersey to fill the vacancy caused by the death of my late colleague, Hon. W. Warren Barbour, is present in the Chamber and ready to take the oath.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator-designate will present himself at the desk, the oath will be administered to him.

Mr. WALSH, escorted by Mr. HAWKES, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by Mr. TAFT, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. The act of August 2, 1939, entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," as amended, is hereby amended by adding thereto the following new sections:

"SEC. 22. It shall be unlawful for any officer or person employed in the executive branch of the United States Government, or any agency or department thereof, other than the Army and the Navy, to deliver or cause to be delivered to persons in the armed

forces of the United States any general communication, general order, Government magazine, Government newspaper, or other literature paid for in whole or in part with Government funds, or to make, or cause to be made, any broadcast to the armed forces of the United States, paid for in whole or in part with Government funds, containing political argument of any kind designed or calculated to affect the result of any election for President, Vice President, Presidential elector, Member of the Senate, or Member of the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall prevent the sending of any letter, magazine, newspaper, or other literature by any individual, corporation, or political committee to any member of the armed forces, addressed personally to such member of the armed forces, and paid for by him, or by the person sending the same.

"SEC. 23. It shall be unlawful for any officer or person employed in the executive branch of the United States Government, or any agency or department thereof, including the Army and the Navy, to censor or interfere with any letter or communication addressed to an individual member of the armed forces for the purpose of removing therefrom political literature or political arguments or other matter sent to such individual member of the armed forces by any individual, corporation, or political committee, unless such literature or other matter contains military information which may be of value to the enemy.

"SEC. 24. Any person who violates the provisions of section 22 or section 23 hereof shall upon conviction thereof be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Members of the Senate who were present yesterday and listened to the debate upon the Taft amendment, which is now pending before the Senate, must realize the difficulties thrust upon the Army and the Navy and the ballot commission with respect to the proper administration of the subject matter contained in the amendment. I have offered a substitute which I think covers the real objective attempted to be reached by the able Senator from Ohio in his amendment, and which will be administratively possible if my substitute is accepted.

In my substitute amendment I have placed all the responsibility for the administration of its provisions upon the War Department and the Navy Department. I leave in it the same features as are found in section 22 of the Taft amendment. I eliminate the question of judgment as to what political magazine is fair insofar as political propaganda is concerned. I undertake to say that in all these matters affecting servicemen in this country or overseas we must rely upon someone, and in my opinion we must rely upon the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy properly to carry out these functions.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Am I to understand that the Senator's amendment is exactly like my amendment, except that the Army and the Navy are entirely eliminated from the provisions of the amendment?

Mr. LUCAS. That is practically correct, but in addition to that, the ballot commission, upon whom the Senator desired to place responsibility which the committee does not believe should be so placed, is stricken from the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Of course the Senator realizes that the main purpose of my amendment was to require the Army and the Navy to be impartial, and of course the substitute proposed by the Senator from Illinois entirely destroys my amendment, except that he is willing to apply the prohibition to the O. W. I.; but so far as the Army and the Navy are concerned, he simply is eliminating them and permitting them to engage in political propaganda or anything else they choose to do. Of course, I could not possibly accept the Senator's amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. First, the Senator cannot cite an instance of the Army and the Navy having engaged in political propaganda, and I want him to do that in the course of the debate if he can. The Army and the Navy are engaged in fighting a war. The Army and the Navy are attempting to take care of the men overseas and in this country in such a way that their morale will be at the highest point at all times. Whenever we take away from the Army and the Navy and attempt to place in the hands of someone else the right to say what these boys overseas shall do in connection with Yank, in connection with Stars and Stripes, in connection with the other magazines and newspapers which go to them day after day and give them the information which builds them up to the highest type of soldiers, then I say we are doing a tremendous injustice to the war effort and that by such an amendment are militating against the effective prosecution of the war.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. Assuming that the Army and the Navy might play politics, is it not true that the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War both belonged to the other party at the time they were appointed?

Mr. LUCAS. Of course that is true. The Secretary of the Navy is one of the prominent Republicans of the country. He was a candidate for Vice President with Landon in 1936. He is an outstanding citizen of America.

Mr. ANDREWS. He is a good man.

Mr. LUCAS. He has made an excellent Secretary of the Navy. As a Democrat I defended him on the floor of the Senate when there were a number of Senators who would not vote to confirm his nomination. I think any reasonable man who wants to be fair and impartial will say that Frank Knox, as Secretary of the Navy, has done a remarkable job, not as a Republican, not as a Democrat, but as an outstanding American who looks to his country ahead of politics. And with respect to Henry Stimson——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. What is to prevent a regular campaign being organized by the Republicans and the Democrats among the officers of the Army so that they may in effect conduct political campaigns in all the camps in the United States and the camps abroad? I do not suggest that they would do so at the front, but most of the soldiers will not be engaged in active fighting. What is there to prevent such officers from conducting political propaganda? Whether it is Republican or Democratic, should it not be eliminated, and how is the Senator proposing to eliminate it?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I asked the Senator from Ohio a moment ago to cite one instance of the Army or the Navy at any time having played politics in this war.

Mr. TAFT. The answer is——

Mr. LUCAS. Just a moment. I do not yield further. I have more confidence, and I am glad I have, in the chiefs of the Army and the Navy than the Senator from Ohio has.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator mean——

Mr. LUCAS. I am not yielding. I do not desire to have the Senator break in on me. I want the Senate rules observed while I am participating in this debate.

Mr. President, insofar as carrying out the provisions of this amendment is concerned, I am glad that I have more confidence than the Senator from Ohio has in the two outstanding Republicans who are heading the war and the Navy Departments at this particular time in a creditable way, Mr. President, in a way that has the admiration of the allied world.

Mr. TAFT. Now, Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In the first place, answering the Senator's question about citing a case, I will say that there has not been an election——

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, there was one in 1942.

Mr. TAFT. If so, it was of very minor effect, and no one in the Army or in the Navy was particularly interested in it. But of course the decision is not made by the officers at the front. The selection of books is made right here in Washington by divisions of the Army and the Navy. The selection of the newspapers the soldiers are going to be allowed to read and the exclusion of those they are not going to be allowed to read rests in a department of the Army or of the Navy. The selection rests not in active Army officers at the front, but in special boards created for that purpose.

I ask the Senator, What would be the duty of the Secretary of the Navy if his attitude is as the Senator says? It would be to issue a general order to all who are in the Navy. In what terms? Exactly in the terms of the amendment I am proposing. Then, why cannot Congress do it? All I am asking Congress to do is exactly what the Senator says the Secretary of the Navy and the

Secretary of War will do if we leave it to them.

Mr. LUCAS. But the Senator forgets the other provisions of his amendment, which would be so exceedingly burdensome upon the ballot commission, as well as upon the Army and the Navy. I am speaking of what the ballot commission has to do with respect to censorship of almost anything that is on the border line of a political argument or political propaganda. No one would dare issue it until he submitted it to the ballot commission and obtained the ballot commission's approval, if he did not want to face a fine and imprisonment under the penalty clause of the section.

I return to one of the primary considerations I discussed yesterday with respect to the magazines and newspapers which are published by the boys overseas themselves—the Yank, the Stars and Stripes, and 1,200 other unit and local publications which are edited, prepared, and issued by the boys in the service. Not by my vote will the Senate ever take that initiative away from those men. I would rather have it in the hands of the boys at the front or the boys in the camps in this country than to have it in any other hands. We can rest assured that they will do a good job. If in these publications they wish to discuss political issues, I want them to do so on their own initiative. If in one of the issues they wish to condemn me, if I am a candidate for reelection in the next election, that will be perfectly all right. That is their privilege. It is the privilege of the newspapers of the country, and I will not vote to take away from the soldier who is fighting the battle for freedom, the right to carry on in his own way, as best he can, and in the best way he understands, in preparing and editing the newspaper of a particular camp or the newspaper which goes to the boys of our country who are overseas.

Mr. President, in that connection let me read a note which was given to me recently:

> The Saturday Review of Literature recently recommended the Pulitzer Prize to the magazine Yank for its outstanding contribution to American letters.

That is how good the magazine is. Yet, under his amendment the Senator from Ohio would have someone in Washington, someone in the Army or the Navy, to prepare a political battle page for this magazine, one writer for the Democratic point of view, and one for the Republican point of view, thereby suppressing the creative genius of the boys who are writing for a magazine that has been recommended for the Pulitzer prize.

Mr. President, the morale of the boys in the Army and the Navy must not be torn down in this way. It must be maintained as it is, if we want to have effective prosecution of the war.

These publications entertain the boys, they give the boys an opportunity to find out what is going on in the camps and at home, in their leisure moments during the war, if they ever have any. The boys who read the magazines realize full well that they are literature which is being compiled and created by their own fellows in the service in whom they are tremendously interested, for there develops in the military service a comradeship which everyone who has served in the armed forces during war knows is unique. That is one of the reasons why I cannot support the Taft amendment.

What I provide in the beginning of my amendment practically would take care of what the Senator from Ohio really desires. The Senator from Ohio and the Senator from New Hampshire are afraid of what the President of the United States would do if he should be a candidate for reelection; they are afraid of what he might do in connection with his broadcasts and in connection with the broadcasts of the members of his Cabinet and of other executive officers. My amendment would take care of that situation. I, too, want to have a fair and an impartial election, as does every Member of the Senate. I do not want to play politics with this bill at all; but, Mr. President, yesterday I heard the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Ohio indulge in what was politics, in something which was wholly irrelevant to the pending measure.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. No; not for a moment.

Mr. President, they dragged the O. W. I. over the political trail yesterday, at a time when very few Members of the Senate were on the floor. They had a great time on their side of the aisle playing politics with the pending measure, although everything they said was immaterial and irrelevant to the issue of whether we are to get the ballot to the soldier and give him an opportunity to vote. Oh, Mr. President, politics. They say we are playing politics with the pending bill; but every inference to be drawn from the remarks of Senators on the other side of the aisle is that the pending bill is a political measure for the benefit of the party represented by Senators on this side of the aisle. We are, however, expected to believe that the Senators on the other side of the aisle are pure, just as pure and undefiled as a new-born babe, on the question of politics.

Mr. President, I am amused. My good friend, the Senator from New Hampshire, has never played any politics since he has been in the Senate. He is certain to win the political Pulitzer prize for making such a statement as that, if one is ever granted.

I desire to read a statement which was made yesterday during the delightful colloquy between the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from New Hampshire. The Senator from Ohio said:

> Whether the Arabs want lapel buttons, or whether they have lapels upon which to put them, I do not know, but the only way to which they can be gotten to the Arabs is to send them to the soldiers and have the soldiers distribute them.

Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio did not take time to ascertain the facts about that matter. He did not take time to verify the accuracy of that statement. The statement was made for purely political purposes. The Senator from New Hampshire wants the people of the country to understand, as the result of that statement, that the present administration is attempting to send to the soldiers, wherever they may be, badges with a picture of President Roosevelt on one side and with a picture of the American flag on the other, and with wording in the Arabic language. What are the facts?

Mr. President, since I have been in the Senate I have found that more misstatements of fact are made on the floor of the Senate than in any other single forum in which I have ever participated. Many Senators seem not to care anything about the facts. Half-baked truths and distorted facts are the things which make the headlines of the newspapers in this country. I have tried a great many lawsuits in my day, and I always was able to win them on the facts; but here in the Senate we cannot do that and make the headlines.

So, Mr. President, in the wonderful address which was delivered yesterday by the Senator from Ohio in the course of the gossipy colloquy between himself and the Senator from New Hampshire, those two estimable gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, two of my good friends, the Senator from Ohio said, "Oh, these buttons and these badges are being sent overseas and are being distributed by the soldiers." Why did the Senator from Ohio make that statement? He did so because he wants the American people to believe, of course, that the present administration is now propagandizing the soldiers with President Roosevelt's picture and with a picture of the American flag.

Let me state the facts about the matter. In the first place, let me say that the information I shall now give comes from an authentic source. First of all, not a single clip was distributed by the O. W. I. to or through the Army. General Osborn, of the Special Services Division, United States of America, attested to this. He is in charge of all troop news, entertainment, and other channels to the soldiers overseas which might have the slightest bearing on the allegations made by the Senator from Ohio. I talked over the telephone to General Osborn this morning. He absolutely denied the statement which was made yesterday by the Senator from Ohio for political reasons.

The hard facts are these: When it became known to agencies, including O. W. I., informed as to military plans that sooner or later our troops would be in north Africa, it became clearly apparent that every possible device should be used to gain the good will of the native population and to help them identify an American when they saw one.

Anyone who understands the situation which prevailed in north Africa when our troops made the first invasion believed then that in that invasion we would lose many more thousands of men than we actually lost. Anyone who knows the Arab picture knows the type of people the Arabs are. It was for the

benefit of the troops, for the benefit of the boys who were fighting and dying, that the American flag and the picture of Roosevelt was sent in there. They were sent in order to create a feeling of friendship and good will for some of our boys who might be lost in the desert because of plane wrecks or because of some other military reason. The Senator from Ohio and the Senator from New Hampshire could not give anyone credit for such a motive. So far as the Senator from New Hampshire is concerned, everything done in this war is done for political reasons. That is the attitude from beginning to end.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator mean to imply that the soldiers in north Africa never see the clips or have anything to do with them? Do the Arabs wear blankets over the clips when they meet a soldier? What is the procedure?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator cannot be humorous with me on this question. He can carry on his delightful colloquy and facetious remarks with the Senator from Ohio, but to me it is a serious matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Perhaps the Senator from New Hampshire is funny without knowing it.

Mr. LUCAS. He cannot make a serious situation look better by a weak joke.

Mr. BRIDGES. Perhaps if I really wished to be funny, I would ask the distinguished majority leader to explain the Kentucky election. Then I think we should have some real humor.

Mr. BARKLEY. That might be comical, but not funny.

Mr. WILEY. That is tragedy.

Mr. LUCAS. Requests were made from north Africa—not originated in the United States—for some such device as what is called a lapel clip, which was sent in very small amounts, beginning in September 1942. I have before me the schedule of those shipments, the amounts, and their destinations. A quantity of 10,000, showing a picture of Franklin D. Roosevelt and the American flag, with an inscription in Arabic, was sent to Cairo in September 1942; 10,000 were sent to Bagdad in March 1943; 17,000, in English and Arabic, were sent to Asia Minor in January and February 1943; 7,000 in English and Portuguese, showing the American and Portuguese flags' are awaiting transportation to Cape Verde; 5,000, in English, showing the British and American flags, are awaiting transportation to the Fiji Islands.

Those people are not going to vote in the 1944 election, I take it. Even if they wear these devices on their lapels, what difference does it make from the standpoint of whether it is political or not? It was a good-will measure, and that was all.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wonder if the same procedure which the Senator is outlining was followed by other nations—that is, whether Churchill sent his picture to the Arabs in north Africa.

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot answer the Senator, and I am not interested in that question.

I should like to return to the point I made a while ago. I wish to make clear that the soldiers are not delivering these badges, as was stated yesterday on the floor of the Senate. The soldiers have nothing to do with them. They are handled by the O. W. I. It is the O. W. I. which is making delivery of these buttons in the proper places.

Since every American flyer who might be forced down in his plane in native territory away from the military concentrations wears a device with an American flag, with an inscription in Arabic, "I am a friend from America," does the Senator object to the fact that there is at least a chance, through the efforts of the O. W. I., that the flag might be recognized? If it saved one American boy who came down in the desert 75 miles away from his camp, all that was spent and all that was done was worth while. That is the basis of it. I challenge anyone rightfully to contend that it was political propaganda. As I have previously stated, it was for the benefit of the American soldier, and no one else.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does not the Senator from Illinois believe that it would be just as effective for the O. W. I. to distribute to the Arabs in north Africa clips bearing only a representation of the American flag, which is the symbol of America, rather than the picture of Franklin D. Roosevelt, or anyone else?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator may be correct; but what is the difference? Roosevelt is a symbol of something worth while throughout the world, notwithstanding the opinion of the Senator from New Hampshire to the contrary.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. Just a moment. I cannot be too serious about what is going on in north Africa, Italy, and other places. These clips are a gesture of good will, and, whether they carry the picture of the President and the American flag, or whether they carry only the American flag, they are worth while from the standpoint of saving the life of some American boy. An Arab who gets one of these buttons and wears it on his lapel may save the life of some American boy. That is the whole idea.

Let me tell the Senate what General Eisenhower says about it. The Senator from New Hampshire will not believe him, either, because, in the Senator's view, he, too, is playing politics over there. This is what General Eisenhower said in a cable from Algiers on October 7, 1943:

> Fall of Naples seems appropriate moment send you message of appreciation for work of Psychological Warfare Branch, which comprises O. W. I., O. S. S., P. W. E., and M. O. I. In Tunisian campaign, later Pantellaria and Sicily, and now invasion of Italy, P. W. B. has unquestionably made its contribution as an integral part of the fighting forces, and I look forward to continued valuable work by this branch.
>
> Equally important has been base propaganda in north Africa and occupation propaganda in Sicily and initial spots in Italy, where P. W. B. efforts, working in closest liaison with civil administration in north Africa and military-government section in Sicily and Italy, have greatly contributed toward the friendly and cooperative attitude of the local inhabitants.

What is the situation in Lebanon at this particular time? What is it in Palestine at this particular moment? Ask any of the Senators who went around the world what they found over there among the various tribes in those countries. Anything could happen at any time; and any honest attempt on the part of the O. W. I. or any other branch of this Government to cause that condition to subside certainly is in the interest of the American soldiers who are fighting over there.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the distinguished Senator from Illinois please tell me, so long as he has made a big issue of this question, what different effect is produced by a clip bearing a picture of President Roosevelt, worn on the lapel of an Arab, or some part of his clothing, as compared with a similar device showing only the American flag? I have always been taught that the American flag is the emblem of America, regardless of individuals and regardless of governments. It means America. Certainly those people know what the American flag stands for. If it is desired to place a picture on the clip in addition to the representation of the American flag, why not use the picture of General Eisenhower, or someone like him? He is known to them. He represents something.

Mr. LUCAS. No picture would satisfy the Senator unless it were a picture of the Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am sure I would like to see the picture of the Senator from Illinois on that clip. I would not object to it.

Mr. LUCAS. We will collaborate right upon that after this debate. [Laughter.]

One further word in response to what the Senator says. The good will of the Moslem world is of tremendous importance. This is evidenced by the fact that the recent conference of the President, Churchill, and Chiang Kai-shek was held in Moslem surroundings. I do not believe that Senators are fearful of the magic that might be wrought by the picture of the President of the United States on the burnoose of an Arab thousands of miles away from these shores. If so, I quote the well-known radio commentator, Earl Godwin, who said that in that event the clips were used in the wrong parts of the world, and should have been distributed in New York, New Jersey, and Kentucky. I am playing a little politics in the Senator's behalf when I make that statement. That is the truth of the matter. Godwin was right. These clips have absolutely nothing to do with the 1944 campaign; and

yet, judging from the colloquy yesterday, that was one of the big features of the 1944 campaign. Senators wanted the American people to believe that Roosevelt was trying to campaign in Morocco and some of the other countries in order to get the people of those countries to vote for him in the next campaign.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I was going to suggest to the Senator that, as I understand the pending bill, it is for the purpose of giving the boys the right to exercise their constitutional function. It is a recognition of a right which they already have. Does the Senator see any reason why we should begin to place restrictions about the boys so that they will be denied the right of seeing a picture of the American flag or a picture of the President of the United States? Are those privileges denied to other citizens of the United States? Would not such a denial to the American soldiers be a reflection upon them?

Mr. LUCAS. It would be a reflection upon their intelligence.

Mr. TUNNELL. I believe it would be.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. What does the Senator say about the circulation by the O. W. I. throughout the world, and at all places where the armed forces are located, of the magazine Victory containing a large picture of the President, as well as four or five other pictures of the President, and a generally laudatory article?

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the Senator from Ohio that I do not think it should have been done, and under the amendment which I have offered, as well as under the amendment of the Senator, it could not be done. I condemn such action as strongly as the Senator from Ohio condemns it. Under the amendment the O. W. I. could not engage in the distribution of such matter.

Mr. TAFT. I suggested that only to show that such things have been done and they might perhaps be done again. That is the only purpose of the suggestion which I made in my remarks.

Mr. LUCAS. I was dealing with the important point, though, with respect to the soldiers being taken, under the implication of the Senator, from their duties in order to deliver the clips containing pictures of President Roosevelt and the American flag.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I still am not at all convinced that the clips were not distributed by the soldiers. General Osborn's division in Washington did not distribute them. They were taken to Africa by the O. W. I. The O. W. I. does not have a force in Africa. Does the Senator, or does anyone, know whether they were distributed by soldiers in Africa?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I do not know. Once again I say to the Senator that I have to have faith, and if the American people do not have faith in their Army and Navy, then in whom shall faith be reposed in conducting the war?

Mr. TAFT. It is not a question of faith. The O. W. I. takes approximately 50,000 buttons to Africa and they face the question of how they are going to distribute them to the Arabs. What do they do? They ask the soldiers to distribute them. That is the only way the buttons can be distributed in Africa. I would not condemn the Army for that. The O. W. I. is speaking for the Government of the United States in distributing the buttons. I am simply trying to make it clear that under the pending proposal from now on the Army and the O. W. I. cannot engage in activities of such nature.

Mr. LUCAS. I will believe General Osborn and not the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I should like to invite the attention of Senators to regulations which have already been issued by the Army regarding political activity by officers. As I understand, the substitute offered by the Senator from Illinois would permit the Army and Navy officials to select the periodicals or make the determination with respect to them. The Senators opposing the amendment wish to write some further prohibition into the law which would tend to restrict or curtail the right of Army or Navy officials to engage in political activity. Am I correct about that? That is not a new subject. It has heretofore been thrashed out in detail on the floor of the Senate.

I will quote from a very eloquent and able speech by the majority floor leader [Mr. BARKLEY] on this exact question on the 8th day of April 1943, in which he quoted the present Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, regarding a statement which the Secretary had issued in connection with an order relating to officers becoming candidates for public office. May I read that into the RECORD at this point?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The following is the statement of the Secretary of War as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 8, 1943:

> In response to a question asked by the press concerning a revision of Army Regulations issued February 25, 1943, the Secretary of War at his press conference, April 8, 1943, made the following answer—
>
> The following is a sentence from the Secretary's statement—
>
> As far back as 1925 Army Regulations (AR 600–10, June 30, 1925) prohibited persons on active duty from taking active part in political management of political campaigns.
>
> So as far back as 1925 Army Regulations prohibited officials of the Army from taking active part in a political campaign.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for his statement.

Mr. HATCH. I shall not read the entire statement, but I ask unanimous consent that the entire statement made by the Secretary of War on April 8, 1943, as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 3125, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As far back as 1925, Army Regulations (AR 600–10, June 30, 1925) prohibited persons on active duty from taking active part in political management of political campaigns. As far back as 1937, Army Regulations (change 3 to AR 600–10, July 15, 1937) prohibited persons on active duty from participating in nonmilitary activities or interests which would tend to interfere with or hamper in any degree the full and proper discharge of their military duties, or would normally give rise to suspicion that such participation would have that effect. The above prohibitions were continued in effect at all times after they had first been promulgated. They were republished in the revision of AR 600–10 of September 6, 1938, which was the last revision of AR 600–10 before the current one of June 2, 1942.

In September 1941 the country being still at peace, the War Department relaxed the above rule as to elective office to the extent of allowing members of the Reserve components, who had been called to extended active duty and who were on leave status from public offices held by them, to run for election, on the condition that their election to and occupancy of such office would not interfere with their military duties (AG 000.1 (7–23–41) MB–A–M, September 26, 1941).

After Pearl Harbor, the country being then at war, it became essential to assure that all military personnel on active duty would devote their entire time and energy exclusively to the discharge of their military obligations. By War Department Circular No. 243, dated July 24, 1942, it was provided that "no individual on active duty will hereafter seek election or reelection to public office, or take an active part in political management or political campaigns."

Cases arose, however, in which this absolute prohibition worked unnecessary hardships, where members of Reserve components who were on leave status from public offices held by them were threatened with loss of substantial pension and retirement and other benefits, theretofore earned by them, if they could not stand for reelection. In consequence, the rule was relaxed by War Department Circular No. 413, dated December 18, 1942, so as to allow, in proper cases, individuals on active duty to become candidates for and accept reelection to public office held by them when they entered upon active duty, on condition that neither their candidacy for such office nor their occupancy thereof would interfere with their military duties.

The change, dated February 25, 1943, to AR 600–10, did not alter or modify anything in the foregoing. It merely consolidated the various outstanding directives, which were scattered in different places, and put them into one place, in the appropriate Army Regulations.

The War Department considers that the existing policy is not only wise and necessary from the point of view of the effective functioning of the Military Establishment in time of war, but, also, that it is the only policy which is compatible with democratic principles and procedures. Nothing could more directly expose a political system to the improper intrusions of the military, than to allow men to exercise military and civil (and more especially, legislative) office simultaneously. The existing War Department policy, which prohibits officeholders from exercising the functions of office while on active military duty, is essential for the maintenance

of the traditional American separation between the military and the civilian branches of government.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the able Senator from New Mexico for his very valuable contribution. It refreshes my memory by calling to my attention the position taken on the matter by the Secretary of War.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Reed
Andrews	Guffey	Revercomb
Austin	Hatch	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hawkes	Robertson
Barkley	Hayden	Russell
Bilbo	Hill	Scrugham
Bone	Holman	Shipstead
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Brooks	Kilgore	Taft
Buck	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lucas	Tobey
Byrd	McCarran	Truman
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Caraway	McFarland	Tydings
Chandler	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh, Mass.
Davis	Moore	Wheeler
Eastland	Nye	Wherry
Ellender	O'Daniel	White
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Wiley
George	Overton	Willis
Gerry	Pepper	Wilson
Gillette	Radcliffe	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

REHABILITATION OF DEMOBILIZED VETERANS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I appreciated very much the discussion which took place on the floor this morning related to the bill before the Senate. It is a very important measure, designed to afford the men of our armed forces an opportunity to vote at the next election, if it can be done constitutionally; but I wish to discuss for a few moments a still more important measure. I have reference to a measure to provide that when the boys come back the opportunity for physical and mental rehabilitation shall be given them here in America. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill that relates to that subject.

I have heretofore briefly discussed this question, adding my several thousand words to the many thousands of words already spoken on behalf of the rehabilitation program. I have discussed the matter on the floor of the Senate on 2 previous days.

The political ramifications of this legislation are endless, but to my mind it is a matter in which politics should have no part.

I introduce the bill and I ask, Mr. President, that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, and that it be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1566) to consolidate and coordinate governmental activities affecting reestablishment and rehabilitation of veterans in the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the World War Veterans' Act of 1924, Public Law 242, Sixty-eighth Congress, June 7, 1924, Section 430, Title 38, U. S. Code, be amended to read as follows:

"The Administrator shall establish a central office in the District of Columbia, and such regional offices and suboffices as necessary within the territory of the United States and its outlying possessions as may be deemed necessary by him and in the best interests of the work committed to the Veterans' Administration and to carry out the purposes of the laws governing the Veterans' Administration. Such regional office and suboffices may, subject to final action by the Administrator in case of an appeal, and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Administrator, exercise such powers for hearing complaints and for examining, rating, and awarding compensation claims, granting medical, surgical, dental, and hospital care, convalescent care, and necessary and reasonable aftercare, granting vocational training and all other matters delegated to them, or some of them, by the Administrator as could be performed lawfully by the central office.

"The Administrator may abolish any regional offices or suboffices when in his judgment this may be done without detriment to the administration of work of the Veterans' Administration and upon such termination all records and supplies pertaining thereto shall be delivered to the central office, or as the Administrator shall otherwise prescribe."

SEC. 2. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to assign a qualified representative or so many representatives as he may deem proper to each Army post, camp, and station, including discharge stations and each Navy, Coast Guard and Marine Corps post, yard, and station, including discharge stations in the United States and its Territories. It shall be the duty of such representative or representatives to consult with each member of the military, naval, Coast Guard, and Marine Corps forces, including the Women's Reserve components thereof, prior to discharge for the purpose of (a) informing him as to benefits afforded veterans by law, including national service life insurance; (b) ascertaining his vocational aptitude and experience; (c) directing him to suitable employment or training and educational facilities. The Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and Marine Corps shall require each member of the respective services, including the Women's Reserve components thereof, to submit in writing a statement showing vocational qualifications and preferences for future employment after discharge, such statement together with the complete service record shall be made available to the representative of the Veterans' Administration. The Administrator shall have the power to employ the facilities of other governmental and State employment agencies for the purpose of placing in gainful employment discharged personnel of the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and Marine Corps. The Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and Marine Corps shall make available suitable office space and facilities for such representative or representatives of the Veterans' Administration, shall facilitate and assist in arranging interviews and shall cooperate to the fullest with such Veterans' Administration representative in the reestablishment in civil life of discharged personnel of the services.

SEC. 3. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to assign a qualified contact representative or so many representatives as he may deem proper at each Army, Navy, Marine, Public Health hospital, or contract hospital or institution, in which members of the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and Marine Corps, including the Women's Reserve components thereof, are being treated or maintained. It shall be the duty of such Veterans' Administration contact representative or representatives to consult with each member of the Military, Naval, Coast Guard, and Marine Corps forces, including the Women's Reserve components thereof, prior to discharge from the hospital or institution for the purpose of (a) furnishing general information pertaining to benefits provided by the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration with particular attention to compensation, hospitalization, vocational rehabilitation, and National Service Life Insurance; (b) assisting members of the service forces in the execution of forms used in claims for benefits; and (c) directing members of the service forces to suitable employment or training and educational facilities as provided in section 2 hereof. The Army, Navy, Coast Guard, Marine Corps, and Public Health Service shall make available suitable office space in hospitals and institutions for such contract representative or representatives of the Veterans' Administration, shall facilitate and assist in arranging interviews and shall cooperate to the fullest with such Veterans' Administration representative or representatives in carrying out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 4. (a) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall be and hereby is vested with the authority, duties, and powers heretofore vested in the Director of Selective Service by paragraph (g) of section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, Public Law 783, Seventy-sixth Congress, September 16, 1940. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall have access to all records of the Selective Service System essential and proper to the exercise of the authority and duties hereby transferred to him.

(b) All orders, rules, regulations, or other issues made or granted in respect of any functions consolidated or coordinated under the provisions of this act and in effect at the date of its enactment shall continue in effect to the same extent as if such consolidation had not occurred, until modified, superseded, or repealed by the Administrator.

(c) It shall be the duty of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and he shall have authority to do all things necessary and proper to secure replacement of discharged personnel of the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, or Marine Corps, including the Women's Reserve components thereof, in their former positions and in securing employment in new positions to the end that every discharged person shall be reestablished in civil life as soon as possible after discharge; for the accomplishment of this purpose the Administrator shall have the power and duty to cooperate with and employ the facilities of other governmental and State employment agencies. If the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs deems such action necessary, he may create a special Veterans' Employment Service to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 5. It is further provided that the administration of any law creating benefits for veterans, the administration of which has heretofore been vested in some department or agency other than the Veterans' Adminis-

tration, is hereby transferred to the Veterans' Administration, provided the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may in his discretion permit the administration of any such benefit by the agency heretofore vested with it, when it seems best in the public interest so to do.

SEC. 6. Appropriations for the Veterans' Administration shall be available for the administration of this act, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amount or amounts as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in introducing this bill I have in mind not only the future of the returning young men and women but the future of our country, which is facing difficult times at best. We can well take to heart a lesson from the aftermath of World War No. 1 and avoid the obvious pitfalls which led to the catastrophes and bread lines of the late twenties.

In this war we are dealing with figures that stagger the imagination—ten or eleven million men and $300,000,000,000; $300,000,000,000 is a perturbing figure, but what should interest us most are the ten or eleven million men.

I am heartily in accord with the suggestion of the President in his message to Congress of November 21, 1943, which is Document No. 361. I am in full accord with every point made therein. Social security for these men of ours, these boys who come back, is an important matter and certainly should not be overlooked; nor should insurance, either Government insurance or Government-insured private policies; but the social and economic security of these men at the moment is the real question which I am discussing before the Senate today.

Already 500,000 men have been discharged from the armed services, and, from my investigation, little, if anything, has been done to assist them. With a discharge and a little money in their pockets, they have been turned loose on the streets to find employment as best they can. I understand that many of my colleagues are in receipt of messages from constituents protesting the manner in which their sons are discharged. I, too, have received such messages.

Mr. President, I am thinking not only in terms of these boys of ours; I am also thinking in terms of our beloved America. I do not want any sores in America that need not be there. I do not want these boys—and God knows many of them have gone through hell—to come back home confused and befuddled mentally, as many of them are, because they have gone through the hell of war and have been thrown out upon the streets of America with $100, $200, or $300 in their pockets, as suggested by the President.

No; America owes them something more. None of us who have been in a situation which caused us to become confused can forget what it meant to have a helping hand, to have the guidance and direction of someone with an understanding heart. I say to the Senate that the measure I am proposing is more significant by far than the one having to do with sending ballots to the boys. I am interested in seeing that when the boys return they shall remain voters, that they shall remain competent to take their part in determining the destiny of this great Nation. The youth are entitled to be protected.

I have in mind one message received by a colleague from a constituent, the mother of a son just discharged from the service, who, she protested, was given his fare home and nothing else. I can read between the lines of that letter. We are not quite as heartless as that. The boy had more than merely his fare home when he was discharged. What he did with it is a matter of conjecture rather than discussion. But we are realists. We remember what took place after the last World War. Leaders of veterans' organizations in this city have said to me it was that class which created the great problem which cost America billions of dollars. I know we are all concerned with our own petty affairs, partisan politics, or what not, but this is far above that field. This is something which calls for the preservation of the very fundamentals of America.

We can all be glad that the boy about whom I have spoken had the good fortune and the fortitude to return home safe in body and mind. But I ask any of my colleagues, if you had gone through months of torture in the hell holes of the East, or if you had gone through the fire of hell at Salerno or in the north African campaign, and were to come home with a discharge in your pocket, and were given a hundred or two hundred, or three hundred dollars, what would you do? If you were the average individual in the service of the country, what would the result be? Naturally you would feel like a duck out of water. You would be coming out of active service, out of war, and returning to the homeland, which knows not war, which cannot appreciate war, on which no bombs are falling. Frankly the tendency on the part of anyone would be to spend the money and go the limit. Then what? Confusion, regret, mental chaos. These boys are wandering on the highways and byways and the lanes of America. So what are we to do about it?

Mr. President, that brings me to an important feature of the bill presented by the administration, and incorporated as a part of the bill which I have introduced today. I refer to demobilization pay. That is an extremely important item. Our boys must be discharged with sufficient funds on hand for their immediate needs, but, more important than that is the mind of every returning veteran, and in his mind is the question: What will I do when I cease to be in uniform? I have no hestitation whatever in saying that 95 percent of them will want jobs, and I say, Mr. President, that our greatest problem is providing jobs for demobilized veterans.

I have presented to the Senate the views of two of our greatest veterans' organizations, the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Their expressions have been printed in the RECORD during the last 2 days. Their letters were written to me in support of the measure or the suggestion I am proposing today. It is important, to my mind, to know that both these organizations join in urging that veterans' affairs be kept under the jurisdiction of a centralized organization.

We already have such an organization, the Veterans' Administration, but it would seem that many others have a finger in the pie of administration of veterans' affairs, and those not already interested are doing all they can to become interested. I do not like that attitude. We already have too many bureaus and too many bureaucrats. We have a Veterans' Administration which is doing a fine job, and my bill suggests that the Veterans' Administration be given the sole responsibility in this angle of rehabilitation.

There is only one organization, I repeat, an organization established by law, to administer the affairs of the veterans, namely, the Veterans' Administration. The Selective Service System would now like to have a portion of the work to do. I say it is not part of their business or their work. We do not want the Selective Service System retained as another bureau or arm of the Government, whoever may be in power when the war shall end. There will be no need for it. Yet there is an attempt now to perpetuate that bureau in office. I say rehabilitation is no part of their work. The returning veteran will not wish to return to his selective service board for advice as to how to rehabilitate himself, but to an organization especially established for the purpose.

Mr. President, we have created a new man—first a man who was proud to wear the uniform, medals, and insignia of the service to which he belonged; now a man who will be proud to wear the button designating him as a member of the discharged armed forces of World War No. 2. I am certain we all understand what his attitude will be. I am sure we understand that he will wish to be ministered to as a war veteran by a veterans' administration, rather than by a selective service board.

Let us compare these two organizations. What is the function of the Selective Service System? Its function is to select the men for the armed services. What is the function of the Veterans' Administration? Now, Mr. President, we come to a complicated matter—the administration of benefits for our veterans. It will, I am sure, be of interest to the members of the Senate to go briefly into the activities of the Veterans' Administration. It was highly enlightening to me. Just briefly let us review the activities of this organization for the relief of World War No. 2 veterans and dependents from December 1941 to August 31, 1943.

During that period pensions for service-connected veterans were paid out in a total of $3,997,848.18, while to the dependents of veterans was paid $5,352,413. During the same period, under our national service life insurance benefits, cash payments for death have been disbursed in the amount of $9,416,947.90.

The approximate cost of hospitalization and domiciliary care for World War No. 2 veterans to date has been $4,301,095.96.

Who received this money? How was it spent? During that period admissions to hospitals and patients under domiciliary care totaled 26,052 persons. Remaining under hospitalization or under domiciliary care at the end of September 1943, were 7,799. It may be presumed that the difference between the admissions and those remaining is made up of those who were discharged, and there is no means of finding out where they went or what became of them. That, I insist, is reprehensible. I do not intend to imply that these men should be carrying identification cards or report as parolees. But I should like to see another figure in that report. Of those 18,253 men I should like to see a figure indicating that approximately so many returned to their previous occupations, so many obtained jobs with the assistance and guidance of the Veterans' Administration, and so many more did not wish to avail themselves of the services established for them.

Mr. President, it is vital to know how many mentally healthy persons live in America. If conditions arise whereby men are discharged and we do not know their condition, we are sabotaging our own security.

It will be apparent from the figures I have given that the Veterans' Administration is already fully familiar with the returning servicemen. It is cognizant of all the difficulties incident to discharge from the armed services of prior wars.

Mr. President, I have an outline of the activities on behalf of veterans of previous wars, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADMINISTRATION OF ACTIVITIES AFFECTING RETURNING WORLD WAR NO. 2 VETERANS

Ninety-three facilities (84,388 beds of all types with program for additional beds).

Fifty-two regional offices. (Veterans' Administration Bulletin No. 1–J, January 30, 1943, attached.)

Administers all veterans' benefits: National service life insurance and United States Government (converted) life insurance; protection of commercial insurance policies under Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended; pensions and compensation for disability or death; hospitalization and domiciliary care, prosthetic appliances, and out-patient treatment; vocational rehabilitation of service-connected disabled World War No. 2 (Public Law 16, 78th Cong., March 24, 1943, copy attached).

Emergency officers retirement pay, World War No. 1, and pays reserve officers retired pay; guardianship and supervision, in cooperation with State courts, over payments of any benefits made on account of insane or minor beneficiaries; burial allowances.

It also has under its jurisdiction other departments and agencies:

1. Reemployment of discharged veterans: Reemployment Division, Selective Service System; War Manpower Commission (see Reemployment Bulletin No. 1, September 29, 1943, copy attached).

2. Veterans Placement Service and United States Employment Service, War Manpower Commission (includes civilians).

3. Civil Service Commission, veterans' preference.

4. Federal Security Agency: Job training, rehabilitation, non-service-connected disability (State plans), includes civilians. (Public Law 113, 78th Cong., July 6, 1943, copy attached.)

5. Old-age and survivors' insurance: Federal Security Agency.

6. Unemployment insurance: Federal Security Agency.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, obviously, the Veterans' Administration should be designated to administer all veterans' affairs. It is for that reason that on November 29 I suggested to the Senate that it be the task of the Veterans' Administration to establish a division to assist in the reemployment of our veterans under two main points.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the two points printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Without objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Before his discharge from the service prior to or after the armistice, each veteran is to submit his qualifications and desires for future employment. His questionnaire is to contain a complete dossier of his preservice and his service record. It is important that this be done while he is still under military jurisdiction and discipline.

(I would stress here again the importance of having each man's desires as to employment and locality of employment established. We cannot turn these young men onto the streets without some concrete objective for their future. Demobilization pay is important only if there is a definite plan: Where they are going; what they are going to do. That plan should be executed immediately upon their discharge. If we do not, they will pile up in every large city and community of the country—again the beginning of the bread line.)

2. Acting upon information contained in the questionnaire, an employment expert of the Veterans' Administration will personally consult with each of the veterans about to be discharged. Through the facilities of other organizations—American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Red Cross, State and Government Employment Services, the United States Employment Service, etc—this operative will have at his disposal recorded lists of jobs and of qualifications for employment therein. After discussion with the veteran, through his experience and training, he will be in a position to determine the man's qualifications for the job best suited for him. He will know the locality to which the young man wishes to return, and why. He will not act arbitrarily, but will attempt to guide the veteran through the confusion of this readjustment—return him to the section of the country which he desires, with a definite appointment for trial to the job he wants.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, again I strongly urge the Senate and the Congress as a whole to consider the immediate plight of the returning serviceman. Give him money in his pocket, and a job to look forward to; do not turn him loose on the streets without first offering him all the facilities to obtain reemployment and readjust himself to normal, everyday life. He cannot immediately forget all he has learned in the service.

World War No. 1 should have taught us many lessons, among them, that the returning servicemen, fresh from the grimness of battle and death, must not be expected immediately to adjust themselves to the normal, quiet channels of everyday life. They have lived each day for the moment; and those periods when they touched upon civilian life while on leave, were days that were carefree and happy, days when they were not held under disciplinary restraint, and when the dollar in their pockets was for only the moment's pleasure. Such responsibility as they did assume was taken from them and automatically transferred to the government of their commanding officers.

Mr. President, the outline contained in my bill is not a plan for the future. It is a plan for the immediate now, and I trust the bill will receive the immediate consideration of whatever committee takes charge of it. Failure to do this job will mean the stabbing of America in the back.

The plan is a plan for this very hour. At this very hour, within the boundaries of our country, a hundred men, or 200 men, or 300 men, are doffing the uniform they have worn for months, or years. It may startle Senators to learn that at this very moment there are over 500,000 discharged servicemen back in civilian life, with little if any aid coming from us in their readjustment.

I repeat the figures I gave yesterday. In Cleveland, Ohio, 130,000 men were taken into the service. There have already returned to that one city alone over 7,000 men; and men discharged from the services are pouring back at the rate of 35 or 40 a day into that one city. Think of what the figure amounts to in the whole country. These men have gone through the stress and hell of war, and we are sending them back into the stream of life as though they were normal and ready to take what you and I are taking every day.

Mr. President, if we fail now we may at some time in the not too distant future be cursed for our failure.

There have been these thousands of men discharged. There will be thousands more discharged before Christmas, and men will continue to be discharged, according to the record presented on the floor by the majority leader, at the rate of from 70,000 to 80,000 a month. That includes those who are injured physically, those who are injured mentally, those who have both kinds of injury. We are making provision for their physical rehabilitation. But I say we must not delay a day, we should not delay an hour, in taking appropriate action so that these boys, these heroes who are giving their all, may have a little of the paternalism, a little of the paternal handling and consideration, a little of direction and guidance, to which they are justly entitled.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of

September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting in time of war by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to speak not more than 10 minutes on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and from a little different angle than that from which it has previously been discussed. The amendment, of course, would amend the measure before the Senate, but as a matter of actual fact it would also amend the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. The amendment definitely discloses its purpose by its opening sentence, which reads:

SEC. —. The act of August 2, 1939, entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," as amended, is hereby amended by adding thereto the following new sections.

To amend the Corrupt Practices Act, the so-called Hatch Act.

Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio and also the substitute proposal offered by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are subject to the charge that they create a new statutory crime, a statutory crime in a field which embraces the most cherished right of the American people. That being the case, it follows as night follows day that all the elements of the crime, if there is ever to be a conviction, must be proved, and proved beyond a reasonable doubt.

I do not know whether the distinguished Senator from Ohio ever had the misfortune to serve as a prosecuting attorney, but I should like to ask a few questions in analyzing this proposal.

What are the elements which will constitute this new crime and which must be proven if a conviction under it shall ever be secured? I venture the assertion that it will be an absolute impossibility to secure a conviction under it.

What is the first factor? That it shall be unlawful for any officer or person employed in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, to do certain things.

At this point I call attention to the fact that the type of literature which is sought to be controlled could be disseminated by the senatorial committees of this body on either side, and by similar committees on the House side, and not be brought within the purview of this measure. The political committees which are set up in the legislative branch or in other branches could send out such literature and not be brought within the purview of the proposed amendment if it became law. That is the first factor.

What is the next factor? That the type of literature in question must be delivered or caused to be delivered. That is a factor in the crime that must be proved.

Delivered where?

To persons—

Not one person. It must be delivered to more than one person.

Where must it be delivered?—

in the armed forces of the United States.

Where? In Africa? Yes. In India? Yes. In Alabama? Yes. In Iowa? Yes. It is an attempt to throw around the men in the armed forces of the United States a safeguard which would not be thrown around citizens outside the armed forces. That is a factor.

What is the next factor? That it must be—

Literature paid for in whole or in part with Government funds, or sponsored by the Government or any officer, agency, or department thereof, including the Army and Navy.

That is the next factor which must be proved.

What is the next factor? That it is such matter—

containing political argument or political propaganda of any kind.

What constitutes political propaganda? The reference is to political propaganda, not partisan propaganda. Any prosecutor assigned to prosecute under such an act would be faced with proving that the matter was political propaganda and political argument.

What is the next factor? That it is—

designed or calculated to affect the result of any election for President, Vice President, Presidential elector, Member of the Senate, or Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I will ask any prosecutor how he would prove that. Here I will interpolate several questions: Where would a prosecutor prove it? Where would the venue of the crime be? When would the crime be completed? It would have to be completed by delivery in New Delhi, for instance. It could not be completed until there was delivery to the persons there. Where would the venue of the crime be? How would it be possible to prove all those elements of the crime in order to secure a conviction, and where would they be proved? Where would be the jurisdiction of the venue of the crime?

What is another factor? It is whether the new commission which is to be created shall exercise a judicial function superseding the amendment of the act to which it applies—not the pending measure—but the so-called Hatch Act. It is left to the commission to determine whether an act violates this section or does not violate it. That is a judicial act. Does any person, does any lawyer in the United States Senate or elsewhere, think that such a decision, made by a commission, would not be evidential matter which would prevent a conviction under the Corrupt Practices Act, the Hatch Act, from which I shall read:

It shall be unlawful for any person employed in any administrative position by the United States, or by any department, * * * or agency thereof, * * * to use his official authority for the purpose of interfering with, or affecting the election or the nomination of any candidate for the office of President, Vice President, Presidential elector, Member of the Senate, or Member of the House of Representatives, Delegates or Commissioners from the Territories and insular possessions.

I ask this question in all candor: Is there any lawyer who thinks that such a decision by a commission could not be presented in evidence, if the pending amendment became a part of the law, and thus preclude a conviction under the present act?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. Of course no lawyer thinks so. That is the very purpose of the amendment—to preclude a conviction under the act if the commission finds it is not political. That is why the section is there.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am heartily in agreement with the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio as to the purpose of the amendment; but the Senator is seeking to amend a law of the United States, a law which denominates and defines a crime, and fixes a penalty for it. In so doing the Senator would create an additional crime, with additional factors which would be impossible of proof in any venue in the country in time to be of any value in a campaign, even if the purpose the Senator fears—and I fear with him—or abuses which might be developed, existed.

Mr. TAFT rose.

Mr. GILLETTE. I ask the Senator to permit me to conclude my remarks on this point. This brings up another question. A fine of $1,000 would be imposed. Mr. President, I had the dubious privilege of serving as chairman of a committee of this body to investigate campaign expenditures in the 1940 Presidential campaign. I had occasion to know the practices which were indulged in by members of both parties, by the organizations of both parties. I know there were many millions of dollars spent on both sides. If members of the political parties wish to abuse that situation, what would be the effect of a prospective fine of $1,000, dependent upon a conviction secured on the basis of a multiplicity of factors, a conviction which could not be secured until long after the election was over?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, the argument the Senator is making regarding the difficulty of proving a crime could be made against half the criminal statutes on the statute books. Certainly it could be made against the Hatch Act. The Hatch Act provides:

No officer or employee of any State or local agency whose principal employment is in connection with any activity which is financed in whole or in part by loans or grants

made by the United States or by any Federal agency—

That must be proved, and that is a very doubtful question—

shall (1) use his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election—

What is his official authority or influence? That would have to be proved. The provision of the Hatch Act continues—

for the purpose of interfering with an election or a nomination for office, or affecting the result thereof, or (2) directly or indirectly coerce, attempt to coerce, command, or advise any other such officer or employee to pay, lend, or contribute any part of his salary or compensation or anything else of value to any party, committee, organization, agency, or person for political purposes.

In other words, every objection the Senator is making against the amendment could be made at least as strongly, if not more strongly, against the Hatch Act. I cannot understand the strength of the Senator's objection.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I will endeavor to explain it as best I can. It is true, as the Senator has said, that those elements of the crime that is defined under the Hatch Act would have to be proven before a conviction could be secured, by proving the integral elements which make up the crime. But the Senator is seeking to amend that act by his amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say I do not see what the amendment of the Hatch Act has to do with the matter. These sections of the Hatch Act have exactly the same effect as if they were a separate act. They in no way are affected by any other provision of the Hatch Act, and they in no way qualify any other provision in the Hatch Act.

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes; but the Senator will realize that if his amendment is agreed to it would be a part of the Hatch Act, and that the Hatch Act——

Mr. TAFT. The amendment is similar to the Hatch Act, but the penalties of the Hatch Act would not apply to it. The amendment provides its own penalties, which would apply to two different sections.

Mr. GILLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. The penalties of the Hatch Act apply only to section 8 of the Hatch Act, not to sections 22 and 23. I cannot understand the Senator's point about amending the Hatch Act.

Mr. GILLETTE. The amendment would amend the Hatch Act by setting up a new and distinct crime.

Mr. TAFT. Exactly.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is the position the Senator takes.

Mr. TAFT. And it is no different than if I had proposed to add these sections to the law, and had forgotten the Hatch Act. The legal effect would be exactly the same.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to continue, let me say that, while it is true that under the present Hatch Act, in order to secure a conviction thereunder, it would be necessary for a prosecuting officer to prove all the factors making up the crime, if there were an attempt to secure a conviction under the pending bill, as amended, if and when it is amended, and if and when enacted, it would be necessary to prove the additional factors I have listed, and which are not component parts of the crime as defined in the statute as it now exists. It is a new crime, with new factors which do not now exist.

Mr. TAFT. It is an entirely different crime from the crime set out in the Hatch Act. It does not modify the Hatch Act. It is not modified by the Hatch Act. All reference to the Hatch Act could be omitted from my amendment, and it would have no different effect. I cannot understand the Senator's objection to the amendment on that ground.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I do not wish to take the time of the Senate longer, except to say this: The amendment would create a new crime in a cherished field of American citizenship rights, namely, the right of freedom of expression. It would introduce certain factors to make up that crime. Every one of those factors would have to be proved in order to secure a conviction. It would create a crime with no venue.

There is another point which I did not mention in that connection. How many crimes would be committed? If 1,000,000 pamphlets or magazines were distributed, would that constitute 1 crime, or many crimes? Would each and every piece of literature distributed constitute a separate crime? It would be only 1 crime, and a person could not be put in jeopardy more than once for the same crime.

The Senator asks how the amendment would affect the existing law. It is an additional provision. It would be a new law clothing a new commission with judicial authority to make certain decisions, and those decisions could be used as evidence in connection with prosecutions for the crime already defined in the Hatch Act. As one who had a short and very unpleasant experience as prosecuting attorney, let me say that, in my humble opinion, the amendment would absolutely preclude securing a conviction before any jury that could be impaneled.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, that is the purpose of the provision. If two Democrats and a Republican should find that certain material is not political propaganda, my amendment would preclude the conviction of anyone for distributing it, as against a prosecutor who might claim that it was political propaganda. That is the very purpose of the provision.

Mr. GILLETTE. Then it is an unfortunate purpose, because the decision of a nonjudicial body would be the determining factor in a prosecution for a crime now defined on the statute books. No commission should be clothed with such authority.

Mr. President, I do not wish to consume further time of the Senate. I am convinced that however laudable the purpose—and I know it is laudable and sincere—not only would the amendment be unworkable and ineffectual, but it would be dangerous. It is an attempt to protect the armed forces from the great mass of campaign literature to which the civilian in this country is subjected. It is not limited in its application to those outside the United States. It would be a crime to make certain documents available to any citizen of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. That sounds like a proper criticism. The justification is that, as to at least 5,000,000 men, all means of communication are in the hands of the United States Government, and the Government may permit access to such means of communication, or it may not, as it sees fit. All my amendment would do would be to set up a flag, and to say, "The Congress expects the Government, in getting this information to the soldiers, to be fair as between political parties.' That is the purpose, and the only purpose. If no one were ever convicted, that would not bother me, because I am satisfied that if Congress says what the law is, practically every department in the Government will comply with the law. But if we leave the law open, and if a captain can say to a soldier, "There is nothing illegal in your conducting a political campaign in the Army," or if a commanding officer in a section can tell the editor of a magazine, "Be very careful not to attack the President in this election campaign, but always support him," and if there were nothing illegal in doing so, that situation might easily arise in the Army or Navy, or any other department of the Government. Men are naturally partisan; and if Congress refuses to say that such activity is illegal, it seems to me they would have a perfect right to engage in it. I think many of them would.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, in closing let me say that I am entirely in sympathy with what the eminent Senator is trying to do. As I have endeavored to outline the situation, it seems to me that the amendment would be ineffectual, destructive, and unworkable. It might be dangerous, and might prevent conviction for a crime defined in the present act.

Before I take my seat, let me say that I feel that I have not wasted my time when the Senator from Ohio admits that one of the arguments which I have presented has some appearance of validity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. CHAVEZ obtained the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Reed
Andrews	Guffey	Revercomb
Austin	Hatch	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hawkes	Robertson
Barkley	Hayden	Russell
Bilbo	Hill	Scrugham
Bone	Holman	Shipstead
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Brooks	Kilgore	Taft
Buck	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lucas	Tobey
Byrd	McCarran	Truman
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Caraway	McFarland	Tydings
Chandler	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh, Mass.
Davis	Moore	Wheeler
Eastland	Nye	Wherry
Ellender	O'Daniel	White
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Wiley
George	Overton	Willis
Gerry	Pepper	Wilson
Gillette	Radcliffe	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

ADVANCEMENT IN GRADE OF AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, on September 24, 1943, I introduced Senate bill 1374. It has for its purpose the promotion of certain American prisoners of war in the custody of the Japanese. This bill is short, containing one and one-half pages, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That effective December 8, 1942, each officer of the Army, Navy (including the Coast Guard), or Marine Corps below the grade of colonel or corresponding grade in the other services, and each warrant officer and enlisted man below the grade of master sergeant or corresponding grade in the other services, who was serving in the Philippine Islands or on Wake or Guam on December 8, 1941, and who is now a prisoner of war, shall be advanced one grade from the grade he held on that date; and similar promotions shall be made December 8, 1943, and December 8 in each year thereafter in the case of each person below the grades above specified on such dates, respectively: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to reduce the grade or pay of any person promoted between December 8, 1941, and the date of his capture.

SEC. 2. Each of the persons specified in section 1 who, by reason of the character of his service, such as aviation personnel, persons serving on submarine duty, and the like, received special pay, shall continue to receive such pay during the time he is a prisoner of war notwithstanding the fact that by reason of his status he is unable to engage in the service qualifying him for such additional pay.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in bringing about the enactment of laws, committee work is extremely essential, and legislation desired to be enacted is generally referred to a committee of the Senate which has jurisdiction over the particular class of legislation which is being proposed. Senate bill 1374 was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. In the practical way of handling legislation, and notwithstanding that the particular committee which has jurisdiction over a proposed bill is supreme, and that neither the Congress, nor either body of it must necessarily consult the various departments of the Government with reference to the legislation being proposed, nevertheless, it is the practice of the standing committees of both Houses to submit bills referred to them to the various Government departments with which the proposed legislation would have to do.

Senate bill 1374 was therefore referred by the Committee on Military Affairs to the War Department and to the Navy Department, the two departments affected by the proposed bill. As I have said, the bill would permit the promotion of certain officers and personnel of the Army who were captured by the Japanese at Guam, Wake Island, and the Philippine Islands.

A most sympathetic response to the bill was received from various parts of the country, especially from the relatives of the boys who had been made prisoners by the Japanese. Not only the committee but myself as the sponsor of the bill have received many letters in its support. I have a list of those letters with me, and as I state the names and addresses of those who submitted the letters, I ask consent that their messages be inserted in the RECORD after the name is mentioned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, this proposed legislation affects officers and soldiers all over the United States. It happens that I was particularly interested because the entire National Guard of New Mexico, which was designated as the Two Hundredth Coast Artillery Anti-aircraft, was in the Philippines. More than 2,000 boys from New Mexico were there, and so were officers and soldiers from every other State of the Union.

In order to show the response of those interested in the bill I have asked permission to insert the letters to which I have referred. One of them came from Dr. Arthur Schramm, of Los Angeles, Calif.

(The letter from Dr. Schramm is as follows:)

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *November 15, 1943.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Delighted to hear about S. 1374. Will you please send me a copy of the bill?

I have a son in prison camp in the Philippine Islands.

Hope the bill will be coming up soon and that it will be passed.

Sincerely,

Dr. A. SCHRAMM.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Another letter came from Mrs. Abran Sena, of Santa Fe, N. Mex., the mother of a private who is a prisoner of the Japanese.

(The letter from Mrs. Sena is as follows:)

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *November 9, 1943.*
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As a mother of a prisoner of war interned at Fukuoka Prison Camp, island of Honshu, Japan, I wish to express my deepest gratitude for your farsightedness in the introduction of Senate bill No. 1374.

I feel that you have at heart and fully well know the anxiety and mental torture that we mothers suffered throughout that trying ordeal, the fall of Bataan and surrender of Corregidor. Your action merits the highest of gratitude.

My son is Pvt. Louis Sena, who was with the Two Hundredth.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. ABRAN SENA.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have another one, from Mrs. Vida R. George, of San Antonio, Tex.

(The letter from Mrs. George is as follows:)

NOVEMBER 10, 1943.

DEAR SIR: This is in commendation of bill No. 1374, whereby we remember those who, once active, are inactive, not by choice, in our armed forces.

Yours sincerely,

VIDA R. GEORGE.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have a letter from R. N. Dosh, of Ocala, Fla., the father of Captain—or Major—Dosh, a West Point graduate of the class of 1938.

(Mr. Dosh's letter is as follows:)

THE OCALA STAR-BANNER,
Ocala, Fla., November 7, 1943.
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Will you be kind enough to have your secretary mail me a copy of Senate bill 1374, which, I understand, is sponsored by you, and has for its purpose the promotion of the American officers who served in the Philippines during the early days of the war. My son, Capt. (or Maj.) Louis N. Dosh, who graduated from the West Point Military Academy with the class of 1938 (and one of the principals in the West Point wedding in Life of that year), served with the Fifty-seventh Filipino Scouts on Bataan and is a prisoner of the Japanese.

It might be of interest to recall to your memory the evening you spent in Ocala as a guest of the Florida Canal Authority, and the dinner party held at Hotel Marion, with some 17 Senators and all members of the State cabinet present. As I remember it, you made one of the wittiest speeches of that occasion. I think I told you so at the time. My son, then a second lieutenant, was present on that occasion and sat with me next to the late Senator Lundeen.

As most all the classmates of the men who served on Bataan have been advanced in rank, although many of they have not been out of the country, you are to be commended for your efforts to do tardy justice to the boys who made new military history in their heroic defense of the Philippines.

With warmest personal regards, I beg to remain

Sincerely yours,

R. N. DOSH.

P. S.—In case you care to do so, you might mention my having written you in connection with Senate bill 1374 to Senators ANDREWS and PEPPER, both of whom are my personal friends.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We have another letter from the Mothers' Club of Deming, N. Mex., a city that furnished two of the

troops that were in the Philippines at the time of the surrender.

(The letter from the Mothers' Club is as follows:)

MOTHERS' CLUB,
Deming, N. Mex., October 28, 1943.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ.

DEAR SIR: We will appreciate it so much as individuals, also as a club, if you will support bill No. 1374 which provides (as you, of course, know) for promotion of our boys, who are now prisoners of war.

We believe this would help their morale as well as help them financially.

It does seem like everything possible should be done for our boys who gave so much for us and for their country.

Yours truly,

Mrs. W. B. LINDSAY,
Secretary.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Then, we hear from Mrs. Gracious Galbraith, the wife of a naval officer of the 1929 class at Annapolis.

(The letter from Mrs. Galbraith is as follows:)

KNOXVILLE, TENN., *October 27, 1943.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: Thank you so much for your nice letter of October 13 in reply to my telegram, and also for bringing up, at the preliminary hearing with the Committee on Military Affairs on Friday, October 15, the matter of including in your bill S. 1374, officers and men surviving naval vessel sinkings, such as the late cruiser *Houston*, who are now in Japanese prison camps or missing.

I wish to bring to your attention the fact that the present naval regulations apparently do not consider such prisoners of war or the missing for promotions when their classmates are considered.

Yesterday, a letter from Navy friends tells me that some of my husband's best friends and classmates (class 1929 Annapolis) have been made full commanders and even some in the class of 1930 are full commanders. This both surprises and, I admit, hurts me and his family, as it must all the families in our unfortunate predicament. These same friends were promoted to lieutenant commander along with my husband. Therefore, his time for consideration should also have normally come up.

I do not grudge in any way promotion to these men. On the contrary, they deserve it by virtue of long naval training and good work. It is simply that I do not see why my husband or any of his co-sufferers in prison, who put their country before their wives and children, should now be quietly passed—forgotten, if you like—when their turns would normally have come.

Further, I have been informed that West Point graduate officers, regardless of their status, are automatically promoted. If this is so, Why this uneven situation?

My one consolation through 3 years of continuous separation (this will be the fourth Christmas and, as you know, not the last even if I am lucky enough to have my husband returned eventually); through the anguish of uncertainty endured for 1 year and 3 months following the message "missing in action"; through the consequent impairment of my good health to the extent that I had to give up a writing job on a paper; through the receipt of a solitary letter only this August, the entire 100 words of which are taken up with concern over the future, my allotment, retirement plans, indicating a troubled mind while in prison; through all these things, my one consolation was simply this: We were sacrificing, I told myself, for something bigger than us and our personal happiness, our health and finances. It was for something fine, traditional, our grand Navy and country which he served faithfully.

Now—this country which stood first in his life, duty, and loyalty, fails to consider him, not for a reward, medal, or ribbons, but simply for an earned promotion.

Does it not amount to a punishment for being a prisoner of war or missing in their country's behalf? And they, as a friend with no one in this war, put it, "held the line when it was so thin and only went down to defeat because of the great odds against them."

Surely, this regulation must be due to lack of precedent set by a similar situation. Whatever it is due to, it is a wrong which needs righting, and we thank you for bringing the matter up.

Very respectfully yours,

GRACIOUS GALBRAITH.
(Mrs. W. J. Galbraith.)

P. S.—You mentioned receiving "both of your telegrams." I sent only one, and assume the other was from another Galbraith family. We understand there is another Galbraith naval man among the prisoners, and his home is in Seattle, I believe.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The bill is supported by the American Legion national legislative committee in Washington, as evidenced by their letter.

(The letter from the American Legion national legislative committee is as follows:)

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., October 28, 1943.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: The national legislative committee of the American Legion is interested in your bill S. 1374 to provide for promotion of certain American prisoners of war.

We do not have a specific resolution on this subject but we do have a broad covering resolution from one of our national conventions and I, as executive director of the national legislative committee, could support your bill.

If there is anything the national legislative committee can do to further the progress of this bill, I shall appreciate it if you will advise me.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
Executive Director.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mrs. Beth King, secretary-treasurer of the Two Hundredth Club of Artesia, N. Mex., which furnished many a boy to the forces in the Philippines wrote a letter.

(The letter from Mrs. King is as follows:)

ARTESIA, N. MEX., *October 25, 1943.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senator, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We greatly appreciate the information furnished our club by you in regard to our soldiers who served with the Two Hundredth Coast Artillery Division in the Philippine Islands and who are now interned in the different countries occupied by Japan. We will greatly appreciate any information you may have in regard to our prisoners of war in Japanese prison camps.

Again, thanking you for your efforts, we are

Yours very truly,

THE TWO HUNDREDTH CLUB,
BETH KING, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

Mr. CHAVEZ. Then I have a letter from Mrs. Dow G. Bond, of Taos, N. Mex. Mrs. Bond is the mother of a war prisoner.

(Mrs. Bond's letter is as follows:)

TAOS, N. MEX., *October 28, 1943.*

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: It is so considerate of you to introduce bill No. 1374, which provides for the promotion of all members of the armed forces who were serving in the Philippines, Guam, or Wake on December 8, 1941.

The B. R. O., Veterans of Foreign Wars, and its auxiliary are all behind you.

Thanking you for your efforts in behalf of our boys of the Two Hundredth and Five Hundred and Fifteenth Coast Artillery.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. DOW G. BOND.

Mr. CHAVEZ. A letter from Mr. F. L. Anders, who resides at Ennis, Mont., and is the father of Capt. Franklin Albert Anders, of the same city. That letter was addressed to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Representative WIRT COURTNEY, of the Seventh District of Tennessee, writes in support of the measure.

(Representative COURTNEY's letter is as follows:)

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., October 26, 1943.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your letter of October 25 concerning your S. 1374.

I plan to introduce the companion bill in the House, with the additions you have suggested.

With kindest regards.

Very sincerely yours,

WIRT COURTNEY,
Member of Congress.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mrs. R. H. Vesey, one of the wives who were evacuated in 1941 from the Philippines, who left her officer husband in the Philippine Islands to be the victim of Japanese superiority in materials and supplies, writes a letter.

(Mrs. Vesey's letter is as follows:)

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *October 21, 1943.*

Mr. CHAVEZ,
United States Senator from New Mexico, Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In a recent issue of the Army and Navy Register, I noticed that you had introduced a bill (S. 1374) to advance in grade certain officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men who were serving in the Philippines or on Wake Island or Guam on December 8, 1941, and who are now prisoners of war. This is, of course, as it should be, since these men were the first to begin the fighting in this war and will be the very last to see the end of it. They are constantly in the minds and hearts of us who have our men there.

I was one of those wives evacuated from the Philippines in the spring of 1941, and a great percentage of my friends of recent years are still there.

Most of us who have our men there have been piecing together bits of news that we have garnered from many sources and we know that most of those who are listed as missing in action since the fall of Corregidor are still alive and most of them are still fighting. I am enclosing one of those pieces

of information, although this is not particularly specific.

Perhaps these men are included in your bill; but from what I gathered in the Register, it does not seem so. There may be some technical reason why they could not be included in the bill. I am extremely interested to know about this. Would you be so kind as to let me know?

Very sincerely yours,

(Mrs. R. H.) EFFIE B. VESEY.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Dr. and Mrs. Byron B. Thorpe, and Mrs. J. D. Thorpe, wife of Lt. Joseph D. Thorpe, of Artesi, N. Mex., write a letter in support of the bill.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

ARTESIA, N. MEX., *October 21, 1943.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
c/o Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We wish you to know we are with you in behalf of your Senate bill, No. 1374, 100 percent, introduced by you September 24, 1943. We have a son and husband in Philippine Islands, First Lt. Joseph D. Thorpe.

Very truly yours,

Dr. and Mrs. BYRON B. THORPE.
Mrs. J. D. THORPE.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mrs. Mary E. Schuster of Elsmere, Del.—and I am sure my good friend the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] knows where Elsmere is, and probably knows the family—writes a letter. Mrs. Schuster has a son who is a war prisoner.

(Mrs. Schuster's letter is as follows:)

SEPTEMBER 27, 1943.

DEAR SIR: I seen in the paper Sunday where you was going to introduce a bill to sought promotions for our captives in the Philippines and thank God someone thinks of our prisoners. I have a son, Wesley W. Wilson, signalman first class, U. S. N. He has been in the Navy since he was 19. Will be going on 11 years this November and I have not seen him for 6 years. He was in China and in the Philippines and waiting to come home when this war came and, you see, he would stay the same rank. But if your bill passes it would raise him, so I hope your bill will pass, and I thank you for thinking of our men. I know everyone that has anyone prisoners will think the way I think and I will not forget you in my prayers. I just want you to know I think you are a very nice man to think of our boys.

Thanking you again,

MRS. MARY E. SCHUSTER,
Elsmere, Del.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mrs. Sarah Perry Harrell, of Albuquerque, writes a letter.

(Mrs. Harrell's letter is as follows:)

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.,
September 26, 1943.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: What a wonderful suggestion you have given the United States Army. How like you to think of such a fine thing for those brave young men who have been held prisoners of war so long. Most of the 200 C. A. were stationed at Camp Bowie at Brownwood, Tex. I was there at the time they left. They were moved out by train, leaving at 4 o'clock in the morning. My daughter, Phyllis, and I bought several cases of candy bars, chewing gum, cigarettes, and took to the train and personally distributed them. Almost to a man, that group came from New Mexico. They were attacked immediately upon landing. We never heard from them after our good-bye at the train. We hope your bill will go through quickly. You will live in the hearts of your countrymen always for this step. Perhaps you may remember my daughter and I had a lovely tea room in the Sena Plaza years ago. We have been warm friends of Dave and Genevieve for many years, and it was due to their friendship we were in Santa Fe. I recall with much pleasure the fried chicken dinners you and your family had with us. At present my daughter is in defense work at Kirkland Field here. We are stopping in a friend's home only temporarily until I can find an apartment, so I am having our mail sent to a box at the post office (875). I saw the enclosed notice in the Journal and felt that I wanted to thank you personally for your effort in behalf of those young soldiers who deserve much, and are receiving so little. You are giving them new hope and much solace. I only wish it might have been done sooner. Nothing during the whole war has hurt me as deeply as the plight of those brave boys. I hope each of them may receive some personal recognition by the Army before it is too late—so many of them are dying.

With sincere good wishes,

Mrs. SARAH PERRY HARRELL.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mrs. C. J. Peters, of Seattle, Wash., the State of the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], who is presiding over the Senate at the moment, writes a letter.

(The letter of Mrs. Peters is as follows:)

SEATTLE, WASH., *September 27, 1943.*

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: It was with a great deal of interest that I read in the Seattle Times of your bill recently introduced, proposing the advancement of rank for our war prisoners.

My brother, and the husbands and sons of many of my friends, are prisoners of war in the Philippines, having been in the islands since November 1940, and we all want you to know of our appreciation of your efforts in their behalf.

The purpose of your bill has been one of the foremost wishes expressed by many as one of the few ways to repay our men for their sacrifices, and we sincerely trust it will receive majority consideration and prompt passage.

Please accept my sincere appreciation and best wishes for the success of your bill.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. C. J. PETERS,
Care of Consolidated Dairy Products Co.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mrs. John C. Coleman, of Wellington, Tex., writes in support of the bill.

(Mrs. Coleman's letter is as follows:)

WELLINGTON, TEX., *September 26, 1943.*

Senator CHAVEZ of New Mexico,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have just read that you have introduced a bill for the promotion of men who were serving in the Philippines. I am greatly in favor of this bill. I have a husband who was on Bataan and is now a prisoner of war in Japan. The families of these men think something should be done. It was true that we could not help them on Bataan but you have a chance to help them now in Washington. I hope Washington will not fail them now.

We are really behind you in this move. I think our men in the Philippines knocked a home run even though many of them will never reach the homeland again. I think the promotion should begin from the fall of Bataan or the war.

Thanking you for the help you have been to the many families with loved ones in the Philippines, I am,

Yours truly,

Mrs. JOHN COLEMAN.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Honorable R. Q. Mills, of Wichita Falls, Tex., who has a son who is a prisoner of the Japanese, also writes in support of the bill.

(The letter of Mr. Mills is as follows:)

STATE OF TEXAS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Wichita Falls, Tex., September 27, 1943.

Mr. CHAVEZ,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: Just noticed an item in the newspaper about your bill, S. 1374, that has reference to the automatic promotion for the boys that were lost in the Philippines and Wake Island. I just wanted to call your attention to the One Hundred and Thirty-first Field Artillery that was last heard from in Java, May 10, 1942.

I wish that you would include the One Hundred and Thirty-first Field Artillery in your bill mentioned above. I think that your bill is a wonderful bill and hope that you will be successful in getting it enacted into a law. I am,

Yours very truly,

R. Q. MILLS,
State Representative,
One Hundred and Twelfth District.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mrs. Gladys Peters, of Osseo, Minn., writes in support of the bill.

(The letter of Mrs. Peters is as follows:)

OSSEO, MINN., *October 5, 1943.*

Hon. CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: I am writing to tell you how grand I think you are for introducing a bill about the promotion of those poor forgotten souls in Japanese prison camps. I have told many people about it, and you should hear the praises sung about you.

We who love them and find our lives empty without them haven't forgotten, but we sort of felt that everyone else had.

My husband is a doctor in the Regular Army and was on Bataan during the entire campaign. He is now in Philippine prison camp No. 1.

There are so many boys from Minnesota there. I have read that you have over 2,000 from New Mexico.

We have all felt that they, too, deserve promotion in grade for the way they fought. We believe everyone was too busy fighting to think about advancement at that time. They fought and lost, but we, too, believe that they should be promoted as well as their fellow soldiers everywhere else. When this is over and they come back, they will know that they were remembered by the country for which they fought.

Senator, is there anything that I, as an individual, can do to help you or advice I can pass on to hundreds of fellow Philippine evacuees who have had to leave dear ones there? We are all so willing to help in any way if you will advise us.

I want to wish you the best of luck in your work. May God bless you.

Very truly yours,

GLADYS W. PETERS
(Mrs. Joseph F.).

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. Carl F. Whittaker, of Albuquerque, N. Mex., who has a son in a prison camp and still suffering from wounds which he received in resisting the Japanese, writes also in support of the bill.

(The letter of Mr. Whittaker is as follows:)

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
WAR VETERANS INFORMATION BUREAU,
Albuquerque, N. Mex., September 30, 1943.
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Mrs. Whittaker joins me in extending our appreciation for your sincere efforts in behalf of American prisoners now held by the Japanese.

We have received a post card from our son indicating he is under treatment for injuries and is improving.

I think your Senate bill providing for promotions is a step in the right direction toward recognition of the splendid service rendered and the extreme hardships endured by these Americans.

The thought occurred to me that you might acquire more House and Senate support for this bill were it to apply to all prisoners of war.

Very truly yours,
CARL F. WHITTAKER.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mrs. Robert D. Montgomery, whose husband, Lieutenant Montgomery, was captured at Corregidor, also writes a letter. She resides at Milton, Pa.

(Mrs. Montgomery's letter is as follows:)

MILTON, PA., *September 27, 1943.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: I read with much interest the notice in the paper yesterday about the bill you have introduced to Congress under which men who are captives of the Japanese would be promoted. I commend you for this fine step and want you to know that I hope your bill will pass.

My husband was sent to the Philippine Islands in October 1941 as a first lieutenant and was captured on Corregidor in May 1942, and no promotion had gone through for him, even though war had begun and he had fought bravely, even being wounded and receiving the Purple Heart. Naturally, I would certainly like to have him receive a promotion, one that I feel he deserved before being captured—so I trust your bill will pass. I feel it would greatly improve the mental state of the prisoners of war out there to know they had been promoted, for their spirits are low enough. Those fine, brave men deserve this promotion as much as some men in this country who are receiving annual promotions and who will never see actual overseas service. Don't you agree? I hope so.

Please do all you can for our husbands out there, our dear ones whom we have loaned to Uncle Sam for 2½ years now—we would love to have a future home the same as others. But it will take more than the bonds I can buy to help us when they return.

Thank you for your interest in our heroes of Corregidor.

Sincerely,
MRS. ROBERT D. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. H. E. Barron, of Hobbs, N. Mex., writes about his son.

(Mr. Barron's letter is as follows:)

HOBES, N. MEX., *September 22, 1943.*
Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ.

DEAR SENATOR: I was reading in the Bataan Relief Organization Bulletin No. 6, that you were a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, to have the prisoners of war held by the Japanese promoted with corresponding pay increases according to the average promotions of soldiers in this country and elsewhere in our armed forces.

According to this I think my son, Private Charlie R. Barron, who is captured by the Japanese, is due a promotion according to the average promotions of soldiers. It breaks my heart to hear my son is still a private and has been in the Army 2½ years, while these soldiers over here are being promoted fast. I think all the soldiers that are captured deserve a promotion. I have noticed that several of those that are captured have been promoted since the war.

Trusting that you will do all that is in your power to do in this matter and thanking you very much, I am,

Your friend,
MR. H. E. BARRON.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Dr. A. A. Brooks, minister of the First Methodist Church of Omaha, Nebr., the father of Capt. Lee C. Brooks, who is a prisoner of the Japanese, writes in support of the bill.

(The letter of Dr. Brooks is as follows:)

FIRST METHODIST CHURCH,
Omaha, Nebr., September 20, 1943.
Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ:
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: In the last bulletin issued by the Bataan Relief Organization I noticed in Dr. Spensley's report that you were going to introduce a bill in the Senate through which authority would be given for the soldiers in the prison camps of Japan to receive promotion in rank the same as those who have been fortunate enough to be either here at home or fighting in some place where odds were not so terrifically against them that there was no other possible thing for them to do than surrender.

I feel very keenly that these splendid men who had the misfortune to be sent to the Philippines when we were so patently unprepared to defend the islands and put up such a brave fight against overwhelming odds of men and equipment should be given the same promotion that would have come to them in the ordinary run of Army life, just the same as the boys here and abroad are receiving promotion.

We have a son, Capt. Lee C. Brooks, now a prisoner of war in Zentsuji prison camp on the island of Shikoku, Japan. He was commanding a battalion of the Thirty-first Infantry, United States Army, on Bataan for some weeks before and at the time of the surrender, and we feel he and others of his comrades who fought so splendidly should receive the same recognition by promotion even though they are enduring God only knows what in the prison camps of Japan.

I have acquaintance with the two United States Senators from Iowa, both of the Senators from Nebraska are close personal friends, and also the two Senators from Colorado.

I shall take it up with them and with our own Congressman and some half dozen other Congressmen who are friends of mine also, just as soon as I may hear from you that it would be helpful.

Thanking you on our own behalf and the behalf of the young men who will be benefited as well as their parents and friends I am,

Sincerely yours,
A. A. BROOKS.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mrs. Kathryn E. Bailey, of Los Angeles, Calif., writes a letter. Her letter is short, but it tells a story, and I shall read it:

Please support bill 1374 and be ever vigilant in demanding relief be sent our boys in the Philippines; also that supplies be sent MacArthur so that he may fulfill his promise to free our boys.

Mr. President, in view of the letter written by the War Department in response to the request of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate to give their views, let me say that if the suggestions made by this good lady had been followed prior to Pearl Harbor, the War Department would not be dubious of the courage or failure of our boys in the Philippines.

Mr. W. H. Magill, of Fargo, N. Dak., writes to Senator LANGER about Senate bill 1374. His son, William H. Magill, Jr., naturally, could have been one of those the War Department had in mind in doubting their ability to resist.

(The letter of Mr. Magill is as follows:)

W. H. MAGILL SEED CO.,
Fargo, N. Dak., October 16, 1943.
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Chambers, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: It has come to my attention that Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, of New Mexico, introduced Senate bill 1374 on September 24, providing for automatic promotion in rank of certain officers and enlisted men in the armed forces who were taken prisoner by the Japanese in the Philippine Islands and other Pacific islands.

As you know, my son, First Lt. William H. Magill, Jr., was in the Philippines at the time of their capture in April 1942 and has been listed as a prisoner of the Japanese by the War Department. A card from him received about a month ago indicated that he is in Philippine Military Prison Camp No. 2.

At the present time these men who are held prisoners by the Japanese are receiving no promotion in rank and are being discriminated against to this extent. I understand the bill provides for one promotion in rank as of December 1942 and each December thereafter while still being held prisoner. It seems to me eminently fair that these men should receive this consideration and I believe it would meet with the hearty approval of the country as a whole.

I hope you will find it possible to support this bill and make every effort to see that it is acted upon by the Congress in the near future.

Yours very truly,
W. H. MAGILL.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. James Howell, of Clayton, N. Mex., writes in regard to the bill.

(Mr. Howell's letter is as follows:)

CLAYTON, N. MEX.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: I wish to take a stand with you on your proposal that the boys in the prison camps receive their promotion in rank and file. It seems to me that is the least thing we can do, and I also wish that we could send the Mikado of Japan word that we are holding him personally responsible for the treatment of our boys and that it makes no difference whether he is the rising sun or some other god that off comes his head when this thing is over if he sits and let them boys rot in a prison camp. These boys should have never been sent where they were in the beginning as I think everyone knew in the start we could not hold the Philippine Islands.

JAMES HOWELL.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. and Mrs. Nick Mares, of Albuquerque, N. Mex., a couple whom I have known all my life, and who have a boy who is a prisoner of the Japanese in the Philippines, write in support of the bill.

(The letter of Mr. and Mrs. Mares is as follows:)

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *October 13, 1943.*

HON. SENATOR CHAVEZ: This is to advise that we are interested in your support of the bill No. 1374 concerning our boys of the Two Hundredth Coast Artillery, who are, we presume still prisoners of the Japanese Government. Hoping that this bill will pass, we remain as always,

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. NICK MARES.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Miss Eunice Biggar—and I want my colleagues to listen to this letter—Miss Eunice Biggar, of Milwaukee, Wis., bless her soul, presents a different angle. She writes about her fiancé, Capt. Franklin Anders, of the Fifty-seventh Infantry, who is now a prisoner of the Japanese. She has a right to feel that he did not surrender because he did not have the fortitude to resist.

(The letter of Miss Biggar is as follows:)

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *October 12, 1943.*

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I should like to congratulate and shout, "Bravo!" for the bill which I am told you have introduced in the Senate relative to promotions for our prisoners in the Philippines. Wisconsin, too, had men on Bataan and I have a personal interest because my fiancé, Capt. Franklin Anders, was intelligence officer for the Fifty-seventh Infantry and is now a prisoner there. I know I voice the opinion of all others who have friends and relatives there, that your bill will become law.

In order for me to correctly inform people about your bill, I should appreciate it very much if you could send me a copy of it. There are many people I know who would like to write to their Senators, but they, as well as I, would like to know the exact provisions. So if your secretary can send a copy to the above address, you will indeed have my gratitude.

Sincerely,

EUNICE BIGGAR.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have received a telegram from V. H. Spensley, president, Bataan Relief Organization, of Albuquerque, N. Mex., which reads as follows:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.,
December 1, 1943.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

How could Bataan, Corregidor, Guam, Wake heroes know your splendid legislation would be presented? They even prayed Almighty God to give them strength to continue fighting. About time War Department from top to bottom realizes it was defeated on Bataan, not our boys.

Furious resentment aroused in all appreciative Americans by Stimson's insinuations. We urge you to carry fight to floor of Senate. Your splendid cooperation and stand greatly appreciated.

BATAAN RELIEF ORGANIZATION,
V. H. SPENSLEY, *President.*

Mr. President, we know that it is not necessary for any committee of this body or of the other body to ask the views of any department, but it has come to be the practice to ask for their views, and they are considered and respected even at times when a committee does not agree with them. If the War Department and the Navy Department had written to the Military Affairs Committee and had stated that the legislation did not meet the general ideas of the War Department as to the promotion of officers and personnel of the Army, no one would have complained, even though we disagreed with the views thus expressed. But, Mr. President, I was surprised, extremely surprised, I was actually depressed, when I read a part of the letter that was written by the War Department to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, and at this time I wish to read the letter to the Senate.

The report they made was adverse to the legislation proposed. That is all right. The War Department can think that way, and no one is going to make any complaint or criticism. But, Mr. President, you know and I know the circumstances under which the boys surrendered in the Philippines; you know and I know under what circumstances a few American prisoners were taken on Wake Island; you know and I know the history of Guam; and the War Department knows it just as well as we do. It knows the circumstances under which General MacArthur left the Philippine Islands. It knows the circumstances under which General Wainwright was placed in command in the Philippine Islands. Under such circumstances, why the Department should write to a standing committee of this body and give the excuses they set forth as reasons for their opposition to the proposed legislation is beyond the comprehension of anyone who has any red blood in his veins, and has any feeling over what the boys in the Pacific have gone through.

Mr. President, I believe in the integrity and the honesty of purpose of Secretary Stimson, and I say this with Christian charity, I cannot get myself to believe that he saw the paragraph I am about to quote to the Senate. Remember, the War Department is passing on proposed legislation, Senate bill 1374, and nothing else. They were requested by a standing committee of the Senate to give their views, and this is a part of their views. They made an adverse report, and in explaining and talking about those affected, the officers and the men who have gone through the agony of the damned and are prisoners of the Japanese, listen to this wonderful idea:

In the case of captured personnel—

Every man who is alive in the Philippine Islands is "captured personnel"—

there is no way to distinguish—

They are going to distinguish, now, as between two classes of American soldiers—

between those men who (1) by virtue of having fought to the last might be deserving of a reward—

That is not what the bill provides for. It provides for promotions under a sound line of reasoning, not for reward or sympathy. They do not need that; they need fair play and justice—

deserving of a reward in the form of promotion—

And the second class—

and those who surrendered in circumstances under which they might reasonably have been expected to continue to resist.

Two classes of prisoners we have now, according to the interpretation of the man who wrote this letter to the Committee on Military Affairs, one class composed of those who, by virtue of having fought to the last, might be deserving of a reward in the form of a promotion. That is how the War Department would recompense the men who fought to the last. They want to reward them by promotion. Then they take another class, "and those who surrendered in circumstances under which they might reasonably have been expected to continue to resist."

Mr. President, I ask, what right has the War Department even to insinuate that one man at Guam, at Wake Island, or in the Philippine Islands, did not resist to the last? Who was the commanding officer in the Philippines, placed there after General MacArthur left? It was General Wainwright, a courageous man, respected and loved by every Army prisoner who ever saw him, and who had the opportunity to see him in everyday life, in the Philippines and elsewhere. He was respected by the soldiers. He was the one who gave the orders, and for the second time, so far as I remember my history, a general of the United States Army had to surrender his sword to the enemy. As I recall, the other one was Gen. William Hull, who surrendered to our now beloved ally, England, at Detroit. I have never known of any other.

Would they imply that it is possible that General Wainwright did not know what he was doing, and that he might have surrendered "in circumstances under which he might reasonably have been expected to continue to resist"?

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think that is a most unfortunate expression. I have had opportunity to talk with General MacArthur about the surrender at Bataan and Corregidor, and I am positive that the men under General Wainwright fought as long as they could stand. Then they starved. General MacArthur said they were too weak even to get up. They were out of food, and when they lay down at night, they were too weak to rise and fight another day. This is one of the most unfortunate statements I have ever read.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Having great respect for and belief in the sincerity of purpose and honesty of the Secretary of War, I will not believe, until he says so, that he read that particularly unfortunate statement when he signed this letter, if he did sign it. Presumably he did; the original is in the office of the Committee on Military Affairs.

"In circumstances under which he might reasonably have been expected to

continue to resist." The regular reports we hear are to the effect that the men in the Philippines were barefooted, unclad, with no ammunition to fire, with no airplanes, no guns, eating monkeys and mules for subsistence; yet a homeland hero in the War Department suggests that there could have been circumstances in which they could have continued to resist!

Mr. President, I have known of General Wainwright for years, I have known of General King for years, I have known of General Sharp for years, and I know of other generals who are now in the Philippine Islands, and if the War Department can make this sentence stick, believe me, they had better not talk about morale.

I know why those soldiers could no longer resist; I know why they could not shoot back; I know why they could not exist at Corregidor. The water mains were ripped to pieces by the Japanese guns and bombs, and there was no water to drink, and there were no hospitals in which to put the wounded, and no shoes for the soldiers. I say this, and I do not care who knows it, they quit because they had nothing with which to fight. Those who could have helped them, who could have aided them in resisting, were thinking too much of going east instead of going west. That was the whole trouble, and everyone knows it.

My protest is that the War Department, under the signature of Secretary of War Stimson, should dare to say that there could have been in the Philippine Islands those who surrendered "in circumstances under which they might reasonably have been expected to continue to resist."

Mr. President, I have in my hand a list of every boy from New Mexico who was in the Philippine Islands. The list comprises 38 pages of closely typewritten names, with addresses. I find here the name of Frederick B. Howden, of Roswell, N. M., and I find the name of Richard M. Riley, of Albuquerque, N. Mex., both captains. Young Howden was the son of the bishop of the Episcopal Church of my State. Dick Riley was born and reared in Albuquerque. I know his father and his mother, and I have known the youngster since he was born. Both men were captured by the Japanese. Both of them died in a Japanese prison camp. And then, Mr. President, to think of someone in the War Department writing a letter saying that those two boys, who are now dead, could have surrendered "in circumstances under which they might reasonably have been expected to continue to resist"! Shame on the writer of that letter!

Mr. President, I find in the list of names the name of Col. Charles G. Sage, of Deming, N. Mex., the name of Lt. Col. Memory H. Cain, of Deming, N. Mex., and of Lt. Col. John C. Luikart, of my colleague's home town—all prisoners. But under the interpretation and the words of this letter it could have been possible that those men surrendered "in circumstances under which they might reasonably have been expected to continue to resist."

I find in my list the name of Maj. George T. Colvard. I know George Colvard. He was practicing medicine in my State and belonged to the National Guard. He was a delegate to the national conventions in 1932 and 1940 and helped nominate a President of the United States. He was captured while working his head off with the sick and the wounded. Under the interpretation of the letter, Major Colvard could have surrendered "in circumstances under which he might reasonably have been expected to continue to resist."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I was, unfortunately, out of the Chamber when the Senator began to speak, and I did not hear whether he stated who wrote the letter from which he was quoting.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, as the Senator knows, when proposed legislation is introduced it goes to a committee, and the committee refers it to the particular department interested. Senate bill 1374 was introduced by me. It went to the Committee on Military Affairs, which requested the views of the War Department. I have stated that the Department has a right to express its views, though the committee is not obliged to accept them. The committee can do as it sees fit. Nevertheless, the committee obtained the views of the War Department. If the War Department had said, "The legislation is not in keeping with the program of the moment; it is contrary to the general policy or the strategy of the War Department in bringing about promotions," no complaint would have been made. But, notwithstanding the thousands of prisoners over there, the Department used this language, and I want the Senator to follow me:

In the case of captured personnel—

That includes all of them—

there is no way to distinguish between those men who—

To distinguish now—

by virtue of having fought to the last might be deserving of a reward in the form of a promotion, and—

And the next class—

and those who surrendered in circumstances under which they might reasonably have been expected to continue to resist.

That is the part of the letter to which I object, and which I think should be resented and will be resented by everyone who knows the American soldier. No one should know better as to what happened in the Philippine Islands and on Wake Island and in Guam than the War Department itself. When the American people did not know what the boys were going through, the War Department did. When the American people did not know that the boys were fighting when they were starving, sick, and wounded, the War Department knew about that. I am sure, in my own mind at least, that the Department instructed General Wainwright that if a certain circumstance should arise wherein it was necessary that an American general surrender his sword to a Japanese officer, he should do it. He was in command, and there were other generals there. I think there were 13 or 14 at least, and perhaps more, besides the other officer personnel.

As I interpret that letter it is possible to accuse even General Wainwright of possible surrender "in circumstances under which (he) might reasonably have been expected to continue to resist."

Mr. President, with what were the boys to resist? The tanks were in Tunisia, the airplanes were in Europe, the medicine was elsewhere. The needed quinine was not in the Philippine Islands. For the War Department under such circumstances to make a statement of this nature is beyond my comprehension.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I think it is a very unfortunate remark, because it does cast a reflection upon all these men, because there is no segregation, and so far as I know they all resisted and went the limit of human endurance.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, of course I am interested in the boys from New Mexico. I happen to know them. Another boy who was captured was named Silva. I have known him since he was a boy. He was a former employee of the Albuquerque Fire Department. What I resent and what his mother resents is that someone in the War Department should say that he died because he might have surrendered "in circumstances under which" someone in the War Department thought he "might reasonably have been expected to continue to resist."

I find in the list the name of Capt. Alfonso Melendez, of Santa Fe, N. Mex., and First Lt. Reynaldo F. Gonzales, of Taos, N. Mex. As I have said, Mr. President, the list comprises 38 pages of closely typewritten names and addresses of home boys from New Mexico. I resent the implication contained in the letter which was written by someone in the War Department. I repeat I do not think Secretary Stimson wrote the letter, even if it were signed by him. I resent the intimation that all those boys, or that even one of them, would surrender when he might still be able to continue to resist. Mr. President, the reason for the surrender was that they no longer had anything with which to fight. They had no bullets. That was the reason for the surrender. The American people know that to be so.

Mr. President, here in Washington there are hundreds of wives of Army officers and of Navy officers who left their husbands at the pier at Manila. Ask them how they feel with respect to the suggestion that their husbands could have quit under the circumstances implied by the letter from the War Department.

I have made this statement before, and I wish to make it again: To show how the people of New Mexico took their defeat and their suffering and their sorrow I will tell the Senate of a little incident which occurred when I was in New Mexico. I was in New Mexico at the time when Bataan fell. I was in the little city of Deming. Two of the highest

officers of our National Guard came from that little town. Colonel Sage and Lt. Col. Memory H. Cain came from Deming. I was there. I knew Mrs. Colvard to whose husband I have referred. She is the wife of Captain Colvard, the boy who went to help us nominate a President at Chicago, and, another time, at Philadelphia. I knew Mrs. Colvard well. She asked Mrs. Chavez and me to come to see her. She said she was going to have a group of women meet at her home. It was the day Bataan fell. Those women were not crying. They were feeling bad. Their dear ones were over there; possibly they had surrendered, although I deny that they surrendered under the circumstances implied by the War Department. She had approximately 40 women in her home. We talked to them. What can one do under the circumstances, Mr. President? Very little. One feels so helpless, but at least he can say a kind word, instead of giving an insult.

Mr. President, in New Mexico we have what we call the Mexican population, also referred to as natives. I asked Mrs. Colvard what about the native soldiers from Deming.

She said, "A large portion of our troops were so-called natives."

I said, "Do you have a list of them?"

She said, "Yes." She gave me a list next morning after going to church. I went to the little Mexican Catholic church and asked the priest, "How are they feeling?"

He said, "Senator, they have not reached the crying stage yet. They are holding novenas, and burning candles, and saying group prayers, and so forth."

So we went from house to house. Late in the afternoon I went to a little Mexican adobe jacal, a one-room place, across the railroad tracks. A nice little woman about 5 feet tall met me. I told her who I was. Two little children were hanging onto her apron. I said, "How do you feel?"

She said, "Senator, I feel all right. I am poor; I don't have 10 cents to my name. I can't obligate myself to a dollar to buy a bond. But if my three boys in the Philippine Islands who are represented by those three burning candles need to give their lives to win what we are fighting for, I am still satisfied."

Mr. President, what more does the War Department want? Does it want even by implication to accuse the three sons of that woman of having surrendered under circumstances under which they might reasonably have been expected to resist? I have stated before, and I repeat, that it is not necessary to get the views of the War Department or of any other department in order that this body may act. It is my purpose to fight for this bill in the Senate committee and on the floor of this body because I think it is fair, because I think it is just. I know that every American mother, wife, or sister affected is not interested in reward. Their loved ones are fighting for their country and are willing to die for their country. But we do insist on fair play. We do not want the War Department to be sending letters to committees of this body insinuating about even the commanding general of the American Army who—the second time in history such a thing has happened—surrendered his sword. I hope General MacArthur and our other men in the Pacific are given all they want. We can whip the Japs. The boys in the Pacific can whip the Japs; and I do not want the War Department or anyone else to think the war is Europe only.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 861) to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States.

The message returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (H. R. 2207) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting in time of war by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Reed
Andrews	Guffey	Revercomb
Austin	Hatch	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hawkes	Robertson
Barkley	Hayden	Russell
Bilbo	Hill	Scrugham
Bone	Holman	Shipstead
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Brooks	Kilgore	Taft
Buck	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lucas	Tobey
Byrd	McCarran	Truman
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Caraway	McFarland	Tydings
Chandler	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh, Mass.
Davis	Moore	Wheeler
Eastland	Nye	Wherry
Ellender	O'Daniel	White
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Wiley
George	Overton	Willis
Gerry	Pepper	Wilson
Gillette	Radcliffe	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, before the vote is taken on the substitute offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] for the amendment which I offered, I desire to modify my amendment. I send the modification to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out lines 5 to 7, inclusive, on page 1 of the amendment, and lines 1 to 20, inclusive, on page 2, and insert:

Sec. 22. It shall be unlawful for any officer of, or person employed in, the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, including the Army and Navy, to deliver or cause to be delivered to persons in the armed forces of the United States any general communication, Government magazine, Government newspaper, motion-picture film, or other literature or material, or to make, or cause to be made, any broadcast to the armed forces of the United States, paid for in whole or in part with Government funds, or sponsored by the Government, or any officer, agency, or department thereof, including the Army and Navy, containing political argument or political propaganda of any kind designed or calculated to affect the result of any election for President, Vice President, Presidential elector, Member of the Senate, or Member of the House of Representatives, except as hereinafter provided:

(1) Nothing herein shall prohibit the rebroadcast over Government-controlled radio stations of any political address, but equal time must if requested be given for such purposes to representatives of each political party presenting a candidate for President at the election.

(2) Nothing herein shall prevent the distribution to members of the armed forces of books, magazines, and newspapers which have a general circulation in the United States, or of servicemen's magazines or newspapers, such as Yank and Stars and Stripes; but the list of such books, magazines, and newspapers of general circulation shall be determined in accordance with the preference of the members of the armed forces in some reliable method to be determined by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, and the conduct of.

In line 9 on page 3 it is proposed to strike out the word "selection" and insert the word "list."

Mr. TAFT. I ask further permission to change the subsection numbers in lines 1 and 8 on page 3, from (2) and (3) to (3) and (4), respectively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the modification I have made is in accordance with two or three suggestions made yesterday in the debate on this question. The first modification is to make it clear that the prohibition against broadcasts applies only to broadcasts sponsored or paid for by the Government. There was an ambiguity before, which made it appear to prevent any broadcasts.

At the same time, in order to meet the objection made by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], there is inserted this new clause:

Nothing herein shall prohibit the rebroadcast over Government-controlled radio stations of any political address, but equal time must, if requested, be given for such purposes to representatives of each political party presenting a candidate for President at the election.

That is the rule which prevails today among commercial radio stations. It is

reasonable that if the Government-sponsored short-wave stations are to rebroadcast over the entire world any political address for one party—an address by the President, for example, as suggested by the Senator from Connecticut—the other party should also have similar time to rebroadcast its addresses.

The other change relates to the method of selecting magazines. I have adopted in substance the suggestion made by the Senator from New Mexico that the list of books, magazines, and newspapers of general circulation "shall be determined in accordance with the preference of the members of the armed forces in some reliable method to be determined by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy," instead of having them "fair as between the different political parties," which was the language used in the original amendment.

I have also changed the word "selection" to "list," so it is clear that the only thing that is to be passed on in any event is the list of magazines, books, and circulars, and not the material contained in each one. I do not think that would have been the interpretation of the word "selection," but in order to make it clear I have simply changed the word "selection" to "list." The same change is made in line 9, on page 3.

Mr. President, the issue between the substitute and my amendment as modified is whether the prohibition against political propaganda and political argument under Government control or Government sponsorship should extend to the Army and Navy. The substitute offered by the Senator from Illinois provides such a prohibition with respect to all Government departments except the Army and Navy.

Of course, the only purpose of this amendment arises out of the peculiar condition that all means of communication to at least half the members of the armed forces is in the control of the United States Government.

It seems to me perfectly clear that in the case of the Army and the Navy we should lay down in Congress the rule that in providing Government facilities for the distribution of information we should be absolutely fair and impartial in any political election. I see no reason why the provision should not apply to the Army and Navy, as well as to any other department of the Government.

Mr. President, on the substitute offered by the Senator from Illinois I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as modified. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Reed
Andrews	Guffey	Revercomb
Austin	Hatch	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hawkes	Robertson
Barkley	Hayden	Russell
Bilbo	Hill	Scrugham
Bone	Holman	Shipstead
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Brooks	Kilgore	Taft
Buck	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lucas	Tobey
Byrd	McCarran	Truman
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Caraway	McFarland	Tydings
Chandler	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh, Mass.
Davis	Moore	Wheeler
Eastland	Nye	Wherry
Ellender	O'Daniel	White
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Wiley
George	Overton	Willis
Gerry	Pepper	Wilson
Gillette	Radcliffe	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to reconsider House bill 2207, the papers on which, pursuant to a motion agreed to last night, have been returned from the other House.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object. The pending amendment has been under consideration so long that I think we should dispose of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DANAHER. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as modified.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WALLGREN. My colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], is unavoidably absent. I am informed that if he were present and voting he would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are detained on public business. I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] are detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to the State of Colorado.

Mr. WAGNER. I have a pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is confined to his home with a cold.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent on departmental matters. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent because of illness. He has a pair on this question with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. The Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay" and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent due to a death in his family. He has a pair with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. The Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay" and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—36

Andrews	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Hatch	Pepper
Barkley	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hill	Russell
Caraway	Kilgore	Scrugham
Chandler	Lucas	Stewart
Chavez	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Truman
Eastland	McFarland	Tunnell
Ellender	McKellar	Van Nuys
Gillette	Maybank	Wagner
Green	Mead	Wallgren

NAYS—39

Aiken	Holman	Smith
Austin	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Bridges	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Lodge	Tobey
Buck	Maloney	Tydings
Burton	Moore	Vandenberg
Butler	Nye	Walsh, Mass.
Byrd	O'Daniel	Wheeler
Capper	Overton	Wherry
Danaher	Revercomb	White
Davis	Reynolds	Wiley
Ferguson	Robertson	Willis
Hawkes	Shipstead	Wilson

NOT VOTING—21

Bailey	Downey	McNary
Ball	George	Millikin
Bone	Gerry	Murdock
Brewster	Glass	Murray
Bushfield	Gurney	Reed
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	La Follette	Walsh, N. J.

So Mr. LUCAS' amendment in the nature of a substitute for Mr. TAFT'S amendment, as modified, was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] as modified.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, under the amendment on which the Senate is about to vote, I want to remind the Senate that the ballot commission has the power of censorship over practically every political speech or political argument or any kind of propaganda, and the person who makes the speech or undertakes to use material as propaganda may be compelled, if he has any doubt at all, to submit it to the ballot commission. The ballot commission was never set up for that purpose.

Furthermore, I want the Senate to know that under the Taft amendment the Congress would be saying to the Army and the Navy that the individuals who are publishing the Stars and Stripes and the boys who are in control of Yank and the other newspapers would have nothing to say insofar as they are concerned individually as to what political material can go into these newspapers in the 1944 campaign. The amendment would take away from the men in the field the very initiative and responsibility which they should have in order to keep up the Army morale. I hope the Senator's amendment will be voted down.

Mr. MALONEY and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield first to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator would be very helpful to me if he would point out where in the amendment he finds such restrictions and limitations as he suggests. I do not so understand the Taft amendment. I do not understand that there is any censorship on political speeches, as the Senator has just stated. It is my understanding that the amendment simply provides that a like amount of time shall be allowed to each political party and that the Stars and Stripes, and Yank, and all such regular soldier publications can go, without censorship of any kind, to the soldiers.

Mr. LUCAS. I fear the Senator is not familiar with the amendment.

Mr. MALONEY. I thought I had an understanding of it.

Mr. LUCAS. I read what is now paragraph (4) on page 3 of the amendment as modified:

(4) No communication, order, magazine, newspaper, or other literature, and no broadcast, and no list of books, magazines, or newspapers, shall be deemed to be in violation of this section if it is first submitted to the United States War Ballot Commission, and found by such Commission not to be in violation of this section, but it shall not be compulsory to make such submission.

Mr. MALONEY. That is not at all what the Senator said a moment ago. He talked about political speeches and publications of the soldiers, but as I understand the amendment, these are not censored, and do not have to be submitted to the war ballot commission.

Mr. LUCAS. I did not say that publications of the soldiers had to be submitted to the ballot commission. I say that under section 22 if there is any question at all in the mind of any officer or person in the executive department as to a speech being political, or an argument being political, or propaganda being political, even if it is on the border line, he is compelled to submit the speech in advance to the ballot commission for its approval. If he does not submit it, and if it should later develop that it is political in its implications, he is subject to a fine and a jail penalty.

What I have been trying to do all the way through is to take away from the ballot commission any power of that kind whatsoever. And again I maintain, as I said in my previous remarks, that the power of determination among these men on the battle front who are responsible for Yank and other newspapers should not in any way be interfered with by congressional legislation.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator one or two questions?

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly.

Mr. MALONEY. Am I correct in assuming that all regular newspapers and all regular magazines, such as Yank, and Stars and Stripes, and similar publications can go to the soldiers without censorship or am I in error about that?

Mr. LUCAS. The Yank and Stars and Stripes and 1,200 other publications now edited by different service commands or on different ships, of course, are sponsored by the Army and Navy, but, if those in charge advise me correctly, the boys themselves prepare all the matter which is printed, including the editorials. There is a cable and news service in New York which serves, for instance, the Yank, with 14 different editions scattered throughout the world. Each day that governmental sponsored organization in New York sends a daily clip sheet, and also a daily cable of news. When it reaches the Yank or the Stars and Stripes and the 1,200 other newspapers of the Army and Navy, they can take from the clip sheet or from the cable service whatever they desire and print it, and the rest they can throw into the waste basket. In other words, the responsibility is on these boys, and they have done a great job. The Yank, for instance, has been recommended for the Pulitzer prize.

Mr. MALONEY. I appreciate the Senator's speech, but will he answer my question?

Mr. LUCAS. I thought I had answered it.

Mr. MALONEY. I want to know whether the Stars and Stripes or the Yank will be affected by this amendment?

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly will be affected.

Mr. MALONEY. In what way?

Mr. LUCAS. I shall read from the amendment:

Nothing herein shall prevent the distribution to members of the armed forces of books, magazines, and newspapers which have a general circulation in the United States, or of servicemen's magazines or newspapers, such as Yank, and Stars and Stripes; but the list of such books, magazines, and newspapers of general circulation shall be determined in accordance with the preference of the members of the armed forces in some reliable method to be determined by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. MALONEY. It says the question shall be determined by the armed services, does it not?

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly that is what it says, but I still think under this amendment which has been offered, that the men who are editing these publications will not be free of the authority of the Army and the Navy such as exists at the present time.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the amendment under consideration, which I should like to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, after line 24, it is proposed to insert the following new paragraph:

It shall be unlawful for any person to solicit or receive or be in any manner concerned in soliciting or receiving any assessment, subscription, or contribution for any political purpose whatever from any person known by him to be a member of the armed forces of the United States.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the amendment speaks for itself, and if there is a possibility that the Senator from Ohio will accept it, I should like to say that the words are copied almost verbatim from the Hatch Act.

Mr. TAFT. I have no objection to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The fact that the yeas and nays have been ordered prevents the Senator accepting the modification at this time.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator from Ohio let me have a copy of the modification of his amendment?

Mr. TAFT. Certainly.

Mr. HATCH. He made a modification of the amendment beginning in line 18, page 2. I do not have the exact language of the modification.

Mr. TAFT. I am glad to furnish the Senator a copy.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, as modified. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" seem to have it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may the amendment be reported?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to insert a new paragraph on page 3, after lines 24, as follows:

It shall be unlawful for any person to solicit or receive or be in any manner concerned in soliciting or receiving any assessment, subscription or contribution for any political purpose whatever from any person known by him to be a member of the armed forces of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. A point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. I thought the yeas and nays had been demanded and ordered before the Senator from Nebraska offered the amendment. If they were, I

make the point of order that the amendment is not in order, but that we should vote on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio as modified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order made by the Senator from Illinois is overruled.

Mr. BUTLER. May I request the Senator from Ohio——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I thought I had the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Did the Senator from Georgia ask for a division?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I sought recognition from the Chair, and the Chair very kindly recognized me, and I requested that the amendment be stated. I did not understand that by requesting that the amendment be read I lost the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment was read. Did the Senator still desire to occupy the floor?

Mr. RUSSELL. I desire to say, Mr. President, that we will be going a very long way if we pass an act which will make it illegal for any person to receive a voluntary contribution from any person who is in the armed services. We would be denying such a person the right every other citizen possesses if we say that he cannot contribute to any political campaign. If I understand the amendment correctly—and I have not seen it in print—it provides that any person who so much as receives a campaign contribution from anyone who is known to be in the armed services of the United States shall be guilty of a crime. Certainly it could have no other effect than to deny the soldier or sailor or marine of the United States the right to contribute to a political campaign, a right enjoyed by every other citizen of the United States. Why should we so discriminate against those we have called to the colors to save our country?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I think no one has any idea of presenting an amendment which will not be entirely satisfactory to each side, and with that thought in mind, with the consent of the Chair, I shall withdraw the amendment at this time, and present it later.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as modified.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I merely desire to make perfectly clear the effect of the provision relating to the ballot commission. The ballot commission would have no veto power on anything. Any Government department would send out any Government matter if it wished to take the responsibility of determining whether it was political propaganda or not. If there were any doubt, they should not send it out, anyway, but to take care of various timorous people I have provided that if they wish to go to the ballot commission and get a release, they will be protected for all time to come. If they should not do so, they could take the responsibility themselves. If there is any doubt at all about the matter being political propaganda sponsored and sent out through Government channels, then it should be eliminated. So it seems to me the statement regarding the ballot commission is not at all in accord with the facts.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I correct in understanding that if a Cabinet officer desired to make a speech of any kind in 1944, which might be considered nonpolitical by him, but which someone would say was political, it is a fact that under the Senator's amendment he would have to go before the ballot commission and get their approval if he wanted to be safe?

Mr. TAFT. No, because he could make any speech he desired to make, anywhere he wanted, but if he wanted to have the Government, through the O. W. I., or through any board, broadcast information to the soldiers of the United States, then he would have to go to the ballot commission in order to ascertain whether it was political propaganda or not.

Mr. LUCAS. Suppose the Attorney General of the United States is making a broadcast over a Government hook-up, and United States soldiers are listening to the broadcast. If there is any question about that kind of a broadcast at all, the Attorney General of the United States would be compelled, under the amendment, to go to the ballot commission and get their O. K. before he could make a political speech?

Mr. TAFT. Certainly. He should not make a political speech at Government expense and broadcast it from a Government radio station. This is intended to prohibit that. What is provided is that—

> Nothing herein shall prohibit the rebroadcast over Government-controlled radio stations of any political address, but equal time must if requested be given for such purposes to representatives of each political party presenting a candidate for President at the election.

That is the rule of commercial radio stations, and I see no reason why it should not apply to the Government radio stations.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Under the Senator's amendment, if an individual were a candidate for an office that is named in the amendment, anyone who would even mention his name in any way whatsoever on Government-controlled radio stations would be subject to a penalty, unless he went before the ballot commission, would he not?

Mr. TAFT. If it is political argument or propaganda he would be subject to a penalty. If he thought there was any question about it, he could go to the ballot commission and get a release.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, when the question at issue in the pending bill was first raised, I thought we were going to have an honest, patriotic bill, which would permit the soldiers, sailors, and marines to vote at the coming election, but it has now drifted into a vigorous partisan bill.

I was not surprised when we came here yesterday and saw lobbying on the floor a former Senator, who I think was the agent of Mr. Pew of Philadelphia, and possibly the du Ponts of Delaware, telling Senators about their votes on this bill. Of course, Joe Pew does not want to extend the voting franchise.

We made Pennsylvania a Democratic State by doing away with the poll tax, and by having personal registration and adopting the voting machine. That is why Pennsylvania has been Democratic, and that is why Pennsylvania will be Democratic next fall, if the soldiers in the front ranks and the sailors and marines shall be accorded the right and shall have an opportunity to cast their votes.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, am I out of order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No, the Senator from Pennsylvania is not out of order. [Laughter.]

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I am very glad to know it. I want to obey the rules of the Senate, even though some of the New England Members do not.

Yesterday the Senate voted on the question of permitting men in the merchant marine to vote. I was very much surprised when checking the names of those who voted against the extension of that privilege to the sailors in the merchant marine to note how the New England Senators voted, and how the Senators from coast States below New England voted. The two Republican Senators from Maine voted against extending that privilege. The two Republican Senators from New Hampshire voted against it. The one Republican Senator from Massachusetts, who I understand is for various fishermen and sailors, voted against it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator is entirely misinformed when he says that any Senator voted against giving anyone the right to vote. The sailors have the right to vote.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts has the right to vote as he sees fit. I am not questioning that right. The Senator has that privilege.

Mr. LODGE. No, Mr. President; I say that the merchant marine sailors have the right to vote, and no one has denied them the right to vote, and the Senator from Pennsylvania knows that to be so.

Mr. GUFFEY. The Senator from Massachusetts denied it yesterday.

Mr. LODGE. No.

Mr. GUFFEY. The Senator tried to. He voted against giving them the privilege. Then we come down to New Jersey, Mr. President, and we find that the Republican Senator from that State voted against giving them the right to vote.

We then come down to Delaware, and we find that the Republican Senator from that State voted against giving them the right to vote.

My own colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]—and many men engaged in the merchant marine come from Pennsylvania—voted against giving the men in the merchant marine the right to vote.

Mr. President, I merely call attention to this feature of it because the pending amendment is of a partisan nature.

Mr. MOORE rose.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I have nothing to say about the Members of the Senate representing the farmers of the Middle West voting as they please. I have merely called attention to how Senators from New England States and Atlantic Coast States voted.

I have now completed my remarks, Mr. President, and I yield the floor to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I merely wanted to say that I am astonished to hear that the Senator from Pennsylvania discovered only yesterday that there were any partisan features to the bill.

Since I am on my feet, Mr. President, I might say that I am probably the only Senator present who has not discussed the bill. From the very time we began to consider the bill in the Committee on Privileges and Elections several months ago, and since we have been discussing it here on the floor of the Senate day in and day out there has never been any question in my mind that it is a measure of the most partisan character.

I have not yet found a Senator—and there are many able lawyers among the Members of the Senate—who is even willing to say that the bill is constitutional under the express provisions of the Constitution. There certainly cannot be any doubt in the minds of the people of the country today that this is a purely political discussion. I doubt very much if any Senator present, or anyone throughout the country, has any idea about who would profit by the votes of the soldiers if and when they are cast, under a law which is certainly unconstitutional, unless it shall be declared constitutional under what are called the embedded provisions of the Constitution which may be discerned whenever necessity requires. Of course, everyone understands that the bill is definitely partisan in every shape, form, and manner, and that it is not anything else.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Oklahoma if it is his contention that the armed forces of the United States and the merchant marine are made up entirely of Democrats?

Mr. MOORE. I did not understand the question. Will the Senator repeat it?

Mr. KILGORE. I wondered if the Senator from Oklahoma contended that the armed forces of the United States, and the merchant marine, were composed entirely of Democrats.

Mr. MOORE. I will say to the Senator from West Virginia, if I correctly understand his question, that I do not believe he will assert that there is a Senator on the floor or an American citizen who is not in complete sympathy with the so-called objectives of the bill. Does that answer the question?

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I dislike very much to have to disagree with my very distinguished colleague, but I want to keep the record straight in the matter of the repeal of the poll-tax law in the State of Pennsylvania. I myself can take a little honor for the repeal of that tax. A former very distinguished member of this body, who served with such distinction and ability as, I am satisfied, have few who have served in the Senate, was one of the strongest advocates in the State of Pennsylvania for the repeal of the poll tax. He is a Republican. His name is David A. Reed, of Pennsylvania, former United States Senator from that State.

I also wish to call the attention of my distinguished colleague to the fact, as I recall it, that a Republican State senator from the downtown section of the city of Pittsburgh, was a very strong advocate of the repeal of the poll tax in Pennsylvania. I am very proud of the fact that it was a Republican legislature which passed the anti-poll-tax measure. Its authors were Republicans.

Mr. President, I am not ashamed of the vote which I cast yesterday, to which my colleague has called attention. I believe that everyone in the armed forces should have a vote. I shall be willing to debate the question with my distinguished colleague not only on the floor of the Senate but on the platform when the time comes for the people of the country to vote for the next President of the United States.

Mr. DAVIS subsequently said: Mr. President, referring to the repeal of the poll-tax provision in the constitution of the State of Pennsylvania, and granting the right to people to vote without paying a poll tax, I have looked up the record, and find that on February 4, 1929, a joint resolution to repeal the poll tax provision of the constitution of the State as a requisite to voting was introduced in the senate by Senator Albert Davis, of Lackawanna County, and was passed during the 1929 session. The matter went over to the next session of the general assembly, and again the joint resolution was passed, in the 1931 session. It was accepted by the people of Pennsylvania on November 7, 1933, by a majority of 204,189, and the poll-tax provision was removed from the constitution. So from that time it has not been necessary in Pennsylvania that a poll tax be paid before one is entitled to vote.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not like to permit to go unchallenged one statement which has been made. The charge was made by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] that a former Senator had been lobbying on the Senate floor with Senators on behalf of my amendment or against the bill. Of my knowledge nothing of the kind has occurred. Certainly nothing of that kind has occurred with respect to my amendment. I wrote the amendment myself. In it I tried to meet the suggestions made by different Senators. So far as my amendment is concerned it is not political. It provides, for instance, that the contents of these magazines shall be wholly nonpartisan, nonpolitical, which is exactly the rule which was in force in World War No. 1, as explained by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] yesterday or the day before. The effort is to give absolute equality to both parties throughout. My amendment, provides that if an article is not nonpartisan, nonpolitical, equal space shall be given to the other side of the question. If an editorial is proposed to be written favorable to one side, space must be permitted for the insertion of an editorial in behalf of the other side. That is all I want to provide for. I wish to say that in my amendment I have not the slightest idea of partisanship or politics. But when we have a peculiar situation where the Government has the only access to the servicemen it is important that Congress tell the executive departments that it expects them to be absolutely nonpartisan and perfectly fair in handling this means of communication upon which the sacredness of the soldier's absentee ballot depends.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as modified. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WALLGREN. The senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is unavoidably absent. I am informed that if he were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] are detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to the State of Colorado.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is confined to his home with a cold.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent. He has a pair on this question with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. The Senator from Maine would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent due to a death in his family. He has a pair with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. The Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—42

Aiken	Hawkes	Reynolds
Austin	Holman	Robertson
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brooks	Langer	Taft
Buck	Lodge	Tobey
Burton	McCarran	Tydings
Bushfield	Maloney	Vandenberg
Butler	Millikin	Walsh, Mass.
Byrd	Moore	Wheeler
Capper	Nye	Wherry
Danaher	O'Daniel	White
Davis	Overton	Wiley
Ferguson	Reed	Willis
Hatch	Revercomb	Wilson

NAYS—35

Andrews	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Russell
Barkley	Hill	Scrugham
Bilbo	Kilgore	Smith
Caraway	Lucas	Stewart
Chandler	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McFarland	Truman
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Tunnell
Eastland	Maybank	Van Nuys
Ellender	Mead	Wagner
Gillette	O'Mahoney	Wallgren
Green	Pepper	

NOT VOTING—19

Bailey	George	Murdock
Ball	Gerry	Murray
Bone	Glass	Thomas, Idaho
Brewster	Gurney	Thomas, Okla.
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Colo.	Walsh, N. J.
Connally	La Follette	
Downey	McNary	

So Mr. TAFT's amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the vote just taken on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as modified, be reconsidered.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to the language on page 34, under the paragraph entitled "Act To Be Liberally Construed." It seems to me, upon reflection, that all Senators will find themselves challenged by the nature of the escape clauses which are included in the bill. I desire to read the two sentences, which are very brief:

ACT TO BE LIBERALLY CONSTRUED

SEC. 119. No mere informality in the manner of carrying out or executing the provisions of this title shall invalidate any ballots cast under it or otherwise be permitted to defeat its purposes. The provisions of this title shall be construed liberally in order to effectuate its purposes, and substantial compliance with its requirements shall be deemed to be sufficient.

I call attention to the fact that these escape clauses do not apply alone to the casting of the ballot by the soldier in some far-off place. They would follow the ballot right down to the local, home precinct where it is counted; and we are inviting informality in connection with this operation.

Mr. President, we have had certain informalities, in our experience and observation, in some of the rotten boroughs in this country in connection with the handling of elections; and I doubt whether, upon reflection, any Senator will desire to invite, by statute, any more informality than that with which we already have to contend.

The purpose is obviously good. The authors of the bill obviously have been trying to see to it that no pure technicality shall be pleaded against the right of the soldier to use his ballot. But, Mr. President, I think every voter will find himself adequately protected under the precedents; and I doubt whether we want to set a precedent for informality in the operation of an election law.

Not satisfied with merely inviting or condoning informality, we add that the law is to be liberally construed; and, not satisfied with that, after we have identified informality and liberal construction, we then complete the circuit by saying that mere substantial compliance with the act will suffice.

Mr. President, I do not believe we can write a voting law in the United States on that basis. I shall move to strike the language on page 34, from line 3 to line 10, both inclusive. I am wondering whether I am colliding with my good friend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] or my good friend the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] in that connection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, did the Senator from Michigan ask me a question?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes. I am inquiring whether an amendment of the nature I have suggested would be acceptable to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan is quite correct as to the motive which prompted the inclusion of these phrases in various parts of the bill. There are difficulties either way, as the Senator has indicated. On the one hand, casting a vote for President, Senators and Representatives is an important thing, and we do not want the intention to be vitiated by technicalities. On the other hand, however, we do not want the language of the bill to be so strictly construed, as it easily might be, that a soldier voting, often under informal circumstances, in an informal way, would not have his vote counted. Where to draw the line between the two extremes is difficult, as no doubt the Senator from Michigan realizes.

It seemed to us that this language was fair under the circumstances. Doubtless mistakes will be made by the soldier in marking his ballot. Doubtless mistakes will be made by the officer or the person who takes his acknowledgment. Doubtless mistakes will be made in addressing the outer envelope strictly in accordance with the language of the bill. In all such cases, with the soldier casting his vote in a place where no expert is available to advise him, as there is in most voting precincts, and where he has only the officer in charge to ask about these points, or acts without consulting the officer, it seemed to us to be fair to the soldier, sailor, or seaman to let his vote be counted in accordance with his obvious intent. That was the sole purpose of this language. I admit that there may be abuses; but I think the abuses which would result from including the language would be fewer than would result from excluding it. That is a question of opinion.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] for his observation on the subject.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let me say to the able Senator from Michigan that when this provision was written the committee had in mind the type of ballot which will be used in connection with the election. As the Senator knows, it will be a write-in ballot. A soldier might write in, we will say, the word "Republican." That ought to be construed as a Republican ballot. He might write in the word "Democrat." In that event the ballot should be construed as a Democratic ballot.

Among the election-contest cases in which the Senator from Illinois has been interested as a lawyer, I distinctly recall one case in central Illinois in which the name of a candidate for mayor was written in. As I recall, the named was Burnsmeyer. That name was written in probably 25 or 30 different ways. Nevertheless, the court, in making the decision under the laws of the State of Illinois, took into consideration the intention of the voter in writing that name, and counted the ballot for Burnsmeyer, even though the name might have been misspelled, so long as it was apparent from the name, regardless of how it was spelled, that the voter intended to vote for that particular candidate.

I am willing to compromise with the Senator from Michigan. I do not know how my colleague the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] feels about it. I am willing to compromise by striking out lines 4 to 6 inclusive, and the words "its purposes" at the beginning of line 7, leaving the general provision:

The provisions of this title shall be construed liberally in order to effectuate its purposes, and substantial compliance with its requirements shall be deemed to be sufficient.

I think that such a provision should remain in the bill as a matter of protec-

tion to the soldiers themselves. Certainly there could be nothing wrong with that. It would be a matter ultimately for the election judges in the particular precinct where the vote finally is lodged, to say whether or not the ballot is effective. I cannot see the danger in the paragraph which the able Senator from Michigan reads therein.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, may I add an illustration from my own State?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me first respond to the Senator from Illinois by calling attention to the language beginning at the bottom of page 21. It seems to me that that language ought to care for the general situation to which he refers. The language reads:

> No ballot shall be invalid by reason of mistake or omission in writing in the name of the candidate or his political party where the candidate or party intended by the voter is plainly identifiable.

In other words, we have already cared for the situation which the Senator now defines, and it is a situation which I wish to care for. It seems to me that it is already adequately cared for.

We are not only dealing with a section which relates to the casting of the ballot by the soldier somewhere in Africa, Asia, or somewhere else outside the United States, but we are also dealing with the entire electoral system after the ballot comes back home, after it goes to the secretary of state, and after it goes back to the local voting precinct where it is to be counted. We are saying that informality is to be permitted even in the counting of the ballots.

It seems to me that in view of the language at the bottom of page 21, which fully covers the point appropriately raised by the able Senator from Illinois, all of the language from line 3 to line 10, on page 34, should be eliminated, because it seems to open the door to a loose administration of the election laws. I know that the Senator from Illinois is as much interested in preventing that as I am.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Michigan. I do not want any loose administration of election laws in the respective States where votes are to be counted. Obviously, when the ballot reaches the State of Michigan or the State of Illinois the election judges will count it in line with what is required by State law. That is my judgment about it, notwithstanding what we may say here. Personally I cannot see any objection to the liberal construction of the proposed act. I cannot see the danger which the Senator sees in a provision that the act shall be liberally construed. It may be an over-statement of the case, in view of the language pointed out by the Senator from Michigan with respect to mistakes which might be made in writing in the ballot, and other irregularities.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I would have no objection to leaving in the language:

> The provisions of this title shall be construed liberally in order to effectuate its purposes.

However, I do not like to add—

> and substantial compliance with its requirements shall be deemed to be sufficient.

I think that goes too far.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I am willing to accept that modification.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Rhode Island finds the amendment agreeable. How about the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I can see no objection. I believe that the language "The provisions of this title shall be construed liberally in order to effectuate its purposes" is wholly sufficient to cover the purpose of the other language which we have used.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I also move, in line 7, to strike out the word "title" and insert in lieu thereof the word "act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], on page 34, to strike out lines 4, 5, and 6, and the first two words in line 7; in line 7, to strike out "title" and insert "act"; and in line 8, after the word "purposes" to strike out the comma and insert a period, and strike out the remainder of line 8 and all of lines 9 and 10.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may we have the section read as altered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The section, as proposed to be amended, will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 34, after line 3, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out lines 4 to 10, with the exception of the following:

> The provisions of this title shall be construed liberally in order to effectuate its purposes.

And in the foregoing language, to strike out "title" and insert "act."

Mr. WHITE. That part is to remain?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is all that would remain.

Mr. LUCAS. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, as I understand, the clause will stand, as amended:

> The provisions of this act shall be construed liberally in order to effectuate its purposes.

Is not that the established law in interpreting any election statute anyway?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suppose it is; but if it is desired to reiterate it, I have no objection, so long as the other two back doors are closed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the law with regard to the interpretation of election statutes would not apply to a Federal election law, because there is no Federal election law today to which it could apply. The statement of the Senator from Ohio is generally true in the States; but the proposed law would not require the interpretation of any State law in regard to the holding of elections, so it seems to me not inappropriate that this provision should be in the bill.

REPORT BY SENATOR BUTLER ON HIS TRIP TO CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICA

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is now on the floor, I wish to make a brief statement. A few days ago he asked to have printed as a Senate document a so-called report which he, as an individual Senator, had brought to the attention of the Senate as the result of his travels through Latin America. Regardless of the fact that the report has turned out to be controversial, it still retains its status as a Senate document when printed and circulated.

I have requested every department of the Government of the United States, every agency, and everyone who has had anything to do with the expenditure of money in any of the countries to which the Senator from Nebraska referred to furnish me with the exact facts, not only with reference to any appropriations which have been specifically made or earmarked by Congress, but any expenditures out of any other funds for any purpose and for all purposes, by all the agencies of the Government of the United States, so that there can be no longer any controversy about the accuracy of the amounts and the purposes for which the money was spent. When that information is obtained and has been gathered together in some form which will be suitable in order that the facts may be disclosed, I shall then desire that the compilation shall also be made a Senate document. I am not asking now, in advance, that that be done, but I am inviting the attention of the Senator from Nebraska and other Senators to the fact that I think that when the information shall be obtained in a way which will be indisputable, it ought to be printed in a form which will be handy and accessible.

As a matter of fact, if there were any way by which it could be done, it should be combined with the material submitted by the Senator from Nebraska and all the information put together, but I presume that would be impractical at this time. I merely call attention to the fact that we are seeking to gather minutely and meticulously any facts in regard to the matters brought to the attention of the Senate by the Senator from Nebraska. When that information is gathered, I shall wish to have it made available to the country.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have just heard the remarks made by the distinguished leader of the majority, and what he suggests is perfectly satisfactory to me. I wish him every success in the world in arriving at the complete story of expenditures in Latin America. I am sure the result will be interesting to everyone.

During my absence from the Chamber today the distinguished Senator from

Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] made a motion, and, if I may be permitted, I shall read what was said:

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I should like to make a motion that the report of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] on his trip to South America be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I have read the report, and it covers bureaus and matters that fall under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

In the absence of the Senator from Nebraska, the acting leader of the minority asked if the motion of the Senator from Missouri was agreeable to the Senator from Nebraska. The Senator from Missouri replied:

I am sure it is because he is a member of the Banking and Currency Committee. If it is not, I shall be glad to put it in any way that is agreeable to him, but I am sure it is agreeable to him.

The Vice President put the question, and the motion was agreed to.

Since then, I have visited with the Senator from Missouri, and, as I understand his agreement, it is that any investigatory work that is to be conducted will be left with the Truman committee because the Committee on Banking and Currency, of course, has no investigators. I suggested that the report be referred to the committee of which the distinguished Senator from Missouri is chairman for the purpose of investigating war expenditures. Therefore, I request again that it remain as established by the action taken by the Senate the other day, with the understanding that it may be referred, so far as legislative questions are concerned, to any other committee which the Chair thinks appropriate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the fact that the report was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency does not mean that it was taken away from the Truman committee, so far as its power to investigate is concerned. That committee has the authority, anyway, whether the report is referred to it or not. I think it well to leave the situation as it is.

Mr. BUTLER. That is satisfactory to me.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, yesterday a motion was made to return from the other House all papers relating to Calendar No. 393, House bill 2207. It was agreed on the floor between my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] and the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] that a motion to reconsider could be made after the papers were returned from the House. The matter involves a very brief amendment, which has been agreed to by all parties concerned, and which has the recommendation of the Attorney General of the United States. I note that the matter has been recently concluded. I therefore move that the Senate now proceed to a reconsideration of the votes by which, day before yesterday, the committee amendment was agreed to and the amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Connecticut.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KILGORE in the chair). The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed that at the end of the bill there be inserted the following:

SEC. 3. Section 339 of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1160), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 339. A person who claims to have derived United States citizenship through the naturalization of a parent or through the naturalization or citizenship of a husband, or who is a citizen of the United States by virtue of the provisions of section 201 (c) (d) (e) and (g) of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1138; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 601), may apply to the Commissioner for a certificate of citizenship. Upon proof to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the applicant is a citizen, and that the applicant's alleged citizenship was derived as claimed, or acquired, as the case may be, and upon taking and subscribing before a member of the service within the United States to the oath of allegiance required by this act of a petitioner for naturalization, such individual shall be furnished by the Commissioner or a deputy commissioner with a certificate of citizenship, but only if such individual is at the time within the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] is interested in this matter. He does not happen to be present on the floor, but it seems to me that he should be here, particularly if an amendment to the bill is to be agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I was not present when House bill 2207 was called up the other day. The senior Senator from Connecticut, my distinguished colleague, has now entered the Chamber. I am sure he knows all about the matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has just come into the Chamber.

Mr. MALONEY. Inasmuch as I have just come into the Chamber, I want to let it be known that I was busy at a meeting of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Not that it is necessary to confirm anything the Senator from Connecticut says, but I am glad to confirm that statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to contain a brief statement by way of explanation of the amendment which has been adopted. While it purports to speak for itself on its face, the fact is that children of American citizens born abroad have no way whatever by which to achieve a certificate of citizenship. Congress provided long ago that those who derive citizenship through naturalization may obtain certificates of citizenship through the court in which the naturalization process was had; but there has been no remedy for a citizen born to American parents, let us say, in Montreal. The hiatus obviously produced so many dilemmas and so many embarrassments that it is a wonder it was not long ago cured. The Attorney General, in a letter to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Immigration under date of July 5, 1943, recommended the adoption of the proposed measure, and states that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget has told him that there is no objection to the submission of the report. I want that to appear of record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting in time of war by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have an amendment to submit to the pending bill, S. 1285. Because it is rather lengthy, I think I may proceed with an explanation of it without causing it to be stated by the reading clerk for the present. I ask Senators therefore to bear with me on the understanding that in due course the proposed amendment will naturally be read.

I think it would be apropos, Mr. President, to suggest the absence of a quorum, and I do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Eastland	Maloney
Andrews	Ellender	Maybank
Austin	Ferguson	Mead
Bankhead	George	Millikin
Barkley	Gerry	Moore
Bilbo	Gillette	Nye
Bone	Green	O'Daniel
Brewster	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hatch	Overton
Brooks	Hawkes	Pepper
Buck	Hayden	Radcliffe
Burton	Hill	Reed
Bushfield	Holman	Revercomb
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Reynolds
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Capper	Kilgore	Russell
Caraway	Langer	Scrugham
Chandler	Lodge	Shipstead
Chavez	Lucas	Smith
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Stewart
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Taft
Danaher	McFarland	Thomas, Idaho
Davis	McKellar	Thomas, Utah

Tobey	Wagner	White
Truman	Wallgren	Wiley
Tunnell	Walsh, Mass.	Willis
Tydings	Walsh, N J	Wilson
Vandenberg	Wheeler	
Van Nuys	Wherry	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, on the desks of Senators there has been for several days the proposal of a substitute for the committee bill, printed in form, and bearing the date of November 29, 1943, as will appear. I am abandoning the suggestion of a substitute for the entire bill, in view of the many amendments which have already carried on the floor of the Senate.

I, therefore, move an amendment, Mr. President, which will commence on page 20 of the committee amendment, line 15, and strike from the committee amendment all material there inserted down to and including line 10 on page 34 of the committee amendment, and in lieu of the matter thus stricken I would insert material which will be stated in due course by the reading clerk, but which may be found commencing on page 5, line 13, of the print which I had caused to be placed on Senators' desks, running through line 5, page 21, in the November 29 proposed substitute.

Actually what I am proposing to do is to substitute for the mechanism contemplated by the committee bill a method of voting by absentee soldiers, and members of the merchant marine and others comprehended by the Aiken amendment, which will bring the election itself and the actual casting of the votes back to the States. The ballot will be cast in the State, it will be cast under a power of attorney which will be executed by the absentee voter. The vote when cast within the State shall be subject to all the State laws. The voters will be canvassed and counted and certified in each State by its proper canvassing board in the usual manner obtaining in the State.

The entire subject, after everything is said and done, finds us in rather a precarious position as a matter of law. I am personally of the opinion that under article I, section 4, of the Constitution of the United States, we do have the right, in voting for Members of Congress, at the very least, to supersede State laws, or to make regulations with respect to the manner of voting. Whether or not under the war powers we have that power with reference to Presidential electors, I do not know. That has never been canvassed in court, so far as I know; it has never been decided in any jurisdiction, except insofar as the Senate itself undertook to do so in 1942 in Public, No. 712, and in that action the House concurred, and the President approved Public, No. 712. Able lawyers here urge that our war powers under the Constitution are equal to our extending the vote for Presidential electors, such vote to be cast by absentees in the manner suggested by the committee bill. I voted, as I yesterday intimated, against the Aiken amendment, because I seriously doubt if we have any power whatsoever to extend our war powers to civilians who are serving with the armed forces, irrespective of the capacity in which such civilians serve. That is especially true in view of the fact that 47 out of the 48 States have already seen fit to enact absentee voters legislation in favor of such civilians. Therefore there is an existing mechanism under the laws of all but 1 of the States.

Moreover, I perceive from the committee bill that in title 3, section 302, this language is to be found:

> Nothing in this act shall be deemed to restrict the right of any member of the armed forces of the United States or of any other person to vote in accordance with the law of the State of his residence, if he does not elect to vote in accordance with the provisions of title I of this act.

Therefore, Mr. President, since this is an alternative proposal to the existing laws of the overwhelming plurality of our States, I would employ a mechanism which it seems to me is essential if we are to preserve the character of the States with reference to their control of voting within their borders, not only as to the manner, insofar as we can comport with existing State law, but also as to the certification and the canvassing and the counting of all the ballots.

Moreover, under the proposal as I intend to explain it in detail, there will actually be a person within the jurisdiction of the State who is actually casting a ballot in the State.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I indeed regret that I shall not be present tomorrow to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, which he is discussing so ably. If I were able to be present, I should vote for it. I am sorry also I shall not be here to vote for the substitute to be offered by the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I should also be glad to have opportunity to vote for the Eastland-McClellan-McKellar substitute, but I shall not be present tomorrow, and consequently shall not be able to vote for these amendments.

However, I recognize that there is going to be a final vote on the bill in some form or other giving a right to our soldiers to vote, and I want to say that I should like very much to be present when the vote is had, and if I were present I should vote to give the soldiers the privilege of voting.

I thank the Senator from Connecticut very much for yielding to me.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I wish to call the Senator's attention to a matter which is of some concern to me and to the people of Maine. Some of us think that the election to be held there next September is the most important election to be held throughout the country. But it seems to me that the Senator's amendment, as it is now drafted, excludes from the benefits of the legislation, if they be benefits, the soldiers and sailors of my State who may be abroad. Let me call the Senator's attention to the language on page 6 of his amendment.

> You having been appointed my proxy to vote in my behalf in the general election to be held November 7, 1944.

In Maine, Mr. President, our Senators and our Representatives are not elected in the November election at all, but are elected in September. I wish the Senator would consider an amendment of that language so that it will read substantially in this wise:

> You having been appointed my proxy to vote in my behalf in the general elections—
>
> Making that word plural—
>
> to be held in 1944.

That would cover both the September election in my State and the elections held in other States in November. Much the same suggestion should be made with respect to the language appearing on the top of page 8. That language is as follows:

> Oath of elector for voting in the general election to be held on November 7, 1944.

That language has the same infirmity as the other language of which I have just complained. If the Senator will consider making the word "election" plural, so that it will read "elections," and then to have the remainder read "to be held in 1944" I think that would cover my State as well as other States, and I see no reason for any objection to the alteration.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I not only agree in the suggestion of the Senator from Maine but gladly adopt his suggestion. I would point out to him that on page 22 of the committee bill, after line 12, the same thing appears, and it was on that account that I carried over into the mechanism I propose the suggestion of the committee.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator is quite right. The same infirmity appears in the committee bill, and I had intended at the appropriate time to call attention to it.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me ask the Senator from Maine, while we are on the subject: So far as this enabling legislation is concerned, in the State of Maine it would apply in September so far as Members of Congress are concerned.

Mr. WHITE. That is quite right.

Mr. DANAHER. And would apply again in November so far as Presidential electors are concerned. Is that not so?

Mr. WHITE. Yes; that is correct, with the change made as I suggested. In September we elect all officers voted for in the State of Maine save Presidential electors. Every fourth year we have a second election, that second election coming in November, at which time we choose our Presidential electors.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me ask the Senator from Maine another question. Is there an absentee voters' law in Maine?

Mr. WHITE. There is.

Mr. DANAHER. And under that law may absentee voters vote in both elections to which the Senator has referred?

Mr. WHITE. They would have the privilege of voting in both elections, but they would have to make their applications for their ballots to be cast in both elections.

Mr. DANAHER. And in that election may they also vote on an absentee ballot for all State officers?

Mr. WHITE. On an absentee ballot they may vote for every officer who is a candidate for office in our State.

Mr. DANAHER. It is perfectly clear that a citizen of the State of Maine who will be absent at either election date would be much better off were he to avail himself of the privileges conferred by the law of the State of Maine than were he to avail himself of this bill. Under the law of the State of Maine he would be permitted to vote for all officers.

Mr. WHITE. If he wanted to vote in the September election he could proceed under the State law and vote without regard to the provisions of the proposed legislation. The same thing is true with respect to the November election. He could proceed under our absentee ballot law and vote in that election. But it seemed to me that the statute which we are proposing to enact ought to make it clear that he could utilize the provisions of the committee amendment if he saw fit to do so.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me further ask the Senator from Maine, with reference to his State, Would not the citizens of his State be infinitely better off if we were to adopt title II of the committee bill and create a mechanism which the Army and Navy would be required to follow in taking the applications of the Maine absentee voters from the field to the State House, or to whatever appropriate election centers there be in Maine?

Mr. WHITE. I am not clear in my own mind without checking what title II is.

Mr. DANAHER. It begins in line 11, on page 34.

Mr. WHITE. There has always been a question in my mind whether with absentee voting laws in force in 47 States we ought not to confine ourselves to that method in any event.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me point out to the Senator from Maine that in the committee print in title I there is a provision that the Army and Navy officials in administering the act shall expedite the ballots, and shall do everything possible to make certain that opportunity shall be given, through air carriage generally, to carry the ballots from the field to the respective States. There is no such provision in title II. Does the Senator notice that?

Mr. WHITE. That is quite true, I believe.

Mr. DANAHER. So that if we were to amend title II to require that the Army and Navy give the same expedition to applications as has previously been authorized by State law we would be doing a very real service to the absentee voters of the State of Maine, would we not?

Mr. WHITE. I quite agree.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I was interested in the proposal made by the Senator from Maine. I think a unique situation exists in his State. I am not familiar with the language of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut; but the statement made by the Senator from Maine raises an unusual situation, and I want to inquire whether or not the language which has already been proposed by the Senator from Connecticut will take care of it. In the event the proxy or power of attorney is presented in September, can it remain on file until November, and can it be used again at that time, or is there any language which needs to be altered so that the same proxies can be used at the two State elections?

Mr. DANAHER. The language of my amendment would not so provide because it provides that the vote shall be had in accordance with the laws of the State where the vote is to be cast.

Mr. BURTON. My question is whether the proxy which is presented in time for the September election could remain on file and be used in the November election also?

Mr. WHITE. I do not believe that could be done under the Maine State law. I think an application would have to be made for absentee ballots for both elections.

Mr. DANAHER. And the same thing would be true under the committee bill, would it not?

Mr. WHITE. I think so.

Mr. DANAHER. Except that no application would be required, but there would be a separate ballot in each instance.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. My recollection is that the committee had no intention at all of having this machinery apply to the election of State officers.

Mr. DANAHER. Oh, that is true. I agree.

Mr. AUSTIN. It was a voluntary and willful separation from the permission to use the State machinery for State elections, simply because of the complication and extraordinary work that would be imposed on the Army and the Navy if we made this machinery useful in all the different kinds of elections which might be held.

Mr. DANAHER. But I am sure that even the answer of our distinguished friend from Vermont does not go to the question asked by the Senator from Ohio. Am I not correct?

Mr. BURTON. Yes; the question I raised——

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, Mr. President, I was not trying to answer that question.

Mr. DANAHER. I thought the Senator was.

Mr. AUSTIN. No. I am sorry. I was not trying to answer that question. I was trying to answer a previous question.

Mr. BURTON. If I may inquire again, then, referring solely to the election of the Federal officers—that is, of Senators and Representatives in September, and the Presidential electors in November—would it be necessary for the soldier from Maine to have two powers of attorney, or could the soldier sign one power of attorney and have his proxy use that to vote in the September election, and then let it remain on file, to be used again by his proxy in November for casting a ballot in the election for Presidential electors?

Mr. WHITE. I do not know the answer to that question. The use of a proxy in casting votes in my State is something I never heard of. It is not a part of our law. Under the Maine law as it now stands I have no question that an application would have to be made for an absentee ballot for the September election, and a separate and distinct application would have to be made for an absentee ballot for the November election.

Mr. DANAHER. But what the Senator from Maine says about the proposed amendment applies alike to the committee bill. There would have to be two separate ballots; is that not so?

Mr. WHITE. I believe that to be true.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes. Would the Senator from Rhode Island differ with that statement?

Mr. GREEN. Yes, Mr. President; I would differ. Because the committee amendment applies only to the Presidential election——

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator does not mean that. The committee amendment applies to both——

Mr. GREEN. To the Presidential election and the congressional election.

Mr. DANAHER. To both the Presidential and congressional elections.

Mr. GREEN. Yes; I said it applies to both.

Mr. DANAHER. I am sorry; I did not understand the Senator.

The Senator from Maine has also said that, in Maine, the soldier would have to have two ballots, one in order to cast his vote in the September congressional election and the other in order to cast his vote in the November Presidential election. Is that not so?

Mr. GREEN. I presume it is.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I should like to clarify the situation, if I am able to do so. I understood the Senator from Maine to suggest that the language relative to the power of attorney be so changed that it would cover the power of attorney for the general elections in 1944, thereby requiring the soldier to sign but one instrument. I am simply wondering whether that would be sufficient, if the suggestion were adopted.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine did not say only one application would be required. He did not even mean that. What he did mean by making the statement "general elections," in the plural, was to cover all general elections. Is that not so?

Mr. WHITE. That is correct, Mr. President; the general elections, both the

general election in November, when candidates for President are voted for, and the general election in September, when candidates for Senator and Representatives are voted for. I do not know what the proposed interpretation is, but I should assume there would be two powers of attorney, although I suppose they could be incorporated into one power of attorney, granting the power to act in both elections. However, that is mere guesswork on my part.

Mr. DANAHER. But whatever the fact may be, it applies alike to the committee proposal, so far as the State of Maine is concerned; does it not?

Mr. WHITE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, it raises, obviously, an additional phase of the intricacy of an attempt by the Congress to override in this manner the election laws of the 48 States. It certainly does present, as I said when I commenced my remarks, what can at best be described as a precarious situation.

While the Senator from Maine has said that in his State there has never even occurred to the very able people who live there the notion of a vote by proxy, the fact remains that in the State of Connecticut it has been the practice for a good many years, and it works admirably. What I am seeking to do is to call to the attention of the Congress a method which, in principle, would be adapted to the ends we all seek to accomplish, to make it possible for absentees to vote, but to vote in person, through their alter egos within the State, and in accordance with its laws.

Not only can that be done; but I respectfully submit, that the method I have suggested can be adapted to every single recommendation of the committee. Indeed, Mr. President, I have done no more in the proposed amendment than to substitute the principle of the proxy vote for the language which came from the committee. I have followed its structure, I have followed its framework, I have even adopted the very form of declaration with reference to the ballot which the committee itself has set forth. There is no variance in that particular.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, the Senator from Connecticut has admitted that the secrecy of the ballot would be violated by having a proxy vote.

Mr. DANAHER. No, Mr. President; I do not admit that. This is what I say: Take, for example, the way the thing operates in the State of Connecticut, at this moment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am not so much interested in that.

Mr. DANAHER. That is a good way to find out—to have me tell the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Perhaps so; but let me inquire whether the pending bill is patterned after the Connecticut laws.

Mr. DANAHER. No; the bill before us is patterned after the committee's recommendation, simply adapting to it a mechanism which in principle is the Connecticut mechanism, and which works admirably.

Mr. LUCAS. What advantage could there be in having a boy at Guadalcanal send the information to his father in Havana, Ill., and say to him, "I want you to vote the way I have instructed"? What advantage would there be?

Mr. DANAHER. Let us assume a case. Assume that in Havana, Ill., there is a gentleman named John W. White who presents himself to the moderator in his own election precinct on the morning of November 7, 1944, and demands to vote; and the moderator runs his finger down the list, and ascertains that on the list is the name John W. White. The moderator asks, "Where do you live?"

The reply is, "22 Evergreen Avenue, Havana, Ill."

Then his name is checked off, and he is permitted to vote. He can come back in 2 or 3 minutes, and can say, "Now I want to vote for my son, John W. White, Jr." The registrar or moderator would say, "What is your authority to vote for him?" He would say, "He is an absentee soldier. He is in Munda. He has sent me this power of attorney."

The power of attorney would be identical with the inner-envelope idea the committee has suggested. It would contain on its face a statement that the soldier was 21 years of age, or whatever his actual age might be, that he was in the armed services. I would also require that his serial number be set forth. Moreover, I would require that he appear before a superior officer and attest and take oath to the power of attorney in fact; that the commissioned officer further certify that he knows the individual who presented himself to him, and that in fact he is the soldier who purports thus to create the power of attorney. That, I submit, is a very marked difference from the language of the committee bill.

Mr. LUCAS. However, Mr. President, what is the——

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I should like the Senator to permit me to continue, and to take up the matter step by step.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well.

Mr. DANAHER. Then he would present the power of attorney, and it would be valid on its face; and the moderator would say, "That is all right; that complies with all the instructions which we understand to apply." So he would check off the name "John W. White, Jr., absentee," and he would write the words "By John W. White, proxy." And that individual would enter the booth, and open his son's instructions. The man who knows that his own son is fighting perhaps for his very life at that moment would be confronted with his son's instructions. He never would violate those instructions of his son. He would obey them. He would abide by them just as faithfully as he could.

But before he went into the booth, he would take an oath, consummated before the moderator, that he would not disclose the instructions his son had given to him; and he would not do so unless and until there were an election contest, in which case a court of competent jurisdiction could of course make inquiry, as it can in any election case. Then, and in those circumstances, those very inhibitions would be removed by the court order of a court of appropriate jurisdiction.

Moreover, John W. White, Sr., would be within the jurisdiction, where everyone knows him, where the moderators can check on him. He would, moreover, cast the vote in accordance with the law of the State of Illinois, and it would be counted in the same manner, because it was a vote which was cast there, and in person, by John W. White, in behalf of his absentee son.

The son having selected his own father or his own wife, or, if he have no father or wife or other relative to whom he chooses to entrust his ballot, he may designate his trusted friend, whom he himself selects——

Mr. LUCAS. He could select the leader of the precinct; could he not?

Mr. DANAHER. He could select his political leader; but it is infinitely better that he select the political leader than it is that the secretary of state in some State send all the absentee ballots to what the committee bill calls "appropriate officials." I have heard before now of appropriate officials whose actions have resulted in court contests—yes, in convictions—because of the manner in which such "appropriate officials" have carried out or have abused, as the case may have been, the trust reposed in them. There would not be any chance for that.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. There would be no reason why the political leader of a county or of a precinct should not accept 50 proxies, if he could get them, and vote the proxies.

Mr. DANAHER. That is true.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, under the Senator's amendment, we should have proxy hunters all over the United States, looking for soldiers' ballots in the 1944 campaign. The Senator has not yet told me the advantage of proxy voting over the plan outlined in the bill. That is something I cannot follow.

Mr. DANAHER. I cannot understand why I have not told the Senator. If he does not follow me that is another matter.

Let me put it in this way: If there are 10,000,000 servicemen absent in the service, and each of those men selects his own wife or father to act for him, what more could the Senator want? He would be selecting the one person he knows he can trust, or at least has every reason to think he can trust.

Mr. LUCAS. Apparently the Senator does not trust absentee balloting at all; yet we have it in 46 of the 48 States, where absentee ballots are voted absolutely in secret and counted by the judges of the election precincts, the same as any other ballots.

Mr. DANAHER. Does the Senator feel that that system is adequate?

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. Then why are we taking all this time with this bill?

Mr. LUCAS. I certainly feel that the absentee ballot laws, so far as they go, are adequate; but they cannot meet the situation in the emergency which exists at the present time. I went over all that with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] the other day in the debate.

I cannot follow the Senator when he makes the statement that the proxy ballot would still be a secret ballot. If one political leader knows how 50 men in the Army are going to vote——

Mr. DANAHER. How would he know that?

Mr. LUCAS. If he were a proxy hunter, he might know it. I can assure the Senator that under his amendment there would be proxy hunters all over the country seeking soldiers' votes. There would be nothing to keep a proxy hunter from casting 25 or 50 votes, if he had the proxies in his pocket.

Let me say to the Senator that when we first introduced the bill we conceived the idea of having the ballots microfilmed and returned by V-mail. I was charged by a very prominent newspaper in my State with a conspiracy with President Roosevelt to steal the 1944 election, because we were violating the secrecy of the ballot.

Mr. DANAHER. There is nothing to that charge. I hope the Senator was absolved.

Mr. LUCAS. I cite that merely as an illustration. If we were proposing to violate the secrecy of the ballot by having the ballots sent here by microfilming, I undertake to say that the Senator's amendment is far more open to that charge than was the original proposal. In other words, if 5,000,000 soldiers vote by proxy, at least 5,000,000 persons will be looking over the soldiers' shoulders when they go into the booths to vote. I think that the editorial in the Herald Tribune, which is the bible of the Republican Party, was eminently correct when it stated that the amendment of the able Senator went right to the heart of suffrage, in that it certainly would violate the secrecy of the ballot. I do not see how the Senator can contend that his proposal does not violate the sacred right of secrecy.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, our Government is founded upon the sanctity of the oath—our oath, the oath of a jury which makes deliverance between the accused and his Government, the oath of the President himself, and the elector's oath, under which he acts for himself. The man who holds the proxy takes oath that he will preserve the secrecy of his appointment by his son to execute the son's wishes. I refuse to believe that that particular person, in violation of his oath, will go around telling how his son wanted him to vote. I do not believe it.

I respectfully suggest to the Senator from Illinois that this is the best method it is possible to devise for obtaining honest, accurate voting in behalf of absentee soldiers. I know that it would work. I do not have to leave this Chamber to tell the Senator that in the city of Hartford we had an election on November 2 of this year. Hundreds of absentee soldiers voted under that particular method, the only distinction being that under our law they empowered a moderator, whom they did not know, to appoint two electors, from opposite political parties, to vote in behalf of the absentee. The electors took an oath of secrecy and voted 200, 300, 400, or whatever number of absentee ballots were entrusted to their care.

Because of the possibility mentioned by the Senator from Illinois, I have restricted proxies to the father, mother, or relative of the absent soldier. Going one step further, if that is all the Senator has to worry about, we could easily limit the number of ballots that could be cast by any one father.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. What kind of a ballot would the proxy finally vote after he got into the booth?

Mr. DANAHER. The very ballot, in the very same words used by the Senator in the committee bill. I adopted the very same language.

Mr. LUCAS. That would mean that the ballot commission would have to send to the election officials of every precinct in America a great number of ballots. I do not know how many, but the total would be in the millions, in order to take care of voting by proxy. Where would the proxy get the ballot?

Mr. DANAHER. Where did the Senator expect the soldier in the field to get a ballot? He would get it through the electoral commission, which prints them and sends them out to the field.

Mr. LUCAS. Then when he votes the ballot——

Mr. DANAHER. It is the very same thing. There is no difference.

Mr. LUCAS. He will go into the election booth, with the ballot——

Mr. DANAHER. He will open his instruction envelope, on the outside of which will be his power of attorney.

Mr. LUCAS. Then he will go into the booth by himself.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. What ballot will he vote when he gets in there?

Mr. DANAHER. The ballot his son sends him.

Mr. LUCAS. Then the son will not mark it at all?

Mr. DANAHER. Certainly he will. He will mark it just the way the Senator from Illinois suggested in the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Why will the proxy have to go into the booth, if the ballot is already marked?

Mr. DANAHER. If the Senator wants to let him walk by a box and drop it in the box, instead of going into a booth, that is all right. It is immaterial.

Mr. LUCAS. Then the ballot proposed by the Senator is the same as that proposed by the committee. The only difference is that instead of it being sent to the secretary of state, it would be sent to the next of kin, the father, the brother, or sister.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois, who is so distinguished a Member of this body, has done me scant honor. The very least he could have done before asking all these questions would have been to compare what I have caused to be printed with what the committee reported. If he had only looked at it, he would have seen that the two forms are identical. There is no difference. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that he will save the time of the Senate if he will compare what appears on page 22 of the committee print with what appears on page 6 of my amendment. The two forms are identical.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not want the Senator from Connecticut to think of my doing him scant honor. I do not feel that way about him.

Mr. DANAHER. If the Senator had read my amendment——

Mr. LUCAS. I have read the Senator's amendment, and I will say candidly that I have not yet been able to ascertain from reading it just how the vote is to be cast when it finally gets back, we will say, to Havana, Ill. I do not understand it, and I wish the Senator would explain it to me again. I cannot follow it.

Mr. DANAHER. I was talking about a man named John W. White, of 22 Evergreen Avenue, Havana, Ill.

Mr. LUCAS. I have heard of Mr. White.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. White receives from John W. White, Jr., at Munda, an inner envelope, but it comes to him via the secretary of state of the State of Illinois. I believe that we can place more trust in the father of the absentee soldier when he receives that envelope from the secretary of state of Illinois than we can place in the election officials of some other places in Illinois when they receive absentee ballots from the secretary of state of the State of Illinois.

The committee bill suggests that the secretary of state of Illinois send the ballots to "appropriate officials" within the given election precinct. I do not want that to be done. I have heard too much about some States. I want the ballot to be sent to the father, John W. White, in Havana, Ill., whose absentee son has taken an oath that he is willing to trust his father. Now, if the Senator from Illinois will turn to page 6 of the suggestion of the Senator from Connecticut, he will find that the son would mark a proposed ballot identical with that which the Senator from Illinois and the committee have set forth in the committee print. The only difference is that the ballot would be cast in Illinois by a citizen of Illinois who is an American citizen and the father, or the trusted friend of the absentee, instead of entrusting it to an official, however appropriate he may be.

Mr. President, I go one step further and say that the actual physical act of violating the State law, should there be any violation, would occur within pre-

cincts where the violation could be prosecuted, where the individual who violates the law would be amenable to the laws of the State of Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Would not the election officials be amenable if they should violate the law?

Mr. DANAHER. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that we do not have to go to the length of putting them in jeopardy. We can handle the matter by providing that the father shall cast the ballot.

Mr. LUCAS. By using the proxy method there is one more individual who can be charged with violation of the law. In addition to the officials perhaps being charged with having done something wrong, there would be another individual involved, just as there would be if, at the present time, the ballot was sent through the county clerk.

Mr. DANAHER. No; all I would do would be to substitute the father for the election officials. The same number of persons would handle the ballot in exactly the same way except they would all be amenable to State law.

Mr. LUCAS. When the father receives the ballot for John White in Munda from the secretary of state in Illinois, he then carries the ballot with him; he protects it, he can vote it if he wants to, or not vote it if he does not want to. It is up to him. Some ballots are sent to the political leader. Some soldier may not have a next of kin living in his own community, and he has to send the ballot to his political leader, who carries it with him for 10 days, 2 weeks, or perhaps 3 weeks, or whatever the time may be, and then finally walks into the booth on election day and drops the proxy in the ballot box. Am I correct about that?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. And that is all there is to it. Of course, he takes the oath when he drops the ballot into the ballot box that it is in the same condition as when he received it, and so forth, and so on.

Mr. DANAHER. And that preserves secrecy. Let me say further that I do not agree that it would be carried 10 days, 2 weeks, or 3 weeks. The Senator has put that in.

On page 29 of the committee bill, in line 21, we find the following language:

> The secretary of state of the State of the voter's residence who shall at an appropriate time transmit it to the appropriate election officials of the district, precinct, county—

That is what the committee wants to do. What does the committee mean by "an appropriate time"? I assume that in the State of Illinois mail from Springfield can reach any of the election precincts in not to exceed 3 days. I suppose the Senator had in mind that the secretary of state would see to it, under regulations which the Senator would authorize the Commission to prepare, that the ballot would be sent, perhaps, by registered mail with return receipt requested. Maybe 5 days would be required. I do not know. But, whatever the Senator from Illinois wanted, I took identically the same language and provided that the secretary of state at an appropriate time should cause the ballot, with the instructions of the soldier, to be delivered to the named proxy.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the point exactly. In other words, the secretary of state, under the committee bill, at the appropriate time delivers the ballots to the various county clerks in the State of Illinois, and in Chicago I think it would be—and if I am wrong about it my colleague can correct me—to the chairman of the board of election commissioners there. I think that is the way it would be handled. But, anyway, in the case of the counties down-State having county clerks, the secretary of state would send all the ballots to the various counties, and the county clerk, who is a duly elected official, under bond, would hold the absentee ballots until such time as he could distribute them to the election officials in the various precincts.

Mr. DANAHER. In the Senator's judgment, what is the appropriate time which is provided for?

Mr. LUCAS. As I recall, the ballot has to be in the proper election precinct 2 or 3 days before the date of the election. Under the present absentee-voting law it has to be cast within 30 days before the election, but under our proposal, it can be cast any time after it is received. An election might be held in Munda some 2 months before it was held in the United States and the ballot might be in the clerk's office for 40 days, if it is sent there from the secretary of state the moment he receives it.

The same thing could occur under the Senator's proposal. When the secretary of state gets the ballot he will send it on to John White at Havana, Ill., where it may remain 20 or 30 or 40 days in advance of the election and John White would carry that proxy around with him during that length of time.

Mr. DANAHER. He would not do it if the words "appropriate time" are given anything like the reasonable construction which the Senator and I would expect, as a matter of law, would be given.

Mr. LUCAS. It would not make any difference.

Mr. DANAHER. No; it would not make any difference.

Mr. LUCAS. He is the person trusted by the soldier, and he can well carry the proxy for 20 days.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes; but the Senator and I are ignoring the practicalities of the situation. It would not be that way, as the Senator knows. Moreover, on page 18 of the amendment which I propose, this language is found:

> No ballot otherwise authorized to be cast under the provisions of this title shall be valid if * * *
>
> (2) The date of the oath of the absentee voter is later than the date of the holding of the election.

That would end it right there. There would be no waiting to find out how many votes are needed before the election official goes into the ballot sack.

Mr. LUCAS. Under the Senator's amendment the proxy would take care of that long in advance.

Mr. DANAHER. No; I think the soldier of the United States who is interested enough to want to vote for President and Members of Congress will do everything he can to safeguard his vote. I want him to have the privilege of voting because I think 9 out of every 10 of the absentee soldiers will vote Republican, and I want their votes to be counted.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator wants the votes counted, he had better withdraw his proxy provision, and vote for the pending bill instead.

Mr. DANAHER. I respectfully comment that I can understand why the appropriate voting election official is suggested.

Mr. LUCAS. There are some honest election officials in this country. I do not know whether the officials of Connecticut have had anything to do with the changing of the law in that State from this method to that method, but it is a recognized fact that the percentage of absentee voting in 46 of the 48 States is just the same.

Mr. DANAHER. When we saw what was happening in other States, Connecticut adopted the system which I have described, and it is very effective.

Mr LUCAS. I regret that the Senator has cast reflection on 46 States. Some of them, at least, must have some honest officials somewhere along the line, and I believe that in most States the votes are counted.

Mr. DANAHER. No; they started too early, may I say to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Kentucky if it is his disposition that we conclude at or about this time, or shall we press on?

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought the Senator would probably wish to conclude before we conclude, but if he does not, I would conclude to quit.

Mr. DANAHER. I will go along with the Senator from Kentucky now, as I so often do.

Mr. BARKLEY. I mean that if the Senator does not wish to conclude his remarks this afternoon in order that we may reach a conclusion concerning what he has proposed, I shall be glad to reach the conclusion that we ought to conclude our work.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to have the other 70 Senators have an opportunity to read in the RECORD what I have said today.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure that they will have the opportunity, but whether they will take it or not, I do not know. [Laughter.]

Mr. DANAHER. So if the Senator from Kentucky is willing that an adjournment or recess be taken until 12 o'clock tomorrow, it is agreeable to me.

Mr. President, I send to the desk now the text of the amendment which we have been discussing, and ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mr. DANAHER to the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes, viz: Commencing on page 20 in line 15 of the printed committee amendment, as amended, strike out all material down to and including line 10, on page 34, and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"INSTRUCTIONS

"SEC. 104. (a) Each person eligible to vote in general elections under this title, may on an appropriate form to be known as an 'Appointment and instruction blank' appoint under oath and in writing an American citizen who may be his father, mother, relative, or other trusted friend, to act as his proxy, who shall be bound to cast a vote in behalf of such absentee in accordance with the instructions of such absentee, who shall indicate his choice of candidates or party on such appointment and instruction blank.

"(b) The Commission shall cause to be prepared and printed for use by those persons who are eligible to vote in accordance with section 102 an adequate number of appointment and instruction blanks. Each such blank shall be printed in the following form insofar as the officers enumerated are appropriate to the particular election, and shall contain directions as indicated:

"SPECIAL ABSENTEE VOTER'S APPOINTMENT AND INSTRUCTION BLANK

"Directions. If you wish to appoint an American citizen, who may be your father, mother, relative, or other trusted friend, to vote in your behalf and in accordance with your instructions, you may direct that such person so appointed write in the name of the candidate of your choice for each office or that such person write in the name of your political party—Democratic, Republican, or other

"You having been appointed my proxy to vote in my behalf in the general election to be held in 1944, I direct that you cast my vote in my behalf in accordance with the instructions hereinafter indicated.

"ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

"(A vote for President includes a vote for Vice President of the same party)

"Write in the name of your choice for President or the name of his party_____

"UNITED STATES SENATOR

"Only if a Senator is to be elected in your State

"Write in the name of your choice for Senator or the name of his party_____

"REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FOR YOUR DISTRICT

"Write in the name of your choice for Representative in Congress for your district or the name of his party_____

"REPRESENTATIVE AT LARGE IN CONGRESS

"(Only in the States entitled thereto)

"(Vote for one or two as the case may be)

"Write in the name or names of your choice for Representative at Large or the name of his party_____

"Instructions for a vote by party designation shall be deemed to call for a vote for the candidate of that party by name. Instructions for a vote for a Presidential candidate by name shall be deemed to call for a vote for the candidates for Presidential and Vice Presidential electors of his party. No instructions shall be invalid by reason of mistake or omission in writing in the name of the candidate or his political party where the candidate or party intended by the absentee is plainly identifiable.

"(c) The Commission shall also cause to be prepared and printed an appropriate number of official inner envelopes for use in sealing the official appointment and instructions. Each envelope shall be gummed ready for sealing. Upon one side of the envelope shall be printed:

"OFFICIAL FEDERAL APPOINTMENT OF PROXY FOR ABSENTEE VOTER FOR GENERAL ELECTION

"Name of voter _____
"(Print your name plainly here)

"Home residence:

"Street and number (if any) or rural route _____
"(Print street and number or rural route plainly here)

"City or town (if any) _____
"(Print city or town plainly here)

"County _____
"(Print county plainly here)

"Upon the other side of such envelope shall be printed the following oath, at the top of which shall be set forth the date of the election:

"OATH OF ELECTOR FOR VOTING IN THE GENERAL ELECTIONS TO BE HELD IN 1944

"I do hereby swear (or affirm) that:

"(1) I am a citizen of the United States;

"(2) The date of my birth was _____;

"(3) For _____ years preceding this election my home residence has been in the State of _____;

"(4) For _____ years preceding this election my home residence has been in the (city, town, or village) of _____ in the county of _____ at (street and number, if any, or rural route) _____;

"(5) I am in the armed forces of the United States and my serial number is_____; and that I am relying exclusively on this method of voting, that I have not voted and do not intend to vote in this election at any address other than the above; and that I have not received or offered, do not expect to receive, have not paid, offered or promised to pay, contributed, offered, or promised to contribute to another, to be paid or used, any money or other valuable thing as a compensation or reward for the giving of a vote at this election, and have not made any promise to influence the giving or withholding of any such vote; and that I have not been convicted of bribery or any infamous crime, or, if so convicted, that I have been pardoned or restored to all the rights of a citizen, without restriction as to the rights of suffrage.

"I, therefore, appoint as my proxy for me and in my behalf to vote in accordance with the instructions herein contained, in the place of my own residence, as above_____

_____
"(Here insert name of proxy)

who is my_____
"(Father, mother, or other relative, or trusted friend, indicate which)

who, according to my best information last lived at_____
"(Street and number, if any, or rural route)

_____
(City or town)

_____
"(County) (State)

"_____

"(Voter must sign his usual signature here and oath must be administered and attested.)

"Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____, 194__. I further certify that the above-named absentee voter is personally known or has been specifically identified to me as being the person bearing such name and that I did not solicit or advise said absentee voter to vote for or against any political party or for or against any candidate.

"_____
"(Commissioned officer or other person authorized to administer and attest this oath (indicate which).)

"(c) The Commission shall also cause to be prepared and printed an appropriate number of official outer envelopes for use in returning to the Commission the official appointment and instruction blank and official inner envelopes. Upon such outer envelope the following shall be printed:

"Free of all postage, including air mail.

"Official Special Absentee Voter's Appointment and Instruction Blank.

"To the special absentee voters' commission:

"For transmission to the secretary of state of the State shown below:

"Voter's home residence:

"Street and number (if any) or rural route _____
"(Print clearly)

"City or town_____
"(Print clearly)

"Ccunty and State_____
"(Print clearly)

"(d) Appointment and instruction forms and envelopes for use outside the United States shall be suitable for air mailing.

"(e) The Commission shall also cause to be prepared and printed an adequate number of copies of directions for following the procedure specified by the provisions of this title.

"(f) Where the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy determines that the transmission abroad of any material required to be prepared and printed by the provisions of this section is inexpedient because of transportation difficulties or for other reasons arising from the conduct of the war, the Commission is authorized to arrange for such material to be printed outside the United States.

"SEC. 105. (a) As an alternative to voting in accordance with the law of the State of his residence, an absentee voter may appoint as proxy to vote in his behalf in the place where the absentee would be entitled to vote were he present in person, an American citizen who may be his father, mother, relative, or trusted friend who shall when appointed reside, according to the absentee's best information, in the same village, town, or city in which the absentee has residence. Any person desiring to appoint a proxy to vote in his behalf under the provisions of this title shall privately fill out the instruction blank so as clearly to state the manner in which he wishes his vote to be cast and shall place the appointment and instruction blank in the official inner envelope and shall seal the same. Thereupon such person shall appear before a commissioned officer or other person authorized to administer and attest oaths and shall sign and swear to the statement of appointment and to the affidavit prescribed on the outside of the official inner envelope. The commissioned officer or other person authorized to administer and attest oaths before whom such voter has appeared shall administer the oath (or affirmation) of such person, shall subscribe the same, and shall further certify that such person being an absentee voter appeared before such official, that such absentee voter is personally known or specifically identified to such official as being the person bearing such name and that he signed and swore to (or affirmed) the affidavit concerning the appointment and voting instructions in the manner prescribed, and that such official did not solicit or advise such absentee voter to vote for or against any political party or for or against any candidate. After the oath of the absentee voter has been duly attested and the certificate of the official taking such oath has been affixed, the absentee voter shall then place the official inner envelope in the official outer envelope provided for the return of the appointment and voting

instructions to the Commission and shall deliver it to a person designated by proper authority to receive the executed forms of transmission to the Commission.

"(b) Any commissioned officer in the armed forces of the United States and any other person designated for this purpose by the Commission is authorized to administer and attest such oaths as are required by this title. All such oaths shall constitute prima facie evidence that the voter is entitled to vote unless the statements contained in such oath indicate the contrary.

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 106. The Secretaries of War and Navy shall be responsible for the administration of this title with respect to members of the armed forces entitled to vote under this title.

"TRANSMISSION OF APPOINTMENTS AND INSTRUCTIONS

SEC. 107. (a) In each year in which a general election for Senators and Representatives in Congress is to be held, the Commission shall furnish well in advance of the election an adequate number of appointment and instruction blanks, envelopes, and copies of directions referred to in section 104 for voting procedure to the Secretaries of War and Navy.

"(b) The Secretaries of War and Navy shall, wherever practicable and compatible with military operations, transmit as furnished by the Commission, to the various units of the armed forces, in ample time to insure an opportunity to conform to the provisions of this title, in 1944, not later than August 15, an adequate number of appointment and instruction blanks, official inner envelopes, official outer envelopes, and copies of the directions referred to in section 104 for voting procedure in such general elections as furnished by the Commission.

"LISTS OF CANDIDATES

"SEC. 108. The secretary of state of each State shall furnish the Commission such information as the Commission shall request for compiling a list of candidates and their parties in any general election for President and Vice President or for Senators and Representatives in Congress. The Commission shall transmit to the Secretaries of War and Navy, at such times as it deems to be appropriate for compliance with this title, lists of candidates compiled from the information so received, even if incomplete. The Secretaries of War and Navy, shall, in ample time for compliance with this title, transmit such lists to all units of the armed forces, to the extent that such transmission is practicable and compatible with military operations. Incomplete lists of candidates so furnished, or failure to furnish such lists, shall be no bar to exercising privileges conferred by the provisions of this title. No list of candidates furnished under this title shall include information as to a candidate other than his name, address, party affiliation, and office for which nominated.

"DISTRIBUTION AND COLLECTION OF APPOINTMENT AND INSTRUCTION FORMS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

"SEC. 109. (a) The Secretaries of War and Navy, insofar as practicable and to the fullest extent compatible with military operations, shall cause appointment and instruction forms, envelopes, directions referred to in section 104, and lists of candidates to be distributed to members af the armed forces in ample time to insure an opportunity to appoint a proxy to vote in general elections under this title and shall cause executed appointment and instruction forms to be collected and transmitted to the Commission.

"(b) Wherever practicable and compatible with military operations the appropriate commanding officer shall be required—

"(1) to designate a balloting day for voting in general elections which shall be, whenever possible, after he has received a list of candidates from all States, but which shall be not later than the date which the Commission may fix for the area in which his command is located;

"(2) to cause lists of candidates to be posted and otherwise made available at conspicuous and convenient places prior to and on the balloting day and to cause copies of directions as prescribed in section 104 as to voting procedure to be furnished to members of his unit;

"(3) on the designated day, to cause appointment and instruction forms and envelopes to be distributed, to provide a convenient place for marking them in secret, and to cause the official outer envelopes to be collected and delivered for transmission to the Commission;

"(4) to assume general responsibility for assuring that every absentee voter in his unit has an opportunity to avail himself of the election procedure prescribed in this title.

"PRIORITIES

"SEC. 110. The Secretaries of War and Navy and other appropriate authorities shall take all steps necessary to give to the transmission and delivery of forms and communications under this act priority over all unofficial communications and priority over official communications except where, in the judgment of the appropriate military and naval authorities, such priority would interfere with the effective prosecution of the war. Appointment and instruction forms and enclosing envelopes executed outside the United States shall, wherever practicable to expedite their delivery, be transmitted by air.

"TRANSMISSION

"SEC. 111. (a) The Commission, upon receiving any outer envelope as hereinbefore described, shall promptly transmit it to the secretary of state of the State of the absentee voter's residence, who shall thereupon open the outer envelope and ascertain the name and address of the proxy named by the absentee voter as the same shall appear on the outside of the inner envelope. At an appropriate time, the said secretary of state shall cause the inner envelope to be transmitted to the named proxy at the address stated. No person other than the said secretary of state or a person specially designated by him for the purpose shall open any outer envelope and no person other than the proxy named by the absentee voter shall open an inner envelope purporting to contain an appointment and instructions under this title.

"(b) In order to expedite the transmission of outer envelopes with their contents executed outside the United States to the appropriate secretaries of state, the Commission may establish such regional offices as may be necessary to receive such outer envelopes, sort them out, and forward them to the appropriate secretaries of state.

"(c) When any proxy named on any inner envelope shall receive such inner envelope purporting to contain instructions as to the casting of a ballot in behalf of an absentee voter, he shall retain such inner envelope unopened until the day of election, whereupon said proxy shall present himself in the absentee voter's village, town, or city of residence, to the appropriate election official of the district, precinct, county, or other voting unit of the State of the voter's residence and present unopened the inner envelope as evidence of his appointment, whereupon such proxy shall be sworn to carry out faithfully the instructions of the absentee voter and that he will not disclose to anyone unless required to testify thereto in some competent court, how any such absentee voter instructed his vote to be cast, or how it was cast. The appropriate election officials shall indicate of record the name of the proxy and the name of the absentee voter in whose behalf he shall act, and after the name of the latter shall write the word 'absentee.' Thereupon the proxy shall be admitted to vote in behalf of the absentee voter. Each absentee voter's ballot shall be deposited in a special absentee voter's ballot box which shall be provided at each voting place. After he shall have voted, the instructions for voting shall be deposited in a container specially provided for the purpose which shall be retained by the appropriate election official until the time for any election contest has passed when such container with its contents shall be destroyed. No such container shall be opened by any person except by order of a court of competent jurisdiction.

"REPORTS

"SEC. 112. (a) The Secretaries of War and Navy shall report to the Commission on compliance with this title, including the number of appointment and instruction blanks distributed, received, and transmitted to the Commission, together with any comments thereon or explanation thereof.

"(b) The Commission shall prepare a statement of all outer envelopes received and transmitted to the various secretaries of state. Each secretary of state shall prepare an account of all outer envelopes received by him and of all inner envelopes transmitted to proxies named on the outside of said inner envelopes. The appropriate election officials shall keep an account of all proxies who shall have cast a ballot under this title and shall make report thereof to the secretary of state. Within 30 days after any election in which ballots shall have been cast under the provisions of this title, each secretary of state shall report such accounts to the Commission together with any comments or explanation thereof.

"VALIDITY OF BALLOTS

"SEC. 113. (a) Votes authorized to be cast under the provisions of this title shall be canvassed, counted, and certified in each State by its proper canvassing boards in the usual manner obtaining in such State.

"(b) No ballot otherwise authorized to be cast under the provisions of this title shall be valid if—

"(1) the voter purporting to be an absentee shall have voted in person or shall have voted by absentee ballot in accordance with the procedure provided by State law; or

"(2) the date of the oath of the absentee voter is later than the date of the holding of the election; or

"(3) the absentee voter shall be known by his proxy to have died before the date of the holding of the election; or

"(4) such inner envelope purporting to contain directions to vote in behalf of the absentee shall be received by the named proxy later than the date of the holding of the election, except that any extension of time for the receipt of absentee ballots permitted by State laws shall apply to ballots to be cast under this title. All outer envelopes received by a secretary of state at a date or time too late for proper delivery and all inner envelopes not delivered to the proxy named therein shall not be opened, but shall be endorsed with the date of receipt and shall be retained by the secretary until the time has expired for contesting the election, when they shall be destroyed without examination.

"VOTING SAFEGUARDS

"SEC. 114. Every individual concerned with the administration of this title shall take all necessary steps to prevent fraud, to protect voters, whether absentee or proxy, against coercion of any sort, and to safeguard the integrity and secrecy of the execution of appointment and instruction blanks and of ballots to be cast as herein authorized.

"PENALTIES

"SEC. 115. (a) Whoever willfully and without justification deprives any absentee voter or any proxy named by him of any right or privilege provided for in this title, or interferes or attempts to interfere with the right of any person to vote, or to vote as he may choose, under the provisions of this title, or willfully refuses or fails to count any ballot validly cast or authorized to be cast under the provisions of this title, or whoever does or attempts to do any fraudulent act in connection with the casting of ballots under this title, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not make criminal any act done in good faith by a member of the armed forces of the United States in the exercise of his judgment as to what was practicable and compatible with military operations.

"(b) All existing provisions of law prohibiting offenses against the elective franchise shall apply against elections and voting pursuant to the provisions of this title.

"APPROPRIATE STATE OFFICIALS

"SEC. 116. Wherever, in any State, an official other than the secretary of state is the appropriate State official to carry out any function vested in the secretary of state under this title, the term 'secretary of state' shall mean such other official.

"OFFICIALS AND AGENCIES TO ACT FOR SECRETARY OF STATE

"SEC. 117. Each secretary of state may utilize the services of his deputy or any employee of his office specially delegated for the purpose in the exercise of his powers and duties under this title."

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, December 3, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, December 2 (legislative day of November 18), 1943:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Josh Lee, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board in the Department of Commerce for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1949. (Reappointment.)

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The following-named persons to be Interstate Commerce Commissioners for the terms expiring December 31, 1950 (reappointments):

Joseph B. Eastman, of Massachusetts.

John L. Rogers, of Tennessee.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, MEDICAL CORPS, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

First Lt. William Ward Currence, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Raymond Joseph Getz, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Avery Parsons King, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Frank Wisner Lynn, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Lester John Olson, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Richard Coffman Shrum, Medical Corps Reserve.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT, DENTAL CORPS, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

First Lt. Clare William Sauser, Dental Corps Reserve.

TO BE CHAPLAIN, WITH RANK OF FIRST LIEUTENANT, TO RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Chaplain (Maj.) James Joseph McMahon, Army of the United States.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Admiral William H. P. Blandy, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 20th day of May 1942.

Rear Admiral George F. Hussey, Jr., United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years, from the 1st day of December 1943.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 2, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious God, our Father, Thy power resolves life's discords and tears into psalms and seeks to save every human being from sin and doom. We praise Thee that Thou canst gather into Thy mighty hands the body and soul, in life and in death, and lift them before the throne of grace into that spiritual realm which touches the heights and depths of the unseen world.

As men walk the streets and byways of our land, we thank Thee that they are sustained by the sheltering presence of the Good Shepherd; alone, but not lonely, "we touch Him in life's throng and press and we are whole again." Keep in motion the genial currents of our souls and grant that no strife nor bitter antagonisms may cause us to fail or deny us of the inward power which melts disunity into harmony. We pray, dear Lord, that our fellow countrymen may not be soft-fibered, but heroically fashioned in the cause of freedom and justice for all men. Endow them with that just understanding which shall bring gratitude and appreciation to our public servants who truly bear the torch of truth and integrity. By simple honesty, by rejecting falsehood, by wise approach, and consistent example may we all grow in knowledge and become better and increasingly persuasive as a force in the affairs of state and society. In the name of Him who is the Light of lights. Amen.

The Journal of the procedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had ordered that the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the bill (H. R. 2207) entitled "An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940."

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the end of the legislative day, and all other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday next, following the special orders heretofore entered, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from the Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on narcotic control in the Far East, and include extracts from a letter on the same subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE NEWS RELEASE OF THE CONFERENCE AT CAIRO

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks with a telegram that I have received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the slipshod and bungled manner which the powers that be have used in breaking the news of the Three Power Conference at Cairo will further destroy the confidence of the American people in their Government.

Congress has voted large sums of money for the Office of War Information. This agency has the responsibility of giving the American people the facts about the progress of the war. This information must be not only factual but it should be released when it is news—not hours, days, or months after it is released in foreign capitals. Yesterday we witnessed the disgusting spectacle of the breaking of the news of the Three Power Conference in Cairo in every important capital of the world 33 hours in advance of the release by our own papers. Berlin and Tokyo had the story—why not the United States?

I have discussed this matter with officials in the Office of War Information. They absolve themselves of all guilt and make a good case. Mr. Elmer Davis stated the premature release was reprehensible. Regardless of that, it did occur and this was not the first time.

What about the release of our raid on Tokio and the wording of it? What about the recent General Patton incident?

Everyone except the American people knew of these incidents and the facts surrounding them. No citizen wants any information released which will give aid to the enemy but he does lose confidence in his own Government when he must get important news developments from neutral or enemy sources. Mr. Ray Green, editor and owner of the Blade-Empire, Concordia, Kans., has just wired me as follows:

CONCORDIA, KANS., *December 1, 1943.*
Congressman FRANK CARLSON,
House Office Building:

Believe Elmer Davis and his O. W. I. kicked American newspapers around about enough. Handling of news on Tri-Power Conference smacks very much of child's play for which American taxpayers are paying dearly. Idea of ordering papers to hold story from Tuesday morning until 6:30 p. m. Wednesday when all Europe knows details is plain silly and tends to destroy all confidence in press and O. W. I. also. Suggest Congress might scrutinize O. W. I. appropriations more carefully in future to determine whether necessary and whether money is to be used to defray expenses of playing with news reports. Also suggest O. W. I. reports be released at some hour when newspapers have a chance to compete with radio which seems to be favored on all big news breaks by Davis.

RAY GREEN.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, also I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] be given indefinite leave of absence, on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include certain leters pertaining to Army and Navy training in our colleges and universities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a series of quotations on the contribution of commercial air lines to our war program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Geraldine Larkin Recknagel, the wife of a Toledo war hero, Alvin Recknagel, now engaged in Pacific war theater, to the English and speech section of the Northwestern Teachers Association, at Toledo, and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NEWS RELEASES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] seems to be laboring under the old philosophy that the people of the United States are entitled to be advised of what is going on in the World War.

This union now, this united states of the world, this federation of nations, that is to solve all our—all the world's—troubles, must have a head—a president, it may be—and while the President of the United States is campaigning for the presidency of the united states of the world, there is no reason why, the vote here being secure, they, including Harry Hopkins, should not go over to the other side of the world and extend to the British the privilege of making news releases. That, at least, seems to be the theory, and the newspapers, which have been and are all for union now, should be the last to complain.

I am afraid that the gentleman from the wheat fields of the far West still thinks that the American people are entitled to know what is being done—how far we are being and to what we are being pledged.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, these are too serious days in the life of any American, no matter what our party affiliations might be, to take the floor and make statements about the President of the United States wanting to be president of the world. I have heard such statements made before. There is serious doubt in the minds of some——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have only 1 minute. Will the gentleman wait until I complete my thought?

I think we ought to stop that kind of statement. There is no foundation for them. Everyone knows that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield I will show him where the foundation is.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will yield when I get through with my thought.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, after you have finished.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no foundation for any such statement as that. The President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, is abroad, as we now know, in the line of duty. One thing is certain, when a democracy is faced with a serious war we have got to have in the White House a strong and courageous man. Prime Minister Churchill evidences that leadership in England. Chamberlain was all right, but if Chamberlain were still conducting the Government of England, we know what the probable result would be. In our country it is absolutely essential, without regard to what the party affiliations of the man who is in the White House might be, when war confronts our country we have got to have a strong and brave man in the White House. In every great crisis of our country, men elected as Democrat or Republican have been in the White House, but above all they were Americans. The President of the United States is one man whose constituency is the entire country, and he is charged actually and historically with the responsibility of steering the ship of state to safety. Fortunately we have had a strong and brave man in the White House in every crisis of our history.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman will wait until I get through.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is waiting for his minute to expire.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman wait until I get through with my thought?

I repeat, fortunately we have had strong and brave men in the White House in the past, and we have a strong man and a courageous man in the White House today. President Roosevelt is doing his duty as his conscience dictates to win the war and preserve our country. All I hope and pray for is, after you and I are dead and gone, and if some future generation of Americans is faced with a similar crisis, I do not care whether he is a Republican or Democrat, whether he is a Catholic or Protestant or Jew, I do not care what his name might be, but I hope and pray there will be in the White House a strong and courageous President.

READJUSTMENT OF RETURNING VETERANS

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I would like to call the attention of this honorable body to what I think constitutes criminal negligence on the part of the Government of the United States of America. Already more than 600,000 servicemen have been mustered out of the armed forces of the United States of America. Of these 600,000 men who have been mustered out, most of them are living in poverty and are nothing short of being criminally neglected. I would like to draw an interesting comparison, and that is that the States in the Government of the United States of America treat convicts who have been released from prison with more respect than the men who have been mustered out of our armed forces. When a man is mustered out of

prison, he is given a suit of clothes—civilian clothes—he is given pocket money, and in most cases given a job. We muster men out of the armed forces and ask them to take their uniforms off within 90 days. We give them no pocket money. After due consideration, perhaps 6 or 8 months, we give them a $10-a-month pension.

I would like to just read 1 letter, which is not an isolated case but which constitutes at least 50 cases which I have in my file, which, in my judgment, constitutes nothing short of criminal negligence. The letter reads as follows:

> Three months ago I got honorably discharged from the Army on account of wounds received in the Battle of Tunisia, in north Africa. Now I have a stiff wrist, stiff thumb, and also a stiff trigger finger, and the Government is giving me absolutely nothing as yet.
>
> I got wounded by machine-gun fire. I was a sergeant of Company L, Sixtieth Infantry, Fort Bragg, N. C., and was in the armed forces for 3 years. Tonight I finally received word that I am under advisement for vocational rehabilitation. I have already been home for 3 months. What am I going to eat? What am I going to wear until the Government decides to give me vocational rehabilitation and civilian clothes and some food, in order that I may take care of myself?

This, gentlemen, constitutes at least 50 cases I have in my files of 600,000 already mustered out of our armed forces. I say that the Government is criminally negligent. I think something ought to be done about it.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman mean to tell the House that that number of service-connected disabled veterans are being neglected in the United States?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to this question, and that is, I feel that the rules and regulations that we have set up to take care of these men who are being mustered out of our armed forces are too technical, they are too cumbersome, I think, to adequately take care of these men.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I will not object, but I will ask for recognition.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin is granted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests. First, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the development of hydroelectric power in Russia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in answer to an article in the Utilities Fortnightly magazine of recent date.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

WORLD WAR VETERANS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we have just listened to a most outrageous, most misleading, and false indictment——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that those words be taken down, if he is referring to the statement made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI].

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. I am referring to the statements of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI], who has just spoken, attacking the Government of the United States for the way it is treating our disabled veterans.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Are you charging that that is misleading? If that is so, under the rules I do not think the gentleman has the right to make that statement.

The SPEAKER. A Member certainly has a right to argue that a Member is making a misleading statement.

Mr. RANKIN. The members of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, Democrats and Republicans, have labored diligently to bring out legislation that would provide amply for the disabled veterans of this war. If there is any Congressman who has a constituent who is suffering from a service-connected disability, who is not being properly taken care of, it is not due to the negligence of the committee. We are providing for those men the same relief that was provided for veterans of the First World War. We are providing hospitalization, and every single man who is discharged from the armed services now with a service-connected disability is entitled to both hospitalization and compensation. For a Member of Congress to arise on this floor and tell the American people that this Government is "criminally negligent" with reference to those men is a false and indefensible misrepresentation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is not the fault of the Members of Congress that these service-connected veterans are not getting their compensation. It is because of faulty administration. There is case after case of men and women who are not getting their compensation, due to faulty administration. There has been great negligence in that respect. I have brought this matter to the attention of the House repeatedly, and also to the attention of General Hines. I think General Hines sees the error of his ways. It may not have been his fault, but the negligence has been there, and he has said that he will have rating boards at the hospitals, or at least at some of them, to rate the men at once. I have repeatedly stated to the House that the men are not informed of their rights, and I defy any Member to contradict me in that. The men are not told of their rights. Contact men have not been allowed to go into all the hospitals and it is the fault of somebody, and a very serious far-reaching fault, and is causing a very tragic situation, a condition that should not be tolerated. All the legislation passed by the Congress is useless if not properly administered. The shortage of doctors and nurses and other personnel is responsible for some of the lack of proper treatment of the veterans. There is no excuse for a shortage of personnel. The personnel should be taken from other agencies. Care of the veterans is the sacred duty of the people of America.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, has expired.

OBSERVANCE OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADOPTION OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 186) to provide for the proper observance of the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of the adoption of the first 10 amendments of the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

> *Resolved, etc.*, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week of December 12 to 18, 1943, as Bill of Rights Week, calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on December 15, the actual anniversary, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and prayer.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the foundations of American democracy rest squarely upon the 3 greatest political documents ever conceived in the mind of man. They are the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, which are known as the Bill of Rights.

Thomas Jefferson not only wrote the Declaration of Independence, but in writing the Bill of Rights he gave us a living Constitution in conformity with the Declaration of Independence.

The Constitution itself is a ministerial instrument dealing with government. It prescribes the manner and method of enacting legislation and gives general powers to Congress. It provides for the

three coordinated branches of our Government—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. It confers upon the President the power to appoint Ambassadors and certain other officers of government. It establishes a method of admitting new States to the Union, and it provides the manner by which the Constitution can be amended.

The Bill of Rights, on the one hand, puts a real soul into the Constitution—makes it a living instrument. This is well demonstrated in the very first amendment, wherein is set forth those provisions for freedom of religion, of speech, and of the press, as well as the right of assembly and petition, which makes the United States the great democracy it is. The language of the first amendment is as follows:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Thus it will be seen that while the Constitution proper establishes the methods of government, the Bill of Rights establishes the principle of human rights in a democracy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, without expressing any opinion upon the resolution, permit me to state that I realize that the majority leader, the gentleman who comes from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has, as majority leader, the right and privilege of exercising the function we are told was sometimes exercised by the mythical fish-wives of the eastern seaboard, that is, the right to scold, in this instance the Member from the Fourth District of Michigan. With all due humility I accept the scolding just administered, realizing as I do that it is administered for my own good and not as political propaganda—or is it?

Recently the gentleman from Massachusetts undertook to chastise the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] who is chairman of a group of some 60 or 70 Republicans who have grown tired of what they think is inaction on the majority side and has ventured to suggest that we devote our attention to some legislative matters which would assist in the winning of the war. I hope that that committee will some time get around to the amendments to the Wagner Act, which have been pending here for many long months. The National Labor Relations Act needs amendment. That is acknowledged by practically all union leaders as well as employers.

With reference to this matter about which I spoke this morning as to the President of the United States being a candidate for president of the united states of the world, if I overstepped, I want to apologize not to the House or to the American people, but to the majority leader. No doubt the President's decision to be a candidate for a fourth term may be influenced somewhat by the November election and by the more recent election in the Fourth District of Kentucky. I confess that perhaps I should not have given as much weight to the source from which I derived the opinion that the President might be willing to accept the place as president of the world as I did. I may have been in error. I relied in a measure upon the statement of a Member of the other body, a sometime spokesman for the White House. I think he is from Florida. He said that it was the height of his ambition—I am not quoting his words, but the substance of them—he belongs to the same party as the gentleman—he said it was the height of his ambition to nominate the President of the United States as president of the united states of the world, of the united nations of the world.

Now, if I was wrong in that and if that spokesman of the Democratic Party over in the other body does not want to nominate him as president of the united states of the world, then I was in error in relying upon that information. The press carried it and I have never seen a denial on the part of the President. So, in all humility, in all charity, in all kindness of spirit, I would suggest that the gentleman go over and talk with the member of his own party over there and ask him to correct me if I wander off on a false lead, if I am in error in thinking that our President does not desire to preside at the peace conference—a laudable ambition—will not be a candidate for the presidency of union now or the united states of the world with Harry Hopkins as adviser if that proposed organization is created.

The President is over there now in behalf of all the people of the world, and that is all right, nobody is objecting to that, and we hope that, while he is over there, he tells Mr. Churchill and Mr. Stalin if he meets him that while those two gentlemen are for the best interests of their countries at all times and in all places on every measure, that he—our President—is speaking and intends always to speak for the interests of the United States when those interests come in conflict with the interests of other countries and that he intends to maintain our independence, protect our sovereignty.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution now before the House is too sacred, and the subject matter it covers is too precious, to be used as a subject of partisan controversy.

It covers the first 10 amendments of the Constitution of the United States written if not by the hand, at least under the inspiration of Thomas Jefferson, to guarantee to the American people the freedom toward which mankind had been struggling for more than 2,000 years. I am going to read those amendments if I have time. They constitute the Bill of Rights, the "ark of the covenant," the "ten commandments" of liberty and freedom.

They read as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield briefly.

Mr. RAMEY. I do not know that I shall have time to ask what I wanted to. I agree with the majority leader that in time of war we must always have a strong President—I do not care whether he be Catholic, Protestant, Jewish—a President who is able to carry on the conduct of the war; but does the gentleman believe that any man should be President of the United States that is a bigot or who should make an assinine remark about any religion?

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] that my views on this subject are well known to this House. No man has ever heard me criticize another man's religion. Any religion is better than none. I have contempt for any one who slurs another's religion.

Mr. RAMEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Amendment No. 2 reads:

A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

Amendment No. 3:

No soldier shall, in time of peace, be quartered in any house, without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

Amendment No. 4:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

There are some people I should like to have read that salutary amendment at at least once a day.

Amendment No. 5 provides:

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself; nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Does not the gentleman from Mississippi believe there are at

least a few people who ought to read that amendment every day as well as the other?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; as I said these first 10 amendments constitute the "ten commandments" of American liberty; that is the reason I am taking the time of the House to read them again this morning.

Here is amendment No. 6:

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. What does the gentleman have to say as to the conduct of these O. P. A. courts that are set up which as a means of enforcing their orders impose penalties in the nature of refusals to permit restaurants, for instance, to have meat and otherwise penalize business people as well as private individuals?

Mr. RANKIN. I think any man or woman who violates any one of these sacred commandments of American freedom and American liberty ought to be driven from the Federal pay roll and scourged from public life.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if it is giving a man a fair trial to indict and try him in an area where he has to be tried by a jury composed of public officials or of people on the Federal pay roll or the State pay roll. What this amendment means is a fair and impartial trial for all men and women charged with criminal offenses.

Amendment No. 7:

In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed $20, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States than according to the rules of common law.

Amendment No. 8:

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

In this body and in the other body we hear a great deal of talk about there being implied powers in the Constitution to take over the election machineries of the various States and concentrate them into the hands of a Federal bureaucracy. There is no such implied power, as one of my distinguished Senators from Mississippi pointed out on yesterday, reading from a Supreme Court decision to that effect. For amendment No. 9 says that—

The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

The Federal Government has only such powers as are specifically delegated to it. For amendment No. 10 reads:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Thomas Jefferson gave us these "ten commandments" of American freedom and American liberty. They cannot be changed except by consent of all the States. You may change anything else in the Constitution by a simple amendment except this Bill of Rights contained in these first 10 amendments.

When you tamper with the Bill of Rights and destroy any one of them, you are striking at the very foundation, not only of our Government but of our free American system and our way of life. When you attempt to reach out and take powers away from the States that the States never delegated and that there is no occasion for them to delegate, and that we have no right to take away from them under the pretence that it is a war measure when it is nothing in God's world but political expediency, and so admitted privately by its sponsors, then you are doing violence to the most sacred document the American people have ever known outside of Holy Writ, and that is the Bill of Rights—the first 10 amendments written into the Constitution of the United States at the behest of Thomas Jefferson which, as I said, constitute the "ten commandments" of American freedom.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Inasmuch as we have expended a great deal of money and energy to determine what are the subversive elements in this country, is it the gentleman's opinion that anyone who will knowingly violate these 10 commandments in the Constitution may be committing a greater degree of subversiveness?

Mr. RANKIN. Abraham Lincoln said that no man had a right to vote for a law that he knew to be unconstitutional. All the great statesmen who have helped build this Republic, who helped build our American system and develop our way of life have religiously adhered to and sacredly regarded every one of those first 10 amendments included in the Bill of Rights.

I am glad this resolution is to be passed. I am sorry they made such a blunder in the Jefferson Memorial down here and that they did not inscribe these first 10 commandments, the Declaration of Independence, and the 16 points set out in Jeffersons' first inaugural address, which, he said, constituted the sum of good government, instead of some of the misleading stuff they did inscribe on the walls of that memorial.

I am glad to support this resolution, and I hope it passes unanimously.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the resolution.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPORTATION FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES FREE OF DUTY OF CERTAIN GRAINS AND OTHER PRODUCTS TO BE USED FOR LIVESTOCK AND POULTRY FEED

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Wednesday next to consider House Joint Resolution 171 under the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I hate to be placed in the embarrassing position of reserving the right to object on this request of our chairman, but this is an important piece of legislation and I would object if I were not certain that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means would go before the Rules Committee and secure a rule. This bill removes the tariffs on wheat, oats, barley, flax, and cottonseed and I think it is too far reaching to pass without serious and thoughtful consideration.

It is difficult to oppose a measure drawn for the express purpose of relieving a serious feed shortage in certain sections of our Nation. This bill if approved, will not in my opinion, be of any assistance. Its approval will upset the orderly marketing of grain that has been in use for many years. Removal of these tariffs would set a precedent that might place the American farmer in continuous competition with the grain producers of Canada and South America. It will increase the cost of the imported grain to the livestock and poultry feeders.

I am going to agree to this unanimous-consent request with the understanding that we have 1 hour's debate, 30 minutes on a side, and that it be considered under the rules of the House.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to include that in my unanimous-consent request, the time to be equally divided between the opponents and proponents of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] asks unanimous consent that there be 1 hour's general debate, the time to be divided equally between the ranking majority and minority Members and that the bill be considered under the rules of the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SUSPENSION DURING PRESENT WAR OF THE APPLICATION OF SECTIONS 3114 AND 3115 OF THE REVISED STATUTES AS AMENDED

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3309) to suspend during the present war the ap-

plication of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with Senate amendments thereto and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out all after "until" down to and including "designate" in line 10, and insert: "2 years after the date of the enactment of this act, or until the day following the date of the cessation of hostilities in the present war (as defined in sec. 780 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code), whichever shall first occur."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to suspend temporarily the application of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this amendment from the Senate just fixes a time limit?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It fixes a time limit. This is a bill relating to the suspension of the collection of tariff duties on repairs made to ships in foreign ports. The Senate put on a time limitation, either 2 years or at the end of hostilities, whichever occurred first. We think that is a proper time limitation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. In other words, if hostilities end this year this legislation will expire automatically?

Mr. ROBERTSON. They cannot get the waiver of the tariff after the end of the war.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. What constitutes cessation of hostilities?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is defined in the Internal Revenue Code.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask uanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and that he further be permitted to extend his remarks and include therein a short article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial and a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committee:

DECEMBER 2, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker, United States House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Respectfully,

HERMAN P. EBERHARTER.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following request from the Senate of the United States:

IN THE SENATE OF THS UNITED STATES,
December 1, 1943.

Ordered, That the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the bill (H. R. 2207) entitled "An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940."

Attest:

EDWIN A. HALSEY,
Secretary.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

JAPAN

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The world will in the end detest you and look upon you as wild beasts.
—*Emperor Meiji of Japan.*

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, that the wages of sin is death is a Biblical injunction in which all convinced Christians devoutly believe.

Because of the commission of mortal sins against a decently disposed humanity, frightful misdeeds beyond the numbering, a sentence of death has been righteously imposed upon the Empire of Japan.

And for these wanton violations of the immutable laws of God this penalty will be approved of by all men of good will and decent impulses, by the millions of bleeding victims, the innocent sufferers from this outlaw nation's ruthlessness.

But dire though this solemn pronouncement is, it is not alone because of the violation of this Christian precept, to which the infidel Japanese do not subscribe, that the wrath of God and the scorn of mankind is visited upon them.

There is another law, the highest law of the country, which they themselves by their wickedness have brought disgrace upon, the deliberate violation of which justifies all that their cruel misdeeds have brought upon them.

In the words of the wise Meiji, an Emperor of another day, they stand condemned, for, indeed, modern Japan has blatantly defied, angrily torn into bits, wantonly flouted and denied, the highest ideals which this old philosopher proclaimed to the world in his imperial rescript as the code of good conduct of the soldiers and sailors of Japan.

That the wisdom in his words may be made manifest, let me quote a line or two from the imperial edict of this Mikado of another day, words which the Japanese of today might well cogitate as they sadly contemplate their country's undoing.

It is this philosophy which the Japanese of the future must reembrace and take again into their hearts if the tragedy of today is ever to be retrieved.

These were Meiji's words:

There is true valor and false. To be incited by mere impetuosity to violent action cannot be called true valor. * * * Never to despise an inferior enemy or fear a superior, but to do one's duty as soldier or sailor—this is true valor.

Those who thus appreciate true valor should in their daily intercourse set gentleness first and aim to win the love and esteem of others.

If you affect valor and act with violence, the world will in the end detest you and look upon you as wild beasts.

Of this you should take heed.

Mr. Speaker, had the false leaders of this modern, hate ridden, despised, this most contemptible of nations—its militarists, as Meiji warned, now detested and looked upon "as wild beasts"—but harkened to the advice of this old Mikado, the headlines of the public prints of today might have told an entirely different story—one of love and admiration, rather than of hate and universal condemnation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech I have made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Chicago Tribune and an editorial from the same paper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the Stream Control Commission of Michigan relative to the waters of Lake Michigan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune and another from the Washington News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

RELEASE OF NEWS OF CONFERENCE OF ALLIED LEADERS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I have never wholly or completely agreed with the policies of O. W. I., but I cannot let this occasion pass without commending Elmer Davis, head of the O. W. I., for the courageous and forthright action he has taken in criticizing and condemning the unwarranted and unofficial release of the news of the conference of the Allied leaders overseas by the Reuters News Agency.

In taking such action he is voicing the sentiments of all American newspapermen, who have had this same confidential information in their possession and, because of the importance of this occasion and for the safety of the men concerned, have held this secret in voluntary censorship. When Reuters, a private British press association released this news through various subterfuges through Lisbon and other places, they put the American newspaper wire services and other American newspapermen who knew of this conference at a great disadvantage.

One of the first rules of journalism is the respect of news given in confidence. Particularly in this essential wartime, when publication of such news would jeopardize not only the safety of the men involved but the actual progress of the war. The publication of this news did effectively give aid and comfort to the enemy through supplying the German radio with news before it was generally released for publication. I think Elmer Davis is absolutely right in voicing this strong condemnation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article concerning the Lea bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

NAVAL INTELLIGENCE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the resignation of General Holcomb makes us all pause to review his tremendous service to the country and especially to the Marine Corps. The horrible slaughter of our gallant marines at Tarawa should make everyone evaluate the importance of having full information regarding every country. Full and complete military and naval intelligence should be made available to all attacking forces. It is not only essential to a speedy and successful conclusion of the war but is only decent to give our fighting forces that protection.

I bring to the House the suggestion that we must have men in our naval and military intelligence of the highest training. To my mind, there has not been enough attention paid in the past to intelligence. If there had been, we would have known about the condition at Tarawa, we would have known about the strength of many of the outposts where our men are now fighting, and we would have saved thousands of lives. I do not mention the loss in dollars and cents because that does not seem important where human life is in question. The request for the ablest intelligence personnel in the armed services must not and cannot go unanswered. America has the most completely trained intelligence in the world, and to neglect that service will just mean another war.

JAPANESE PROGRESS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my own remarks with a few brief quotations on the question of Japanese progress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, insofar as radio and newspaper comments which are now available to us today about the Near East Conference are concerned, and based upon the brief information which we have had, I want to go on record in approving what I understand has been announced with respect to territorially stripping Japan. In 1936 I released an article to one of our national magazines, and what has happened since, together with these most recent conferences, I think make the observations I made at that time quite appropriate for the people of my district, as of today. In that connection I request permission to extend my remarks by including with my own remarks made at that time two or three brief quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. My own statement of 1936, which contains the quotations referred to, are as follows:

Traveling via the Great North Circle, a distance of 4,300 miles; sailing time 10 days 22 hours 45 minutes on fast Pacific President Line, one reaches the Empire of Japan; like the sun, the king of the day; the leader of the Asia.

Japan proper, with an area of 148,756 square miles and about 10,000 less square miles than the State of California, has, according to most recent figures, a population of over 95,000,000 souls.

Japan in the light of the family of nations is a "becoming." Like a little child, Japan knows not what its destiny is to be, and if Japan does not know, the balance of the world cannot know.

On July 8, 1853, when Commodore M. C. Perry, brother of the Lake Erie hero, proceeding in a very firm and aggressive manner, presented his calling card in the form of a letter from President Fillmore at the Japanese Bay of Yeddo, he unlocked the door to a nation whose isolation had been scrupulously maintained since the Iyemitsu's edict, and he placed in operation forces which have gathered such momentum and on such a large scale that today the balance of the entire civilized world is wondering what the direction of Japan is to be. Since that day Japan has been taking lessons from western countries—lessons in war, navy building, military tactics, manufacturing, transportation, banking, and in world trade with all of its diversifications and ramifications, to say nothing about the making of treaties.

Will the present Japanese forces carry on until the end of that Empire has accomplished some of the achievements planned by the Alexander the Great of Japan—Toyotomi Hideyoshi, and which will, if accomplished, bring under the control and within the Japanese Empire that great area now known as the Manchurian territory, Mongolia and on to the Ural Mountains? Furthermore, can we now assume that Japan ih moving in that other direction which received much consideration before the Tokugawa Shogunate prohibited the seafaring enterprises of Japan from carrying out the conquests to take over certain territory on the American Continent as well as Hawaii, the Philippine Islands, and all other South Sea islands as far as Australia?

Ninety-five million Japanese proper, organized and coordinated into the most perfectly running and most efficient agricultural, industrial, military, economic, and financing machine the world has ever known, will never rest until national security and national welfare are attained. Because of military deficiency, Japan has in the past, from time to time, been forced to recede from her decided position. Western nations have taught the Japanese that military power assures a nation a place in the world among the great powers.

Baron Reijiro Wakatsuki, a veteran Japanese statesman, in addressing himself to the people of America, discussed Japan's position in the Far East and her aim there. He said:

"I cannot help believing, if you were in our place you would do exactly what we are doing today."

Continuing, the baron said:

"The peace of east Asia would not have been maintained nor would the rights and interests of the powers there have been secure if Japan had not played the part of a watchdog. On the peace of east Asia hangs the fate of our nation. Other powers may have important interests there, but these interests at most concern only their commercial prosperity, whereas the interests which we have are vital."

He claims that in the interest of world peace and harmony, the nations like Japan which are attempting to catch up with the more advanced countries of the world should be given an adequate sphere of activity and expansion. Mr. Etsujiro Kurasawa, speaking

on "Pacific," says: "Heaven ordained the Empire of Japan the leader of the Asian continent, and so she is under obligation to make the peoples of the said continent happy."

Japan is concerned about her own salvation, about her position among the nations of the earth; her rank among the world powers. Japan is not static. Japan is dynamic. Japan has been going places. Japan is on her way. The World War and its need supplied Japan with an impetus, with a stimulation of industry, with a position to sit around the table with other great world powers. At the conclusion of the war and when the peace(?) treaty was being completed, the "powers that be" mandated certain islands previously under the control of Germany and located in the Pacific, to Japan. The stimulation which the war orders gave the Japanese industry had hardly faded into the distance when the great earthquake of September 1, 1923, occurred, resulting in a loss of property with an official estimated value of 5,500,000,000 yen. The loss of the old always provides for the building of the new, and the modern sections of the cities of Tokyo and Yokohama today show what a perfect building program was carried out. This vast expenditure of energy and money further stimulated Japan's purchasing program, as she needed supplies from different parts of the world. During the period from 1923 to 1929 Japan held her own in the trade of the world. The coming of the great economic washout of 1929, with its consequent collapse in domestic and foreign trade throughout the world, presented to Japan a most startling opportunity. Japan was in the harness. She was full of industrial youth. She was building, accomplishing, conquering. The Japanese people were full of hope and attainment. Her industry, shipping, banking, and general financing were well organized. The stunning blow which the economic debacle had dealt to other great industrial and shipping powers did not so affect Japan. Having lived simply and unostentatiously as a people and as a nation, Japan was doing business with little overhead costs. The great expensive "exchange machine" used by England, the United States, and other world powers and the staggering war burden and costs were not bearing heavily upon the back of Japanese industry. Her stokers were fired. Steam was in her boilers. She was on the economic firing line with no great and excessive tax, interest, and expensive overhead burden to carry. This placed her in a position to go out, pick up the raw material, take it to her shores, fabricate it into finished products, and then undersell the world. In this way she has expanded her industry, shipping, colonization, merchant marine, military and naval activities, and standing as a world power, far beyond the dreams and understandings of the other peoples of the earth.

Informed students and high-ranking Japanese estimate the Japanese population is increasing at the rate of from 800,000 to 1,000,000 souls annually. Anyone who travels throughout Japan proper meets quite a bit of evidence in support of this claim. Everywhere he sees the great numbers of happy mothers and children.

Japan has a choice of doing one or more of several things. She can cease to propagate—which no one can ask her to do; or she can let her nationals go to the unsettled and undeveloped lands of the earth and there colonize—and this she is doing on a rather large scale in some instances, as in the Philippines, even, under the American flag, and also in Brazil; or she may send her people to highly developed countries in event there are no "exclusion acts" running against Japanese; or last, and perhaps most interesting to other countries, Japan can ship her nationals into all the countries of the world in the form of industrialized products. One only needs to stand on the shipping docks of the Japanese ports and take special note of the millions of bags, bales, crates, bundles, and cases addressed to the merchants and distributors located in practically every port on the globe. Wrapped in these cargoes are the flesh and blood of Japanese life. But it is flesh and blood which exclusion acts, as ordinarily thought of, do not keep out.

Though exclusion acts may be passed by the legislative bodies of the different countries of the world, Japan's answer to that is literally this: "We will send out raw material scouts to your ports and inland districts; survey your supply of raw material which we can use in our industrial processes; establish Japanese buying and exporting houses in your own country; load Japanese bottoms with finished goods at Japanese ports, send them to your ports, unload them, refill them with your raw material, and bring it back to Japan."

The carrying out of such a program calls for much detail of planning and execution. But nothing has been overlooked by the Japanese in this respect. When a nation builds a merchant marine it has in mind two or three main purposes—to carry goods for itself and other nations, to act as an auxiliary to its navy, and to expand its own commerce. From the record it appears that at least two-thirds of all finished goods which Japan exports are first received into Japan in the form of raw materials from other countries. This means Japan must go out and find these raw materials in suitable quantity and quality. She must then purchase them and usually at a price f. o. b. docks, where she picks them up and places them on her own merchant marine ships. Japan becomes the owner of those goods at point of origin. Japanese merchant marine ships serve as warehouses for raw material while on its way to Japanese factories for fabrication. The faster those freighters and passenger ships, making up the Japanese merchant marine, plow through the waters of the seven seas, the less time Japan has money tied up in raw material in transit. When ownership of raw material is once assumed, the owner carries the risk, bears the interest burden on money tied up, pays the insurance costs, suffers the depreciation and deterioration, and absorbs the decline in the market if prices go down. Therefore speed is the most important thing after the purchase is made. Speed to get the raw goods to Japan, processed, back on board ship, to the foreign markets and delivered to the customer with money in hand and the profit on the transaction in the bank.

Japan's accomplishments in all of the minutest details involved in this highly complicated, far-flung, world-wide activity of hers is one of the marvels of our modern age. Japan has no consequential home supply of raw materials. The Island Empire lies in the north Pacific Ocean off the coast of China and Siberia. Formosa (Taiwan), the southern point, lies due east of Hongkong and just north of the Island of Luzon, one of the Philippine group, and in 21° 45′ north latitude, and other positions of the empire lie northward to about 50° north latitude, to within a few miles south of Kamchatka. In this extended area the climate ranges from subtropical to subarctic. Using an Atlantic seaboard yardstick, Formosa would lie just east of Cuba and southern Florida and the northernmost island just off Labrador.

Few places in Japan are far removed from mountain or seashore. This makes an ideal situation for the world trade in which Japan is engaged. All products of the empire are produced near shipside. All incoming raw or finished material moves in via ocean carriers and outgoing processed and finished goods move out likewise at the lowest transportation cost and with the geratest speed known to modern commerce. Growers and producers of primary goods living and operating inland in the United States have a transportation cost to bear which so far transcends the cost of the Japanese competition that the advantage enjoyed by the Japanese operator in the form of "a transportation export premium" becomes an insurmountable obstacle for the American operator, whether farmer or manufacturer. This transportation export premium, together with several others which are enjoyed by the Japanese operator, creates a situation whereby Japanese competition cannot be met.

Because of the benefits in Japan's favor here mentioned, along with many others, Japanese exporters are conquering the markets of the world in an amazing manner, and while doing this they are underselling their competitors at from 25 to 75 percent in actual price and at the same time averaging net profits on invested capital running at from 5 percent to 60 percent per annum, and all with a wage increase very, very much higher than the wage level which existed in what has become known in our country as the base period (1910–1914). How much lower in price can Japanese exporters go in offering their goods to the consumers of the United States, and will Japan continue the aggressive and staggering competition with which she has confronted the trading world during the past 6 years? This question has become the nightmare of thousands of individual operators throughout the world, and is giving state departments throughout the world many headaches.

When England industrialized, she found an open road to the great undeveloped markets of the New World. In due course this was augmented by colonial possessions she took over from time to time and which now constitutes the British Empire. Subsequently Germany industrialized and there began a competitive race for world trade and naval power which culminated in the World War. When America industrialized we, to a very, very large extent, consumed from year to year for an extended period most of the products flowing from our manufacturing plants, decreasing, of course, the sales of manufactured goods to us by both England and Germany. But when Japan industrialized she began the shipment of the products of her manufacturing plants into those markets so well served by Great Britain, France, Germany, and the United States, and at the very moment the economic structures of these countries were so badly paralyzed by reason of war burdens and a general economic collapse incident thereto. So Japan's economic expansion has added fuel to the fire and is further dislocating and disrupting the trade relations of these nations with their own foreign customers, as well as the relations existing between the respective nations and their own nationals.

How far can Japan go? The answer to this question is unknown. A brief glance at the accomplishments of Japan in her new state, Manchukuo, gives some indication of how far she can go and how fast she can travel in making set-ups in construction, in extraction of raw materials, building of railroads, etc. Her progress there has been phenomenal. Give Japan the raw material of Manchuria, Mongolia, and North China, with her present organization and efficiency and coordination plus improvements she will naturally make from time to time, and the balance of the world will take greater notice of Japan's competition than it does today.

Feudal Japan marches along hand in hand with modern Japan and without conflict. This alone is an amazing situation. Japan is now building most modern and intricate machinery. Let Japan secure control or jurisdiction of the manpower of northern China, Manchuria, and Mongolia (Inner and Outer)

and industrialize that manpower and raw material plus the materials that she can gather from other parts of the world, and then America will face a competitor beyond our comprehension. America needs to study and understand Japan. In due course and as the United States recedes from the Philippines, it is reasonable to assume that Japan will dominate that archipelago. Developed, these islands will easily accommodate another 50,000,000 people. Japan is looking for territory rich in natural resources, undeveloped and underpopulated. She is now proceeding to develop certain parts of the Philippine archipelago while the Stars and Stripes still fly over the islands, and it is a very important customer for certain basic products of those islands. In South America Japan is proceeding to take a great part in the development of agricultural lands and production as a source for raw materials.

The Pacific era is before us. Between Japan and certain great European powers lies North America, made up largely of the United States and Canada. The public domain suitable for homesteading in the United States has been developed, and our land harvest is thus finished. Indeed, we have begun the program of recovering back into the public domain eroded and marginal farms. Generally speaking, it can be said that man in his migration westward has traversed the whole world. The Empire of Japan, which considers itself the king of the day, the watchdog of Asia, has at last industrialized. America is now face to face with the low-cost production of the new empire. It is the fate of the United States to be placed at the front of the turmoil of trade and other activities which will accompany the new placing of people and their energies resulting from this new industrialization. After his return to the United States from his sojourn in the Bay of Yeddo, Perry wrote:

"It is idle to suppose that because the policy of the United States has hitherto been to avoid by all means possible any coalition, or even connection with the political acts of other nations, we can always escape from the responsibilities which our growing wealth and power must inevitably fasten upon us. The duty of protecting our vast and rapidly growing commerce will make it not only a measure of wisdom but of positive necessity to provide timely preparation for events which must, in the ordinary course of things, transpire in the East. In the development of the future the destinies of our Nation must assume conspicuous attitudes. We cannot expect to be free from the ambitious longings of increased power, which are the natural concomitants of national success."

The events to which Perry directed the attention of the United States are now taking place. Industrially and agriculturally speaking, the people of the United States will need to strip for action, clear their decks, tighten their belts, and eliminate from their activities the staggering waste and excess overhead burden which has crept into our whole existence. Failing in this, wherein can we hold that portion of our trade with which Japan directly competes and keep our goods moving in the channels of commerce—domestic and foreign? Under the economic pressure which bears down upon the shoulders of the buying world today, when the people go out to market, they look for the "bargain counter." Japan is supplying those bargains today, as evidenced by the great strides she is making in taking from the United States and other countries the markets which they have heretofore controlled. In the recasting of armaments, trade treaties, reciprocal agreements, and in the designing of a new agricultural and industrial program for the United States, Japanese industrial and shipping activities must necessarily be given great attention, otherwise the United States must lose.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMAS of Texas). Under special order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield that time now, and at the conclusion of the other special orders today I may proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House heretofore made, the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is recognized for 40 minutes.

ASIATIC AND FAR-EASTERN QUESTIONS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to revise and extend my remarks which I am about to make, and to include therein certain excerpts, tables, and certain Government documents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I hope today, in the few remarks that I shall make, to contribute something toward the thinking of this Congress, and the people, on the subject of Asiatic and Far Eastern questions. It is a very appropriate occasion, in view of the meeting that has been held, and is being held in the Near East on the same subject. The other day I found a United Press report in one of the papers concerning remarks that were attributed to Saburo Kurusu, whom we all remember as a special envoy to Washington, and who enabled things to be strung out to the point where the premeditated destruction of Pearl Harbor could happen without warning. The United Press report is as follows:

WAR "AIMLESS," KURUSU SAYS

SAN FRANCISCO, November 26.—Saburo Kurusu, Japan's special envoy to Washington at the time Pearl Harbor was attacked, today referred to the war as an aimless one, a Tokyo broadcast said.

"As long as lofty ideals of Washington and Lincoln still remain among the American citizens there is bound to rise serious opposition to further continuation of the aimless war," Kurusu said in a press interview broadcast by the Tokyo radio and recorded here.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that when Mr. Kurusu thinks this is an aimless and futile war, he thinks in his peculiar Japanese way that they have won and that it is aimless for us to continue fighting, and I am sure that we will agree here that from his standpoint, the war is indeed an aimless and a futile war, because he will get much less than nothing out of it.

The full text of the agreement reached by the Allies at Cairo, in which our peripatetic President, the Prime Minister of England, Mr. Churchill, and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek took part, provides that Japan shall be stripped of all the islands in the Pacific and the territories which she has seized or occupied over the past 40 years, and of course provides for unconditional surrender, without which the war had better not end. There can be no armistice with Japan. The press release follows:

FULL TEXT OF AGREEMENT REACHED BY ALLIES AT CAIRO

President Roosevelt, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, and Prime Minister Churchill, together with their respective military and diplomatic advisers, have completed a conference in north Africa.

The following general statement was issued:

"The several military missions have agreed upon future military operations against Japan. The three great Allies expressed their resolve to bring unrelenting pressure against their brutal enemies by sea, land, and air. This pressure is already rising.

"The three great Allies are fighting this war to restrain and punish the aggression of Japan. They covet no gain for themselves and have no thought of territorial expansion.

"It is their purpose that Japan shall be stripped of all the islands in the Pacific which she has seized or occupied since the beginning of the First World War in 1914 and that all the territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China. Japan will also be expelled from all other territories which she has taken by violence and greed.

"The aforesaid three great powers, mindful of the enslavement of the people of Korea, are determined that in due course Korea shall become free and independent.

"With these objects in view the three Allies, in harmony with those of the United Nations at war with Japan, will continue to persevere in the serious and prolonged operations necessary to procure the unconditional surrender of Japan."

UNCONDITIONAL SURRENDER

Permit me now to make a few remarks on the subject of unconditional surrender, and call the attention of the House of Representatives to the fact that unconditional surrender originated with none other than our old friend, Gen. "Black Jack" Pershing. In Paris on October 30, 1918, "Black Jack" Pershing addressed a letter to the Allied Supreme War Council in Paris. This letter was transmitted to the Secretary of State by the special representative, Mr. House. I shall read the final paragraph of it because that is the important one. He says:

13. Finally, I believe that complete victory can only be obtained by continuing the war until we force unconditional surrender from Germany; but if the Allied Governments decide to grant an armistice, the terms should be so rigid that under no circumstances could Germany again take up arms.

I desire to present at this point the verbatim text of the telegram from Edward M. House to Secretary Lansing, dated October 31, 1918. That was 11 days before the signing of the armistice ending hostilities in World War No. 1. I am sure that General Pershing in one of his infrequent visits with President Roosevelt has reiterated his position for unconditional surrender and pointed out that we really lost the last war when we failed to march to Berlin.

The following document is lifted from the Lansing Papers, volume II, a Department of State publication, commencing on page 169:

763.72119/8987:Telegram
The Special Representative
(House) to the Secretary of State
PARIS, *October 31, 1918—2 a. m.*
[Received 7:45 a. m.]

14. For the President:

Five minutes before I entered into conference this afternoon of Prime Ministers and Foreign Secretaries and without previous notification General Pershing handed me a copy of the communication I quote herewith, the original thereof having already been sent to the Supreme War Council at Versailles and when George read this his comment was: "Political not military; some one put him up to it". When Clemenceau read it his comment was: "theatrical and not in accordance with what he has said to Marshal Foch". No Allied general has ever submitted a document of this character to the Supreme War Council without a previous request having been made by the civilian authorities. I have written the following letter to General Pershing "In regard to the communication which you sent in to the Supreme War Council this afternoon will you not let me know whether your views are shared by any of the other Allied generals?" He sent me a verbal answer saying he had not gotten the views of the other Allied commanders on this question.

["]Paris, October 30, 1918.

To the Allied Supreme War Council, Paris.

Gentlemen: In considering the question of whether or not Germany's request for an armistice should be granted, the following expresses my opinion from the military point of view:

1. Judging from their excellent conduct during the three months, the British, French, Belgian and American armies appear capable of continuing the offensive indefinitely. Their morale is high and the prospects of certain victory should keep it so.

2. The American army is constantly increasing in strength and experience, and should be able to take an increasingly important part in the Allied offensive. Its growth, both in personnel and material, with such reserves as the Allies may furnish, not counting the Italian army, should be more than equal to the combined losses of the Allied armies.

3. German manpower is constantly diminishing and her armies have lost over 300,000 prisoners and over 1,000 piece[s] of artillery during the last three months in their efforts to extricate themselves from a difficult situation and avoid disaster.

4. The estimated strength of the Allies on the western front, not counting Italy, and of Germany, in rifles is: Allies, 1,564,000; Germany, 1,134,000; an advantage in favor of the Allies of 37 per cent. In guns: Allies, 22,413; Germany, 16,495; advantage of 35 per cent in favor of the Allies. If Italy's forces should be added to the western front we should have a still greater advantage.

5. Germany's morale is undoubtedly low, her allies have deserted her one by one and she can no longer hope to win. Therefore we should take full advantage of the situation and continue the offensive until we compel her unconditional surrender.

6. An armistice would revivify the low spirits of the German army and enable it to organize and resist later on and would deprive the Allies of the full measure of victory by failing to press their present advantage to its complete military end.

7. As the apparent humility of German leaders in talking of peace may be feigned, the Allies should distrust their sincerity and their motives. The appeal for an armistice is undoubtedly to enable the withdrawal from a critical situation to one more advantageous.

8. On the other hand the internal political conditions of Germany, if correctly reported, are such that she is practically forced to ask for an armistice to save the overthrow of her present Government, a consummation which should be sought by the Allies as precedent to permanent peace.

9. A cessation of hostilities short of capitulation postpones, if it does not render impossible, the imposition of satisfactory peace terms, because it would allow Germany to withdraw her army with its present strength, ready to resume hostilities if terms were not satisfactory to her.

10. An armistice would lead the Allied armies to believe this the end of fighting and it would be difficult if not impossible to resume hostilities with our present advantage in morale in the event of failure to secure at a peace conference what we have fought for.

11. By agreeing to an armistice under the present favorable military situation of the Allies and accepting the principle of a negotiated peace rather than a dictated peace, the Allies would jeopardize the moral position they now hold and possibly lose the chance actually to secure world peace on terms that would insure its permanence.

12. It is the experience of history that victorious armies are prone to overestimate the enemy's strength, and too eagerly seek an opportunity for peace. This mistake is likely to be made now on account of the reputation Germany has gained through her victories of the last four years.

13. Finally, I believe that complete victory can only be obtained by continuing the war until we force unconditional surrender from Germany; but if the Allied Governments decide to grant an armistice the terms should be so rigid that under no circumstances could Germany again take up arms.

Respectfully submitted. John J. Pershing, Commander in Chief American Expeditionary Forces."

EDWARD HOUSE.

Let us hope that the unconditional surrender which we shall wrest from Japan will make certain that under no circumstances will Japan be able to take up arms again.

Mr. Speaker, I have before me a publication entitled "Japan, a Geographical Review," which is a publication of the American Geographical Society, and I call attention to certain features that there are in this review, which have to do with the people and the population of Japan.

The article gives the historical background of the population increase in Japan from the earliest times of which they have record—namely, the year 1721 up to the present. It shows that for a long period of time the Japanese population remained fairly static at approximately 27,000,000. Beginning at about 1852, the time of the visit by Admiral Perry and the lifting of the exclusive restrictions upon their people, the population of Japan began to increase and it went from 27,000,000 to 34,000,000 in 1872, to 52,000,000 in 1915, and to 73,000,000 in 1940.

I am going to include this article in my remarks, but for the benefit of the House I would like to read a short portion of it which is of keen interest:

Failing of entry into these and other areas of warm climate where the standard of living is higher than at home, the Japanese leaders have held that to solve their population problem they had no choice but to obtain territorial expansion by force. In this connection it is interesting to note the alarm of national spokesmen at the recent sharp fall in the birth rate. The anonymous gentleman who made public the results of the 1940 census expressed consternation.

Then the article closes by remarking on their campaign to increase the Japanese birth rate:

The campaign to be thus "drastically enforced" is described in detail in another Japanese publication, Contemporary Opinions on Current Topics.

"The Government's population-increase program adopted recently deserves our wholehearted support. The Government intends to increase Japan proper's population from 72,000,000 at present to 100,000,000 by 1960, to improve the nation's physical construction and mental capacity, and to effect proper distribution of Japanese among East Asiatic races."

With regard to the birth rate, it is explained, the goal is twofold: First, to reduce the average of marriage age by 3 years (from the present average of 28 years for men and 24 years for women); and second, to urge each couple to have at least five children. To achieve this goal the following means are to be employed:

Maintenance of the family system.
Advance of marriage funds.
Protection of maternity.
Prohibition of the employment of women older than 20 years.
Protection of pregnant women and nursing babies.
Restriction and prohibition of birth control.
Aid to families with many children.
Establishment of marriage agencies.

For the present leaders of Japan, clearly, the fear that in the future their people may be at a greater numerical disadvantage to other Asiatic races far outweighs their concern lest the means of life run short at home.

The entire portion of the article dealing with the population problem follows:

THE POPULATION PROBLEM

In recent decades the pressure of population in Japan has been a cause of deep concern. Since the opening of the country to commerce in 1853 the population has been rapidly increasing, and for at least a generation the problem of finding profitable employment for more and more people has been imperatively calling for a solution.

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

After centuries of fierce rivalry among warring clans, the Tokugawa family established supremacy in 1603; they were able to maintain comparative internal peace for more than 250 years thereafter, during which they enforced strict seclusion from contact with the outside world. This should have been a period favorable to the natural growth of population. In fact, during the second half of the period, when records were kept, numbers remained relatively stationary. The official censuses, probably self-consistent although incomplete, give the following figures for the years 1721 through 1852:

TABLE XVI.—*Japan proper: Official population according to the 17 censuses of the Tokugawa Shogunate, 1721–1852* [1]

Year:	*Population*
1721	26,065,000
1726	26,549,000
1732	26,922,000
1744	26,153,000
1750	25,913,000
1756	26,062,000
1762	25,921,000
1768	26,252,000
1774	25,990,000
1780	26,011,000
1786	25,086,000
1792	24,891,000
1798	25,471,000
1804	25,622,000
1834	27,034,000
1846	26,908,000
1852	27,201,000

[1] From Ishii: Population pressure, p. 7.

The reasons for this stability were basically economic. The local autarchy of each feudal estate and the rigidity of the checks upon movement within it permitted only subsistence agriculture and the simplest handicrafts. Pestilence, famine, and natural disasters were, therefore, peculiarly destructive, and social habits tended toward deliberate thinning of the population through abortion, infanticide, exposure of the aged, and a ready use of the death penalty.

This self-contained, compartmental society was ripe for change when Commodore Perry entered Japanese waters in 1853 and secured for his country the right to trade which for over 200 years had been denied to foreigners, with the exception of concessions to the Chinese and Dutch in 2 treaty ports. The release of the expansive spirit was almost immediately reflected in a rapid growth in population. The census of 1852 had recorded 27,200,000, or a probable total of 30,000,000 after allowance has been made for omitted groups. By 1868 the total population had reached approximately 33,000,000.

TABLE XVII.—*Japan proper: Estimated actual population, 1872–1915* [1]

Year:	Population
1872	34,806,000
1875	35,316,000
1880	36,649,000
1885	38,313,000
1890	39,902,000
1895	41,557,000
1900	43,847,000
1905	46,620,000
1910	49,184,000
1915	52,752,000

[1] For basis of estimate, ibid., p. 53.

In 1869 the feudal system which had rested upon the local rule of the clans was completely abandoned, the basis of land ownership was transformed, and the Emperor restored to supreme power. Personal freedom and economic opportunity swept away the controls which had formerly kept the population static, and, in the early years of Emperor Meiji's reign, the Government set about reducing the death rate of infants and aged people. The totals of estimated actual population from 1872 to 1915, though not comparable in accuracy with later census data, indicate the burst of growth which accompanied Japan's industrial revolution.

THE MODERN PERIOD

The first adequate census of population was made in 1920; and it has been followed by similar enumerations at 5-year intervals, which enable students of the problem to describe the population in this period and to define its trend with some exactitude.

A population increasing rapidly, though since 1930 at a slackening rate, is indicated in the returns. (See table XVIII.)

The factors in this growth are a birth rate which rose until 1920 and a death rate which was slowly falling from 1918 until 1935.[1] Refined measures indicate that the birth rate established a definite downward trend in 1920.[2] As the momentum of the earlier rapid rise continues through the productive lifetime of the larger new generations, Japan's population would normally be expected to increase until about 1970. By western standards, the death rate, even in 1935, was high for all groups in the population and especially for infants, youths, and females of every age below middle life.[3] The drastically reduced rate of growth in 1940 reflects both a drop in the birth rate and an increase in the death rate of the civilian population; it gives no clue, however, to military casualties, for "every man called to the colors was dealt with as still remaining in his shotai or home." [4] This rather ghostly total is, therefore, subject to downward revision.

TABLE XVIII.—*Japan proper: Total population recorded in quinquennial censuses, 1920 to 1940*

Year	Population	Gross increase	Rate of growth
1920	55,963,053		*Percent*
		3,773,769	6.7
1925	59,736,822		
		4,713,183	7.9
1930	64,450,005		
		4,804,143	7.5
1935	69,254,148		
		3,860,160	5.6
1940	73,114,308		

Source: Toyo Keizai, as quoted in Contemporary Japan, vol. 10, p. 817.

Urban and rural groups have shared most unequally in the growth of population.[5] Urban population (i. e., that in communities of 10,000 or more) has doubled in the 20-year period while rural population has declined both in absolute and relative numbers. Among the urban groups, there seems to have been a fairly direct relation between size and rate of growth. The larger the community, the faster the rate at which it grew; since 1935, the pace has moderated somewhat irregularly.[6] Concentration in large units has gone so far that in 1940 nearly one-fifth of the population (14,400,000 or 19.7 percent of the national total) lived in the six great cities—Tokyo, Osaka, Nagoya, Kyoto, Yokohama, and Kobe." [7]

These urban centers of the southern coast attract surplus rural population from all parts of Japan. Of the predominantly rural geographical regions, only Hokkaido shows a consistent gain—the result of carefully fostered immigration. The complexity in local rates of change, on the other hand, is made apparent in Dr. Kiss' population map of the islands of Honshu, Shikoku, and Kyushu (see plate I reverse).

THE PROBLEM

The dilemma is to find productive occupation for the increasing numbers for the next 20 or 30 years. It is usually conceded that the resources of Japan proper could, with difficulty, provide subsistence in the form of rice, fish, and vegetables; but agriculture and fishing cannot provide a means of livelihood for all these people or maintain a civilized standard of living. The problem can be solved only by industrial or territorial expansion. Since 1931 the advocates of the peaceful pursuit of the first alternative have been overridden and displaced by the proponents of the second.

The palliative of emigration long appealed to the Japanese authorities. Several formidable barriers prevented its full application, however. These were: First, the preference of the Japanese for warm climates, which made them reluctant settlers of Hokkaido, Karafuto, and Manchuria; second, the already existing density of population in the warmer parts of the outlying Japanese Empire—Korea and Formosa; and third, restrictions against the immigration of Japanese or their full exercise of economic citizenship in the less crowded areas of suitable climate in the Pacific—Australia, the East Indies, the Philippines, Hawaii, the United States. Such has been the force of these barriers that only about one and a half-millions of Japanese were recorded in recent reports as living in the outer Empire.[8] and, among foreign countries, in 1937 there were as many as 100,000 Japanese residents only in Hawaii, the United States, and Brazil.[9] Before the outbreak of the present war it had been suggested that carefully planned Japanese settlement of certain sparsely populated islands in the East Indies, the South Seas, and the Philippines, and of the shore of Australia north of Capricorn would have proved generally advantageous.[10]

Failing of entry into these and other areas of warm climate where the standard of living is higher than at home, the Japanese leaders have held that to solve their population problem they had no choice but to obtain territorial expansion by force. In this connection it is interesting to note the alarm of national spokesmen at the recent sharp fall in the birth rate. The anonymous gentleman who made public the results of the 1940 census expressed consternation:

"Judging from all available data * * * a gradual fall in our population increase is inevitable, admitting at the same time that

[1] Ishii: op. cit., pp. 110, 114, 115; Pelzer: Population, p. 29.

[2] Penrose: Japan, p. 104.

[3] Penrose: op. cit., pp. 87–92.

[4] Contemporary Japan, vol. 10, p. 817.

[5] TABLE XIX.—*Japan proper: Proportion of urban and rural population in 1920, 1935, and 1940*

Year	Total population	Urban population	Percent of total	Rural population	Percent of total
1920	55,900,000	18,000,000	32	37,900,000	68
1935	69,300,000	31,700,000	46	37,600,000	54
1940	73,100,000	36,400,000	49	36,700,000	51

Sources: Data for 1920 from the Japan Yearbook 1926, p. 52; data for 1935 from the Japan Yearbook 1940–41, p. 47; data for 1940 from Toshai Mondai, as quoted by McCune: Recent Growth of Japanese Cities, pp. 164, 165.

[6] TABLE XX.—*Japan proper: Rates of growth of principal urban groups between 1920 and 1935 and between 1935 and 1940*

Group	Average of rates of growth by 5-year periods 1920–35	Average rate of growth 1935–40
	Percent	*Percent*
Japan proper	7.4	5.6
6 largest cities	18.6	12.5
12 cities over 200,000	16.5	10.2
29 cities between 200,000 and 100,000	13.1	10.8
57 cities between 100,000 and 50,000	12.6	5.9
78 municipalities under 50,000	9.7	6.1

Source: Toshai Mondai, as quoted by McCune: op. cit., pp. 164, 165.

[7] TABLE XXI.—*Japan proper: The population of the 6 great cities as a group in relation to total population and total urban population in the censuses of 1920, 1935, and 1940*

Year	Total population	Totalurban population	Population of the 6
1920	55,900,000	18,000,000	5,500,000
1935	69,200,000	31,700,000	12,600,000
1940	73,100,000	36,400,000	14,400,000

Source: Toshai Mondai, vol. 32, pp. 1148–1167, as translated by Shannon McCune.

[8] TABLE XXIII.—*Japanese residents in outer parts of the Japanese Empire*

Date of record	Political unit	Number of resident Japanese
1938	Korea	333,288
1938	Formosa	308,845
Dec. 31, 1937	Manchukuo	417,759
June 30, 1939	South Sea mandated islands.	73,028
End of 1938	Karafuto	329,743
End of 1938	Kwantung leased territory.	180,689

Source: Data from the *Japan Yearbook 1940–41* pp. 859, 882, 903, 914, 929, 930.

[9] Pelzer: op. cit., p. 37.

[10] Crocker: The Japanese Population Problem, pp. 198–203; Pelzer: Japanese Migration * * * pp. 155–194.

the observations of the present census are attributable to some special factors.

"A campaign to combat this deplorable state of things has of late been put into motion in the country, and, as a consequence, various measures for increasing our birth rate are being studied. If some effective measures to this end are worked out, the downward tendency of our population increase will have been checked." [11]

The campaign to be thus drastically "enforced" is described in detail in another Japanese publication, Contemporary Opinions on Current Topics:

"The Government's population-increase program adopted recently deserves our wholehearted support. The Government intends to increase Japan proper's population from 72,000,000 at present to 100,000,000 by 1960, to improve the nation's physical construction and mental capacity, and to effect proper distribution of Japanese among East Asiatic races."

With regard to the birth rate, it is explained, the goal is twofold: First, to reduce the average age of marriage by 3 years (from the present average of 28 years for men and 24 years for women); and, second, to urge each couple to have at least 5 children. To achieve this goal the following means are to be employed:

Maintenance of the family system;

Advance of marriage funds;

Protection of maternity;

Prohibition of the employment of women older than 20 years;

Protection of pregnant women and nursing babies;

Restriction and prohibition of birth control;

Aid to families with many children; and

Establishment of marriage agencies.[12]

For the present leaders of Japan, clearly, the fear that in the future their people may be at a greater numerical disadvantage to other Asiatic races far outweighs their concern lest the means of life run short at home.

Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, much complaint has been made by the Japanese in the past concerning the fact that their population is increasing out of all proportion to the size of territory they occupy as a homeland, and that consequently it is necessary for them to go out and conquer additional lands or take by other means additional lands so that their people can have a place within which to live, a place referred to by the Germans, of course, as lebensraum.

Here we find they are engaging in a program of propagation, of deliberately increasing the number of Japanese throughout the Pacific world, particularly in Japan itself. Therefore, no consideration whatever need be given to the Japanese claims for the needs of further territory and certainly no such consideration can be given so long as they hold to this program of deliberately increasing the number of living Japanese. That policy was begun a long time ago, evidently, and has been continued up to today. From 1872 to 1942, which, I believe, covers a period of 70 years, they have increased to more than double, knowing that they cannot all live on the island of Japan. If they are going to double again in the next 70 years they will have 140,000,000 people. However, I think that they hope to increase at a faster rate than that and to overrun the eastern part of the world with little Japanese. If they do that, then it matters not what peace is made, stripping the Japanese of their territory; no matter what peace is made, taking armaments and territory away from them, our Japanese problem still remains unsolved because they will have expanded and settled their race throughout that territory, no doubt with the hope of overrunning it completely with little Japanese babies that will grow up to be soldiers. Their program in the United States can well be set forth by an examination of the following table. I shall insert the table in the RECORD.

The matter referred to follows:

Chinese and Japanese population in United States

	Total population in continental United States	Total inhabitants of Japanese origin	Total inhabitants of Chinese origin
1890	62,947,714	2,039	107,488
1900	75,994,575	24,326	89,863
1910	91,972,266	72,157	71,531
1920	105,710,620	111,010	61,639
1930	122,775,046	138,834	74,954
1940	131,669,275	126,947	77,504

Growth of Chinese and Japanese population by nativity, 1900–30

	Total	American born	Foreign born
Chinese:			
1900	89,863	9,010	80,853
1910	71,531	14,935	56,596
1920	61,639	18,532	43,107
1930	74,954	30,868	44,086
Japanese:			
1900	24,326	269	24,057
1910	72,157	4,502	67,655
1920	111,010	29,672	81,338
1930	138,834	68,357	70,477

It shows in 1890 there were in the entire United States 2,039 Japanese. In 1900 there were 24,000; in 1910, 72,000. Between 1910 and 1920 came the gentleman's agreement, by which they withheld the right of their citizens to emigrate to the United States. In spite of that the population has increased in the United States so that in 1940, at the time of our last census, there were 126,947 inhabitants of Japanese origin living in the United States.

On the other hand, look at the Chinese situation in America and you will find that in that same period of time the total number of inhabitants of Chinese origin in the United States decreased from 107,000 to 77,000.

Let me call your attention for a moment to the statistics concerning the native Japanese resident in the United States, and the children which were born to them. In 1900 there were 269 American-born Japanese. They were born in this country. There were 24,057 of the foreign-born Japanese. By 1930, the American-born Japanese had increased to 68,357, showing you that the program for more babies has worked very satisfactorily to them in this country.

I understand from one who has recently returned from the islands—and I wish the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON] were here to corroborate the statement if he could—that there is a very strong program among the Japanese in the Hawaiian Islands, already comprising approximately one-third of the population, to have more babies, so that very shortly there will be more Japanese on the islands, than all of the other nationalities together. That is the sort of program which they are following to propagate and populate the shores of the Pacific.

ASIATIC QUESTION AT VERSAILLES

I want to discuss for a few minutes the problem as it related to the Versailles Treaty and the Versailles Conference. As you all know, when the subject of Japanese and Chinese interests was about to be presented to the Versailles Conference, our own people who were over there, made reports to our Government concerning the viewpoint of the Japanese and the Chinese. Those statements and exchanges of telegrams and memoranda are included in a number of volumes published by the Department of State at Washington entitled "The Foreign Relations of the United States."

On page 49 of volume 1, entitled "The Paris Peace Conference of 1919," you will find a report from our Ambassador in Japan, Mr. Morris, to the Secretary of State. He says:

The Chuwo warns America that if she becomes conceited and attributes the defeat of the enemy to her own strength, assuming at the same time a positive attitude in world affairs, she will be doomed as Germany is now doomed. If she recklessly attempts to display her strength, this journal concludes, the result will be the unhappiness of mankind.

That paragraph which I have just read is in the nature of an advance declaration of war to America, away back in November 1918.

The full verbatim text of Ambassador Morris' letter is as follows:

The Ambassador in Japan (Morris) to the Secretary of State

No. 299 TOKYO, November 27, 1918.
[Received December 23.]

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith, supplementing my despatch No. 285 November 5, 1918,[1] a number of translations [1] made in this Embassy of comments in the Japanese Press and current magazines on matters connected with the position of Japan at the forthcoming Peace Conference and other related questions. While these comments are of the same character and scope as the earlier ones that have already been forwarded they show more fully and definitely what the Japanese public expects and desires in the way of a settlement after the war.

Mr. Kiroku Hayashi, M. P., considers the disposal of Kiaochow Bay the foremost among the questions affecting Japan exclusively. The abandonment of this territory by Germany he declares is of paramount importance for the preservation and peace of the Far East. He is, however, one of those who believe that the question of restoring [it?] to China should not be left to the Peace Conference, as it is a matter that concerns only China and Japan.

Dr. Mutsumami, of the Imperial University, has no doubt that the two countries, being of the same race and having a common medium of writing, can reach a satisfactory solution by themselves as to its disposal.

Dr. Terao, a leading authority on International Law, voices a widely prevailing desire

[11] Contemporary Japan, vol. 10, p. 818.

[12] Contemporary Opinions on Current Topics, No. 369, p. 7.

[1] Not printed.

in proposing that Japan secure a lease on Tsingtao for a certain period, keeping in mind the object of restoring it to China eventually.

Baron Shibusawa, Japan's eminent financier, wants for Japan a recognized position of absolute superiority in China. He declares that, while the relations of other powers to China are those of interest, the relations of Japan are more vital, affecting her existence, and therefore she cannot place her interests on a par with those of other powers.

Mr. Oishi, a former leader of the Kenseikai Party, asks for special recognition only in respect to Manchuria and Mongolia, so that Japan can make herself secure from the possibility of post-bellum economic rivalries of the powers in those regions.

With regard to Siberia, the *Yamato* advocates that Japan insist at the Peace Conference on having Vladivostock converted into a free port; that the Chinese Eastern Railway be placed under Japanese control; and that other Siberian Railways under the joint control of the Allied Powers.

With regard to a League of Nations, Mr. Hayashi believe that, while it will be a gratifying achievement for the sake of the world's peace, care must be taken to remove artificial barriers that may hinder the peaceful development of individual nations. The preservation of the territorial *status quo* indefinitely will be, he states, a source of affliction to nations with limited areas that contemplate future development, the progress of mankind and the development of states will thus be obstructed. Indeed the idea that the League of Nations will circumscribe rather than assist weak and poor nations in achieving their manifest destiny is widely prevalent among Japanese publicists.

The limitation of armaments does not meet with much favor in Japan. The *Kokumin* asserts that it is doubtful whether Great Britain and America will consent to break up their warships and use the steel for other purposes, and points out that the Japanese Army is to Japan what Navies are to Britain and America. Even Baron Shibusawa advises the nations to be ready for America, the Champion of Democracy, lest she make it a part of her policy to check Japan's military expansion in the future.

There is in fact general fear of America's growing power, and distrust of her motives. The *Chuwo* warns America that if she becomes conceited and attributes the defeat of the enemy to her own strength, assuming at the same time a positive attitude in world affairs, she will be doomed as Germany is now doomed. If she recklessly attempts to display her strength, this journal concludes, the result will be the unhappiness of mankind.

The conviction is general that Japan has much at stake in the deliberations of the Peace Conference, not only in respect to the specific terms that affect Japan exclusively, but also in regard to general questions of post-bellum reconstruction. It is argued that Japan must take a leading part in the problems that affect the Far East, particularly in view of the fact, as the *Kokumin* points out, that the fate of the Yellow Race depends upon the attitude of Japan. While Japan has not been formerly [*formally?*] entrusted with representing the Race, this journal observes, it is a question whether China's voice will be effective, because the value of her part in the war is not generally recognized, and also because her war aims are not clear.

I have [etc.] ROLAND S. MORRIS

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HINSHAW I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. Would not the gentleman think that the Japanese were afraid that America might attempt to interfere with their aggressive ideas toward eastern Asia and China in particular?

Mr. HINSHAW. Oh, certainly. That appears all throughout the statements made by the Japanese leaders at that time, as are contained in these three volumes that I have before me, distinctly indicating that they were intending to proceed with conquest and overrun, not only all of the immediate islands surrounding Japan, but to continue the occupation of Korea, Manchuria, portions of Siberia, and as much of China as they could devour. Of course, ultimately she came into possession of mandated islands all over the Pacific. The idea of empire is not new in Japan. It is an old idea, and one that they have followed consistently throughout the last four decades, at least, and possibly longer.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel that the United States should have gone into the mandated islands and at least have found out what was going on, the nature of the terrain, and the physical structure of those islands?

Mr. HINSHAW. I may say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that I hope to be granted some time a little later in the month to go into the subject of the mandated islands as carefully as I can, reading the various memoranda—dispatches, telegrams, and so forth—that refer to them, and point out that the Japanese had every intention of permanently occupying those islands by one means or another and that World War No. 1 gave them the opportunity which they sought.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And we should have intervened on the spot.

Mr. HINSHAW. As a matter of fact, the first thing that they did at the beginning of World War No. 1, in 1914, was to proceed to take and occupy all of the German possessions in the immediate neighborhood of Japan, which included the Marshalls, the Carolines, Shantung Province of China, and so forth and so on. They occupied every last one of them, and no one that I know of, officially—that is, an official representative of this Government or any other government—has made an investigation of those islands to find out whether or not they were fortified.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And it was great negligence.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. ROLPH. I am very much interested listening to the learned address of my colleague from California. He mentions this notice that the Japanese gave in 1918. Does not the gentleman believe that many years before, the Japanese had designs on the United States secretly, but that this was the first evidence they had given publicly of their feelings toward this country?

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman remembers my reading the article which I just presented from the American Geographical Society in which the statement was made that the Japanese enjoyed the more temperate and warmer climates, not the cold climates.

I feel that there is no question whatever, if one will examine the record, that they have had their hungry eyes on the entire rim of the Pacific that was suitable in climate and that would be liked as a place of domicile by their people, and that included the Pacific coast of the United States.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. I too wish to compliment the gentleman on introducing this matter into the RECORD, because I believe the gentleman is making a coherent statement on a very important problem, and that is, that while America in the last war was interested only in maintaining the peace of the world and was glad to give her entire cooperation toward that end, yet Japan all the while was using that war merely as a means to her own ends. Does not the gentleman believe that she had those designs for a long time, concealed, and hypocritical, never departed from but furthered by every means they could use?

Mr. HINSHAW. I think that is very definite. I do not believe the Japanese consider themselves hypocritical at all. I think they consider us a nation of suckers and acting on that belief did and said anything they wanted to with the feeling: What did it matter? They could get away with it. That is just exactly what they have done. They have hoodwinked every other nation except the Oriental nations and I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that China has never been fooled by the protestations of Japan. She in fact has protested to us that we should in no way believe what the Japanese said. In this connection let us examine the telegram from the United States Ambassador to Japan, Mr. Morris, to Secretary of State, Mr. Lansing, dated November 13, 1918, which, incidentally, was November 12 in Washington. I quote verbatim from page 489 of volume 1 of the Paris Peace Conference published by our State Department:

763.72119/2583:Telegram

The Ambassador in Japan (Morris) to the Secretary of State

TOKYO, November 13, 1918—8 p. m.
[Received November 13—5:44 p. m.]

The news of the armistice is viewed by the Japanese press and people with a detached attitude. Satisfaction is professed but without enthusiasm. Newspaper comments reveal a keen interest in Japan's aims at the Peace Commissioner [*Conference?*], chief emphasis being laid on the necessity of securing recognition of Japan's paramount position in Eastern Asia.

Is that an answer to the gentleman's question?

Mr. WRIGHT. It is, if an answer were needed.

Mr. HINSHAW. I continue reading:

The advance in quotations on the stock exchanges both at Osaka and Tokyo were not anticipated and indicates a general feeling of optimism in economic circles. The Advisory Council on Foreign Affairs met today when it is reported Japan's peace terms which have been drafted by the Foreign Office in collaboration with the War and Navy Departments and the appointment of a new Ambassador were discussed.

MORRIS.

Then there is a subsequent telegram from Ambassador Morris to the Secretary of State which is as follows:

763.72119/2636:Telegram

The Ambassador in Japan (Morris) to the Secretary of State

TOKYO, November 15, 1918—11 p. m.
[Received November 16—10:08 a. m.]

An adjourned meeting of the Advisory Council has been called for next Tuesday, to consider further the plans for Japan's participation in the Peace Conference. The Minister for Foreign Affairs announced today that he anticipated two conferences, one for the actual signing of peace with the Central Powers, and another early next year for a more conclusive settlement of international question[s]. Chinda or Matsui will probably act alone for the present but the government contemplates sending to the second conference a special mission consisting of a number of Army and Navy experts and members of the permanent diplomatic service and headed by a statesman of recognized prestige. The Navy has already decided upon Admiral Takeshita as its chief representative. Who the others to be selected are, particularly the head of the mission, is much debated. My British colleague is showing unusual interest in the subject and has discussed it with the Minister for Foreign Affairs. He favors Viscount Kato who seems also to be the most popular choice in Japan, but his appointment is doubtful for political reasons.

It is hoped by Japanese that the organization of a League of Nations will offer an opportunity to assert the equality of the yellow race, a question which underlies all discussions on the subject. With this in mind plans are being seriously discussed for an immediate alliance with China so that the two nations may work in harmony at the Conference.

Mister Norman, counsellor of the British Embassy has been chosen as one of the advisers of the British Bondholders Commission and leaves for London next week. He has had long experience in Japanese and Near Eastern affairs.

Peace celebrations are being planned by the authorities in the larger cities.

MORRIS.

Then, here is a string of telegrams that should be studied carefully. They appear on pages 492–494 of this volume:

862.20294/21:Telegram

The Acting Secretary of State to the Ambassador in France (Sharp)

WASHINGTON, December 12, 1918—8 p. m.

177. For House. The Department is in receipt of a telegram dated the 2nd instant from the Embassy at Tokyo reading as follows:

"Department's November 30, 6 p. m.[1] regarding German propaganda. Reference Embassy's quarterly report number 3.[1] Since the collapse of the Central Powers, all traces pro-German sentiment have at least temporarily disappeared, showing that its former strength was at the same time its weakness. That is to say, this propaganda was largely the work of militarists and German educated university professors, whose prestige depended upon preserving institutions of a German pattern and therefore it became thoroughly discredited as soon as it could no longer be demonstrated that Germany was worthy of emulation or expedient to cultivate on account of her strength. In this connection it is significant that none of the Peace Conference delegates on the part of Japan are classed as belonging to the German school. At the present moment I can trace no influences here which would indicate German origin. Morris."

POLK.

[1] Not printed.

763.72/12570a:Telegram

The Acting Secretary of State to the Ambassador in Japan (Morris)

WASHINGTON, December 19, 1918—4 p. m.

Press reports give summary of recent statement alleged to have been made by Okuma, indicating Japan's ambitions in South Sea Islands. Please cable substance of statement, indicating reason for statement, date, occasion upon which made, and such other information as you may be able to obtain. Please mail full text in first pouch.

POLK.

763.72/12571: Telegram

The Ambassador in Japan (Morris) to the Acting Secretary of State

TOKYO, December 21, 1918—6 p. m.
[Received December 21—12:37 p. m.]

Your telegram December 19, 4 p. m. Since the publication of the interview reported in my telegram of November 3, 1 p. m.,[2] Okuma has made no public statement with reference to Japan's ambitions in the South Sea Islands. Reports in the American press are probably based on a special interview granted their representative which were [*was*] not given out in Japan.

MORRIS.

763.72119/3248: Telegram

The Ambassador in Japan (Morris) to the Acting Secretary of State[3]

TOKYO, January 2, 1919—9 p. m.
[Received January 2—6:47 p. m.]

In a contribution to the *Kokumin* of January 1st, Marquis Okuma states that permanent peace cannot be achieved without first solving the question of the equality of treatment of races and the question of armaments. He asks how America proposes to treat in future the alien races in her territory, and expresses the hope that American public opinion will adopt a generous attitude toward this question. At the same time he insists that Japanese emigrants be freely allowed to enter every country. He further hopes that in order to act [*secure*] a permanent peace the powers will avoid severe tariff wars. In connection with the question of armaments, the Marquis asks how America's new naval program and Great Britain's insistence on naval supremacy can be reconciled with the declarations of these countries. He hopes that the press reports to the effect that Congress has disapproved of President Wilson's fourteen fundamental terms are without foundation.

MORRIS.

763.72119/3308:Telegram

The Ambassador in Japan (Morris) to the Acting Secretary of State

TOKYO, January 7, 1919—1 p. m.
[Received January 7—11:05 a. m.]

Marquis Saionji, Japanese Peace Ambassador, accompanied by his personal suite consisting of Prince Konoye, Mr. Saionji, his heir, Dr. Minucle, his physician, Mr. Matsuoka, secretary, Mr. Akzuki, formerly Ambassador to Austria Hungary, Viscount Motono, son of the late Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Mr. Ito, son of the late Prince Ito, will leave for France on the *Tamba Maru* sailing on January 14th via Suez and due to arrive Marseilles early in March.

Prince Konoye, in a contribution to Japan and the Japanese, a fortnightly magazine, urges that Japan should lend no ears to a peace based on Anglo-American interests alone, because economic imperialism with which these powers threaten the world is no less a menace to the free development of nations than military imperialism. He therefore regrets that Japanese are inclined to accept without discount or examination the democracy and humanitarianism advocated by British and American statesmen. While not opposing a league of nations based on justice and humanity in the strict sense, he thinks that if one such as favored by America and Great Britain is formed, the two powers will have the lion's share of the advantages, while others, deprived of the arms to resist their economic aggression, will be obliged to submit to the lead of these two powers. If Great Britain closes her colonies to foreign countries, how can Japan maintain her existence with her limited territory, slender resources and poorly equipped factories? Under such circumstances Japan will be obliged to assume the same attitude as Germany before the war and destroy the status quo. Prince Konoye further insists that the discriminatory treatment accorded to yellow race in America and British colonies must be removed. It is worthy of note that Prince Konoye's views are shared by a number of publicists.

MORRIS.

Please take due notice that Prince Konoye notified us in January 1919 to the effect that if we did not remove restrictions on the settlement of her fast-breeding and multiplying population, then Japan would destroy the status quo, all of which means to fight us. Why were we so concerned with things at home and elsewhere that we failed to take due note of impending war.

The Chinese were not being fooled by that; the Chinese knew what they were up to. The Chinese knew that the Japanese were using every means at their command to gain control over the Chinese delegation to the peace conference and also over the Chinese Government, and they were doing it by a great many means which I am sure none of us here would condone. The Chinese plead with us not to abandon their weak and disorganized country to the Japanese.

I find on page 525 of volume 2 of the Paris Peace Conference, 1919, a memorandum of transmission by Capt. Stanley K. Hornbeck to the commission to negotiate peace. Capt. Stanley K. Hornbeck, as everyone here knows, is now one of the chief political advisors in our State Department. At that time he was attached to the military mission at Versailles. This is entitled "Problems and Policy in the Far East." I shall include it with my remarks.

Paris Peace Conf. 793.94/9

Captain Stanley K. Hornbeck to the Commission to Negotiate Peace

PROBLEMS AND POLICY IN THE FAR EAST

1. The American Minister to China has sent a lengthy cable which he desires to have

[2] *Foreign Relations*, 1918, supp. 1, vol. I, p. 661.

[3] Forwarded to the Commission to Negotiate Peace, Jan. 6, 1919, 3 p. m.

called particularly to the attention of the President.

2. The message is a powerful plea for a "thorough-going and permanent settlement of the Chinese question".

Its features are: (1) A presentation of the fundamental factors which underlie the whole problem of settlement and policy in and with regard to the Far East; (2) interpretation of facts and suggestions as to policy; (3) predictions as to the danger which attends neglect of the present opportunity.

3. As to the Minister's statements of fact,—it is the opinion of the writer that they are uniformly and absolutely accurate.

4. As to the Minister's expressions of opinion,—the views expressed represent the mature judgment of a man long recognized as a first-rate authority on international questions—particularly on problems of the Far East. In advance of the Boxer uprising of 1900, Dr. Reinsch predicted the bursting of that storm. He has been during the past five years the Representative of the United States at Peking, the political storm centre of the Far East.

5. This message is worthy of the most careful consideration of the Peace Commissioners. The necessity for arriving at a just and practicable settlement of various outstanding Far Eastern questions is, in its bearing upon the problem of safeguarding the peace of the world, most urgent. The problems are vital. Upon their treatment depends the directing of the course which will be followed in the future political development of races which constitute one half of the world's population, and, incidental thereto, of the relations of those races to the peoples of the Occident.

6. There are attached hereto:

A. A précis of the contents of the cable;

B. A copy of the cable. (It has been somewhat mangled in course of transmission.)

Respectfully submitted by

STANLEY K. HORNBECK.

Following is the copy of the cable from our Minister to China to which Captain Hornbeck refers. It appears verbatim:

763.72119/3309: Telegram

The Minister in China (Reinsch) to the Acting Secretary of State[1]

PEKING, January 6, 1919—8 p. m.
[Received January 7—9: 34 a. m.]

I beg to request you to transmit the following to the President to reach him in Europe.

I feel in duty bound to call your attention to the imperious necessity of including a thoroughgoing and permanent settlement of the Chinese question among the arrangements to be made for the establishment of peace. I appeal to you directly not only because of your determined purpose to create a just foundation for human relations throughout the world but also because you have become to the people of China the embodiment of their best hopes and aspirations. Your championship of the four great principles laid down in your speech of July 4th,[2] has found a deep response throughout China. These people whose rights have been trodden under foot while the war of liberation was going on in Europe, know from their own bitter experience, the vast importance of these principles for protecting free development and justice within the nations and for preventing coercion, plots and conspiracies from without. Never before have the words of a foreign statesman entered so deeply and directly into the hearts of the Chinese people, from the President of China who has again and again cited them in his manifestoes, down throughout all the ranks of the people. Though with bitterness akin to despair they observed that while the western powers were fighting for human rights in Europe the rights of the Chinese people were invaded by one of the Allies with every device of corruption and coercion, they now again have raised their hearts in hope and confidence that those who defeated evil in Europe and especially their leader and spokesman, the President of the United States, will no longer tolerate in Asia the execrable practices of military domination, secret trafficking with fundamental rights and the corruption of the life of a people and they ask no charity but justice, they ask no support but the assurance that the constant exertion of evil influences from without and the attempt of foreign military autocrats to seize control of the Chinese resources, finance and defenses shall be put an end to so that the Chinese people may continue the arduous work of establishing a representative Government without having every constructive attempt maimed and every weakness aggravated by selfish interference from without.

I need not recall to you that the action of China during the war was inspired by the example of America and by a desire to realize our common ideals of freedom and justice. It was the liberal elements that are working for representative government which determined the rupture of diplomatic relations in February 1917. Could we at that time have devoted attention to China, her entire course in the war could have been guided by America as China sought earnestly of one accord to follow this guidance. The new President, though trained in the older school of statesmanship, singled out your greeting as the most noteworthy statement upon his accession and has since in words and action expressed his desire to guide the country after the models of American statesmanship. In their trouble, aggravated by foreign intrigues, both sides have repeatedly and fervently expressed the assurance that if you would consent to mediate all China would be happy to accept your judgment and advice. Such has been the attitude of the Chinese people throughout the war during the latter part of which, unhappily, the controlling power in the government fell into the hands of men who through ignorance, corruption and treachery prostituted their public trust to Japanese desire for power.

Nor need [I] more than summarize the acts of Japan during the fateful years of the war while her Allies were shedding streams of blood for liberty. In 1915 coercion was applied and China was forced by threats to solidify and extend the privileged position of Japan in Manchuria and Mongolia and to agree prospectively to a like regime in Shantung together with the beginnings of special position in Fukien province. After this there was a change of methods although the policy tended to the same end, domination over China. Instead of coercion [they] used secret and corrupt influence through alliance with purchasable officials kept in office by Japanese support. The latter insidious policy is more dangerous because it gives the appearance that rights are duly acquired through grant of the Chinese Government; no demands or ultimatums are necessary because corrupt officials strongly supported by Japanese finance, acting absolutely in secret channels, suppressing all discussion with the strong arm of the police, are able to exercise contractual rights regular in form though of corrupt secret origin and evil tendency.

Japan has used every possible means to demoralize China, by creating and sustaining trouble, by supporting and financing most objectionable elements particularly a group of corrupt and vicious military governors in their methods, by employing instigators of trouble, by protection given to bandits, by the introduction of morphia and opium, by the corruption of officials through loans, bribes and threats, by the wrecking of native banks and the depreciation of local currency by illegal export of the copper currency of the people, by local attempts to break down the Salt Administration, by persistent efforts to prevent China from going into the war and then seeing to it that China was never in a position to render to the common cause such aid as would be in her power and as she would willingly render if left to herself, finally by utilizing the war and the preoccupation of the Allies for enmeshing China in terms of a secret military alliance.

As a result of these methods and manipulations Japan has gained the following: A consolidation of her special position in Manchuria and Eastern Mongolia and the foundation of the same in Shantung and Fukien; control in the matters of Chinese finance through the control of the Bank of Communications and the Bureau of Public Printing and the appointment of a high financial adviser together with the adoption of the unsound gold note scheme happily not yet put in[to] force. She has secured extensive railway concession[s] in Manchuria, Shantung, Chihli and Kiangsu; mining rights in various provinces and special monopolistic rights through the Kirin forestry loan, the telephone loan and others. Through the secret military convention Japan attempts not only to control the military policy of China but [incidentally] national resources such as iron deposits. All these arrangements are so secretly made that in most cases not even the Foreign Office is in possession of the documents relating thereto. Together with this goes the persistent assertion of special interests which are interpreted as giving a position of predominance.

I realize that this is a strong indictment and I feel the fullest responsibility in making these statements to you. Fundamentally friendly to the Japanese as my published expression[s] show, I have been forced through the experience of five years to the conclusion that the methods applied by the Japanese military masters can lead only to evil and destruction and also that they will not be stopped by any consideration of fairness and justice but only by the definite knowledge that such action will not be tolerated. As a steady stream of information from every American official in China and from every other source as well as my own experience have made this conclusion inevitable, I owe the duty to state it to you and to the American Government in no uncertain terms, nor is this said in any spirit of bitterness against the Japanese people but from the conviction that the policy pursued by their military masters can in the end bring only misery and woe to them and the world. During this period it has not appeared possible for the European powers or the United States to do anything for China; the United States, though assisting all other Allies financially, could not contribute one dollar toward maintaining the financial independence of China as undivided attention was necessary to the requirements of the West Front. The Lansing-Ishii notes[3] undoubtedly intended to express a friendly attitude towards any legitimate aspirations of Japan, while safeguarding the rights of China, was perverted by the Japanese into an acknowledgment of their privileged position in China. Now at last when the pressure has been released America as well as European countries must face the issue which has been created which is whether a vast peaceable and industrious population whose most articulate desire is to be allowed to develop their own life in the

[1] Forwarded to the Commission to Negotiate Peace as Department's telegram No. 168, Jan. 10, 1919, 4 p. m.

[2] Foreign Relations, 1918, supp. 1, vol. I, p. 268.

[3] See Foreign Relations, 1917, pp. 258 ff., and ibid., The Lansing Papers, 1914–1920, vol. II, pp. 432 ff.

direction of free and just government, shall become material to be molded by the secret and unconscionable plottings of a foreign military despotism into an instrument of its power. If it is said that the aims of Japan are now but economic and in just response to needs of Japan's expanding population, it must be remembered that every advantage is gained and maintained by political and military pressure and that it is exploited by the same means in a fashion taking no account of the rights of other foreign nations or of the Chinese themselves. Divested of their political character and military aims the economic activities of Japan would arouse no opposition. The fact that at present when it has been announced that Japan will tolerate only bona fide economic business in China, huge iron enterprises, loans, mining concession[s], et cetera, are being actively promoted by Japanese with the assistance of subservient members of northern military clique who desire to use the proceeds for the purpose of increasing their personal forces—gives a clear insight into the method of Japanese economic business in China.

Detailed reports on the facts of the recent situation as well as discussions of remedies to be applied have been sent the Secretary of State in considerable volume, particularly in my telegrams of October 19, noon; November 7, 6 p. m.; November 12, 6 p. m.; November 18, 4 p. m.; November 23, 6 p. m.; November 27, 11 p. m.; December 4, 5 p. m. (?); December 10, 5 p. m.; December 20, 6 p. m.; December 20, 7 p. m.; December 24, 7 p. m.; December 27, 3 p. m.; December 30, 6 p. m.;[4] and despatches number[s] 2342, November 23rd; 2361 and 2362, both December 3rd, and 2408, December 20th.[5]

Only the refusal to accept the result of Japanese secret manipulation in China during the last four years, particularly the establishment of Japanese political influence and privileged position in Shantung can avert the onus of either making China a dependence of a reckless and boundingly [*boundlessly?*] ambitious caste which would destroy the peace of the entire world or bringing on a military struggle inevitable from the establishment of the rival spheres of interests and privileges in China. Peace is conditioned on the abolition for the present and future of all localized privileges. China must be freed from all foreign political influence exercised within her borders, railways controlled by foreign nations and preferential arrangements supported by political power. If this is done China will readily master her own troubles particularly if the military bandits hitherto upheld by Japan shall no longer have the countenance of any foreign power.

The advantages enumerated above were gained by Japan when she was professedly acting as the trustee of the Associated Powers in the Far East and they could not have been obtained at all but for the sacrifices made in Europe. They are therefore not the exclusive concern of any one power With respect to Shantung, the German rights there lapsed together with all Sino-German treaties upon the declaration of war. A succession of treaty rights from Germany to Japan is therefore not possible and the recognition of a special position of Japan in Shantung could only proceed from a new act to which conceivably some weak Chinese officials might be induced [apparent omission] but which would be contrary to the frequently declared aims of international policy in China and which would amount to the definitive establishment of exclusive spheres of influence in China leading in turn to the more vigorous development of such exclusive spheres by other nations. The present situation of affairs offer[s] the last opportunity by which to avert threatening disaster by removing the root of conflict in China. This can be done only by abolishing localized preferences and particularly by commercializing all Chinese railways under unified Chinese control with such foreign non-political expert assistance as may be necessary. Slight sacrifices of special advantages already held by one or two European powers would be justified by the suppression of formidable danger to civilization. [Thereby] the opportunity for the infiltration of political influence in the interior of China is precluded; the development of stable and free government is assured particularly if America should give some practical indication that we are not indifferent to the preservation of the right of the Chinese people to develop freely.

Never before has an opportunity for leadership toward the welfare of humanity presented itself equal to that which invites America in China at the present time. The Chinese people ask for no better fate than to be allowed freedom to follow in the footsteps of America; every device of intrigue and corruption as well as coercion is being employed to force them in a different direction, including constant misrepresentation of American policies and aims, which, however, has not as yet prejudiced the Chinese. Nor is it necessary on this account to exercise any political influence. If it were only known that an exchange [*sic*] in concert with the Liberal powers would not tolerate the enslavement of China either by foreign or native militarists, the natural propensity of the Chinese to follow liberal inclinations would guide this vast country towards free government and propitious developments of peaceful industrial activities, even through unavoidable difficulties in the transition of so vast and ancient a society to new methods of action. The eager attention which has been paid to your words, the trust and confidence which the Chinese feel in your policies and aims, are evidence of a spontaneous desire to follow along the path of American action and aspiration which you have made so clear to the world. If China should be disappointed in her confidence at the present time the consequence of such disillusionment on her moral and political development would be disastrous, and we, instead of looking across the Pacific towards a Chinese nation sympathetic with our ideals, would be confronted with a vast materialistic military organization under ruthless control.

REINSCH.

You will take note that the Report on Problems and Policies in the Far East, which was drawn up by our then Minister to China, Mr. Reinsch, was cabled to the Secretary of State. Mr. Reinsch earnestly requested that this entire statement of fact be transmitted to President Woodrow Wilson so that it might reach him in Europe at the peace conference.

Another important message, the last sentence of which is most significant, is as follows:

Paris Peace Conf. 793.94/8:Telegram

The Acting Secretary of State to the Commission to Negotiate Peace

WASHINGTON [undated].

[Received January 5, 1919—5 p. m.]

97. Telegram in substance as follows has been received from Legation at Peking: The Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs during course of short conversation in Tokyo with Chinese Minister for Foreign Affairs said that desires of China at Peace Conference would be supported by Japan but Japan would expect that status of Shantung should without delay be settled amicably between the Chinese and Japanese Governments. It would seem that the Chinese are being encouraged by the Japanese to make demands which it is a foregone conclusion will not be granted categorically by the Powers such as abolition of extraterritoriality and of customs tariff restrictions, and in return for their support the settlement of the Shantung question is being urged. All general provisions made by the Peace Conference for the protection and salvation of China would be futile if Japanese special right in Shantung should be acknowledged.

POLK.

In a number of places in these State Department documents one can read very well how the Japanese agents in China bribed the Chinese officials, supplied opium and narcotics, and engaged in all sorts of illicit traffic for the purpose of breaking down the morale and the will of the Chinese. That was allowed to continue, and unfortunately some of the European nations winked at it and allowed it to go on.

The thing that we should have done in China then and before, and certainly since, was to make China the strongest nation in the Orient in order that she might have her place by right instead of being overrun by the little brown race of the island. I hope to goodness that at the conclusion of this war the great powers of the world—the United States, Great Britain, and Russia—will see to it that China has an opportunity to take her place in the world and to become that great democratic force I know she will be, in order to offset the villainous, unprincipled, immoral Japanese in the Orient.

I shall include certain other excerpts in the RECORD. I do want to call attention to another section in this geographic review of Japan by the American Geographic Society, in which they point out the process by which Japan has been able to put over her program of territorial expansion in the Orient.

TERRITORIAL EXPANSION

From the moment when population pressure first became acute in Japan, there were military men, speculative entrepreneurs, and assorted political opportunists to argue, in season and out, that new territory alone could solve the problem. The demand for territorial aggrandizement, a recurrent motif in Japanese history, has been very much alive in the modern period, but its supporters have not always been in control. During the decade following the signing of the Treaty of Versailles, liberal leaders pursued a conciliatory foreign policy the greater part of the time.[1] Democratic institutions in Japan were still rather spindly, however, and too weak to withstand the campaign of terror and guile by which the militarist forces attacked them in 1931. Since then, the program of territorial expansion has been pressed forward ruthlessly, destroying the elements of freedom both among the subjugated peoples and among the Japanese people for whose alleged benefit the war is waged.

The record of Japanese territorial expansion may be summarized in four parts: (1) During some 2,000 years of Japanese history, the main islands of Japan proper

[4] Of the telegrams cited, only three are printed: Oct. 19, noon, Foreign Relations, 1918, p. 112; Nov. 18, 4 p. m., *ibid.*, Paris Peace Conference, vol. I, p. 242; Dec. 10, 5 p. m., Foreign Relations, 1918, p. 197.

[5] Despatch No. 2342, *ante*, p. 491; No. 2361, Foreign Relations, 1919, vol. I, p. 566; others not printed.

[1] The premiership of General Tanaka from 1927 to 1929 provided a reactionary interval.

were won from the aboriginal Ainu, successfully defended against any subsequent invasion from the continent of Asia, and united in a single political unit, recognizing the supremacy of the Emperor.[2] At the beginning of the seventeenth century, when the spirit of exploration and conquest was dominant in the west, the Tokugawa line of shoguns (regents) imposed a seclusion upon Japan that lasted for 250 years. During that time the Japanese, so far from attempting conquests abroad, were forbidden to leave the country on pain of death, or even to build a ship of more than 50 tons. (2) The intrusion of Commodore Perry and his men-of-war in 1853 and the ensuing establishment of diplomatic relations, brought Japan into contact with the outside world at a time when the great powers of Europe were engaged in a scramble for concessions in China, the ultimate prize being the lion's share of the Chinese trade.[3] The role of force in the victories of European diplomacy in China was not lost upon Japanese observers, who saw in the superiority of western science the explanation of the helplessness of their strongest neighbor. The resolution to escape a similar fate and, if possible, to take part in the struggle for Chinese prizes led them to adopt western methods eagerly. It was nearly a generation, however, before Japanese forces were ready for a trial of strength on the mainland. As a result of the Sino-Japanese War of 1894–95, the Russo-Japanese War of 1904–5, the First World War of 1914–18, and intervention in Siberia from 1918 to 1922, Japan had made notable additions to the territory of the Empire by 1931. These included a screen of island outposts in the Pacific on three sides of Japan proper and on the fourth, the landward side, the adjacent Korean Peninsula and a foothold of leased territory beyond in Manchuria.[4] Although valuable from the strategic point of view, these acquisitions did not add greatly to the economic endowment of the Empire nor offer much unoccupied land suitable for settlement.

(3) During a 10-year period of undeclared war against the Chinese Republic, between September 18, 1931, and December 7, 1941, Japanese control was extended still farther over islands in the Pacific,[5] and the holdings of continental territory were enormously increased. By the latter date, Japanese forces had seized Manchuria, Jehol, Inner Mongolia, the principal cities and railways in the northern and eastern provinces of China proper, and the principal ports along the Chinese seaboard, and they had put into effect a defacto military occupation of Indo-China in July 1941, after having concluded a peace agreement with the Vichy Government in May. (4) Between December 7, 1941, and May 1942, war with China, the United States, the British Empire, and the Netherlands spread Japanese control southward over most of the chief islands in the South Pacific and on the mainland southward from the border of China to the Indian Ocean and westward to the borders of India.[6] Free China was forced to depend for supplies upon air freight and the overland routes from Russia, and the Allies were left with no adequate naval base nearer to Japan than Australia.

The method of administering the territories has differed in form in the outer Empire, the puppet states, and the newest conquests, but the underlying principle has been the same: the exploitation of the economic resources of the country for the benefit of Japan and under Japanese auspices. In the Empire this was accomplished with the help of a common currency, a customs union, and government support of Japanese investment.[7] In the puppet states set up in Manchuria and at Nanking the Japanese "advisers" have seen to it that similar ends are kept in view in the laws relating to currency, taxation, and trade regulations. Government-sponsored holding companies have been floated to commandeer industrial property and enforce its operation according to the master plan.[8] Looting and smuggling have been winked at. Less is known of the procedure in the more recently conquered states, but it may be surmised that the amenities are none too scrupulously observed.

The economic program envisaged for the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere may be deduced from the plans announced for its charter members.[9] Japan is to be the imperial center, setting the course and drawing dividends from the farthest corner of the sphere. The "highest type of precision industry" is to be the industrial specialty of the metropolitan country, but mining, heavy industry, chemical and electric enterprises may be developed in Manchuria and textiles and light manufactures in China proper. The production of food and of agricultural raw materials, such as raw cotton, is to be extended to the limit of the potentialities of the member countries and the use of nonrenewable resources carefully regulated. The intention is to make the sphere independent, so far as possible, not only of western importers but of western investors, also.

The political implications of such a program are plain. Although they involve the elimination of the property rights and influence of occidentals to the utmost possible extent, some foreign relations would be unavoidable. The Japanese Government, acting for the region as a whole, may make alliances with the Fascist powers and arrive at a modus vivendi with a neutral power, when necessary. Within the sphere, political opposition must be rooted out, whether it be in the form of liberalism in Japan or nationalism of any tinge in the tributary members.

The Government of the United States had no choice but to deal with a Japanese Government embarked on such a course. The economic interests of this country in the Far

[2] It is generally believed that Japan proper was colonized by immigrants, many of Malayan stock, who came from the continent by way of the Korean Peninsula and landed in the southern part of the islands about the beginning of the Christian era. They gradually pushed the original inhabitants northward and achieved a discordant unity of rival clans under an emperor resident in Kyoto. Their first cultural relations were with China. The seventh and eighth centuries are known in Japanese history as the period of the imitation of China and things Chinese. (See Kuno: Japanese Expansion on the Asiatic Continent, vol. I, p. 28.) Although tribute was paid by Japan to China and at other times by China to Japan, neither succeeded in invading the other country. The most notable efforts were the thirteenth century expeditions of Kublai Khan, whose armadas were brought to grief in the Tsushima Straits before reaching the home waters of Japan, and Hideyoshi's expedition to the mainland which succeeded in subduing Korea for a few years in the late sixteenth century. The wars between China and Japan were fought chiefly on the Korean Peninsula for the right to dominate the kingdoms there. The depredations of Japanese, Korean, and Chinese pirates ranged as far as the South Sea islands, and there are records of Japanese settlers in Siam, Cambodia, and Java in the sixteenth century. (See Timperley: Japan, pp. 31–41.)

[3] See Hudson: The Far East in World Politics.

[4] The Pacific islands were obtained from China, Russia, Great Britain, and Germany. The Lyuchyu Islands, dependencies of China, were yielded to Japan in a treaty with China signed in 1874, and their incorporation was completed in 1879. Formosa and the Pescadores were ceded by China in the Treaty of Shimonoseki in 1895. The Bonin Islands which had been vaguely claimed by Britain were relinquished to Japan in 1876 and incorporated in the Japanese Empire. In 1914 the islands in the South Pacific held by Germany were seized by Japanese forces, and Japan was given a mandate over them by the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, with the provision that they were not to be fortified. The southern Kurile Islands had been obtained from Russia in 1875 in consideration of the abandonment by Japan of a claim to the southern half of the island of Sakhalin. The latter was seized in the Russo-Japanese War, and the section south of the fiftieth parallel was allotted to Japan by the terms of the Portsmouth Treaty. The northern part of the island was occupied by the Japanese forces in the period of intervention from 1918 to 1925, and a treaty signed in 1925 granted Japan concessions for the production of petroleum in the Russian section.

The gains on the mainland were obtained from China, Russia, and the nominally independent state of Korea. In 1905 the Treaty of Portsmouth transferred Russian rights over Port Arthur, the Kwantung Leased Territory, and the South Manchurian Railway to Japan, and the existence of a Japanese protectorate over Korea was recognized. In 1910 Korea was formally annexed. Japanese claims of further rights in Manchuria to enforce the security of the railway zone were among the notorious Twenty-one Demands presented to China in 1915, but were not included in the Versailles Treaty. The former German holdings in Shantung Province of China, seized by Japan in November 1914, were awarded to Japan over Chinese protests by the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, but were peaceably returned to Chinese sovereignty in 1922.

[5] The departure of Japan from the League of Nations in 1931 removed the legal barrier to fortifying the mandated islands in the South Pacific. In the spring of 1939, Japan annexed the island of Hainan from China and the Spratly group, dependencies of Indo-China.

[6] Japanese military forces had succeeded in occupying the strategic points in the following islands or island groups in the Pacific: Guam, Wake, the Philippines, the Netherlands Indies, Sarawak, British Borneo, most of New Guinea, the Solomons, and the Bismarck Archipelago. In addition, they had occupied Hong Kong, Thailand, Malaya, and Burma, together with the Andaman Islands.

[7] In 1936 the value of the merchandise trade of Korea with Japan proper and other parts of the Empire amounted to 86 percent of the total foreign trade (1,166.0 as against 188.1 million yen); in Formosa the imperial share was 89 percent (602.7 as against 77.9 million yen). See Japan, Finance Department: Economic and Financial Annual 1937, pp. 248, 274, 275.

[8] See J. E. Orchard: Japan's Economic Invasion of China, pp. 471–476, and D. J. Orchard: Manchuria, pp. 36–39.

[9] The following description is based upon the statements in the Program for Economic Construction Embracing Japan, Manchukuo and China, published by the Cabinet Information Bureau, Tokyo, in November 1940, and summarized in Quigley: Far Eastern War • • • pp. 125, 126.

East were weighty,[10] the preservation of the sovereignty of the Philippines was a claim upon the national honor, and the fundamental foreign policy of the United States was clearly challenged. That policy has been to support the principles of orderly change, equality of treatment in trade, respect for territorial integrity, nonintervention in domestic affairs, and the international reduction of armament.[11] Foreign relations have been affected also by the high protective tariff upon many imports entering the United States [12] and by immigration laws that bar both Chinese and Japanese.

The principles governing American foreign policy were embodied in the Naval Treaties of 1922 and 1930, the Nine-Power Treaty of 1922, and the Pact of Paris of 1929,[13] but maintaining their effectiveness soon proved difficult. The United States associated itself with the League of Nations in condemning Japanese aggression in Manchuria in 1931 as a violation of the Nine-Power Treaty and the Pact of Paris as well as of the League Covenant. It acted in similar coöperation in 1937. After notice by Japan of the proposed abrogation of the Naval Treaty of 1930 in 1934, common action by the United States and Japan became almost impossible, and mutual relations grew increasingly strained. Protests, warnings, and forebearance in exacting compensation from Japan for injury to American rights in the Far East proved ineffectual. The denunciation by the United States of the Japanese trade treaty on July 26, 1939, to take effect six months later, permitted the employment thereafter by the State Department of trade restrictions as a means of political pressure.[14] These were applied with a stringency that reached a climax in the freezing of all Japanese credits in the United States in July 1941.[15] The government of the United States had meanwhile been extending to the legitimate government of China credits that amounted to 197 million dollars between 1931 and the end of 1941,[16]

The motives of the territorial expansionists as stated by themselves do not admit of rational analysis. It is difficult, for instance, to see how the professed need of Japan for access to raw materials and for relief from population pressure can be met simultaneously with the bringing of new prosperity to the conquered peoples. The plans calling for heavy investment of capital in the sphere and the announced intention of minimizing contact with the West,[17] where funds for investment and capital goods are most plentiful, appear to face in opposite directions. Nor does the assumption by Japan of the role of an apostle of the cultural unity of the Asiatic peoples [18] seem to agree with the Japanese practice of discrimination against the natives of long conquered lands like Korea or to take account of the heterogeneity of religion, race, and mode of life among the multitudinous residents of east Asia. The exclusiveness and extravagant claims of the Shinto religion alone would be a formidable stumbling block to unity. We can only conclude that the swelling grandiosity of the titles of the territorial expansionists indicate symptoms of megalomania rather than a sober statement of their case.[19]

Foreign observers' interpretations of the motives of the territorial expansionists cover much ground. Some stress the element of religious fanaticism that belief in the divine origin of the Japanese race and worship of the Emperor give to their conviction of Manifest Destiny.[20] Others lay much of the trouble to a deep-seated feeling of personal insecurity acquired by the Japanese in early life.[21] Some point out the fact that the ancient strength of the militarist tradition was reinforced at the moment of emergence from feudal conditions by the intensive tutelage of Prussian instructors.[22] Sensitiveness to racial discrimination by "white races" and a keen feeling of inferiority at any failure to grant Japan the full status of a great power have been enlarged upon as important causes of resentment.[23] Other analysts see the issue primarily as the struggle for power among sovereign states, each desirous of regional political supremacy.[24] Still others demonstrate the force of the economic motive that would lead Japan to prevent the independent unification of China lest the superiority of Chinese resources in manpower and raw materials reduce Japan to the position of a minor industrial competitor.[25] Finally, it has been shown that the seething social unrest in Japan in 1931 and the apparently irreconcilable dilemma it presented to the leaders made the distraction of foreign campaigns seem to them the only way of escape.[26]

The form of government in Japan, which gives ranking officers of the army and navy on active duty the power of initiative and veto in the counsels of state while allowing the mass of the people no responsible representative, favored the ascendancy of the militarists from the first moment of crisis,[27] and the trend toward a more nearly complete military dictatorship developed rapidly after 1940.[28] It will be evident even from this brief outline that the majority of the Japanese people have suffered much. It has been said of them that "lacking in political experience and deprived of liberal leadership by a vigilant police, they tread submissively the traditional path of loyalty. While it may not be anticipated that they will revolt, it is important to realize that the Japanese policy of aggrandizement is not a people's movement. There is greater community of interest between the Japanese and Chinese peoples than either of them realize. * * * The Japanese people will not forsake their emperor. But they may arrive at a new conception of the requirements of loyalty." [29]

There is another way in which the United States has been made a glorious sucker in the Far East. I remember very well, following the last war, how the Japanese came to this country and prevailed upon us to assist in financing some of the enormous power projects in Japan. We did just that and aided in the supplying of machinery of all kinds, including munitions machinery, so that they might set up their empire. We

---

[10] In 1939 the total foreign trade of the United States was valued at 5,495.3 million dollars, of which the trade with Eastern, Southeastern, and Southern Asia (excluding Oceania) accounted for 1,197.0 million dollars. In 1936 the total had been 4,878.6 and the equivalent share, 1,065.9 million dollars. See United States Department of Commerce: Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1941, pp. 548, 549.

Moreover, this trade provided the United States with imports of high strategic value. Professor Hall, writing in 1940, summarized the situation: "Under present conditions Southeastern Asia supplies the bulk, if not all, of five first-priority materials: manila fiber (100 percent), quinine (99 percent), rubber (98 percent), silk (98 percent), and tin (93 percent). It also supplies the bulk of two second-priority materials—tungsten (92 percent) and mica (61 percent of preferred grade)." Hall: American Raw-Material Deficiencies * * * p. 185.

[11] See the statement of the Secretary of State, quoted in Hornbeck: The United States and the Far East * * * p. 6.

[12] No reciprocal trade agreement for the reduction of the standard rates of duty has been entered into with a Far Eastern country.

[13] Hornbeck: *op. cit.*, pp. 11–57.

[14] Diebold: New Directions in Our Trade Policy, pp. 119–121.

[15] At the time of the freezing, Japanese assets in the United States were valued at 138 million dollars and American assets in Japan at 110 million dollars. Less than ten years earlier, in 1932, Japanese assets in the United States had totalled 1,700 million dollars. See Quigley: *op. cit.*, p. 204.

[16] Information supplied by the Far Eastern Unit, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and quoted in Quigley: *op. cit.*, p. 205. and Lend-Lease aid was made available early in 1941. An understanding with Great Britain as to joint naval action in the event of hostilities in the Pacific was prepared.

[17] See Hishida: Japan Among the Great Powers, p. 387.

[18] See Kawai: The Goal of Japanese Expansion, p. 92.

[19] The stages have been described by Mr. Hornbeck (op. cit., pp. 44, 45):

"There was common knowledge of certain changes that had appeared in the phraseology employed in Japanese official utterances on foreign policy in the course of the preceding 3 years. When Japan sent troops to north China in July 1937, Prime Minister Konoye had stated that this action was taken only to preserve the peace of east Asia. On November 3, 1938—while Prince Konoye was still Prime Minister—the Japanese Government had issued a formal statement in which it announced that Japan was seeking the establishment of a new order based upon coordination between Japan, Manchukuo, and China in political, economic, cultural, and other fields. On August 1, 1940, Prince Konoye, who had again become Prime Minister, had stated that Japan sought the construction of a new order for greater east Asia. Later, Prince Konoye's Minister for Foreign Affairs had stated to Ambassador Grew that it was the intention of Japan to create a new order in greater east Asia, including the south seas. And soon after the announcement of the alliance, Prince Konoye referred, on October 4, 1940, to the aim of the alliance with Germany and Italy as joint cooperation to establish a new world order."

[20] Timperley: op. cit., pp. 62–66.

[21] Embree: The Japanese.

[22] Moore: With Japan's Leaders.

[23] Hudson: The Far East in World Politics, pp. 181–182.

[24] Spykman: America's Strategy in World Politics, pp. 129–164.

[25] Hudson and Rajchman: An Atlas of Far Eastern Affairs, pp. 71, 72, 124, 132.

[26] Hubbard: Eastern Industrialization, p. 103.

[27] The Japanese constitution of 1889, although outwardly democratic in many of its institutions, is far from being so in actual operation. It is based upon the supreme power of the Emperor, who is hedged about with groups of advisers representing the aristocracy, the bureaucracy, and the armed forces. The lower house of the Diet is the only directly elected body; it has very limited prerogatives and is prevented from effective use even of these by the lack of a coherent system of political parties.

See Reischauser: Japan: Government-Politics and Colegrove: The Japanese Cabinet. A detailed account of the struggle between the representatives of civil and of military power during the critical years is found in Young: Imperial Japan 1926–38.

[28] See Quigley: op. cit., pp. 149–165; Fahs: Government in Japan * * * and Borton: Japan since 1931.

[29] Quigley: op. cit., pp. 281–282.

financed the industrial and military expansion of Japan very largely in this country and, as a matter of fact, bid against Great Britain for the opportunity to do it on certain occasions.

What does Japan propose to do? She proposes to set up an empire called the Greater East Asia Coprosperity Sphere, which will be insofar as possible entirely independent of the rest of the world. She feels that she is in position now where she can defend that empire against all comers. Of course, we have strong doubts of that and, as a matter of fact, we hope to demonstrate very conclusively the incorrectness of that conclusion, but nevertheless that is her hope. If some time through the development of the Greater East Asia Coprosperity Sphere, it is possible for her to obtain control of the hundreds and hundreds of millions of people in China and in the archipelagoes to the south, and to have more Japanese babies so that her own population, descended as they think from the rising sun, shall rule that whole territory, most of which will be slave, it would be quite possible in the event of such a development to make it very difficult for the rest of the world to live in any close proximity to her at all.

On a trip I had the pleasure of making with the Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents 2 years ago, we went down to Peru. In Lima, Peru, we found a Little Tokyo of 30,000 Japanese. Very few of them spoke Spanish. They were not interested in speaking Spanish. I have learned since then that they went back into the mountains, obtained the rights to power sites, that is dam sites, and also over other means of production, including fertile valleys, and that they also took up lands in certain of the mountain passes so that they would be able to control the routes over into Brazil.

On the other side, in Brazil, there is an enormous Japanese population in the city of Sao Paulo. The Japanese population of Sao Paulo, Brazil, is about 125,000. They own large textile mills, glass factories, and all that sort of thing in Brazil. Everyone has read of the cache of arms found there, weapons enough to arm 25,000 men. In other parts of Brazil and elsewhere in Latin America they have established themselves and multiplied like weasels.

The record of their operations up and down the Pacific coast from North America to South America is one of obtaining control over as much of the productive land as they could possibly grab and doing it on frequent occasions through chicanery, as the gentleman from California here before me will testify. He well remembers how they got control of the Santa Margareta ranch by chicanery. They went on down into Mexico and other places that are strategically important. They found Central America was not very much to their satisfaction, so they jumped on south into Peru and Chile and there set up these little Tokyos.

Mr. ROLPH. The gentleman will further recall that some of the holdings in California were close to or next to some of our most important airports and aircraft manufacturing plants.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes, and they straddled pipe lines, I am told, although I do not live in that part of California. At all events, they were in very good control of certain lands that adjoined the harbor of Los Angeles, through their fishing fleet operations, and they sat there and watched everything that went on, the comings and goings of the United States Fleet, for years, and nobody did anything about it.

This problem will not be settled by the winning of this war. The Japanese intend to populate the entire Pacific area by what you might call family means, more babies and more babies and more babies, until they have saturated the entire Pacific area with more Japanese babies, so that ultimately the Japanese will fully control that area. That presents a problem to any person who will consider the subject of a peace, that is little beyond decision in the realm of war. How it can be answered I do not know, but let us not be fooled by any statement that the Japanese may make that their population is so great that they must have lebensraum for additional population, because they are making that population increase deliberately and for the purpose of spreading their people all over the Pacific. They are deliberately breeding a population problem that stripping from her her ill-gotten gains will not solve on any permanent basis.

Now in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I desire to present without comment certain earlier documents. The first is a letter from President Wilson to William Jennings Bryan, then Secretary of State, and then Mr. Bryan's reply and President Wilson's remarks:

811.52/300

President Wilson to the Secretary of State

27 JANUARY, 1915.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This is, of course, something that (or, at least, something like what) we must at the opportune time seek to do for Japan, whose friendship we so sincerely desire and to whom we so sincerely desire to do justice.

But there are many things to consider first: among the rest her present attitude and intentions in China and her willingness or unwillingness to live up to the obligations she has assumed towards us with regard to the open door in the East.

I would be very much obliged if you would ask Mr. Lansing to prepare for our discussion a memorandum explicitly setting forth just what obligations in this sense she did undertake.

Faithfully Yours,

W. W.

811.52/300b

The Secretary of State to President Wilson

WASHINGTON, *March 8, 1915.*

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Now that Congress has adjourned and you are relieved somewhat from the pressure to which you have been subjected there is one matter which I would like to have you revolve in your mind.

I see but one way of relieving the Japanese situation on the Coast and that is by the dispersion of the Japanese in this country so as to relieve the economic pressure which has aroused protest. In discussing the subject with the Japanese I have tried to convince them that the question is not a race question, but purely an economic question and I have given them what seems to be conclusive proof, namely, that although we have Japanese in every state they have no trouble whatever with their neighbors except where they congregate in large colonies and thus create an economic situation. If it were a race question they would have trouble wherever they appear, but, being an economic question the trouble appears only when they are found in sufficient numbers to create economic embarrassment for Americans about them.

If I am right in this theory then the remedy for the difficulty would seem to be the dispersion of those in this country—emigration having now been stopped—among enough states to prevent economic complaint.

I venture to submit, therefore, for your consideration the following plan:

A diplomatic agreement between the United States and Japan that the two Governments shall cooperate for the scattering of the Japanese now in this country with a view to reducing the number in California by one-half, the reduction to be made where the concentration is greatest and where complaint has been aroused.

Japanese now residing in California are to be encouraged to move into other states, with the understanding that not more than one thousand shall go into any other state, not more than one hundred into any one county in such state, and that those going into a county shall be so distributed that not more than five per cent of the population of any organized city, village or voting precinct shall be Japanese.

I have talked over this plan with Ambassador Chinda but I have explained to him that it did not have your endorsement and was not presented as a proposition and should not be presented to his Government. It has simply been discussed by us unofficially in an effort to reach some solution of the difficulty.

If we can reduce the Japanese population in California by one-half and give assurance to other states now complaining that there will be no increase in their population and that this plan of scattering will be used as far as the two Governments can bring influence to bear, we may be able to secure a repeal of the anti-Japanese laws in California. These laws were not intended so much against present evils as against evils which the people of California feared.

For the same reason I believe that such a plan would prevent hostile legislation in other states because when Japanese have come into other states agitation has been commenced on the fear that they might come in numbers large enough as to raise economic objections.

Will you let me know whether you think there is any merit in the above plan and if so whether any modifications suggest themselves to you? If the plan seems to you improbable have you anything in mind that would give us a working basis for a settlement? The Japanese Government has exercised so much control over its citizens here that I believe it would be possible to carry out some such plan as this, and, if carried out, I believe it would go far toward restoring harmonious relations. As the "gentlemen's agreement" has prevented any new immigration, the number of those in the country would, by natural law, gradually decrease and this decrease would be accelerated by those who return to Japan, so that in the course of a few years we might expect the friction to cease entirely.

With assurances [etc.] W. J. BRYAN.

811.52/302½

President Wilson to the Secretary of State

WASHINGTON, *8 March, 1915.*

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I should like to take time to think this over maturely. I have now no comment to make except this preliminary one; that there seems to me to be a danger that the attempt to disperse the Japanese in this country might lead to the very thing we wish to prevent. It might produce uneasiness in the States to which the Japanese were induced to migrate and to popular

clamors there which legislatures might not withstand. Would we not beforehand have to canvass the matter with State authorities and work out a programme which we could be sure from the outset we could carry out. Otherwise the offense might grow greater, not less, in case of failure.

Faithfully Yours,

W. W.

Following is a part of the published material concerning the Lansing-Ishii negotiations:

THE LANSING-ISHII NEGOTIATIONS

793.94/594½

Memorandum by the Secretary of State of a Conference With the Japanese Ambassador on Special Mission (Ishii), September 6, 1917 [1]

The Special Ambassador and I conferred this afternoon for an hour and a half at the Department.

During the first part of the conference the subject discussed was to what extent Japan had rendered aid in the war, and how it might cooperate more fully with the Allies and this country.

I told him that I considered the great problem was transportation, and that it seemed to me Japan might be able to do more than she had done in this matter.

He replied that Japan was doing a good deal to aid and that they had chartered several hundred tons of shipping to the Allies which was being used in the Mediterranean trade.

He then spoke of the fact that we had embargoed iron and steel and that it was causing not only dissatisfaction but much distress in Japan on account of its absolute need in the shipyards of that country, which have been greatly increased in capacity.

I explained to him that this Embargo had been made necessary by the fact that steel was being used largely in the manufacture of munitions and in the increased output of shipping in this country; that of course we had to look out first for our own interests in that particular; that again transportation entered into the problem in that we had to depend upon scrap-steel on the Pacific coast for our shipyards there or else bring it from the east, which was very difficult as our rolling stock was short. I went on to say that possibly some arrangement could be made for the release of a certain amount of steel to Japan, provided Japan would transfer to us some of the ships already constructed, as it was a matter of immediate importance to us to obtain shipping, and it was a matter of immediate importance to Japan to obtain material. I said that while I could not speak with accuracy about these matters I believed that we might be able to supply steel to build vessels which would have a combined greater tonnage than the vessels they would transfer to us.

The Ambassador said he was not sure whether this could be arranged, but he thought it was very well worthy of consideration and that we could take it up more in detail later.

It was very evident that the industrial situation in Japan was chiefly in his mind and I thought the suggestion such as I made appealed to him.

We further discussed the possibility of utilizing Japan's tonnage for the transportation to Russia of railroad material and munitions.

The Ambassador said he felt that this could very well be done and his Government would be glad to aid in the matter. At the same time he said it was a more or less technical matter and he could only speak as an amateur.

[1] For correspondence previously printed concerning the mission of Viscount Ishii, see Foreign Relations, 1917, pp. 258 ff.

I told him I was in very much the same situation and that of course our conversation was entirely informal and tentative.

I asked the Ambassador whether he desired to discuss other questions than those immediately pertaining to the war, because if he so desired I was willing to do so—but I thought the supreme object of both Governments at the present moment should be the winning of the war and an understanding as to how we could cooperate to that end.

He said that in view of the fact that he had come here and been so handsomely received by the American people he thought it would be unfortunate not to consider some of the other questions as we had to look forward to a time when the war would be over. He said in the first place he ought to inform me that when he returned to Japan from France, where he was Ambassador in 1915, he stopped in London and saw Sir Edward Grey. Japan at that time had taken Kaio Chau and the German Islands in the South Pacific. He said he told Sir Edward Grey it was the intention of his Government to return Kaio Chau to China, but that no Government in Japan could stand if they did not retain some of the South Sea Islands as "souvenirs" of the war; that it had been a sacrifice for his Government to enter the war, which they were not compelled to do under their treaty of alliance—that is according to the letter of the treaty—but he thought they were according to the spirit. He then went on to say that Sir Edward Grey had practfcally consented in the readjustment of territory after the war; that the German Islands north of the equator should be retained by Japan, while those south of the equator should go to Great Britain.

I replied that I was glad to know this and appreciated his frankness in telling me, but that I could make no comment on such an agreement at the present time.

I asked him what further questions he wished to discuss and he said to me: "Have you anything to propose in regard to China?"

I replied that I had and while I realized that he would want to consider my proposition before making a reply I would like to present it. I said the proposition was this:

That the co-belligerents against Germany should, jointly or simultaneously, re-declare the "Open Door" policy in a statement which would have a very beneficial effect upon China and I believed upon the world at large, as it was in accord with the principles of commerce to which we all agreed.

The Ambassador seemed a little taken aback by this suggestion and said that of course he should like to consider it and that he appreciated the arguments in its favor although he said he did not know as it was absolutely necessary in view of the fact that Japan had always lived up to the principle.

I replied that Japan had always lived up to any declaration which she had made; that the good faith of Japan could not be questioned; and that upon that this Government always relied and felt no anxiety once the Japanese Government had passed its word.

The Ambassador replied that he felt that Japan had a special interest on account of its position in regard to China, and while its desire was to have China open and free to all countries he felt there might be criticism if there was a bare declaration of the "Open Door" policy without some mention of Japan's special interest.

I replied to him that we recognized the fact that Japan, from her geographical position, had a peculiar interest in China but that to make a declaration to that effect seemed to me needless as it was the result of natural causes and not political; that any such declaration might be interpreted as a peculiar political interest and I was very doubtful whether it would be wise to include it in a reaffirmation of the "Open Door" policy.

The Ambassador said that his Government was of course in favor of the "Open Door" policy; that they would maintain it as they had in the past, but he was not willing yet to say whether he thought it would be a real advantage to reaffirm it.

I said that the "Open Door" policy was peculiarly advantageous to Japan; that if we should return to spheres of influence in which the various powers had a paramount interest in certain sections of China the advantage which Japan had in geographical position would be destroyed; that Japan, with the industrial advantage which she had by reason of cheap and efficient labor and the short distance which she had to carry her goods to the Chinese markets, benefited more than any other of the countries by the "Open Door" policy; that so far as this country was concerned it might be considered advisable to reestablish spheres of influence, but that it was entirely contrary to our policy and principle and we were most anxious to preserve the doctrine in dealing with China. I said I hoped he would give the matter very careful consideration and would be prepared to discuss it further at our next conference, which is to take place on Monday, September 10th.

During the course of the early part of the conversation the Ambassador said that through various channels the German Government had three times sought to persuade Japan to withdraw from the Allies and to remain neutral, but that in every case his Government had firmly rejected the suggestion.

I said to him that I could imagine their seeking some such step as they had planned to attempt it through Mexico as was indicated in the Zimmermann note.[2] I further said to him that it was a matter of no concern to this Government, in view of the fact that Japan's loyalty to an ally, and her reputation for good faith was too well established to be even suspected.

793.94/594½

Memorandum by the Secretary of State of a Conference With the Japanese Ambassador on Special Mission (Ishii), September 22, 1917

Viscount Ishii called at 3:00 p. m. by appointment, and after some preliminary remarks he introduced the subject of the "Open Door" and the suggestion that a redeclaration at this time would be advantageous.

He said that he had heard from his Government and that they did not wish to do anything to affect the status quo in China and that it would be hard to explain to the Japanese people why a declaration was made at this time if the suggestion was adopted.

I told him that he must realize that in the present state of the world Japan and the United States were the only countries which could furnish money for the development of China's vast resources; that, if we permitted the gradual restoration of the policy of "spheres of influence", which seemed to be going on, the Allied Governments would look upon us as seeking to monopolize the opportunities; and that it seemed to me that we should unite in every possible way to dispel the impression that we would selfishly seek to take advantage of their wasted condition and build up our own fortunes without thought of those who were fighting the battles of this country and of Japan, as well as their own battles. I said that I thought this was a time when Japan and the United States ought to show a magnanimous spirit and say to them, "We will not take advantage of your calamities as we might do. We will seek no special privileges in China. When this war is over and you begin to rebuild your fortunes by commerce and trade, you will find the markets of China and the opportunities in that land as open and free to you as they

[2] *Foreign Relations*, 1917, supp. 1, p. 158.

are to us." If we redeclared the "Open Door" policy, I told him that is what it would mean, and I asked him if it was not worth while to gain the gratitude and confidence of the Allies by an announcement of our purpose to be generous and unselfish in this time when the future must look so dark to them.

The Viscount said that he appreciated all this and that he also realized what I had said before about Japan being the chief beneficiary from the "Open Door" which was manifestly true, but that the Japanese people would be likely to blame the Government if there was nothing said about Japan's "special interest" in China, that the opposition in the Diet would seize upon such an opportunity to attack the Ministry for making a needless declaration, while getting nothing for Japan.

I said to him that if he meant by "special interest" "paramount interest", I could not see my way clear to discuss the matter further; but, if he meant a special interest based upon geographical position, I was not unwilling to take the matter into consideration. I said further that I appreciated his difficulty which pertained to the political situation in Japan and would try and find some formula to satisfy the wishes of his people in case a redeclaration of the "Open Door" policy could be agreed upon in principle.

The Viscount said that he wished I would prepare such a formula first for his consideration and I told him that I would. He seemed to be much impressed with the idea that to redeclare the "Open Door" at this time would be accepted as a generous act by the Allies and strengthen the bond of friendship and confidence between the powers and Japan. He also said that he was convinced that Japan on account of its proximity to China would be especially benefited by a continuance of the "Open Door" policy, and that the only difficulty of the proposed redeclaration was that it might not appeal to the Japanese public and be used as a pretext to attack the Government.

In this conversation I also said to him that there seemed to be a misconception of the underlying principle of the "Monroe Doctrine"; that it was not an assertion of primacy or of paramount interest by the United States in its relation to other American Republics; that its purpose was to prevent foreign powers from interfering with the sovereign rights of any nation in this hemisphere; and that the whole aim was to preserve to each republic the power of self-development. I said further that so far as aiding in this development this country was on an equal footing with all other countries and claimed no special privileges.

As for China I said that I felt that the same principle should be applied and that no special privileges and certainly no paramount interest in that country should be claimed by any foreign power. I also said that I appreciated the pressure of population in Japan and the need for industrial expansion, and that I believed that Japan had occupied Korea and was developing Manchuria chiefly because of this unavoidable necessity.

The Special Ambassador spoke of Manchuria and said that his country desired the "Open Door" policy to be applied there, that his Government sought no monopoly there, and that even if China was willing to cede the territory to Japan, Japan would not accept it.

I told him that I was glad to hear this frank declaration and I hoped that his view of the application of the "Open Door" policy was the same as mine. My view was that in China foreign commerce and trade should be entirely unhampered. He replied that was his view. I then said that I felt that when a railroad or canal was built in China by the nationals of one country special rates or other privileges should not be given to citizens of that country engaged in trade or industry in China, but that the citizens of all countries should receive identical treatment. The Ambassador assented to this with some hesitation, and seemed desirous to avoid a discussion of the application of the principle of the "Open Door".

We discussed other subjects, but they were of minor importance.

793.94/583a

The Secretary of State to President Wilson

WASHINGTON, *September 25, 1917.*

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As I informed you yesterday by telephone Viscount Ishii intends to leave Washington on Thursday, the 27th, and I am very anxious before he goes to submit to him a formula for a note relative to the "Open Door" policy.

I enclose memoranda of two interviews I have had with him on the subject—one dated September 6th and the other September 22d.[3] These memoranda will explain the reason for the draft note to him which I enclose.[4]

I hope that you can return these papers to me with your views in order that I may submit a draft to him tomorrow—(Wednesday).

Faithfully yours,

ROBERT LANSING.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] is recognized for 40 minutes.

HENRY CLAY DID NOT DEFEND AARON BURR FOR TREASON

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article from the State Journal of Frankfort, Ky., of date Saturday morning, November 13, 1943.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, when William Cullen Bryant said that "to him who in the love of Nature holds communion with her visible forms she speaks a various language," he was talking about woods and trees and birds and suns and systems. But the response and the enthusiasm of the Nature lover, as Bryant describes it, is consigned to second place by those who undertake to try to set right the mistakes made in life by careless commentators who talk recklessly and often about events which, seemingly unimportant as of the day of which they write, later make pseudo history and become issues preponderant.

So, when Paul Brannon suggested that Henry Clay defended Aaron Burr for treason, he did it carelessly and easily, and his suggestion went its way until it met the eagle eyes of the Honorable South Trimble, historian de luxe, who would not tolerate nor listen to such an untruth as he knew that suggestion to be. Mr. Trimble set to work to collect the necessary factual data with which to controvert and to consign to oblivion the thoughtless and hastily made remarks derogatory to the character and reputation of Henry Clay.

I have had an interesting and profitable experience during the years I have been in Congress in joining with a Kentuckian in an attempt to correct carelessly written history. Together we have tried on one or two other occasions to preserve the dignity of history, and to let the light of truth and fact into the fog and dark places man made against incontrovertible evidence to contradict them.

This great man South Trimble has done his State and his country a very great service, not only as Clerk of the House of Representatives, but also in the line of accurate, painstaking historical research.

History as written by Brannon is but the "evanescent distillation of a rumor which casts its shadow far into the land."

If what he writes be true and if it is to be permitted to remain unchallenged, it should be accepted as a fact and an example. On the other hand, as said Tacituus:

> The principal office of history I take to be this: to prevent virtuous actions from being forgotten, and that evil words and deeds should fear an infamous reputation with posterity.

Henry Clay never defended Aaron Burr against a charge of treason.

The proof is to be found in the letter which our able, genial, and distinguished Clerk of the House has written, and which was published in the State Journal of Frankfort, Ky., on November 13, 1943, and which, under permission heretofore granted I am inserting in full because it is a document of great historical significance, carefully prepared and substantiated after long research, exhaustively made.

In this connection may I say right here and now that Dr. William P. Kennedy of the staff of the Washington Star, and no mean historian in his own right, has interested himself extensively over the years in the investigation of this whole matter as made by Mr. Trimble in his effort to write history right.

I am glad to be able to contribute my small part to erase from the pages of history and to destroy for all time any odium which might have heretofore attached to the memory of so able and great and so good a man as was Henry Clay of Kentucky.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure and privilege to put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today the complete, corroborated denial of the statements made derogatory to Henry Clay. It is the perfect and final answer to any charge that can or could be made against the name and the fame of one of the greatest statemen of any day or generation.

[From the State Journal, Frankfort, Ky., of November 13, 1943]

SOUTH TRIMBLE STANDS PAT ON DENIAL CLAY DEFENDED BURR IN TREASON CASE—ONLY TRIAL ON THAT CHARGE IN VIRGINIA—SILENCE ON QUESTION NOT SURRENDER SIGN

(By South Trimble)

JUNE 24, 1943.

Mr. JAMES B. RHODY,
Care the State Journal,
Frankfort, Ky.

MY DEAR RHODY: It seems that my letter to you of December 14, 1942, challenging the statement made by Paul Brannon that Henry Clay was defending Aaron Burr, charged with treason, which was published in your column and the State magazine in Kentucky, stirred up such an avalanche of criticism to my chal-

[3] *Supra.*

[4] Not printed.

lenge that you proclaimed in your column, viz: "Raging controversy over whether or not Henry Clay, famed Kentucky statesman, defended Aaron Burr in the latter's trial for treason against the United States swung from Washington back to Frankfort." My positive declaration that Clay did not defend Burr for treason has been attacked through your column and the column of the State Journal to the extent that I suppose by my long silence of more than 6 months because of official duties, my critics have concluded that I have folded my tent, hoisted the white flag, and unconditionally surrendered to my critics, Messrs. Brannon, Keller, etc., and by so doing admitted that Henry Clay did defend Aaron Burr, on trial for treason, but such is not the case. I have just begun to fight. I feel sure that the prevailing opinion of the people of Frankfort (who are interested) is sympathetic with my critics, who positively and unequivocally state "that Clay did defend Aaron Burr for treason." The people have been deluded by misleading statements, erroneous quotations, and perverted historical facts. This prevailing sentiment I feel sure I will dissipate by irrefutable historical references.

Rhody, this friendly discussion has been a blessing to me in disguise as it has forced me to do some research from which I have learned more history of Kentucky in general and Frankfort in particular than I ever knew before. As for myself, I do not assume the role of historian any more than I would that of an astronomer; each involves an exacting science of the highest order. However, my active participation in politics for nearly three score years, together with my official relationship to events in and out of Congress approaching half a century, has given me an advantage of personal experience, which enables me by the process of absorption, to treat of such events with a certain degree of familiarity. I might prefer silence in regard to the obvious inaccuracies of my critics in the Burr-Clay episode in Frankfort, but if they appear inexplicable even when no injury is intended, they become of sufficient importance to be contradicted.

In searching every available history in the Congressional Library, approximately 20, relative to the Burr-Clay episode, I have come to the conclusion that Henry Adams, who was a professor of history at Harvard University in the closing years of the nineteenth century, was right when in lecturing his class he said: "There is no such thing as history." Of course, he immediately qualified by stating that he meant accurate history. I have never known of such a conglomeration of contradictions, of dates, misquotations, misleading statements, inaccuracies of every kind and description which make it impossible to harmonize many statements of the historian's own compilation.

I will now endeavor to analyze the five clippings of the State Journal, which appeared in your "This and That" column, on the much mooted question: "Did Henry Clay defend Aaron Burr for treason?"

In Mr. Brannon's very interesting and illuminating story of Frankfort, which appeared in your column, also in the State-sponsored magazine, In Kentucky, there appeared this item: "Here the swashbuckling Burr strode the streets to answer the charge of treason with Henry Clay, the great pacificator, at his side to defend him." After reading this item in both publications, I immediately addressed a communication to you in which I stated: "I want to call your attention to a flagrant error in part 1 of the Story of Frankfort, written by Paul Brannon. There is not a scintilla of truth in the statement relative to Henry Clay being Burr's attorney in the treason trial." I then digressed. The controversy now is, Did Henry Clay defend Aaron Burr in his treason trial as Mr. Brannon avers or did he not defend him in his treason trial as I declare. Subsequently Mr. Brannon addressed a communication to you, which also appeared in your column This and That, in which he states: "On rare occasions when such subjects come up, I have been very reasonably sure of fixations which include such items of knowledge as Jackson killed Dickinson, Washington liked to fight chickens, Frederick the Great did not like to take a bath, and that Henry Clay defended Aaron Burr on charges of treason in Frankfort, Ky." You will note that Mr. Brannon still maintains, after due time for cogitation, that Henry Clay defended Aaron Burr for treason but in his original swashbuckling statement printed in the magazine In Kentucky, he did not say in "Frankfort, Ky.," therefore, he is misquoting his own statement. If he had stated "in Frankfort, Ky.," I would not have challenged his statement. I had never heard of the court episode in Frankfort until I read his Dear Bummie letter to you and, of course, was greatly surprised.

I knew and everyone else knows that Aaron Burr was never tried but once for treason and that was at Richmond, Va., in 1807. Being somewhat familiar with the evidence developed in the Richmond trial, viz: That Burr had a rendezvous on Blennerhassett's Island in the Ohio River where he was building boats, assembling arms, ammunition, food, and soldiers to make war on the King of Spain. I immediately envisioned that Burr had awakened to the fact that Washington was rife with rumors, seething with excitement concerning his criminal intentions and that Jefferson had secret agents in Frankfort, Blennerhassett's Island, Nashville, and all down the Mississippi River to New Orleans investigating his activities, which prompted him to go to Lexington and engage the services of Henry Clay as counsel should charges be made against him. I have no doubt that as subsequent events developed that he had heard of Colonel Daveiss' (the United States District Attorney) plans to indict him in Frankfort, which occurred on the 5th of November 1806. Burr was not present in court in Frankfort but was in Lexington when Daveiss made his famous charge in an affidavit of approximately 350 words charging him with the crime of high misdemeanor. Up to that time, Burr had not solicited Clay to represent him. Of course, within 3 or 4 hours, or as fast as a messenger on horseback could ride to Lexington with the text of Daveiss' charge, Burr instructed a Mr. Jordan, one of his agents, to write Clay. I herewith submit a letter in reply to the one Jordan received from Clay, which is self-explanatory.

AN EXCERPT FROM THE WORKS OF HENRY CLAY, VOLUME IV, PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE, PART 1, 1801–32

Aaron Burr to Mr. Clay

LEWIS INN, *half past 3.*

"SIR: At 9 this morning Mr. Jordan received your letter in reply to one which he wrote at my request.

"I have just arrived wet, and something fatigued, and send to inquire whether my presence in court is now deemed necessary or expedient.

"I pray you to consider yourself as my counsel in the business moved by Mr. D. A more technical application will be made when I shall have the pleasure to see you. An early interview, at this house, would very much gratify me."

Analyzing the above undated letter from Aaron Burr to Mr. Clay, it is fair to assume that Jordan's letter, written at Burr's request, was dispatched and a reply received by messenger on the 6th of November, the day after the district attorney made his charge against Burr designating the crime high misdemeanor and not treason and asked Judge Innes to order Burr's immediate apprehension. After deliberating 2 days, the judge refused to order Burr's arrest but suggested that Daveiss take his case before a grand jury which he would assemble. It is also fair to assume that Henry Clay accepted Burr's invitation to visit him at the Lewis Inn in Lexington, evidently discussing Daveiss' charge in detail and was convinced by Burr that he was not guilty of any criminal designs against the Government with the result that Clay agreed to be his counsel without fee. The grand jury was assembled on November 12. Great excitement prevailed. The courtroom and corridors of the court were crowded as well as the lawns in front. In the midst of the confusion, Daveiss arose and proclaimed that his main witness, a man by the name of Floyd, was not present and asked for the discharge of the grand jury much to the chagrin of the crowd. It was then, after the grand jury was discharged, that Burr, Clay and Allen, his attorneys, immediately appeared and all assumed that the discharge of the grand jury meant the collapse of the case, much to delight of 90 percent of the inhabitants. Judge Innes, before the court adjourned, permitted something unprecedented—Burr, the culprit, to deliver a harangue protesting his innocence and affirming loyalty to the Government. Burr's friends celebrated the victory that night by giving a grand ball. The next night a ball was given by Daveiss' friends.

Further along in Mr. Brannon's letter to you, he reiterates that Clay defended Burr and now he is going to offer proof. I quote him: "When the tempest in a teapot from Washington broke over my unoffending head, I immediately bestirred myself to substantiate the statement, remembering at once that only lately while thumbing through a history of Franklin County, Ky., by L. F. Johnson, I had come across this reference." You will note, Rhody, that Mr. Brannon is going to quote Mr. Johnson, which is to substantiate his position, but he does not quote this reference at all but digresses immediately. For the record, I am going to quote Mr. Johnson verbatim as follows:

AN EXCERPT FROM THE HISTORY OF FRANKLIN COUNTY, KY., CHAPTER V, BY L. F. JOHNSON

"The year 1806 was one of the most exciting epochs in the history of the county. It was during that year that two alleged conspiracies were unearthed, by parties who were living in Frankfort. There was the so-called Spanish conspiracy in which it was alleged that Frankfort citizens were the chief conspirators, and which is said to have been planned about the year 1790; and the other one is known as the Burr conspiracy, with Blennerhassett and others about 1805–06.

"An article published in the Western World, October 15, 1806, openly accused Aaron Burr and others of conspiring against the United States. Colonel Daviess, who was, at that time, district attorney, asked for a warrant against Burr, which Judge Innis refused; but he convened an extra term of the grand jury. Burr was at Lexington at that time and he immediately came to Frankfort with Henry Clay, his attorney. Burr demanded an immediate investigation of the charges against him; after a bitter fight the grand jury ignored the charge. All the country around Frankfort was crazed with excitement on the day of the expected trial. Frankfort was crowded and the courthouse gorged with citizens and strangers. After his release, a ball was given at the Love house in Frankfort, to Colonel Burr, which was largely attended, and conspicious in the crowd were many officers of both State and Nation. In a short time after this another ball was given in honor of Colonel Daveiss, the attorney

who prosecuted the case, and this was also numerously attended.

"There has been an effort made to prove that some of Frankfort's citizens were connected with the Burr conspiracy; but subsequent facts and circumstances tend to show that the so-called Spanish conspiracy had no connection with the Burr conspiracy, except, perhaps, Colonel Burr was trying to take advantage of that independent Kentucky sentiment which was rife at that time, to forward his own nefarious and ambitious designs. The Spanish conspiracy which the editors of the Western World exposed about the same time the charges of conspiracy were made against Colonel Burr deals more particularly with the people of Frankfort and Franklin County."

Rhody, you have read everything word for word that Johnson's history states. Do you see anything there in that statement to confirm Mr. Brannon's contention. This is what I call a misleading statement calculated to confuse. The casual reader of Mr. Brannon's letter, not seeing the statement, will just assume that Johnson's history substantiates him.

Mr. Brannon goes on to state: "I, of course, have sought much further and have found the evidence in support of my statement not only to be conclusive but voluminous. There is no middle ground, Bummie. Of one thing I am certain and that is Mr. Trimble is wrong and I am right. There have been those who, in the midst of this great controversy, have said that both of us were right. But not me. Mr. Trimble said that Clay did not defend Burr in Frankfort." Look at my letter, Rhody, and see if Mr. Brannon is right when he says that Mr. Trimble said that Clay did not defend Burr in Frankfort. This is another flagrant misquotation. I did not mention Frankfort in my letter. I said that Clay did not defend Burr for treason.

Mr. Brannon further states after saying: "Mr. Trimble said that Clay did not defend Burr in Frankfort. I said that he did, and the evidence proves it without a shadow of doubt." Now, this last quotation is misleading because he shows no evidence and he cannot prove his statement. Then he goes on: "Mr. Trimble complained that I had committed a 'flagrant' error and asserted that I had uttered a 'canard,' which between you and me, Bummie, just about amounts to saying something else." Here Mr. Brannon misquotes me again. I never said he uttered a canard, but I do say now that canard is the proper word to describe his swashbuckling item. Webster says that a canard is an extravagant or an absurd report set afloat to hoax the public. Hoax, Webster says, is a mocking or mischievous deception or story or practical joke.

Of course, this swashbuckling article was a fantastic day dream of Mr. Brannon's and absolutely without justification. He states that Burr and Clay strode the streets of Frankfort. That sounds like they were putting on a parade. How many streets do you think Frankfort had at that time, a town of less than 800 people? I doubt if they had but 1 street, and that was the highway on the dirt road from Lexington to Frankfort, and I feel sure that Mr. Brannon got his inspiration to write this fairy tale from a news item in the Western World that Aaron Burr, Clay, and Allen, his attorneys, came to Frankfort on the 12th of November and arrived at the courthouse after the grand jury had adjourned. I doubt they had much time to put on parade, and even if such a parade had been staged, the Western World, which was viciously anti-Burr and Clay, would have most certainly reported such proceedings. I imagine they rode on horseback over muddy roads from Lexington down the present town hill highway to Frankfort and tied their horses at the hitching post on the outside of the original capitol—now the site of the present old capitol fronting Broadway, where court was being held. Mr. Brannon goes on and misquotes me again as follows: "Mr. Trimble said that Clay severed association with Burr in 1805." In my statement I did not mention 1805.

Mr. Brannon refers to Van Dusen's Life of Henry Clay; Henry Clay by Carl Schurz; Andrew Jackson by Marquis James and the History of Henry Clay, and alleges that they confirm his declaration. Then he states: "What surprises me more than anything else is the vehemence of the contradictions." I do not contradict a single quotation made by any of these historians but do they substantiate Brannon's direct statement that Henry Clay defended Aaron Burr for treason? Absolutely not.

Rhody, I am now going to emphasize my vehemence by pledging you that I will contribute to any charitable organization you may designate $100 if Messrs. Brannon, Keller, Jillson, or anyone else can show you a reputable history that states that "Henry Clay defended Aaron Burr in his trial for treason."

Then Brannon further states: "After all, Bummie, why should have Henry Clay not defended Burr, particularly after Burr assured Clay through Judge Rowan, of Federal Hill fame, that he (Burr) was not guilty of charges of treason?" Rhody, why don't you answer Brannon's ridiculous question put to you as a reason for Clay's justification in defending Burr because Burr confessed to Judge Rowan that he was not guilty. Did he expect Burr to plead guilty before being indicted? Many references are made to Judge Rowan's participation in the Clay-Burr affair. I herewith give you the story copied from Kentucky in the Nation's History by Elroy:

"After the dismissal of this first grand jury, Burr sought to induce John Rowan, secretary of state for Kentucky, and a Member-elect of Congress, to engage with Clay as his counsel; but Rowan declined, upon the ground of his recent election to Congress, declaring that he did not think it proper, under such conditions, to engage as a party in a controversy which might involve fidelity to the General Government. This excuse Burr accepted for the time, but upon a subsequent occasion reopened the question, and began an argument concerning the objections, which that gentleman had expressed, to appearing as his attorney. His remarks, however, were cut short by Rowan's statement that "he had been taught from early childhood not to reason on subjects which his feeling in the first instance condemned.' This troubled Mr. Clay, also a Member-elect of the Federal Congress, and he asked Rowan's advice as to whether he should not also withdraw from the case, upon the same excuse. Rowan suggested that, in view of the fact of Clay's having already undertaken the case, it would be a better course to demand of his client, 'a declaration upon his honor, that he was engaged in no enterprise hostile to the peace or union of the country.' And well it was for the 'Great Commoner' that this precaution was taken, as otherwise his defense of Burr might have seriously injured his reputation as a patriot. To Clay's demand, Burr responded in the following words dated December 1, 1806:

"'I have no design, nor have I taken any measure to promote a dissolution of the Union, or a separation of any one or more States from the residue. I have neither published a line on this subject, nor has anyone, through my agency, or with my knowledge. I have no design to intermeddle with the Government, or to disturb the tranquillity of the United States, nor of its Territories, or any part of them. I have neither issued, nor signed, or promised a commission to any person, for any purpose. I do not own a musket, nor a bayonet, nor any single article of military stores, nor does any person for me, by my authority, or my knowledge. My views have been explained to, and approved by several of the principal officers of the Government, and, I believe are well understood by the administration, and seen by it with complacency; they are such as every man of honor and every good citizen must approve. Considering the high station you now fill in our national councils, I have thought these explanations proper, as well to counteract the chimerical tales, which malevolent persons have industriously circulated, as to satisfy you that you have not espoused the cause of a man in any way unfriendly to the laws, the Government, or the interests of his country.'

"'AARON BURR.'

"This daring falsehood completely deceived Clay, and he entered upon plans for Burr's defense with the enthusiasm and ability which later made him such a power in the affairs of the Nation."

I have not disputed Clay's rights to defend Burr. He had a perfect legal right to defend a man who murdered his own father in cold blood, but does he have the moral right to do so? Emphatically no! Had he a legal right to defend Burr at his trial for treason in Richmond but did he have a moral right to do so? After taking his oath of office as United States Senator, viz: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; * * *. I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God." Knowing that the President of the United States had filed charges against Burr for treason in a message of approximately 2,800 words sent to both branches of Congress, containing irrefutable evidence proving him guilty, I doubt if he had the legal right to do so but if he had defended Burr, it would have been the last of Henry Clay in public life and perhaps he would and should have been expelled from the Senate for his action in defending a man indicted for treason, which means the overthrow of the Government, the destruction of the Constitution, after he takes a solemn oath as Senator of the United States to support and defend the Constitution. I wonder if Mr. Brannon really believes that Henry Clay had either a legal or moral right to defend Aaron Burr in his trial for treason as he vehemently avers.

You state, Rhody, that "South Trimble, Clerk of the House of Representatives in Congress, read the article (Brannon's) and immediately rushed to Clay's defense." I did not rush to Clay's defense because it was Henry Clay but because he was a Kentuckian, and I would rush to the defense of any other Kentuckian in national public life who was maligned; but of all Kentuckians, Henry Clay, who is one of the few men other than Presidents of the United States that has lived in history, both national and international. Henry Clay, in his native State, Virginia, was dubbed in his youth "the mill boy of the slashes," and in his adopted State, Kentucky, "Harry of the West," whose simple sentence, "I would rather be right than President," rings like sacred music in every true American soul. Three times he failed to reach the Presidency, but he lived and died an independent American sovereign. Few can recall the names of all the Presidents, but the name Henry Clay rushes to the lips and fills the heart like a song learned at our mother's knee. Fate decreed that he should never be President, but Almighty God made him a prince among the people, living in history as

one of the outstanding intellects, statesmen, and orators of all time.

Had Brannon's article been printed only in a local paper or any Kentucky paper, I would not have challenged it, but when it was printed in the magazine In Kentucky (which has an official status), and has a circulation in every State in the Union, I felt it my duty, as a Kentuckian, to have the true history of this famous trial that happened 136 years ago chronicled in the imperishable RECORD of Congress in order to save the name and fame of Henry Clay, and to inform the present and future generations that the article in the magazine In Kentucky was not a fact wherein it stated that Henry Clay defended Aaron Burr in his trial for treason, and to that end I had Mr. Kennedy, who writes historical articles, to come to my office. I explained the controversy that I had gotten into relative to the Aaron Burr trial for treason in which Henry Clay was brought into the discussion because he was the counsel for Burr to circumvent his indictment for the crime, high misdemeanor, filed against him (Burr) by Col. John H. Daveiss, United States District Attorney for Kentucky. I gave the five clippings from your This and That column to Mr. Kennedy, who became greatly interested and gladly agreed to write this story, which he did, and it was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Congressman PLUMLEY, of Vermont.

Rhody, after you received the Brannon letter, your column came out with this caption: "Clay controversy flares—a raging controversy over whether or not Henry Clay, famed Kentucky statesman, defended Aaron Burr in the latter's trial for treason against the United States." The above boldface excerpt from your column is absolutely correct as the basis of this controversy. Burr was never tried in Frankfort for any crime, and Clay did not defend him in Frankfort for any crime, because he was never indicted and Clay because of his great popularity succeeded in circumventing Burr being indicted by the grand jury, the purpose for which he was engaged. Judge Innes, the presiding Federal judge, assisted Clay in accomplishing his purpose by permitting Burr, the culprit, and an outstanding lawyer and orator, Clay and Allen, his attorneys, to make political speeches, ostensibly addressing the court, but intended for the crowded court room including the grand jury. When Daveiss, the United States district attorney, asked permission to go before the grand jury and explain his charges, the Federal judge refused to permit him to do so because the attorneys for Burr objected. This was probably the most disgraceful scene that ever occurred in a Federal court up to the present time in history and if a Federal judge were to permit such conduct today there is no doubt that he would and should be impeached. I note here for the record that Judge Sebastion was investigated by the legislature and forced to resign, Judge Innes, General Wilkinson, of the United States Army, Senator Brown, of Frankfort, and many other prominent men were all publicly implicated with Burr in his nefarious designs.

I will now pay my respects to Assistant Attorney General Keller. I am surprised at the Attorney General, being a lawyer of note, stating that Burr was tried for treason in Frankfort. It seems that you were having an interview with him when he said, seemingly with much gusto: "I'm with Paul Brannon. He's right." Then he produced Bernard Mayo's book on Henry Clay and said: "Let 'em read that and note how well Mayo has documented every statement he made." I quote from Mayo's history: "Joseph Hamilton Daviess was still the United States Attorney for Kentucky." Continuing, Mayo added: "On Wednesday, November 6, 1806, before the Federal Court at Frankfort, Daviess moved that a compulsory process be issued for Aaron Burr's immediate apprehension, charging him with preparing a warlike expedition against a friendly power." I looked up this quotation in Bernard Mayo's book on Henry Clay, chapter 7 entitled "Counsel for Aaron Burr." Rhody, I want to call your special attention to the reference of General Keller where he quoted Mayo's history of Henry Clay, viz: "On Wednesday, November 6, 1806, before the Federal Court * * * against a friendly power." This is the caption to Daviess' charge before the court, but the Attorney General does not finish that quotation of Mayo's on page 7, which reads as follows: "This, he asserted, can and will be fully substantiated. Proof equally conclusive could also be obtained for Burr's treasonable project for separating the West from the Union, he added. But at present he would confine himself to the formal charge of high misdemeanor." Why didn't Keller finish Mayo's quotation? What he quoted does not prove anything but the last paragraph in Mayo's above quotation (ch. 7) is the closing of the 350-word charge made by Daviess, which says Burr was guilty, not of treason, but of high misdemeanor. The reason that Mr. Keller did not finish Mayo's quotation is because it would have nullified his and Mr. Brannon's contention that Clay was defending Burr for treason when the District Attorney designated the crime as high misdemeanor. Now, Rhody, go on and read the balance of Keller's reference and see if you can find a single word or sentence stating that Henry Clay defended Aaron Burr for treason.

Attorney General Keller refers to a letter written by Clay to Dr. Pindell nearly 22 years after the Clay-Burr episode in Frankfort simply to prove that Clay was Burr's attorney without fee. No one disputes that and I cannot understand why he brings such irrelevant matter into this discussion except to confuse. I am sending you a copy of this letter which I am going to analyze for the record. Dr. Pindell must have been a very prominent man and intimate friend of Clay's for Clay to answer a letter relative to happenings 22 years previous. It seems that Pindell was asking Clay to explain to him certain charges that were made by his opponents in his second candidacy for the legislature after he had served in the Senate about 4 months (Colonel Adair's unexpired term ending March 4, 1807). Under normal conditions, Clay would not have had any opposition to be elected to the legislature but Senator Humphrey Marshall, the Federalist, and his cohorts thought that they could defeat Clay because of his questionable association with Aaron Burr; therefore, they brought out a candidate against him. Clay's enemies and the Western World, Federalist mouthpiece, viciously anti-Burr and Clay, charged him with everything possible barring libel, all of which was printed in the Western World but no one dared to charge him with defending Aaron Burr for treason. Clay's answer to Dr. Pindell's letter is one of apology and explanation. I will quote from Clay's letter: "Both Colonel Allen and myself believed that there was no ground for the prosecutions * * * when he (Burr) sent us a considerable fee, we resolved to decline accepting it and accordingly returned it * * * The first prosecution entirely failed. A second was shortly afterward instituted. Between the two I was appointed a Senator of the United States. In consequence to that relation to the general Government, Colonel Burr, who still wished me to appear for him, addressed a note to me, a copy of which is herewith transmitted."

AN EXCERPT FROM THE WORKS OF HENRY CLAY, VOLUME III, PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE, PART 1, 1801–32

Aaron Burr to Mr. Clay

"LOUISVILLE, *November 27, 1806.*

"DEAR SIR: Information has this morning been given to me that Mr. Davies has recommenced his prosecution and inquiry. I must entreat your professional aid in this business. It would be disagreeable to me to form a new connection, and various considerations will, it is hoped, induce you, even at some personal inconvenience, to acquiesce in my request. I shall, however, insist on making a liberal pecuniary compensation. The delay of your journey to Washington for a few days cannot be very material. No business is done in Congress till after New Years. I pray you to repair to Frankfort on receipt of this."

Clay further states to Dr. Pindell: "It is not true that the professional services of either Colonel Allen or myself were volunteered * * *. The affidavit of a Mr. John Downing has been procured and published, to prove that I advised him to enlist with Colonel Burr, and that I told him I was going with him myself. There is not a word of truth in it so far as it relates to me. * * * I have no doubt that it was obtained upon false pretenses. * * * So far from my having sent any message to Mr. Downing when I was last in Lexington, I did not then ever dream that the malignity of party spirit could fabricate such a charge as has been since put forth against me. It is not true that I was at the ball given to Colonel Burr in Frankfort. I was at the time in Lexington. It is not true that he ever partook of the hospitality of my house. * * * He never was in my house, according to my recollection, but once and that was the night before I started to this city (Washington, D. C.) when being myself a stranger in this place, he delivered me some letters of introduction which I never presented. On my arrival here in December 1806, I became satisfied from the letter in cypher of Colonel Burr to General Wilkinson, and from other information communicated to me by Mr. Jefferson." I presume he meant satisfied with Burr's guilt as a potential traitor and then Mr. Clay concludes his letter to Dr. Pindell as follows: "This my dear doctor, is a true and faithful account of my connection with Colonel Burr."

At this juncture of the raging controversy in Mr. Rhody's This'n That column, the discussion is diverted from the afore-mentioned column to the open pages of the State Journal, and the editor of the State Journal publishes in its columns the following:

"HENRY CLAY'S DEFENSE OF AARON BURR IS AFFIRMED VIA PAGES OF FRANKFORT PAPER—JILLSON QUOTES FROM WESTERN WORLD'S REPORT OF TRIAL

"(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Being advised that some attempt had recently been made in Washington to rewrite certain phases of early Kentucky history, particularly the incidental association of Henry Clay with the Frankfort trial of Aaron Burr, we have asked Dr. Jillson to prepare a factual statement of the events as they occurred.)

("By Willard Rouse Jillson)

"One hundred and thirty-six years ago the Western World, a newspaper issued weekly in Frankfort, announced in its issue of September 13 that Col. Aaron Burr, late Vice President of the United States, had arrived in the Commonwealth. Editors Street and Wood said: 'This extraordinary character arrived at Frankfort from Cincinnati on Tuesday evening last (September 9) about an hour after sunset. He took his lodgings at Major Love's tavern.'

"John Bradford, editor of the Kentucky Gazette, taking notice of Burr's appearance in the capitol and Lexington in his issue of Monday, November 10, 1806, lifted the following item from the Western World and spread it across page 3 of the Gazette: 'Motion in the Federal Court of Kentucky District against Aaron Burr, Esq., late Vice President of the United States, for crimes of high misdemeanor.'

"*Charge filed November 5, 1806*

"On Wednesday, about noon, on the 5th instant, J. H. Daveiss, Esq., attorney of the

United States for the above district, rose and, addressing the court, said that he had a motion to make of the utmost magnitude and extraordinary nature and which regarded the welfare of the Union at large.

"Colonel Daveiss then uttered his historic charge to the court, Judge Harry Innes, presiding, that it was his firm conviction and belief that Colonel Burr had been and was engaged in the matter of providing the means for 'a military expedition and enterprise within this district for the purpose of descending the Ohio and Mississippi therewith, and making war upon the subjects of the King of Spain, to wit: On the Provinces of Mexico, on the westwardly side of Louisiana, which appertains and belongs to the King of Spain, a European prince, with whom these United States are at peace.'

"And further, Colonel Daveiss stated: 'I have information on which I can rely, that all the western territories are the next object of the scheme—and finally all the region of the Ohio is calculated as falling into the vortex of the new revolution. What the practicability of the scheme is, I will not say; but certainly any program in it might cost our country much blood and treasure.' "

GRAND JURY ASSEMBLED

Having made his motion for the caption and examination of Aaron Burr, the United States attorney rested while Judge Harry Innes debated as to a proper method of procedure. At length a grand jury was called and the Western World of November 15 states on page 2: "Colonel Burr before the Federal court, Wednesday, November 12." Details of the procedure are then given in which it developed that a certain witness desired by Mr. Daveiss was not present making it impossible to present the evidence desired by the United States attorney. The judge then discharged the jury, and the Western World goes on to say: "A few minutes after their discharge Colonel Burr entered, attended by Henry and John Allen, Esqs., his counsel."

On Thursday, December 18, the Western World, carrying the story of the Burr case in detail somewhat, further said that "Mr. Clay, who appeared in conjunction with Mr. Allen as counsel for Colonel Burr, rose and in reply (to arguments and charges made in the court) observed that Colonel Burr was only apprehensive of delay, etc."

On Wednesday, December 3, this Frankfort newspaper reported that "Mr. Daveiss saw nothing novel, nothing out of the common mode of procedure, except the conduct of Mr. Clay." Replying, Mr. Clay stated he "cared not in what attitude he should be considered as standing, but he would instantly renounce Colonel Burr and his cause did he entertain the slightest idea of his guilt as to the charges exhibited against him by Mr. Daviess. "You have heard of inquisitions in Europe," said Mr. Clay; "you have heard of the screwes and tortures made use of in the dens of despotism to extort confession. Is not the project of the attorney for the United States a similar object of terror?"

CLAY'S TRIUMPH TEMPORARY

At the close of these words the grand jury brought in its verdict, in favor of Aaron Burr, and "not only declared him not guilty but clear of suspicion." It was a notable but temporary triumph for Mr. Clay, whose good intentions had been imposed upon by the crafty Burr. Not many months later Henry Clay in Washington became unpleasantly aware that Burr was guilty of all that Colonel Daveiss had charged.

On May 22, 1807, Aaron Burr was tried for treason in Richmond, Va., and the stigma of his treacherous acts against his country was hung upon him for all time. Meeting Clay in Washington on one occasion, Aaron Burr, with his accustomed friendly manner, reached forward to shake hands with the Representative of the Ashland District of Kentucky in the Congress, but Henry Clay, then aware of the perfidy of the former Vice President, drew back and refused to speak or have anything to do with him and, passing on, ignored Burr completely.

Mr. Editor, you state that you were advised that some attempt has been recently made in Washington to rewrite certain phases of the early Kentucky history, particularly the incidental association of Henry Clay in the Frankfort trial of Aaron Burr, and you asked Dr. Jillson to prepare a factual statement of the events as they occurred. Dr. Jillson's factual statement of the events as they occurred is a quotation from the Western World's column, with the exception of the last paragraph. I don't think that statement justifies the caption "Henry Clay's defense of Aaron Burr is affirmed via pages of the Frankfort paper," and it certainly is very misleading and confusing; also, in your note, you state "being advised that some attempt has recently been made in Washington to rewrite certain phases of early Kentucky history, particularly the incidental association of Henry Clay with the Frankfort trial of Aaron Burr." Mr. Editor, you were badly advised by your adviser. I challenge your adviser to refer to a single sentence or word to prove that anyone in Washington was attempting to rewrite the history of the alleged Frankfort trial of Aaron Burr. I presume you referred to Dr. Kennedy, whom I called into my office and furnished with all the excerpts from the This'n That column that appeared in the State Journal. I requested him to write the history of Aaron Burr's trial for treason, which he did, and the same was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 14, 1942, a copy of which I am sending you. I want to call your attention to the fact that neither Congressman PLUMLEY, in his request to have Dr. Kennedy's history printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor Dr. Kennedy, in his history of the trial of Aaron Burr, referred either directly or indirectly to the Frankfort episode of the alleged trial of Aaron Burr in Frankfort. As for myself, when I challenged the statement of Mr. Brannan, who stated in substance that Henry Clay was Aaron Burr's attorney when he was charged with treason, I can truthfully say that I was not aware of the alleged trial in Frankfort, and therefore you cannot charge me with an attempt to rewrite Kentucky history. I reiterate that Aaron Burr was never indicted for any crime in Kentucky; therefore, Henry Clay could not have defended him for treason or any other crime.

Subsequently, Dr. Jillson wrote in pamphlet form in the spring of 1943 a very brief, terse summary of the Burr-Clay episode in Frankfort. It is a concise history of this court travesty and I advise anyone interested to read it; however, I have a few mild criticisms to make. On page 5 in Dr. Jillson's pamphlet captioned "Clay apprehensive," I quote: "Undismayed by his inability to get indictment for Burr for high misdemeanor"—the legal equivalent of treason—I have to take issue with Dr. Jillson on his definition of high misdemeanor, the legal equivalent of treason, as it puts me on the spot, having previously stated in this communication that Colonel Daviess never charged Burr with treason, but high misdemeanor; therefore, if Dr. Jillson is right in defining high misdemeanor as the legal equivalent of treason I am wrong. Consequently, it behooved me to find the legal definition of high misdemeanor as a Federal crime. To that end I had the legal department of the Congressional Library investigate this legal term with the report that no Federal crime was ever designated as high misdemeanor. I then wrote a letter to the United States Attorney General asking if there was a Federal crime of high misdemeanor and his reply in part is as follows:

"DEAR SIR: Reference is made to your letter of March 15 in which you ask for a definition of the crime of high misdemeanor, and whether any Federal or State statute makes provision for such crime. * * * Federal law does not term any crime a high misdemeanor, though offenses less than felony are divided into misdemeanors and petty offenses. * * * All offenses which may be punished by death or imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year shall be deemed felonies. All other offenses shall be deemed misdemeanors: *Provided*, That all offenses, the penalty for which does not exceed confinement in common jail, without hard labor for a period of 6 months, or a fine of not more than $500, both shall be deemed to be petty offenses; and all such petty offenses may be prosecuted upon information and complaint." Then his communication mentions one-half dozen States that designate a crime high misdemeanor but not equal to treason. I am enclosing a copy of the Attorney General's letter.

In the meantime awaiting a reply from the Attorney General, someone suggested that I make a request of the American Antiquarian Society, a national library of American history in Worcester, Mass., and their reply to my request is as follows: High misdemeanor is defined in old English law books as a heinous offense, next in importance to high treason. There must be references to it in Murray's Dictionary, under the word "misdemeanor."

The above information justifies my position that high misdemeanor is not treason.

In the lower paragraph on page 7 of Dr. Jillson's pamphlet captioned "Burr cleared"—I think the caption is not only a misnomer but misleading as the implication is that he was tried for some offense and cleared, but how can a man be tried and cleared if he was never indicted?

I have thumbed through histories, asked questions, and written letters about this controversy in order to combat my critics when I could have proved that they were absolutely wrong and that I am right by quoting the fifth amendment of the Constitution containing the Bill of Rights and also giving the legal definition of grand jury, viz: "No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment of indictment of a grand jury. * * * Nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb * * * (fifth amendment to the Constitution).

Grand jury, viz: "A jury of inquiry who are summoned and returned by the sheriff to each session of the criminal courts, and whose duty is to receive complaints and accusation in criminal cases, hear the evidence adduced on the part of the State, and find bills of indictment in cases where they are satisfied a trial ought to be had."

All references by my critics to different histories in this discussion by implication impresses the casual reader that there was a trial of Aaron Burr in the Federal court in Frankfort. Aaron Burr was never tried for any crime in Frankfort as the Bill of Rights quoted above states that no person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime unless on a presentment of indictment of a grand jury. The grand jury never indicted Aaron Burr; therefore, he could not be tried. It looks like this should forever settle the trial references. It is true that Judge Innes permitted Aaron Burr, the culprit, Clay and Allen, his attorneys, to harangue before the judge and a crowded court room with the grand jury present eulogizing Burr as a patriotic American citi-

zen imposed upon by his political enemies and when Col. Hamilton Daveiss, the United States district attorney, asked the privilege of going before the grand jury to explain the legal phases of the charges he filed, the attorneys for the culprit Burr objected and the judge refused him the privilege of going before the grand jury.

This record would not be complete if I did not define the word "treason." Each history of the futile attempt to indict Aaron Burr for the crime of misdemeanor in the Federal court at Frankfort in the fall of 1806 carelessly misuses the word treason. What is treason? It is a very common, much abused word defined by Webster, "betrayal of any trust or confidence; treachery; perfidy." Treason may be committed a hundred times and not be a crime. You may be a traitor to a friend, your family, religion, fraternal, social, or political organization, etc. There is one outstanding exception—a traitor to the United States—the most heinous of all crimes, the extreme penalty, death, is defined by the Constitution, viz: By the third section, article 3 of the Constitution of the United States, "treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies; giving them aid and comfort * * * no person shall be convicted of treason, unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court."

United States District Attorney Daveiss, although greatly disappointed but not discouraged because of his dismal failure on account of absent witnesses to present his charge to the first grand jury asking for the indictment of Burr, called a second grand jury to assemble on the 3d day of December, at which time he presented his famous charge asking for an indictment of the notorious Burr for a misdemeanor in the following words:

"United States of America, Kentucky district, to wit: The grand jury of the United States in and for the body of the said district, do on their oaths present, that a certain Aaron Burr, late of the city of New York, and Vice President of the said United States, did with force and arms, at the County of Fayette, in said district, on the 25th day of November last past, wilfully and unlawfully, and from evil premeditation, then and there set on foot, and prepare for a military expedition against the dominions of the King of Spain, who is an European prince, at peace with the said United States, to wit: against the provinces of said King, in North America, contrary to the laws of the said United States, in such cases provided, and against the peace and dignity thereof.

"And the jurors aforesaid, upon their oath aforesaid, do further present, that the said Burr did at said district, to wit: At the County of Jefferson, on the day and in the year aforesaid, then and there, willfully and unlawfully, with force and arms, prepare and provide the means for carrying on a military expedition and enterprise against the dominions of the King of Spain aforesaid, who is at peace with the said United States, to wit: the provinces in North America, which are of the dominions of the said King of Spain, contrary to the laws of the United States, in such cases provided, and against the peace and dignity of the said United States.

"And so the jurors aforesaid, upon their oath aforesaid, do say that the said Aaron Burr, is guilty of the misdemeanors aforesaid, contrary to the laws of the United States, and against the peace and dignity thereof.

"J. H. DAVEISS,
"For United States."

The indictment having been read, the grand jury retired to examine the witnesses and frame their verdict in private. In a comparatively short time the grand jury reported: "Not a true bill" and went out of their way to extol Burr and absolve him from all blame, thanks to the popularity and influence of Henry Clay, who subsequently realized that his association with Burr was the mistake of his life.

Rhody, this is a voluminous communication. In the very nature of this discussion it could not be otherwise. I have had to combat an array of brilliant minds and almost a unanimous misguided public opinion and in doing so, I have tried to be meticulously circumspect. I am enclosing with this communication the five clippings from your "This'n That" column and the State Journal in order that you may conveniently analyze my reply.

The next time I am in Frankfort, which I hope will be soon, I will look you up.

Sincerely yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at two separate places in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include therein two editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, the United States Civil Service Commission, acting under what seems to be the hush-hush policy of the bureaucrats, on November 3, 1943, issued instructions to regional directors and their investigators regarding loyalty investigations. These instructions were withheld until after they were exposed in the press. They were finally made available late Monday afternoon, November 29, 1943, with an attached press release written by the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, in order to save time I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the record these instructions and the press release issued by the Civil Service Commission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

[Press release of U. S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C., November 29, 1943]

The Commission's attention has been called to a story being distributed today by the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance relative to certain instructions issued by the Commission to its investigators.

With two or three minor exceptions, these instructions constitute a reaffirmation of the policy which the Commission has followed on these matters since August 1942.

Within the past few weeks, the Commission's attention has been called to the fact that some of its investigators have allegedly, in carrying on investigations, deviated somewhat from the Commission's policies. Recognizing that during the past year there has been a very high rate of turn-over within the Commission's investigating staff as a result of persons entering the armed forces, the Commission felt that it would be wise once again to call its policies to the attention of all investigators.

The Commission believes that adequate evidence relative to the qualifications of persons seeking employment in the Government can be obtained without, in any way, violating the civil liberties of American citizens. The results of the Commission's investigatory activities bear out this belief.

From July 1, 1940, up until August 23, 1943, the cases of 166,915 persons who had been investigated were decided by the Commission. Out of this total, 27,842 were rated ineligible because the Commission found, as a result of the investigations, that they were not suitable for Government employment. Of the total of 27,842 who were rated ineligible, 774 persons were rated ineligible solely on loyalty grounds. Of the 774 rated ineligible solely on loyalty grounds, 461 were found to be members of the Communist Party or active in support of those basic principles of the Communist Party which gave evidence of adherence to the Communist Party line, and 313 were found to be pro-Fascist, pro-Nazi, or pro-Japanese.

A copy of the Commission's instructions referred to in the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance release follows:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., November 3, 1943.

Regional Directors:

The Manual of Instructions on Loyalty Investigations, which was fully discussed with regional directors and a copy of which was placed in the hands of every regional director and investigator in charge for the guidance of investigators, contained detailed information regarding methods of investigation and questions to be avoided. Previously definite instructions had been issued that no questions should be asked regarding union membership or activities. It has recently come to the attention of the Commission that investigators have been asking persons under investigation, and witnesses, questions which the Commission had specifically directed should not be asked. In order that such offenses be not repeated there is set forth below a list of the things investigators should continually have in mind. Copies of these instructions should be immediately placed in the hands of every investigator.

1. Under no circumstances should any question be asked of an applicant or a witness involving union membership, union associations, or union activities. Not only should the applicant not be asked about membership in a union but any question should be avoided which might elicit from the applicant or from a witness union membership or activities.

2. If in the course of the investigation witnesses say that a certain person is a Communist because he has associated with certain persons in a union known or said to be Communists, the investigator should not ask the applicant about his association with these particular individuals, since the asking of such questions would expose the Commission to the charge that this is an indirect way of connecting the applicant with union activities. In other words, the question of unionism should not be brought up in any way in an investigation, either directly or indirectly.

3. Do not ask any question whatever involving the applicant's sympathy with Loyalists in Spain. This means that the investigator should avoid not only asking about the applicant's sympathy in the Spanish War but no reference should be made to any such organizations as the Abraham Lincoln Brigade or any other of the many Spanish relief groups. The whole matter of the war in Spain should be scrupulously avoided by the

investigator as having any bearing on pro-communism.

4. Do not ask any question about membership in the Washington Bookshop or any bookshop in any city similar to the Washington Bookshop.

5. In asking an applicant whether he knows a certain individual, that individual should not be characterized in any way so as to show the individual's views or leanings. For illustration, an applicant should not be asked, "Do you know John Jones, reputed to be a Communist?" The question, if at all necessary, should be, "Do you know John Jones, and what has been the nature of your association with him?"

6. Do not ask a husband, who is an applicant, questions about his wife, and do not ask a wife, who is an applicant, questions about her husband. Ask the applicant only as to matters having to do with himself, but not with members of his family or others.

7. During the special interview never argue with the applicant or indicate that you think he is evasive. Simply ask the question and record the answer. If it is your opinion that the applicant is evasive or untruthful, you may say so in your report and give the basis for your statement.

8. In speaking to the applicant or to a witness do not characterize an organization as communistic or fascist. Do not characterize it at all. Do not say, "We have information that you have been active in the International Labor Defense, a Communist organization." Say rather, "We have information that you have been connected with the International Labor Defense. Have you been associated with this organization and what has been the nature of such association?"

9. Do not ask a witness any question in such form that the witness may derive information regarding the applicant which he otherwise would not have. Remember that your task is to obtain information and not give information. Do not ask a witness whether John Jones, the applicant, is a Communist unless you immediately follow with the question whether John Jones is a Fascist or pro-Nazi. The same applies with respect to the questioning of the applicant.

10. Under no circumstances ask any question or make any statement to the applicant or to a witness relating directly or indirectly to the color, race, creed, or religion of an applicant or witness.

11. Obtain all available information from witnesses which will help establish whether the applicant was a Communist Party line conformist. Do not discuss the party line with the applicant or with witnesses. Familiarize yourself thoroughly with the party line test and ask questions which will specifically bring out whether the applicant changed his views at certain periods, but do not mention party line unless the witness offers the information that the applicant did follow the Communist Party line. In that event ask the witness specifically what statement or actions on the part of the applicant he has in mind or knows about which leads him to the conclusion that the applicant was a party line follower. Again, have in mind it is not your function to argue or give information, but merely to elicit information. Attached hereto you will find a statement which will help you to understand what is meant by the Communist Party line.

12. Do not ask any question regarding the type of reading matter read by the applicant. This includes especially the Daily Worker and all radical and liberal publications. Remember that the mere fact that a person reads a certain publication is no indication that he believes in the principles advocated by such publication. Citizens are free to read anything they like.

13. Do not ask any questions as to so-called mixed parties, that is to say, whether the applicant associates with Negroes or has had Negroes in his home.

14. Do not ask regarding membership or interest in the Lawyers Guild, the American Civil Liberties Union, the Socialist Party, the League of Women Shoppers, or the Harry Bridges Defense Committee. This is not a complete list of organizations about which no questions should be asked, but investigators should avoid asking any questions regarding any organization unless it has been authoritatively designated as subversive. If the investigator is in doubt the best policy is not to ask the question.

15. Do not ask general questions regarding the political philosophy of the applicant, such as, whether he believes in capitalism or what his opinion is regarding certain events of a current or historical nature.

16. Do not ask intimate personal questions. Do not ask such questions as come under the category of "snooping."

17. Exercise intelligence. Keep in mind what you are looking for. Remember that you are investigating the loyalty of the applicant to the United States. You are not investigating whether his views are unorthodox or do not conform with those of the majority of the people. What you are looking for is to determine whether there is evidence that the applicant's interest in the welfare of another country transcends his interest in the welfare of the United States. Remember that a question of an improper nature will result in criticism of, and embarrassment to, the Commission. Do not ask any question which is immaterial and has no bearing on the ultimate issue involved.

18. The investigator conducting a loyalty investigation should also conduct any special hearing which may be required. However, newly employed investigators or investigators without experience in loyalty cases should discuss the questions to be asked during the special hearing with their supervisors. Where feasible an investigator thoroughly experienced in loyalty matters should sit in on all special hearings in which derogatory information relative to loyality is to be discussed.

From time to time you will receive additional instructions as to what to do and what not to do in the course of investigation of loyalty cases. The foregoing instructions are to be rigidly observed and any deviation therefrom will be cause for disciplinary action.

L. A. MOYER,
Executive Director and Chief Examiner.

COMMUNIST PARTY LINE

The Commission, on the basis of its experience in handling thousands of these cases, has developed certain policy standards. It is of primary importance to record the fact that the Civil Service Commission will not consider charges against persons who are found merely to possess a progressive interest in seeking changes in the country's economic and political structure but who adhere firmly to the principle that such changes are only to be brought about through orderly democratic processes.

On the other side of the picture, there have evolved certain fairly well-defined categories, where, assuming adequate evidence, a negative conclusion follows. Typical of these latter categories are the following:

Persons who have advocated revolution or the use of force, if necessary, in order to bring about political or economic changes.

Persons whose association with organizations in agreement with the attitudes and policies of the Nazis, Fascists, or Communists, has been such as to indicate sympathy with the programs of the Nazis, Fascists, or Communists.

Persons who have expressed a desire to see the Axis Nations emerge as the victor in the present conflict.

Persons whose record shows that they are more concerned with the success or failure of a foreign government or a foreign political system than with the welfare of the United States Government.

It is clear, of course, that tied up with the last point mentioned above is the whole question of communism. In connection with the handling of these cases, the Commission has issued the following instructions to its staff:

THE COMMUNIST PARTY LINE

A good definition of a Communist is "one who has followed the Communist Party line through one or more changes." The Communist Party line is the policy advocated by the various factions of the Komintern. It is the policy of preserving and protecting the Soviet Union by whatever means are determined by its leaders.

It is not of great importance that the line during the first 10 years of the existence of the Communist Party be intimately known. It is, however, imperative that any person investigating Communist activity should know the last three major line changes. These are set forth below.

REVOLUTIONARY PERIOD 1929 TO 1934

On May 6, 1929, a Communist Party spokesman said: "I think the moment is not far off when a revolutionary crisis will develop in America." From that time on all Communist activity in this country was actively directed toward violent overthrow of this Government. The literature of the party constantly promised the members that the day of reckoning had arrived; "that the shackles of capitalism were to be thrown off and that the decadent capitalist government was to be replaced by a proletarian dictatorship." In order to reduce the masses to the depth of despair necessary to reduce their resistance to armed revolution, it was essential, in the opinion of the Communists, that the capitalist government refrain from any social changes which might "drug the masses into continued acceptance of the capitalistic system." For this reason the Communists sought to wreck and destroy attempts by the New Deal to pass social legislation. Any person daring to advance such legislation was violently hated by them and branded with the term of contempt "Social Fascist." They included in this category President Roosevelt and the New Deal, John L. Lewis, Norman Thomas and his Socialist Party, and most liberals. They harassed the Socialist Party in its attempt to set up social security and unemployed workers' benefit organizations, and generally attempted to keep the United States in economic chaos. It must be remembered that this period included the worst years of the depression.

COLLECTIVE SECURITY PERIOD DECEMBER 1934 TO AUGUST 1939

In December 1934 Earl Browder returned from a trip to Russia and immediately called a halt to the revolutionary program, and at the same time launched the most effective period of Communist infiltration in this country. This was the Popular Front period. The party made a complete about face. They ceased to apply the term "Social Fascist" to such persons as President Roosevelt, Thomas, and Lewis. They adopted the heroes of the American Revolution as forerunners of American communism. The picture of Abraham Lincoln took its place beside that of Stalin. Where they had previously attacked attempts at social reform they now created a multiplicity of "front" organizations to further such causes. Where they had previously chosen to ignore the rise of fascism in Germany, they now bitterly attacked Hitler and called for a united front of the great democracies—Soviet Russia, Great Britain, China, and the United States—to stop the Mad Dog of Europe. The Daily Worker demanded puni-

tive action against Japan and boycotting of other Axis countries. Where they had previously expressed nothing but hatred toward liberals and other radicals, they now courted these persons assiduously even to the extent of giving a testimonial dinner for Norman Thomas, the arch foe of communism in the years gone by.

COMMUNAZI PERIOD AUGUST 1939 TO JUNE 1941

In August 1939 Russia signed a nonaggression pact with Germany and the Communist Party line made a complete about face. Immediately all preparations for defense were termed by the Communists as warmongering. The British war effort was reviled in the columns of the Daily Worker as an imperialistic war for the perpetuation of capitalist rule.

Communists, through their stooges in the party front organization, violently opposed such defense measures as the conscription bill and the lend-lease bill and extensions of the Monroe Doctrine to the Western Hemisphere as a whole. The Communists allied themselves with other radical peace groups in an attempt to keep America from defending itself and from fighting against Hitler. They spread anti-Yankee imperialist propaganda throughout South America in an effort to divide the Americas. President Roosevelt was denounced as a warmonger. His defense program was termed an effort to drag the American people into an imperialistic war. All of the familiar and time-worn antiwar arguments were adopted by the Communists. In the youth faction the expression "The Yanks are not coming" became extremely popular. Their war cry became, "No A. E. F., no convoys." While the Communists in America did not openly support Adolf Hitler and the Axis, they revived every device for drawing attention away from the injustice perpetrated by that regime. American Communists and fellow travelers sided with Russia in the war with Finland.

COLLECTIVE SECURITY PERIOD (REVIVED) JUNE 22, 1941, TO DATE

With the attack of Russia by Germany on this date, the Communist Party line overnight reverted again to the collective-security phase. Communists began to vie with patriotic Americans in purchasing Defense bonds and volunteering for civilian defense duties. The slogan "The Yanks are not coming," was changed over night to "Stop Hitler Now," and "The Yanks are not coming too late." This is perhaps the most difficult period in which to detect an American Communist.

An earmark of an American Communist today is an advanced degree of patriotism. It is, therefore, difficult to distinguish friend from foe, but it must be remembered that this cloak of patriotism was not donned until June 23, 1941. However, it must also be remembered that many loyal Americans were sincerely isolationist in viewpoint until the necessity of our participation in the war became increasingly evident. The Communist will try to lead one to think that he is of that category. The fact which gives him away is the suddenness of his switch.

It must be made clear that to identify one as a Communist or a Fellow Traveler (or a sympathizer), it will be necessary to show a following of the above line through one or more changes. Many liberals were taken in by the Communists in the first collective-security period but became aware of the true situation with the change in line occasioned by the signing of the communazi pact in August 1939.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues must have wondered who were the pressure groups that could exert such influence on the Civil Service Commission as to cause them to issue such instructions. These instructions in my opinion open the door to let unlimited subversive elements in to join those already on the Federal pay roll, to undermine and destroy our Government.

In order that the Members of the House of Representatives be kept in suspense no longer, I will read a communication addressed to all locals of the United Federal Workers, which is only one of three Federal employees' unions, entitled "U. F. W. A. Clarifies Investigation Procedure," and signed by Eleanor Nelson, secretary-treasurer, U. F. W. A.

U. F. W. A. CLARIFIES INVESTIGATION PROCEDURE

To All Locals of the United Federal Workers:

Tuesday morning a committee from the United Federal Workers met with the full Civil Service Commission to obtain clarity in regard to their investigatory policies. Representing the United Federal Workers of America were myself; Arthur Stein; Milton Freeman of our legal committee; Louis Gerrard, business agent for Local 203; Robert Sherman, business agent for Local 1; and Helen Shonick, business agent for Local 10. Present at the interview for the Commission were the Commissioners, Harry B. Mitchell, President, Mrs. Lucille Foster McMillin, and Arthur S. Fleming; William H. McMillen, Chief of the Investigations Division; and Chief Counsel Alfred Klein.

The United Federal Workers' representatives pointed out that in recent cases civil-service investigators had shown antiunion sentiments, racial intolerance, and improper inquiry into the political views of applicants. In regard to these cases, the Civil Service Commission stated: "We are making an investigation of all the cases to which you refer. The first reports show that in at least three of the four instances presented the allegations are well grounded, and not only the investigators, but their immediate supervisors, definitely violated the Commission's policies and instructions. These employees are now being given the opportunity of presenting their side of the case. If, after all the evidence is in, our tentative conclusion becomes our final conclusion, we will take appropriate disciplinary action."

The national office believes this clarification of policy, coupled with the quick and clear action by the Commissioners in dealing with the investigators who had violated the policy, is of great importance to Federal workers.

The Civil Service Commission further clarified their policy in regard to investigations. Under no circumstances, they maintained, are their investigators allowed to ask questions concerning union activity, racial tolerance, sympathy for the Spanish Loyalists, membership in the Bookshop, and religious matters. On our request, they also agreed to reconsider their policy of questioning married persons concerning the activities of their husbands or wives, and indicated that this type of question would be stopped. They further agreed to reconsider questions concerning personal friends and social acquaintances. They thanked the United Federal Workers for bringing the cases discussed to their attention and urged that we continue reporting to them any similar instances. It is extremely important that every local inform its members of the official position of the Civil Service Commission as described above, so that they are fully prepared in case they are investigated by the Commission. Also, any instance in which the above policies are violated in any way by any representative of the Civil Service Commission should be reported at once to the national office.

U. F. W. A. representatives urged that the Commission stop all questioning concerning membership in so-called front organizations and that such membership be neither a cause for investigation or a subject of questioning. The Civil Service Commission did not agree with our position on this, but promised to send us a clarifying statement on their policy in dealing with membership in these organizations. When this statement is received, the national office will discuss it further with the Commission and other representatives of the administration.

Fraternally yours,

ELEANOR NELSON,
Secretary-Treasurer, U. F. W. A.

This letter is not dated, which happens to be important. It is also significant that out of the thousands of cases investigated by the Commission, even the officers of the U. F. W. A., according to this letter, could find only four cases to bring to the attention of the Commission. Three or four cases are hardly enough to warrant the Commission issuing instructions that nullify probably the most important part of their work.

In the press release of the Civil Service Commission dated November 29, 1943, referred to a moment ago, it is stated:

With two or three minor exceptions, these instructions constitute a reaffirmation of the policy which the Commission has followed on these matters since August 1942.

But in Eleanor Nelson's letter she claims:

On our request they (the Commission) also agreed to reconsider their policy of questioning married persons concerning the activities of their husbands or wives and indicated that this type of question would be stopped.

Eleanor Nelson also stated in her letter:

U. F. W. A. representatives urged that the Commission stop all questioning concerning membership in so-called front organizations and that such membership be neither a cause for investigation or a subject of questioning.

If the Members will read the instructions of November 3, 1943 issued by the Civil Service Commission, previously inserted in these remarks, they will appreciate how effective was the work of this U. F. W. A. pressure group, which follows so closely the Communist party line. It cannot be denied that people who follow the Communist line have only one purpose in mind, which is to destroy our form of government.

UNITED FEDERAL WORKERS OF AMERICA FOLLOW COMMUNIST LINE

Although the United Federal Workers of America claims that it is a bona fide union seeking to advance the interests of Federal workers, it is actually an organization which has as its primary purpose the advancement of the policies and organizations supported by the Communist Party. Its alleged interest in the conditions of Federal employees is purely a device for gaining contact with such employees for its primary propaganda purposes. While this charge cannot be leveled at every single member of the U. F. W. A., since some have joined in their honest desire for a genuine union, nevertheless in my opinion the charge is well founded against those who actually decide the policies of the organization, the real leaders of the union.

As proof that the U. F. W. A. has faithfully followed the line of the Communist

Party in all its variations, let us look at the record. The Federal Record of December 26, 1938, official organ of the U. F. W. A., called for direct aid to the victims of Hitlerism, and in its September 17, 1938, issue, when the line of the Communist Party was for collective security among the democracies against the Fascist aggressors, for a world-wide fight against fascism.

After the signing of the Stalin-Hitler Pact on August 23, 1939, the line of the U. F. W. A. changed accordingly:

First. The Library of Congress Newsletter, a U. F. W. A. local union organ, in its issue of April 1940 opposed guns and bullets or loans to foreign governments and denounced all warlike expenditures.

Second. The Federal Worker of September 3, 1940, U. F. W. A. convention issue, published an article headed "Your Government job won't save you from the draft."

Third. Under the column of National News the mimeographed bulletin Revenues, organ of U. F. W. A. Revenue Local 147, declares:

> Maritime unions protested bitterly as United States-subsidized shipowners planned to evade the neutrality-law program. * * * Labor and war: American labor wants no part in the European war, supports the neutrality program.

And criticized the attack on Earl Browder, which charged him with the falsification of passports.

Fourth. At this time the Federal Workers School arranged a course on War, Its Causes and Relationships.

Fifth. Union Newsletter, organ of W. P. A., Local 1, May 29, 1940, states:

> Labor wants no war or any part of it, and while countries in Europe are engaged in their barbaric orgies of conquest and aggression as they have been doing for centuries, it must ever be the purpose of the United States to remain out of these wars.

This publication recommended affiliation with the Emergency Peace Committee, which was cooperating with the American Peace Mobilization, which conducted the picket line around the White House.

After June 22, 1941, when Hitler invaded Russia, the line of the U. F. W. A. changes accordingly. Heretofore the U. F. W. A. had supported Communist-led strikes in important defense industries during the Stalin-Hitler Pact. The last convention of the U. F. W. A., held in Philadelphia at the end of October 1942, went on record for immediate opening of a second front, passage of the teen-age draft bill without restrictions, a break in diplomatic relations with Vichy France and Franco Spain; declaration of war on Finland.—Washington Post, October 27 and 30, 1942.

The conduct of meetings in the U. F. W. A. in putting over resolutions in support of the current Communist Party line has been arbitrary and undemocratic. Kenneth Decker, former president of the W. P. A. locals, and other officers and members resigned from the union in September 1940 following the adoption of a resolution opposing the draft law. They charged in their letter of resignation:

> The forwarding of this resolution on which the full membership of the union was never given the opportunity to vote, is the latest of a series of instances in which a small official group has undertaken to commit the union to a stand on political questions without full consultation. * * * We have come to feel that as a result of the recent actions on political questions, this union now has become more of a liability than an asset. (Washington Daily News, September 17, 1940.)

It is an acknowledged principle that Government employees oppose the use of the strike weapon for the attainment of their ends. The U. F. W. A. does not recognize this principle. The U. F. W. A. conducted a strike at the Social Security Board in Baltimore a few years ago. At the 1942 convention they amalgamated with the United Cafeteria Workers—a thoroughly unsound step from a union viewpoint. This union has threatened to strike in the Government cafeterias in Washington.—Washington Daily News, October 29, 1942, page 26.

The U. F. W. A. has cooperated with the following Communist-controlled organizations: Workers' Alliance, Consumers' Union, Federated Press, Labor Research Association, the Washington Bookshop, Washington Friends of Spanish Democracy, Friday Magazine, the Washington Committee for Aid to China, and Washington Peace Mobilization, which participated in the White House picket line.—Washington Peace Council leaflet, meeting, December 4, 1940.

The U. F. W. A. has defended Federal employees dismissed for subversive activities. A case in point is that of Helen Miller, fired by the Department of Labor. Note leaflet advertising meeting for this purpose, held on July 25, 26, 1941, called by Local 10.

Donald Henderson, dismissed Columbia University instructor and avowed member of the Communist Party has been a speaker for the U. F. W. A.—circular, Federal Workers School, October 3 to December 12, 1939. Frank Rhylick, former editor of the Federal Record, is now the correspondent of the Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party.

Eleanor Nelson, secretary-treasurer of the U. F. W. A., has a record over a long period of years of being a devoted follower of the Communist Party line. Her full biography in a most laudatory vein appears in the Daily Worker of August 9, 1942. She was a speaker at the Communist-supported meeting to lift the embargo held in Washington.—Daily Worker, March 30, 1938, page 4. She is a member of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, which was active in behalf of Earl Browder.

She was a speaker at the Communist-controlled National Negro Congress in October 1937, cited by Attorney General Biddle as subversive.

She was a speaker at a meeting held in Washington, supported by the Washington Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy and the Communist Party.—Daily Worker, March 30, 1938, page 4.

While I appreciate the Communist elements in the labor movement will attempt to smear me as being antilabor, there cannot be one iota of justification for their statement.

As a matter of fact, the patriotic members of labor unions are as anxious as we all are to expose those organizations that are Communist-dominated for their own protection. In proof of this fact, let me read from yesterday's Washington Daily News the following:

> The largest and oldest of the 3 organizations of this character is the National Federation of Federal Employees, which is credited with 80,000 members and is headed by Luther Steward, president, and Gertrude McNally, secretary-treasurer. It formerly was a part of the American Federation of Labor, but is now independent.
>
> Mr. Steward said today, "The question of the good faith or patriotism of Federal employees has never been an issue in the National Federation of Federal Employees. We do not feel that Federal employees in general have any reason to fear any investigation, conducted in good faith, as to their antecedents or membership in outside organizations."
>
> The third organization of this type is the American Federation of Government Employees, an A. F. of L. affiliate. Its president, James B. Burns, today deferred comment on the disclosure affecting the Civil Service Commission, and said he wished to study the documents.

I understand there is a quotation in the paper today from Mr. Burns. While I have not read it, yet, knowing that his organization is thoroughly patriotic, I have good reason to believe that statement will back me up in my contention.

Who in the name of heaven is running this country?

The duly elected representatives in Congress or the Communists and fellow travelers?

It is high time that we wake up and find out what is going on in our Government, and give evidence that we are ready and willing to do something tangible to keep our oath of office, to wit:

> I do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

Let us emulate the deeds of that great Russian army at Stalingrad, or those never-to-be-forgotten men of Gen. George Washington's army at Valley Forge, and stand steadfast for a benevolent, strong, and patriotic America whose cornerstone of liberty, freedom, and justice is our Constitution.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I think one of the sad commentaries on our people is the fact that they have grown so accustomed to the charge that there are Communists in the Government that it no longer shocks the American people. We take it as a matter of course, where a few years ago we were horrified.

The fact remains that communism has grown in the Government until we can hardly realize the extent to which Communists have control of the machinery of this administration. This morning a taxi driver I was riding with said, "If anyone doubts that the Communists are in control of a lot of things around here, they ought to run a taxi for a while.

They get in my cab and boast about the agencies they have taken over and their plans to take over other agencies."

Mr. BUSBEY. That is absolutely correct, and I have stated publicly from the platforms in this country for more than 20 years that the biggest danger we have is not the enemy from without but our enemies from within. The Communists of this country and their fellow travelers are taking every advantage of the apathy of the American people, who do not interest themselves in trying to find out what is going on in this country. Believe it or not, this infiltration of Communists is going to be the ruination of our republican form of government.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. Yes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman said that he had not seen the statement by Mr. Burns as yet.

Mr. BUSBEY. I have not.

Mr. SCRIVNER. In today's edition of the Washington Daily News this quotation is credited to Mr. Burns, and I think the gentleman should have it in his record at this time:

> While it may be true that improper questions have been asked by some inexperienced investigators when inquiring concerning the connections and antecedents of applicants for Government positions, it is likewise true that character investigations are a necessity, because there should never be any question about the loyalty and moral fitness of Government employees. If the (Civil Service Commission) order should operate to limit the scope of inquiry to an extent which would foreclose pertinent interrogation and defeat the purposes underlying character investigations, it should be rescinded.

I might call attention to the headline covering this story which is: "First U. F. W. president reported picked by F. D."

Mr. BUSBEY. I thank the gentleman from Kansas for his contribution. May I also say that since the news comments in the Washington Daily News of last Monday, and the few remarks I was privileged to make on the floor of this House, I have received several letters from investigators stating that they hope that this thing will be cleaned up; that it is one thing that is giving them heartaches, and that this order of November 3 had really taken the heart out of them and their work.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. Yes.

Mr. ROWE. I said the other day when the gentleman was talking on this same subject, that the laxity may have permitted someon to get in who makes these rules, so that people of communistic and subversive natures will get into the Government, and that they have promulgated these rules for that purpose. I think it is important that we realize the possibility that some of that group may have gotten high enough to promulgate these rules, and they have done it for an ulterior purpose.

Mr. BUSBEY. Oh, this is not the only pressure group involved in this particular order of November 3. At a later date I shall name and go into some of the others, and will also show how this whole picture ties up into a picture of the Office of War Information, and when that story ever gets told to the people of this country, there will really be some fireworks.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BUSBEY. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. If I understand the news from Kentucky accurately, there is no apathy on the part of the American people condoning this sort of thing.

Mr. BUSBEY. The Dies committee investigation of this situation, which is already assured, will uncover some facts to startle the country. If the people will follow this investigation very closely they will get an insight into how the Communists have infiltrated into key Government positions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

CANNERS AND THE O. P. A.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to learn that Judge Vinson applied Galbraith's profit theories in repudiating Government's pledges to canners. At this point I wish to quote from the Washington Food Report, published by the American Institute of Food Distribution:

> In the letter accompanying the directive, Judge Vinson explains the repudiation in about this manner: "I am aware of the promises and commitments of O. P. A. officials and have taken them into consideration but these were commitments of minor officials. In my opinion they are without standing or authority, particularly when the Commander in Chief directs otherwise."
>
> It is difficult to understand this announcement at this time when the administration is concerned about promoting a large pack of canned goods for 1944. Those canners who lost on particular packs this year will be hard to convince that they should repeat their performance next year.
>
> Based upon an order issued by the O. P. A. on March 24, 1943, the canners proceeded upon the assumption that adjustments of maximum prices will be made to reflect the increased cost of labor. In fact, the O. P. A. reaffirmed this agreement again on March 27 and April 7. Now, months after the industry, in good faith, attempted to carry out its part of the agreement, it is summarily scrapped by the direction of the President of the United States through a directive from Judge Vinson to the War Food Administration and Office of Price Administration. The canners, their faith in the Government shattered, are left holding the bag.
>
> If the Chief Executive is to continue to interfere with agreements entered into by his principal food agency, then it becomes obvious that we are wasting millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to maintain the Office of Price Administration as an instrument to solve the Nation's food problem.
>
> The effect of the repudiation will probably have a more adverse effect on the production of canned goods next year than almost anything that could happen. It forces canners to justify their claims for the promised subsidy by furnishing a complete accounting of their financial situation; prohibits the payment of the subsidy to any company making more than 6 percent on their net worth or more than 4 percent on their net sales in 1943, thus penalizing instead of rewarding efficiency. It makes payment of the subsidy contingent on the over-all operations in 1943; interprets the so-called hardship clause to the effect that there is no hardship if the canner's profits were above the specified percentages, and rules that the maximum amount of the subsidy a canner may collect is the difference between his actual earnings and specified percentages.

This lays the foundation for Government regulation of profits of all industries and is a return to the philosophy of the New Deal satellites in the early days of the O. P. A., a philosophy which stirred the anger of the Emergency Court, causing it to tersely comment that no person can be expected to operate an unprofitable business at a loss.

Certainly the administration cannot expect the canners to continue operation at a financial loss; certainly it cannot expect them to go into all-out production in the face of the Government's record of broken promises.

The behind-the-scenes activities of the Chief Executive and his "palace guard" have reduced the total production of canned foods in 1943 to the danger point. The estimates of the 1943 pack that are being used currently by various agencies working on canned foods show a reduction of 27,000,000 cases from the 1942 pack. What we want is an increase in the 1944 pack, not a reduction. The entire canned-food program should be published not later than January 1 for canners to do full-scale planning of maximum production.

Last year the canners sought definite information on raw-material costs, price ceilings, and wages. But by the middle of June, with the packing season under way, very little was done to solve these problems. I hope the canners will not have to go through the red tape and delays they had to contend with last year.

Last year on July 8 I received the following telegram from Indiana:

> Future of canning industry up to you. Socialistic government bungling and strangling entire industry. Pea pack completed. Cost dollar seven. Government ceiling dollar. Cannot survive such loss. Our patience exhausted. Canners will not sell until subsidy removed and fair price set. Food shortage definitely coming. Congress supposedly makes laws. Do something.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I wish to say to the gentleman that last spring representatives of the canning industry came to the Committee on Agriculture and the impression that I think every member received from those hearings was that at that time Dr. Galbraith and other O. P. A. men were more interested in arriving at a way of controlling the profits of the canner than he was in the amount of the goods that were going to be produced in 1943. I would just like to ask the gentleman from Indiana from his exhaustive study of this canning industry in the last year, if that is the right picture to get, that there are so many forces that seem to be much more interested in control than they are in the production of food. Now, is that right or is it wrong?

Mr. LANDIS. I think they are more interested in control than they are in more production.

Mr. BUFFETT. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. I would like to make this observation, that G. D. Cole, one of the great Socialists of England, said many years ago, the best way to bring about socialism was to destroy the possibility of sustained profits and make those in private industries give up any hope of making money and socialism would follow of its own accord.

Mr. LANDIS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. In those cases you are giving as an example this afternoon, is it not a fact that the canners were looking back to the similar period after the last war, and is it not a fact that 70 percent of the canners failed; that is, were compelled, because of the conditions then, to go into very difficult conditions approaching failure? Is it not a fact that they were meeting with the supposedly accredited representatives of the O. P. A. to work out those problems as they apply at the present time and did they not think, will not the gentleman agree with me, that the canners were given the right to think they were dealing with responsible representatives of the O. P. A.?

Mr. LANDIS. There is no question about that. They have spent many days and many weeks down here in Washington conferring with these O. P. A. officials, and they expected their promises to be good, and if Mr. Vinson, as agent for the President of the United States, can revoke any promise they made, the canners are wasting time, and any other businessmen are wasting time in coming to Washington and talking to the so-called minor officials.

Mr. HORAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I am surprised to hear this statement coming from Judge Vinson, because I know right now as they lay plans for next year's pack, canners are looking for not only a positive, but an encouraging and a helpful operation of these agencies, and they need it at this time. I wonder if anything is shaping up at all looking toward a responsible and authoritative single head for the Food Administration?

Mr. LANDIS. That is what we have been claiming all the time, that we need a single food agency, to have somebody to go to where there is some authority. We have to deal with too many agencies. We go to the Department of Agriculture, to the War Food Administration, to the O. P. A., and then to Judge Vinson, and finally to the White House. There is no one who seems to be in authority.

Mr. HORAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield further.

Mr. HORAN. Apparently if it suits their purpose they can repudiate the authority of any other Department?

Mr. LANDIS. That is true.

Mr. HORAN. According to the statement it would seem that way.

Mr. LANDIS. According to this report, what the canners ought to do or any businessmen, when they come to Washington next time, is to go to Judge Vinson and not deal with anyone else. He should handle the situation.

On June 11, I received the following report from Salem, Oreg.:

We can give you very little information of a definite nature, and what little we can tell you is not at all favorable or encouraging. At present, it looks as though we shall not be packing very many of the fruit items this year.

In the first place, we have been endeavoring for months to get approval from the War Labor Board on our petition to increase wages in the cannery. Ever since Messrs. Lewis and Roosevelt tangled in their well-known free-for-all, and the Commander in Chief issued his hold-the-line edict of April 8, we have gotten nowhere fast on our petition for wage increases. Even if this is ironed out and we are allowed to pay what we desire, we have been told indirectly that we shall not be allowed to include any of this advance in wages in our ceiling prices for commodities packed this year. Our pay roll for the 1942 season was approximately $500,000. The wage increase which we have applied for and which we believe will ultimately be approved, reflects an increase of 25 percent. Gentlemen, a little quick arithmetic will give you $125,000. We are sorry to state that our operations of last year did not show us a margin which will allow us to absorb wage increases totaling $125,000.

The other problem we face, which is just as serious, is the fact that in spite of numerous promises from O. P. A. officials at various times during the past several months to the effect that a ceiling would be placed on all fruit items for fresh shipping, we nevertheless have no ceilings for fresh shipping and now have a runaway market.

Gentlemen, this is not a very optimistic letter, but some of you have asked for this information, and you certainly are entitled to get a picture of the northwest canners' problems as they are today. Right at the moment, we know not where we are going or what we are doing.

You can rest assured that we are going to do our utmost to pack everything that we possibly can when we can see that we are able to at least break even by so doing. We are not looking for any large profits, want to do everything we possibly can to furnish processed foods for civilian trade, as well as for the Army, but we cannot afford to pack our heads off when by so doing we would take such a loss that we would not be able to continue operating.

I received the following message from Ohio on April 22:

I want to be patriotic. I have a son in the service. The canning company wants to be patriotic. The labor situation is such that if we cannot get relief on wages, we cannot operate. Ohio, as you know, is an industrial center. Last year we paid 40 cents for women and 45 and 50 cents for men, and at no time last year was I able to run over one tomato line. I run a two-line tomato plant. The people who worked for me last year and who normally only wanted seasonal work, are now working steady in defense plants, making two or three times as much as they could make in a canning plant.

This country needs tomatoes and needs them badly. The shortage of tomatoes is indicated by the high rationing points put on a can of tomatoes and if we are going to be compelled to curtail our canned tomato pack 30 to 40 percent, God help the civilian users of canned tomatoes.

Another letter from Indianapolis reports:

The application itself may be too lengthy for you to read and study, but we wish to point out that if canned or processed foods are to be had in anything like sufficient quantities in 1943, relief from the wage freeze order must be had at once. It is also necessary that whatever wage increases are granted, that they may be given proper recognition by the O. P. A. and added to our present price ceilings, which were established on the basis of 1942 wage rates.

These are just a sample of communications I have received describing some of the things the canners had to contend with last year. No wonder they did not put out a record pack in 1943.

If we are to feed the world we will have to give the canners an early program and eliminate the delays and confusion so they can put out a record pack in 1944.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago I received the following information from the gentleman's own State of Indiana. A gentleman in that State now has 700 acres of corn standing in the field. He cannot get the labor to husk by hand and therefore applied to the harvester dealer for the lease of a corn picker. The dealer informed this gentleman that he had an idle picker, but it was short the tires. It so happens, however, that this man who has the 700 acres of corn is also a catsup manufacturer, and the season being over, has several trucks that are not being used at the moment. He offered to take the tires off his trucks and turn them over to the dealer to put on the corn picker until his crop was harvested and then return his tires. The dealer informed him he would like very much to do it, but was sorry, but the Government would not permit same. Therefore he still has the 700 acres of corn unharvested and at the same time you hear on the radio every 15 minutes somebody speaking for the Government and requesting that everybody make an effort to produce food. The question, therefore, is, Should this gentleman defy the ruling and put the tires from one of his trucks on the corn picker and thus save 700 acres of corn which is so badly needed, or should he comply with this unreasonable order and permit the 700 acres of corn to rot in the field? It is this type of edict which is gradually driving the American people insane.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include extracts from the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations adopted by the execu-

tive committee of the American Legion in Indianapolis, Ind., on November 18.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include therein an article from the Wisconsin Medical Society.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE BALFOUR DECLARATION AND PALESTINE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, early in November 1917, that terrible year 26 years ago when mankind was enveloped in the flames of a world war, even as we are today; when the forces of tyranny and oppression were still in the ascendant, and the nations of the world who represented human freedom and human decency were engaged in mortal combat against these forces, a truly marvelous flash of light broke through the gloom. We must remember that the fall of 1917 held some of the darkest hours of the First World War. The situation of the Allied Nations was much worse than that of the United Nations today. Russia, instead of resisting the Hunnish hordes with the magnificent heroism and efficient dispatch of today, had been forced out of the fight by the crushing blow of the Battle of Tannenberg. England and France still fought on, but they were war weary. The young strength of America had not yet made itself invincible.

The truly marvelous flash of light was a purely humanitarian movement which culminated in a statement issued by the British Government; a statement addressed primarily to the Jewish people, but a statement also which held tremendous meaning for the world at large. This statement was signed by Arthur James Balfour in his capacity as Foreign Secretary, and it has become known to history as the Balfour Declaration. It contains few words, but behind it lie 20 centuries of hope and longing, the longing of a homeless and oppressed people for a home of their own and a free and democratic government.

These are the words of the Balfour Declaration:

> His Majesty's Government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.

The Balfour Declaration was hailed by all men who looked ahead to a better world after the war, by all those who believed that the victory of democracy over tyranny would see many ancient sorrows removed and many ancient wrongs righted. Coming at a critical moment, the declaration lifted up the spirits of the Jews, and, indeed, of all forward-looking men. It was a true demonstration of the Allied purpose to avenge and to honor the claims of justice and humanity. For then, just as today, the strength of us who resist aggression lies not only in our tanks and guns and planes and ships, and in our valiant fighting men, but in the untrammeled justice of our cause.

Before issuing the Balfour Declaration, the British consulted not only with the Allied Nations, not only with the Jewish and Arab leaders, but also with the Government of the United States—so soon to enter the Allied cause. President Woodrow Wilson was deeply interested in the declaration and gave it his blessing before it was published to the world. To make the attitude of the American people and Government plainer still, a joint resolution was adopted unanimously by the House and Senate of the United States on June 20, 1922, and was signed by President Warren G. Harding in November of that same year. The resolution stated that—

> The United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of the national home for the Jewish people.

Twenty-six years have passed since the Balfour Declaration was issued, and the outward face of the world, and especially the map of Europe, has considerably changed. Behind these changes lie many hopes and ambitions—some good, some evil. This old earth has suffered many grievous and heart-breaking disappointments. But some gains have been made, and among them one of the most inspiring is the progress in reestablishing Palestine as the Jewish national home.

The Balfour Declaration and the Palestine Mandate of which it became a part represent a milestone in history, simply as documentary evidence of the progress of humanitarianism. They might be called the Magna Carta of the Jews. But even more important a milestone is the tangible evidence of the development of Palestine during the past quarter century.

It is easy to speak of growth of population, and to point out that the Jewish communities of Palestine have increased tenfold, and now number some 580,000 souls, of whom more than half are refugees from persecution under the swastika. The exiles of today have found a haven in the ancient land of their fathers, in a strip of semitropical greenery along the coast of Palestine, in this spiritual homeland of the Jew who for 2,000 years has said at Passover: "Next year, in Jerusalem."

But what these 580,000 people, most of them from cities where pioneering in a new and semiagricultural life was undreamed of, where such matters as farming and carpentering and draining swampland and planting orchards belonged only to the traditional tales of the Old Testament; many of them from cities where they were hounded into cramped and noisome quarters, and, at the end, hounded from them to death or frightened exile, have accomplished with this land, which for centuries has lain waste and neglected, is the real miracle, and the real milestone for our history books. Something over $5,000,000 has poured into the Jewish homeland from Jewry all over the world. Bit by bit, the Jews have purchased from the Arabs nearly 400,000 acres along the coast of Palestine. Of this acreage, something over 150,000 acres is owned by the Jewish National Fund and leased to the workers. Palestine Jews have their own legislature and council, under the supervision of the executive board of the Jewish Agency for Palestine.

The Jews of Palestine are pioneers, as truly as were the bold and energetic men and women who found a new land and new customs in the Western Hemisphere, and drove westward over the great plains to find not only gold but rich farm lands on the Pacific slope of America, and who remained there to build prosperous cities and thriving villages which in the space of less than 100 years have become centers of culture.

Here are a few of the accomplishments of the Jewish homeland. I feel that even a cursory listing will show something of their significance. Large areas of land have been cleared. Marshes that were infected with malaria have been drained and made fit for the habitation and labor and pleasant works of mankind. Regions along the seacoast that lay buried under sand dunes are now dotted with towns and villages. There are flourishing groves of oranges and other citrus fruits—notable among them an extremely large new variety of seedless grapefruit which has been widely exported—of olives and dates. The vineyards are extensive and are rapidly becoming world famous. Scores of agricultural colonies have been planted in the hills and valleys. Fifty out of every hundred people are farmers or workers. Last year these people produced $120,000,000 in industrial products, 200,000 tons of grain, and half a million tons of citrus fruit. The cedars of Lebanon have been replanted. The Biblical hills of Judea reterraced. Today there are 2,300 thriving factories in Palestine and a rapidly growing export production of potash, fluol, and bromine. The water power of the ancient River Jordan has been harnessed and transformed into electric light and power, and the enormous mineral resources of the Dead Sea are being extracted. There are scientists and inventors, and word comes to us of a great development in photography, a discovery not to be released to the world until after the war. There are schools, universities, libraries, and theaters. The young generation is healthy and handsome, sun-tanned from hours spent on the beautiful bathing beaches of Tel Aviv, active and eager,eyed for a good life in a good world.

The pioneers and refugees of Palestine have taken the Balfour Declaration at

its word. They have staked their hopes, their possessions, their energies, their very lives, on the integrity of the solemn promise of Great Britain, of the democratic governments of the world, and of men of good will everywhere.

Nor are the blessings that have come to Palestine the exclusive possession of those who have had the good fortune to find a haven and a home there. Jewish enterprise has contributed to the Arab standard of living and has brought health and healing to Arabs as well as Jews. Petty irritations spring up, as we all know, but on the whole most of the Jews get along with most of the Arabs. Arab children can go to Jewish schools and medical centers. Arab and Jewish merchants trade side by side without rancor. Arabs are welcome in Jewish theaters, hotels, and places of entertainment. In general, no sharp racial lines are drawn.

Now, mankind is in the throes of another world war. Again, the causes of justice and humanity face a crisis. The victims of the new catastrophe are to be found all over the earth, but the first and most tragic victims, as everyone knows, are the Jews. Hundreds of thousands of them have been killed or imprisoned in concentration camps; other hundreds of thousands, their homes and possessions and dear ones torn from them, have become wanderers upon the face of the earth.

The homeless Jewish multitudes of Europe look to the Jewish national home in Palestine for salvation. On this twenty-sixth anniversary year of the Balfour Declaration, that pledge and promise mean more to the Jewish people than ever before. From the concentration camps in Germany, from the walled ghettos of Poland, from the forests and hills where they seek refuge from persecution and terror, rise up their silent prayers. They pray that the gates of Palestine may open wide for them, that they may continue and complete the work of civilization and restoration which the pioneers who preceded them have so nobly advanced.

To that prayer, men of humanity and good will in America and all other free lands, will say "Amen."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, in two instances; in one, to include a column by Walter Lippmann, and in the other, an article by our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial written by Mr. Henry F. Budde, of San Francisco, in his paper Marina Progress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LT. GEN. THOMAS HOLCOMB

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have touched before upon the extremely gallant and efficient record of General Holcomb, who has just retired from the Marine Corps.

Lieutenant General Holcomb worked apparently so easily, so effortlessly that it is hard to realize that since he took over the command of the Marine Corps he increased the size of the corps 18 times without weakening or diluting the spirit of the marines as the deep devotion of the marines at Tarawa bears witness.

Mr. Speaker, the great courage and bravery of the marines at Tarawa thrills the country today, even at a time when heroic action is hourly and daily taking place by those who serve in our armed forces in this great global war. The marines landed at Tarawa under tremendous difficulties. They had to wade to shore among coral reefs, in water up to their necks. They were constantly being shot down as they went forward. Toward the end it was the enlisted men who were going forward almost alone because they had lost so many of their officers. Every one of the Allied countries today must pay grateful tribute to the marines at Tarawa.

I would like to add also my appreciation of the Marine Corps generals who have preceded General Holcomb, and the officers and enlisted men under them. In all of my years in Washington, I have never failed to receive the utmost courtesy, consideration, and cooperation from the Marine Corps. They have always told me the truth. It is a very remarkable record for any department of the Government. It deserves praise.

The anxiety of the marines to be of service and their wish for cooperation are the reasons they have done so remarkably in their fighting throughout all history. Courage and alert and immediate action are instilled into the minds of the marines from the instant they enter the service. To give their best is the spirit of the marines.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. ROLPH. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts has herself made a tremendous contribution to this Nation in sponsoring the legislation which created the Women's Army Corps or the WAC's. I would like to bring out the fact that the Marine Corps, about which the gentlewoman has spoken so beautifully, is the oldest military organization of continuous service in the United States.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know what the gentleman has done in furthering appropriations and legislation that would help the armed services of the country.

As the gentleman knows, the Marine Corps has a very fine group of women marines who are serving with the Marine Corps. I hear nothing but praise of them. Recently I have been going through Government hospitals and I find that the disabled men speak with appreciation of the women in the service because many of them will not be able to go back even for limited service. It relieves their minds to know they are not so much needed. These men know the horror of war and realize the value of large military forces at once. The WAC's take the place in many noncombat jobs and thereby release men for combat duty.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein an address delivered by a representative of the Chinese Government at a recent food conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INDIAN SCHOOLS NOT TO CLOSE

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, within the past several days, I have received many communications from chambers of commerce and others interested in Indian boarding schools throughout the country, asking if there is any serious probability of such schools being closed in the near future. These communications have come to me as Chairman of the Interior Department Subcommittee on Appropriations having jurisdiction over all Indian schools, and other activities of the Interior Department.

Such communications have been provoked because of a printed report of a legislative subcommittee of the United States Senate, which report has had a wide circulation in Oklahoma and other States having considerable Indian population. It is pointed out that, among other things, this committee recommends the discontinuance of all Indian boarding schools at the end of the present fiscal year.

I merely rise, Mr. Speaker, to say once and for all, and I think I can speak with some authority on this particular subject, that there is not the remotest possibility of the wholesale closing of Indian schools in the near future. Each Indian school, as well as every other Indian institution or agency under the Department of the Interior, must stand on its own merits. Any such school that cannot justify its existence ought to be abolished and abandoned, but certainly there are few, if any, such schools in the Indian Service.

The Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations I feel safe in saying will continue to cut and slash nondefense expenditures if and when it is possible and practical to do so. Moreover, we feel that sizeable cuts can and must be made,

but certainly there are more practical and humane ways of doing so than by closing the school doors to Indian boys and girls, many of whom are orphans and others who are poor and utterly dependent.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. D'ALESANDRO, indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, December 3, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Petroleum Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Friday, December 3, 1943. Business to be considered: To resume petroleum hearings.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be an open meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Tuesday, December 7, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., for consideration of H. R. 2001, relating to penalty mail, at which time the Postmaster General and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, or their representatives, will be heard.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

947. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

948. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a recommendation that S. 981 be amended; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

949. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting copy of a letter addressed to Hon. Harold D. Smith, Director, Bureau of the Budget, certifying that the Post Office Department is within the quota set by that Bureau under date of November 16, 1943, for each of the appropriation units involved; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

950. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 1, act of June 29, 1940 (54 Stat. 703), for the acquisition of Indian lands for the Grand Coulee Dam and Reservoir, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

951. A letter from the Secretary of the interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands heretofore acquired for the nonreservation Indian boarding school known as Sherman Institute, California; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

952. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 316 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 171. Joint resolution to permit the importation from foreign countries free of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed; with amendment (Rept. No. 921). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 3715. A bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels, landing craft, and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 922). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2908. A bill to amend Public Law 537, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 2, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 923). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 610. A bill for the relief of Pacific Dry Dock & Repair Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 925). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 929. A bill for the relief of Irving L. Jones; with amendment (Rept. No. 926). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1519. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the McCullough Coal Corporation against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 927). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2183. A bill for the relief of Mathilde B. Meister; with amendment (Rept. No. 928). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2639. A bill for the relief of William M. Tucker and Nelda M. Tucker; with amendment (Rept. No. 929). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2880. A bill for the relief of H. G. Tooley; without amendment (Rept. No. 930). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 3768. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska, the forty-ninth State; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 3769. A bill relating to the authority of courts other than the Emergency Court of Appeals to determine the validity of regulations, orders and price schedules under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 3770. A bill to provide support prices for cattle and sheep, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. J. Res. 200. Joint resolution extending greetings of the season to the armed forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution to express the policy of Congress with respect to the distribution of protein meal; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 371. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3715, a bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels, landing craft and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON:

H. R. 3771. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fannie Basler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3772. A bill for the relief of Edward Woolf; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3773. A bill for the relief of Staff Sergeant Marion Johnson, United States Marine Corps, and Sgt. George B. Kress, United States Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3839. By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Resolution adopted by the mayor and members of the council of the Borough of Lodi, N. J., under date of November 22, 1943: (1) That all Federal agencies be required to lease rather than purchase property when the same is acquired for only temporary use so that local governments may preserve their necessary revenues. (2) That Congress be urged to enact legislation authorizing the taxation of the following Federal-owned property: (a) Property withdrawn from local tax rolls for temporary uses, whether the same be military or otherwise; (b) property used for housing and resettlement projects; and (c) real and personal property used for manufacturing and industrial purposes. (3) That in providing for the taxation of Federal-owned property Congress enable local governments to levy taxes to the same extent and in the same manner as property owned privately; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3840. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition submitted by Julia A. Gorman, secretary, Dexter (Mich.) Methodist Temperance Committee, and 23 other residents of the community, urging enactment of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3841. By Mr. KING: Petition of Claude W. Young, minister, the First Methodist Church of Redondo Beach, Calif., and signed by members of that church, urging passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the

duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3842. By Mr. HART: Memorial of the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Newark, N. J., recommending the appropriation of additional funds for war housing projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3843. By Mr. VOORHIS of California: Petition of Mrs. W. C. Akin, of South Pasadena, Calif., and 134 others urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3844. Also, petition of June Emmons, of Pomona, Calif., and 14 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3845. Also, petition of J. J. Winkler, of San Dimas, Calif., and 22 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3846. Also, petition of Nova B. Stone, of Pomona, Calif., and 22 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3847. Also, petition of H. C. Whiteman, Jr., of San Gabriel, Calif., and 19 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3848. Also, petition of Mary E. Bond, of Monrovia, Calif., and 24 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3849. Also, petition of Dr. J. Thurman Pugh, of Monrovia, Calif., and 15 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3850. Also, petition of Leslie Charterson, of Monrovia, Calif., and 14 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3851. Also, petition of Nina Logan, of Monrovia, Calif., and 15 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3852. Also, petition of Herbert Moore, of Monrovia, Calif., and 15 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3853. Also, petition of Olis Haynes, of Pomona, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3854. Also, petition of Dr. Wilmer S. Lehman, of South Pasadena, Calif., and 19 others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3855. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of P. S. Preusch and 40 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3856. Also, petition of the Cyrus Crane Willmore Organization, Inc., and signed by 23 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3857. Also, petition of the E. R. Hensel Co. and 12 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the War; to the Committee on the Judiciary

3858. Also, petition of Louis A. Meyer and 32 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3859. Also, petition of Lawrence Gottschamer and 69 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1943

(Legislative day of Thursday, November 18, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, with the deep desire that all our deliberations on this high hill of the Nation's life should be begun, continued, and ended in Thee, as those set apart to the solemn ministry of public service we would enter this forum of the people's hopes through the gateway of prayer. Here may our faulty perspectives be corrected by vast horizons. Here may mistaken magnitudes be revealed in the long sweep of Thine eternal purpose as our thoughts and hopes are lifted above the strident distresses of our immediate times.

In this hour of testing we crave Thy guidance. Lead our leaders, teach our teachers, inspire our people for all virtuous endeavor. Strengthen the arm of our might to beat down even at staggering cost the cruel iniquities that torture the martyrs of freedom and twist truth into a crooked cross. Give us, above all, grace and endurance to plant Thy kingdom in the world, following with fearless feet the bright star of Thy holy will. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WALLGREN, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, December 2, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WALLGREN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Revercomb
Andrews	Hatch	Robertson
Austin	Hawkes	Russell
Bailey	Hayden	Scrugham
Bankhead	Hill	Shipstead
Barkley	Holman	Smith
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Bone	Kilgore	Taft
Bridges	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Buck	Lucas	Tobey
Burton	McCarran	Truman
Butler	McClellan	Tunnell
Byrd	McFarland	Tydings
Capper	McKellar	Vandenberg
Caraway	Maloney	Van Nuys
Chandler	Maybank	Wagner
Chavez	Mead	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	Millikin	Walsh, Mass.
Clark, Mo.	Moore	Walsh, N. J
Danaher	Murray	Wheeler
Davis	Nye	Wherry
Eastland	O'Daniel	White
Ellender	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Ferguson	Overton	Willis
Gerry	Pepper	Wilson
Gillette	Radcliffe	
Green	Reed	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is confined to his home with a cold.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3309) to suspend during the present war the application of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 186) to provide for the proper observance of the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of the adoption of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 316 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

DISPOSITION OF LANDS ACQUIRED FOR THE INDIAN BOARDING SCHOOL, SHERMAN INSTITUTE, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands heretofore acquired for the nonreservation Indian boarding school known as Sherman Institute, California (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR GRAND COULEE DAM AND RESERVOIR

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1, act of June 29, 1940 (54

Stat. 703) for the acquisition of Indian lands for the Grand Coulee Dam and Reservoir, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Two letters from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War (2), Justice, Navy (3), and Agriculture (10); the National Archives, Federal Security Agency (3), and the Executive Office of the President (National Resources Planning Board, War Production Board (2), Office of Price Administration, and War Manpower Commission, N. Y. A.) which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

THE FOOD SUBSIDY PROGRAM—LETTERS, PETITIONS, MEMORIALS, ETC., FROM PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, during the past few weeks I have received a considerable number of letters, petitions, memorials, and telegrams from people in every section and every walk of life in the State of Pennsylvania relating to the subsidy program.

Since this is one of the outstanding questions with which the Congress is now confronted and since it is a question which commands the interest of virtually every American citizen, I believe it would be well for the committee to have access to the various shades of opinion, both supporting and opposing the administration's policy, which are now being submitted on the bill under consideration by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

In accordance with that belief, I have informed all those who have written me that I would submit their views to the appropriate Senate committee for its study and consideration. And in line with that promise, I ask that the communications which have come to my office, pertaining to the question of subsidies, be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency which is now considering the particular bill, in order that the committee may be apprised of the opinions which the people of the State of Pennsylvania hold with respect to this problem.

There being no objection, the letters, telegrams, and petitions from citizens and organizations, praying for the adoption of the subsidy program, and also the letters, telegrams, and memorials from citizens and organizations, all in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the adoption of the subsidy program (presented by Mr. DAVIS), were received and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SUSPENSION OF OLEOMARGARINE TAXES—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL COOPERATIVE MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD as a part of my remarks and appropriate reference a telegram embodying a resolution adopted by the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation meeting in Chicago and representing 300,000 organized dairy farmers.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *December 2, 1943.*

Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Three hundred voting delegates, representing 300,000 organized dairy farmers in 41 States attending twenty-seventh annual convention our federation here, today, unanimously adopted special order of business resolution, text of which follows: "We condemn the selfish deceptive tactics of the oleomargarine interests to use the war emergency as their means and the United States Senate as their foil to wipe out consumer protective legislation of nearly 60 years' standing against the fraud of colored oleomargarine. Knowing full well that the supply of vegetable fats is limited, they seek to rush this bill through the Congress on the false pretense that a change in the law at this time will permit the production of greater supplies of oleomargarine. Changes in laws will not make a single additional pound available in a time when the supply of fats and oils in America needed for many purposes including munitions, is in a state of critical shortage. While the House Committee on Agriculture has refused to be beguiled by the rich few who seek to foist this substitute, colored yellow to imitate butter, upon the American people now there exists a real threat that Senator MAYBANK'S bill, repealing for the duration the commodity tax on yellow oleomargarine and the license tax on those who would add yellow coloring matter to uncolored oleo will be attached as a rider to the new revenue bill by the Finance Committee of the Senate. This effort with terrific unforeseen consequences to consumer and dairy producer alike is being made in complete disregard of the House committee action which deferred for the duration of the Seventy-eighth Congress consideration of such ill-advised legislation. No opportunity is afforded for the adequate presentation of the merits of this controversy to the committee. Such procedure is utterly opposed to the customary democratic legislative way. We resent that covert way in which the Maybank bill is being handled and make known to the body of the Congress our unalterable opposition to it. We protest bitterly the method in which the attempt is being made to railroad it through the Senate Finance Committee and, in so doing, preempting the traditional prerogatives of the Committees on Agriculture of both Houses to consider the bill."

CHARLES W. HOLMAN,
Secretary, the National Cooperative
Milk Producers Federation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

S. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution to aid in effectuating the purposes of the Railway Labor Act; with amendments (Rept. No. 563).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 933. A bill for the relief of Lee S. Bradshaw; with amendments (Rept. No. 564); and

S. 1477. A bill for the relief of Carl M. Frasure; with an amendment (Rept. No. 565).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1164. A bill for the relief of Lucille Sleet; with amendments (Rept. No. 566); and

S. 1528. A bill for the relief of Col. Anderson F. Pitts; without amendment (Rept. No. 567).

By Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 255. A bill for the relief of Col. E. H. Tarbutton; without amendment (Rept. No. 569).

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. J. Res. 175. Joint resolution commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the first airplane flight by Wilbur and Orville Wright; without amendment (Rept. No. 568).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1569. A bill to amend the act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

S. 1570. A bill to extend the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, for 5 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1571. A bill to provide that the transmountain tunnel constructed in connection with the Colorado-Big Thompson project shall be known as the "Alva B. Adams tunnel"; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

DEVELOPMENT AND IMPROVEMENT OF LANDS NOT PREVIOUSLY UNDER JURISDICTION OF RECLAMATION BUREAU

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have today introduced Senate bill 1569, proposing to amend the Reclamation Act of August 4, 1939. The objectives of this amendment will be of vast importance in the post-war period. During the 40 years the Reclamation Service has been improving the public domain of the United States it has been limited largely to the building of dams, laterals, and canals for putting water upon arid and semiarid lands. While that field has been vast and the contribution to the wealth of this Nation has been almost beyond calculation, it must be clear that in the era we are now entering the resources of our country must be developed to a degree that has never been reached before.

Under our system of government, we have permitted huge areas of timberlands to become almost valueless as we remove the timber growth therefrom. Throughout the entire Pacific Northwest and Pacific coast timber-producing sections as well as in the Rocky Mountain States and the South, there are tremendous stretches of cut-over lands which in their present condition have little productive value. This bill will give the

Reclamation Bureau authority to improve and develop such lands. It likewise will give the Reclamation Bureau authority to improve by the construction of drainage canals and similar drainage facilities enormous areas of land now useless.

The field of land improvement in that category reaches into every section of the United States. Of course, such an important program must be developed carefully under direction by the Congress through the provision of appropriations and the approval or disapproval of the recommendations of the Bureau. However, until the Bureau has authority to explore and develop these fields, there is no authority under which it can act.

When this measure extends the authority of the Bureau to explore these projects, there should be developed a system of public land improvements that will provide employment for returning soldiers in the construction of the facilities I have mentioned and also make available countless acres of valuable lands for them to settle upon and construct their permanent homes.

This is a very practical program to meet the demands for the fullest possible employment in the post-war period.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 186) to provide for the proper observance of the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of the adoption of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PAY OF NONOPERATING RAILWAY EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENT

Mr. TRUMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 91) to aid in effectuating the purposes of the Railway Labor Act, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO THE REVENUE BILL

Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. WILSON each submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (H. R. 3687) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, which were severally referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

REGULATION OF INSURANCE BUSINESS—AMENDMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1362) to affirm the intent of the Congress that the regulation of the business of insurance remain within the control of the several States and that the acts of July 2, 1890, and October 15, 1914, as amended, be not applicable to that business, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS — AUTHORITY FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE TO REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations is ready to report the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes. I desire to ask unanimous consent to submit the report thereon during the recess of the Senate, as I understand the Senate will adjourn, probably, until next Tuesday. At any rate, whether it adjourns to Monday or Tuesday, I ask unanimous consent to make the report on the first supplemental national defense appropriation bill, House bill 3598.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator has reference, I understand, to a report on the first supplemental deficiency appropriation bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. May I ask the Senator from Tennessee when it is expected that the full committee will meet and act?

Mr. McKELLAR. Tomorrow at 10:30 a. m., and we desire to make the report so as to have the bill ready to be considered on the following Tuesday.

Mr. WHITE. The permission requested by the Senator from Tennessee, if granted, would authorize the committee to file a report tomorrow, so that the bill would be in order for consideration the first of next week?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITE. I have no objection, Mr. President.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, then, it is contemplated to bring the bill up on Tuesday?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; it is contemplated to have it considered on Tuesday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. I also ask unanimous consent to file motions in writing to suspend the rules for the purpose of offering certain amendments that will have to be submitted to a two-thirds vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE BILL 3598

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, the following amendments, namely:

Insert a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 305. No part of any funds appropriated for the War or Navy Department, when it is found by the head of such Department that any part of such funds is not necessary for the completion of the purpose for which appropriated, shall be used for any other purpose without the specific approval of law by the Congress; and notwithstanding any other provision of law providing for transfer of any part of such funds, when it is found by the head of such Department that such funds are not to be used for the purposes for which appropriated, such appropriations to that extent shall be rescinded and canceled and the secretary of such Department shall certify the amount so reduced, rescinded, and canceled to the Treasury Department, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate: *Provided*, That no appropriation or part of any appropriation heretofore, herein, or hereafter made available for any executive department or independent establishment to construct any particular project shall be impounded, or held as a reserve, or used for any other purpose, except by direction of the Congress, and any part of such appropriation not needed to complete such project, or the part thereof for which appropriation has been made, shall be retained by the Treasury: *Provided further*, That Section 3 of the Military Appropriation Act, 1944, approved July 1, 1943, is hereby repealed."

Insert a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 306. No funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for the War Department shall be used directly or indirectly for or devoted to the purpose of the cancelation of existing certificates of authority with respect to the manufacture and distribution of Army insignia and no such funds shall be used directly or indirectly to either enforce or announce the provisions of order AR 600-90 as amended or any amended or similar or comparable order or regulation restricting the manufacture and distribution of Army insignia."

Mr. McKELLAR submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3598, the first supplemental national defense appropriation bill, 1944, which were ordered to lie on the able and to be printed.

(For text of the amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: Under the heading "Public Health Service" and in the item "Emergency health and sanitation" strike out the figures "$1,350,000" and insert the following: "$1,695,000: *Provided*, That the Surgeon General is authorized, on application of a city, county, or other local subdivision of government duly approved by the State Health Department having jurisdiction over said city, county, or other local subdivision of government to enter into agreements with private practicing physicians and dentists under which, in consideration of the payment to them of a relocation allowance of not to exceed $250 per month for 3 months and the actual cost of travel and transportation of the physician or dentist and his family and household effects to the new location, such physician or dentist will agree to move to and engage in the practice of his profession in such area for a period of not less than 1 year: *Provided, however*, That no such contract shall be made with any physician or dentist unless such physician or dentist shall be admitted to practice by the State author-

ity having jurisdiction of such new location: *Provided further,* That each such applicant subdivision shall contribute $100 to the total cost of such relocation allowance, travel, and transportation costs of each such physician or dentist and his family obtained by said applicant."

Mr. RUSSELL also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3598, the first supplemental national defense appropriation bill, 1944, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. NYE submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: immediately under the heading "War Department", insert the following:

"MILITARY ACTIVITIES

"Nothing contained in this act or in the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes', approved July 1, 1943, shall be construed to prevent or to interfere with the instruction, education, training, transportation, or service of class IV–E conscientious objectors within or outside of the United States, its Territories and possessions, when such instruction, education, training, transportation, or service is conducted and paid for by a religious or philanthropic agency for the purpose of carrying out relief operations, or to prevent persons paid from appropriations made by the said acts from incidentally facilitating the said instruction, education, training, transportation, and relief services."

Mr. NYE also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3598, the first supplemental national defense appropriation bill, 1944, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: At the proper place under the heading "Bureau of Indian Affairs," insert the following:

"That the section of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1944, approved July 12, 1943 (Public Law 133, 78th, Congress, p. 22), which authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to purchase United States Treasury War bonds for the membership of the Shoshone Tribe of Indians is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed, with the consent of the business committee of the Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming, to purchase one United States Treasury Series E War bond of the denomination of $500 for each member of said Shoshone Tribe according to a roll of said tribe prepared as of July 12, 1943, and approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and to pay the total cost of the bonds so purchased out of the principal of the judgment fund of said tribe in the Treasury. Each bond shall be registered by the Treasury Department in the name of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in trust for the enrolled member of the Shoshone Tribe for whom purchased and shall be held by the United States until the date of maturity, whereupon said bond shall be redeemed and the proceeds thereof paid to the Indian owner free of any trust or restriction. In the event of the death of the Shoshone owner, the proceeds of said bond at maturity shall be distributed to his devisees or heirs or next of kin as provided by existing law. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to grant permission to the county chairman of the War bond purchase program of Fremont County, Wyo., in which county the Shoshone Tribe resides, to include the total amount of bonds purchased for the members of said tribe in his quota of War bond sales.'"

THE SUBSIDY PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ELLENDER

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subsidy program, delivered by Senator ELLENDER on December 1, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP—ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by him before the American-Soviet friendship meeting at Philadelphia, Pa., on November 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLISH INDEPENDENCE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BREWSTER

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on Polish independence delivered by Senator BREWSTER, at Manhattan Center, New York, November 21, 1943, in commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of Polish independence, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS—ADDRESS BY REV. JOSEPH B. CODE

[Mr. RADCLIFFE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Rev. Joseph B. Code, Director of the Inter-American Institute, at Habana, Cuba, on September 18, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MURRAY-WAGNER-DINGELL SOCIAL SECURITY BILL—EDITORIAL FROM THE RICHMOND TIMES-DISPATCH

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Senator to the Doctors," from the Richmond Times-Dispatch of November 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUBSIDIES—LETTER FROM CHESTER BOWLES

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter relating to the question of subsidies, written by Hon. Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, which appears in the Appendix.]

ASSISTANCE TO EUROPEAN JEWS

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD three editorials from Washington newspapers and one from a New York newspaper relating to the extension of assistance to surviving European Jewish people, which appear in the Appendix.]

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS OF AMERICAN LEGION

[Mr. DANAHER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an extract from the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations adopted by the executive committee of the American Legion at Indianapolis, Ind., November 18, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY—INTERVIEW OF J. EDGAR HOOVER BY EARL GODWIN

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio interview of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the F. B. I., by Earl Godwin, on the subject of juvenile delinquency, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARMY CONSTRUCTION WORK IN HAWAII—RADIO ADDRESS BY FULTON LEWIS, JR.

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD three consecutive radio addresses dealing with Army construction work in Hawaii, delivered by Fulton Lewis, Jr., beginning on November 29, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

LAUNCHING OF THE BATTLESHIP "WISCONSIN"

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in a few days the mightiest battleship in our war fleet will be launched. It will be christened the U. S. S. *Wisconsin.*

I am deeply conscious of the significance of the name "Wisconsin" which will be given to the newest and greatest ship of the United States Navy. Wisconsin is the great State which I have the honor to serve in the United States Senate. As a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs of this body, I know the true distinction attached to having one of the most formidable of our warships, if not the most formidable, bear the name of one's home State.

In this instance it is my sincere belief that the distinction is deserved, since the contributions of Wisconsin to the progress of our Nation and especially to the advancement of the cause of world liberation in this war, have been many and valuable.

Wisconsin has been a State since 1848. It is characteristic of the forward-looking people of Wisconsin that among the first steps taken by the new State government was the establishment of a free public-school system. In the first war after Wisconsin became a State 91,379, out of a population of 775,881, fought in the United States armed forces—that is, in the forces of the North. This record of action favoring the freedom of speech, religion, assembly, and of the press, together with the wholehearted support of the United States in time of war, has been maintained throughout the 95 years of Wisconsin's existence as a State.

Americans of Norwegian, Swedish, Danish, Dutch, Polish, Swiss, German, Welsh, English, Irish, French, Scotch, Luxemburg, Italian, Greek, Belgian, and Czechoslovakian ancestry made Wisconsin their home and made possible the great strides in the State's agricultural, industrial, lumbering, and mining development. For nearly a century these Wisconsin citizens have demonstrated the ability of peoples of varying national

origins to live together in productive peace. Mr. President, if there is any one thing which is needed on earth today, it is for the peoples to learn the lesson of how to live together. Although their historic backgrounds have been divergent, the people of Wisconsin, by working in unison, have built a thriving community State from a wilderness in an incredibly short period of time.

This unity of action has never been more forcefully expressed than during the present war. Hundreds of thousands of Wisconsin citizens are in the armed forces of the United States, on every ocean and on every battle front throughout the world. Wisconsin's farms and Wisconsin's great dairy industry, which in 1940 produced almost as much in the way of dairy products as all other States combined, are sending food to our fighting men, our allies, and to the peoples of the liberated lands. Wisconsin farm machinery, mining machinery and automobile factories are turning out parts for ships and planes and tanks. Wisconsin's machine tool plants are producing guns and precision instruments. Liberty ships slide down the ways in northern Wisconsin while shipyards in the eastern section of the State build PT boats and submarines. Wisconsin's forests produce lumber, so essential for the war effort.

Even as the war effort continues at an augmented pace, Wisconsin educators, office workers, merchants, businessmen, and religious leaders are preparing to take an active part in the post-war world of more closely related international contacts.

The U. S. S. *Wisconsin* represents the same qualities the State of Wisconsin represents. Its officers and men, of varying national ancestry, embody the pioneer spirit of America. They come from widely different occupations, yet they have the same goal: The liberation of the oppressed and the preservation of our Country.

God speed the U. S. S. *Wisconsin*.

THE QUEBRACHO CARTEL

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, in order to afford some variety to the daily menu of the Senate I desire to make a few brief observations on cartels, pools, quebracho, palmetto, tannic acid, gambier, et al. Recently the Assistant Attorney General of the United States appeared before one of the investigating committees of the Senate and presented a very important subject to the American people by outlining the cartel or pool which had been established to control the importation and sale in the United States of quebracho and other tannic acid substances. The question of an adequate supply of tannic acid is vital to every man, woman, and child in America, and at this particular time it is a very important war material. The Assistant Attorney General says in his statement that there has been a very large and effective pool established with the collaboration of certain American industrialists, largely under the leadership of a man by the name of Sullivan, a graduate of Harvard College, who was an American citizen once, and who made his way to South America and projected a world-wide cartel in order to control this one particular substance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the statement concerning the quebracho cartel, made by Wendell Berge, Assistant Attorney General, before the Subcommittee on War Mobilization, Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, on November 24, 1943, made a part of my remarks in the RECORD in order that the subject may be brought before the American people so they may understand the seriousness of the situation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This statement has to do with quebracho extract, a material which is of great use to the Nation in the war effort. It is a material which has been found most desirable for tanning the leather which goes into the shoes, harness, straps, and other leather articles of the armed forces. It is of some interest to every man, woman, and child whose ration stamps are used to buy a pair of shoes.

Practically all heavy leather tanned in this country has been tanned by use of a blend in which this material is an important ingredient. It comes from the southern part of South America, and there have been times when it was difficult, and others when it appeared it might be impossible, to ship the material to this country. The production and sale of the material is controlled by a monopoly pool or cartel, and this country is at the mercy of the pool in procuring the material in adequate quantities and at a reasonable price. The pool has exercised its power to curtail the quantity shipped to this country, to prevent any adequate stock pile in this country, and to raise prices out of proportion to any increase in costs.

A year ago the Department of Justice submitted the facts of this monopoly pool to a Federal grand jury in New York, and it promptly returned an indictment against five American corporations, one Canadian and one British corporation, and five individuals, officials of four of the American corporations. Pleas of nolo contendere were subsequently entered by three of the American corporations and four of their officials. Fines were levied against and paid by these defendants, totaling $59,002. A nolle prosequi was entered as to the two remaining American corporations, the two British corporations, and one official. The reason for the nolle prosequi in the case of the two foreign corporations was that they were outside the jurisdiction of the court.

The national interest in such a situation plainly warranted a diligent effort long ago to find an adequate substitute which would relieve us from entire dependence upon the ability and willingness of a foreign cartel to supply us with a vital material. I suggest that the committee investigate and ascertain for itself the extent to which we, as a nation, have gone in providing a safeguard against the eventuality of our being cut off from the supply of this material.

The extract is obtained from the quebracho tree. For commercial purposes the growth of these trees is limited to Argentina and Paraguay. Although there are quebracho forests in southern Brazil, the extract manufactured from these trees is inferior to Argentine and Paraguayan extract and cannot compete favorably with it in the market. Ninety-eight percent of the world production of quebracho wood and extract comes from Argentina and Paraguay. In 1942 the total production amounted to approximately 300,000 metric tons of extract and was valued at $25,000,000.

This war has naturally affected the market for quebracho in Europe. Several years before the war the German Government took steps to render that country less dependent upon the continuance of quebracho imports. Clauses were inserted in all Army and Navy contracts for the purchase of leather goods that at least 12 percent of such goods should be tanned by German-manufactured tanning agents. This resulted in the development of a new industry based upon the production of tanning material from German trees. Tannic acid was extracted from the oak trees of south Germany and was permitted to find a place in the tanning industry by reason of the Government policy. Thus the German leather industry gradually became independent of quebracho importation from South America.

The loss of the continental European market due to the war was not felt to any great extent by the quebracho exporters because of the great increase of exports to the United States. During the war the imports of quebracho almost doubled due to the tremendous production of leather goods for the armed forces.

STRUCTURE OF THE QUEBRACHO INDUSTRY

The quebracho industry consists of 22 producers in Argentina and Paraguay. Five of these are owned or controlled by the British corporation, the Forestal Land, Timber and Railways, Ltd., through its Argentine subsidiary, La Forestal Argentina S. A. de Tierras, Maderas y Explotaciones Commerciales e Industriales. These 5 companies have a productive capacity which constitutes approximately 57 percent of the total capacity.

All producers, except four having a capacity of about 11 percent of the entire industry, are members of a quebracho pool which regulates the production and sale of the product. Quebracho is sold by official agents of the pool, and it recognizes two official agents in the United States: the Tannin Corporation and the International Products Corporation, both of New York.

EXTENT OF CONTROL OF FORESTAL LAND, TIMBER AND RAILWAYS, LTD.

Forestal of England controls La Forestal of Argentina through the ownership of a majority of its stock and a substantial portion of its bonds. One John B. Sullivan, chairman of the board of Forestal of England, is also the manager of Forestal of Argentina. Sullivan is an Argentine citizen who was formerly a citizen of the United States and a graduate of Harvard College.

By reason of La Forestal's ownership of 57 percent of the total productive capacity of quebracho in South America, which is approximately eight times the capacity of its next largest competitor, Forestal has completely dominated the quebracho industry. Its policy has been to restrict production and maintain high prices.

Forestal's economic dominance in Argentina has enabled it to exert a great influence upon the Government of Argentina. For example, in 1942 the efforts of John B. Sullivan alone were primarily responsible for the imposition by the Argentine Ministry of Agriculture of highly restrictive export quotas upon each producer. These restrictions were imposed upon the industry at a time when it appeared that the efforts of Forestal to continue similar restrictions upon the South American producers might fail.

Forestal's domination extends not only over the production of quebracho but over its distribution as well, including importation into this country. Through St. Helen's, Ltd., a Canadian corporation, Forestal of England owns substantially all of the stock

of Tannin Products Corporation, a Delaware corporation, which in turn owns all the capital stock of the Tannin Corporation, a New York corporation. The Tannin Corporation imports approximately 70 percent of all quebracho extract consumed in the United States. The Tannin Corporation has been controlled by Forestal of England since 1913 and during the past 30 years its controlling officials have been completely subservient to the policies of Forestal of England. Thus Forestal controls this material from the tree to the United States consumer.

The questionable character of the functioning of these American subsidiaries is indicated by portions of a letter written December 23, 1941, by Carl B. Ely, president of the Tannin Corporation, to J. B. Sullivan of Forestal, whom he addresses as "My dear Jack":

"You will recall the formation for good and practical reasons of the Tannin Products Corporation in 1925, at which time a very large dividend was paid, which procedure continued in a more or less degree during the following years, particularly in 1929 and 1934 The company, as you will see, earned $3,284,427.28 and paid out dividends of $4,200,000. In other words, we declared practically $1,000,000 more during the 16-year period than we earned.

"Under the circumstances I have no fault to find with this, provided our principal stockholders, the Forestal Co., are aware of it and are prepared to take care of our money situation as the same arises.

"To come right down to the last analysis, we have been living on Government funds, which under proper business procedure should be reserved for income-tax payments, but, as these payments are not due until next year, it has been possible to use this money. We owe the Government today $500,000. This money, together with your most helpful postponement of payments, has made it possible for us to have cash to pay the dividend we did. I believe that with the extra terms on future purchases of extract we will make our position stronger during the next 6 months, and we are trying diligently not to borrow from the banks, as in this particular case it would appear that such borrowing was done to pay dividends. This I believe would have a very bad effect on our goodwill and financial standing—and we enjoy today the good will and respect of the tanning industry as we never have before."

I have already pointed out that Forestal controls 5 of the South American producers. One of the other 17 is the International Products Corporation of New York. Another producer, Samuhi S. A., is controlled through ownership of a majority of its stock by two American corporations, Proctor Ellison and Howes Bros. of Massachusetts.

International Products Corporation and Samuhi together have a capacity of about 8 percent of the entire industry. Both of these producers have been ineffective in preventing La Forestal from carrying out its policy of restricted output and high prices, and International Products has in the past frequently cooperated closely with La Forestal to further such a policy.

Since 1934 International Products Corporation has consulted with Tannin about the prices to be charged to quebracho extract consumers in the United States, so that the prices of both companies have been fixed, uniform and high. From May 1934 to July 1939 Tannin owned a substantial amount of the stock of International Products Corporation, and from May 1934 until May 1936 the president of Tannin, Carl B. Ely, was a member of the board of directors of International Products Corporation. On February 26, 1935, Ely wrote to Sullivan:

"I am giving the I. P. C. problems a lot of my time, and, as previously told you, have found that there is a lot to be done to straighten out that problem. I am working slowly so as not to upset the apple cart any more than is necessary.

* * * * *

"I am getting their sales policies straightened out and believe now there will be no more monkey business."

From 1934 to 1939 International Products Corporation was a member of the quebracho pool, and by reason of its designation as an official pool agent for the United States gave up its business of selling extract in England and in Asia.

American purchasers of quebracho might well wonder whether this American company was more concerned with giving them a good deal or with favoring certain foreign concerns, from the concluding paragraph of a letter from one of its officials to its president dated November 16, 1939:

"You undoubtedly know that Mr. Seldes was successful in substituting Casado extract to fill the order we had for Forestal for 535 tons of Supremo for delivery in Buenos Aires for shipment to Japan. We paid for the Casado extract with a dollar draft and have since received from Forestal the sterling representing the sales. The net result of the whole transaction represents a loss of a little more than a $1 per ton, which, as explained in a previous letter, is really not a loss at all, as we will use this extract to fill orders for North America which will net us a nice profit."

The production of Samuhi was so small, being about 1 percent of the entire industry, that it could hardly contain any competitive threat to La Forestal. Nevertheless, our records show that for many years Forestal harassed this company by every means and sought to buy up its assets and its stock.

OPERATION OF THE POOL

It is interesting to observe in what manner the quebracho extract pool operated to carry out Forestal's policy of restricted output and high prices. Before the formation of the pool the price per pound of quebracho extract was 2½ cents. By the terms of the pool agreement a directive committee, dominated by Forestal, was empowered to fix the prices of all its members. The directive committee between November 1934 and January 1941, decreed six price rises, raising the basic price of quebracho extract for the whole world market from 2½ cents up to 4⅞ cents, an increase of nearly 100 percent. Sullivan admitted in July 1942 that at the then-existing price, which prevails at present, Forestal was making a net profit of 33 percent on every ton of quebracho it sold.

The exorbitant profits of the quebracho manufacturers were severely criticized by the famous leading Argentine newspaper, La Prensa. The following excerpt was taken from a letter of May 20, 1936, written by the manager of the Buenos Aires office of the International Products Corporation to its president:

"Another matter, which has caused a lot of excitement amongst the manufacturers, has been the inopportune declaration, made by the chairman of the Forestal during the annual meeting of the shareholders, viz, that the understanding of the manufacturers was performed under the auspices of the Argentine Government, in other words, that the Argentine Government was really responsible for the agreement and that it was protecting the same. This news was reproduced all over the world and the La Prensa, the most important paper on the Southern Hemisphere, has seized the opportunity to denounce the huge profits made by the quebracho manufacturers, profits which in their opinion mean a loss for the Argentine Republic on account of the decrease in the export of both quebracho extract and logs. I am enclosing herewith the article, as appeared in the La Prensa of Monday the 18th inst., and we would add that this paper has on more than one occasion criticized the so-called gentlemen's agreement. Mr. Marti told me that he is at a loss to understand how the Baron made these declarations as Mr. Sullivan has always stressed the necessity of not mentioning the Argentine government in connection with the manufacturers' agreement, a fact which can be noted in the balance sheets of the other companies, who, referring to the higher prices, explain that they are due to a better understanding in the sales policy abroad. Anyway, I hope that his faux pas will have no serious consequences."

To maintain high prices it was necessary to limit the production and the sale of quebracho in the world market. The method used to limit production under the pool agreement was to allocate a quota to each producer in accordance with his respective productive capacity. These quotas limited the amount of quebracho extract which any manufacturer could sell during a given period. Each member of the pool was compelled to make substantial contributions at regular periods to a so-called "battle fund" of the pool. These contributions were retained by the pool unless the producers adhered to the pool's regulations relating to prices and quotas, in which case a portion of each producer's contribution was refunded. So restrictive were these quota limitations that producers who desired to sell above their quotas often paid enormous prices to acquire the quota rights of other producers.

This rigid control of the market so severely limited the production of many companies that in 1941 several deserted the pool. These companies were LaChaquena S. A. and Cotan S. A. These two companies, together with International Products Corporation, Samuhi, and Weisburd & Cia. Ltda., a new concern, have been the only producers outside of the pool since 1941. Although the total productive capacity of these five companies did not exceed 12 percent of the total industry, their threat of full production and decreased prices jeopardized its whole structure. To meet this threat, Forestal succeeded in persuading the Ministry of Agriculture in February, 1942, to impose export restrictions upon each producer which prevented exportation of more than approximately one-third of their total capacity. In addition, Forestal attempted to prevent companies outside the pool from shipping their extract to the United States.

One instance is the experience of Hammond Carpenter Corporation, an independent importer which has sought to compete with the Tannin Corporation and International Products Corporation in the importation of quebracho. In February or March 1942, J. A. Barkey, its vice president, attempted to import some extracts produced by Weisburd, an Argentine extract manufacturer, who entered the industry in 1941. He called at the offices of the Sprague Steamship Co. and spoke to Mr. Bodemann of that company. Mr. Barkey later described the conference as follows:

"Mr. Bodemann retorted that it was very unlikely that our firm would be given any space for the reason that we were newcomers in the import of quebracho extract and for the further reason that the "pool" had supported his line during the lean years before the war and by reason of such support his line would be obliged to support the "pool" during the present emergency."

Similar sentiments were voiced by Mr. Horgan of the Stockard Steamship Corporation.

The aid of the Buenos Aires agency of Moore-McCormack was also previously enlisted. In October 1941, the Moore-McCormack line stated that—

"At the request of the Forestal Co. they had promised their cooperation for the purpose of keeping out any of the new brands * * * The understanding was that whenever they were offered outside extract and they had space they were to reject it and advise the other manufacturers, who would try to offer replacement."

Forestal's tactics are well illustrated by the case of T. Valentine, exporter and concessionaire of a projected new company. International Products Corporation was informed in September 1941, that—

"It has proved impossible so far to reach a satisfactory agreement with the new factory at Santiago del Estero. For this reason, the Forestal Co., in an endeavor to impede the exportation of the extract, has been all the steamship companies requesting them not to give space to any outsiders, but to advise the Forestal who would immediately offer replacement cargo. The steamship companies promised to act accordingly."

The Basal Agency had obtained shipping space for Valentine in the past. "The Basal Agency," an official of International Products Corporation wrote to Feeney a week later, "has informed us that Valentine wants to book a further 200 tons on the next steamer but that they would refuse to take it if we or the Forestal would offer them replacement cargo."

The effect of the restrictive Government decrees and other measures taken by Forestal has been to force one independent, Cotan, S. A., back into the pool, while another, Samuhi, S. A., is contemplating rejoining the pool.

It appears inevitable that within a short period of time the remaining independents will be forced into full cooperation with the pool and that the industry's policy of restrictive production and high prices will continue unless some completely satisfactory substitute may be found for quebracho extract. Apparently the tanners in this country find that wattle extract is the only tanning product interchangeable with quebracho extract, and it is therefore significant to observe that the wattle extract industry, which is located in south and east Africa, is also controlled by Forestal of England, and that the principal importers of wattle in the United States are the Tannin Corporation and International Products Corporation.

The chief official of one of the companies which stood up against the bulldozing tactics of the pool wrote a letter to American Tanners, Ltd., on February 7, 1935. After discussing in a critical manner the actions of the pool and referring to a conversation with an individual whom he said could be "interpreted as a stool pigeon for Forestal," he wrote:

"We also pointed out the fact that if the arbitrary methods of the gentlemen (the pool) were pursued, that they were throwing away their markets, they were encouraging the fields of research and that they would wake up one day and find that the volume of consumption of quebracho extract had been greatly reduced due to the introduction of other materials which supplanted quebracho and I cited the instance of what the tanners went through with substituted leather and how the volume of the market had never been regained and that the same thing would happen to quebracho."

It is our hope in the Antitrust Division that every cartel which misuses its monopoly control over a product needed by our people will wake up to find that product supplanted by another and better product which is not so controlled.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I have just received a letter from Sprinz & Sprinz, a firm of national importers, of New York, and I wish to read the letter into the RECORD. It is dated November 26, 1943, and is as follows:

Hon. THEODORE G. BILBO,
United States Senator from Mississippi, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have read the article by Assistant Attorney General Wendell Berge regarding the cartel on quebracho extract and he is perfectly right in everything he says, but that has been going on for years.

The main reason that quebracho extract was used is because of its high content of tannin and its ease of procurement. We Americans, taking the road of least resistance, have forgotten about our vast natural resources of tanning material. In your State the saw palmetto grows in great luxuriance and it is practically a weed. About 35 or 40 years ago experiments were made to extract the tanning material and it was found that the roots contained about 28 percent tannin and the leaves about 13 percent tannin; besides the residue from the leaves can be used for making paper and rope products.

Palmetto extract is a very rapid tanning material and is far superior to gambier that has been imported in very large quantities in past years.

I understand gambier is grown on the Malayan Peninsula, which is now under the control of the Japs.

It makes light-color leather. This extract can be made all year round and if it was promoted we could make ourselves self-sufficient and not need any imported tanning materials.

We would like to have your view on the matter.

Very truly yours,

SPRINZ & SPRINZ,
SAMUEL B. SPRINZ.

In my campaign to establish four chemurgic laboratories, I discussed this one product essential for the American people, and tried to show that we had a storehouse of unlimited supplies of materials from which could be extracted tannic acid to be used in the tanning of all the leather that is used for harness, saddles, shoes, and other leather products which are necessary to our present civilization. I merely bring this matter to the attention of the Senate and the attention of the American people in order that I may succeed in having the chemurgic laboratories, New Orleans division, proceed at once with experimentation in line with experiments which have already been made, so as to convince the industrialists of the country that in our own territory a great field, which is now open to investment, is capable of providing an article which is absolutely essential to the welfare of the American people. In that way we can defeat the efforts of this international cartel which has not only pooled the supplies but has undertaken to control the production in order to control the price, in the midst of the war effort has prohibited the shipment of the material into America, and has boosted the price so high that it is almost impossible to use the source material of tannic acid—quebracho extract—which the American people have been using.

If anyone has any doubt about the possible sources of supplies of tannic-acid material for use in tanning, he has only to visit the States of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Florida and possibly South Carolina, where there are millions of acres covered with the saw palmetto. With modern bulldozers, the roots of the saw palmetto can be taken out of the ground at very small expense of production, because the roots are very large in proportion to the size of the top of the bush. If 28 percent of the roots and 13 percent of the leaves are tannin, there is a great field for industrial investment for the great body of American people, with their accumulated millions and billions of dollars since the war effort began, to provide a material which the American market must have, and which is now being controlled by Sullivan and Forestal, of England and South America, both in respect to the South American product and the south African product, as those products are obtained in both those territories from the quebracho tree and the wattle tree or bush, as well as from gambier.

I trust that the laboratories at New Orleans will go to work on this experiment, so as to convince the industrialists of our country that we have an unlimited storehouse of tannic-acid material from which all the tannic acid needed in the years to come can be obtained, and thus, in that one way, defeat the international monopoly or cartel over which the laws of the United States have no control.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting in time of war by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER].

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, there has been some discussion among various Senators with reference to the definition of areas which are not included within any village, town, or city. In some States there are such unincorporated areas which, nevertheless, have a recognized and definite legal status within a given State. In order to make certain of comprehending such areas within the amendment, I modify the amendment at the desk by inserting, on page 6, in line 10, after the word "city," the following: "or area not included within any village, town, or city." Thus striking out the word "or", where it appears before the word "city."

The sentence then will read, commencing in line 3:

SEC. 105. (a) As an alternative to voting in accordance with the law of the State of his residence, an absentee voter may appoint as proxy to vote in his behalf in the place where the absentee would be entitled to vote were

he present in person, an American citizen who may be his father, mother, relative, or trusted friend who shall when appointed reside, according to the absentee's best information, in the same village, town, city, or area not included within any village, town, or city, in which the absentee has residence.

Mr. President, I shall briefly repeat, having in mind that some Members of the Senate now present were detained by committee appearances yesterday, a brief résumé of what the pending amendment seeks to do. It would take from the committee amendment the mechanism which the committee has recommended, and would substitute therefor a mechanism which would bring the vote within the State where it is to be cast. It would simply authorize the absentee voter to designate, through power of attorney, to his father, mother, wife, relative, or trusted friend, the authority to vote in behalf of the absentee voter and in accordance with the latter's instructions, precisely as though he were present in person within the appropriate voting precinct of his individual State. A vote so cast would be amenable to, and would have to conform with, all State laws. The individual who would cast the vote would be within the operations of the law-enforcement agencies of the given State.

There would thus be provided, Mr. President, through the proposed amendment, a mechanism which would retain all the general format of the proposal of the committee itself, except as to the manner of voting. In that particular, we would have the very definite advantage, it seems to me, that the Congress would not be superimposing upon the States some form of voting, some method of voting, some interposition, in other words, of Federal law within the State, but, rather, would be simply carrying over all applicable State laws to a manner of voting which is clearly within our prerogative, at least so far as voting for Federal officers may be concerned.

I think every other feature of the proposal has been thoroughly canvassed in the course of the debate during the past many days; and since I have done no more than correlate by adaptation all the amendments which hitherto have been adopted, with the proposal as to mechanism which I have submitted, there is before the Senate, I believe, a complete formula by which we can preserve the integrity of the absentee voter. That, of course, is our prime objective, after all, Mr. President, having in mind that our absentee soldiers, sailors, merchant marines, and others serving in our armed forces who have been included by the definition contained in the Aiken amendment would be protected in every single aspect in their attempt to exercise their franchise.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator for the benefit of the Senators now in the Chamber state the procedure, let us say, when the ballot starts, or when something originates with the war ballot commission, and thence goes to the soldier, and thence from the soldier back to the war ballot commission—in other words, the steps of procedure? Will the Senator describe them briefly?

Mr. DANAHER. I shall be glad to do so. I thank the Senator for the suggestion, and I am happy to comply.

The committee amendment suggests—and I adopt the program—that the commission shall cause to be printed a certain number, which the bill calls an adequate number, of blanks. Those blanks are to be transmitted in inner envelopes and outer envelopes, to all the areas where those entitled to vote under the bill may be found. When the soldier who wishes to vote finds in his hands an instruction sheet with instructions for voting, which, after all, follows in form exactly what the committee itself has recommended, he will find on that form language to this effect: "As an alternative to your reliance upon the absentee voting laws of your State, you may employ this alternative method if you choose: You may designate a person of your choice to vote in your behalf, in the same place where you yourself would be entitled to vote were you present in person for Presidential and Vice Presidential electors, for Senator, if there be a Senate candidate, for Representative at large, if there be a candidate for the office of Representative at large, and for Representative in Congress, and you may designate by party or you may designate by name."

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I rise to ask a question for information. I have not studied the Senator's amendment as carefully as I should, but I have been reading it rather hurriedly trying to ascertain exactly what it provides. First, I wish to know if I am correct when I state that I find that under his amendment no special ballot is provided.

Mr. DANAHER. The ballot is the instruction form, which appears in the amendment.

Mr. HATCH. That in itself is the ballot?

Mr. DANAHER. That is the ballot.

Mr. HATCH. That is one of the points I wished to know.

Mr. DANAHER. That is the ballot.

Mr. HATCH. I read that part of the amendment, and I took that to be an instruction to the proxy to vote a ballot.

Mr. DANAHER. This is what would happen, following through with the suggestion submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]: The soldier would indicate his choice on the instruction sheet, as we presently call it. That instruction sheet would be placed in a so-called inner envelope, upon the outer side of which would be a power of attorney, which would authorize the proxy named to take that particular instruction sheet, which, when voted, becomes a ballot, to the polling place. In other words, it is not really a ballot until it is cast; but when it is cast it becomes a ballot.

Mr. HATCH. Perhaps the language is unfortunate. It is a little confusing. The instructions are:

If you wish to appoint an American citizen, who may be your father, mother, relative, or other trusted friend, to vote in your behalf and in accordance with your instructions, you may direct that such person so appointed write in the name of the candidate of your choice for each office——

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. That is, actually to vote in accordance with his instructions. Or he may direct that such person so appointed write in the name of the candidate of his choice for each office.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. Why does he not do it himself, if this is the ballot?

Mr. DANAHER. I see the Senator's point.

Mr. HATCH. I am merely trying to straighten it out in my own mind. I am not raising any argument as to detail.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator is perfectly correct. I was confused by the Senator's question and my attempt to follow through with the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire at the same time. Perhaps my single-track mind should have taken the questions one at a time. Then there would have been no confusion. I understand what the Senator has in mind.

The soldier will designate, through his instructions, the way he wants his ballot to be cast. The inner envelope will contain the sealed instructions. The proxy will present the instructions in due course. There is another step, of course. The outer envelope will include the inner envelope. The outer envelope will be addressed to the secretary of state, just as the committee amendment suggests. The secretary of state will open the outer enevelope. He will tabulate the number of such envelopes received, and keep an account of them. He will thereupon, having opened the outer envelope, discern the name and address of the proxy named, because it will be on the outside of the inner envelope. At an appropriate time, before the election, he will send the inner envelope to the proxy designated.

On election day the proxy named will present himself at the appropriate voting precinct and say, "I am authorized to vote for an absentee"—naming him—and he will present the unopened envelope, with the power of attorney duly sworn to, to the moderator or other official, and the moderator or other official will say, "That is valid on its face"—as the committee amendment suggests. "You are hereby permitted to vote in behalf of the absentee," whose name will be entered on the list with the word "absentee" after it, "by So-and-So, proxy." Whereupon the individual being permitted to vote in behalf of the absentee will open his instruction sheet and find out what the soldier wishes to have done, and he will execute a ballot in accordance with those instructions.

Mr. HATCH. Will he actually write the ballot?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes; and the ballot will be cast in secret, and deposited in the box.

Mr. HATCH. The proxy will actually write in the name of the choice for President, or the name of the party.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct, in accordance with what the soldier himself has demanded in the instructions.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the power of attorney be disclosed to anyone? Will the inspector of elections see or check as to whether or not the proxy votes in accordance with the power of attorney?

Mr. DANAHER. It will not be disclosed. It will be a secret process. The proxy will be sworn to secrecy, and faithfully to execute the demands of his appointer.

Mr. FERGUSON. What would happen if the holder of the proxy, that is, the man who is to do the voting, when he gets the envelope, should open it outside the booth? Would that invalidate the ballot?

Mr. DANAHER. It would. If he did not present an unopened envelope, the ballot would not be valid. He must present himself, with a sealed envelope, to the moderator of the election, and verify his appointment in that respect.

Mr. FERGUSON. But no one can check as to whether or not he votes as he has been authorized to vote.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is where the secrecy enters into it.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes. The soldier himself is the one who deputizes the individual to act in his behalf. I respectfully submit that if the Senator's son were to send such a request to him, with instructions to vote for him in his home city, the Senator would cut off his right hand rather than violate those instructions.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. DANAHER. That is exactly what any American citizen would do.

Mr. FERGUSON. When the man who has the proxy votes, does he use the regular ballot?

Mr. DANAHER. He would use a ballot prepared in the form which the committee recommends.

Mr. FERGUSON. He would not use the State ballot or the municipal ballot?

Mr. DANAHER. He would not use a State ballot. Otherwise he would be likely to vote for State officers, which he has no right to do under the power of attorney. Moreover, the ballots would be placed in a separate absentee voters' ballot box.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has cleared up a point which I was trying to understand. I was asking how the vote was to be cast. The Senator from Connecticut told me that it was to be cast on this instruction sheet.

Mr. DANAHER. I should have said after the manner set forth in the instructions.

Mr. HATCH. But there would be a special form of ballot.

Mr. DANAHER. That is true.

Mr. HATCH. Does the Senator's amendment provide for the same kind of ballot as is provided for by the committee bill?

Mr. DANAHER. That is what I seek to do.

Mr. HATCH. The proxy would take the special ballot, which would be in the form which the committee has recommended, and follow the instructions by writing in the names on the special ballot.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. And the special ballot would be dropped in the ballot box in the local precinct?

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. Let me ask the Senator a further question, which is of some importance. How, and by what authority, are the local election officials to tabulate, tally, and report on the ballots for which no provision is made under their own laws, or under their instructions in the States and local precincts? As I have stated, I have not studied the Senator's amendment. Perhaps he covers it, but I should like to know what the procedure would be in that regard.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. GREEN rose.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan and to the Senator from Rhode Island, both of whom have been on their feet, but first let me ask the Senator from New Mexico if he understands that the bill as recommended by the committee deals with the point raised by his last question. If under the committee amendment the Congress has power to confer upon the officials within the State authority to follow out the plan which the committee recommends, I do no more than say, "All right; if that plan is legal, so is this."

Mr. HATCH. I am not inquiring about the legality. I am trying to ascertain the procedure, the actual process involved, and whether or not it is practical and can be carried out. I am not trying to raise any technical legal points.

Mr. DANAHER. On page 14, line 13, of my amendment, the Senator will find the following provision:

> Votes authorized to be cast under the provisions of this title shall be canvassed, counted, and certified in each State by its proper canvassing boards in the usual manner obtaining in such State.

Insofar, therefore, as we have power to confer upon the officials authority to count the ballot of an absentee soldier under the committee recommendation, I adopt the very same suggestion. If we are to go further and say that the Congress has no power to confer such authority on State officials, that is a very different question. Of course, the Senator from New Mexico will agree with that statement.

Mr. HATCH. Yes; and I have not raised that question. I was merely trying to get at the procedure to be followed.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. There is one provision which has not been made clear to me. Perhaps I have not understood it as I should have. Suppose a soldier, not knowing enough about the local conditions, does not fill out the blanks on his ballot and, trusting his father, says, "I wish, Dad, you would vote this ballot as you think I should like to have you vote it." Would that be legal?

Mr. DANAHER. I should say that any such instructions would be void, and that they do not in fact comprehend instructions. Rather, they transfer discretion from the voter to his attorney in fact, which would not be valid.

Mr. GREEN. I assume that to be the case. In other words, the one who actually cast the ballot could not vote as he saw fit.

Mr. DANAHER. No; I should say that such a thing would be invalid.

Mr. GREEN. I thought the Senator meant the instruction would be invalid. How could the ballot be proved to be invalid? The father would take the ballot in accordance with his son's request and go to the polls. No one would see the contents of the ballot except the father, and he would say, "I want to vote my son's ballot." He might vote as he thought the son would like to have him vote.

Mr. DANAHER. Even though the instruction blank be in fact blank?

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. No such authorization is contemplated, and such an attempted vote would be invalid. If the Senator asks how we are to determine that such a vote in fact is invalid I can answer only in this way: There would be a separate box in which to deposit the absentee voter's ballot, and a separate box in which to deposit his instructions. Both would be retained until the end of the period within which an election contest might be held within the State in question, after which, if there were no contest, all ballots and instructions would be gathered up and burned or otherwise destroyed. If in fact there should be a contest the person who voted could be called upon by order of a competent court of jurisdiction to testify under oath. In that way the instructions would be apparent.

Mr. GREEN. But if, as in most cases, there should be no contest, there would be nothing to prevent a father from voting as he thought his son wished him to vote the blank ballot which the son had enclosed in the envelope, and no one would question him.

Mr. DANAHER. I think that is true.

Mr. GREEN. If that is true with respect to voting by the father, it is also true with respect to a trusted friend, is it not?

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

Mr. GREEN. The proxy might be a real trusted friend or he might be a local political chieftain of a ward or a district, who might gather the names and addresses of all the good men in his political party, in his district, and send them letters saying, "Please send me your blank ballots as your trusted

friend"; and the men, not knowing much about it, or being under obligation to the local chieftain, be he Democrat or Republican, or affiliated with some other political party, would send in their ballots. Under such circumstances, what is there to prevent the local political boss walking around before election with perhaps hundreds of blank ballots in his pocket to vote as he sees fit? Under such circumstances, what deals could he not make? Any man who can vote 200 votes instead of 1 vote, as under the present law, would have a tremendous advantage. It is quite obvious that the situation would be open to all sorts of corruption. For that reason, I think, many States which once had provisions for voting by proxy have, in the interest of the secrecy of the ballot, done away with such provisions. Connecticut once had a provision for voting by proxy, but, like most other States, did away with it and has now reestablished it as a renewed experiment. But why the Federal Government should run such risks, why it should abolish the secrecy of the ballot and make possible bargaining for votes, as undoubtedly would be the case, I cannot understand. I should like to have the Senator from Connecticut explain it, if he will kindly do so.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have proceeded on the theory that the absentee soldier who wishes to vote will, of course, wish to have his vote designated and counted. Therefore, he will, of course, fill out the blanks which will execute his will. If in fact there are soldiers who would do as the Senator from Rhode Island has suggested, I grant to the Senator that the proposed mechanism would not take care of that type of case if, in fact, a violation should occur.

It was suggested yesterday that there could be a limit imposed on the number of proxies which could be cast by any given attorney-in-fact. Personally I do not see any merit to that particular suggestion. If, indeed, the degree of corruption to which the Senator from Rhode Island draws attention exists anywhere the same type of political leader could have five ballots allocated to each of 20 henchmen, but to my mind that is beside the point.

Mr. GREEN. It seems to me that the same risk would be involved because an additional person is introduced into the chain. Under the committee amendment the soldier would cast his vote in camp. It would be sealed in two envelopes and sent unopened by the officer to the war ballot commission in Washington. Still sealed in two envelopes, it would be transmitted unopened by the war ballot commission to the secretary of state of the State.

Mr. DANAHER. So far the two plans are identical.

Mr. GREEN. That is correct. Then, instead of the secretary of state sending it directly to the man in charge of the election booth on election day, to be opened in the presence of representatives of both parties, and cast as the soldier made it out, it would be sent to a third person, a trusted friend, and on election day the trusted friend would take it to the polling place. I do not see anything to be gained by that procedure if the trusted friend should carry out the soldier's instructions. I think the procedure is open to many objections such as I have indicated.

Mr. DANAHER. There is a difference. The Senator is incorrect in stating that there would be one additional step. The same number of persons and the same number of steps would be involved, but with this essential difference: The ballot of the soldier would not fall into the hands of some anonymous "appropriate official" as under the language of the committee amendment, but the ballot would come into the hands of the mother, father, wife, or trusted friend, and if the soldier's confidence were abused at any time it would, of course, be a betrayal of the soldier himself. I do not believe that under such circumstances a person so appointed as attorney in fact by an absentee soldier would betray such a trust.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, there is one additional requirement in the Senator's proposal—namely, that the person holding the instructions from the soldier at the front must take an oath.

Mr. DANAHER. That is true.

Mr. LUCAS. He must take the oath in the election precinct where the proxy is voted.

Mr. DANAHER. And keep his instructions secret unless there is a court order to disclose them.

Mr. LUCAS. The instructions which are sent to the proxy are placed in a separate ballot box of some kind, sealed up, and kept for a certain length of time thereafter. Thus there would be involved additional steps which would entail additional work and labor on the local precinct officials.

Furthermore, the ballot commission—and I am glad the Senator and I understand each other on this point, because we did not in yesterday's colloquy—in addition to sending ballots to every camp in the United States and to every camp in foreign lands, would also be required to send sample ballots, similar to those which were sent across the sea, to all election officials in the United States. They would have to have a sufficient number on hand so that, when the proxy came in, they could give him a copy of the ballot, and he could take it into the booth with him. The Senator and I have agreed upon that.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with my colleague from Rhode Island that the amendment would open the door to wholesale fraud and corruption in connection with elections. I say with all deference to my very able friend from Connecticut, that there would not be any advantage whatever in his amendment; in fact, there would be a tremendous disadvantage, as I view it. Assuming 6,000,000 soldiers vote in the election, at least 6,000,000 people other than the soldiers will know how they voted providing they carry out the trust.

Mr. DANAHER. That is true.

Mr. LUCAS. If that would not involve a violation of the secrecy of the ballot, which is the very heart of suffrage in this country, then I cannot understand what would. We openly say that we are going to violate the secrecy of the ballot and commend it, so to speak.

The Senator has spoken about election officials who are going to handle the ballots and has indicated that there may be something wrong with the method provided by the bill. It is the only tried and proved method in at least 46 of the 48 States with respect to the casting of absentee ballots. In other words, no one but the soldier himself, under the bill, will know how he voted unless there is chicanery and corruption of some kind around the ballot box.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I ask a question of the two Senators, if I do not interrupt them?

Mr. LUCAS. It is perfectly all right with me, sir.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand the effect of the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, separate ballots will be sent to every soldier and sailor, and so forth, and instead of the names of candidates of the political parties there will be a blank, just as is now provided in the committee bill. Instead of trusting the soldier or sailor or other serviceman to stamp the ballot himself, he makes out an affidavit in which he designates somebody, either father or mother or friend—it may be anybody he happens to think of at the time—and sends the ballot back. Then the trusted friend takes it, and any other ballots which he may have accumulated in the same process, whether fifty or a hundred, and goes into the booth with the ballot, which we have not trusted the soldier himself to vote, but trusted him to designate somebody else by power of attorney to vote. If the friend has more than 1 ballot when he goes into the booth he knows how each of the absentee voters votes. If he happens to have 50 ballots he knows how each 1 of the 50 votes. He remains in the booth, I suppose, until he has stamped all those 50 ballots, or, if he does not do that, he comes out after stamping 1 and deposits it in the ballot box, as if the soldier were there and personally voting. I do not know how that would work. If he had 50, I presume he would go into the booth with all of them and would stamp the ballots, not according to any instructions of the soldiers as to how he should cast them, but according to his own notion of how he thinks the soldiers ought to vote. Is not that true?

Mr. LUCAS. No.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the affidavit tell him how to vote?

Mr. DANAHER. No; the instructions are on the inside, and the affidavit is on the outside of the envelope.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not want to use an offensive word, but it seems to me to be ludicrous to send a ballot to a soldier,

require him to make an affidavit, which is on the envelope or outside the ballot somewhere, require him to issue to his trusted friend instructions as to how he shall vote the ballot when it reaches him, but not trust the soldier himself to stamp the ballot and seal it. If anyone was so minded to violate the soldier's instructions and to vote for a different party or different candidate than the instructions indicated, nobody would ever know it, unless later there was a contested election. In the case of a United States Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, the contest would have to be decided by the House of Congress affected, and not by a court. If it affected the Senate of the United States, the Senate would have to determine the contest, after examining all the ballots, and all the affidavits, and all the instructions, to ascertain whether the soldiers' trusted friends had carried out the instructions the soldiers had intended.

Mr. DANAHER. In order to see if we understand each other, would it meet the Senator's point if the soldier, in fact, should cast the ballot, that is to say, prepare the ballot?

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no point in amending the bill by the Senator's amendment, because the soldier casts his ballot personally under the bill reported by the Senate committee, which we have before us now. I do not think the Senator could doctor up his amendment so that it would meet my objection to it.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President——

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH. I have listened to the discussion of the amendment proposing voting by proxies and going through all that process. Why not let the States send a list and a ticket, have them distributed to the qualified voters, and let the soldier vote and seal his vote and have it transmitted back to his State? Then his name would be on the register of his local community or voting precinct; his vote would be counted, and there would be no trouble about it. Why send the ballots to the soldier? Why is it proposed to provide cumbersome machinery, when it is just as easy to send the list of absentee votes to the several States? Let the soldier execute his vote, seal it, put it in an envelope, and transmit it to the proper authorities, and then use our airplanes to get it here in time to be counted, so that those who are so anxious to vote may do so.

It seems to me it would be just as simple as could be to print the votes in the several States, with instructions in accordance with State laws, and have them distributed to the soldiers. There will be a vote for President, Vice President, Senators, and Members of the House of Representatives. It seems to me that if we wanted to include a whole State ticket in, that would be all right. Let the soldier vote it, put it in the envelope, and then send it to the proper distributing authorities.

Mr. DANAHER. I undertake to answer the Senator from South Carolina by saying that we have no power whatever to permit absentee voting for anyone on a State ticket. We have not any authority to pass any such act, and the Committee on Privileges and Elections, recognizing that, very properly has brought in a measure which comprehends only voting for Federal officers.

Mr. SMITH. Does the Senator from Connecticut stand here and tell me this body has not the power to do anything it desires to do, even to violate the Constitution? I am surprised at the Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. DANAHER. Knowing the views of the Senator from South Carolina in that respect—for he has adverted to them once or twice before, as I recall——

Mr. SMITH. I need not do so in the presence of this august body. [Laughter.]

Mr. DANAHER. The fact remains that it is not as simple as the Senator from South Carolina would make it out to be. We have no authority whatever to create a mechanism by which absentee voters may vote for members of a State government.

Mr. SMITH. I merely put that in as incidental; it is not necessary. Let us get back to the Senator's construction of the Constitution, that the soldiers will vote for President—which seems to be the object of all this furor, as to who is going to get the greatest number—they will vote for President, Senators, and Members of the House of Representatives. A Senator sitting nearby suggests that I left out the Vice President. I am sorry I did, for his is a very great office.

I am serious about this, Mr. President. A State could print its ballot, restricting the voting to the number of candidates it would be constitutional to vote for, and send the ballot to the voter. He could vote the ticket, whatever ticket there was. There would be tickets of all the parties. He would select the ticket of his choice and put the ballot in the envelope, seal it, and send it to the distributing body, who would send it to his State. That ballot from the soldier who voted it would be opened and deposited.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator permit me to point out to him that in 1942 Congress passed Public Law 712? The President of the United States approved it on September 16, 1942, and it became law. We therefore have already adopted an absentee voters' mechanism which is applicable to voting for Presidential electors, and for Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SMITH. Why should we be amending that.

Mr. DANAHER. Why we are not perfecting that particular act, instead of substituting a completely new mechanism, I do not understand.

I may say to the Senator from South Carolina, further, that if we should do no more than take title II of the bill as reported by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and impose on the Army and Navy the duty of carrying the ballots we provided for in Public Law 712 to and from the affected areas, we would then bring everything back within the laws of the several States. That much we could do. It seems to me that much would protect the rights of those in the armed forces. But when I found that the situation was as presented by the pending bill reported by the committee, it seemed to me that it was in the interest of preserving the integrity of States' rights in this situation that we cause each ballot to be cast within the State, in accordance with its laws. I therefore have sought to develop a mechanism which will make that possible. I am answering the Senator's question as to why it was done. There is no other way by which we can bring the individual voting within the purview of the State legislation than to have someone present and voting. That is all there is to it. That was the only reason for all the effort, so far as I personally have been concerned.

Mr. SMITH. Does the Senator pretend to say that a sovereign State cannot print its ticket, and its rules and regulations, and transmit them as the pending bill devises, send them and have them distributed in the different camps, to the soldiers named from the State, residents of the State, so that they may have opportunity to vote the ticket of their own State?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I think perhaps I can contribute to a reply to the Senator's question. In the first place, the Army does not know where all the soldiers from a certain State may be stationed. As I recall the number, there are 10,000 changes of stations a day in the Army, and if the State officials do not know the serial numbers of the soldiers—and of course they could not possibly know them—it would be a major operation for the Army to determine where the individual State quotas were scattered around. Moreover, the State ballots are all of different sizes, they are printed on paper of much greater thickness than the proposed Federal ballot would be; they come out at different times, thereby eliminating the bulk carriage at a simultaneous time of all the ballots, and because they come out at different times, far greater organizing efforts on the part of the Army would be required, thereby taking a much larger number of officers and men away from military duties in order to carry out the procedure. It is a practical question of air transportation and organization.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SMITH. The pending bill is the beginning of the end of States' rights—you know it, Mr. President, I know it, and we all know it; that is the whole story. I am trying to preserve the owners of America, namely, the 48 States. We must not forget that the people elected us to this body, and it is now proposed that we set up the machinery

which will control the electorate. This is the beginning of it.

Mr. DANAHER. Does not the Senator recognize that what I have been trying to do is to bring the election back under the laws of the States?

Mr. SMITH. I do recognize that, but I think the method proposed is impractical.

Mr. DANAHER. I can answer the Senator's comment as to impracticality merely by saying that in my State we do substantially what is proposed, and it works.

Mr. SMITH. But all States are not so virtuous as is the Senator's State. [Laughter.]

Mr. DANAHER. I know that; they have already demonstrated that. That is why I am here.

Mr. SMITH. Every now and then they exercise poor judgment; but proceed.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me point out to the Senator that this language appears in the committee bill:

In time of war, notwithstanding any provision of State law——

Mr. SMITH. Oh, that is i the bill, but it is not going to pass.

Mr. DANAHER. But the Senator must recognize that when we have a bill here from a committee, we have to deal with it.

Mr. SMITH. I am going to deal with it, and vote against it, and I hope every other Senator will do likewise. Does the Senator pretend to read a bill here which might be adverse to everything that every Senator loves, and because some committee is fool enough to report it, contend that we have to consider it and be governed accordingly?

Mr. DANAHER. No; but I know very well that when we have such a bill, the Senate must deal with it, and I respectfully suggest to the Senator from South Carolina that under the mechanism I propose we would be able to deal with it.

Mr. SMITH. I hope we will deal with it properly when the appropriate time comes. All I am asking is that every State print its ballots and the rules and regulations of the State governing elections, and send them to the distributing center. The Senator from Massachusetts says it will take a great deal of organization. It looks as if it is taking a great deal of organization to provide for the ballot commission.

It is as simple as can be if we will forget politics and get down to the basis of things. It is simply a matter of printing the ballots, printing the instructions, and sending them to the citizens of the States who are absent. If the Army does not know where they are, then they are in a devil of a fix. The idea of saying that they are shifted about and that the Army does not know where they are. The names of all these men are recorded and the Army knows where they are, or it ought to know.

Mr. President, the matter before us now has developed into a most serious question.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from South Carolina that if we took the law we passed last year, Public, No. 712, and adapted it to the situation which the Senator from Massachusetts explained, we would have all that we need. But that is not what the committee is presenting to us.

Mr. SMITH. I have made a proposal to amend the law of 1942. I know that being in the dog house, Senators do not care to read my proposals, but I have written one, and I am going to ask for a vote on it. Under the act of 1942, it is a simple thing for each State, according to its voting list, to print the ballots and print the instructions, and send them to the proper distributing center, and have the soldier vote on the enclosed ballot for whatever ticket he seets fit. The ballot can then be enclosed in an envelope and sent to the distributing center to be sent back to his State. I should like to know what objection there could possibly be to that suggestion. I feel that the suggestion is better than the proposal that we provide for proxies to cast the votes. If I were to get hold of some proxies I think I should vote them right—yes; I would vote them according to my notion.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, title II of the pending bill provides that the commission shall print certain postal cards and follow out, as I recall—and I am speaking from memory, as I do not have the bill at hand—follow out insofar as it can the mechanism of the election laws of the several States, wherever methods of absentee voting have in fact been provided by the several States. Am I correct in my statement, I will ask the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. LUCAS. It provides an alternative method of voting. In other words, there will be millions of men in the United States who probably could comply with the absentee ballot laws of their own respective States, and wherever that is possible we are urging the men who are in the United States to take advantage of the absentee ballot laws which are provided by their States, and vote for every candidate from President down to sheriff.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I think there is an exception. It varies from title I of the bill. In title I the Senator from Illinois will remember there appears this section on priorities:

PRIORITIES

SEC. 111. The Secretaries of War and Navy and other appropriate authorities shall take all steps necessary to give to the transmission and delivery of ballots and communications under this title priority over all unofficial communications and priority over official communications except where, in the judgment of the appropriate military and naval authorities, such priority would interfere with the effective prosecution of the war. Ballots cast outside the United States, shall, wherever practicable to expedite their delivery, be transmitted by air.

That provision does not appear in title II, does it?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Connecticut is correct, and the question of airplane priority is one of the important features of the bill, so far as making it effective is concerned. The committee provided for such priority. However, the Senator knows that the secretaries of state are authorized under existing law to send out the ballots. In the bill we substitute the commission for the secretaries of state. Many constitutional questions have been raised here. I take it that this change is of no constitutional significance.

Here is something about the question of constitutionality, if I may say a word about it while I am on my feet. In the substitute for basic law, there is nothing that we did not do 1 year ago, and only five Senators voted against the law as it exists at the present time. The Senate and the House passed the bill, and the President of the United States signed the bill, and there is not a single thing in the pending measure which was not in reality passed upon a year ago by the Congress.

Mr. DANAHER. That is what I was telling the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] a few minutes ago.

Mr. LUCAS. This question was debated in the House and in the Senate. The poll tax feature and the registration feature were debated by eminent lawyers on both sides. Nevertheless, the result was that we passed the law, and there were only five United States Senators who voted against it. We passed that measure in a day and a half. Now we have been almost 2 weeks arguing over the same basic principle, and the only thing we are trying to do is to make the basic law effective so that the soldier will have an opportunity to vote. That is the only thing that is in this bill. We are merely extending and expanding what is already basic law.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois will also agree, I am sure, that even were the pending bill to be defeated, there would still remain on the Federal statute books a mechanism, whether adequate or not, but a mechanism by which absentees could vote.

Mr. SMITH. And is not that mechanism better than that which is now proposed?

Mr. DANAHER. Perhaps the Senator from Illinois will not agree with the Senator from South Carolina. He will agree with me.

Mr. LUCAS. Everyone who is interested in the proposed legislation knows that the present law is totally ineffective to permit the man overseas to vote. Not a single man outside the continental limits of the United States will vote under existing law. But we believe that if the proposed amendments to the law are adopted probably 80 percent of the soldiers outside the continental limits of the United States will vote.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, there being such a vast audience present at this moment [laughter], I shall resume what I have to say at a later time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I invite the distinguished Senator's attention to page 11, at line 16, of the Senator's amendment, to the following language:

The commission, upon receiving any outer envelope as hereinbefore described, shall promptly transmit it to the secretary of state of the State of the absentee voter's residence.

I should like to inquire if it is not true that the proxy that is sent by the soldier would be sent free?

Mr. DANAHER. Oh, yes.

Mr. LANGER. Would the inner envelope be sent free, or would it not?

Mr. DANAHER. I presume it would be sent free.

Mr. LANGER. The language does not so provide.

Mr. DANAHER. The language which the Senator read is contained in an amendment which is proposed as an amendment to the committee's bill, and the committee's bill makes provision for that.

Mr. LANGER. It does?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes. The committee's bill even prescribes that matter carried by air mail shall be carried free.

Mr. LUCAS. And shall have priority unless it militates against military operations.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to be certain that the envelope which is placed within the outer envelope shall also be sent free to the local precincts, because some secretaries of state may not have sufficient funds to pay for mailing them.

Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Connecticut another question, if I may. I should like to have the Senator tell me whether or not, in view of the act passed last year, against which only five Senators voted, any provision is made with respect to educational requirements by the Southern States?

Mr. DANAHER. I will answer the Senator by saying that we do not do anything about those States. All we do is to take the States as we find them, with the law we now have. That is true of the committee's bill, and it is true of the amendment I am suggesting. We do not do one single thing in that respect. If the Senator will turn to the committee bill——

Mr. LUCAS. We merely repeat the poll tax and registration requirements.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes. On page 19 of the committee bill, line 23, the Senator will find this language:

(b) In time of war, notwithstanding any provision of State law relating to the registration of qualified voters, every individual specified in subsection (c) who is absent from the place of his voting residence but otherwise eligible to register and qualified to vote in any election—

And so forth—

shall be entitled to vote for such officers in accordance with the provisions of this title.

So that the bill would do no more than leave them where it found them.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a further inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I agree with what the Senator has said, but I call his attention to the letter which was read 3 days ago, I believe, by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], in which it was said that in addition to the State law relating to the registration of qualified voters, there are also educational qualifications, which are not referred to in the original bill.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. I wanted to obtain the Senator's opinion, if I might have it, as to whether, even though the educational qualifications were not specified, nevertheless, the men could vote.

Mr. DANAHER. I will answer the Senator in this way: On page 31 of the committee bill, line 2, we find the following language:

SEC. 114. (a) Votes cast under the provisions of this title shall be canvassed, counted, and certified in each State by its proper canvassing boards in the same manner, as nearly as may be practicable, as the votes cast within its borders are canvassed, counted, and certified.

I assume that if a vote is to be canvassed, it must have been validly cast insofar as the laws of the State are concerned. If it has been validly cast, it must have been cast in accordance with the provision I earlier read, by a soldier who is otherwise eligible to register, and qualified to vote, except for the fact that he is absent in the armed services. That is what I assume that provision to mean.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DANAHER. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. I think the Senator understands that I am very sympathetic to the purpose of the amendment, and would favor it. I simply want to have the Senator's idea as to whether, in view of the letter read by the Senator from Mississippi, any educational requirements would be applied to the man who made out the proxy.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I should say that the answer would have to be in the negative. I know we went all through this matter last year when we passed Public Law No. 712. In fact, all the debate turned on that sort of thing, as I recall it, and that is why we adopted the language which the committee itself, as I read the bill, has simply translated verbatim from Public Law No. 712 into this bill. Is not that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield for that purpose?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes; I yield for whatever purpose any Senator wishes to have me yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bone	Capper
Andrews	Bridges	Caraway
Austin	Brooks	Chandler
Bailey	Buck	Chavez
Bankhead	Burton	Clark, Idaho
Barkley	Butler	Clark, Mo.
Bilbo	Byrd	Danaher
Davis	McKellar	Taft
Eastland	Maloney	Thomas, Idaho
Ellender	Maybank	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	Mead	Tobey
Gerry	Millikin	Truman
Gillette	Moore	Tunnell
Green	Murray	Tydings
Guffey	Nye	Vandenberg
Hatch	O'Daniel	Van Nuys
Hawkes	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Hayden	Overton	Wallgren
Hill	Pepper	Walsh, Mass.
Holman	Radcliffe	Walsh, N. J.
Johnson, Colo.	Reed	Wheeler
Kilgore	Revercomb	Wherry
Langer	Robertson	White
Lodge	Russell	Wiley
Lucas	Scrugham	Willis
McCarran	Shipstead	Wilson
McClellan	Smith	
McFarland	Stewart	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut a question.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. DANAHER. I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought the Senator had concluded.

Mr. DANAHER. No. The Senator from Rhode Island said he wished to ask me a question. I wish to answer it, and then I shall yield the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall wait until the question is asked and answered.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, several times during the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut he has made statements to the effect that the proposal in his amendment is either identical, or identical in principle, with the law of the State of Connecticut which he stated had proved effective and free from objection. Therefore he contended that the proposed plan should prove equally effective and free from objection when applied to voting by absentee soldiers.

I have taken the pains to look into the Connecticut law, and I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut whether what I am about to state is a fair summary of it?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, before the Senator asks me the question, let it be made perfectly clear that at no time have I said that this proposal is identical with the Connecticut law. I have not even suggested it.

Mr. GREEN. Or identical in principle.

Mr. DANAHER. I asserted that the principle of having an absentee name a proxy within a State who will be an individual within the State and subject to its jurisdiction is in the law. That is now the law.

I shall be happy to answer the Senator's question, or try to do so.

Mr. GREEN. As I understand, this is the procedure under the Connecticut law:

The absentee voter applies, through his town clerk, for a blank form of affidavit and voting instructions, not more than 3 months before election day. The voter fills out the voting instructions and affidavit and mails them to the town clerk. They must be received by the

town clerk not later than 3 days prior to election day. The town clerk delivers the unopened envelope to the presiding moderator of elections. The moderator appoints two electors, who are members of different political parties, to cast the votes of all absentee voters. If there are a considerable number of absentee ballots cast, he appoints as many groups of two as may be necessary to handle the ballots.

These electors swear to carry out the instructions and not to disclose how the vote is made. The electors cast the ballots.

If that is a correct summary of the procedure, the votes are not cast by proxies chosen by the voters, but they are cast by a very small number of electors who are chosen by the moderator. In other words, a soldier cannot appoint his father, mother, sister, brother, uncle, aunt, or trusted friend, or anyone else to do it. It is done by an appointed official of the town or the State, who has entire charge of the whole proceeding. Is not that correct?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. If that is correct, it seems to me that the provisions of the committee amendment are much more like the Connecticut law than are the provisions of the amendment which the Senator from Connecticut is now proposing.

Mr. DANAHER. If it seems that way to the Senator, very well.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think it is the general feeling among Members of the Senate that the debate on this bill ought to be brought to a speedy conclusion, and that the bill should be disposed of. I wish to state that if that can be done today, it is my purpose to move that the Senate take a recess until next Tuesday. If we cannot dispose of the bill today, it will be necessary to hold a session tomorrow in order to try to conclude consideration of the bill.

With that in view, I ask unanimous consent that during the further consideration of the bill no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 15 minutes on the bill or on any amendment thereto or on any motion in connection therewith.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I share with the Senator his desire to obtain action on the bill. I think there is no disposition on the part of any Senator to delay action on the bill; but I wonder if the Senator, in making his request for a limitation of debate, would provide that in the event an amendment of any kind dealing with the poll tax should be offered the limitation would not apply.

Mr. BARKLEY. As the Senator knows, the bill contains a provision dealing with the nonpayment of poll tax by servicemen as a requirement for voting in Federal elections. I appreciate the fact that the general subject of poll taxes ought not to be complicated with the pending legislation. I have no idea that any Senator would offer such an amendment. I have a feeling that no Senator would do so; but if such an amendment were offered, it would extend the question beyond the present provisions of the bill. I am willing to include in my unanimous-consent request the proviso that if an amendment dealing with the poll-tax situation generally is offered the unanimous-consent agreement shall become void.

Mr. HILL. The Senator will include that in his request?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I include that in my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. As the Senator observes, at the moment the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], who is the acting minority leader, is absent from the Chamber. Will the Senator from Kentucky state whether he has discussed the agreement with the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not only discussed it with him but he, as well as the Senator from Michigan on the Republican side, and Senators on the Democratic side, have been urging me to seek an agreement for limitation of debate.

Mr. BURTON. That is in accordance with my understanding. I merely wanted to make it clear on the record that the matter has been discussed with the Senator from Maine and, so far as I am concerned, it is entirely agreeable.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. May I inquire if it is the Senator's expectation and his hope that the consideration of the pending measure will be completed today?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; it is.

Mr. TOBEY. Amen.

Mr. HILL. With the understanding as to the modification of the Senator's request excluding any amendment dealing with the poll tax, or any proposal involving the poll tax, I certainly have no objection to the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], as modified.

Mr. DANAHER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Brooks	Clark, Idaho
Andrews	Buck	Clark, Mo.
Austin	Burton	Danaher
Bailey	Butler	Davis
Bankhead	Byrd	Eastland
Barkley	Capper	Ellender
Bilbo	Caraway	Ferguson
Bone	Chandler	Gerry
Bridges	Chavez	Gillette
Green	Millikin	Thomas, Utah
Guffey	Moore	Tobey
Hatch	Murray	Truman
Hawkes	Nye	Tunnell
Hayden	O'Daniel	Tydings
Hill	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Holman	Overton	Van Nuys
Johnson, Colo.	Pepper	Wagner
Kilgore	Radcliffe	Wallgren
Langer	Reed	Walsh, Mass.
Lodge	Revercomb	Walsh, N. J.
Lucas	Robertson	Wheeler
McCarran	Russell	Wherry
McClellan	Scrugham	White
McFarland	Shipstead	Wiley
McKellar	Smith	Willis
Maloney	Stewart	Wilson
Maybank	Taft	
Mead	Thomas, Idaho	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is detained in one of the Government departments on business pertaining to his State.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is confined to his home with a cold.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], who is absent because of a death in his family, has a pair on this question with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. If present the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea," and I am advised that the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent because of illness. If present he would vote "yea." He is paired on this question with the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] who I am advised would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—30

Bridges	Capper	Holman
Brooks	Danaher	Johnson, Colo.
Buck	Davis	Langer
Burton	Ferguson	Moore
Butler	Hawkes	Nye

O'Daniel	Shipstead	Wherry
Reed	Taft	White
Revercomb	Thomas, Idaho	Wiley
Robertson	Tobey	Willis
Russell	Vandenberg	Wilson

NAYS—50

Aiken	Green	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Guffey	Pepper
Austin	Hatch	Radcliffe
Bailey	Hayden	Scrugham
Bankhead	Hill	Smith
Barkley	Kilgore	Stewart
Bilbo	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Lucas	Truman
Caraway	McCarran	Tunnell
Chandler	McClellan	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wallgren
Eastland	Maybank	Walsh, Mass.
Ellender	Mead	Walsh, N. J.
Gerry	Millikin	Wheeler
Gillette	Murray	

NOT VOTING—16

Ball	George	Murdock
Bone	Glass	Overton
Brewster	Gurney	Reynolds
Bushfield	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	La Follette	
Downey	McNary	

So Mr. DANAHER'S amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], who is necessarily absent, I offer four amendments to the pending bill, and ask that they be read by the clerk. I move the adoption of the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma on behalf of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the Senator offer them one at a time.

Mr. MOORE. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma on behalf of the Senator from South Dakota.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, line 2, it is proposed to strike out the words "other Federal departments and agencies" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War."

On page 18, lines 3, 4, and 5, to strike out the words "The Commission may delegate such powers or duties conferred upon it under this act as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of this act."

On page 18, line 8, to strike out the words "and the other agencies and officials charged with the performance of duties under this act."

On page 24, line 25, subdivision (b), after the word "commissioned", to strike out the comma and the words "noncommissioned, or petty officer not below the rank of sergeant" and insert in lieu thereof the word "officer" following the word "commissioned."

On page 25, commencing on line 2, to strike out the words "and any other person designated for this purpose by the Commission."

On page 29, lines 7 and 8, to strike out the words "and other appropriate authorities."

On page 30, lines 9 and 10, to strike out the words "and the heads of other agencies designated to administer this act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). There are several different amendments in the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma on behalf of the Senator from South Dakota. If there is no objection, they may be considered en bloc.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I must object to that, because I do not believe they should be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the consideration of the several amendments en bloc.

Mr. MOORE. Very well, Mr. President. I am presenting the amendments in the interest of the Senator from South Dakota, and I think their purpose is self-evident.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, line 2, it is proposed to strike out the words "other Federal departments and agencies" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the purpose of the amendment is to commit the administration of the act exclusively to commissioned officers of the Army and Navy.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I think that if we strike out the language suggested by the Senator from Oklahoma we take powers away from the commission in the administration of the act which it really should have. We have all agreed that the ballot commission is to be purely an administrative agency, and the ballot commission may have to go to other agencies for assistance in carrying out the purposes of the act. The provision was inserted for this purpose, primarily: When the ballots are returned from the Southwest Pacific, in the event the bill shall become a law, it was the thought by the committee that there should probably be established a headquarters in San Francisco in order that the ballot commission could at that point take care of the ballots as they came in, without having to transport them all the way across the continent. That, and nothing else, is the real purpose of the provision in the bill.

Mr. MOORE. I should say that in the administration of the law the Army and Navy would be bound to administer it in places convenient to the voters. It seems to me that there should not be any objection to limiting the administration of the law to the Army and Navy. When it comes to delegating that power, the commission might conceivably delegate it to someone in whom we would not have the greatest confidence. When we say "any commissioned officer of the Army and Navy," we afford a pretty wide field from which to select. I cannot see why there should be any objection to that.

Mr. LUCAS. What the Senator is now attempting to do is further to shear the ballot commission of responsibility in the administration of the act in the United States of America. We place all the responsibility upon the Army and the Navy, insofar as carrying out the purposes of the act in the Army camps are concerned, but when the ballots are returned, the commission will have a duty to perform. In view of the way the commission is to be selected under the bill, I cannot see why the Senator should have any fears about the ballot commission.

Mr. MOORE. I am not expressing any opinion about the reliability of the ballot commission, but I am expressing concern about the general power to delegate the authority for the administration of the law to anyone who may be named.

Mr. LUCAS. All we are attempting to do is to keep the ballots from going all the way from San Francisco to Washington.

Mr. MOORE. Why would that be necessary?

Mr. LUCAS. Because under the bill as it is at present the ballot commission would be set up in Washington, D. C., which would be its headquarters, and every ballot that came from overseas would have to go to the ballot commission in the first instance; the ballot commission would segregate them and send them on to the secretaries of state. The thought was that the commission could save probably 2 or 3 days by having headquarters on the west coast, and the bill merely provides that the commission may delegate its powers to a subordinate group on the west coast to carry out the functions of the ballot commission. That is all there is to the provision, and I hope the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma will not prevail.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to ask the Senator from Illinois a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair suggest to the Senator from Oklahoma that the Senate is operating under a time limit, and he has only 15 minutes on the amendment.

Mr. MOORE. I yield the floor, then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I desire to suggest to the Senator from Illinois that possibly he might accept the second of the amendments, on page 18, lines 3, 4, and 5, to strike out the words, "The commission may delegate such powers or duties conferred upon it under this act as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of this act." It seems to me that is a broad clause which should not be in any law. If we give powers and duties to anybody it seems to me we should not provide that they may delegate them to any other body in the Government. It seems to me the other amendments are now more or less unimportant, but I suggest that I think the Senator from Illinois himself would feel the provision for delegation is too broad for any law. I think if the Senator will accept an amendment leaving the commission free to receive the assistance of other departments, as provided in the previous sentence, leaving the rest as it is, but

cutting out this provision for delegating any powers and duties under the law, perhaps the Senator from Oklahoma will withdraw the other amendments.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the able Senator from Ohio whether he believes that if the language suggested were deleted from the bill the ballot commission would still have the power to set up in San Francisco a suboffice to handle the situation as I explained it.

Mr. TAFT. I think so, without any question whatever.

Mr. LUCAS. With that assurance, I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Oklahoma says that is satisfactory, so that if the Senator will accept the amendment striking out the one sentence I have read, I understand the other amendments on the first sheet will be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment before the Senate at this time is the first amendment. Objection was made to the amendments being considered en bloc.

Mr. MOORE. What the Senator from Ohio suggests is satisfactory to me.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator from Oklahoma will withdraw the first amendment and offer the second, I think it will be accepted.

Mr. MOORE. I take that course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma withdraws the first amendment, and now offers the second amendment. The question is on the second amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, lines 3, 4, and 5, it is proposed to strike out the words, "The commission may delegate such powers and duties conferred upon it under this act as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the next amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, line 8——

Mr. TAFT. The rest of the amendments are withdrawn.

Mr. MOORE. Now, Mr. President, I wish to offer another amendment on behalf of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are all the rest of the amendments withdrawn?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have been trying to ascertain what the situation is. I understood that if the amendment which has just been acted upon prevailed, the other amendments offered by the Senator from Oklahoma were to be withdrawn.

Mr. TAFT. Only those on the sheet marked "A," which contains some seven amendments. The Senator is now offering an amendment on sheet "B."

Mr. WHITE. The amendments heretofore offered are now being withdrawn. Am I right about that?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Except the one which has been accepted.

Mr. WHITE. Except the one already accepted?

Mr. MOORE. Yes; that is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment now offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] on behalf of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD].

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 19, line 9, following the words "United States," it is proposed to insert the words "outside the territorial limits of the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, inasmuch as I offered the amendment on behalf of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] I presume I should discuss it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MOORE. I will yield to the Senator from Ohio to discuss the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. The amendment is probably the most important amendment that has been before the Senate in connection with the pending measure. In brief it proposes that the Federal ballot be sent to the soldiers outside the United States but that the soldiers within the United States be held to the regular absent voters' balloting of the several States. In other words, it makes a division between them. It is based on the theory that constitutionally certainly the whole theory of a Federal ballot for Presidential electors is of very doubtful validity. The argument made for going beyond the express terms of the Constitution is that it is necessary for these men to have the vote. That argument has some force as applied to soldiers outside the United States, but it has no force as to soldiers inside the United States. Those soldiers are easily available. They are able to vote by means of the regular absent voters' ballots of the different States. All the absent voters' ballot laws allow 30 days, and within 30 days a ballot may reach any camp in the United States and be voted and returned.

Under the law we passed previously, the postal cards are to be accepted, and the postal cards which go out will be accepted by all the secretaries of state, so that such postal cards may be sent and arrive at the voter's home precinct even before the ballots are printed.

So that, so far as I can see, there really is no argument for exercising, if you please, war powers, if we have any war powers; there is really no argument or necessity that I can see for creating this Federal ballot for men who are within the United States. That ballot is unsatisfactory. It has to be in the form in which it is because of the time limit, but, so far as the men within the limits of the United States are concerned, there is no reason why they should be asked to vote on a ballot on which there are no names, on which they are probably required to vote for men whom they do not know, and whose names they do not know, and about whom they know nothing.

Whatever justification there is for the bill—and if the part proposed to be eliminated by the pending amendment is eliminated, I would expect to vote for the bill in its present form—I do not see any justification for extending this so-called Federal ballot to the soldiers within the United States.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I was a member of the subcommittee which considered the bill, and I voted to report the bill favorably, but I should like my colleagues who were on the committee with me to know that this amendment appeals to me as being in accord with the theory on which we built up the proposed machinery for voting in the case of absentee soldiers. I shall support the amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the proposed amendment would limit the provisions with respect to absentee voting to only those servicemen who are located outside the territorial limits of the United States. What would be the effect of the amendment? Would it aid or hinder a serviceman in casting his ballot in the national election of 1944?

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has spoken about the various absentee ballot laws which are now in existence in the respective States of the Union. I wish it were in the power of every soldier to vote a State ballot from top to bottom, but under the existing absentee voters' laws of most of the 48 States I undertake to say that it cannot be done.

There are 11 States in the Union which have 20 days or less for absentee voting. I have not looked into the regulations concerning the absentee voting laws in all these States, but if the absentee voting laws in the 11 States are like the law in Illinois it would take mail services before a ballot could finally come back. Five mail services are required to bring back the ballot to the county clerk in my county. I undertake to say that that is not sufficient time for probably 70 percent of the men from those States who are serving in the continental limits of the United States.

Mr. President, that soldier would have to be on the move day and night almost to make an application for his ballot, get it back, and have it voted within that length of time, and if he should happen to be on maneuvers for 2 weeks he would not be able to vote at all. It is not fair to say to the man who is performing his military duty in this country that he cannot vote, but that the soldier in north Africa can vote, as would be done if the proposed amendment were adopted.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. What the Senator says is, I think, in line with the position of the bill in its early days, but toward the very last of our consideration of it we inserted

the provision appearing on page 34 so that the measure would apply to voting for Federal, State, and local officials, and would enable the absentee ballot procedure to be utilized to the greatest possible extent. The theory was that if the plan here stated should be followed it would expedite what otherwise would be what the Senator says, too slow a process to obtain the ballot, and get it back to the ballot box. But it is my opinion, and it was my opinion at the time I agreed to this amendment, that under any of the State laws, pursuing the course now set forth in title II, soldiers on this continent could cast their ballots.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I find that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] has inserted the words of his amendment in the wrong place, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified so that the words, instead of being inserted on page 19, line 9, following the words "United States", be inserted on page 19, line 12, following the word "components." It is intended to modify the definition, not to modify the term.

Also, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified by striking out the words "territorial limits of the" because, in section 3, the term "United States" is defined to include only the territorial limits of the several States of the United States and the District of Columbia.

Mr. LUCAS. I have no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be so modified.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I now want to read to the Senate the States which have 20 days or less absentee-voting privileges:

In Alabama it is 20 days.
In California it is 20 days.
In Florida it is 15 days.
In Missouri it is 15 days.
In South Dakota it is 15 days.

The Senator who is the author of the amendment is from South Dakota, and there is a 15-day absent-ballot law in his State.

In Texas it is 20 days.
In Vermont it is 12 days.
In Arkansas it is 10 days.

And so forth. Mr. President, I undertake to say that under the absentee-voting laws of those States thousands upon thousands of soldiers in those States will not have an opportunity to vote if the amendment is agreed to. I reiterate what I said a moment ago—that it is totally unfair to say that a man who is just back from Guadalcanal, and is stationed in California, who has been in Guadalcanal for 15 months, and is back in the United States training other men to go over and fight and take his place—it is unfair not to accord to him the same privilege he would have were he fighting in Guadalcanal, and he could not have that privilege if the proposed amendment should be adopted.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Most of the absentee-voters' privileges are based upon absence for personal business reasons.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. For the purpose of taking care of personal business. The men in the armed forces are absent from their homes, not for personal business reasons but are disfranchised because they are sent away and are absent on the country's business. Is that not correct?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct, of course.

Mr. KILGORE. Furthermore, there are now in the United States thousands of them who, if the pending bill were not to become law, would not be registered to vote for Federal officials. They would be precluded from registering by the act of Congress in sending them away. Therefore, the Congress would disfranchise them unless it passed this bill, and they would be without a vote.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is absolutely correct. I was also about to discuss the point that in many cases the men have become of age while they have been in the Army. Those are two points which I was about to discuss in connection with the amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Let me inquire of the Senator whether most of the State laws do not require that the affidavits be sworn to before a notary public, which requirement would make it impossible for the soldiers in many of the camps to use absentee ballots.

Mr. LUCAS. I think it is uniformly a requirement that the absentee voter go before a notary public and swear to the contents of the instrument. It would be absolutely impossible for the men in the armed forces to find that kind of an official, unless, as I said before, they had nothing to do but concentrate on that job from the time they were permitted to file an application to vote until the time when the ballot was finally cast. In that event, they would not have opportunity to do any soldiering at all.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator explain about the five different mailings?

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say to the Senator from North Dakota that in Illinois, the steps are as follows: In the first instance, if I am in the city of Washington, and if I desire to vote an absentee ballot in Havana, Ill., I first write to the county clerk, and request, by application, the particular form which our statute specifies one must use. That is one mailing.

The form comes to me in Washington. That is two mailings. Then I execute the form, I swear to it, and on that basis it is returned to the county clerk. That is the third mailing.

When the county clerk receives it, he returns the ballot to me. That is the fourth mailing.

When I receive the ballot, I mark it in secret, before a notary public, here in Washington, and then return it to the county clerk. That is the fifth mailing.

Mr. LANGER. Would not there be a sixth mailing—when the county clerk sends the ballot to the appropriate precinct?

Mr. LUCAS. That is right. The county clerk, after he receives the ballot, must send it to the precinct election officials of the precinct in which I reside.

Mr. President, just so surely as the Senate agrees to this amendment, the Senate will disfranchise I do not know how many soldiers, but I say thousands upon thousands upon thousands of the members of our armed forces, because they will never have an opportunity to vote. The basis of the bill from beginning to end is to provide them with an opportunity to vote for Federal officials, at least—a right which I contend they have today, under the Constitution. From the very inception of this bill the idea has been to encourage soldiers to take advantage, if possible, of the opportunity to send for absentee ballots, but we certainly do not want to make it a necessity and make it mandatory that they do so. We cannot do that, Mr. President, and have the uniformity, the fairness, and the equity we should have if we are really to have a ballot law which is worth while.

Mr. GREEN rose.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Illinois if it is not also true that the assumption is false that the men can be communicated with in the ordinary time required for communication between civilians. Are not most of the men in the armed forces moved from camp to camp, sent abroad, or brought home again, so that often the ordinary length of time would be required in order to communicate with them, between the time of the first application and the time of the final voting?

For instance, today I had at my desk, and read, a letter I received from an officer in the service, to whom I had written approximately 5 weeks ago. He sent me a note about a change of his address, because my letter to him had followed him around, and he had only recently received it. I think every Member of the Senate who has been in correspondence with members of the armed forces has had similar experiences. All Members of the Senate know that mail follows the soldiers around, and sometimes never reaches them at all. That factor must be taken into consideration.

I myself cannot understand why the idea seems to be prevalent among certain Members of the Senate that the number of votes to be cast by the soldiers should be whittled down to the smallest possible number. I had supposed that the right to vote is not only an American right, but a duty, and that the men should be encouraged to vote.

Apparently, the idea is to have the number of men included under the bill as small as possible. We all know that Congress passed an absentee-voting law more than a year ago, and, so far as I can find out, only approximately 28,000 persons were able to take advantage of it.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. Regardless of whether the amendment is agreed to or rejected, would the bill still give the soldier the option of voting his ticket under the State law?

Mr. LUCAS. It would, regardless of whether the amendment is agreed to or rejected. We want the soldiers to do that, and we urge them to do it, providing they are in a physical position to do so. We do not want to disfranchise any soldier. As the Senator from Rhode Island said a moment ago, men are going from camp to camp and from place to place, all over the country, as well as going abroad. All one has to do is to get on a train leaving Washington, to see the tremendous numbers of soldiers, sailors, and marines who are going here, there, and everywhere in connection with the war effort. Why it should be proposed to place such a burden on the men in the service in order to enable them to obtain absentee ballots is more than I can understand. I cannot understand how the Senator from Ohio can make an argument of that kind if he desires to be fair and to have complete uniformity and simplicity throughout the country and throughout the world, so far as concerns voting by our soldiers. Let me say that complete uniformity and simplicity are essential if we are to enable the soldiers to vote.

Mr. ANDREWS. The assumption is that they will use the State ballot, if possible, because that will permit them to vote not only for Federal officers but for candidates on the State tickets, in which of course they will be deeply interested.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. President, I cannot yield further, because I am speaking under a limitation of time.

Thirty-three States have a limitation of 30 days or less: Illinois, 30 days; Indiana, 30 days; Iowa, 30 days; Kansas, 30 days; Michigan, 30 days; Minnesota, 30 days; Nevada, 30 days; North Carolina, 30 days; North Dakota, 30 days; Ohio, 30 days; Oklahoma, 30 days; Oregon, 30 days; Utah, 30 days; West Virginia, 30 days; Wyoming, 30 days; and Nebraska, 30 days.

Fourteen of the 33 require that a particular form of application for absentee ballot, furnished by the State, be used by the absentee voter. They recognize no other form of application. That gets back to the question asked a moment ago by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. In other words, they must have this original form, and must fill it out in making their application for a ballot.

Mr. President, all these restrictions would tend effectively to nullify the attempt to enable the servicemen stationed within the continental limits of the United States to vote in 1944. There would be no uniformity in the legislation, if the amendment were agreed to and should become a part of the law. It would be rank discrimination between the soldiers themselves, as I have pointed out. For instance, there would be rank discrimination in regard to the question of registration.

Do Senators realize how many States of the Union have registration laws? Many of them do. In 1941 the State of Illinois passed a permanent registration law; and I was compelled to go back to Illinois to register, before I could vote in the following election. I personally had to be there. But, Mr. President, the Illinois National Guard was sent from Illinois to Tennessee before that registration law became effective. Under the circumstances, we would disfranchise every member of the National Guard who left the State at that particular time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois on the amendment has expired.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I will take 15 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the amendment be agreed to, it will disfranchise every one of the members of the Illinois National Guard who left the State of Illinois under those circumstances and who has not been able to return to the State since that time to appear physically and register in the precinct where he maintains his residence.

Furthermore, what about the soldier who has become of age since he has been in the Army? Thousands upon thousands—probably millions—of boys have become of age since they have been in the Army, but when they were home they never had an opportunity to register, because they could not register; they were not old enough. Yet, under the amendment, we would disfranchise those soldiers, the soldiers we have sent out to protect the lives and liberties of the people of the country. Nevertheless, there is brought forward an amendment of this kind, which would provide that soldiers could not vote unless they complied with the absentee ballot law of their States. Mr. President, I cannot understand it. Why give to some their God-given right of franchise but deny it to others? One cannot be for giving one geographical group the opportunity to vote and saying to the others, "Thou shall not pass." That is exactly what this amendment proposes. This is another bold attempt to cripple and sabotage the bill. In fairness to all servicemen and in equity and good conscience the amendment must be defeated.

Mr. President, I hope Senators on both sides of the aisle will appreciate and understand what it would mean to literally thousands of men so far as voting is concerned, if this amendment should be adopted. Take a man serving down in Key West, Fla., at the present time who would not have an opportunity to vote, although a man on a ship only 10 miles at sea would have the privilege of voting. Perhaps at that very time the man to whom I refer would be out on maneuvers, with no opportunity to vote. Is that the way to promote morale? Is that the way properly to prosecute this war?

Mr. President, I cannot believe that the Senate will adopt this amendment.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that the apprehension I have with respect to this amendment is that a young man from another State who might be in camp in Texas might become 21 years of age while he was at camp. He could not get home to register, and he would be off the list. Is not that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is 100-percent correct. I explained that a moment ago. I am glad the Senator has mentioned that point. That is the second point to which I have referred. The first was registration, and the second was the fact that a man may become of age after going into the Army, without any possible opportunity to return to register under State law in the precinct where he resides.

Mr. TOBEY. Because of that element of injustice, I do not think I can vote for the amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator. I think he is eminently correct in his position.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has already spoken on the amendment. The Chair cannot recognize him a second time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I will speak on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio may proceed.

Mr. TAFT. I believe that some of the objections made by the Senator from Illinois are valid. However, there is this to be said: Every State is under obligation to give its citizens the right to vote. I know of three States in which the State legislatures will be called into session as soon as Congress enacts a law, in order that the States may conform their laws to the necessities of the case. It has been necessary to do that because under the law which Congress enacted last year a form of ballot was prescribed, easing the State method of voting.

In the first place, we are not disfranchising anyone. No matter what we do, this Congress cannot disfranchise anyone. The States are perfectly able to provide for voting by their own citizens.

However, I think that the form in which the amendment is presented is open to objection. In title II of the proposed law there is a special provision for voting under State laws for State as well as Federal officers. For example, a special postal card is prescribed. Such postal cards may be used if State laws permit. The bill contemplates that State legislatures may be called into session to provide for the use of such postal

cards. I will say frankly that if I were preparing an amendment to deal with this particular situation I would undertake to amend title II, rather than follow the method which the Senator from South Dakota has proposed to accomplish the same purpose.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I do not believe that the issue we desire to present is properly presented under this amendment, and I am perfectly willing to have it voted down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] on behalf of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 21 in the committee amendment, commencing in line 9 with the words "No ballot", it is proposed to strike out "No ballot shall be invalid by reason of mistake or omission in writing in the name of the candidate or his political party where the candidate or party intended by the voter is plainly identifiable. Where, because of any defect in marking, a ballot is held invalid as to any particular candidate for office, it shall remain valid as to the other candidates for office."

On page 34, beginning in line 4, it is proposed to strike out all of section 119, containing the words—

> No mere informality in the manner of carrying out or executing the provisions of this title shall invalidate any ballots cast under it or otherwise be permitted to defeat its purposes. The provisions of this title shall be construed liberally in order to effectuate its purposes, and substantial compliance with its requirements shall be deemed to be sufficient.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment just stated appears to be more than one amendment. Is there objection to considering the amendments en bloc?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The amendments will be considered separately. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may the amendment be again stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 21, commencing in line 9, with the words "no ballot" it is proposed to strike out:

> No ballot shall be invalid by reason of mistake or omission in writing in the name of the candidate or his political party where the candidate or party intended by the voter is plainly identifiable. Where, because of any defect in marking, a ballot is held invalid as to any particular candidate for office, it shall remain valid as to the other candidates for office.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I cannot agree to that amendment, because yesterday, in colloquy with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], we discussed section 119, and I agreed with him to eliminate practically all of said section when he called my attention to the words in the amendment which the Senator now seeks to eliminate. I think it is the general rule of construction in election contest cases that, even though a name may not be spelled correctly, if it is written so as to convey the intent of the voter, and it is apparent from the writing that the voter means, we will say the name "Bridges", the election officials will count that ballot. I have been in some election contest cases in my time. That is the rule of law in Illinois. I certainly do not see why that language is objectionable, and why it should not remain in the bill.

Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I do not wish to take the time of the Senator from Illinois. I will take my own time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois cannot occupy the floor more than once.

Mr. BRIDGES. As I understand the amendment, in the judgment of the Senator from Illinois, the second part of the amendment, on page 2 of the printed amendment, was agreed to yesterday. Was not that phraseology eliminated?

Mr. LUCAS. Section 119 on page 34 was eliminated with the exception of the following language:

> The provisions of this title shall be construed liberally in order to effectuate its purposes.

In addition, in the foregoing language the word "title" was changed to "Act." We stopped right there, and eliminated the remainder of the language. We referred to the language which the present amendment seeks to strike out. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] called my attention to the fact that this language was in the bill, so, with that understanding, I agreed to strike most of section 119.

I hope the Senator will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. In the absence of the senior Senator from Michigan, I feel that I may with propriety confirm what the Senator from Illinois has just said. All of section 119 was stricken from the bill yesterday, with the exception of the language:

> The provisions of this title shall be construed liberally in order to effectuate its purposes.

As has been indicated, in the foregoing language the word "title" was changed to "act."

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. That is all of section 119 now in the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. I think the agreement for the elimination of the remainder of the section was influenced in large part because of the previous language to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. LUCAS. Precisely so.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. As a result of the explanation which has been made, my understanding is that the Senator from South Dakota, the author of the amendment, is willing to withdraw both parts of the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota wish to withdraw the pending amendment?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 24, line 22, it is proposed to strike out the words commencing with "A person designated by proper authority to receive executed ballots" and insert in lieu thereof the following words——

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, we are not offering the amendment; we are withdrawing it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma states that the amendment has been withdrawn.

The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer a short amendment about which I have spoken to the Senator from Illinois. In the penalties section, on page 32, in line 24, after the word "justification," I move to amend by inserting the words "within or without the United States."

It is not entirely clear to me, unless we make some special provision, that a violation of the law by someone outside of the United States, for instance, in Italy or Africa, can be said to be a violation of the law, unless we make it perfectly clear that we intend to apply the penalty to acts outside the United States. I have a little doubt as to whether we could even make such violation a crime. I have not looked up the law on the question, but I assume we could. In any event, I move that the bill be amended as I have suggested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 32, in line 24, after the word "justification", it is proposed to insert, "within or without the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Suppose, as the Senator has said, a man should commit a crime in Italy or Africa; where would he be tried? Would it be in the United States?

Mr. TAFT. I am not sufficiently advised on that point to answer the Senator. I am told that there are statutes giving

jurisdiction to certain courts to try those charged with crimes on the high seas and outside the United States for violations of the laws of the United States. I do not state that positively. I will have to look up the law on the subject, and if there is any difficulty about it, we can perhaps have an amendment made in the House.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator kindly repeat the place in the bill where his suggested amendment would be inserted? I could not distinctly hear him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will restate the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 32, line 24, after the word "justification", it is proposed to insert the words "within or without the United States."

Mr. TAFT. The language would then read:

> Whoever willfully and without justification within or without the United States deprives any voter of any right or privilege—

And so forth.

Mr. GREEN. The amendment is agreeable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, a few days ago I offered an amendment to the original bill. I have since found that section 302, on page 37 of the committee amendment, covers practically the same ground covered by the amendment which I offered, and I therefore withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida withdraws his amendment.

If there be no further amendment, the question recurs on the substitute offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I shall not discuss at any great length the amendment in the nature of a substitute which has been proposed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], for himself, and on behalf of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] and myself. When the Senator from Mississippi submitted this amendment as a substitute for the pending bill some 2 or 3 days ago, he made a very able presentation of its merits as contrasted with those of the committee bill.

I do not believe it can be said of those of us who are interested in the adoption of the substitute proposal that we are not as deeply interested in absentee soldiers having the opportunity to vote in the coming elections as are those who are sponsoring the original bill. We certainly desire that every man in the armed services have the opportunity of voting. But we are also of the opinion that those who serve in our armed forces today, who are fighting the battles of this country, as well as all our people who love freedom, are anxious that this Government defend and, in fact, preserve substantially in quality the same democracy for which they left their homes to fight. For that reason, Mr. President, I doubt if any substantial number of men in our armed forces would want the Congress of the United States to pass a measure at this time which would be contrary to the Constitution which they are fighting to preserve, in order to give them the privilege of voting in a coming election.

I believe that some of them also fight for a principle we have recognized since the formation of the Union, namely, that of State sovereignty and States' rights, and the right of a State to determine the qualifications of its electors.

Mr. President, it is recognized in practically every State of the Union that there are now on the statute books of the States laws making provisions for absentee voting. In any State in which such a statute does not obtain—I think there is only one, according to statements during the debate—there is yet opportunity for such State, by appropriate legislation, to set up the necessary machinery, or enact a statute which would enable the citizens of the State who are now serving in the armed forces to cast absentee ballots.

With that situation in mind, and with the hope of preserving that which we think is certainly dear to our armed forces, as well as to other citizens of this Nation—namely, our Constitution and the powers which are reserved to the several States—we have offered this substitute, in the hope of making available the necessary machinery of the Federal Government, the War and Navy Departments, the franking privilege, and the cooperation of the Federal Government with the several States, to enable them to afford to all the men in the service the opportunity of voting through the regularly constituted processes of State government.

Mr. President, it can be done. I am of the opinion that as a result of the enactment of the proposed amendment as a substitute for the pending bill, together with the cooperation of the Federal Government as provided by the substitute measure, substantially as many votes would be cast, returned, and counted from the men in the armed services of this Nation as would be if we should undertake to proceed in the unorthodox and, in my judgment, unconstitutional way proposed by the pending bill. Certainly that opportunity ought to be afforded within the provisions and within the limitations of constitutional processes. I think that we can all agree on that.

Some amendments which are not objectionable have been adopted to the pending bill. They have been sponsored by able Senators; they have been fully debated, and have been adopted more or less as precautionary measures, more or less as safeguards which some Senators, a majority of the Senators, have thought ought to be employed in any proceeding designed to give the soldiers the opportunity to vote.

I say to you, Mr. President, and to Senators who are interested in the amendments which have been adopted, that if the substitute amendment is adopted in lieu of the pending bill, then there is no reason why the amendments which have already been agreed to by a majority vote of the Senate should not be added to the substitute and made a part of the law as we shall pass it. While I did not vote for all the amendments which a majority of the Senate has approved, though I supported some of them, as one of those who sponsor the pending amendment, I think it would be only fair and right, since a majority of the Senate has expressed its views with regard to them, that those amendments should immediately be adopted and accepted as amendments to the substitute, if the substitute shall prevail.

Mr. President, I am very serious about this matter. There is too great a tendency already—a tendency recognized by the people of this Nation today—toward overthrowing the sovereignty of the States that make up this Nation. Step by step, degree by degree, we are wresting away from the American people the power and the right of self-government. What do we hear, Mr. President, on the campaign hustings everywhere throughout the Nation today? What do we hear in almost every public address pertaining to the state of affairs of our Nation? We hear the charge of centralized bureaucracy in Washington, which the people are beginning to resent more and more. I say to you that the pending bill will simply be another step in the direction of centralized control and the destruction of State sovereignty.

Mr. President, this job can be done and it ought to be done within the provisions of the Federal Constitution and with respect to the rights and sovereignty of the States. If, Mr. President, we take over in Washington the machinery of elections—and this is the beginning of it—just so certain as we do so, and whenever it shall have been accomplished, there will be no such thing left as political State sovereignty. In that event we may as well abolish the political subdivisions in the country and, instead of voting for Senators and Representatives from districts and from States, we may as well turn elections over to a centralized authority in Washington to vote for Senators and Representatives throughout the Nation as a whole.

There must be some check, Mr. President, to the trends of the day if America, as you and I have known it and as we love it, is to be preserved. I think the pending bill is a dangerous step, and I appeal to those who believe in the fundamentals of States' rights, of State sovereignty, of the States controlling their own election machinery, and of the States being able to say who is eligible to vote, and under what circumstances they shall vote. I appeal to them to help us adopt the substitute and keep the authority and the control where the Constitution rightfully places it.

Mr. TUNNELL and Mr. AIKEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield first to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. TUNNELL. I desire to ask a question for information. In the State of Delaware tickets are not completed until 20 days before the election. After completion of the ticket, then they have to be printed. Of course, under this arrangement if the tickets are to be sent to the boys throughout the world, I take it that there would have to be allowed at least 10 days for the printing of the tickets. Does the Senator believe that it would be possible for the State to get the tickets to the different parts of the world and have them returned in time for voting on election day?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am not advised fully as to the time that will be required. There has been some discussion of that, and some disagreement between the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the author of the pending bill, and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the author of the substitute amendment. I may say to the Senator, however, that what the proponents of the substitute are undertaking to do is to secure the enactment of legislation which will get the ballots to the soldiers so that they may vote. If the Congress of the United States can pass such legislation, certainly each State in the Union can modify or amend or change its own laws to provide for adequate time. That could be done in the State of Delaware and in every other State, and there is ample time for it to be done, as I understand.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I gladly yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. I will ask the Senator a question. Statements have been made that this bill will give members of the armed forces the right to vote, and the time element is brought into play as justifying the necessity for passing this measure to give to members of the armed forces the ballot. Is it not a fact that, because of the utter unconstitutionality of the pending bill, if passed, the whole thing will immediately be thrown into the courts and the servicemen will be deprived of their God-given right to vote, about which we have heard so much?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am sure there is some possibility of it; I cannot say, with certainty, that it will be done.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator think the States of this Union will take "lying down" this measure which destroys their control over elections?

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the States were fully advised as to the implications of this particular measure as some of us representing them feel we are, I believe there would be great resentment at this process of further encroaching upon and destroying the sovereignty of the States.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator from Arkansas that his time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. I will give the Senator from Arkansas some of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas desire to speak on the bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Chair will recognize me, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say that a Senator cannot yield time to another Senator for a speech.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think I have 15 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has 15 minutes on the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I gladly yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I was going to call attention to the fact that the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi, the Senator from Arkansas, and the Senator from Tennessee, applies only to persons serving in the armed forces; it does not include the groups headed by the American Red Cross which were included by the amendment which I offered and which was adopted day before yesterday. I will ask the Senators who have offered the amendment if they would be willing to modify the amendment so as to include persons serving with the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Ferry Service, the Women's Air Force Service Pilots, and the United Service Organization outside the United States who are attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States?

That would be inserted on the first page, in line 5, after the words "United States" and on the second page, line 13, after the words "armed forces."

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not know whether the Senator was in the Chamber when I made reference, not specifically to the amendment to which he now calls attention, but to those amendments which were offered and adopted to the pending bill. In view of the fact that a majority of the Senate have expressed approval of those amendments, I have suggested that if our substitute shall be adopted, the same amendments which have already been agreed to should be adopted as applying to the substitute, because a majority of the Senators have already expressed their wishes in those regards. I think it is agreeable to the Senator from Mississippi that the amendment the Senator has just read be accepted.

Mr. AIKEN. Then may we consider the amendment the Senator has offered to be modified by the inclusion of the amendment I have suggested, which was adopted day before yesterday?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, we will accept the amendment which the Senator now offers as an amendment to the substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Vermont offering an amendment to the substitute?

Mr. AIKEN. Is it necessary for me to offer the amendment if the authors of the substitute accept it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The authors may modify their own amendment if they desire. The Chair is seeking to keep the record straight.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand they are willing to modify the substitute amendment so as to include my amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What I have been trying to say is that if the substitute shall be agreed to, then I shall be willing, and the other authors of the substitute will be willing, to accept the amendment the Senator from Vermont offers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Perhaps the Chair should observe that after the substitute is agreed to, if it should be, it will not then be subject to amendment. Any modification should be made before the substitute is acted upon.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the Senator from Vermont offers the amendment at this time, we will accept it as a modification of the pending substitute.

Mr. AIKEN. That is what I rose to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont now offer an amendment to the substitute?

Mr. AIKEN. I do offer it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 5, after the words "United States," it is proposed to add the words "or serving with the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Ferry Service, the Women's Air Force Service Pilots, and the United Service Organizations outside the United States who are attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States", and on page 2, line 13, after the word "forces" to add the words "or serving with the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Ferry Service, the Women's Air Force Service Pilots, and the United Service Organizations outside the United States who are attached to and serving with the armed forces."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the authors of the substitute accept the proposed amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The authors of the substitute proposal accept the amendment offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And modify their substitute accordingly.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And modify the substitute accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The authors have a right to do that. It is so ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I now offer as an amendment to the substitute the amendment dealing with political propaganda, and so forth, which was yesterday adopted by the Senate as an amendment to the pending measure.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LUCAS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. I inquire, what is before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio to the substitute.

Mr. LUCAS. I thought the Senator's amendment had been offered as an amendment to the pending measure, and had been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. But it is being offered as an amendment to the substitute offered by the Senator from Mississippi. The substitute is now pending before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. May a Senator offer the same amendment to other amendments, as many times as one may be presented?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment may be offered to the substitute.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Has the Senator from Ohio offered his amendment?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I offer the amendment in the words in which it was yesterday adopted as an amendment to the pending measure.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The authors of the substitute accept the amendment, and request that the substitute amendment be modified accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The substitute will be modified in accordance with the request of the authors of the substitute.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to interrogate the Senator concerning two points in his substitute which impress me. The first is that part which provides for memorializing the State legislatures to modify their election laws so as to have the dates of elections conform to some reasonable schedule which will enable the soldiers to vote. I think it is generally agreed that as the State laws now stand, it would be utterly impossible for a great many soldiers to vote. It seems to me that when we memorialize the States to change their election laws, we know very well that most of them will not do it, and if they do not do it, then the soldiers from those States will be disfranchised.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should not say they would be disfranchised; they may not have the opportunity to vote, but the responsibility would lie with the States, as it does now.

Mr. LODGE. I think that is an accurate statement, the responsibility would lie with the States, and insofar as we project a workable system for making it possible for the soldiers to vote, the responsibility would to that extent lie on us.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Certainly there is no question of constitutionality involved in the substitute proposal. There is a grave question as to the original bill.

Mr. LODGE. I am not raising the constitutional question. I might be prepared to admit that the type of Supreme Court we used to have might entertain grave doubt as to the committee bill. I do not know what the present Court would do. But I am not raising the constitutional question. What is interesting and important to me is that we provide a workable system which would permit servicemen to vote, and it seems to me that we know in our hearts that the State legislatures would not change their laws so as to enable the soldiers to vote.

I have a second question, regarding the distribution of postal cards. The postal cards are to be printed in the States, and as I read the language, the postal cards would be sent to the soldiers from the various States. That raises a question which has been impressing me from the very beginning, that unless we know the serial number of a soldier, it is extremely difficult to ascertain where he is within any appreciable period of time. There are a great many men in the Army with identical names, identical Christian names, middle initial, and last names. We can easily ascertain the location of the units of the Army, the divisions and the corps, but to find out where an individual soldier from any State may be is very difficult, and I do not believe the postal cards would reach the soldiers.

Mr President, will the Senator bear with me a little further?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will hurry because my time is limited.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I shall be glad to have the time I now consume taken out of my own time, if that can be arranged, because the Senator has been very generous with his time.

We then come to the sending out of the individual State ballots. Each State has ballots of different sizes. They are printed on different thicknesses of paper. They are not printed on thin paper of a size that can be stacked and loaded in bulk and readily transported by airplane. Instead of making a bulk carriage of ballots to a great many theaters of operation, and bringing the ballots back from the various theaters of operation, we will have the ballots dribbling along for a considerable period of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that when the Senator from Massachusetts made inquiry with respect to whether the time now consumed by him should be taken out of his own time, the attention of the Chair was diverted by another matter. The Chair will now state that the time being consumed comes out of the time of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. LODGE. Is there no way by which we can arrange to have it taken out of my time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No way at all, unless the Senator from Arkansas suspends.

Mr. LODGE. I do not want to take more time, but I will sum up by saying that if the substitute is adopted it seems to me the net result will be that our men in the armed forces will not have an opportunity to vote in the election of 1944.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator if he has considered any machinery to permit the men who might have registered had they been home, to register under the suggested provision, so they would be eligible to vote? As I read the substitute, it would take care only of those who have already registered. I am sympathetic with the purpose of the substitute the Senator is discussing, but I see a void in it, and I ask if there is a special reason for it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There is no reason for it, and I do not see any reason why it cannot be amended so as to provide for what the Senator has in mind. I am not opposed to his suggestion. The important thing to me is that we do not want to destroy something which has been precious to us and which has preserved our country through the years.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think that void could be very easily filled either in conference or in the House. I regret that it is not in the substitute now, because it would be manifestly unfair to keep from voting men who might have registered had they been home, and who would be eligible to register, but who cannot register because they are absent from home.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I will say to the Senator from Maryland that, according to my information, a great number of States have adopted State absentee voting laws which provide for a waiver of registration. I know that my State has.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. But the Federal law ought to contain a provision that would aid the States in registering soldiers who might have registered had they been home. The measure does not now contain such a provision.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I shall be glad to accept the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall be glad to accept that amendment.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I understand the statement was made earlier, in response to a question by a Senator, that the authors of the substitute were willing to adopt all the amendments which have been adopted by the Senate to the committee amendment. I do not know whether it comes within the express terms of that statement, but I notice that the substitute as now printed, which is offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and other Senators, limits its provisions to the armed services, and that part of the committee amendment which was acted upon included also members of the merchant marine. I wondered whether the Senator was willing to accept that provision, also.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; I have offered to accept any of the amendments the

Senate has by majority vote adopted to the pending measure. I did not vote for all of them, but I think the Senate has fully expressed its approval of the amendments it has accepted.

Mr. GREEN. I wanted to be sure with respect to that matter. I did not know whether the amendments to the bill which have heretofore been agreed to would be out of the bill if the Senator's substitute were agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have only a few words to say about this matter. I have been very busy and have not had as much time as I should like to have had in which to discuss the measure. I have examined the bill reported by the committee, and I wish to say that in my judgment it would be difficult to find a bill which is more patently unconstitutional than the bill as reported. I do not believe any court would hold it to be constitutional. It is violative of several of the express provisions of the Constitution, and for that reason I cannot vote for it.

But there is another even more impelling reason than that why I cannot vote for the bill and why I am in favor of the substitute which is now before the Senate. I wish to say that while my name is attached as coauthor of the substitute, and properly attached as coauthor, the real authors of the substitute are the two Senators who have preceded me in discussing it, and I have merely given the substitute my firm and active and earnest approval because I know it is constitutional.

I wish to speak about the constitutionality of the committee measure. A Presidential and a congressional election will be held next November, and we do not want a contest to arise with respect to that election. Ever since our Government was established the States have controlled elections. The Federal Government has never in its history controlled elections. Therefore it seems to me to be almost monstrous to undertake at this time to provide for controlling so large a proportion of the election through the enactment of a Federal law on the subject.

Mr. President, I think the bill is unconstitutional. I have heard no one seriously, or very seriously at any rate, state his belief that the bill is constitutional. Some of our best lawyers have said that they did not want to discuss the question of its constitutionality, but wanted to appeal to "a higher law." So far as I am concerned, with one exception, I know of no higher law, and so far as we as Senators are concerned, all of us held up our hands to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. I was reminded of that very forcefully yesterday when I listened to the oath being administered to the distinguished new Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH]. He took an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. During 150-odd years our elections under that Constitution have been under the control of the States, something with which everyone agrees. Now, after 150 years of experience, it is proposed on behalf of a higher law that we put something into the Constitution that is not there, and to undertake to place control of or supervision over part of the election next year in the hands of the Federal Government.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. NYE. The Senator from Tennessee has made reference to the oath of office which we as Members of the Senate have taken here.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. NYE. Does the Senate know where in that oath reference can be found to a higher law, to something that goes beyond the Constitution?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I do not find it, and I challenge any Senator to point it out. I thank the Senator from North Dakota for his timely suggestion.

Mr. President, I am as much in favor of the soldiers being accorded an opportunity of voting as is any other man on earth. I think the soldiers ought to vote. I think we ought to give them every encouragement to vote, and I think the substitute gives them every such encouragement. It does so in a constitutional way. My distinguished friend, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], whom I admire very much and esteem very highly, has said that the States will not pass laws for this purpose. I think the Senator is mistaken, for I do not believe any State will fail, if the substitute shall be adopted, to pass a law governing the voting by soldiers in an election.

Let us consider my own State for a moment. We already have a law by which the soldiers can vote. But suppose it should be determined that they cannot vote without registering. We have a registration law in our State; 247,000 soldiers come from Tennessee alone. Would not the people of my State deem it absolutely necessary, from a political standpoint, to have the legislature called together and have it make arrangements for the soldiers to vote, without registration, in view of the fact that they have not registered since they became soldiers, and thus give them an opportunity to register and give them an opportunity to vote? In my belief the legislature will do that just as soon as we pass the substitute measure.

The Senator has said there would be difficulty in sending the postal cards to the soldiers. Mr. President, there would not be any difficulty. Every soldier has a number, and the State authorities have records of the numbers of the soldiers from their States. They know where the soldiers are. There would not be a particle of trouble in obtaining the addresses of the soldiers and sending the postal cards to them.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator think that the parents of the boys in the armed forces would cooperate in seeing to it that the postal cards reached the boys?

Mr. McKELLAR. They certainly would cooperate, just as surely as two and two make four. They are the ones who will take the greatest care and precaution to see to it that the boys are able to vote.

Mr. President, I ask Senators not to go into this wholly untried field, which never before has been entered by the Federal Government. Let us stand by the States; let us stand by the Constitution of the United States. Let us adopt the substitute which has been offered, under which, in my judgment, every soldier who desires to vote will have an opportunity and a right to vote, and to vote freely and voluntarily, without any coercion.

Let me say, Mr. President, that yesterday, without having made careful examination of the amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], I voted against it. This morning I went to my colleagues, and spoke to them in behalf of the amendment and urged them to accept it. Any amendment of that kind, providing for purity and independence in the use of the ballot, should be agreed to. I am glad to say that my colleagues at once said they had already made up their minds to accept those amendments, and I am very happy that they have been accepted.

It seems to me we should stand by what has been done before. First of all, we should stand by the Constitution. Every Member of the Senate has held up his hand to Almighty God and has sworn he would stand by the Constitution. That is the first thing we should stand by. Next, we should stand by the traditions of the country, and should act in conformity with the actions previously taken in our country. At no time have the States ever asked the Congress to intervene in elections. At no time has it ever intervened. The proponents of the substitute are following the beaten track; they are following the Constitution; they are following the institutions of our country; they are following democracy. They are giving the boys in the armed forces every opportunity on earth to cast the ballot fairly, and they have accepted the amendment of the senior Senator from Ohio. I think his amendment is very important, and I think it was properly agreed to. I think that of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] also was properly accepted, because we want to have a perfectly fair and honest election, and we ought to have it, in accordance with our Constitution and laws, in accordance with our own way of doing business. I sincerely hope the substitute will be adopted.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I hesitated to ask questions of the Senator who has just concluded speaking because I did not want to take any of his time. I should like to suggest some practical objections to what he advocated, because it must be remembered that all States do not have absentee-voting laws, and that all the States cannot give the sol-

diers the right to vote, since their constitutions prevent it.

However, I do not wish to discuss the constitutionality of the bill. I take that position for two reasons. In the first place, the constitutionality of the bill was discussed at length when the first soldier's voting bill was passed, more than a year ago. It was discussed in the House; it was discussed in the Senate. The bill passed the House, passed the Senate, and was signed by the President, and such action would not have been taken if the doubts about its constitutionality were well founded.

In the second place, the question of constitutionality has been discussed at length on the floor of the Senate in connection with the bill reported by the committee. Although many Members of the Senate were absent at the time when such discussion occurred, I see no advantage in repeating the arguments which already have been made. However, I desire to go to the root of the pending amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

Because my words may not carry much weight, I shall, in the main, use the arguments against the amendment which were presented by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, on whom would fall the duty of carrying the law into effect.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi and two of his colleagues is practically the same as House Joint Resolution 196, introduced in the House by Representative RANKIN of Mississippi. An early version, similar in substance to Mr. RANKIN's resolution, had been considered by the House committee. It related to the election of President, Vice President, Senators, and Representatives.

In regard to one such version—that is to say, House Concurrent Resolution 149—the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy filed a written report, dated November 13, 1943, with the chairman of the House committee. That joint report makes clear the practical difficulties facing the Army and the Navy in attempting to administer, under the divers laws of the several States, a law providing for voting by members of the armed forces. In that connection, I desire to read, not the whole report, because that would take too much time, but three paragraphs from it. Senators will note the difficulties presented, and will note how applicable they are to the substitute amendment now proposed:

Forty-six States already have enacted balloting legislation under which absent servicemen may vote. Such State laws vary greatly on almost every conceivable point: the elections to which applicable, the geographical location of the eligible absentee, the time when a ballot may be requested, the form which such request must take, the date upon which the ballot will be sent out, the manner in which and the person to whom the executed ballot must be returned, the time before which the executed ballot must be received in the State in order to be counted, etc. The registration requirements of the many States cannot be met by many members of the armed forces because of considerations of distance and time. Because of the limited period of time, in many States, between the date on which the candidates are known and, accordingly, the State ballots can be printed and sent to servicemen, and the date on which servicemen's executed ballots must be received back by the proper election officials in order to be counted, it seems probable that under existing State laws it will be a practical impossibility for many servicemen within, and for even more servicemen without, the United States to vote. The laws of a number of States require several steps to be taken before a ballot is actually cast, thereby creating extraordinary difficulties for servicemen who are far from home and whose movements are unpredictable.

If the proposed resolution contemplates action by only the two States which do not now have absentee-balloting laws, the situation would remain the same as regards the 46 State absentee-balloting laws which present the above-mentioned difficulties to effective use by members of the armed forces. If, on the other hand, the proposed resolution contemplates a modification of existing State laws, there can be, of course, no assurance that the States would act in pursuance thereof. It is difficult to foretell how many States, in addition to those which have regular sessions in 1944, might have special sessions in which their existing absentee-balloting laws may be changed. Even more significant, it is most uncertain that the 48 States would pass legislation which would be reasonably uniform in operation and simple for the War and Navy Departments to administer. Without such uniformity and simplicity, the objective of giving the maximum possible opportunity for voting to members of the armed forces could not be attained.

In connection with the foregoing, passage by the States of uniform laws, even if they embody a simple procedure, would not necessarily attain the desired objective. Facilities for air-mail carriage in wartime are both critically limited and dependent on military operations. The War and Navy Departments have heretofore expressed the belief that, in regard to one general election, they may be able, in bulk, to distribute, collect, and return uniform air-mail ballots. But it is doubtful whether air-mail facilities would permit the distribution, collection, and return of millions of ballots for primaries and elections separately mailed over a period of several months. Nor could this practical problem be solved by the several States providing to the services at one given time sufficient quantities of their ballots for bulk distribution and collection. The proposed resolution implies that each State will wish its citizens in the services to vote its particular ballot, which will bear the names of candidates. Because in almost every large unit in the Army and Navy there are citizens of many States, the services would be required to transmit to each such unit a sufficient quantity of ballots from each State to accommodate an estimated potential from each State in such unit. Air-mail facilities could not sustain such a burden. Nor would it be feasible, by reason of military security and necessity, to solve this problem by requiring the Army and Navy to identify in advance the number of voters from each State in each such unit throughout the world. An equally impracticable solution would be the use of State ballots in blank, supplemented by lists of names of candidates to be voted upon, because of the tremendous volume of candidates involved in all the Federal, State, and local primaries and elections in 1944.

It was for these reasons that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy advised the House Committee that they believed that the proposed resolution, "if implemented by appropriate action by the several States, might place burdens upon the services which could not be effectively discharged in wartime, and might, to that extent, fail to provide any opportunity to servicemen to vote."

What the services realize is that air-mail facilities in wartime cannot perform miracles. Unless, as in the bill before the Senate, air mail is limited to one bulk carriage of blank ballots overseas and one bulk carriage of executed ballots back to America, in regard to one election, the burden placed upon these air-mail facilities will be impossible to sustain. That was the fundamental thought on which the committee amendment was built.

Another factor is that because of the short period of time, in most States, between the date when a State will first issue an absentee ballot and the date when the duly executed ballot must be received back in the State, it will be a practical impossibility for most servicemen overseas to vote under existing State absentee balloting procedures. It must be remembered that there are at least three air carriages—five in about a dozen States—involved under State absentee balloting; the application is carried from the soldier to his State, the blank ballot is carried from the State to the soldier, and the executed ballot is carried from the soldier to his State. In cases in which five communications are necessary, the application must be made for a special form of application, and that application must be returned to the soldier by the secretary of state.

From the Army's testimony before the House committee I have obtained the facts as to average air-carriage times on regularly scheduled Army flights, based on long experience, from various points where our troops are located to a central point in the United States—for illustration, Springfield, Ill. Relating the triple air carriage required by State absentee balloting procedures to these average carriage times, and adding a minimum of 4 days for necessary action by the soldier and the State official, we find that the following air-carriage times will be involved under State procedures:

From an overseas point in the European theater to Springfield, Ill., 37 days.

From an overseas point in the Pacific theater to Springfield, Ill., 43 days.

From an overseas point in the Far East area to Springfield, Ill., 52 days.

Most State absentee-balloting procedures allow 30 days, or less, from the time the ballot is given out to the time when it must be returned to be counted. Therefore, if the vote of overseas soldiers cast under State procedures is to be counted, many States must move forward their primary dates, and almost all States must change their existing election laws.

So, basing the conclusion on this advice given by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, I think I am justified in stating that if any Senator votes for the substitute amendment, he will, intentionally or unintentionally, be voting against restoring to our soldiers and sailors the right to vote which he voted to prevent the soldier exercising when he voted to draft him.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I offer a perfecting amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Maine will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 22, after line 12, it is proposed to strike out "Oath of elector for voting in the general election to be held on November —, 194–" and insert in lieu thereof "Oath of elector for voting in the general elections to be held in 1944."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have submitted the amendment to the Senator from Illinois, and I will gladly refrain from explanation if he will accept it.

Mr. LUCAS. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I am so sincerely in favor of some method of obtaining the votes of the boys in the armed services that I hasten to put myself on record with reference to the pending substitute.

So far as my State is concerned, the substitute is clearly and fully a bill to nullify any effort to have the soldiers' votes recorded. I asked the Senator from Arkansas how citizens of our State could possibly vote. They could not do so, and there is no use in deceiving ourselves about it. The substitute amendment is simply a method of eliminating the bill, so far as many of the States are concerned.

In fact, the pending amendment does nothing of any consequence to change the present situation except to make some recommendations and promise to pay for some postal cards. The language of the proposed amendment reads:

> That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring, and recommends to the several States the enactment of, appropriate legislation.

In my State there will be no regular session of the legislature until after the next election shall have been held. I believe that to be the situation in many other States. I could not vote for the proposed substitute without publishing to the people of my State that I do not want the soldier boys to vote. That is what it would mean in Delaware, and I think that is what it would mean in many other States of the Union.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Will the Senator allow me to ask him one question?

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. Does not the Senator believe that his State is patriotic enough—as are other States—to call a special session of its legislature to provide an opportunity for the precious boys to vote?

Mr. TUNNELL. Why does the Senator speak so sarcastically by saying "precious" boys? I think they are entitled to vote.

Mr. SMITH. I do, too, and I think the Senator's State should recognize that fact.

Mr. TUNNELL. It would be absolutely impossible, and the Senator knows it as well as I do.

Mr. SMITH. Does the Senator mean that it would be impossible to call a special session of the legislature?

Mr. TUNNELL. No; but it would be impossible to get the soldiers to vote in accordance with the proposed substitute, and no one knows it better than does the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH. I do not know any such thing.

Mr. TUNNELL. Then the Senator does not know as much as he should know. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has the floor.

Mr. TUNNELL. The proposed substitute would require the State of Delaware to have printed some postal cards and send them to our soldiers throughout the world. After being returned, presumably, ballots would be sent to the soldiers who requested them. No dates are set out; no arrangement is provided for in the amendment as to when the postal cards would be sent, such as "as expeditiously as possible," or words to that effect. If the Senate does not want the boys to vote, let it say so fearlessly. Let us not use a subterfuge and pretend that we are giving something when we are not. Merely to recommend that the State legislature convene and enact a law which would give the soldiers the right to vote when no such law could be enacted would be useless.

After the ballots have been sent to the boys they must come back. As I suggested once before today, there are only 20 days from the time of filing the nominations until the election. If there are only 20 days, when would the sending of the postal cards be started? When would they leave the United States? Would it be after the ballots are printed, or before? There is nothing in the proposed substitute covering that point. There is the recommendation that the State do something to give the boys the right to vote. It is clearly and plainly shown by the proposal that it would not give the boys a right to vote.

On the second page of the amendment occurs the language:

> It is recommended that each State cause to be printed and delivered to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy an adequate number of postal cards for use by such absentee voters.

That is merely a recommendation.

Further on we find the following language:

> It shall, wherever practicable and compatible with the military operations, be the duty of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to cooperate with appropriate State officers and agencies in the distribution, execution, collection, and return of such absentee ballots and envelopes.

I wonder what they are to do? The language is:

> Whenever practicable and compatible with military operations—

And so forth. It is the duty of the Secretary of War and of the Secretary of the Navy to cooperate. In other words, they are supposed to be sympathetic.

There is also contained in the proposal the further language:

> Such ballots and envelopes, and communications in connection therewith, including postal cards, shall be transmitted free of postage—

There we find something which is real—

> including air-mail postage, in the United States mails.

To say that the postal cards would be sent to the boys, and returned by them to the various States, and that ballots would be sent from the States to the boys, and then marked and returned, is simply to stretch the credulity of the American people.

I had hoped the Members of the Senate would pass such a bill even though it should never be approved by the other House, as it would show a desire on the part of the Senate to allow the boys to vote. To agree to the proposed amendment as a substitute would be clearly an announcement that the Senate of the United States does not believe that the boys are entitled to much consideration.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I desire to make my position clear on this subject.

The State of Michigan is in substantially the same position as the State of Delaware in respect to its election laws. In our State the ballot is not collected until the last week in September, or the first week in October. It is perfectly obvious that if we are to rely on the present State system it will be impossible to obtain a substantial soldier vote by reliance upon our regular absentee law.

I have urgently recommended to the Governor of Michigan that he ask the 1944 session of the legislature to move forward for the duration the dates for holding our conventions and our primaries. Whether or not that is done will determine whether or not the substitute will be workable so far as Michigan soldiers are concerned.

In connection with the proposed legislation, in spite of professional New York newspaper scandalizers to the contrary, it happens that I have a deep and abiding interest in making the ballot available to the maximum number of absentee soldiers. So far as my record on the bill is concerned, the fact that every amendment which I have submitted has been accepted by the authors of the bill is an adequate disclosure of the situation. Feeling that way about it, I am unable to support a substitute which, barring State legislative action, I cannot guarantee. I am unable to accept a system which, in my opinion, would make it practically impossible for the absentee Michigan serviceman to vote.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I imagine that Michigan has more than half a million men in the service, has it not?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; I believe so.

Mr. McKELLAR. I believe that the number must be quite that great. Is it possible that the Governor would not call an extra session of the Michigan Legislature, and are not the people of Michigan sufficiently interested in the right of the boys to vote to insist that an extra session be called so that arrangements may be made for the boys to vote? States have been voting that way for a long time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I quite agree with the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Therefore, why would not the Governor of Michigan be willing to call an extra session of the legislature and let it take such steps as are necessary to guarantee the right of absentee soldiers, who are citizens of Michigan, to vote? I should think Michigan would do it, and I believe it could be done in Delaware.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think there will be a session and that the law may be changed. Certainly I prefer the use of the State absentee ballot if for no other reason than that it permits the soldier to vote for all officers instead of merely Federal officers. Still, confronting the naked situation as it exists today, I am unable to permit by my vote an exclusive reliance upon the State system, for if there is one thing which a man in uniform is entitled to it certainly is to vote as well as fight.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not know what the Senate will do with the amendment in the nature of a substitute which has been offered, but I wish, as an individual Member of the Senate, to make my position known in regard to it.

With all due respect for the authors of the substitute, for all of whom I have the profoundest respect, the adoption of the substitute will have no more effect upon procuring the right to vote among the men in our armed forces than the adoption of a pious resolution by the ladies' aid society or the Rotary Club of some city, town, or community.

We did not depend upon State legislative action in order to get our boys into the service and put them into the muck and mire and heat of battlefields all over the world; we were not willing to rely upon State legislatures to raise an army for us; we were not willing to rely upon Governors to call extra sessions of State legislatures in order that we might raise an army to fight for democracy.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall yield in a moment. I am not willing to rely upon exclusive State action in regard to the right to vote which we are now undertaking to confer upon the men in the armed forces scattered all over the world. I now yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has several times relied upon the State authority to furnish the election machinery by which he has been elected to this body, and so have all of us; and why is it necessary, at this late day, to change our reliance on the State authorities and rely only on Federal authorities?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senator from Tennessee knows that we are not doing so. What he is talking about is a situation that prevails in normal times. We are not living in normal times now; we are in a very abnormal situation, and I do not believe that it is fair that soldiers from some States, who are fighting all over the world to preserve our right to vote, should be given the opportunity to vote and that such opportunity should be denied soldiers from other States by a a mere failure to act on the part of the States. We have put into effect the universal draft, which affects every man alike, no matter in what State he may live. I think if we are going to try to give the men in the armed forces the right to vote because the arm of the Federal Government has reached into every home and taken them and has sent them into the Army and into the Navy and into the other armed services and scattered them all over the world, there certainly ought to be the same universality of the right to vote that we have imposed upon them in the universality of their obligation to service in the Army and Navy of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield further to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator believe that the bill which has been reported by the committee is in accordance with the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not set myself up as the last word or even the first word on the Constitution of the United States; I have never set myself up here as a constitutional lawyer.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know the Senator has read that remarkable instrument.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, I have read it; I have read it over and over again. I believe, answering the Senator's question categorically, in the circumstances under which we are seeking to pass this legislation, that it is constitutional and that it will be so held by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. I noticed that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court when it was proposed by the bill to make him a member of the war ballot commission immediately sent word that he would not be able to accept such a post because he knew perfectly well that the law was likely to come before that court in the end. Surely we should not want an election next November that will be contested in the courts; and that seems to me to be certain if we enact the pending bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. The position Chief Justice Stone took that he did not want to involve the Supreme Court in the decision of an election law that might later come before that court had nothing to do with his opinion of the constitutionality of the proposed act. I can very well appreciate Chief Justice Stone's reluctance and unwillingness to act as an umpire of an election which might conceivably come before him, and I think his action in that regard was eminently proper and according to his high conception of his duty; but that has no bearing at all upon the constitutionality of the bill nor upon what Chief Justice Stone would decide as to its constitutionality if it should reach the court.

Mr. McKELLAR. That may be true, Mr. President, in regard to what he will decide, but it shows there is a controversy, that there is a question that he knew would arise and might come before that court.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think so.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to say, with all the affection and esteem that I have for Chief Justice Stone that my admiration for him increased greatly when he sent his declination at the beginning, and I commend him as strongly as I know how to commend him.

Mr. BARKLEY. I share the Senator's high opinion of Chief Justice Stone, and it was not necessary for him to write the letter in question in order for me to entertain that opinion of him. I can very well understand his position; but the position I am taking is that we are justifying this legislation, if we are justifying it at all, because the Congress of the United States has created an abnormal condition that has taken away from men in the armed forces the right to exercise the suffrage under the conditions prescribed by the States. We certainly owe it to them to go as far as possible in order that we may assure to them all the rights they have heretofore enjoyed and ought now to enjoy as soldiers and sailors of the United States in the Army and Navy and other branches of the service.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall yield in a moment. I think it would be extremely unfair and unfortunate if, under their present laws or the enactment of new laws in some of the States and the failure to enact new laws in other States, a portion of our servicemen would be allowed to vote next year for President of the United States or Vice President, Senators, and Members of the House of Representatives, and that right should be denied to others, because some State had not recognized its own obligation to the same extent we are trying to recognize our obligation in the Congress of the United States.

I now yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. GREEN. May I draw the attention of the Senator from Tennessee to the fact that the law under which we are now acting was passed last year; an election was held under it and no question was raised after the election as to its constitutionality, although such questions were raised on the floor of the House and the Senate before the law was enacted.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me further?

Mr. BARKLEY. I only have 15 minutes, and I should like to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Senator from Kentucky declines to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield for one more question.

Mr. McKELLAR. This will be the only question I shall ask. The Senator says that the Congress has brought about an unusual condition. The Senator knows as well as I do, as well as we all do, that six times in our history the Congress of the United States has brought about a similar extraordinary condition, and yet the Congress has never before taken charge, or attempted to take charge of the voting of the country.

Mr. BARKLEY. In reply to that, I will say that the Congress of the United States has not six times created a similar situation. There never was in the history of the United States a selective-service law enacted by the Congress of the United States of the comprehensive dimensions of that which is now in force. We did enact a selective-service act in World War No. 1, but, prior to that, there was no such legislation, except in the later stages of the Civil War, when the Congress attempted a very limited application of the draft law. But even if it had been an exact situation, the negligence or lack of foresight on the part of Congress six times heretofore, in my judgment, does not justify us now in attempting to deny the men in the armed services the right of suffrage.

Mr. McKELLAR. There was the War of 1812, the war of 1846, the war of 1861, the war of 1898, and the present war.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am familiar with all those wars, but there was no selective-service law enacted when those wars were in progress comparable to the one now on the statute books.

Regardless of the intention of the authors of the substitute, for whom, as I have said, I have great admiration, and of whose good faith I have the highest opinion, regardless of their intention, the effect of the substitute, if it should be adopted by the Congress, would be that no soldiers' votes would be cast, except in a very limited degree.

I am not willing to go on record as denying a man whom we have taken into the service, and whom we have required to serve, and whom we would court martial if he should desert in that service, the right to express his choice for public officers of the United States, and because I entertain that belief, I shall vote against the substitute.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I admire and believe in the philosophy of the sponsors of the pending amendment. I wish we could in a practical way carry out their ideas. I happen to be one of the two Members of this body representing the State of New Mexico. I should like to go along with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] in carrying out their philosophy. The difficulty is, however, that action in accordance with their philosophy would not allow the boys to vote. There must be some law.

So far as my State is concerned, under the situation now prevailing, under the present law, if the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, the Senator from Mississippi, and the Senator from Tennessee should prevail, not a single one of the boys from New Mexico would be allowed to vote. What I want is that they may have opportunity to vote. I feel that I speak the mind also of my colleague the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH].

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD excerpts from an article by Frank R. Kent, published in the Baltimore Sun of December 3, in his column entitled "The Great Game of Politics." I invite the attention of Senators to the article, and ask them to read it, regardless of how the bill shall progress from now on.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS

(By Frank R. Kent)

OF CONCERN TO ALL

WASHINGTON, December 2.— * * * With a record such as this, it is not surprising to find the full administration weight behind two pending bills, both of which conflict with a basic principle of the Constitution—to wit, the right of the States to determine the qualifications of its voters, so long as they do not discriminate because of race, creed, or color. One of these bills repeals the poll tax, which exists in eight Southern States. The other is the bill to allow all servicemen to vote in the 1944 election.

So far as the poll tax is concerned, the arguments against it are as well known as the forces behind it. The latter are composed of the Negro leaders, the radical and communistic press, and the C. I. O. lobbyists. Except for pressure from them the administration would have little interest in the repeal proposal—and everybody knows it. The contention of the opposition is that the poll tax does not discriminate against the Negro in that it applies to whites as well as blacks and that its repeal in the eight States will not enfranchise any more Negroes than vote today.

The fact is that some of the leading Senators who oppose the repeal do not favor the poll tax at all. Rather, they would welcome its abolition but they insist that this be achieved by constitutional means—either by action of the States or by a constitutional amendment. And they justifiably assert that the issue is of concern to every State and every citizen; that if the Federal Government can take away this right to prescribe the qualifications of their voters, vested solely in the States by the Constitution, it can take away any and all other rights. Surrender this right and the States will have completely lost their independence and function only in directions permitted by the Federal authority. Actually, the fight against this bill is of the very greatest concern to every person who wishes to preserve the American form of government.

With regard to the soldiers' vote bill, the same principle of the Constitution is attacked by its New Deal sponsors. What they originally sought was to sweep aside all State legislation laws and simply accept the word of every soldier without any check-up as to where he lived or his qualification to vote in that place. Under this bill, as at first presented, any man in uniform, here or abroad, over 21 years old, would be handed a ballot and his vote counted in the State where he said he lived. This would enfranchise a great many thousands of individuals who never voted before, who never contemplated voting, who never registered and could not meet the voting qualifications of the State in which they lived. But, if the State officials refuse to count the votes of such persons the whole vote of the State could be thrown out by Congress.

There are Republican as well as Democratic Senators who regard these provisions as not only unconstitutional but bad. It may be that by the time this piece is printed they will have succeeded in correcting some of the bill's most obnoxious features. There is general recognition that the 10,000,000 voters affected may determine the election. There is also recognition that as originally drawn it gave advantages to the administration candidate, expected to be Mr. Roosevelt, which he should not have. Yet, those who strove to amend the bill are subjected to the unfair charge that they do not want the soldiers to vote.

Under these conditions, it takes real courage to speak out against this bill—particularly from Senators who come up for election next year. The fact is that the purpose of each of these bills is thoroughly sound. Their avowed objective is one upon which almost unanimous agreement could be had. But the methods by which it is proposed to reach their goals cannot be reconciled with a sense of fairness and dangerously disregard the principles of American government. There is no expectation that the poll-tax bill will pass at this session, but the soldier-vote bill will, which makes it all the more important it should be amended so that partisan advantage be eliminated, fair administration assured, and the fundamental rights of the States protected. None of these things is provided in the bill as it now stands.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I yield to no man in my reverence for the Constitution of the United States. I yield to no man in my reverence for States' rights. I yield to no one in my desire to see every available opportunity given, that is possible under legislative machinery, which would enable the soldiers to vote in the 1944 election.

Mr. President, the election next year will be the most important national election held since the days of Abraham Lincoln. Whoever may be elected by the United States in that year will shape the destiny of this Nation for perhaps the next 75 years.

I am one of those who believe that under the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and under section 1 of article 4 of the Constitution, and under the war powers, we have the power to enact legislation which is constitutionally affecting the particular question before us.

I recall the time in 1932, when we had a real domestic emergency in our economic life, and all will remember that through the welfare clause and the interstate commerce clause, under the Constitution of the United States, as construed by decisions of the Supreme Court, relief was afforded this Nation.

What we can do in an economic sense we can do in a political sense. In my humble opinion, we cannot through distortion of the political life of this Nation, fail to give our boys the opportunity now asked. We can pass a measure such as that suggested here which will be held constitutional by the Supreme

Court, because the proposal is to extend the privilege of voting to some 6,000,000 or 7,000,000 voters whom we are taking out of the political life. It is estimated that 5,000,000 soldiers will be overseas in 1944 at election time, and under the amendment offered, very few of those boys would have an opportunity to vote, in my opinion, unless the legislatures of the States should meet and pass special acts which would practically suspend or eliminate all the conditions and regulations dealing with absenteeism and registration, and the other regulations. There is no sign yet that any legislature is going to do that. Weeks ago, in speaking before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I called the attention of the Governors of the States to this matter, and I said that if I were the Governor of a State I should immediately call the legislature into session and have it remove all restrictions in the way of servicemen voting. But not one move has been made along that line, and, as the majority leader has so well and ably stated, if Uncle Sam can take his long arm and reach into every home in the United States and take a boy from the fireside, from the farm, from the store, and the factory, and send him anywhere in the world, thereby disfranchising him because of State regulations, because of State conditions, I undertake to say that the Federal Government must find a way, through legislation, to restore to that boy the right to vote in the election of 1944.

Mr. President, these men have been called from their peaceful pursuits in life; they have enlisted in an emergency to protect the security and sanctity of their homes; they are fighting to keep the American home from pillage and desecration; they are offering their all in the interest of free government, and they are in a different category from professional soldiers. These are citizen soldiers, who have been taken from their homes, soldiers who are ready to return to their homes the minute the bloody war shall be ended, and then continue to carry on the peaceful pursuits of life.

Those who vote for the pending amendment will have to assume the responsibility of denying practically every man overseas an opportunity to vote. As I pointed out a few days ago, from the statement given by Colonel Cutler of the Army, under the amendment, not a single boy from the State of Illinois who is now serving beyond the limits of continental United States, could vote in 1944. Does the Senate want to deny them that privilege?

I ask, if the individual who is fighting for freedom, who is willing to give his all in the protection of the home and the security of the country, is not entitled to vote, who, in heaven's name, is? That is what those will have to account for who vote for the amendment, Mr. President, for under the amendment, as the able Senator from Michigan, the able Senator from Massachusetts, and other Senators on both sides of the aisle, have so well said, there is not a chance in the world for such a boy to vote beyond the limits of continental United States, and there is not the slightest chance for him to vote if he is within the limits of the United States, unless he himself takes the initiative and follows the matter from beginning to end.

Furthermore, in States such as that of the Senator from Delaware, and other States to which I referred earlier in the debate, some 11 of them, unless there are absentee voting laws, not even citizens of those States serving in this country will be permited to vote.

No, Mr. President, this is an amendment which seeks to kill the bill, and it will kill it cold. It will be worse than nothing, so far as it would give the soldiers the right to vote is concerned, and I hope the Senate will not adopt it. Do not at this hour of peril vote for an amendment which will break the morale of the greatest and "fightingest" soldiers in all of the annals of time.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to say merely a word in connection with the pending substitute. My colleague from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] spoke a moment ago and said that if the substitute were adopted not a single soldier from our State would be permitted to vote. He spoke the truth. Under our laws and our Constitution, as they now exist, and which it will be impossible to change, no matter how good the faith of the State legislature and the Governor may be, nothing we can do will enable our soldiers to vote if the bill is killed.

Mr. President, the amendment now before the Senate is offered under the name of a substitute, something to take the place of the bill which we are now considering. The bill which we are now considering will give the right to American boys to vote wherever they may be. The substitute will not do so. The substitute is offered in the name of States' rights. I am sorry, Mr. President, to see that issue injected into the debate at this time and in this form, because under the very name of States' rights, by which they would deny the Federal Government the right to pass legislation giving the soldiers the right to vote, the authors of the substitute call upon the Congress of the United States to direct and to tell the State legislatures what they shall do. Is that consistent with the theory of States' rights? Will the Senators who propose the substitute point out to me where in the Constitution there can be found the right and power of the Congress even to recommend to a State legislature what it shall do?

Mr. President, I wish to say that I have the greatest respect for those who earnestly oppose the bill on the ground that it is beyond the constitutional power of the Congress to enact it, and I should expect them to vote "nay" on the straight-out issue as to whether Congress does have the power and should enact the legislation. But I would greatly deplore and greatly regret to see the Senate of the United States, in the name of States' rights or anything else, avoid a straight-out vote on the constitutionality of the pending bill as reported by the committee. If it is beyond our power to give the soldiers the right to vote by congressional act, as we seek to do, then let us say so by our vote; let us vote "nay" on that issue. If we believe it is within our power, then let us vote "yea." But under no circumstances let us avoid the issue. Let us not piously recommend to the States that they shall have some postal cards printed and sent to the soldiers.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Suppose all the soldiers who received the postal cards should decide that they would like to have ballots, and answered the postal cards, and the postal cards were sent back to the sources from which they came; in view of the rapid movement of our soldiers not only within the continental United States but their rapid transport to the four corners of the earth—and it has been stated by General Marshall that by the end of 1944 it is expected that 5,000,000 soldiers will be scattered all over the world—how long would it take the ballots requested by the soldiers in the postal cards to chase them around the world and catch up to them so that they could cast the votes and return back in time to be counted?

Mr. HATCH. Of course, Mr. President, the Senator's question answers itself. It would be impossible. One of the strong reasons for my support of Federal legislation is that I know that it is impractical or impossible for the 48 States to act and have the votes of the soldiers counted in time, in view of the different laws in the several States.

Mr. President, we either want the soldiers to vote or we do not want them to vote. We either have the constitutional right to enact the legislation or we do not have. Let us face the issue squarely and fairly and vote "yea" or "nay" on the main issue, but let us not vote for a substitute which would do nothing except to stultify the Congress of the United States.

I hope the substitute will be defeated.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Radcliffe
Andrews	Hatch	Reed
Austin	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hayden	Robertson
Barkley	Hill	Russell
Bilbo	Holman	Scrugham
Bone	Johnson, Calif	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Brooks	Kilgore	Stewart
Buck	Langer	Taft
Burton	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	McCarran	Tobey
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Caraway	McFarland	Tydings
Chandler	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Wagner
Clark, Mo	Mead	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh, Mass.
Davis	Moore	Walsh, N. J.
Eastland	Murray	Wheeler
Ellender	Nye	Wherry
Ferguson	O'Daniel	White
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Gillette	Overton	Willis
Green	Pepper	Wilson

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I do not intend to take more than a minute of the time of the Senate. Statements have been made that the bill is for the purpose of giving the soldiers the right to vote. Under the terms of the committee amendment, the gift would be only a hollow thing; we would be giving the soldiers nothing but a lawsuit. If the bill as proposed to be amended by the committee were passed, it would be certain to result in litigation. The committee amendment is absolutely unconstitutional, and it would result in denying the vote to the members of the armed forces of the country.

I trust the States. The 48 States have shown a desire to cooperate. State after State has enacted absentee voting laws, so as to give the ballot to the members of the armed forces.

Under the provisions of the substitute, those States will cooperate with the Federal Government; and the substitute will certainly mean more to the soldiers than would the committee amendment, for the reason that if the substitute is adopted, the soldiers will receive from their home precincts ballots which will permit them to vote in a constitutional way for all officials of the Government, both State, National, and local.

I submit that the substitute is the only solution of the problem, the only way to get the ballots to the soldiers, and that the first duty the Congress owes to the 120,000,000 people not in the armed forces, as well as to those in the armed forces of our country, is to assure an orderly, legal election next year, and not throw the election of the President of the United States into the courts or into the House of Representatives—especially not throw it into the courts, for I know how many persons feel about the present personnel of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. President, I think the substitute should be agreed to. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and permit my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] is confined to his home with a cold.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent because of a death in his family. He has a pair with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. I am not advised how either Senator would vote if present.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—42

Andrews	Hawkes	Robertson
Bailey	Hill	Russell
Bankhead	Holman	Scrugham
Bilbo	McCarran	Shipstead
Buck	McClellan	Smith
Butler	McKellar	Stewart
Byrd	Maybank	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Millikin	Tobey
Caraway	Moore	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Nye	Walsh, Mass.
Danaher	O'Daniel	Walsh, N. J.
Eastland	Overton	Wherry
Ellender	Reed	White
Gerry	Revercomb	Willis

NAYS—37

Aiken	Hatch	Radcliffe
Austin	Hayden	Taft
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Brooks	Kilgore	Tunnell
Burton	Langer	Vandenberg
Chandler	Lodge	Van Nuys
Chavez	Lucas	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Wallgren
Davis	Maloney	Wheeler
Ferguson	Mead	Wiley
Gillette	Murray	Wilson
Green	O'Mahoney	
Guffey	Pepper	

NOT VOTING—17

Ball	Downey	McNary
Bone	George	Murdock
Brewster	Glass	Reynolds
Bridges	Gurney	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Johnson, Calif.	Truman
Connally	La Follette	

So the amendment, as modified, in the nature of a substitute, proposed by Mr. EASTLAND, for himself, Mr. MCCLELLAN, and Mr. MCKELLAR, was agreed to.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I move that the vote just taken be reconsidered.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended by the so-called Eastland substitute.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill S. 1285 was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring, and recommends to the several States the immediate enactment of, appropriate legislation to enable each person absent from the place of his residence and serving in the armed services of the United States, members of the merchant marine of the United States or serving with the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Ferry Service, the Women's Air Force Service Pilots, and the United Service Organizations outside the United States who are attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States, who is eligible to vote in any election district or precinct, to vote by absentee ballot in any general election held in his election district or precinct in time of war; and in order to afford ample opportunity for members of the armed forces, members of the merchant marine of the United States, or persons serving with the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Ferry Service, the Women's Air Force Service Pilots, and United Service Organizations outside the United States who are attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States to vote for Federal, State, and local officials and to utilize the absentee balloting procedures of the various States to the greatest extent possible, it is recommended that each State cause to be printed and delivered to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy an adequate number of postal cards for use by such absentee voters in the armed forces in making application for absentee ballots, and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall, wherever practicable, and compatible with military operations, cause such postal cards to be delivered to members of the armed forces located within or without the United States, as expeditiously as possible in order to enable such members of the armed forces to secure, execute, and return said ballots in ample time to be recorded for such election.

"SEC. 2. (a) It shall, wherever practicable and compatible with military operations, be the duty of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to cooperate with appropriate State officers and agencies in the distribution, execution, collection, and return of such absentee ballots, and envelopes to be used in connection therewith, as may be provided under the laws of the several States for the use of persons in the armed services in time of war.

"(b) Such ballots and envelopes, and communications in connection therewith, including postal cards, shall be transmitted free of postage, including air-mail postage, in the United States mails.

"SEC. 3. The act of August 2, 1939, entitled 'An act to prevent pernicious political activities,' as amended, is hereby amended by adding thereto the following new sections:

"SEC. 22. It shall be unlawful for any officer of, or person employed in, the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, including the

Army and Navy, to deliver or cause to be delivered to persons in the armed forces of the United States any general communication, Government magazine, Government newspaper, motion-picture film, or other literature or material, or to make, or cause to be made, any broadcast to the armed forces of the United States, paid for in whole or in part with Government funds, or sponsored by the Government, or any officer, agency, or department thereof, including the Army and Navy, containing political argument or political propaganda of any kind designed or calculated to affect the result of any election for President, Vice President, Presidential elector, Member of the Senate, or Member of the House of Representatives, except as hereinafter provided:

"(1) Nothing herein shall prohibit the rebroadcast over Government-controlled radio stations of any political address, but equal time must if requested be given for such purposes to representatives of each political party presenting a candidate for President at the election.

"(2) Nothing herein shall prevent the distribution to members of the armed forces of books, magazines, and newspapers which have a general circulation in the United States, or of servicemen's magazines or newspapers, such as Yank and Stars and Stripes; but the list of such books, magazines, and newspapers of general circulation shall be determined in accordance with the preference of the members of the armed forces in some reliable method to be determined by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, and the conduct of servicemen's magazines or newspapers sponsored or paid for by the Government shall be wholly nonpartisan and nonpolitical, unless an equal amount of space is allotted in each issue to editorials, columns, or other argumentative matter supporting each party concerned in the Presidential election.

"(3) Nothing herein shall prevent the sending of any letter, magazine, newspaper, or other literature by any individual, corporation, other than Government-owned corporation, or political committee to any member of the armed forces, addressed personally to such member of the armed forces, and paid for by him, or by the person or committee sending the same.

"(4) No communication, order, magazine, newspaper, or other literature, and no broadcast, and no list of books, magazines, or newspapers, shall be deemed to be in violation of this section if it is first submitted to the United States War Ballot Commission, and found by such Commission not to be in violation of this section, but it shall not be compulsory to make such submission.

"SEC. 23. It shall be unlawful for any censor or other member of the executive branch of the United States Government to censor or interfere with any letter or communication addressed to an individual member of the armed forces for the purpose of removing therefrom political literature or political arguments or other matter sent to such individual member of the armed forces by any individual, corporation, or political committee, unless such literature or other matter contains information which may be of value to the enemy in their prosecution of the war.

"SEC. 24. Any person who violates the provisions of section 22 or section 23 hereof either within or outside of the United States shall upon conviction thereof be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year or both."

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION OF DR. CLARENCE POE TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is only one nomination on the Executive Calendar. I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the nomination be considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none. The clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dr. Clarence Poe to be a member of the Federal Board for Vocational Education.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, as in executive session, the nomination is confirmed.

FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST AIRPLANE FLIGHT BY WILBUR AND ORVILLE WRIGHT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 175. This is a joint resolution commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the first airplane flight by Wilbur and Orville Wright. Celebrations are to be held at Kitty Hawk on December 17, and also in Washington. Mr. Orville Wright himself will be here. I think it will be the first time he has attended a dinner of the kind which is to be held.

The joint resolution carries no appropriation whatever. It merely expresses the gratitude and respect of the Nation for the contribution made by those founders of the airplane industry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 175) commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the first airplane flight by Wilbur and Orville Wright.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. What is the purpose of the joint resolution?

Mr. TAFT. Possibly if the resolution is read, it will be apparent. I ask that the joint resolution be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas, on December 17, 1903, the first flight of a heavier-than-air machine was made by Wilbur and Orville Wright at Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, N. C.; and

Whereas this flight fulfilled man's dream to conquer the air; and

Whereas this achievement of the Wright brothers has been of incalculable value to mankind; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States heretofore has recognized this epochal event by authorizing the erection of a memorial at the place of the flight; and

Whereas the fortieth anniversary of the first flight of a heavier-than-air machine will be commemorated on December 17, 1943: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the Nation express its gratitude and respect for this signal and astounding contribution to the progress of the world on the fortieth anniversary thereof.

That an engrossed copy of this joint resolution be transmitted to Orville Wright, the surviving brother.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to suggest to the Senator from Ohio that the whereases in the joint resolution be eliminated. Among the whereases there is the recital that "This achievement of the Wright Brothers has been of incalculable value to mankind." In my opinion, it is probably the greatest disaster that has ever happened to mankind. I am not willing to give my consent for the consideration of a joint resolution which contains such a whereas. I do not think there is any question that the Wright brothers, high as were their motives, probably contributed more to the disasters to mankind than any other two men who ever lived in the history of the world. I am not willing to vote for the joint resolution with the whereases; and, holding those views, unless the whereases are omitted, I shall object.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator states my own view with respect to whereases in general. I am perfectly willing to eliminate the whereases. I understand that the House will be in session next week. My only doubt is as to the House amending the joint resolution before the date of the celebration.

Without agreeing to anything which the Senator has said, I am sufficiently against whereases to offer an amendment eliminating the whereases if the Senator will permit the joint resolution to be considered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. With that understanding, Mr. President, I withdraw my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 175) commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the first airplane flight by Wilbur and Orville Wright.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, has the Senator offered an amendment to strike out the "whereases"?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has not yet offered an amendment to the joint resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think he is getting ready to do so.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will be satisfied with striking out the three middle "whereases," leaving the other two, which lay the groundwork for the joint resolution, I think that would meet his objection.

I move to strike out the three middle "whereases," leaving the other two.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that in view of the fact that the language proposed to be stricken is in the preamble, the preamble cannot be acted upon until after the joint resolution is passed.

The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I now move to strike out the second, third, and fourth "whereases" in the preamble.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, in the preamble, to strike out:

Whereas this flight fulfilled man's dream to conquer the air; and

Whereas this achievement of the Wright brothers has been of incalculable value to mankind; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States heretofore has recognized this epochal event by authorizing the erection of a memorial at the place of the flight; and

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 861) to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States, and it was signed by the Vice President.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take an adjournment until next Tuesday at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate took an adjournment until Tuesday, December 7, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate December 3 (legislative day of November 18), 1943:

FEDERAL BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Dr. Clarence Poe to be a member of the Federal Board for Vocational Education for the unexpired term of 3 years ending July 17, 1946.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, spirit of infinite love, we are standing at the threshold of a new day which has come to us without a blemish. It is ours for good or ill. With hearts filled with gratitude and with an unshakable trust in Thy providence, we welcome it. Thou knowest, blessed Lord, how prone we are to falter. We pray for Thy guidance that we may keep it free from unjust criticism and petulance, and free to serve in the spirit of cooperation. O give us real strength to forgive wrongs, to bear and to forbear. As we cherish the flower without the blight, so help us to appreciate suffering and sinning humanity without its checkered life. Grant that the wide sweep of duty and responsibility may be compassed by resolution, knowledge, and wisdom, and Thine shall be the praise. O God, endow us with the true spirit that nothing adds to the glory of character like humility and sacrifice, which go down to help and bless those in need. For the sake and in the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2207. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

CABLEGRAM FROM MME. CHIANG KAI-SHEK

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following cablegram, which was read:

CHUNGKING.

Vice President WALLACE and Speaker SAM RAYBURN,

Washington, D. C.:

Please convey my warmest congratulations to the Senate and the House of Representatives on the statesmanlike action in passing the Warren-Magnuson bill, and thereby repealing the Chinese Exclusion Act. The recollection of the spontaneous and touching welcome that Congress and the American people accorded me when I was in America will ever remain fresh in my mind. Congress, which voiced the sentiment of the American people, has once again shown its friendship to China not only in words but in a deed which will echo round the world. By this vivid and concrete demonstration of the unity of the United Nations you have unmistakably reaffirmed the liberal leadership we have all come to expect from America.

Mme. CHIANG KAI-SHEK.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I would like to find out the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Monday bills on the Consent Calendar will be called up, on Tuesday bills on the Private Calendar will be called, and on Wednesday the Murray bill, that unanimous consent was obtained yesterday to consider, will be taken up. I understand that there are two bills reported by the Committee on Naval Affairs authorizing certain work to be done by the Navy in the way of construction to be considered. I am hopeful that those bills will be brought up either on Wednesday or Thursday, probably Thursday, although I am not able to state definitely now.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. When is this appropriation bill that has been completed and ready to be acted on, as I understand it, to be taken up?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. I am informed that bill will come up immediately following disposition of the Disney bill which will be considered on the 13th as the result of a discharge petition having been signed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There is no chance of getting that up next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. It will be in order, but I have been requested not to bring it up next week and naturally, as far as possible, I like to comply with the request that has been made. I have been asked to have it brought up after the Disney bill and that is the intention in relation to that bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is unfortunate that we cannot have it considered next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

FREIGHT RATES

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, it is sincerely hoped by many of us from the South and West that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will soon dispose of the several bills now pending regarding the controversial subject of freight rates.

Lately, Members of the House have been circularized by some of the railroads serving the South and West with publications setting out opposition to any or all of the pending bills.

As the author of one of the bills seeking to deal with this long-past-due and much-needed legislation, I am certain that I speak for my colleagues who are authors of other similar bills when I assert that all that is sought for is justice. The desired hearings before our distinguished Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will undoubtedly develop the true facts on this important subject.

As a part of my remarks, I enclose herewith an editorial from the Greenville News, of Greenville, S. C., under date of September 26, 1943:

FOR EQUAL FREIGHT RATES

The view sometimes expressed by spokesmen for some railroads in the South that

the Nation's freight rate structure is not discriminatory to this section does not appear to receive much ground of support in the report just filed by a board of investigation and research created by the 1940 Transportation Act.

The board, which has evidently made a thorough and unbiased study of the rate situation, makes a strong recommendation for equalization of freight rates and says the existing differences are "not justified by costs or other transportation conditions. Equality of rate levels, particularly the rates on manufactured articles, would create conditions more favorable than have existed in the past for the development of particular industries in the South and the West, since present rate disadvantages would be removed." The report asserts that average first-class rate levels in the South are 39 percent higher than in the East, and in the West they are 28 to 34 percent higher. The New England member of this board, it is true, did not concur with the other members, one of whom is from Kentucky and the other from Nebraska.

Careful consideration should be given by Congress, we think, to the basic recommendation of this board, which is that congressional action should be taken to put the South and West on a basis of freight-rate equality with the rest of the country. While it may be argued that this is rather a matter for I. C. C. decision than for legislative action, this board makes a sound point we think, in holding that it would be simpler for the I. C. C. to revise the entire rate structure if it had a mandate from Congress to bring about uniformity to the extent that it is practicable. It would be quite proper and highly desirable, it seems to this newspaper, for Congress thus to set forth clearly a fundamental freight-rate policy to be carried out by the I. C. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an address by my colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] on December 1 before the Women's Clubs of Ohio at Columbus, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COURTNEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address by Chester Bowles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

ELECTION AS CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 372) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That BRENT SPENCE, of the State of Kentucky, be, and he is hereby, elected chairman of the Standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Banking and Currency.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address by Edward Tomlinson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BURGIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain correspondence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH]?

There was no objection.

THE SAN FRANCISCO PLAN

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Calinia [Mr. ROLPH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, time after time from this floor Members criticize price control. Not because of the idea itself, but the way the act is being administered.

No one has been more outspoken than myself. Not alone in this Chamber, but also before the Banking and Currency Committee. Repeatedly I have expressed my ideas especially on the manner in which rent control is being handled.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to tell you what happens when all parties cooperate. Mail from home gives information that as an outcome of my negotiations, the Wholesale Perishable Food Committee of San Francisco and O. P. A. have reached a workable arrangement.

No black markets exist in San Francisco for fresh fruits and vegetables.

The plan should be helpful in every section of the country. It has been adopted in New York, likewise Newark, N. J. Under unanimous consent, I am introducing complete details and hope many communities throughout the country will benefit from the San Francisco plan.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House today for 20 minutes at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter and copy of a resolution passed at a recent meeting of the New England radio stations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH]?

There was no objection.

SUBSIDIES

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, as shown on page 512 of the hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee last October 11, Dr. Gilbert, of the O. P. A., in answer to a question from me stated that the administration planned subsidies of about $800,000,000 and said that if they were allowed $1,000,000,000 for this purpose it was ample, and I quote, "it probably would run very much under that."

According to this morning's press, Mr. Bowles told the Senate committee yesterday that they were now spending at the rate of one billion one hundred million for subsidies and that one billion two hundred and fifty million would be ample for their needs.

Thus, like little Topsy, the subsidy program just keeps growing.

If they are going to raise their sights by $300,000,000 in less than 2 months, by this time next year they will be asking for at least $3,000,000,000 a year; and heaven knows what a year later.

Subsidies are like the drug habit. They call for larger and larger doses as time goes on.

If Congress ever approves of this consumer subsidy principle there will be no end to the demands made upon us for this purpose.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Kansas City Star regarding flood control and soil conservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a press release issued by the Bureau of Reclamation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Marion Daily Republican.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia.

There was no objection.

PROHIBITION LEGISLATION

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, more than 60,000 citizens of the State of Michigan have expressed their protest against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress. Their petitions make particular reference to H. R. 2082, which is before the Committee on the Judiciary.

At the request of these people I am today presenting to the House the petitions bearing their names.

Among them are the names of soldiers including Pvt. Louis Wiedling, a resident of my congressional district, who was injured at Pearl Harbor. By a strange and tragic coincidence his father, Eugene G. Wiedling, also a resident of my district, died of a heart attack while listening to the radio announcement of the fateful attack on Pearl Harbor. Although the father did not know that his son was in the midst of the catastrophe, he did know the meaning of war for he was a veteran of World War No. 1.

This is an example of how our boys who are now fighting so courageously for victory feel about the question of prohibition. They have been told that they are "out there" in the battle for liberty—is that very liberty to be denied to them at home? Other veterans of Guadalcanal, Lae, and other places now memorable in the history of our Nation have signed their names to these petitions voicing their views in a similar manner—they do not want prohibition.

But not only the men garbed in their country's cloth feel this way. Doctors, lawyers, defense workers, clerks, teachers, and students are also opposed to national prohibition. From every profession, trade, and walk of life comes to us the same plea: "Vote against any and all such proposed legislation."

As a matter of fact, these petitions were brought to me by a representative of the working class, Mr. Eugene J. McCann, executive secretary of the Michigan State Council of Brewery Workers, C. I. O. Labor, too, has a vital interest in this question.

As expressed in the petition, national prohibition, during a test of 13 years from 1920 to 1933, brought upon the Nation the uncontrollable evils of the speakeasy and the bootlegger—the degradation of teen-age girls and boys, Nation-wide home manufacture of illegal liquor—widespread vicious crime, official corruption, and disrespect for law—all of which so outraged public decency that the eighteenth amendment was repealed by a majority of 10,000,000 votes.

Another reason, although not as important as the moral aspect, should not be overlooked. The enactment of any such legislation would completely destroy all legalized control and cause the loss of Federal revenues of more than $1,500,000,000 a year and local revenues of $500,000,000 a year without any compensating benefits to either State or Nation.

These are only a few of the many reasons why the majority of the people are opposed to a return of prohibition; why they have expressed this opposition in the form of petitions which, Mr. Speaker, I am presenting to the House today.

May the wishes of these 60,000 people be respected—they are truly representative of a majority of the people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address by Mr. Charles Nelson, of Willmar, Minn., on the subject of postwar problems.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

FARM MACHINERY

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, on the 30th I discussed for a few minutes before the House the question of farm machinery and the great need for extra farm machinery in this great Nation of ours for the production of food. Following up that discussion, I am today introducing a joint resolution, which I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk now read. It is very short.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution relating to the allocation of steel for the manufacture of farm machinery and farm implements

Resolved, etc., That the War Production Board shall allocate, for the domestic manufacture of farm machinery and farm implements for domestic use, an amount of steel equal to not less than 125 percent of the steel used for the domestic manufacture of farm machinery and farm implements for domestic use in the calendar year 1940, and such steel shall be allocated and made available soon enough to permit its use in the manufacture of farm machinery and farm implements for use by the farmers of the United States in the planting, cultivation and harvesting of agricultural commodities during the calendar year 1944.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

TAX COLLECTIONS

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I have been one of those Members who have believed that a courageous tax program might bring a good deal of order out of the chaos that exists in our national financial affairs. However, since receiving the statement of the Treasury on November 30 I am not so sure. For the first 5 months of this fiscal year the tax collections and other Treasury income have gone up from $5,000,000,000 to $14,000,000,000, almost a 200 percent increase but in the same period the deficit, like "Old Man River," just keeps on rolling along. For these same 5 months it is $23,000,000,000 this year. It was $23,000,000,000 last year for the same period. So far more taxes have simply meant more spending.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein excerpts from the hearings before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors on the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway, including the statement of Col. P. A. Feringa of the Army engineers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

SO-CALLED FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMITTEE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, while President Roosevelt is away, a bunch of crackpots down here in what they call the "Fair Employment Practice Com-

mittee," seem to be doing everything they possibly can to drive the white people of the South out of the Democratic Party, by trying to force them to accept Negroes on terms of social equality. They seem to have succeeded as far south as Kentucky and Oklahoma, judging from the latest election returns.

If they should succeed in driving a few more Southern States out of the Democratic Party, we would not have enough Democrats left in this House to force a roll call. The party would be as dead as a door nail.

When they go out and attempt to force every private enterprise in the South to accept Negroes, force them to employ Negroes and promote them, whether they want them or not, they are simply creating dissension that is going to bring race trouble, just as it did in Detroit, Mich., and Harlem, New York, and will result in injury to both whites and Negroes for years and years to come.

When they attempt to force private enterprise, I say, to bend to their wishes in this respect, they commit one of the most dangerous acts of communistic nonsense I have ever seen attempted by anybody on the Federal pay roll.

When they go to the railroad brotherhoods and tell the white men working on our railroads, who have been good to the Negroes of this country, that they have to make engineers and conductors out of them, and that they have to accept them on terms of social equality, I say they are insulting the white railroad men of the country, and doing the Negroes an irreparable injury.

This so-called Fair Employment Practice Committee is really a rump organization without any legal authority, and should be abolished at once. This is no time for a bunch of crackpots to be stirring up race trouble throughout the country.

VEGETABLE OILS AND ANIMAL FATS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ELECTION TO A COMMITTEE

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I present the following resolution (H. Res. 373) which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, of the State of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS GOODS

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, in October of this year $10,500,000 worth of surplus goods were sold by the Treasury Procurement Division. That is nearly one-half of the amount sold since last February, when the President directed this function. Less than half of this amount went to the other Government departments, which have priority on requests. I am wondering if this body has approached the time when it ought to go into a policy on the disposition of surplus goods. The crescendo of disposal seems to be increasing as each month passes by. I believe it is time we should take inventory of the stock pile, and direct a policy that will put this surplus back into commercial lines, with no severe shock to our national economy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the House on next Tuesday for 15 minutes, following any business which may be on the Speaker's table and any other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Also, Mr. Speaker, on Thursday next, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes, following any other business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] for 15 minutes.

OPPOSITION TO THE NEW DEAL

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and include certain matters and newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, some bad news came in this week from my district. A friend has advised me that unless I begin to show some opposition to the New Deal I am not going to be elected next election day. I was also told that unless I got rid of the O. P. A. I might just as well come home. So this morning I am making a personal appeal on my own account, and not now on behalf of the country, but just speaking for myself, to the Democratic leadership; that is, the regular Democratic leadership, and to the insurgents within the Democratic ranks, and to the Republican leadership; that is, to the regular Republican leadership, and also to those on the committee for direct action—and I notice one of the cochairmen is here, and that most of the members are present—to help me with this job, because I have discovered after almost 10 years down here that in passing legislation neither the logic nor the volume of the argument has decisive effect. They do it here by vote. They call the roll, and they mark down the vote up there at the desk, and it takes a majority, I have discovered, to pass any legislation. And for 10 years or more the New Dealers have had the votes. So I am announcing now, for home consumption, that I am opposed to the New Deal, and that I am in favor of curtailing or rendering more effective the O. P. A.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Briefly, but not for any point of parliamentary law.

Mr. CASE. I want the RECORD to show that the gentleman from Michigan certainly could call the roll of Members of this House and obtain almost a unanimous vote in stating that he had done his duty in expressing his opposition to the New Deal.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is very kind, and if the gentleman would let me have that contribution for circulation under his own name in my district, I am sure that it will be helpful in the next election, for he is known throughout the Midwest as a statesman and an accurate commentator.

In my hand is a picture printed in the Detroit News which has aroused considerable comment in Michigan and has brought many of us, not only Republicans, although this picture shows only Republicans, but all Members of the House, into disrepute. Just why the Detroit News should take a picture of the Republican table, where only Republicans are permitted to eat, although Members of the majority sometimes stop by and get intellectual food, I do not understand, for practically all Members eat in the House restaurant on occasion. There is something wrong about this idea, it seems to me, of charging it all to Republicans.

This picture has to do with that so-called subsidy dinner to which reference was made rather briefly some few days ago. I cite it again only as showing that some of these papers, the Detroit papers, are blaming the Republicans all the time for not voting for subsidies. My memory is that there were 100 Democrats who voted for subsidies and 98 Democrats who voted against subsidies, which is only 2 less than the number who followed the New Deal. And even the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] who spoke so long and so often for subsidies when the test came voted for the bill which banned them. Now, as long as the Democrats are in control—and they are—I cannot understand why bad results, failures of legislation, should be charged to Republicans.

Then here is something else that frightens me—or does it? From Detroit comes this card. Look at it. There is shown a rope with a hangman's noose at the end. It asks the patriots to go to Washington with a rope and hang inflationist Representatives to a lamppost. That would be a dirty trick on the lamppost, anyway.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield, just briefly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The card I received had the same type of rope drawn on it and the fellow said the Detroit News recommended that the patriots

come to Washington and hang to the lamppost those fellows who voted against the subsidy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, whether that be so or not, my only answer would be that the owner and the editors of the Detroit News become candidates for Congress and defeat those Democrats who come from Detroit and themselves come down here and give us and the State adequate representation. They might get cards suggesting that they be hung. Who knows?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield just briefly.

Mr. MAY. I was just going to suggest that these hangman's nooses and ropes being sent here altogether on the Republican side might be a bad sign.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What was that you said?

Mr. MAY. I just said that these hangman's nooses and ropes being sent here to hang the Representatives on the Republican side of the House might be a bad sign and might be unfortunate. They are a bunch of good fellows and ought not to be hanged.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why, I agree with that. But I recall something about a recent Kentucky election where the voters decided we needed more Republicans. They are not hanging them down there. They are just defeating New Dealers and putting in Republicans to take the place of those "yes" men.

Mr. MAY. I was going to say they might want to hang the Republican who was just sent up here; I don't know. I hope you gentlemen on the other side don't ever do that, because he is a nice fellow.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We get along pretty well. The people seemed to think pretty well of him down there. The vote indicates they do, and we accept their decision.

THE O. P. A.

But this is what I wanted to talk about. The O. P. A. Listen to this telegram from a paper mill in my district:

In past 60 days we have lost 11 days due to inability to buy paper stock legally—

Note the word "legally"—

Running time 78 percent. We manufacture 225 tons daily and have lost in these 11 days 2,464 tons. All this is paperboard needed in the war effort. Closing today for balance of week. Inventory today is 63 tons mixed papers and 125 tons newspapers. Other mills this vicinity report similar conditions. If W. P. B. is to get paperboard in amount they say is required, O. P. A. must do something to stop chiseling, of which we understand they have plenty of affidavits and evidence. Can we expect any release?

Now, to go back, back to August, that was not the beginning, but back in August I took this matter up with the O. P. A. here. I would like to ask you to follow this so as to get the picture of how the O. P. A. is not enforcing the price ceilings. How its failure to act favors the black-market operator. Here are some letters from which I will read pretty soon, blaming the Republicans and those Democrats who voted against the subsidy for the inflation. But what is the use of giving these boards or the administration power if they do not exercise it? For example, in price fixing; and when they do fix prices, not forcing compliance. Why protect and encourage black-market operators?

The letter reads as follows:

Earlier this week we talked with you on the telephone regarding the critical shortage of waste paper, which, if not relieved, will curtail our production of paperboard, which is now largely being used in the manufacture of ammunition containers, ration-kit boxes, and other essential war uses.

We give you below the situation as it exists in this area. Anything you can do to wake up the O. P. A. to a realization of this situation will certainly be appreciated by everyone in this business who is trying to cooperate in the war effort and operating in accordance with Government rules and regulations. The buying price of waste paper used by the paperboard manufacturer and other paper mills is regulated by price schedule No. 30 and various amendments.

Last year mills were asked to put away large stocks of waste paper to take care of the war and civilian need for paperboard and paperboard products. In our own case we filled our entire warehouse capacity and piled approximately 3,000 tons outdoors so that at one time we had 8,500 tons of waste paper on hand. Up until about April 1 of this year, we were able to buy enough waste paper to take care of our consumption, and at that time we adopted the policy of using up some of the material that was stored outdoors because waste paper deteriorates rapidly when stored outdoors during the winter, and our plan was to use this stock up during the spring and summer and, if again necessary, to store another large tonnage outdoors for the coming winter.

Complaints have been made regularly to the Chicago office of the O. P. A. However, nothing has been done to stop this chiseling. Certain persons have been called to their office for questioning. We are told that the complaints are referred to the legal department, and when we asked the legal department for some action, they tell us they are short of field men, and without their investigation it is impossible to get sufficient evidence to bring the violators into court.

Now, do you get the picture? I took it up with the O. P. A. and they told the paper manufacturers in my district, who complained to the Chicago office, that they should ask their Congressmen to vote more money. But this company submitted to the O. P. A. in Chicago facts and figures showing the chiseling. Did they stop it? They did not. That was back in August. Today I received the wire that I just read to you that the chiseling is going on just the same.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Would you like to know where some of their field men are? A Chicago paper carried the story that they were going up and down my district getting confessions from little tenant farmers, whose wives raise chickens and produce eggs, and they have told them they would not be prosecuted, and then after getting the confessions they get a $30, or $50 fine from them.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And in a kangaroo court.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the Member from Illinois.

Now, let me read this last paragraph.

We realize that it takes two to make a bargain, that the paper stock dealer is not the only violator. Either the consuming mill directly or through their box board manufacturer are violators and are equally guilty with the dealers.

If prompt action would be taken by the O. P. A. and some of these violators were exposed and punished, this black market would collapse and the price schedule would be adhered to.

I again called the attention of the office down here to the situation. They admit there is a black market. First, they said they were considering it. Later they said they did not have the evidence. The company claims it gave the Chicago office the evidence. Still no prosecutions, as far as I know, have been undertaken.

Here is a letter from W. P. B. dated November 30.

The War Production Board has deemed it inadvisable to control the available supply of waste paper for fear of discouraging collections.

In short, we gave O. P. A. authority to fix prices on different things. They fixed the price of waste paper which, through this mill, goes into the containers which carry the ammunition across the seas.

Now, here is the War Production Board and the O. P. A. They have absolute control of this industry, of this situation. The Congress has authorized them, and directed them to fix these prices which would prevent inflation. They know of the black market. I repeat again, we have given them information which would justify prosecutions. We have told them the names of the people who are buying, and the dates and the prices, but they do not act. Then they have the effrontery to write me this letter of the 30th, saying:

The War Production Board has deemed it inadvisable to control the available supply of waste paper for fear of discouraging collection. We are today securing approximately 35 percent of total production and about 50 percent of the total available reuseable supply.

The black market has been admittedly quite extensive but I believe has now reached the point where it is being brought under some control. You undoubtedly know that the shortage has been extremely great.

It is futile for Congress to give the administration power to control prices, to prevent inflation, if, as it here appears from the correspondence, neither the O. P. A. nor the W. P. B. will act to end black market operations which are hiking the price of this commodity needed for war production.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

PROTEIN MEAL FEEDS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on November 1, the President of the United States transmitted a most important message to the Congress. It was on the subject of food and was in the form of an outline of his food program for the needs of our armed forces, our ci-

villians at home, and our fighting allies. The first two sentences in the Presidential message are important, and I quote:

Food is as important as any other weapon in the successful prosecution of the war. It will be equally important in rehabilitation and relief in the liberated areas and in shaping of the peace that is to come.

From this statement we have a right to assume that the administration is cognizant of the necessity for a sound food-production program. We are led to wonder, Mr. Speaker, as we observe the handling of this program, if the administrators are in sympathy with the objectives of the President. It appears that a game of hide-and-seek is going on and even the experts are confounded. Today the feed situation has reached a point that the War Food Administration has called a conference of feed dealers to consider this highly important problem. All who are acquainted with the situation admit that the food-production program for 1944 will be seriously impaired. There has been too much guessing by theorists and too little common sense applied. Now what does War Food Administration propose? It admits that the feed situation is extremely acute and it proposes to control the distribution of protein meal throughout the Nation.

A so-called Food Production Order, No. 9, has been prepared which is designed to place limitations on the sale, shipment, and inventories of protein meal and on the use of soybean products. This contemplated order is to become effective January 1, 1944. So that all Members may know what is proposed in the order, I am asking for unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to insert a copy thereof at this point in the RECORD.

PROPOSED PROTEIN MEAL ORDER

(Title 7, agriculture: chapter X, War Food Administration (production orders); Food Production Order No. 9, revision No. 3; part 1220, feed)

LIMITATIONS ON SALE, SHIPMENT, AND INVENTORIES OF PROTEIN MEAL AND ON USE OF SOYBEAN PRODUCTS

Effective January 1, 1944, section 1220.2 is hereby revised and amended in its entirety to read as follows:

1220.2. Limitations on sale, shipment, and inventories of protein meal and on use of soybean products—(a) Set-aside requirement: Any processor or grinder shall, when so ordered by the Director of Food Production, War Food Administration (hereinafter referred to as the "Director"), set aside, for sale and delivery to such agency or other person or into such area as the Director may designate, such quantity of protein meal as the Director may specify, not in excess of 20 percent of the quantity of protein meal produced or ground by such processor or grinder during a designated period beginning not sooner than the thirty-first day following the issuance of such order.

(b) Restrictions on shipments into designated areas: The Director may, from time to time, prohibit the shipment or delivery of any kind of protein meal into any area as he may designate. No person shall make or accept any shipment or delivery of protein meal in violation of any order issued by the Director pursuant to the authority granted by this paragraph.

(c) Limitation on delivery of protein meal by retailers: Whenever he deems it necessary to obtain an equitable distribution of protein meal in any area, the Director may limit the quantity of protein meal which retailers or any class of retailers within such area may deliver to feeders during any feeding years.

(d) Limitations on mixed-feed manufacturers: During any feeding year, no mixed-feed manufacturer shall use any quantity of protein meal in the manufacture of mixed feeds, which is in excess of 110 percent of the quantity of protein meal used by him in the manufacture of mixed feeds during the 1942 calendar year. After the effective date of this order, no mixed-feed manufacturer shall use any quantity of protein meal in the manufacture of mixed feeds, during any quarterly period, in excess of 110 percent of the quantity of protein meal used by him in the manufacture of mixed feeds during the highest 3 consecutive months of the 1942 calendar year. For the purposes of the limitations imposed by this paragraph, protein meal sold by a manufacturer to a feeder, which is mixed by the manufacturer with other feed ingredients supplied by the feeder, shall not be considered as used in the manufacture of mixed feed, if the mixing and the purchase of other ingredients are not required by the manufacturer as a condition of the sale of the protein meal.

(e) Prohibition on sale, purchase, and use of soybean products other than soybean meal, cake, or pellets for feed: No person shall sell or deliver and no person shall purchase or accept delivery of soya flour, grits, or similar edible products of soybeans, other than soybean meal, cake, or pellets, for use as or manufacture into feed for livestock and poultry, and no such products shall be used as or manufactured into feed for livestock and poultry.

(f) Inventory limitations: (1) No person, other than a feeder, shall accept delivery of any protein meal which, together with his inventory of protein meal, would exceed the total tonnage of protein meal needed by such person to fill his manufacturing and sales requirements for 15 days. No feeder shall accept delivery of any protein meal which, together with his inventory of protein meal, would exceed the total tonnage of protein meal needed by such feeder to fill his consumption requirements for 30 days.

(2) The limitations of paragraph (f) (1) shall not apply to:

(i) Purchases of protein meal by any person in minimum carload lots, as determined pursuant to Office of Defense Transportation regulations, if such purchases are made in quantities and at intervals which are in accordance with purchases regularly made by such person.

(ii) Purchases of protein meal by any person in quantities of 2,000 pounds or less, if such purchases are made in quantities and at intervals which are in accordance with purchases regularly made by such person.

(iii) Purchases of protein meal by any ranchman, if such purchases are made in quantities and at intervals which are in accordance with purchases regularly made by such ranchman, and such purchases are necessary for economical use of transportation facilities under Office of Defense Transportation regulations and to provide a readily available supply of protein meal for ranch feeding purposes.

(iv) Protein meal acquired by a soybean or cottonseed producer in exchange for soybeans or cottonseed. However, the quantity of protein meal acquired during any feeding year, together with the quantity on hand at the beginning of the feeding year, shall not exceed the minimum quantity of protein meal required by such producer for the feeding of livestock and poultry on his farm during the feeding year. The minimum quantity required shall be determined in accordance with the usual feeding practices on the farm.

(3) The Director may prohibit processors from having on hand an unsold inventory of protein meal in excess of either the quantity produced by him during the last 15 days in which he produced protein meal or his inventory of protein meal on the corresponding day of the feeding year 1941–42, whichever is greater. Any order issued by the Director pursuant to this paragraph shall not take effect before the 31st day after its issuance.

(g) Limitations on deliveries: No person shall deliver protein meal to any person, other than a feeder, unless the person to whom delivery is to be made tenders at or before the time of delivery a statement in substantially the following form:

The undersigned declares to his vendor and to the War Food Administration that he is familiar with the provisions of Food Production Order No. 9, Revision No. 3, effective January 1, 1944, and that this purchase, acquisition, or acceptance of protein meal from such vendor is in compliance with the provisions of such order.

Purchaser

Address

Date

(h) Existing contracts: The restrictions imposed by this order shall be effective without regard to the rights of creditors, existing contracts, or payments made.

(i) Audits and inspections: The Director shall be entitled to make such audit or inspection of the books, records, and other writings, premises, or stocks of protein meal of any person, and make such investigations, as may be necessary or appropriate, to the enforcement or administration of the provisions of this order.

(j) Records and reports: Every person subject to this order shall maintain for not less than 2 years accurate records concerning his monthly production, sales, purchases, contracts for sale or purchase, deliveries, and shipment of protein meal and mixed feed. Any person receiving statements pursuant to paragraph (g) shall retain such statements on file for not less than 2 years. The Director may require the keeping of such other records and the furnishing of such reports as may be necessary or appropriate to the enforcement or administration of this order. (The record-keeping requirements of this paragraph have been approved by the Bureau of the Budget in accordance with the Federal Reports Act of 1942. Subsequent record-keeping and reporting requirements are subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget in accordance with the Federal Reports Act of 1942.)

(k) Petition for relief from hardship: (1) Any person affected by this order, who sells or uses 75 percent or more of his protein meal or mixed feed in the State in which his place of business or plant is located and who considers that compliance with this order would work an unreasonable and exceptional hardship on him, may apply in writing for relief to the chairman of the State Agricultural Conservation Committee for such State, setting forth in such petition all pertinent facts and the nature of the relief sought. The chairman may take such action as he deems appropriate and shall notify the petitioner by letter accordingly. If the petitioner is not satisfied with such action, he may within 10 days thereafter file with the chairman of the State Agricultural Conservation Committee a written appeal to the Director, setting forth the facts upon which his appeal is based and the nature of the relief sought. The chairman shall promptly transmit the appeal to the Director, together with his recommendation. The decision of the Director shall be in writing, shall be communicated to the petitioner and the chairman of the State Agricultural Conservation

Committee, and shall be final and conclusive.

(2) Any person affected by this order, who does not sell or use as much as 75 percent of his protein meal or mixed feed in the State in which his place of business or plant is located and who considers that compliance herewith would work an exceptional and unreasonable hardship on him, may apply in writing for relief to the Director, setting forth in such petition all pertinent facts and the nature of the relief sought. The Director may take such action as he deems appropriate. The decision of the Director shall be in writing and shall be final and conclusive.

(l) Violations: The War Food Administrator may, by suspension order, prohibit any person who violates any provision of this order from receiving, making any deliveries of, or using protein meal, or any other material subject of priority or allocation control by the War Food Administrator, and may recommend that any such person be prohibited from receiving, making any deliveries of, or using materials subject to the priority or allocation control of any other governmental agencies. In addition, any person who wilfully violates any provision of this order is guilty of a crime and may be prosecuted under any and all applicable laws. Further, civil action may be instituted to enforce any liability or duty created by, or to enjoin any violation of, any provision of this order.

(m) Delegation of authority: The administration of this order and the powers vested in the War Food Administrator, insofar as such powers relate to the administration of this order, are hereby delegated to the Director. The Director is authorized to redelegate, to any person within the War Food Administration, any or all of the authority vested in him by this order.

(n) Communications: Except as provided in paragraph (k) (1), all reports required to be filed hereunder and all communications concerning this order shall, unless instructions to the contrary are issued, be addressed to the Director of Food Production, War Food Administration, Washington 25, D. C., Ref. FPO 9.

(o) Definitions. For the purpose of this order:

(1) "Protein meal" means tankage, meat scrap, liver meal, fish meal, whale guano, and cake, meal, or pullets derived from cottonseed, soybeans, peanuts, flaxseed, copra, sesame, babassu, ouricury, palm kernel, or corn germs (corn gluten meal).

(2) "Feeding year" means the period from October 1 to September 30.

(3) "Person" means any individual, partnership, corporation, association, business trust, or any organized group of persons, whether incorporated or not, including the States of the United States, their political subdivisions and agencies.

(4) "Processor" means any person operating a processing plant for producing any protein meal.

(5) "Grinder" means any person who grinds protein cake into meal, sized cake, or pellets, for sale as such or for use in the manufacture of feed.

(6) "Feeder" means any person who acquires protein meal for feeding livestock or poultry.

(7) "Retailer" means any person engaged in the business of selling protein meal direct to feeders.

(8) "Mixed feed manufacturer" means any person who uses protein meal in the manufacture of mixed feed for sale.

(9) "Mixed feed" means any feed manufactured for sale for the feeding of livestock, poultry, or animal pets, which contains, among other ingredients, protein meal.

(p) Food Production Order No. 9, revision No. 1 and Revision No. 2: Food Production Order No. 9, revised, issued on April 29, 1943, is hereby designated Food Production Order No. 9, revision No. 1. Food Production Order No. 9, revised 2, issued on September 30, 1943, is hereby designated Food Production Order No. 9, revision No. 2.

(54 Stat. 676, 55 Stat. 236, 56 Stat. 176; E.O. 9280, 9322, 9334, 9392; 7 F.R. 10179, 8 F.R. 3807, 5423, 14783).

Issued this _____ day of _____ 1943.

_____,
War Food Administrator.

There is considerable doubt, Mr. Speaker, in the minds of the farmers and feed dealers of this country that the proposed order will work. There is a real danger that there will not be a flow of protein feed where it is needed. There is the expressed danger that it might be used for political purposes. The great urgent need in this situation is the equitable distribution to those sections of the country where it is needed. To that end, on yesterday, I introduced House Joint Resolution 59.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert this resolution at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. BROWN of Georgia). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides, as follows:

That it is the sense of the Congress that the War Food Administrator or any other officer or agency of the Government, including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation, (1) in acquiring, selling or otherwise disposing of protein meal, or (2) in imposing upon processors, grinders, or other persons any requirements or restrictions with respect to the sale or other disposition or the shipment, delivery, or distribution of protein meal, should so act as to insure distribution of protein meal among the several States on the basis of, and in proportion to, the livestock units in such States.

This problem should not be left to the whim or caprice of bureaucrats and the adoption of my resolution will serve as a guide and insure equitable distribution of this important feed. It must flow to the areas where it will result in food production.

The War Food Administrator must know where the livestock units in this country are located, and the supply of feed can be directed to those points. If we are to have a real food-production program in 1944, then the importance of protein feeds must be fully realized. The 1939 issue of the Agricultural Yearbook states:

If there were any one "secret of life," protein might be considered to be at the heart of it, since protein is the essential stuff of which all living tissue is made.

Not only are proteins essential to the production of meat but they are essential in the production of milk, cheese, butter, and fowl.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem unnecessary under present conditions that the Government exercise control over this particular situation in order to insure an equitable distribution of these important food elements. The industry can police itself.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman on the logical program he has developed in his resolution for the distribution of these protein feeds. I was meeting with a group of farm representatives this week from the areas where many of these proteins are produced in protest against the proposed Executive order which as the gentleman realizes would deprive especially the areas producing these protein feeds from having them for their own use. I think the gentleman has a logical formula and a praiseworthy one and I hope it will be accepted by the War Food Administration without the necessity of compulsion from Congress, but if compulsion is necessary I hope it will be forthcoming.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. I wonder if there is anything in this new order that becomes effective on January 1 that will authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation, when it takes over a part of the protein feed, to change existing prices.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Answering the gentleman's question I can say only that it has been done and I believe there is a real danger it may be continued.

Mr. RIZLEY. If the gentleman will yield further right there, the thing that alarms me somewhat about it is this: During the summer, I think it was the first day of August, that what they call Order No. 5 became effective and the Commodity Credit Corporation took over all of the remaining 1942 supply of cottonseed cake, soybean cake, peanut cake, and all that sort of protein feed under the guise, as some of us thought, of making a more equitable distribution because in making that order they said that regardless of outstanding contracts that dealers owning that feed might have it, could only thereafter be sold, and so forth, and so on.

In other words, they canceled out all contracts which had been made. The result was, however, that they raised the price that the owner of livestock had to pay by $13 a ton. The livestock feeder could still go to the dealer and get the exact amount of protein feed he had already contracted for but he had to pay $13 a ton more than he had contracted to pay and that $13 came back to the Commodity Credit Corporation and I understand was used as an indirect subsidy to offset some of the losses that the Commodity Credit Corporation had in dealing in these products previously and some other things. I am wondering now, in view of that experience, whether there is anything in this order that is going into effect that would permit them again to raise the price to those who buy protein feeds.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I believe in that connection they are going to assume that right. The order provides that they may abrogate the contracts, as a matter of fact, that individuals have with one another. I am going to place in the RECORD as part of my remarks the correspondence I have had with Mr.

Hudson on this very important matter, to which the gentleman from Oklahoma has called attention.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I appreciate very much the remarks the gentleman has made and the questions my colleagues have asked him concerning this important subject, because certainly not only are the feed dealers, the feeders of this country, very much interested in it but all of the people of the country will be interested in it about a year from now when some of them are hungry.

Last spring we had a very serious situation in my own district wherein the people who were feeding livestock, hogs, poultry, could not get feed, had to sell an unfinished product for whatever they could get for it, and had a loss because of the feed situation. I received many complaints on the way protein feed was handled, how it was taken out of our section and shipped some place else that was not nearly as heavy a feeding section as ours.

I believe the formula suggested by the gentleman in his resolution is much more sensible than this 110 percent order that has been promulgated out of the War Food Administration, and I assure the gentleman of my effort in behalf of either getting the order changed which has been made or having the gentleman's resolution passed by the Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am much interested in the gentleman's proposal to distribute protein feed on the basis of livestock units. I thought possibly the gentleman might have been prompted by this article that was in the Madison State Journal of October 21, and with the gentleman's permission I will read it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I should be pleased to hear it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin (reading):

FARMERS TO GET PROTEIN FEED—500 CARS OF MEAL ON WAY TO WISCONSIN

(State Journal Washington Bureau)

WASHINGTON.—Representative LA VERN R. DILWEG (Democrat, Green Bay) announced today that 500 carloads of linseed and soybean meal have reached Chicago en route to principal points in Wisconsin, particularly the Eighth Congressional District, for distribution among dairymen.

Wisconsin farm leaders have asserted for some time that they will be unable to meet production goals unless additional supplementary cattle rations are made available.

(State agricultural experts told the State Journal today that 500 carloads of protein feeds would be of great benefit to the dairy industry.)

DILWEG said he had won his fight to secure protein feeds for Wisconsin dairy herds, and added that if the 500-carload supply is not sufficient he would ask that more be sent to Wisconsin.

He said that many of his constituents had complained that since the Commodity Credit Corporation allowed food processors to purchase proteins they were unable to secure them, and that processors were using them in mixed feed, the price of which was regarded as prohibitive.

I say that for the reason that as a result of the news article quoted above I have received many letters from people asking me when I was going to get 500 carloads for my district. So I agree with the gentleman now speaking that we will have to distribute those proteins on the basis of livestock units or it will not be distributed fairly to the people of this country.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

One thing is certain, that the War Food Administration and the Commodity Credit Corporation must avoid going into this business for a profit. The history of the Commodity Credit Corporation is not too good in this connection and at this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I insert a letter by myself to J. B. Hutson, president, dated September 29, 1943, and Mr. Hutson's reply thereto, dated October 16, 1943:

SEPTEMBER 29, 1943.

Mr. J. B. HUTSON,
President, Commodity Credit Corporation, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My attention was called to a recent speech on the floor of the House by Representative BOREN, Democrat, of Oklahoma, regarding the practice of your Corporation, and its conduct in the handling of protein feeds.

Will you please furnish me with the information on the following points:

1. Please cite authority in the law which gives the Commodity Credit Corporation the right to fix the local market prices on protein feeds.

2. What authority in law does the Commodity Credit Corporation have to raise the local market prices on these proteins and then direct that the processor shall pay the difference between the market price and your price to your corporation?

3. Kindly advise if the Corporation has followed the same practice regarding soybean meal, cottonseed meal, and linseed meal, and if so the dates when this practice began. Also, in this connection, does the practice still prevail?

4. How much money has been returned to the Commodity Credit Corporation under the practice herein mentioned on each of the following: soybean meal, cottonseed meal, peanut oil meal, linseed oil meal?

I would like to have the amount in dollars that has been returned on each of these items.

I am sure that this information is readily available and will greatly appreciate your prompt attention to this request.

Very truly yours,

LAWRENCE H. SMITH.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION,
Washington, D. C., October 16, 1943.

Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SMITH: This is in reply to your letter of September 29, in which you refer to statements made on the floor of the House by Representative BOREN, of Oklahoma, regarding activities of Commodity Credit Corporation.

Since information relative to the first three questions cited in your letter is included in a letter which I have written to Representative BOREN, I am enclosing a copy of that letter for your information.

Your fourth question relates to the amount of money returned to Commodity Credit Corporation in connection with purchases and sales of soybeans, cottonseed, peanut, and linseed-oil meal set aside under Commodity Credit Corporation order 5.

We do not have, at this time, complete information regarding the quantities of meal affected by the provisions of this order. All information relating to these transactions is sent to our regional offices at New Orleans and Chicago, and the summarized reports are not received here until some time after the reports are received in the regional offices from the processing plants. Furthermore, the transactions resulting from this order have not been completed, and it will be some time before all reports are received in our regional offices. The latest summaries received as of September 30, 1943, however, show the following returns to Commodity Credit Corporation on the tonnages of soybean, cottonseed, peanut, and linseed meal indicated:

	Tons purchased and sold	Gains to Commodity Credit Corporation
Soybean cake and meal	253,564	$2,613,540
Cottonseed cake and meal	18,370	175,049
Peanut cake and meal	6,133	84,688
Linseed cake and meal	0	0
Total	278,067	2,873,277

While these figures are very incomplete, as indicated, the total returns to Commodity Credit Corporation in connection with these particular purchases and sales will be very small in relation to the losses, totaling more than $18,000,000, which Commodity Credit Corporation has incurred in supporting the prices of 1942 crop oilseeds, maintaining ceiling prices on vegetable oils, and maintaining the very low prices which prevailed during most of the 1942-43 season on oilseed meals.

Sincerely yours,

J. B. HUTSON, *President.*

A reading of that letter reveals that the Commodity Credit Corporation was in the business of selling protein feeds, in fact, purchased and sold 278,067 tons and made a profit of $2,873,277. Certainly this Government Corporation was not organized for that purpose. No satisfactory explanation has yet been given for the particular venture referred to.

Now there are one or two things in the proposed Food Order No. 9 that I want to refer to in conclusion. Subsection (j) of section 3 provides for the making of records and reports. We have all had experience with this kind of practice in government and it is highly desired that bookkeeping requirements be reduced to an absolute minimum.

This order, like all others, provides a penalty for violation of any part of it. In my opinion, it is highly objectionable and should be eliminated. "Any person," so it is provided, "who willfully violates any provision of this order is guilty of a crime and may be prosecuted under any and all applicable laws." There is a real danger that any abuse may arise here and in view of what has been happening in O. P. A. and other agencies, law-abiding citizens may be hauled before so-called kangaroo courts to answer charges of Government agents. This is un-American and establishes a dangerous precedent.

Then there is a provision (m) which provides for the delegation of authority. Here is the perfect illustration of bureaucracy in full bloom. It starts out with the statement that all powers of enforcement are in the War Food Administrator. Then the Administrator delegates that authority to the Director and he in turn "is authorized to redelegate, to any person within the War Food Administration any or all of the authority vested in him by this order."

Now, this is the kind of practice that our people are complaining against; it is one of the things that must be corrected. I hope that Members of this body will raise their voices in opposition to it. I trust that the Committee on Banking and Currency will give this resolution consideration so that protein meal will begin to flow to those areas that need it most.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain correspondence I have had with the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next following any special orders heretofore entered and after disposition of the regular business of the day I may have permission to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next at the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next after disposition of the regular business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes on the subject of subsidies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I have observed on the floor of the House a certain trustful expectancy as to the possibilities of our food supply for 1944. The matter of probable crop percentages for 1944 seemed to me to come to a head on Monday of this week. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] asked some questions of the Democratic leadership which are being asked all of us, both Democrats and Republicans, by our own constituents. When I was home last summer, as all Members of Congress were home for the 2 months' recess, I found that the questions and the comments could very roughly be divided into certain groups. If I were to take all of the comments and all of the questions and put them in these groups, the one outstanding question would have been about the O. P. A. and about regulations which today are being imposed upon the people of the United States, a great many of them without legal authority. Without exception, the next group of questions could have been expressed something like this: What is Congress going to do about it? Or, to put it in other language: When is Congress going to take back the powers that it gave away? These questions are being asked us, and there being few visible evidences of any real activity on the part of the Democratic leadership in Congress to give the people an answer to them, it seemed to me that quite properly the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] should ask the same questions on the floor. The reply of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the Democratic leader, was that the gentleman from South Dakota had not voted for the extension of Selective Service, or had he? or he had not voted on a conference report several years ago on lend-lease, or had he?

Now, I am a very new Member of this House and I recognize my ignorance of the procedures of the House, but I am very willing to learn. One of the things I would like to learn is the possible connection between the present failure of the Democratic majority in this House, which has a majority of every committee, which has the chairmanship of every committee of the House, which controls the all-powerful Rules Committee of the House and can therefore let out or keep in any bill it wants to, which has control of the entire Congress, I repeat, what connection is there between that and how any Member of the House, Republican or Democrat, voted prior to the time the United States entered the war?

Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts did not raise the point of consistency, and I hope that will never be raised against any Member of this legislative body or any other.

If the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] will permit me, I will quote a respected member of his own party, former Senator Ashurst of Arizona, who said in the Senate of the United States on February 24:

> Whoever in his public service is handicapped and shackled by the vice of consistency will be a man not free to act as various questions come before him from time to time. He will be a statesman locked in a prison house the keys to which are in the keeping of days and events that are dead.

So, while waiting for the particular problem to be solved for me that I have asked about, I thought I would turn to some of the things the next apologist for the present inactivity of Congress offered us last Monday afternoon.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] took the floor and defended the fact that a great deal of material is being piled up by Government departments, which have no centralized buying and quite often compete with each other for foodstuffs; and that some of this material is spoiling. The gentleman made a very fine and a loyal, patriotic address, worthy, in my opinion, of the finest traditions of Fourth of July picnics in the rural areas, some of which I represent.

Boiled down to very simple language, it was that our troops must be well fed. I think I can say without any hesitancy that that is the unanimous opinion of the Members of the Congress of the United States. In my experience, I have heard nothing whatever upon this floor which would give us any doubt that every action of the Congress supports that desire. Our boys are well fed. We want them to be well fed. We are willing to go without food that they may be well fed, and if occasionally there is spoilage because we have piled up too much for them in some outlying place in the world, I do not think anyone in Congress will raise his or her voice in criticism. But I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, what this has to do with the present discussion in Congress.

Congress has been asked whether the philosophies which have been applied to the administration of food in wartime are the sort of philosophies which will produce more food in 1944 than was produced in 1942 or 1943; or, to put it in other language, whether these philosophies will, in the words of the President of the United States, "maintain and increase production." The farmers want to know. When I speak of the farmers, I speak, in my opinion, of the finest men of all the nations of the world. The farmer will produce to the extent of his ability. He will produce in spite of labor shortages. He will produce in spite of equipment shortages, and in spite of the O. P. A., and in spite of the peculiarly divided responsibilities which surround the Food Administration program of World War No. 2.

I should like to point out that a recent report from the National Grange indicated that the farmer is today working an average of 81 hours a week, as opposed to the hours of other industries.

It would seem to me, again, as a new Member, that it would be a very simple and a very American thing for the majority of this House to bring out of the Rules Committee a rule on that bill of which the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], is the author, and the number of which is H. R. 2837. This does the same thing that was done in England, that was done in Canada, that was done in the United States in the last World War, that was even done in Germany, and that has always been done successfully. I quote from the British Minister of Agriculture, when he says:

> Per man unit, Britain's food production is three times greater than Germany and substantially more than America.

I spoke the other day with a Member of the Canadian Parliament, who said the same thing about the Canadian situation.

It would seem to me, therefore, that this rule should be brought out. I do not know how long H. R. 2837 has been in the Rules Committee exactly, but the report of the Committee on Agriculture, of which I am a member and of which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] and several other Members present here today are members, is No. 599, and is dated June 24, 1943; so the Rules Committee has for at least 5 months and 9 days had this matter before it, a matter which would do nothing but bring efficiency and centralization into the administration of food supplies in the United States. Whatever the Rules Committee thinks of it, I think it is important; I think it is extremely important, and I would suppose that something so important so closely related to the production of food in the United States would be considered important by the Rules Committee, which has nine Democratic members and five Republican members and is, therefore, 2 to 1 in the control of the majority of this House. It is sufficiently important, to my mind, to have a very direct effect upon the production of food in 1944.

Mr. Speaker, nothing that I am saying or nothing that I will say today is intended to offend anyone or intended to excite anyone. What really started my mind upon this train of thought was the statement of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] that "there was no curtailment on the part of the farmers" to produce and that "we can produce all we want."

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman referred to the Fulmer bill, H. R. 2837. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Agriculture, as I am. That bill came out of that committee by a unanimous vote of the committee, as I recall.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. RIZLEY. The committee consists of 14 Democrats and 12 Republicans. Still the bill lies before the Committee on Rules and no action has been taken on it, even though the bill came out of the committee which was the proper committee to consider it with a unanimous vote of that committee, a committee predominantly controlled by the administration.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman is absolutely right. For 5 months and 9 days we have had a continuation of the confusing division of food authority in the United States.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. In my remarks on Monday I sought to draw a parallel between the production of foodstuffs, where we have a distribution of authority, and the production of industrial implements, where we have a concentration of authority in Donald Nelson. I wonder if the gentleman does not agree with me that if we had a single food administrator we could achieve the perfectly amazing results which have already been achieved by industry because there we have had a concentration of authority in one man.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The situation is comparable and the gentleman is right.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Not just at the moment. I want to get to what I am trying to say about the food situation in 1944. First, I shall lay before you certain matters that have to do with milk. You have heard that we have been killing some cows in the Los Angeles and other stockyards, more cows than we killed in the preceding year, and each time we kill a few more we say, "This cannot go on. The situation is serious." It has seemed to some people that perhaps nothing very serious has happened and that perhaps all that is involved is the general agricultural situation. It reminds me of a little joke that I heard some time ago, something to the effect that when a city boy proposes to his girl he promises to love until the end of time, but that if he would say until the farmers are satisfied it would be a much more permanent pledge. However, let us look at the figures. In 1941, in the Los Angeles stockyards 66,201 dairy cows were slaughtered. In 1942, 86,673 dairy cows were slaughtered. That is an increase of 20,000 dairy cows.

For the first 10 months of 1943 we have slaughtered 60,449 dairy cows. This means that we will slaughter more in 1943 than in 1941 and just a few short of the number slaughtered in 1942. Taking the 10 months and comparing them for the 3 years, it would still show an increased slaughter for 1942 as against 1941 and a slightly less slaughter in the first 10 months of 1943 against the first 10 months of 1942.

Figures do not mean very much in themselves. We have to determine what to read from them, historically or prophetically.

What I read is that the dairy farmer, having found it difficult to get milkers and other agricultural labor, began to cut down his dairy herds. At first, this did not make a great deal of difference in the total daily production of milk for, obviously, the cows he sent to the stockyards would be the ones he should cull, and perhaps some that he should have culled before that time. Somehow, he survived that labor shock. The plane plants and the shipyards got the men, but he kept enough cows milked and enough feed in the cows to keep up the gallonage.

In 1942 and the early part of 1943, a more difficult thing happened. Feed became scarcer. Again he culled his herds and actually sent an increased number of cows to the stockyards. But for a while this made no appreciable difference in the gallonage. Why? Very simple. He fed the amount of grain and protein feed that he had to a smaller number of cows and kept up the production of milk from the smaller herd.

We face a more difficult situation in 1943, and we will face an increasingly serious situation in 1944, which cannot be met by either of these expedients. When the cows go now the gallonage is going to fall. We already see the situation in California. The gallonage is off better than 12,000 gallons a day in the Los Angeles milkshed; it is off better than 20,000 gallons a day in the San Francisco area, and it is off better than 18,000 gallons a day in the San Diego milkshed. These are the three largest milksheds of the State.

How did the O. P. A., and the W. F. A., perhaps, meet this milk crisis? The first thing they did was to announce, as you know, Mr. Speaker, a subsidy upon grain. I think that solution undoubtedly was thought up by one of these Harvard-trained economists of draft age, who dwell, enjoy life, and are nourished in the somewhat rarefied atmosphere of the Washington offices of the O. P. A. I do not need to tell you it was not thought up by any farmer, because about half the dairy feed of California is raised by the dairymen themselves. And in the Los Angeles area we require 500,000 tons of hay every year brought in by truck and train. And so this bright idea was to place a subsidy upon the purchase of grain, the purchase of hay for feed. If the dairyman accepted this idea, he would of necessity have to stop raising feed for himself, half of which he was raising up to the time of the idea. I think I should say in defense of the young men of the O. P. A. that with very little effort on their part and with not more than several weeks of argument by the farmers, they were able to grasp the situation and the order was never put into effect.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the simplest solution is just to say to the farmer, "You may have the cost of production." In California, at the most, this would mean a cent a quart increase in the retail cost of milk per quart. I say at the most, because I am not at all sure that some of the costs between producer and consumer could not be absorbed. I have no

doubt, as soon as this copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reaches the west coast I shall receive frantic telegrams from all the milk distributors, but I am willing to stick my chin out to the extent of saying I believe that would be the utmost increase in the price of milk. Our milk costs in west-coast milk sheds are less than they are in the milk shed of the gentleman from New York, and less than they are in many other milk sheds. There is a difference of sometimes as great as 5 cents per retail quart between these different milk sheds. Here is a curious thing: In the Chicago milk shed, which is Government-controlled, mind you, the price of milk has been increased to the consumer. In the milk sheds where the price of milk is controlled by State milk-control acts it is not permitted to be raised. A corollary of that, equally interesting, is the fact that the Chicago milk shed, so far as I know, is the only milk shed where there is enough milk for the consumer.

In California we keep a most meticulously accurate accounting of the cost of milk, to the third decimal place. We know exactly how much it costs to produce milk. We have kept such records for 7 or 8 years in the Los Angeles milkshed, in the Imperial Valley milkshed, and the San Francisco milkshed, and elsewhere. The seriousness of the situation, of course, is that this is the 3d of December, and by the first of the year the milk producers of America must know exactly what program they are going to have and what they are going to be paid. Visualize it: Here, on one hand, is a milk producer, compelled to work every day in the week and compelled to compete for labor with shipbuilding and airplane plants. Over here is a farmer raising, on the same type of ground, vegetables that he does not have to milk every day and for which he is getting more net returns. Now, what would you do if you were a milk producer, dealing with the O. P. A., losing money every month, not knowing what you were going to do after the first of the year, while your neighbors were getting their lands ready to plant vegetables, on which they know they will make a profit; what would you do? Would you keep your dairy herds because of an altruistic desire to give milk to the people of America at a loss to yourself and in spite of the O. P. A., or would you sell your dairy herd and plant vegetables in the ground where you otherwise would plant feed for your cows? That is the seriousness of the situation, and it is a situation which has to be met quickly.

I would like to say in passing that, of course, the argument is you are keeping the cost of milk down to the consumer. Well, a cent a quart is important. I am not denying it. But why let the price of melons go up to 90 cents a melon, which ought to cost 30 cents or less a melon, and lose on 1 melon the saving on 60 quarts of milk? I do not think that is protecting the consumer, and I have said so before.

Now, about farm labor. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] said, "We can produce all we want." That is a pretty strong statement. I am not sure we can produce all we want, because Nature does not understand that language.

Nature says we have to prepare the ground; we have to plant the ground; we have got to harrow it, and in some parts of the United States we have to water it. We have to weed it. We have to take off the crop. We have to ship the crop and get it to the consumer. That is what Nature says must be done. She does not understand statements on the floor of Congress, when somebody says, "We can produce all we want." The farmer is willing to plant. He has some difficulty in getting seeds. He has greater difficulty in getting agricultural equipment.

I would like to hear from the Democratic leadership of this House a little more about the shipment of agricultural implements to Canada, to South America, and to Europe when our farmers, who are supposed to raise the food that the people in other countries are to have, do not have the equipment with which to prepare the ground and harvest the crops.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I shall have to decline to yield. I will have to say in the words of Napoleon, "You may ask me for anything you like except time."

I had intended to bring here this morning a map that shows the serious farm-labor areas of the United States. You can get one from the Department of Agriculture. That map will show you that California and the Western States are in a serious condition, as shown by the Department of Agriculture reports on farm labor.

California produces 10 percent of the food supply of the United States. This area that is having serious agricultural labor trouble is the area from which 10 percent of the food is to come. The crops of California are harvested by seasonal agricultural workers. You know that. You have read some highly fictional books on the subject of California agricultural workers. Last year, in spite of everything, California harvested all the crops. That statement is important. In 1943 we harvested all of the crops. How did we do it? I will tell you. We had 102,000 acres less of sugar beets planted than in 1942. We had 85,000 tons less of peaches. We had 65,000 fewer acres of cotton. We had 25 percent of normal apricot crop, and only 65 percent normal of other deciduous and citrus fruit crops. So Nature, having decided it would be impossible to change the regulations of O. P. A., has taken a hand herself, and Nature is reducing the crops and giving us only the quantities for which we have sufficient agricultural labor.

California learned its lesson. California created the California War Production Council. It gave it an appropriation of $1,800,000. It put in charge of it Mr. W. B. Parker, who prior to that time was the director of agriculture of the State of California, and very highly respected as our director of agriculture. Between these two jobs he had been doing work for the United States Government, both in this country and in South America. It told him "to assist in producing, harvesting, and marketing the food needed in the war effort." We brought in 37,000 Mexicans. They did an excellent job, under conditions very favorable to themselves, especially after farm placement was transferred from the Farm Security Administration to the Extension Service. The State expended its own funds for housing. It provided housing for 31,925 workers. It spent $665,039 for this. We used a great deal of the housing left over from a previous relief administration. Some of it we got from the War Relocation Authority for the Japanese. We thus secured, for a very small amount of money, $665,000, housing that would have cost us $2,147,545 to build.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask the courtesy of the House, that my time may be extended for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. If that is agreeable to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am curious to know how your gallonage of milk in 1943 compared with 1938 and 1939?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I do not have those figures here, but I shall supply them to the gentleman willingly.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would like to say that those figures would not be of much importance in this case, on account of the thousands of people who have gone to your State since 1938.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I was compelled to leave that fact out of my speech, but I will put in my speech on Monday, if I may, the changes in the census figures which show that our agricultural areas have dropped off, some as high as 12 percent, while manufacturing areas have sometimes increased as much as 74 percent in 3 years, 1940 to 1943. These are Census Bureau figures.

Mr. WRIGHT. If the gentleman will yield again for a moment, although I do not wish to take up his time, the reason I asked the question is that I suspect, although I am not certain, that when he talks about the dropping off of gallonage from 1941 to 1943 there may have been an extremely large number of dairy cattle in 1941 and 1942, in herds which the farmers had built up to meet the demands they thought they would have because of the war. It is also a good thing to bring into comparison the 1943 figures with normal figures like those for 1938 or 1939 to show that there has really been, under this administration, a greater production, not only of milk but also of other commodities, than

there ever was before in the history of the country.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Certainly.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That might be true, but the administration did not have much to do with it because that is where the Good Lord came in. Never in the history of this country did we have the weather we had in 1942 and 1943, as far as milk production is concerned.

Mr. WRIGHT. If production goes down, the administration gets blamed for it. While I do not believe the administration should be given credit for good weather, by the same token, I do not believe the administration should be blamed for all the bad weather we have.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is absolutely right, but I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the gentleman from Wisconsin, and I are most interested in seeing that consumers get milk.

Now, to conclude very hurriedly, the Government of the United States is asking for an increase in production; it is asking for this in the face of figures showing declining production. I have figures here which show that the cultivated crops in California in 1943 were 7 percent less than the cultivated and irrigated crops of 1942. It is my opinion that no amount of optimism can offset a fact. Unless the Congress of the United States takes action upon these matters, the gentleman's statement that "we can produce all we want" will turn out to be more optimistic than factual.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes; excuse me; I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I did not hear all of the gentleman's speech, but as I entered the room I heard some reference to a former Senator from Arizona and a quotation from him.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is right.

Mr. MURDOCK. And some comment as to consistency and its relationship to statesmanship.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I said I hoped it would never be imposed upon statesmanship to impede statesmanship.

Mr. MURDOCK. Which does the gentleman mean to imply then, that consistency or inconsistency is the characteristic of statesmanship?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Senator Ashurst did not answer that question.

Mr. MURDOCK. Whether the former Arizona Senator was facetious or serious at that time, I am asking the gentleman his view.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Perhaps the stating of the question will be sufficient answer.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am trying to find out definitely which the gentleman means is an attribute of statesmanship when he speaks of consistency and of inconsistency.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Definitely, consistency on matters of principle; but a willingness to change one's opinions as new information comes to the statesman.

Mr. MURDOCK. Did the gentleman note any consistency or inconsistency in the debates or in the House votes on Tuesday and Wednesday of last week?

Mr. PHILLIPS. What were the votes?

Mr. MURDOCK. One was on the tax bill and one was on the subsidy bill. Some were against food subsidies because Americans had more money than they could spend and against taxes because the people could not stand them.

Mr. PHILLIPS. On the tax bill I am perhaps not in a position to answer. I was one of 27 who voted against it. I did not think it was a very good way to handle a tax bill for $2,139,300,000; so perhaps I agree with the gentleman on that.

On the subject of subsidies I hope the gentleman will not ask me a question on that subject when I have no time left. Today in the Senate statements are being made that I am convinced are without foundation in fact. It is reported in the papers that the statement was made that costs to the consumers will be raised as much as 10 percent; I hold them to be without foundation in fact.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF H. R. 3715 AND H. R. 3741 DEALING WITH THE ACQUISITION, CONVERSION, AND CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN AUXILIARY VESSELS AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia rose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Georgia rise?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order of Thursday, December 9, 1943, to call up the bill (H. R. 3715) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels, landing craft and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; and the bill H. R. 3741, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; that there be not exceeding 1 hour's general debate on each bill to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs and the ranking minority member; that following the general debate the bill may be read for amendment under the general rules of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, as I understand what the gentleman is requesting is merely to waive the necessity of going to the Committee on Rules and securing a rule; in other words that the legislation will be brought up under the regular rules of the House with general debate and consideration of amendments under the 5-minute rule if any Member desires to offer an amendment.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If this request is granted then these bills will be considered just as though the Rules Committee had granted a rule providing for the consideration of the bills.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Georgia has asked only for December 9. Supposing the legislation were not concluded that day?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I hope we will be able to conclude them on that day. If not we will propound a request again on December 9.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, if we cannot consider these on December 9, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to consider them next week. I announce to the House that I hope to call them up on December 9, so the House will be notified.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If the gentleman calls them up earlier, he will give us 24 hours' notice?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know what the nature of these bills is.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the bill (H. R. 3715) provides for additional auxiliary craft for the Navy, for land barges and harbor facilities. The other bill (H. R. 3741) deals with the construction of certain public works.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. They are both part of the war effort?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. They are both a part of the war effort; yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article written by Robert E. Kennedy, as published in the Chicago Daily Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROWAN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be privileged to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an account of the historic ceremony at Pearl Harbor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House today for 3 minutes at the conclusion of the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an account of the naval service of Rear Admiral Olaf M. Hustvedt, who was recently awarded the Legion of Merit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and after any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the completion of other special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE CANOL PROJECT

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion of the Canol project in the past few days and there probably will be an early official report from the Senate committee which has been looking into the affair. Since I have called the attention of the House to this project on several occasions, I want to discuss briefly the War Department's attitude on this $134,000,000 expenditure which has as yet not put a barrel of oil into the war supply of petroleum and which will not for a considerable time, if at all.

The Undersecretary of War has done his best to defend a waste of public funds. His assertions do not stand the test of logic. He said that this was an emergency affair. The Japs were threatening to invade Alaska. An oil supply was needed, regardless of cost.

So, to meet the emergency, it was proposed to lay a pipe line to an oil supply that was then of doubtful quantity. The line would have to be 500 to 600 miles long and it would be laid in a country that had no roads, no railroads, and no supply bases. Anyone could see that much time would be required.

No emergency was met. The vague statements about the date when the pipe line and the refinery will be ready to operate show that 2 years will have gone by since this dream was first born. The Japs have come and gone. They have been thrown back from the Aleutians. No barrel of oil from Fort Norman field has helped to throw them out. The job was done with petroleum that came from the fields of the United States.

The contention is made that movement of oil by tankers was hazardous. They do not tell you that the transportation of the supplies for Canol was also hazardous. Submarines could sink tankers but they could sink other ships as well. Supplies for the armed forces were gotten through to Alaska, oil and all other kinds of supplies. Troop transports went through. Why was the Navy presumed to be unable to protect any oil tankers?

Let us stick to the facts. The Canol project has contributed nothing to the war effort. It has done nothing except waste millions of dollars, use vast amounts of scarce materials, and tie up thousands of workers in a time of manpower shortage.

Under Secretary Patterson made another statement in his effort to make a good case which I think we should set straight. He said that "we have already uncovered an estimated pool of 50 to 100 million barrels."

The fact is that "we" uncovered nothing. The field was discovered in 1920 by Imperial Oil, Ltd., a Canadian subsidiary of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. Its commercial value was so small that only a few wells were drilled in the next 20 years. Our contribution to the oil supply there was to finance the drilling of a number of wells and this was done after it had been decided to build the pipe line. Our War Department, ignoring the advice of even the company that knew most about the country, as was shown in the testimony, proceeded with a plan that somebody had approved, and did not wait until it was known whether there would be enough oil to fill the line. The Under Secretary said that the production is now an "assured" 20,000 barrels a day. Mark the distinction between "assured" and "actual" production. The production is estimated at 3,000 barrels a day and I doubt if they can increase this very greatly. I am informed that the production comes from a limestone formation. Any oil producer will tell you that limestone production is not noted for its long life and staying powers. The Under Secretary's estimated 20,000 barrels can quickly become a far lesser amount if the wells are produced over any appreciable length of time.

It is all justified, the War Department spokesmen say, on the grounds of military necessity. That necessity has vanished. The Army and the Navy have done a pretty good job up there in Alaska and no thanks to the Canol project.

So now I am of the opinion that the War Department should cease work on this Canol project, bring approximately 2,500 to 3,500 men back to the United States, bring this material back to the United States, where we have a manpower shortage and where materials can be used in development of our oil industry. Discontinue this project immediately; it is just a bad deal and should be written off as something to be remembered but not talked about. In any event we should discontinue spending any more of the American taxpayers' money on this impractical oil venture.

The War Department's principal advisers in this project at the outset could not have been chosen with less attention to their qualifications. There was the explorer, Stefansson. It is in the statement of the Under Secretary that he was the man who came to Washington with this grand idea. Is he an expert on petroleum? Does he know anything about pipe lines or refineries? Had he consulted those who did know? The answer must be "No" to all these questions.

He brought in with him another planning expert, Frederic A. Delano. We all know about his work. He headed a professional planning agency that has the all-time record for proposing vague, impractical, and utterly visionary schemes to make over the United States. The reports made by his National Resources Planning Board cost this country several million dollars. I think there may be significance in the quotation which Under Secretary Patterson put into his statement. He said that Mr. Delano made an inspection trip last July and reported that—

> The proposed delivery of crude oil to Whitehorse refinery seems fully justified, and the distribution of gasoline from there is a natural and important sequence.

No more meaningless assertion could be found and it seems to me that the Under Secretary went out of his way to be certain that Mr. Delano's connection was put into the record. The third planner was a Colonel Graham, former dean of engineering at the University of Kentucky. At least, he was an engineer, but he makes no claim to knowing anything about petroleum; however, he testified that he gave this project his wholehearted support.

There they were, 3 men who were in utter ignorance so far as oil supply and distribution were concerned. There was a consultation with Imperial Oil Co. men—very brief. It was all over in less than a day. The Imperial men tried to stop the project, Colonel Graham said. They urged that the War Department do the prudent thing and see if there was enough oil to grease the inside of the proposed pipe line. But there was a terrific hurry. These planners acted as though the whole project could be finished in a few weeks and they seemed to think that it was beside the point to have an assured supply. One Army general did object. He said 10 times the volume could be supplied from the United States at a tenth the cost.

Who else was consulted? The War Department employed some independent engineering firms. In June 1942 they joined with the Standard Oil Co. of California in recommending that the whole thing be dropped and another plan of getting oil supplies from the United

States be put into effect. The alternative plan, with modifications—it was also recommended by the Petroleum Administrator—was used, but Canol went merrily ahead.

Thus, more than a hundred million dollars has been poured down the rat hole to make somebody's dream come true. At the end of the war we are to get out. The pipe line and the refinery will be for sale. Who will want them? The Under Secretary now says that negotiations are under way with the Canadian Government to give us some future use of this great project. What he says in effect is that we made a deal and we do not like it now, so we are going back and saying to the other party, "We have spent a lot of our money and we think you should forget what we agreed to do and give us a better break" because the American taxpayer is raising hell with us.

All the time this Canol project has been on the boards, the oil producers of the United States have been begging for a chance to increase the supply. The same administration that has thrown away more than a hundred million dollars in northern Canada has frozen private enterprise here and produced a shortage. The increase in cost of field development here was brushed aside as of no importance while the Government rushed into the frozen wilds on a scheme that could not have been any greater folly than a plan of harnessing the aurora borealis. I almost hesitate to mention this latter for fear somebody will get an idea.

This project will come to an end. It will probably never serve any useful purpose, at least none that will benefit the taxpayers of this country on whom the load falls. It should be a warning. The Under Secretary of War, frantically attempting to shield his Department from the blame for this monstrous error, has said that Canol may well be the inspiration for other ventures in foreign countries.

I am willing to let the case rest on that. If all the crowd of Government officials who now have the itch to get into the oil business abroad will use Canol as the justification for their ambitions, I think all of them can be stopped before they spend much money.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. What is the gentleman's recommendation in the matter?

Mr. GAVIN. I recommend that the War Department immediately stop the Canol project at once.

Mr. WHITE. It is not the War Department, it is the Navy Department, as I understand.

Mr. GAVIN. It is the War Department. It is under the supervision of the War Department. We have thousands of tons of material and hundreds of men up there sitting around when they could be in productive enterprise contributing to the war effort. Let us discontinue it and bring this manpower back home and save the taxpayers' money.

Mr. WHITE. What is the sale price of that oil delivered at the tanks? At what price are we going to get that oil?

Mr. GAVIN. We are paying $1.25 a barrel, I presume at the well. The deal with the Canadian Government is that after the first 1,500,000 barrels at $1.25 a barrel has been produced, the price will be reduced to 50 cents a barrel or we are rebated 75 cents a barrel. This will effect a saving to the United States, they say, of 75 cents a barrel. On the basis of a saving of 75 cents a barrel, with a 3,000-barrel-per-day production, the saving per day would be $2,250. Divide $2,250 into the total cost of $138,000,000, and you see that it will take 61,333 days, or on the basis of 365 days in the year, 168 years to get our money back and 168 years from now it will not make any difference to the Members of the House whether we did or did not get our money back.

Mr. WHITE. Is there any provision in the contract that we will get the money back?

Mr. GAVIN. We have not been able to see a copy of the contract. I think it is in the hands of the Truman committee. I requested of the War Department a copy of the contract of May 20, 1943, but on their claims of military secrecy we were denied the opportunity to review the contract. I am of the opinion, however, that the contract calls for two valuers to be established after the war, one from Canada and one from the United States. They will determine the commercial value of the property after the war, and then the Canadian Government is privileged to purchase the entire set-up, lock, stock, and barrel if they care to. As far as purchasing is concerned, with the 3,000-barrel production and no market for the oil in the immediate area, they could not ship it to the United States so what good is it. The oil companies realized this years ago. Therefore, the entire project will fall into disuse and be abandoned. I doubt very much if the Canadian Government would even want to pay scrap prices, as it would have no commercial value.

Mr. WHITE. Who gets the $1.25 a barrel? Does that come as a credit to the United States, or do we pay it out?

Mr. GAVIN. We are paying that price for the oil. We are not getting anything, we are paying for everything, the entire cost of the project, the pipe lines, the highways, the waterways, the airports. It is just a gigantic boondoggling project for opening up the great Canadian wilderness on the strength of being a contribution to the war effort. Now that the Jap threat is removed it should be discontinued. What I object to is this: If we are going to carry on a project of that nature, why not spend the money in California, or spend it in Pennsylvania, Texas, Arkansas, Mississippi, or Louisiana, in the exploration of these great oil areas we have? Why is it necessary to go 75 miles south of the Arctic Circle and dump $135,000,000 to $138,000,000 of the American taxpayers' money into a project that is impractical and unsound and which does not produce any oil in any commercial quantities?

Mr. WHITE. Do I correctly understand from the gentleman's statement that we finance with that $135,000,000 the production of that oil, and then buy the oil at $1.25 a barrel after it is finished?

Mr. GAVIN. That is right; we buy the oil and we finance the job, and after the war it reverts to Canada at whatever price they agree upon.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is not the gentleman inclined to agree with the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, on this matter?

Mr. GAVIN. Yes; the Secretary of the Interior is definitely opposed to it, but, although he is the Petroleum Administrator for War, he was not given the opportunity to pass judgment on the project or the contract. He was bypassed. He definitely was opposed to it. He objected strenuously to it. He tried to have it stopped. Even though he is the Petroleum Administrator for War, he was not consulted. Somebody had an idea that Arctic Circle was a great reservoir of oil, and what I am trying to find out is whose idea it was—Explorer Stefansson or Delano of N. R. P. B., or who it was that got the idea, and who pushed it through and where the authority to rush the job originated. I am of the opinion it came under the supervision of Gen. Brehon Somervell.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the gentleman it came under the supervision of the Secretary of War.

May I ask this question of the gentleman: I agree with the premise of the Secretary of the Interior on the initiation of the project, but I wonder if it is not the duty of Congress, even assuming that the facts the gentleman stated in the beginning are correct, that the project may have been ill-advised in the beginning; or putting this on the basis we will get nothing out of it, but rather that 3,000 barrels is the present estimated capacity, but there may be a great deal more oil in the Norman oil field.

Mr. GAVIN. I may say to the gentleman that the field has been known for 20 years. When outfits like the Imperial Oil Co., subsidiaries of the Standard Oil of New Jersey, know of such oil territory, and they have known of these deposits for many years, and do not go up there and get the oil, then you can rest assured that there is not sufficient volume in the field to economically justify the investment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They estimate there is more oil there, but the great problem is transportation.

Mr. GAVIN. And I say this to the gentleman: Anybody with common sense who is going to spend $138,000,000 would know how much oil was there before they made any investment. We will assume that this table is an oil field; before they would go ahead building refineries, pipe lines, highways, railways, airports, they would go in there and find out by spotting this field whether it was a proven field and there was the oil there that would justify the expenditure; and

this was not done. We just rushed in on the recommendation of people not qualified to determine the possibilities of the field, then wake up with no oil and a headache for the American taxpayer.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. GAVIN. We produce in the United States 4,250,000 barrels of oil a day. Last year we produced 1,385,000,000 barrels of oil. You could imagine what a production of 3,000 barrels a day would amount to, probably enough gasoline to carry four bombers for a day.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has time after the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The oil goes to a place called White Horse or is supposed to go there. The cost of gasoline in White Horse is triple or quadruple what it costs any place else. This is due to transportation difficulties. White Horse is destined to become one of the great aviation cross roads of the New World, and I quite agree with the gentleman that whatever the oil is worth, it is going to end up at a place which after the war no one can imagine what amount of transportation facilities will exist.

Mr. GAVIN. I am very glad that the gentleman has brought out that point, that they are building a 3,000-barrel refinery, and that they anticipate 20,000 barrels per day production. Does that make sense. But that is only another vision, this 20,000 barrels a day production. They hope there will be that much production. In any event, the deal that we have made does not permit us to participate in this production 6 months after the termination of the war. We are out. If we were going to participate in it to some extent, that is all right, but this all goes to Canada at the end of the war so it becomes evident it is not going to help our aviation future.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then the gentleman has to assume that Canada is going to stand on her technical rights, and not give us any benefits at all. I cannot assume that.

Mr. GAVIN. What does the gentleman think?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I cannot assume that yet.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman, I am of the opinion, thinks it is going to be "hands across the border" and that they are going to turn it over to us after the war is over.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have hopes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Our past experience with the British and the Canadians show that they look after themselves. Over in the Senate, a Democratic Member of the other House, from Illinois, had to make a speech demanding that the Canadians let our planes stop there when we were engaged on another enterprise up there, which was of as much benefit to Canada as to us. I have nothing against the Canadians. I think it is all right for them and for the British to look after themselves, but it is about time that we began to look after ourselves.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The gentleman from Michigan is probably right in some instances, but I do think it is the duty of this Congress not to foster that impression, and I think that we should assume that there is going to be "hands across the border" with Canada. I think post-war Canada, the new Canada, realizes that, and Canada will work hand in hand with the United States for hundreds of years after the war.

Mr. GAVIN. I quite agree, but do not you think they ought to bear their share of the cost of the Canol job, and not let us pay all of it? If we should put it on a fair basis and let us pay our proportionate share of the cost and Canada their share I would feel more satisfied. Remember the project is all in Canada and, as I understand, we are paying the entire costs without rights to participate when war is over.

We are the ones who are doing the paying and paying plenty for privilege of exploring Canadian wilderness.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If that formula is correct they have got about $10,000,000 in that project.

Mr. GAVIN. I do not think they have anything in it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I mean, they are owing about $10,000,000.

Mr. GAVIN. I believe you will find they owe us nothing when the contract is made public.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is, if that formula is correct.

Mr. GAVIN. Recently in Canadian Parliament an appropriation came up for $1,755,000, I think, for mines and resource item in a war appropriation, according to a British publication, and they were very much concerned whether any part of that $1,755,000 was going to be used on this Canol project. Several of the members questioned just what this money was going to be spent for. So they were going to be sure not to put a dime into this oil exploration project. The American taxpayer foots the bill. If we were going to get anything out of it, if it was an investment on which ultimately there was going to be a return to us and we were going to get oil in the years that lie ahead or were going to be permitted to participate in this great area that they claim has reservoirs of oil, which has only produced 3,000 barrels, which is a drop in the bucket, that would be fine. But we are out when the war is over.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Did I understand the gentleman to say that this was just a boondoggling project?

Mr. GAVIN. I would say it is the most colossal boondoggling project yet uncovered because if it was investigated before they went in there, and they took the recommendation of the Petroleum Administrator for War, Secretary Ickes, and listened to what he had to say, in view of the fact that he was the recognized Petroleum Administrator and should know something about oil reserves, the job never would have gone ahead and we would have saved the American taxpayer a big headache.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Surely the gentleman does not want to lead the country to believe that the distinguished Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, and the distinguished Under Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, both prominent Republicans, are boondogglers and are, in time of war, wasting the Government's money, as he has indicated?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter by Mr. F. V. Heinkel, president of the Missouri Farmers Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks and include a short poem by a friend of mine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon Monday next and also upon Wednesday, at the conclusion of legislative business and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on each occasion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON] is recognized for 3 minutes.

CONTROLLING INFLATION

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, in the opinion of leading economists, the only way to curb inflation is by draining off surplus income. If their contentions are correct, may I submit the following plan which I will illustrate in this way:

If an individual is now paying an income or other tax of $800, and it becomes necessary to assess a future tax to curb inflation which brings the total up to $1,000, the money so collected would be placed in the Federal Treasury in two separate funds. The original amount of $800 would be placed in the general fund, to be used in the carrying on of regular business of government. The $200 increase would be placed in trust. A non-

interest bearing certificate of deposit would be issued to the taxpayer for this $200, which would be returned to him at the close of the war, either in a lump sum or in the same quarterly or monthly payments as it had been deposited. The same principle would apply to business.

Industry, railroads, and utilities find it impossible at present, because of the shortage of materials, to perform certain types of regular maintenance work. The funds allowed by the Treasury under present tax laws for such reconstruction could be deposited in a similar manner. These funds would be returned to the respective depositors at the close of the war to absorb the post-war unemployment shock which is inevitable when hostilities cease. The individual, as a recipient of returned moneys, would be in a position to purchase durable goods which he cannot buy at present. Such purchases would give employment to millions of returning soldiers, either in durable goods industries or in post-war deferred maintenance or reconstruction.

Such a proposal as I submit would merely make the Federal Treasury a safe deposit vault for millions of Americans. The funds should remain intact, the property of individual depositors, and not subject to appropriation by Congress.

Inasmuch as there is at present approximately $19,247,000,000 in circulation and a proposal of this type would probably collect $7,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000 annually, call loans could be arranged with banks to keep funds in circulation, such loans returnable upon demand at the close of the war.

A program such as this is my answer to the so-called surplus-income problem and refutes the argument of certain individuals that taxation is the only way to stop inflation. This plan would drain off pent-up spending power into a post-war reservoir of purchasing power. It would retain the wisdom of the age-old story of the seven fat years and the seven lean ones. We must not destroy, through taxation, American business, or the American home. We must bear in mind that when you destroy in America the incentive to accumulate, you destroy the initiative that built the country.

As a Member of Congress, I believe that if tax money is collected and placed in the general fund of the Federal Treasury, regardless of the amount, it will be appropriated and spent. I am of the opinion that the only result of increased taxation over and above the amount we are now paying will be increased spending and increased spending will but lead to economic ruin.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after the other special orders on the Speaker's table, the Speaker be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

LEND-LEASE AND NYLONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, my purpose is to correct a misstatement that was made in good faith on the floor of the House on November 25, and which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 26, 1943, on page 10029. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] addressed the House and called to the attention of the House a news item that appeared in the Minneapolis Star-Journal and which was written by Cedric Adams, commentator of the Minneapolis Star-Journal, and which was based on a news story that came from abroad to the effect that—

> Thousands of pairs of nylon stockings will be on sale in Australia within the next 3 months. Supplies are being sent from America under the lend-lease agreement with the United States and will be released through the clothing commission.

There is no question but what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] made the statement in good faith. He quoted a news item. There is no question but what the Minneapolis Star-Journal printed it in good faith and Cedric Adams prepared it, based on a news item which came out of New Zealand, and that in turn was based on a statement made in New Zealand by a Mr. McCall, member of the Rationing Commission.

So my purpose is not in any way to criticize, because I might have made the statement myself, considering that as sufficient authority.

But investigation shows that Mr. McCall was mistaken, and, as a result, everything else that followed, that which appeared in the Minneapolis Star-Journal, what Mr. Adams wrote, and what our distinguished friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] said was not consistent with the true facts.

There is no question but what the Minneapolis Star-Journal printed the story inadvertently and without knowledge of the true facts. I am sure that this paper, as well as Mr. Adams, will be very glad to correct the story in accordance with the facts.

I have some news items from various Australian papers dated November 8, which clearly and definitely show that the statement made by Mr. McCall was incorrect. I can also assure the House my investigation with our own agencies and the information I received is confirmatory of the news items which appear in these several papers, showing that nylon stockings will not be sent, and that lend-lease is not sending any nylon stockings. I make this statement so that that misunderstanding may be corrected.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that I may extend my remarks by including therein several news items on this subject which appeared in the papers of Sydney, Australia, November 8, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The statements are as follows:

[From the Sydney (Australia) Herald of November 8, 1943]

NO NYLON HOSE COMING—OFFICIAL DENIES M. P.'S STORY

There was no substance in the announcement that nylon stockings, imported from the United States under lend-lease, would be on sale in Australia soon, said the director of the Division of Import Procurement, Mr. A. C. Moore, yesterday.

(Mr. McCall, M. P., of the Rationing Commission, said in Sydney on Tuesday that such stockings would be on sale in Australia within 3 months, and would be sold in three weights, at three prices.)

Mr. Moore said that no nylon stockings would be coming here because—

"(a) No requisition or demand has been made by the Australian Government for nylon stockings; and

"(b) The United States Government has taken steps to insure that nylon is used for war purposes in preference to use in the manufacture of stockings. The principal use of nylon today is in the production of parachutes, tooth brushes, and for electrical purposes."

ANTICIPATORY GLOW

"Even the most spartanlike Australian women will have experienced an anticipatory glow and a faster pulse beat at the news that nylon stockings would be imported. It is a pity, in a way, that this news has no substance, because the division which takes care of lend-lease requirements for civilians, would have earned, no doubt, a measure of appreciation and gratitude from Australian women," said Mr. Moore.

"American women for a long time have been conducting a prolonged and tireless search of their shops for supplies of nylon stockings without much success. If supplies are denied American women, there would be no warrant for the United States Government to make supplies available to Australia under lend-lease arrangements. Moreover, traders are not permitted to import stockings into Australia, as the importation has been prohibited for some time.

"Some of our Allied service friends did initially bring in a small supply. I believe a pair or two of nylon made Australian history by being sold for £14 a pair for the Red Cross. There has been some little conjecture as to what ultimately happened to the other pairs."

[From the Sydney (Australia) Sun of November 8, 1943]

OFFICIAL DENIAL ON STOCKINGS

Announcement that thousands of pairs of nylon stockings would be sold throughout Australia within the next few months, was officially denied today by the Director, Division of Import Procurement, Mr. A. C. Moore.

"Even the most Spartan-like Australian woman no doubt will have experienced an anticipatory glow of satisfaction at the announcement, but it is a pity it has no substance in fact," said Mr. Moore.

There were two important reasons, he pointed out, why the statement had no substance. These were: No requisition or demand had been made by the Australian Government for nylon stockings; the United States Government had ensured that nylon was used for war purposes, in preference to stockings.

Even in America, supplies of stockings had been denied women.

[From the Sydney (Australia) Mirror of November 8, 1943]

NO NYLON STOCKINGS, SAYS IMPORT CHIEF

Mr. A. C. Moore, director of the division of import procurement, commenting today on Mr. M. V. McCall's statement yesterday that nylon stockings would be released here in 3 months, said that news of such importations had no substance in fact.

"Apart from other aspects, there are two important reasons why the statement has no substance," Mr. Moore said.

"First is that no requisition or demand has been made by the Australian Government for nylon stockings.

"Second is that the United States Government has taken steps to insure that nylon is used for war purposes, principally in the production of parachutes, tooth brushes, and for electrical purposes.

"American women for a long time have been conducting prolonged and tireless searches of their shops for supplies of nylon without success," Mr. Moore added.

IMPORTATION FORBIDDEN

"If supplies of stockings were denied American women, there would have been no warrant for the United States Government to make supplies available to Australian women under lend-lease.

"Moreover, traders are not permitted to import stockings into Australia, as importation has been prohibited for a considerable time."

[From the Sydney (Australia) Daily Telegraph of November 8, 1943]

NO NYLON STOCKINGS

Nylon stockings would not be brought to Australia under lend-lease trading, the chief of the United States Lend-Lease Mission to Australia, Mr. Walter S. Robertson, said last night.

On Tuesday a member of the Rationing Commission, Mr. W. V. McCall, M. H. R., announced that thousands of pairs of nylon stockings would be available in Australia within the next 3 months.

Mr. Robertson said the Australian Government had made no request for the stockings.

"In America, nylon is not procurable for the manufacture of stockings," he added.

Mr. McCall said last night:

"I based my statement that stockings also would be available in Australia on certain information received from abroad."

STRIKE AT EARL CARROLL THEATER, HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, at the present time there is a strike at the Earl Carroll Theater, in Hollywood, Calif. The strike was occasioned by the waiters' union demanding that the checkers and cashiers should be union members. As a result, the girls who were handling that work were discharged by the theater management. The unions, however, were unable to supply union checkers or cashiers to take their places. Then the theater continued to operate as best it could without them. Since the unions could not supply them the management threatened to go to court to demand that the unions supply the necessary personnel. Because of that threat to go to court the union called a strike and picketed the theater and has forced the theater to close, thereby throwing out of employment over 300 union employees belonging to other unions.

Practices of this kind are going to lead the union labor cause into disrepute, and it is unfortunate that any union should cause a situation of this kind to exist. I think it should be terminated without delay and the situation remedied in order that the cause of organized labor should not be impaired by the unjust and indefensible acts of one particular union.

This entire situation, Mr. Speaker, is very ably set forth in an article which appeared in the Hollywood Citizen-News on November 29, and which I believe should be read by every Member of this House. The statement by Mr. Carroll presents the facts regarding this situation fairly and impartially, even though he is the victim of most unfair and unjust treatment.

The article is as follows:

WHY THE EARL CARROLL THEATER IS CLOSED

I suppose you are fed up with reading about union strikes, especially during these wartimes. I know I am, but here's one you should read. It will make you wonder what America is coming to.

Last Monday the Earl Carroll Theater-Restaurant was informed by the waiters' union that they would call a strike unless the food checkers and cashiers became members of their union. When these girls refused to join—a right every American still retains—I was compelled to dismiss them, even though they were our confidential employees and had been with us for a number of years.

I then notified the waiters' union that we expected them to furnish us with checkers and cashiers who would be experienced, trustworthy, and members of the waiters' union. Then an amazing situation developed. You won't believe it. The union refused to furnish us with these checkers, under the guise that they had none.

With great hardships and considerable financial loss, we operated Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday nights without checkers or cashiers. Then on Friday afternoon the waiters' union called a strike without warning, notice, reason, or provocation.

At a meeting Saturday it was coldly admitted by Mr. Van Hook, head of the waiters' union, that the only reason for calling this strike was because he had been informed that I intended to appeal to the courts to force his union to furnish us with union checkers and cashiers to successfully operate our business.

I was then flatly told by Mr. Van Hook that the strike would continue if any further attempts were made on my part to appeal to the courts for protection. I was astounded. I told him I held very preciously my right, and the right of every other American, to go to court and peacefully decide any controversy. I also told him I deeply resented the autocratic power that some labor leaders were seemingly exercising upon American life, and further, that if our country had reached a point where an individual, to protect his business, could no longer appeal to the courts without fear of a strike, I would prefer to stay closed forever, and finally I told him I believed it was high time that somebody did something to try to protect employers, employees, and the public from any high-handed union leaders.

And now a word to the members of the waiters' union. You must realize you're not the only union represented among the workers of our theater. The actors, chorus girls, musicians, stage hands, electricians, and engineers are all 100 percent union. Yet you have permitted your leaders to throw 300 innocent people out of work for what I think is the most reprehensible reason in all the annals of strikes. You have closed my theater for one reason alone—to teach me that I must take whatever punishment you deal out without one appeal to the only place I can and will appeal—an American courtroom where American justice is dispensed to American citizens in the sacred American way.

EARL CARROLL.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 861. An act to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its order heretofore entered, adjourned until Monday, December 6, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be an open meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Tuesday, December 7, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., for consideration of H. R. 2001, relating to penalty mail, at which time the Postmaster General and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, or their representatives, will be heard.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 3741. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 931). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3257. A bill to amend subtitle—Insurance of Title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize suspension of the statute of limitations in certain cases, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 932). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS:

H. R. 3774. A bill for the relief of the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 3775. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, to provide for the establishment of a uniform classification and uniform scale of class rates for railroad freight, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 3776. A bill to prohibit the use of the mails and of means of interstate commerce and communication to sell certain policies of insurance without having designated an agent in the State in which such policies are sold to accept service of process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 3777. A bill to assist in relieving economic distress in the Virgin Islands by providing work for unemployed persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 3778. A bill to provide that the Tennessee Valley Authority finance the construction of sewage disposal plants for municipalities whose water supply or sewage disposal system has been adversely affected by operations of the Authority; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3779. A bill to insure training and rehabilitation for men and women in the armed services; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. J. Res. 201. Joint resolution relating to the allocation of steel for the manufacture of farm machinery and farm implements; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3780. A bill for the relief of Dennis H. Sullivan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 3781. A bill for the relief of Hall Farris; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McMURRAY:

H. R. 3782. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jeannette B. Stedman; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3783. A bill granting a pension to Roy Donnelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3860. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Agnes H. Wickley and 129 other citizens of Barberton, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3861. Also, petition of M. Ruth White and 250 other citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3862. Also, petition of Marcus Nolan and 31 other citizens of Celina, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3863. Also, petition of Bennet L. Shugart and 15 other citizens of Fairmont, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3864. Also, petition of E. W. Jack and 21 other citizens of Watsonville, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3865. Also, petition of Myrtle M. Brace and 140 other citizens of Eugene, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3866. Also, petition of Elmira H. Passmore and 66 other citizens of Nottingham, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3867. Also, petition of Margaret J. Stevenson and 60 other citizens of Butler, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3868. Also, petition of Mary White and 33 other citizens of Richmond, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3869. Also, petition of Donald Herald and 39 other citizens of Richmond, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3870. Also, petition of Mrs. H. D. VanKirk and 61 other citizens of Columbus, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3871. Also, petition of Grace Harlan and 20 other citizens of Gridley, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3872. Also, petition of Mrs. Ted Highley and 36 other citizens of Converse, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3873. Also, petition of Mrs. Oren Tinkle and 32 other citizens of Marion, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3874. Also, petition of W. C. Dennis and 65 other citizens of Upland, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3875. Also, petition of Mrs. John Hyland and 24 other citizens of Oneida, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3876. Also, petition of Robert Morrison and 242 other citizens of Wilmington, Del., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3877. Also, petition of Edna M. Souers and 30 other citizens of New Philadelphia, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3878. Also, petition of Stephen Braun and 37 other citizens of Westford, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3879. Also, petition of Mrs. W. L. Duncan and 1,339 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Spartanburg, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3880. Also, petition of 270 citizens of Glenwood, Iowa, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3881. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Herman Moellring and 60 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3882. Also, petition of C. Engle and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3883. Also, petition of the United Electric Supply Co. and signed by 24 citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3884. Also, petition of Jacob B. Scott and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3885. Also, petition of Ted Sydow and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3886. By Mr. POULSON: Petition of Anna Fisher and others, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3887. By Mr. RABAUT: Petition of the executive secretary of the Michigan State Council of Brewery Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Detroit, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3888. By Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Petition of seven representatives of the Christian churches, of Xenia, Ohio, favoring the passage of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3889. Also, petition of 124 residents of Springfield, Ohio, favoring the passage of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3890. By Mr. HART: Petition of 103 Americans citizens, residents of New Jersey, protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082, a prohibition bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3891. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Resolution of the board of governors of the Maine Society of Public Accountants, Ernest M. Shapiro, of Lewiston, Maine, president, urging Congress to establish a qualified nonpartisan commission composed of Members of Congress, representatives of the Treasury Department, and independent lawyers, accountants, and economists to write a simple revenue law which will express a permanent and consistent policy of Federal taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3892. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Secretary of the Kentucky Aeronautics Commission, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to House bill 3420; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3893. Also, petition of the clerk of the board of supervisors of the county of Kern, State of California, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition of Senate bill 1257 and House bill 3018; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose hand is on the destiny of this world, let our prayer before Thee be as incense in adoration and praise. O how great is Thy goodness which Thou hast laid up for them that fear Thee and put their trust in Thee before the sons of men. May it be said unto them who are of a fearful heart, be strong, behold our God will come and save you.

Heavenly Father, with solemn earnestness we pray that our souls may be free of the horrors of hate; a good man carries heaven with him and Thy strength ennobles him. Each day let us contemplate with breathless responsibility the far-reaching influence of our labors. Grant that the disciples of our Lord may inspire us; they were wisest when lowliest and least conscious of their attainments. O guard us against self-aggrandizement and clothe us with that spiritual wealth and power which spring out of thoughts divine. Help us to rise above temper and tempest and crown us with a multiplied sense of courage and faith; let the unworded petition breathe forth from every breast. Set Thy will, dear Lord, to resist those who go on in sin and disobedience and are seeking to turn out the lights which illuminate the pathway to a world of peace and cooperation. O deliver this sin-stricken earth from the pestilence that walketh in darkness and from the destruction that wasteth at noonday and Thine shall be the glory forever, through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 3, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 175. Joint resolution commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the first airplane flight by Wilbur and Orville Wright.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

Department of Agriculture.

Department of Justice.

Department of the Navy.

Executive Office of the President (National Resources Planning Board).

Executive Office of the President (War Manpower Commission, N. Y. A.).

The National Archives.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

Department of Agriculture.

Department of the Navy.

Department of War.

Executive Office of the President (War Production Board).

Executive Office of the President (Office of Price Administration).

Federal Security Agency.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY FOR SERVICEMEN

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress, regardless of party affiliation, I am sure, is anxious to give full justice to the men who have been members of the fighting forces. Six hundred thousand men and women have already been mustered out of the service with honorable discharges. Some have been obliged to endure extreme hardships because they left the service practically penniless. They require a cash payment at the time of their discharge.

Congress, I am sure, will do the right thing by the veterans and I rise to urge that it be done when the need is great. The time to do it is now if we are to give justice to all. I hope the committee will report the bill this week and that we can have it a law before Christmas. We could not do anything better to strengthen the morale of the fighting men and the people of the Nation. We, of course, will have a full program later to meet the needs of the veterans. The committee members have been working diligently for months upon this legislation, and they deserve full credit; but, I repeat, let us meet at once the particular need of a cash payment upon discharge.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all agree with the statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]. He has touched on an important matter which confronts every veteran upon his discharge and will confront such veterans in the future.

We are all hopeful that early action may be taken. We all realize that the committee to which the bill has been referred has a large number of bills before it. We are hopeful that the committee will hold hearings as quickly as possible so that legislation will be passed that will provide for the mustering-out compensation for these veterans. It will be of invaluable assistance to veterans discharged in the past and particularly those in the future and will be of equally great assistance to society in the

quick readjustment of these men to civilian life.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. If Members of the House will sign petition No. 8 which the veterans' organizations are asking for to concentrate this legislation in the hands of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, this legislation will be taken up without delay.

TO ELIMINATE PRIVATE SUITS FOR PENALTIES AND DAMAGES ARISING OUT OF FRAUDS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WALTER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 1203) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States, for printing under the rule.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article written by Daniel J. Tobin.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE ROGER M. CALLOWAY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the passing on of Roger Calloway, formerly of the State of Wyoming, one of the reading clerks of the House. Mr. Calloway served in that capacity for nearly 5 years industriously, energetically, and ably. His friends were numbered by his acquaintances. I do not believe that he had an enemy. I never, in all of the time that I have known him, heard him utter a word against anyone. He was a lovable, fine gentleman. He was my friend and I was his friend. He will be missed by all of us.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial recently published by the retail grocers of California.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE ROOSEVELT-CHURCHILL-STALIN CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce to the House that the Chair has in hand a copy of a statement made by Messrs. Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin, which will be released at 1 o'clock. Immediately thereafter, without objection, the Chair will lay the message before the House.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a dinner program of the Furlough Club, at Endicott, N. Y., and also an address by Mr. Ray Youmans, master of ceremonies, together with an address of my own.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of all other special orders today the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] may proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

WAR SAVINGS BONDS

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALE]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GALE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

REGISTRATION OF DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN COMPANIES

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a companion bill to Senate bill 1476 introduced into the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. I am doing this, of course, after having fully consulted with the Senator from Wyoming about my intended action.

This bill is, in my judgment, one of the most important and timely measures ever introduced in the United States Congress, and I believe that the Senator from Wyoming has performed an outstanding service in preparing it for introduction. The bill's purpose is to protect our country against the menace of the international cartel which has proven so great an obstacle to full production of necessary war equipment, as well as to the effective development of America's productive capacity in peacetime.

The measure would require domestic and foreign companies doing business in the United States to register with the Attorney General copies of any foreign contracts in which they or their affiliate companies participate whenever any such contract contains any of the following provisions: First, restriction of production, sale, use, lease, or purchase of any articles of commerce; second, artificial fixing of prices; third, restriction of marketing territory; fourth, provision for the formation or use of any corporation for joint operations; or fifth, regulation or provision for the use of domestic or foreign patents or trade-marks. All such contracts would be open for public inspection.

This bill in other words, Mr. Speaker, is aimed to make the facts regarding international cartels known to the American people before, not after, they have done their damaging work. The international cartel amounts in effect to a secret treaty entered into not by governments but by private monopolistic corporations and we ought by this time to know very well how effective such cartels can be in profoundly altering the relative military strength of different nations, controlling and throttling both international trade and domestic production, and in exacting from the people extortionate prices for products which under competitive conditions would be produced in abundance and sold at reasonable prices.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article with reference to the price of corn, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the price of cotton cloth in China.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and to include two letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Ft. Worth Star Telegram on soldier vote problems, and also to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial by Raymond Brooks, Boston, appearing in the Austin Statesman, on the proposition of States' rights.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUSSELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject Blueprints of a Lasting Peace.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

There was no objection.

BLUEPRINTS OF A LASTING PEACE

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, on this date and at this particular stage of our participation in World War No. 2, although I anticipate a long, hard road ahead, I have no doubts of ultimate victory for the Allied cause. That victory must be unconditional surrender of the Axis powers and their satellites. Now, ever since I became a Member of Congress in January 1937, I have given most of my thoughts and energy to promoting our national defense, as war clouds loomed on the horizon and troubled world conditions became more ominous. Of course, since the outbreak of this war I have given most of my thought and energy to all legislative steps necessary to carry it on successfully.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I feel that—while fighting through—the time has come to give thought to what must follow. Accordingly I have been reading and studying many proposals for plans and blueprints of a lasting peace. Some of these are speeches by eminent jurists, university presidents, diplomats, military leaders, and well-known scientific men. Proposals range all the way from such scholarly discourse of President Hutchins and the guarded language of Sumner Welles to the scientific planning of Ely Culbertson.

Some of these leaders in post-war planning offer high idealism and propose an organization of the united states of the world with our own country playing the leading, beneficent part. Others propose a stern peace enforced as a Pax Americana, if necessary, by the superior armed force of the United States of America. In the midst of all this discussion I am slowly crystallizing my own thought in regard to this most vital of all issues.

WAR RELOCATION AUTHORITY PROPAGANDA

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to restrain my anger and to state just exactly what I think about a certain statement released by the War Relocation Authority, Columbus, Ohio, relative to the inducement of Japanese labor to come to Ohio and Michigan and live on our farms.

I want to give just two quotations from that Midwest Frontier, the publication referred to.

One of them is as follows:

Believe it or not, some few tenants and seasonal workers (in Ohio and Michigan) do not bathe. They think it is unhealthy. We need you people to change our ideas about this. You have a lesson to teach Ohio and Michigan farmers in sanitation. It is a contribution you can make to our way of living.

The other quotation is as follows:

We need your faithfulness to your task, your willingness to work, and your appreciation of a job well done. There are a lot of workers in the Middle West—in Ohio and Michigan—who are not careful, painstaking, and accurate. This you can teach them. You will do much for your fellow men and much for our sense of the art of agriculture, as well as the science.

Mr. Speaker, a single county in the Fifth District has probably more bathtubs than the whole Japanese Empire. We have no such people, unless they are those moved in from other areas. When one remembers the old and infirm who have joined the young and the strong to feed such people as Mr. Dakan and Mr. Weiss, and have maintained Mr. Dakan on the State pay roll for years—no, Mr. Speaker, we are not ready to come to soaking a whole village in one pit—men and women indiscriminately.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, December 13, at the completion of all legislative business of the day and after any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

AID TO DISCHARGED SOLDIERS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we have a matter that we cannot turn our faces away from and that is to provide an immediate cash payment for those discharged from the armed forces. Men of World War No. 1 at the time of discharge from the armed services were given $60. No law of this kind has been enacted for the men of World War No. 2. It is only human and only decent to do this and especially as our war industries are closing down. These men will go home and cannot get jobs. In my own city of Lowell, Mass., 7,500 people have been thrown out of work on account of a munitions plant closing down. Veterans will not be able to secure employment. Many of the women working in that plant are widows and will have no money coming in. Many of these widows have sons or daughters in the service.

Mr. Speaker, unless these veterans can have money to tide them over, they will be in a very sorry situation. Medicine is not an exact science. Many of these men who are supposed to be suffering from some sort of nerve exhaustion will be found later to be suffering from more serious disabilities which will last for some time.

Many of these cases have not been given service connection for nervousness. Many have not been rated at all.

I do not believe there will be a single vote against a cash payment for the veterans and I hope this measure will be passed before Christmas.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article and also a clipping from one of the bureaucratic publications entitled "Midwest Frontier." I may say, Mr. Speaker, that this indicates the depth of intellectual depravity to which some bureaucratic writers sink.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of contract termination and to include copy of an address I made on that subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Daily American, of West Frankfort, Ill., dated Wednesday, December 1, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Wayne County News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution of the St. Louis County Bankers Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Chio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, regarding W. P. A.'s publication Midwest Frontiers, I believe that any farmer or anyone else who has been able to even keep his head above the offal which has been scattered throughout the Middle West during the past 10 years by the master spreaders in Washington should receive a medal and should not be accused of being unsanitary.

The Ohio farmer knows how and has been able to cope with ordinary sanitation problems but this 10-year deluge is something new and more putrescent, probably diabureaurhea.

We middle westerners may not be the most sanitary people on earth, but we do know that when something begins to smell too much, it is rotten and should be buried.

We have reached that conclusion regarding the present putrescent "new stealers" and the interment will be held in November 1944.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain quotations with reference to the Japanese bath story.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

FARM PRICES

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, one of my very fine farmers has sent me a letter in which he said:

Last winter we sold our cows that were through as milkers, and our steers, for 12 cents per pound alive and 25 cents dressed. Now Farmer Peets pays 4 to 7 cents for such animals and we can't sell dressed beef at all. I paid $9.10 for a Co-op tractor axle in 1942, now the bill is $16.50. Chickens are selling at 16 cents per pound in Chesoning and 39 cents per pound in Saginaw, which gives 23 cents to someone. You know, Mr. Crawford, that such conditions are impossible to bear. We have sold all our sows, and pigs can be bought for 50 cents each, and dairy calves must be killed at 2 days to avoid losing $10 worth of milk.

CEILING PRICE ON CORN

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the action of the O. P. A. in raising the price of corn from $1.07 to $1.16 per bushel is typical of the bungling, muddling, and inefficiency of the Office of Price Administration and amounts to just another gesture and is too little and too late. For more than 6 months I have been urging the O. P. A. to either substantially increase the ceiling price on corn or remove it entirely. I even voted against a summer recess as a protest against the delay of the O. P. A. in acting to place a ceiling price on corn where it would start corn moving from the Middle Western States to eastern poultrymen and dairymen. Our dairy and poultry industry in the East is in a critical situation and each month is getting worse. Farms are being abandoned, herds disposed of, and production cut at a time when the country needs greater production in milk and eggs as a contribution to the war effort. I do not believe the action of the O. P. A. will help the farmers of the East or bring them any corn. The ceiling price should have been removed entirely or set at not less than $1.25 per bushel and possibly at $1.35. What the dairymen and poultrymen in the East want is corn and they are willing to pay the price, but if they cannot get it it will mean ruin and destruction for many of them. Two of my distinguished constituents who are dirt farmers have already been forced by O. P. A. bureaucratic exactions and regimentations to change their farm labels from dirt farmers—Franklin D. Roosevelt to a producer and distributor of Christmas trees and Henry Morgenthau, Jr., to a horticulturist and picker of apples.

REHABILITATION OF VETERANS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PHILBIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a copy of a radio address delivered by Mr. Ray Henle in connection with the violation of the censorship agreement by Reuters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

POLITICAL SNIPING

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, former Governor Landon has reached a new political low in his remarks of last Saturday which appeared in the press.

During the past 4 years, in fact, almost since President Roosevelt defeated him in 1936, he has been nothing but an unfair critic of everything the President has done. His tactics have been to engage in cheap political sniping, the type of political tactics that one hardly expects from a man who was once honored by the Republican Party as the nominee for President.

Former Governor Landon seems to have adopted the role of being the front man for those who are trying to smear President Roosevelt.

In the past he has confined himself pretty much to domestic affairs, but last Saturday he extended his sniping efforts to our foreign policy. Mr. Landon was in the ranks of the isolationists before Pearl Harbor. If a majority of the Members of Congress had followed his position of opposition, when Pearl Harbor happened, our country would have been defenseless and unable to carry on the war. The only course we could have taken would have been to make the best terms we could with Nazi Germany and the Japs, and anyone with common sense knows what those terms would have been. Mr. Landon was wrong then and he is still wrong.

One thing is certain. Under the courageous leadership of President Roosevelt we are winning the war—and we will also win the peace.

It is about time the people of our country realize just what is going on, misstatements and false statements being made for purely political purposes, the only result of which can be to divide our people, and an attempt from a political angle to impair the prestige of President Roosevelt. This is a dangerous role to play in wartime.

When men like Governor Landon make unfair and unjustifiable statements, the people should remember his pre-Pearl Harbor record of isolationism.

Constructive criticism is one thing. Mr. Landon's negative criticism and sniping tactics are another thing.

Mr. Landon was so far wrong before Pearl Harbor on legislation concerning the very future and existence of our country, that he ought to be so ashamed of his poor vision and unsound judgment to remain silent on matters concerning the war, and to cease opposition for purely political reasons. He should let President Roosevelt, whose judgment was correct, and under whose leadership the war is being conducted successfully, conduct it to a successful conclusion, without being exposed to the type of unfair opposition that Mr. Landon represents.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I have an estimate of the cost of inserting in the RECORD an address by the Honorable Harold L. Ickes before the American Petroleum Institute and also an address by Mr. Ralph K. Davies before the same institute. The cost of one is $112.50 and of the other $120. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include these addresses if they have not already been inserted in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Chair believes that it has already been done but that can be investigated. Without objection, they may be inserted in the RECORD if that has not already been done.

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and further to extend my own remarks and include therein an editorial and a resolution pertaining to the question of silver.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES AND WORLD PROTEST SHOCKING ARREST OF STUDENTS AT UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD concerning the mass arrest of Norwegian students at Oslo University in Norway, and include therein an article of news of Norway by the Norwegian Ambassador.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, November 29, referring to gasoline which had been given to various union organizers, I made the statement:

> These union organizers, so-called—some of them convicted criminals—have been getting all the gasoline they need to drive from Grand Rapids to Holland.

This morning I received a letter saying the union organizers had never been convicted of any criminal offense. I desire to correct the RECORD by striking out "some of them convicted criminals." I want to let the matter referring to the union organizers who drove from Detroit to Port Huron, and the part that shows a list of their convictions, stand; but with reference to those who drove from Grand Rapids to Holland, Mich., I want to strike that out, as I accept the statement of Mr. Thomas Ward, an attorney whom I know personally, who wrote in their behalf, that such statement was not accurate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS POLICY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no authority to speak for Mr. Landon. I do not believe I ever met the gentleman. I think I remember having voted for him on one occasion, but I am sure he will appreciate the advice of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Might I add, too, that if Mr. Landon was mistaken, there were a great many of us in this country who were mistaken about the situation and perhaps our mistake or our misinformation, if it was that, is due to the fact that we were told all the time there was not going to be any war in which we would be involved and no one would be sent across the sea. If that was true, of course, we did not need conscription. I understand from a publication recently sent out by the State Department, the administration knew all about an attack about to be made on Pearl Harbor and what happened just before, but they did not do anything about it. They let it come and the people there were surprised, our people were killed, and our ships destroyed. Now, is it due to the fact they did not actually have the information? Can you charge it is due to those of us who wanted to keep out of this war and who relied on the statements of Members on the majority side and statements of those who told us they were speaking for the administration?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

TOLLING OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last I introduced into the House, House Joint Resolution 199, which provides an extension of time for the court martialing or punishment of any or all persons, military or civilian, who were derelict in their duty at Pearl Harbor or in connection with that catastrophe. As Members of the House know, the press has intimated that both General Short and Admiral Kimmel have expressed willingness to waive the statute of limitations which expires tomorrow. There is a serious question in the minds of many able lawyers whether or not they, or any Department concerned, have the authority to waive in advance of its operation the statute of limitations. My resolution is a plain and simple one. It simply extends the time for court martialing or punishment of any or all persons in military or civilian capacity up to and including 1 calendar year after the formal declaration of peace with Japan has been officially ratified by the Senate of the United States. In fairness to the House I want to say this resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. Unfortunately there is not a quorum of the Committee on Military Affairs in the city, because some of the members have gone home and others are on official trips of inspection. But I talked less than an hour ago to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], who is wholeheartedly in favor of this joint resolution. Many Members, both of the Senate and of the House, Democrats and Republicans alike, have expressed willingness to see it pass immediately, and it must be passed today or not later than tomorrow if it is to be effective. No one has expressed opposition to it. Therefore I am asking unanimous consent to take up House Joint Resolution 199 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would rather that the gentleman wait until the call of the Consent Calendar. Certainly the gentleman will be recognized at that time to make a unanimous-consent request for the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the Chair very much.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS POLICY

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the gentleman from Michigan just now. What is he doing? Is he trying to have an alibi about something? O Mr. Speaker, I remember that just 2 months before Pearl Harbor the gentleman from Michigan and others voted against the extension of the draft. The gentleman from Michigan and those on that side of the House had every opportunity to know what was happening in the world, but because of pure partisanship they blinded their eyes as they are doing now, and as Mr. Landon is doing at the present time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing a great deal of criticism now about the way veterans are being treated—especially by individuals who have done the least for them.

I notice that some men who voted against my amendment raising the base pay of the men in the service to $50 a month, are now contending that there is an unholy combination between northern Republicans and southern Democrats, because we refuse to violate the Constitution of the United States, set up a Federal election commission in violation of the laws of every State in the Union, and wreck the election machinery of the whole Nation.

What we are trying to do is to give men in our armed forces the right to vote for everything, from President down, give them all the help they need to get these ballots to them and back, including free air-mail service, but to leave the election machinery in the hands of the States.

If the substitute passed by the Senate is adopted by the House it will do that very thing.

DISABLED VETERANS

Now as to the disabled veterans, we have been trying in every way we could—I am speaking of members of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation—every single one of them, Democrats and Republicans, to bring out legislation that would take care of these disabled men who are being discharged.

We have a petition in the Well of the House now, petition No. 8, to amend the rules so as to concentrate this legislation in the hands of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

I now invite each and every Member of the House to sign that petition.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter received from Mr. C. W. Kitchen, Deputy Administrator of the Food Distribution Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] in attempting to defend the statement of Mr. Landon says that we were advised of the danger of an attack upon Pearl Harbor and did nothing about it. I would like to remind the gentleman that the President of the United States, as far back as May 1940, called our attention to the serious condition of world affairs and asked for money to strengthen the Army and the Navy. I recall, also, that he appointed two prominent Republicans, one as Secretary of War and one as Secretary of the Navy. If the Army and the Navy were not prepared for Pearl Harbor you cannot charge it to the Democrats, because those two agencies were headed by Republicans, and they know what was coming if anybody knew. So let us keep the record straight. Mr. Landon ought to keep quiet about foreign affairs, because his advice, if we had followed it, would have led us into a situation much worse than the present.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] has expired.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

OFFICE OF FISHERY COORDINATION

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar, S. 1242, to authorize appropriations for salaries and expenses, Office of Fishery Coordination.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NAVY NURSE CORPS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2976, to grant military rank to certain members of the Navy Nurse Corps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That during the present war and for 6 months thereafter, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation may designate, the Superintendent and all other members of the Navy Nurse Corps entitled under existing laws to relative rank shall have and shall be designated by the rank which corresponds to the relative rank heretofore provided by law for such Superintendent and members.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this act contained shall alter, enlarge, or modify the provisions of law relating to the authority of such members of the Navy Nurse Corps, or to the manner of their appointment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AWARDS IN CONNECTION WITH WAR MINERALS RELIEF

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2616, to enable the Secretary of the Interior to complete payment of awards in connection with the war minerals relief statutes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to enable the Secretary of the Interior to complete payment of awards under the act entitled "An act to amend section 5 of the act of March 2, 1919, generally known as the war minerals relief statutes", approved May 18, 1936 (49 Stat. 1355), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $54,775.82, in addition to the sum authorized by such act of May 18, 1936.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MENOMINEE TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 166, to provide for the disposition of the proceeds to accrue as a result of the interlocutory judgment of the Court of Claims in the suit brought against the United States by the Menominee Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when this bill was before the House last Consent Calendar day, I discussed it at length, and then asked that the bill go over without prejudice, in order that I might consult with the Attorney General. I sent the Attorney General a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which contained the debate, urged him to read it, and I asked him what the Department desired to do with reference to the legislation. I have a reply from him.

The letter is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., November 19, 1943.

Hon. JOHN J. COCHRAN,
Chairman, Committee on Accounts,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As requested in your letter of November 15, 1943, I have examined the debate on House Joint Resolution 166, appearing on pages 9537-9538 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date.

You are correct in your statement as to the general policy with regard to gratuity offsets and also in your belief that if the resolution becomes a law and the Menominee Indians do not prevail in other suits now pending in the Court of Claims, the United States might lose the opportunity of asserting its gratuity offsets.

When the matter was submitted to this Department, this possibility was considered. The need of restoring the land to the reservation seemed important from an administrative standpoint, however, and seemed to counterbalance the possibility of losing the opportunity of asserting these offsets, especially as there are a number of other claims and the offsets can be used against any of them. For these reasons this Department did not object to the substantive purpose of the resolution but did suggest amendments which are intended to leave no doubt that the offsets will be available to assert against recoveries in the other suits, if any, and also against the present judgment for the value of the swamp lands in case the plan of acquiring those lands should not be effected. These amendments have been accepted by the Committee on Indian Affairs and have been included in the bill reported by the committee.

Because of the special circumstances surrounding this case, I have no objection to the bill as amended by the committee.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

Mr. COCHRAN. You will note that the Attorney General agrees with everything I said on the floor of the House. He then goes on to state, "When the matter was submitted to this Department this possibility was considered." He says

there is a situation that required the Attorney General to suggest certain amendments to the committee, and that the committee, having accepted the amendments, he is now in favor of the passage of the bill.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to object to this bill, but I want it distinctly understood that with reference to offsets the passage of this bill by no means sets a precedent that I propose to recognize. I want that remembered. This is the first time that the Attorney General has agreed to eliminate offsets, and he is going on the assumption, and I said it was an assumption, that the Menominees are going to win another of their cases, and then we could recover as offsets our advances to those Indians.

Of course, if the Indians lose their other cases then we are out of luck as well as money.

The bill does provide the Government will have the power to offset any other claim by charging off gratuities.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman insists that offsets be counted in, and I assure him that it is my understanding that this bill does not waive the general policy of offsets, as the gentleman has always advocated it.

Mr. COCHRAN. I know it does not, and I know it is not going to do it as far as I am concerned with any kind of a bill. As far as I am concerned, and I know I am only one Member of this House, if this bill does pass and it goes to the Senate, and objectionable amendments are added to the bill in the Senate, I will oppose it when it comes back to the House. The general offset provisions must never be repeated.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I wish to thank the gentleman for the time he has put in on this legislation. I wish to say that his action today is going to facilitate the production of lumber very materially on this Indian reservation—lumber that is badly needed in the war effort and which cannot be used at the present time because no one knows who owns the timber. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. COCHRAN. It was at my suggestion, 8 years ago, the general offset provision was embodied in a deficiency bill. It has already saved the Government hundreds of millions of dollars. True, this is a small amount in comparison with other pending claims, and, frankly, I do not like to, but I am following the decision of the Attorney General because in the past many times I have justified my action on his advice.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the United States Court of Claims, by interlocutory judgment of December 1, 1941, in a suit by the Menominee Tribe of Indians against the United States, No. 44294, brought pursuant to the provisions of the act of September 3, 1935 (ch. 839, 49 Stat. 1085), as amended, found and held that the Menominee Indians are entitled to recover from the United States the value of timber removed from, and the present acquisition cost of, certain swamplands within the boundaries of their reservation which the United States, in violation of the provisions of the treaty of May 12, 1854 (10 Stat. 1064), failed to convey to the Menominee Indians, but reserved for further proceedings the determination of the amount of the recovery and the deduction of offsets, if any; and

Whereas said act of September 3, 1935, provided that in the event of a judgment against the United States as aforesaid, the United States may in lieu of paying the present acquisition costs of such lands acquire and hold said lands in trust for the sole benefit and use of the Menominee Tribe of Indians, but provided no method for exercising such election: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That upon petition of the attorneys for the Menominee Tribe of Indians the Court of Claims shall, in order to give effect to its interlocutory judgment, enter judgment in favor of the said tribe for (a) $13,666.80, representing the amount of the recovery by reason of the timber removed since May 12, 1854, from the swamplands which the court has found the United States unlawfully failed to convey to the said tribe pursuant to the treaty of May 12, 1854; and (b) $1,420,836.03, representing the present acquisition cost of such lands to the said tribe of Indians; and no offsets, including gratuities, shall be allowed to the United States in determining the amount of such judgment, but any such offsets which the United States may have, including gratuities, as defined in section 3 of the act of September 3, 1935 (ch. 839, 49 Stat. 1085), as amended, may be pleaded and allowed in any other suit now pending or hereafter to be brought by the Menominee Tribe of Indians against the United States.

SEC. 2. Upon the entry of such judgment, which shall not bear interest, a copy or transcript thereof, certified by the clerk of the Court of Claims, and signed by the Chief Justice, or in his absence by the presiding judge of said court, shall be presented, as in other cases, to the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall certify the same to the Congress for appropriation.

SEC. 3. After the entry of such judgment, the Court of Claims, without awaiting the appropriation by the Congress of money to pay the same, shall, on petition of attorneys for the Menominee Tribe of Indians, determine the amount of fees which the attorneys for the Menominee Tribe of Indians shall be entitled to receive under section 7 of the act of September 3, 1935, as amended.

SEC. 4. Upon the making of an appropriation by the Congress for the payment of the judgment rendered there shall be set aside from such appropriation a sum sufficient to pay the attorneys' fees, which shall, however, not be paid until after the completion of the purchase of the swamplands specified in section 1 (b), as hereinafter provided; said appropriation to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Interior as herein provided. The portion of such judgment representing the value of the timber specified in section 1 (a) less the pro rata amount thereof deductible for attorneys' fees, in the same ratio that the total amount of attorneys' fees bears to the amount of the judgment, shall upon the completion of the purchase of the said swamplands be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Menominee Tribe of Indians as provided in the last sentence of section 7 of the act of September 3, 1935, as amended. The balance of the appropriation shall be available for the purchase from the State of Wisconsin, but not by eminent domain, of the swamplands specified in section 1 (b). The purchase of the said swamplands shall be made by the Secretary of the Interior, who is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States a quitclaim deed or other form of conveyance to such lands satisfactory to the attorney General of the United States. Title to such lands shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the Menominee Tribe of Indians. The United States shall acquire and hold such lands for the sole benefit and use of the said Indians as if they had become part of the Menominee Reservation pursuant to the treaty of May 12, 1854.

SEC. 5. In the event that said purchase is not completed within 18 months after the entry of judgment by the Court of Claims, then, upon petition of the Attorney General or the attorneys for the Menominee Tribe of Indians, the Court of Claims shall vacate and set aside the said judgment entered pursuant to section 1 hereof. Thereupon the court shall proceed to determine, as provided by the act of September 3, 1935, as amended, the amount of offsets, if any, deductible from the amounts specified in sections 1 (a) and 1 (b) of this act, and shall render final judgment pursuant to the terms of the act of September 3, 1935, as amended. In rendering final judgment under this section, the court may redetermine the amount of the attorneys' fees. Such judgment shall be satisfied from the appropriation made pursuant to sections 2 and 4 hereof; and any balance of moneys appropriated shall thereupon be carried to the general fund of the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 6. All acts or parts of acts in conflict herewith, including the act of September 3, 1935, are, to the extent of such conflict, modified accordingly.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 4, line 23, strike out "18 months" and insert "3 years."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the letter, which I mentioned in my remarks, as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE SABOTAGE LAW (WARTIME)

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3442, to amend sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes," approved April 20, 1918, as amended (40 Stat. 533; U. S. C., title 50, secs. 101, 102, and 103).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this bill has a rather extensive and substantial minority report I object.

Mr. KEAN and Mr. CUNNINGHAM objected.

The SPEAKER. Three objections are heard. The bill is stricken from the calendar.

TO TRANSFER CERTAIN LAND IN THE CROATAN NATIONAL FOREST

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1315, providing for the transfer to the custody and control of the Secretary of the Navy of certain lands comprising a portion of Croatan National Forest in the State of North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, on the last calendar day I objected to the consideration of this bill until I could secure some information from the county in which this land was located. I have received a letter from Mr. R. A. Nunn, county attorney for the county in which he states there is no objection and that they are in accord with the bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to insert this letter at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

NEW BERN, N. C., *November 23, 1943.*

Hon. G. A. BARDEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE: Your letter of 20th instant with your colloquy with Representative FLANNAGAN has been received and I have read it with interest.

I have talked with some of the county commissioners and Mr. Ben O. Jones and they advise me to notify you they have no objection to the passage of the bill transferring lands within the marine base to the custody and control of the Navy.

The county was interested in getting its share of the proceeds of timber cut from the lands in the national forest.

With best wishes.

Yours truly,

R. A. NUNN.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to transfer to the custody and control of the Secretary of the Navy all lands owned by the United States and comprising a part of Croatan National Forest in the State of North Carolina which are situated within the present boundaries of the Marine Corps Aviation Base, Cherry Point, N. C.: *Provided*, That in the event the area transferred pursuant to the provisions of this act shall cease to be used for military purposes, it shall revert to its former national-forest status.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESIGNATING THE PERSON WHO SHALL ACT AS PRESIDENT UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 678, designating the person who shall act as President if a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or when neither a President-elect, nor a Vice President-elect shall have qualified.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in my opinion this matter is too important for the Consent Calendar. I therefore object.

Mr. COLE of New York and Mr. CUNNINGHAM objected.

The SPEAKER. Three objections are heard. The bill is stricken from the calendar.

COURT REPORTERS IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3611, to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States, to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Judicial Code (Act of March 3, 1911, 36 Stat. 1089, as amended) is hereby amended by inserting after section 5 thereof a new section 5a, entitled "Court Reporters," as follows:

"SEC. 5a. Court reporters:

"(a) Appointment: Each district court of the United States, including the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia and the district courts in the Territories and insular possessions, shall appoint one or more court reporters for the district court in the manner provided for the appointment of the clerks of said courts. The persons to be so appointed shall possess the qualifications necessary for the satisfactory performance of the duties specified in subdivision (b) of this section, to be determined by standards which shall be formulated from time to time by the Judicial Conference, and shall take an oath to perform faithfully such duties. The number of reporters to be so appointed shall be determined by the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges (hereinafter referred to as the Judicial Conference). The court, with the approval of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts (hereinafter referred to as the Director) may appoint additional reporters for temporary service not exceeding 3 months, when there is more reporting work in the district than can be promptly performed by the authorized number of reporters and the urgency is so great as to render it impracticable to obtain the approval of the Judicial Conference. If the court and the Judicial Conference are of the opinion that in any district it is in the public interest that the duties of reporter should be combined with those of any other employee of the court, the Judicial Conference may authorize such a combination of positions and fix the salary therefor, as provided by subsection (c) hereof, any provision of law to the contrary notwithstanding.

"(b) Duties: One of the reporters so appointed for each district court shall attend at each session of the court and at every other proceeding that may be designated by rule of procedure or order of court or by one of the judges of the court, and shall record verbatim by shorthand or by mechanical means (1) all proceedings in criminal cases had in open court, whether in connection with plea, trial, or sentence; (2) all proceedings in all other cases had in open court unless the parties shall specifically agree to the contrary; and (3) such other proceedings as a judge of the court may direct or as may be required by rule of procedure or order of the court or as may be requested by any party to the proceeding. The reporter shall attach his official certificate to the original shorthand notes or other original records so taken and promptly file them with the clerk of the court, who shall preserve them in the public records of the court for not less than 10 years. Upon the request of any party to any proceeding which has been so recorded or of a judge of the court, the reporter shall promptly transcribe the original records of the requested parts of the proceedings and attach thereto his official certificate, and shall then deliver the transcript to the party or judge making the request. He shall also transcribe and certify all pleas and proceedings in connection with the imposition of sentence in criminal cases and such other parts of the record of proceedings as may be required by rule of procedure or order of court. The reporter shall promptly deliver to the clerk for the records of the court a certified copy of any transcript that he may make of any part of the record of any proceeding. The transcript of the testimony and proceedings in any case when duly certified by such reporter shall be deemed prima facie a correct statement of such testimony and proceedings. No transcripts of the proceedings of the court shall be considered as official except those made from the records taken by the reporter so appointed. The said original notes or other original records and the said copy of transcript shall be open to inspection in the office of the clerk as provided by law with respect to books containing the docket or minute of judgments, or decrees thereof.

"(c) Compensation: Each reporter so appointed shall receive an annual salary, to be fixed from time to time by the Judicial Conference and to be paid in the same manner and at the same time that the salary of the clerk of the court is paid. In fixing such salary the Judicial Conference shall take into account in each instance the amount of time the reporter is required to be in attendance upon the court engaged in the performance of his duties. Such salary shall not exceed $3,000 per annum, except that if the amount of time any reporter is required to attend upon the court in the performance of his duties exceeds 30 weeks annually, as determined by the Judicial Conference, the salary may in the discretion of the Judicial Conference be fixed in that instance at an amount not exceeding $5,000 per annum. The reporter shall also receive his traveling expenses and expenses incurred for subsistence within the limitations prescribed by law for clerks of district courts while necessarily absent on official business from the place of his regular employment. Necessary equipment and supplies for recording the proceedings shall be furnished to the reporter by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. All other supplies shall be furnished by the reporter at his own expense. In addition, the reporter may charge and collect from parties, including the United States, who request transcripts, such fees therefor and no other, as may be prescribed from time to time by the court subject to the approval of the Judicial Conference. The fees for transcripts of pleas and proceedings in connection with the imposition of sentence in criminal cases and for transcripts furnished to a judge for his personal use shall be paid by the United States out of money appropriated for that purpose. No fee shall be charged or taxed for any copy of a transcript delivered to the clerk for the records of court as required by subdivision (b) of this section. Fees for transcripts furnished in criminal or habeas corpus proceedings to persons allowed to sue, defend, or appeal in forma pauperis shall be paid by the United States out of money appropriated for that purpose; and the fees for transcripts

furnished in other than criminal or habeas corpus proceedings to persons permitted to appeal in forma pauperis shall also be paid by the United States if the trial judge shall certify that the appeal is not frivolous but presents a substantial question. Except as to transcripts that are to be paid for by the United States, the reporter may require any party requesting a transcript to prepay the estimated fee therefor in advance of delivery of the transcript.

"(d) Administration: The Judicial Conference shall supervise and direct the administration of this section. Subject to this section and pertinent laws, it shall be the duty of the court to supervise and direct the reporter in the performance of his duties, including dealings with parties requesting transcripts. The Judicial Conference shall prescribe records which shall be maintained and reports which shall be filed by the reporter. Such records shall be inspected and audited in the same manner as the records and accounts of the clerk and may include records showing (1) the quantity of transcripts prepared, (2) the fees charged and the fees collected for transcripts, (3) any expenses incurred by the reporter in connection with transcripts, (4) the amount of time the reporter is in attendance upon the court for the purpose of recording proceedings, and (5) such other information as the Judicial Conference may determine.

"(e) Taxation of fees as costs: In the discretion of the court any part or all of the fees for transcripts may be taxed as costs in the case. Fees paid by the United States for transcripts furnished to persons allowed to appeal in civil cases in forma pauperis shall be taxed in favor of the United States as costs in the case."

SEC. 2. All laws or parts of laws inconsistent or repugnant to the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry the provisions of this act into effect.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING AN EASEMENT FOR AN OIL PIPE LINE OVER THE OGDEN ORDNANCE DEPOT MILITARY RESERVATION

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1488, to provide a right-of-way for an oil pipe line over the Ogden Ordnance Depot Military Reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like for some member, either of the Committee on Military Affairs or the author of the bill, to explain the provisions of the measure, which apparently gives a permanent easement to an oil company for the construction and maintenance of a pipe line over Federal property. If there is nobody available to explain it, I ask that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 44 OF THE LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2232, to amend section 44 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 44 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) The Commission may, in its discretion and to the extent that it shall determine to be advisable after consideration of current commitments payable from the special fund established under this section, make payments from such fund upon any award heretofore or hereafter made providing for the payment of death benefits or compensation for permanent total and permanent partial disability, and may provide any necessary medical, surgical, and other treatment required by section 7 of this Act in any case of disability, where there has been default in the payment of compensation or of the furnishing of such medical treatment, in any case in which the Commission shall determine that the employer had failed to secure compensation as provided by section 32 of this act and such default was due to the insolvency of the employer, and in any case in which such default is due to the insolvency of an insured employer and his insurance carrier. Such an uninsured employer or such insured employer and such insurance carrier shall be liable for payment into such fund of the amounts paid therefrom by the Commission under the authority of this subsection, including the cost of any benefits under section 7 of this act paid from such fund; and for the purpose of enforcing this liability, the Commission, for the benefit of said fund, shall be subrogated to all the rights of the person receiving such payment or benefits, including the right of lien and priority provided for by section 17 of this act, as against the employer or carrier, or both, and may be a proceeding in the name of the Commission under section 18 or under subdivision (C) of section 21 of this act, or both, seek to recover the amount of the default, or so much thereof as in the judgment of the Commission is possible, or the Commission may settle and compromise any such claim.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after "may," insert "upon application by a person entitled to compensation or upon its own motion,".

Page 2, at the end of line 4, following "disability," insert "as found by the deputy commissioner to be needed,".

Page 2, at the end of line 11, insert "The procedure in respect of claims, modification of awards, judicial review, and the adjudicatory processes as provided by this act and regulations thereunder, shall not be affected because of payment of benefits from such special fund, except that the Commission as representing the interest of such special fund, may appear, in addition to the employer, in any proceeding before the deputy commissioner in respect of any claim or award in which benefits may be payable from such fund, and shall have all the rights of an employer under this act, including those in respect to proceedings before the deputy commissioner and proceedings for judicial review."

Page 2, in lines 14 and 16, after the word "paid" insert "and to be paid."

Page 2, line 22, strike out the word "be" and insert "bring."

Page 2, line 23, strike out "(C)" and insert "(c)".

Page 2, line 24, after "both," insert "and".

Page 3, line 1, after "default" insert "including the value of future compensation and other benefits.".

Page 3, line 3, after "claim." insert "For the foregoing purposes, the Commission is authorized to make, from any annual appropriation for expenses of administration of this act, necessary expenditures for court costs, witness fees, or other expenses incident to initiation or carrying out of any such proceedings or for the purpose of investigating the case of any person claiming benefits or continuation of benefits from such special fund. For the purpose of proceeding against any defaulting employer or insurance carrier under this subdivision, the deputy commissioner shall, in the manner prescribed in section 18 of this act, determine not only compensation in default but the value of future compensation and the value of probable future medical and other costs for services required of the employer by section 7 of this act. The provisions of section 18 and section 21 of this act shall apply with respect to a compensation order declaring such default, and the Commission shall have all rights, for the benefit of such fund, as an applicant or beneficiary under such sections."

Page 3, at the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 2. That section 38 of said act be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 38. (a) Any employer required to secure the payment of compensation under this act who fails to secure such compensation shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment; and in any case where such employer is a corporation, the president, secretary, and treasurer thereof shall be also severally liable to such fine or imprisonment as herein provided for the failure of such corporation to secure the payment of compensation; and such president, secretary, and treasurer shall be severally personally liable, jointly with such corporation, for any compensation or other benefit which may accrue under the said act in respect to any injury which may occur to any employee of such corporation while it shall so fail to secure the payment of compensation as required by section 32 of this act.

"'(b) Any employer who knowingly transfers, sells, encumbers, assigns, or in any manner disposes of, conceals, secretes, or destroys any property belonging to such employer, after one of his employees has been injured within the purview of this act, and with the intent to avoid the payment of compensation under this act to such employee or his dependents, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment; and in any case where such employer is a corporation, the president, secretary, and treasurer thereof shall be also severally liable to such penalty of imprisonment as well as jointly liable with such corporation for such fine.

"'(c) This section shall not affect any other liability of the employer under this act.'"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend sections 44 and 38 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act."

EXPEDITING PAYMENTS FOR LAND ACQUIRED DURING THE WAR PERIOD

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 919, to expedite the payment for lands acquired during the war period.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TO REMIT CLAIMS OF THE UNITED STATES ON ACCOUNT OF OVERPAYMENTS TO PART-TIME CHARWOMEN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3449, to remit claims of the United States on account of overpayments to part-time charwomen in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That remission is hereby made of any and all claims of the United States in consequence of payments of wages at the rate of 78 cents an hour, rather than at some lower rate or rates, for work performed during the period from August 1, 1942, to June 30, 1943, both dates inclusive, by part-time charwomen employed in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing of the Treasury Department. Remission is hereby made of any and all claims of the United States in consequence of payments of wages for hours of work in any one week in excess of 40 at the overtime rate of one and one-half times the rate at which payments were made for the first 40 hours of work in that week, rather than at some lower rate or rates, for work performed on or after December 22, 1942, by any of said part-time charwomen pursuant to temporary details (pending promotions) to assignments requiring 48 hours' work in 1 week. Said remissions are hereby made notwithstanding any determination that the rate or rates at which said payments of wages were made is or are in excess of the rate or rates of pay established by law for said employment: *Provided*, That if said payments of wages at said rate of 78 cents an hour and at said overtime rate are otherwise correct, the Comptroller General is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit therefor in the accounts of the officers accountable therefor, to make no charge against any certifying officer because of certification of said payments of wages, and to remove every charge, if any, heretofore made against any certifying officer because of certification of said payment of wages.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make refunds of any and all amounts heretofore withheld or deducted from wages paid to any of said part-time charwomen for work performed after June 30, 1943, in satisfaction or partial satisfaction of any and all claims or asserted claims of the United States in consequence of said payments of wages at said rate of 78 cents and at said overtime rate. The annual appropriation for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Engraving and Printing, 1944, is hereby made available to the extent of $700 for the purpose of making said refunds as herein provided.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT OF NAVY PERSONNEL FOR PERSONAL PROPERTY LOST AS A RESULT OF FIRES ON LONG ISLAND, ALASKA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3605, to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in tents used as quarters by members of the Twelfth Naval Construction Battalion, Long Island, Alaska, on December 26, 1942, and May 26, 1943, respectively.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $6,562.47, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged in fires occurring in tents used as quarters by members of the Twelfth Naval Construction Battalion, Long Island, Alaska, on December 26, 1942, and May 26, 1943, respectively: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN NAVY PERSONNEL FOR PERSONAL PROPERTY LOSS AT NORFOLK NAVY YARD, PORTSMOUTH, VA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3606, to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire at the Outlying Degaussing Branch of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., on December 4, 1942.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $5,554.95, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged in a fire at the Outlying Degaussing Branch of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., on December 4, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT OF NAVY PERSONNEL AS RESULT OF FIRE AT AMPHIBIOUS TRAINING STATION, NORFOLK, VA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3607, to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in tent L–76 at the Amphibious Training Base, Camp Brandford, Norfolk, Va., on March 15, 1943.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in aggregate not to exceed $221.34, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged in a fire in tent L–76 at the Amphibious Training Base, Camp Bradford, Norfolk, Va., on March 15, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, this concludes the call of bills on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman why Calendar No. 199 cannot be considered at this time?

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that a bill must be on the calendar for 3 legislative days. I understand that this bill has not been on the calendar for 3 legislative days.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, this is a very urgent matter.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the gentleman's bill. I am just calling the attention of the House to the fact.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, this is an urgent matter, as outlined in a letter to the Speaker and I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered at this time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will not recognize the gentleman for that purpose at this time. The gentlemen on the committee have not gone into the merits of this bill and it cannot be called up today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by Judge Neal W. Workman, of Newberry, S. C., on Armistice Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS COVERING THOSE RESPONSIBLE FOR PEARL HARBOR CATASTROPHE

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate

consideration of House Joint Resolution 199.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor by the Japanese on December 7, 1941, caused shock and humiliation to the people of the United States; and

Whereas said attack needlessly caused a tremendous loss of life, property, and prestige as well as immediately jeopardizing the security of the entire Nation; and

Whereas the ability of the Japanese to successfully execute such an attack was a serious and alarming reflection upon those civil and military officials responsible for the maintenance of our national security; and

Whereas a commission appointed by the President to investigate the circumstances surrounding such attack has reported their findings, and such findings have been released in part, indicating a grave dereliction of duty on the part of those military and civil officials responsible for our defenses, and national security at Pearl Harbor; and

Whereas as a result of said commission's report certain Army and Navy officers have been removed from active duty and the public has been assured that as soon as the exigencies of war permit these officers will be court-martialed; and

Whereas the period of time provided by statute, the Articles of War, Government, and Naval Regulations, wherein such prosecutions must commence is about to elapse; and

Whereas the public has been assured also that such limitations will be waived by the officers already named and suggested as having been derelict in their duty; and

Whereas as a matter of law there is doubt that such officers and the departments concerned have any authority to waive any such limitations; and

Whereas there is just reason for believing that there are those persons other than the military officers already named in the commission's report, who may also share in any dereliction of duty that resulted in the Pearl Harbor catastrophe; and

Whereas any statute, article, regulation, or provision of limitation would operate in any event to bar prosecution of any such person whether he be civilian or military; and

Whereas it is highly important and vitally necessary, as soon as war conditions permit, that full and proper inquiry be made respecting this disgraceful national calamity, that responsibility be fixed, and that guilty parties, whether military or civil, be adequately punished, and that this matter is too grave and serious to permit parties who may be equally or more guilty than the Army and Navy officers already named in the commission's report to escape their full share of the responsibility and any just punishment they may deserve: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That all statutes, resolutions, laws, articles, and regulations, affecting the possible prosecution of any person or persons, military or civil, connected with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe of December 7, 1941, or involved in any other possible or apparent dereliction of duty, that operate to prevent the court martial or prosecution of any person or persons in military or civil capacity, involved in any matter in connection with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe of December 7, 1941, or involved in any other possible or apparent dereliction of duty, are hereby extended up to and including 1 calendar year after the formal declaration of peace with Japan has been officially signed and ratified by the Senate of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, we all know, of course, that it is only a very unusual emergency condition which would justify a bill not reported out of a committee being considered by the House in this manner. There is no question but what an emergency situation exists and that this bill tends to meet this situation. It is important, therefore, that the bill be enacted forthwith. However, in agreeing to it being brought up by unanimous consent without being reported out of a committee, I want the RECORD to definitely and specifically show that this is not to be considered as a precedent. We have to respond to exigency when exigency requires action. An emergent condition exists which the bill called up by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] aims to meet and correct. In my opinion, this bill is a sound one, the bill should pass, but it is only because immediate action is absolutely essential that this unusual procedure is permitted. Under no condition is the action in not objecting to this unanimous consent request, and I hope the House will agree to the request, to be construed, particularly in connection with a bill not reported out of a committee, as a precedent for future similar action unless a similar emergency exists.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished majority leader for the excellent statement he has made and the opinion he has expressed, in which I most heartily concur. I am glad, too, that he wants the RECORD to show that this is not to be construed as a precedent. I do appreciate the fine attitude of the distinguished majority leader and his spirit of cooperation in getting this emergency legislation passed at this time.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman intend this to apply to civil persons in civil life as well as to military personnel?

Mr. SHORT. Civil as well as military, providing they are found guilty of dereliction of duty.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]?

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Missouri if it is his intention in extending the statute of limitations to provide that there will be a court martial of the commanding officers in the area involved after the present war is over?

Mr. SHORT. This resolution, if passed, will legalize after the expiration of the statute of limitations the court-martialing not only of General Short and Admiral Kimmel, but any other military authorities or civil authorities who might after thorough investigation be found guilty of dereliction of duty.

Mr. WINTER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman believe we can enact an ex post facto law that will extend the time of the statute of limitations on court martials beyond the time in which a man should be prosecuted?

Mr. SHORT. I am no lawyer or son of a lawyer, but I have read a little law. There is serious doubt in my mind whether these officers can in advance waive the statute of limitations. It seems to me that if the two Houses of Congress concur and pass a joint resolution, they can extend the time of court martial or trial. That is a matter for the courts to decide.

Mr. WINTER. Would this extend the time in which a private in the Army could be prosecuted in a court martial?

Mr. SHORT. This applies only to those cases that are directly connected with Pearl Harbor, the catastrophe of December 7, 1941. It is limited merely to that one incident.

Mr. WINTER. As I understand the matter, the gentleman wants to guarantee that these two commanding officers will be court-martialed?

Mr. SHORT. It is not guaranteeing it, but it certainly is extending the time for 1 year after the cessation of hostilities. We have been assured that unless war exigencies permit they will not be court-martialed. Of course, they cannot very well be court-martialed now, with the war raging and going on. But after the war is over they can be tried if we pass this joint resolution. However, the statute of limitations is going to lapse before the end of the war. That is the purpose of introducing this joint resolution.

Mr. WINTER. Does the gentleman believe that if his resolution is adopted and the time is extended and this court martial is not held, until the year allowed under this resolution expires Short and Kimmel can be tried under a court martial?

Mr. SHORT. No, I do not think they could be. This gives them a whole year after the war in which to be tried. If they are not going to prosecute men within 2 or 3 or 4 years after the incident, of course we should let it go. Mr. Speaker, all this resolution does is toll the statute for 1 year after the war.

Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I advise the gentleman from Missouri that several months ago I introduced a measure which would prevent any person from waiving the provision of the statute of limitation, having in mind that it is the duty of Government to bring anybody suspected of dereliction of duty to trial within that period of time. That did not contemplate that the court martial should be completed within the 2 years, but simply that the proceeding should be started within that time. As far as I know, no report has come from either of the departments on that bill. It is apparent that they desire to have the period of the statute of limitations expire. When it does expire, it is questionable whether any court martial or trial of these responsible officials may be had at all. May I ask the gentleman if the purpose of his

resolution is to preserve that right until after the war.

Mr. SHORT. It is. That is exactly the purpose of the resolution.

Mr. COLE of New York. So that the persons may be brought to trial within 1 year after the cessation of hostilities with Japan, and if they are not brought to court martial by the Government within that period of time, it will be an admission that they were not guilty of any offense.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I think the explanation the gentleman from New York has given shows that the bill he himself introduced is identical in purpose and intent with the resolution that has been introduced.

Mr. COLE of New York. May I inquire of the gentleman from Missouri if his bill does not contemplate Executive approval prior to the expiration of December 7, 1943; and if so, if he is sure that he might have that approval before the time expires?

Mr. SHORT. Of course, I do not know just where the Chief Executive is at this moment. I think it is a good thing that none of us knows exactly where he is. But we have a Vice President, I think, in the Capitol, who perhaps could act in his place.

Mr. COLE of New York. My reason for bringing up this question is to find whether the resolution is worded so that if Executive endorsement should be fixed subsequent to December 7, 1943, the effect might be retroactive, to be effective prior to December 7.

Mr. SHORT. That is a question I cannot answer.

Mr. COLE of New York. It is the gentleman's resolution.

Mr. SHORT. I know; but there are a lot of things the gentleman from Missouri does not know about parliamentary procedure.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is the wording of the resolution such as would make it in and of itself operative as of a particular date prior to December 7, or does it become effective when it is signed by the President?

Mr. SHORT. For it to be effective, I surmise the President would have to sign it. I defer to the judgment of the able gentleman from New York on this point.

Mr. COLE of New York. Then the resolution should be changed.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say in answer to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER] that this is not an ex post facto law because this has nothing to do with the change of the law as to the commission of the crime.

Mr. SHORT. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. It is merely the extension of the time in which the man may be tried.

There is another reason why this resolution should be passed. I doubt very seriously whether these gentlemen can waive the statute of limitations in advance. I as a lawyer and a former prosecuting attorney have observed that when you called a man for trial he had then to decide whether or not he would plead the statute of limitations. So I am afraid that if this measure is not passed you will have no way to compel these two men to waive the statute of limitations. Certainly that waiver cannot apply to others who are probably more guilty than they are, in aiding the enemy during that attack. I hope the gentleman's resolution will pass. I think the President can give his approval in such a way as to make it become law today or tomorrow.

Mr. WINTER. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I want to say to the gentleman from Mississippi that by the same token if these gentlemen could not be tried after today or tomorrow, neither can they be tried by the extension of the statute of limitations on a crime in which the statute of limitation started to run 2 years ago and expires tomorrow.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes.

Mr. WINTER. The courts of this country have passed on it a thousand times. It just simply cannot be done.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Mississippi yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Let me say to the gentleman from Kansas that if Congress can pass a law creating a statute of limitations, why could not the same Congress extend it for an additional year; and since we have been assured the court martial will be held when the exigencies of war permit, then we will have a whole year after the war is ended in which to try these men.

Mr. WINTER. Congress may extend the statute of limitations on a crime that has not been committed, but if I commit a crime on which the statute of limitations is 2 years, you cannot extend that statute of limitations after the time I commit the crime in order to prosecute me later on.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I understand that the gentleman's bill applies to both civilian and military men. Therefore, there could well be two rules. As to the rule with reference to the tolling of the statute of limitations insofar as civilians are concerned, there may be a question as to whether or not this Congress can do it. The only body we can get the correct answer from in reference to that question is the Supreme Court of the United States. The rule as to whether or not this Congress has the right to toll the statute of limitations in regard to military men and their court martial and trial, I think, is without question. Therefore the resolution of the gentleman from Missouri is in proper form and it is the only resolution we can get as to the question of extending this time to anyone. If there is any good to be done by it, it should be done in this manner by passing this resolution and if any portion of it is not valid, then the Supreme Court of the United States will say so.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: On page 3, line 3, after "that" insert "effective as of December 7, 1943."

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I accept the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DECLARATION OF THE THREE POWERS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following declaration, which was read by the Clerk:

DECLARATION OF THE THREE POWERS

We, the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and the Premier of the Soviet Union, have met these 4 days past, in this, the Capital of our ally, Iran, and have shaped and confirmed our common policy.

We express our determination that our nations shall work together in war and in the peace that will follow.

As to war, our military staffs have joined in our round-table discussions, and we have concerted our plans for the destruction of the German forces. We have reached complete agreement as to the scope and timing of the operations to be undertaken from the east, west, and south.

The common understanding which we have here reached guarantees that victory will be ours.

And as to peace, we are sure that our concord will win an enduring peace. We recognize fully the supreme responsibility resting upon us and all the United Nations to make a peace which will command the goodwill of the overwhelming mass of the peoples of the world and banish the scourge and terror of war for many generations.

With our diplomatic advisers we have surveyed the problems of the future. We shall seek the cooperation and active participation of all nations, large and small, whose peoples in heart and mind are dedicated, as are our own peoples, to the elimination of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance. We will welcome them, as they may choose to come, into a world family of democratic nations.

No power on earth can prevent our destroying the German armies by land, their U-boats by sea, and their war plants from the air.

Our attack will be relentless and increasing.

Emerging from these cordial conferences we look with confidence to the day when all peoples of the world may live free lives, untouched by tyranny, and according to their varying desires and their own consciences.

We came here with hope and determination. We leave here friends in fact, in spirit, and in purpose.

Signed: Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin.

Signed at Teheran, December 1, 1943.

JUSTIFICATIONS SUBMITTED THROUGH THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a situation has arisen that I feel should be

brought to the attention of the House and of the country. For several years the Bureau of the Budget has been asking for increased funds. Some such increases have been allowed by the Congress. The result has been that there have been more confusing and more intricate justifications submitted by the different departments so that it is more and more difficult to find out what these appropriations are. Every member of the minority of the Appropriations Committee is committed to try to find out what is in those bills, no matter how intricate they are and if difficulties arise with reference to the reporting of these bills and their consideration subsequently, I want the Congress and the people to know where the responsibility lies.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix.)

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a statement by Mr. Roscoe I. Downs, of Arlington, Va.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I hope that there are members of both the Military Affairs and World War Veterans' Legislation Committees present on the floor this afternoon, as I believe that the problem I am about to discuss will be of particular interest to the membership of those two committees.

Many Members of the House have had letters from men who have served in the present war, who have been wounded and discharged, complaining of the months that elapse between the day of discharge from the service to the date they are placed on the compensation rolls of the Veterans' Administration. From what inquiries I have been able to make, it appears to me that at the present time the fault lies pretty largely with the War and Navy Departments and, to a lesser extent, with the Veterans' Administration.

During the summer recess a Red Cross worker brought a young man, 20 years of age, into my office. He had been discharged by the Army at some camp in South Carolina and permitted to travel alone to his home in Connecticut. His mind seemed to be a complete blank. He did not know the name of the organization with which he had served. He had no recollection of where, how, or when he was wounded, although he did say he had been in battles. Later investigation disclosed that he certainly had been in battles. He had gone through the whole African invasion and campaign and his disability was brought about by the explosion of a large shell not many feet from where he was standing. To permit a young man to return to his home in that condition is a disgrace. No one to advise his family as to the type of care he needed; no papers that would be helpful in filing a Veterans' Administration claim. In fact, he was just cut adrift to flounder as he would. Such things must not be allowed to continue.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts who has done so much to help the veterans.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Only yesterday in a hospital I was talking to a man who had received a very severe head wound. I asked him where he lived. He remembered his State but for a while could not remember the town where he lived. At the end of the conversation he remembered, he said, for the first time, his town. He said: "I am just coming out of a haze; I am just beginning to realize that I am alive again but I cannot focus my mind on things."

That is right in line with the gentleman's statement.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. It is almost criminal to permit men to travel in that condition.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIKES). Does the gentleman from Connecticut yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COCHRAN. Does not the gentleman believe that we should provide that before a man is discharged from the Army or the Navy in such condition that he be turned over to the Veterans' Bureau and placed in Veterans' Administration facilities immediately instead of being turned out on the street?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Absolutely. I am going to touch on that later in my remarks.

My contention is that the Veterans' Administration should put contact men in these hospitals and that these men should be turned directly over to the Veterans' Administration and not sent home in such a confused condition.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Connecticut knows, of course, that the World War Veterans' Committee has done its very best under the circumstances. The trouble has been that the cases of many of these men have not been turned over to the Veterans' Administration. I am informed that the Secretary of War has issued a directive—I have not a copy of it yet, but hope to have one in the next 24 hours—that will correct that condition to a large extent.

What we are trying to do is to speed up the adjudication of these cases because we do not want these men who are disabled as a result of their war service to come home and not have something to live on from the very beginning. It would be a grave injustice to them not to make provision to take care of them as soon as they get home.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that the war and Navy records should be in such shape that the cases can be adjudicated immediately. I have nothing but praise for the work of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. Thousands of disabled veterans call her Blessed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I introduced a bill on Friday that would take care of that when the records cannot be found. We all know that many of the Pearl Harbor records are lost and they can never be secured again. My bill would provide that the men would be assured of pay whether kept in the hospital or sent home under furlough and they would not receive their discharges until their cases had been thoroughly gone into and rated.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I think that would cure the situation. No one should be discharged until their records are complete in every respect.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BURKE], also has introduced a bill and I think perhaps our two bills could be combined.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I hope we can get action at once.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I may say, as the gentleman has already touched upon that matter, that these records are not all together. When a man comes home after he is discharged and he is released, his record has not been assembled, and especially his medical record. This causes a hardship because on his discharge he cannot immediately file his claim.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That is right. His medical records should be assembled before discharge.

Mr. BROOKS. That is causing a delay of many months in some cases.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. When the Burke-Wadsworth selective-service bill passed through the House I introduced an amendment that was adopted. My amendment provided that the War and Navy Departments should give to the man at the time of discharge a statement showing his periods of hospitalization, illnesses, and so forth. During the seventy-seventh session of Congress that provision was repealed. I remember reading the debates at the time. The War Department contended it involved

too much paper work. Now, I have no sympathy with the excuse that it involves paper work. They have the help to do the paper work. They went on to say that in many cases it was not wise to give the man his diagnosis. But there was nothing in my amendment that required the diagnosis to be made available to the man. All I wanted, and the only purpose of the amendment, was to make certain that when the man was discharged he would have a statement indicating that his record was complete. I did not care what the diagnosis was. I wanted it so that in 2 or 3 years after discharge when he files for compensation and he alleges he was hospitalized in Africa at such and such a date, the War Department could not say, "We have no record of it."

Mr. BROOKS. The bill I have presented is a bill that will permit the man at the very moment he is discharged to have a physical examination, it would permit him to be interviewed by a representative from the service organizations recognized by the Veterans' Bureau, then he would file his petition or claim at that very moment of his discharge so that it can be acted on immediately and no undue delay will result.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I believe that is very necessary legislation.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I happen to have received a letter this morning from a mother who tells me about her son in the service. There are also two brothers in the service. He had not seen one of his brothers for 5 years, who had been in the service also and was at home. This man was hospitalized in the South. The boy lived in St. Louis. The boy came to St. Louis to see his brother and mother. When he went back why he was A. W. O. L. He was put in the guardhouse and he was fined for his absence. It is evident to me from a reading of that letter that the boy is a mental patient. Does the gentleman think he should be punished under those circumstances?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Certainly not. He should be referred to a psychiatrist and given the benefit of treatment. I have a case in my own file at the present time involving a man who went A. W. O. L. or deserted last February. There is no question about it. He has been examined by psychiatrists and is in need of treatment. He should be treated as a sick man and not as a prisoner. No serviceman should be court-martialed without a psychiatrist's report being presented to the court if the man has seen combat service.

Mr. COCHRAN. This man I refer to went through the Guadalcanal campaign, I may say.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. They may try him before officers who never heard a shot fired. It is not right.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. It is my contention that when a man comes out of the armed services disabled, the burden of proof should be on the War Department to show that he was in that condition before he was taken into the service, and that his service did not injure him. That is the presumption we really wrote in the law, and I am sure now that that presumption will be carried out. It does not matter whether his records are lost or not, if he has been in the service and comes out of the service mentally or physically disabled, the presumption is that he got his disability in the service and he should be compensated and hospitalized accordingly.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I know the gentleman has written that into bills and it has been the law, but it is hard to get the Veterans' Administration to accept that. The claimant has to prove beyond shadow of doubt that his disability resulted from service.

Mr. RANKIN. There were a great many records lost in the last war of men who came back disabled as a result of their military service. We had to put them on the roll by the Presumptive Act of 1924. We missed a great many of them, and I attempted to put them on by an extension of that act in 1930. Of course, that act was vetoed. Then the Disability Allowance Act was passed. We certainly do not want to have that trouble again, and for that reason I have asked Members to sign this petition so that we may have this legislation before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, in order that we may legislate now to take care of these men who are coming out of the service, many of them totally and permanently disabled and whose records have been lost or destroyed.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The extension of the presumptive clause would have been better than the Disability Allowance Act.

If the Members of the House would realize how acute this problem is at the present time and how many servicemen are involved, we would get the necessary 218 signatures this afternoon to petition No. 8. It is just as important that one House committee handle veterans' legislation than it is that one agency of the Government administer veterans' legislation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentlewoman of Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman spoke of the insurance difficulties. I wonder if he does not feel, as I do, that it would be very helpful if the insurance could be paid to the veteran, when he is totally and permanently disabled, in a lump sum if he wishes it that way. Then he could invest it in a business. I think it might be very helpful to him.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. My mind is open to that suggestion. I think I would rather like the idea of the insurance being paid monthly over a long period of time, for a period of years. At least, that guarantees that the veterans will have that money to live on. I am afraid there are too many oil well salesmen still in existence to make the lump sum payment quite safe, particularly in the cases of those men who have total and permanent disability because of nervous or mental disability.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There are other cases where they would be glad to have it, perhaps to put it in a business and get started.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Whatever the gentlewoman from Massachusetts recommends along that line would carry a great deal of weight with me. The veteran has no more loyal friend in the House than the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If we are to treat the veterans of this war fairly, it is imperative that action be had on this measure this year.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Very definitely, for there are hundreds of cases piling up on which we cannot get justice unless we get some legislation through this Congress.

If time permits, I should like to develop briefly one other thought. It is my sincere belief that every detail of the program we adopt in reference to the rehabilitation of the men and women who serve in the present war should be under the direction of the Veterans' Administration. You will recall the situation that existed at the end of World War No. 1. We had no Veterans' Administration at that time. Men were hospitalized under the Public Health Service, and their records were in the custody of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance. When they took vocational training, some of their records went to the Bureau of Vocational Training. I think this time we should be sure that we have a central agency that deals with all problems of rehabilitating a man from the day he is discharged from the Army or Navy until he is restored to full usefulness, if that is possible, back in his community.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted at the twenty-ninth annual convention of Hadassah at New York City, October 27.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD remarks which I previously obtained permission to extend but on which the time for inserting in the RECORD has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE GUAYULE RUBBER PROGRAM

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein some letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago I took the floor to discuss the progress of our synthetic-rubber program. In that discussion I stated that we have approximately $750,000,000 invested in the program, and that by the end of 1944 we will be producing at the rate of 850,000 tons of rubber per year. That will be more than the amount of rubber we normally use. This indicates that we will be self-sufficient so far as rubber is concerned.

There is a philosophy prevalent that when the war is over, we should liquidate these rubber plants and turn the rubber business over to the rubber monopoly. I take an opposite view because I feel that in the post-war period we will be able to make synthetic rubber in sufficient quantities and at a price which will allow competition between synthetic and natural rubber.

Following my remarks on the synthetic-rubber program, I was asked to give some information about the progress being made in the development of rubber from guayule and also the matter of price of the guayule rubber program. For the information of the House I include with my remarks detailed information concerning guayule and the guayule rubber program furnished to me by the Forestry Service:

Guayule plantations, all in California, have been established as follows:

	Irrigated land	Unirrigated land	Total
	Acres	*Acres*	*Acres*
Spring of 1942		808	808
Fiscal year 1943	15,161	6,344	21,505
Fiscal year 1944 (to be finished in December 1943)	7,175	2,452	9,627
Total	22,336	9,604	31,940

In addition to the plantation acreages listed above, numerous test planting and indicator plots aggregating some 1,500 acres have been established in Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and California to determine the suitability for guayule culture of climate, water, and soils in selected areas in these States.

Guayule has been grown successfully in the Salinas Valley, a coastal valley of central California, for many years by the Intercontinental Rubber Co. Although experiments with irrigated lands were undertaken, experience led the company to utilize unirrigated lands as the safest and cheapest operation, with the object of maturing a crop in about 4 years. The Forest Service started plantings on unirrigated land in conformity with the company's procedure. However, it soon became apparent that if large acreages were found essential for an adequate volume of guayule production, it would be difficult to obtain sufficient unirrigated lands having characteristics similar to that on which guayule previously had been grown most successfully. Analysis of the available but slender amount of experimental information related to guayule culture led to a belief that guayule probably could be grown successfully on irrigated lands, if carefully handled, to millable size and rubber content in about half the time normally required on unirrigated lands in the cool coastal valleys of California.

In the summer of 1942 the urgency to produce rubber as quickly as possible was great. The risk involved in utilizing irrigated lands was acknowledged, as was the increased cost of so doing. The Baruch committee report of September 1942 strongly urged a greatly expanded guayule program that included the use of irrigated lands. The project was thereupon granted a much enlarged planting authorization and increased appropriations by Congress, and in the fall of 1942 embarked on a plan having an objective to plant about 86,000 acres by the end of the planting season in the late spring of 1943. Test plantings on both irrigated and unirrigated lands in regions thought to be generally suitable were established from southern Texas to northern California to determine where plantings necessary in fiscal year 1944 and later might best be made.

Although the planting plans drawn in the late summer of 1942 for very large planting acreages were sharply curtailed in March 1943 to minimize interference with food production, and nearly half of the acreage actually leased by that date for planting has been returned to the owners, substantial acreages of both irrigated and unirrigated lands have been planted. It is anticipated that the first crops to attain size and rubber content suitable for milling will be available for harvest in the fall of 1944. Other later plantings would reach minimum size for harvest at various intervals during the following 3 years. Until the guayule crops have been carried through to harvest and the rubber extracted, the success of the work will not be completely demonstrated. At present, good crops of guayule are growing on both irrigated and unirrigated land. It is necessary to rely now on survival counts and plant analyses for information. Latest reports indicate survival of shrub in plantations made in fiscal year 1943 as approximately 76 percent for irrigated shrub and 64 percent for unirrigated shrub. Analyses of 10-month-old shrub in test plantings scattered throughout California and the Southwest, indicate that shrub production on irrigated land averaged better than twice as great as on unirrigated lands. Rubber production in plots on irrigated lands was nearly three times as large as on unirrigated lands. A representative average irrigated plot at 10 months after establishment tested at the rate of 106 to 160 pounds of rubber per acre. The spread is accounted for by tests made of the effect of spacing of plants on rubber production per acre. An average dry-land plot tested 31 to 36 pounds per acre. Highest honors to date fall to an irrigated plot near Phcenix, Ariz., which tested at the rate of 231 to 300 pounds of rubber per acre.

Unless unforeseen and severe difficulties are encountered in the future, it is expected that crops of guayule will be successfully brought to maturity on both dry and irrigated land in the California plantations and on the test plots in the four Southwestern States.

This does no mean that all problems bearing on the culture of guayule are solved. Rather is the project in the process of ascertaining and establishing the methods best calculated to produce maximum poundage of rubber per acre under the variations of local climate and soil characteristics within the areas where guayule may safely be grown. Localities as dissimilar in some characteristics as the irrigated lands in the San Joaquin Valley of California and the unirrigated Rio Grande plains of southern Texas are being tested.

Considerable progress has been made in improving cultural equipment and practices, the results of which will definitely be reflected in future operating costs. For example, wh n the nursery program was expanded outside of the Salinas Valley, more porous soils were selected and duckboards (for use as tracks to support machinery) were dispensed with, at a saving of some $500,000. Dispensing with the duckboards also reduced nursery sowing costs materially, because of a considerable reduction of hand labor required to lay the duckboards before sowing and their removal, storage, and repair at the end of the nursery growing season.

By adopting the use of oil sprays in the nurseries for weed control, large savings in hand labor and money were effected. The use of oil sprays for weed control in field plantations has reduced labor requirements approximately 50 percent, but over-all weed cost remains about the same, due to the cost of the oil. Experiments now in progress with a new flame-throwing cultivator are promising and will, if proved successful, materially reduce weed control costs in field plantations.

Approximately 250,000 pounds of clean guayule seed is being collected this year with improved seed collectors, at less than 20 cents per pound, untreated. Comparable costs with original pickers acquired by the Government were about 30 cents per pound, at pre-war labor costs. This saving was accomplished by the development of an entirely new, inexpensive four-row seed picker which gathers seed from 15 acres a day, as against 7 or 8 acres per day with the two-row company machine.

Planting machinery and technique have been greatly improved by adapting a commercial planter costing approximately $500, as against a locally designed and constructed machine which cost approximately $1,025 at pre-war labor and material prices. Planting crews on 4-row machines have been more highly trained and now are composed of 10 men, as against the former practice of using

14-man crews. Accomplishments of both crews are approximately the same—8 to 10 acres per day, depending on soil, weather, and other conditions.

Direct seeding, that is the sowing of seed directly in the field, is being carried on experimentally with considerable success under irrigation. Assured success with this procedure would eliminate the need for nurseries which require a very heavy capital investment per acre. The extent to which production costs would be affected cannot be estimated at the present stage of this experiment.

Costs of operations to date are high and undoubtedly can be lowered in the future. This is due in a considerable measure to the present experimental and developmental nature of the program, but probably more importantly to the fact that between September 1942 and March 1943 an organization, improvements and facilities were developed to execute a much greater program than subsequently was carried out. This basic structure was carried on a stand-by though reduced-scale basis in anticipation of a possible request by the Rubber Director for resumption of work on an expanded scale. The request materialized in the late summer of 1943, and final action on an appropriation estimate for funds to undertake the expanded program is pending in Congress as this memorandum is written.

Based on present operating requirements of the project, the costs of agricultural phases of the program are approximately as follows for California operations:

	Irrigated land	Unirrigated land
Average annual land rent, per acre	$28.50	$8
Production of nursery stock for planting, per acre	55.00	55
Farming costs, first year—ground preparation, preirrigation, planting, weed control, cultivation, and irrigation	110.00	75
Farming costs, second year	100.00	50
Farming costs, third year and later, no adequate basis for estimating.		

GUAYULE RUBBER PRODUCTION

The only guayule rubber produced so far on a commercial scale by the emergency rubber project was obtained from old shrub purchased from the Intercontinental Rubber Co., and from wild shrub now being harvested in the Big Bend area of Texas. The cost of guayule rubber produced from these sources is not indicative of the cost of producing rubber from the cultivated shrub planted by the project.

In the spring of 1943 the Emergency Rubber Project milled at Salinas, Calif., 876,200 pounds of crude underesinated rubber from 550 acres of 13-year-old over-mature shrub purchased from the Intercontinental Rubber Co. The cost of producing this rubber was 28 cents per pound. This cost includes the purchase price of the shrub (a little less than 10 cents per pound), care of the field for about a year after purchase, harvesting, milling, and necessary supervision and overhead. The total cost of harvesting and milling this shrub was $63.80 per ton of shrub, dry weight, or 18 cents per pound of rubber. What the company's planting and carrying costs were for this shrub is not known, but it seems unlikely that the price paid for the shrub by the Government covered the actual costs. This shrub should have been harvested at an earlier age when it reached maturity. Because of its over-mature condition, its potential rubber yield was reduced, and consequently the costs per pound of rubber increased.

The cost of harvesting and milling the cultivated shrub in 1943 is not indicative of what such a cost should ordinarily be. All operations were undertaken by inexperienced crews and experimentation in digging, curing, baling, and in various steps of milling were carried on. This first operation was considered as an experimental effort as well as a production job and consequently was carried on over a longer period and in a different manner than a straight production job. Much was learned about all phases of the harvesting and milling jobs. Improvements in operations were made during this campaign and bases for further improvements in later campaigns were developed.

Since the shrub planted by the Emergency Rubber Project is not yet old enough to yield satisfactory quantities of rubber, none of it has been harvested for production purposes. It is impossible, therefore, to determine accurately by actual experience how much it will cost per pound to produce guayule rubber from cultivated shrub under present operating conditions. Positive information is not yet available concerning the volume of 2-year-old shrub that can be produced per acre on irrigated land, nor what the rubber content of such shrub will be when it is milled. Furthermore, there are apparently excellent opportunities for reductions in cost by improved methods of culture, better extraction methods, and by increasing the rubber-producing capacity of the shrub. Such improvements require additional experimental work that is an essential part of a program directed toward lowering substantially guayule rubber production costs.

It has been estimated by a representative of the Office of Rubber Director that crude guayule rubber from cultivated shrub can be produced for about 30 cents per pound in the United States, with farmers growing the shrub on a contract basis and private industry doing the processing, and for less than 20 cents in Mexico. Hazarding a guess, it appears presently that it should be possible to produce guayule rubber in the United States, if work is carried out on a sustained, regular basis, for from 30 to 40 cents per pound.

During the years of 1931, 1934, 1936, and 1941 the Intercontinental Rubber Co. produced 1,370 long tons of rubber from guayule of domestic plantings. This rubber was milled in the Spence factory at Salinas, Calif., which was purchased by the Government in March 1942 for use by the Emergency Rubber Project. The exact cost per pound of producing this rubber was never, to our knowledge, made public by this company, but the following testimony was given by Mr. C. L. Baker, president of the Intercontinental Rubber Co., before the House Committee on Agriculture during hearings on January 8, 1942, on H. R. 6299: "We had planted at one time about 8,000 acres. This whole project contemplated a 30-cent price of rubber or better. When these 8,000 acres were planted, rubber was about 35 cents, and the company thought we were safe in going ahead. When the rubber was ready to harvest the price was 3 cents, and it just knocked the pins out from under us, of course, and we haven't yet had the nerve to tackle it again until we can see some assurance of a price."

A definite cost figure of 12.29 cents per pound is quoted by the then Maj. Dwight D. Eisenhower in his confidential Report of Inspection of Guayule-Rubber Industry, dated June 6, 1930. It should be noted that this cost was based on the operation of a very small area, and may not be applicable to operations of the scope proposed under the guayule program. It is evident that the cost of 12.29 cents is very much lower than could be attained under conditions as they now exist. In 1930, unskilled labor was 35 to 40 cents per hour, as against current labor costs in the area under study of 65 to 75 cents per hour. Material costs also were much lower in 1930, and seemingly no overhead costs are included in the above figure.

The emergency rubber project has no official responsibility in operations yielding rubber imports and has no information about costs of imported rubber that could be used to compare with costs of domestic guayule.

QUALITY OF GUAYULE RUBBER

The present milling process is cumbersome and expensive. Improvements were made by the project over the old company methods during the milling of the shrub purchased from the Intercontinental Rubber Co. It has been authoritatively stated that the best crude guayule rubber ever produced was produced at the Spence factory last spring. The primary improvements over old milling practices were, in order of priority:

1. The use of antioxidant as a preservative.
2. Controlled uniform feed to the mills, resulting in uniform milling.
3. Installation of two-worm washing tanks in mill circuit.
4. Carefully controlled drying.

It can be reasonably expected that the present milling process can be greatly simplified and improved upon.

Research studies now under way on extraction methods give considerable promise of developing processes that will improve the quality of the crude rubber, as well as materially reduce extraction costs and equipment requirements.

TOTAL INVESTMENT IN GUAYULE PROJECT

The total amount invested in the guayule project up to October 31, 1943, is approximately $27,800,000. This includes all expenditures for research and experimentation, as well as approximately $11,000,000 in capital investments.

SUMMARY ON GUAYULE

For those who are interested in the present cost of guayule rubber and our investment in the venture I enclose a letter which I have received from Lyle F. Watts, Chief of the Forest Service in the United States Department of Agriculture:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Washington, November 29, 1943.

Hon. KARL STEFAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. STEFAN: During your recent conversation in your office with Mr. Salmond, of this Bureau, he promised to supply additional information concerning the guayule project. Mr. Salmond believes the following information will be of particular interest to you.

The guayule project was initiated by the purchase for $1,721,235 of the California guayule properties of the Intercontinental Rubber Co. Authorization for this was contained in the legislation authorizing the project. The purchase included 1,483 acres of land, various parts of which were occupied by growing guayule shrub, guayule nurseries, a factory, and miscellaneous administrative and laboratory structures. A portion of the land was used at time of purchase for the production of farm crops. Other items in the purchase included rubber extraction and farm machinery, laboratory equipment, office furniture, water systems, about 550 acres of old overmature shrub, some 117 acres of younger shrub, 22,867 pounds of guayule seed, nearly 19,000,000 seedlings, patents, and experimental and research data.

The 550 acres of shrub, from which 876,200 pounds of rubber was milled, referred to in the enclosure with my letter of November 25, is the same acreage as that listed in the preceding paragraph. The rubber was sold to

the Rubber Reserve Company for $236,574, which sum reverted to the Treasury. This rubber is all that has been milled from cultivated guayule shrub by the Forest Service. The shrub which has been planted by the Forest Service, beginning in the late spring of 1942, will not be large enough to harvest until late in 1944.

The milling operation currently going on is being supplied with wild shrub from the Big Bend area of Texas. The Texas shrub is the remnant of a native stand of guayule that was harvested in part at different times in the past several decades by private enterprise. The yield of rubber from the scattered shrub now being collected probably will be 150 to 200 tons. This production operation is being financed by funds made available by the Rubber Reserve Company on the basis of actual cost of production. The rubber is turned over to that agency as rapidly as it is produced. The estimated cost of crude guayule rubber obtained from this salvage operation is about 70 cents per pound.

Lands used for growing guayule are leased rather than purchased. No authority for purchasing lands for such a purpose is provided in the guayule enabling act. Some land has been purchased for administrative purposes under specific authority. The exact acreage is not immediately available here. It is minor, and primarily to provide land for the erection of labor camps. Labor camps are used considerably, when not needed for guayule operations, to house persons working on other war activities. Eighteen labor camps of semipermanent type have been constructed. Total capacity of labor camps is about 8,500.

The average annual rental of irrigated lands used for nurseries is approximately $35.50 per acre. Annual rental of irrigated plantation land averages approximately $25.50 per acre, for unirrigated land approximately $7.50 per acre. Values of irrigated lands are $200–$600 per acre. Grains and sorghum are principal crops raised on dry lands. Seed crops, sugar beets, tomatoes, peas, lettuce, and various truck crops are grown on irrigated lands, which generally produce more than one crop a year. Nearly all land rented is in California. Rentals in other Southwestern States vary somewhat from California figures; dry and irrigated land in lower Texas being lower, prices for irrigated land in New Mexico and Arizona ranging more nearly at the same general levels as in California.

There are nearly 32,000 acres of guayule plantations. The earliest date on which milling could begin is in the fall of 1944. Should these plantations then be milled at the maximum practicable rate the operation would be terminated by June 1947. It is estimated that from 9,900 to 12,500 tons of rubber should be recovered in this period, the total volume depending on whether maximum rate of production in fiscal years 1945 and 1946 were desired, or a more even spread of production over fiscal years 1945, 1946, and 1947 were preferred. The latter procedure would produce the larger tonnage of rubber and would cost some $300,000 more; the estimated total cost of the latter plan being about $54,200,000 for 12,500 tons as against about $53,900,000 for some 9,900 tons of rubber. The sums stated include all estimated expenditures for the guayule project since its inception, including all research and all expenditures for capital investment. The indicated total cost of rubber per pound for liquidation of the project by either of these plans is $2.43 for the plan that should produce 9,900 long tons and $1.94 for the production of 12,500 long tons of rubber.

A liquidation program designed to produce the probable maximum of rubber from about 32,000 acres would begin milling at a slow rate late in 1944, increase the annual production rate later, and extend the milling period into 1951. Estimating the probable production of rubber from a large acreage over a period as long as 7 years is hazardous due to the many adverse circumstances that can affect an agricultural crop in that period. Theoretically, it should be possible to produce substantially 29,000 long tons of rubber. It cannot safely be said that such a tonnage would be realized. However, it would cost about $62,000,000 to carry the project to a termination in 1951, and should 29,000 tons of rubber be produced, a cost of about 95 cents per pound is indicated. This figure, perhaps rounded off to $1 per pound, might be viewed as the most favorable liquidation cost in terms of cost of rubber per pound that could be reached. Lesser tonnage of rubber produced would mean higher cost per pound.

The discussions of estimated rubber production and liquidation costs above are believed to indicate the approximate ranges within which liquidation of the project would fall if the shrub now planted were harvested and milled.

In making the above calculations, the residual value which might remain at the termination of the enterprise in some thirteen and one-third million dollars worth of capital investment, is ignored.

Very sincerely yours,

LYLE F. WATTS, *Chief.*

LATIN-AMERICAN RUBBER

Much has been said about our rubber program in Latin America. In reply to a letter which I sent to the Rubber Development Corporation, which is an agency of the United States Government, I have the following reply which gives some information about what the rubber in Latin-American countries may be costing us. I include it in my remarks for the information of the membership of the House:

RUBBER DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION,
Washington, D. C., November 20, 1943.

The Honorable KARL STEFAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. STEFAN: We have received copy of a letter addressed to you by Mr. John Caswell of the Rubber Director's Office, dated November 9, 1943, in reply to your letter of October 27. We note that Mr. Caswell has referred to us for answer that portion of your letter requesting information as to the cost of crude rubber obtained from Latin-American countries, including Brazilian rubber and guayule rubber from Mexico.

Rubber Development Corporation has agreements with 16 Latin-American governments for the procurement of crude rubber. These agreements were negotiated in 1942 and end at December 31, 1946. Mr. Caswell has correctly pointed out that it is only proper to judge the cost of rubber from the agreement countries over the full period of the agreements, since it is evident that heavy initial expenditures at the beginning of operations had to be made in order to provide badly needed facilities, transportation, equipment, and supplies for production, labor, etc.

Taking actual expenditures and receipts of rubber to the last available date, plus estimated expenditures and receipts of rubber to December 31 of this year, the total cost of the importation of rubber from April 1, 1942, to December 31, 1943, works out at between 90 cents and $1 per pound.

Estimating the probable imports from the 16 agreement countries for the years 1944, 1945, and 1946 and spreading the presently budgeted expenditures, plus expenditures to date, over the whole period, but leaving out any recoveries that may be realized by the Corporation in the disposition of capital equipment or in the final liquidation of loans made to producers, the projected cost of imports over the whole period from April 1, 1942, to December 31, 1946, is between 65 and 75 cents per pound.

You will appreciate that the figures given above are our best estimates at the present time and are subject to revision as changed circumstances may, in the future, indicate.

We sincerely trust that the information given will adequately serve your purpose.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. BICKNELL,
Executive Vice President.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. As a matter of fact, is it not true that you can get any old price that seems to strike the mind of the person to whom you are talking. There is nothing whatsoever upon which those people down there can depend to fix a price on rubber because of the uncertain and fantastic sums we are paying the workers of the country. We have carried this to a point that has completely upset their whole economy.

Mr. STEFAN. There is no question about the difficulty of getting facts and figures. I agree with that.

Mr. OUTLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. OUTLAND. In the price of guayule rubber, of which you speak, does not the price also include a considerable amount of research work done and which cannot be estimated in the costs?

Mr. STEFAN. Of course research work is part of the overhead cost.

Mr. OUTLAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Paul Roberts is in charge of the planting of guayule rubber plants in California at this time. I have great faith in his ability. He did great work in planting trees and I am sure he will give his best efforts to the work he is now charged with. But so far as the price of guayule rubber is concerned, I cannot talk intelligently about it except to give you information I received from the Forestry Service. But what I want to bring out on the floor of this House is the matter of synthetic rubber in which you and I and the taxpayers of America have $750,000,000 invested.

There is a philosophy, that after the war we should liquidate the synthetic-rubber plants and again surrender the rubber business in the United States to a monopoly. I believe we are going to be able to compete with raw rubber when the war is over.

Mr. OUTLAND. Does the gentleman think in the case of guayule that perhaps it might prove feasible later on to have that done through private contract and the guayule grown by private farmers based upon the experience of farmers?

Mr. STEFAN. If you can produce guayule rubber at a fair price I would agree with the gentleman. Certainly I agree with the gentleman if we have an investment of $28,000,000 in guayule and if there is a possibility of producing raw

rubber from guayule, at a fair price, that investment should be in some way saved to the taxpayers and private industry should be given an opportunity to produce this rubber.

Mr. OUTLAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. I do not think we should liquidate $750,000,000 worth of synthetic-rubber plants. We should sell this rubber at a fair price, so that there will be no loss to the Federal Government, and sell the plants to private industry and compete with natural rubber wherever we can. We should protect all of these vast investments of our people's money.

Mr. OUTLAND. I thank the gentleman for clarifying that point.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is it not true that the expansion of the synthetic-rubber program in the post-war period will make an additional permanent outlet for certain agricultural products and may help to prevent deflation in the agricultural picture?

Mr. STEFAN. There is no question about it. It will help to solve the so-called surplus of grain; that is why I am so interested in this rubber business. My district and State are agricultural. We want to fit ourselves into the farm chemurgy program in order that we can put to new uses our grain and livestock products. Rubber and industrial alcohol are only a few of the items which we are working on now.

Synthetic rubber made from grain alcohol, according to experiments that have already been made, will result in producing synthetic rubber at a very low price. There is the question of byproducts, which are valuable and which will favorably affect the price.

Mr. OUTLAND. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. OUTLAND. Is it not true that synthetic rubber has certain limitations in use for types of tires, and so forth, and has to be mixed with a certain amount of natural rubber which can come from guayule and other sources?

Mr. STEFAN. Not only guayule, but other sources. Experts tell me that the synthetic rubber we are now producing is of fine quality. Experiments will improve it. It is true we have to use a little raw rubber to mix with synthetic rubber. But, we have solved the rubber question. We were up against it before Pearl Harbor. The Japanese took over the rubber plantations from the British and the Dutch, and we could not get raw rubber, so we built synthetic-rubber plants, and we are now making our own rubber. Certainly when the war is over we are not going to junk these valuable plants.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. The philosophy of destroying an industry that has made us already self-sufficient in rubber, a critical material, in my opinion, is wrong.

Mr. OUTLAND. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. OUTLAND. The gentleman stated quite correctly that after Pearl Harbor the greatest source of our rubber supply temporarily disappeared. In the gentleman's opinion, is not our guayule program justified on that basis?

Mr. STEFAN. It was a stand-by or reserve proposition. We had to get rubber from any source we could get it. Guayule was one source. Price was no object. But now we are self-sufficient as far as rubber is concerned. The reason you cannot get an automobile tire whenever you want one is not because of rubber but because of the bottleneck in the tire factories. Manpower, cotton, rayon, and so forth are some reasons, but so far as rubber is concerned, we are now in fine shape, thanks to William Jeffers, the former Rubber Director and his staff of efficient aides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, having been attending the committee hearing, I would like to surrender the time I had reserved for today, and I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday of this week, after the other special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed at this time for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the conclusion of the legislative program and other special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

CARE OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR NO. 2

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, on Armistice Day, I addressed the House and called to the attention of the membership the procrastination that has been going on in the handling of post-war affairs, as far as men in the armed services are concerned. On that occasion I cited in detail the record of the administration in the handling of veterans' affairs in the past 10 or 11 years. On that occasion I tried to emphasize and point out specifically that the post-war period begins for different people at different times; that the handling of post-war affairs is not a matter for the Congress to delay; that as a matter of fact, many thousands of young men have already entered today what is the post-war period. Those remarks on that occasion seemed to provoke some interest and I want to read today from an editorial from the Chicago American-Herald, which was published November 27, to lend additional emphasis to what this newspaper rather curiously named The Unwanted Battalion.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at this point I may extend the entire editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The editorial referred to follows:

THE UNWANTED BATTALION

For 600,000 young Americans the post-war period has begun.

They are the men already discharged by the armed forces. For 2,000 other young Americans the post-war period begins each week.

Every hour of the day 12 men are returned to civilian life.

Many of them find families, friends, and jobs awaiting them.

But many—far too many—enjoy no such good fortune.

There are the thousands discharged on psychoneurotic grounds.

There are the thousands discharged for physical unfitness.

There are the thousands discharged for incapability.

There are the thousands discharged for having lost legs, arms, eyes, and stamina.

Only a few months ago these hopeful young men were the flower of American youth.

Through exhaustive physical and mental examinations, which only the best could pass, they were selected for military duty.

Now they are the unwanted battalion.

They are shunted out of hospitals.

They are shunted back to their families.

The Congress says these men ought to have their jobs back in private industry.

Employers generally agree.

But rigid labor standards imposed by safety legislation, insurance regulations, and measures calculated to reduce industrial accidents are an insurmountable barrier to disabled men's reemployment.

Consequently the infirmities which remove soldiers from battle lines also remove them from production lines.

As days become weeks and weeks extend into months, the plight of these veterans is increasingly worse.

Under the Federal law they are entitled to disability compensation. But to get it they must go through voluminous and often costly red tape and then wait 2 to 4 months for the first payment.

Moreover, military regulations compel discharged men to be out of uniform in 90 days.

Unlike even convicts freed from penitentiaries, the soldiers, sailors, and marines who served their country honorably and heroically at home and abroad are not given a suit of clothes at the expiration of their terms. They must obtain their own.

So deplorable is the condition of returning servicemen that patriotic voices everywhere are raised in righteous protest. In Massachusetts, John J. Sawtelle, only Democratic member of the Governor's executive council and the father of a soldier, recently castigated the national Democratic administration of its mistreatment of Second World War veterans.

Mr. Sawtelle said:

"More than 1,500 Massachusetts boys have been discharged from the armed forces as insane and sent home to their families with no real provision having been made for their medical care.

"The national administration is doing nothing for these new war victims.

"I took up the matter of returning boys being discharged as insane with Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, majority leader in the House of Representatives.

"Mr. MCCORMACK said he was shocked at the number. But he was not shocked into doing anything about it.

"Beyond promises and empty words, nothing has as yet been done for these unfortunate lads.

"It is about time the Government of the Nation stopped spending $15,000,000,000 on housing projects of questionable value and transformed those housing units into veterans' hospitals."

In Washington, speaking on an Armistice Day program, Representative WALTER C. PLOESER, of Missouri, said:

"The political record of the President of these United States in regard to the war veterans is a shame in the eyes of the Nation.

"The political record of the majority Members of Congress to provide aid and sustenance for the men and women returning from this bloody war is a shame.

"The procrastination of the Democratic leaders of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives is a shame."

Then Mr. PLOESER cited a specific case.

He told of a young man who had lost his right leg in the battle of Tunisia. After a period of hospitalization in the Army's Walter Reed Hospital in Washington, D. C., this young man was discharged. For him the post-war period was grim indeed.

The young man lacked money for food and shelter. He lacked money for railroad fare to his home. He lacked money for the civilian clothes which military regulations forced him to obtain.

Before this young man went to war he had worked on a farm in Kentucky.

But now he could no longer walk behind a plow because he had lost a leg in the service of his country.

At various times, before his enlistment in the Army, he had worked for a building contractor.

But never again could he climb ladders or move about roofs. The young man was truly hapless and helpless.

Finally, a kind-hearted woman in Washington gave him a temporary place to stay in her home.

She took him to the Veterans' Bureau, where he received assurance that his case would be adjudicated as rapidly as possible, which meant 60 days and perhaps a hundred and twenty days.

The woman then took the disabled soldier to various Members of Congress and demanded action.

Not all the veterans of this war will find good Samaritans to mother them and sponsor their cases.

Veterans, and particularly disabled veterans, must have the protection and benefits of adequate laws passed by their Congress and approved by their President.

Promises will not rehabilitate veterans sick in body and mind, or fill their empty stomachs.

America, which does not hesitate to give billions to foreign governments, should not hesitate to give something to her own disabled sons.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, very recently the national commander of the American Legion made a hurried survey of conditions as they exist throughout the United States. I have here the statement made by Warren H. Atherton, national commander of the American Legion, on results of the survey of World War No. 2 claims. It is dated December 2. I ask unanimous consent that I may extend it in the RECORD at this particular point in my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

STATEMENT BY WARREN H. ATHERTON, NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, ON RESULTS OF SURVEY OF WORLD WAR NO. 2 CLAIMS

DECEMBER 2, 1943.

A telegraphic and air-mail survey of American Legion service officers on pending World War No. 2 claims show that there has been and still is considerable delay from the time these men are released from service, file their claims, and receive the first check in settlement thereof. This delay is attributable to a number of circumstances, according to these service officers. Some States report no undue delay, but most of them have cases of record filed 3 to 7 months ago and not yet settled. The American Legion feels that all Government agencies concerned should coordinate their activities to the end that men and women released from service because of disabilities shall not be subjected to inconvenience, embarrassment, and at times distress because their claims for disability compensation are not settled promptly. The American Legion has clearly in mind that a great number of these claimants have been in service for several months, have become incapacitated in training or combat, and are now back in civil life or back in hospitals and institutions because the armed services have no further use for them. While they were in they made allotments to their dependents to which was added the Government allowance. This benefit is discontinued in each case upon discharge. Having no other income the disabled dischargee must rely on financial assistance from private or charitable sources. Such a situation, especially for the combat disabled, should not be tolerated. Based upon the findings of the survey just completed, and upon the experience of the organization in claims and rehabilitation fields, the following recommendations are made by the American Legion to the Federal Government:

1. Every serviceman whose disabilities or physical condition are reparable should be retained in the armed services to receive the maximum benefits of hospital and medical care. If there is need for further convalescent or institutional care the liaison between the Army and Navy on the one hand, and the Veterans' Administration on the other, should really function and be applicable in each case. Men should not be returned to civil or State authorities unless so desired expressly by the folks at home.

2. The Veterans' Administration hospital-bed capacity, especially for the nervous and mental cases and the tuberculous patients, should be enlarged so that all those released from service and in need of further care may be accommodated. The American Legion is committed to the proposition that the Veterans' Administration be a war agency for the duration of hostilities and 6 months thereafter, to assure its proper place in the priorities rating for construction material, equipment, personnel, and supplies.

3. As a direct contribution to the informational and advisory service to prospective dischargees the Veterans' Administration should have contact representatives at the larger discharge centers especially those holding combat troops.

4. To obviate delays in adjudicating claims for obvious and indisputable disabilities the War and Navy Departments should permit the assignment of Veterans' Administration rating boards at the larger discharge points or demobilization centers.

5. Mustering-out pay in amounts dependent upon length of service should be made available with a portion payable at discharge and the balance within 30 to 60 days thereafter. The national commander of the American Legion testified before a Senate committee on such a proposal December 1, 1943.

6. The furnishing of medical and clinical records from service hospitals at which the disabled person may have been treated before he reached the discharge center must be speeded up. It is understood that such records may be essential in the adjudication of many cases, but in many others they would contribute little or nothing to the identification and evaluation of the disability causing discharge. Another bottle neck was found in the furnishing of photostat copies of induction or enlistment examination reports. As the result of a former survey made by the American Legion, the War Department was furnished with findings upon which officials took action. It has been reported that this bottleneck is now eliminated and that requests for these photostat records will be handled within 5 days from date of receipt.

7. The present arrangement of sending records and reports of disabled dischargees to the nearest regional office of the Veterans' Administration should be changed so that these records are dispatched promptly to the Veterans' Administration office having jurisdiction in the man's home State. This change may require Veterans' Administration contact people at the different discharge points as recommended above.

8. The lack of sufficient trained personnel in the adjudication field is a cause of delay in handling these cases in most stations. The manpower situation is recognized, but yet the Legion cannot refrain from urging and exhorting the Veterans' Administration to authorize the additional help requested by field offices, and to immediately step up recruitment and training programs for this purpose.

9. Some service officers have reported that the lack of complete and clarifying instructions from the central office of the Veterans' Administration to the regional offices on the adjudication of the new claims has been an element of delay. Certainly this should be overcome immediately.

10. Each claim is assigned a "C" number. So far this is done by the central office. Complaints have come in that the delay in assigning these numbers has held up adjudi-

cation of cases for as long as 2 or 3 weeks. The Legion feels this is an administrative problem that could and should be met and solved right now.

11. The present fiscal arrangement whereby disbursement on vouchers and rolls certified by the Veterans' Administration are made at disbursing offices, one in each Federal Reserve district, also contributes to delay the issuance of the initial check and settlement of the claim. Up to about 8 years ago the Veterans' Administration had its own disbursing officers. Reverting to that arrangement now should serve to expedite the payment of individual and new claims.

These conclusions rest upon observations sent in by trained service officers in 34 States. They cited by name and number (if assigned) 1,535 cases of disabled men. It is understood that many cases may require development of pertinent information, but that should not be permitted to slow down the whole rating machinery. Another factor cited is that of settling the question of waiver of premiums on insurance during period of total disability. Also the payment of insurance benefits and pension to the dependents of those dying in service. The jurisdiction over both these is in central office, and the many delays reported call for prompt improvement in the system of disposing of these cases.

There may be many other considerations touching upon the broad question of delays in the settlement of disabled veterans' claims. The American Legion submits, however, that if all Government agencies concerned would redouble their efforts to effect complete coordination much will have been accomplished toward the goal sought by the dischargees themselves, their folks at home, their representatives, and the Federal Government.

Attached hereto are brief summaries of cases taken from those submitted in the survey. They illustrate many of the points set forth above.

Related to this question are those other important programs of employment and unemployment protection. As to these the American Legion has proposals which are being introduced in Congress and on which further detailed data will be given.

Mr. PLOESER. It is interesting to learn that the results of this survey brought back a report on conditions which cited 1,535 cases of disabled men. I shall read from this report. It seemed that in this report were recorded many cases of extreme delay in the handling of disabled veterans' claims. I have here in my possession some specific cases and I am going to read some of them to the House:

Case 1: In this claim the veteran served honorably in the Navy from March 4, 1932, to February 8, 1938. He reenlisted on May 4, 1938, and was honorably discharged on medical certificate on account of active tuberculosis, incurred in line of duty, on April 6, 1943. The Form 526 was received in an office of the Veterans' Administration on April 21, 1943, and it has not been adjudicated as yet on account of the fact that complete records have not been received from the Navy. Contact was made with the adjudication officer about the delay in this claim on October 22, 1943, and again on November 29, 1943.

Case 2: This veteran was discharged insane, unable to sign his discharge. Claim was filed April 12 and we have not yet been able to get this veteran examined. While it is true that the Veterans' Administration wrote to the sister and a service officer, no letters were written to either or anyone in the months of September and October. Request was made for an attendant by this office on August 2 and the Veterans' Administration under date of November 9 finally complied with this request and wrote the veteran.

Case 3: This boy enlisted on July 13, 1940, and was declared unfit for service on January 13, 1943, with this notation: "Patient was struck in the head while in combat against the Japanese on Guadalcanal, penetrating wound right parieto-occipital region produced by grenade. Diagnosis: Hemiplegia, spastic, left." He was honorably discharged on C. D. D. July 3, 1943, and his claim was filed the same date. He was rated 50 percent disabled October 25, 1943, and advised of this rating on November 4, 1943, with rating effective from July 5, 1943. Vocational rehabilitation recommended.

Case 4: Claim was filed in this case July 3. The case file was transferred to central office for consideration by the Veterans' Claims Service on October 6, 1943. One reason for the delay in this particular case is that the veteran had a claim pending for officers' retirement pay which had to be disposed of.

Case 5: This claimant was discharged from the hospital on August 16, 1943, and on November 11, 1943, an office of the Veterans' Administration had to make a second request of the War Department for a medical report. He was examined at a Veterans' Administration hospital and some adjustment was made.

Case 6: This claimant was discharged August 15, 1942, from the Army Nurse Corps, and claim was filed February 4, 1943. Reports from the Adjutant General's Office, for which requests had been made several times, were not received until the latter part of August 1943. The decision has been deferred until completion of the requested neuropsychiatric examination by the Veterans' Administration.

Case 7: This veteran was discharged from service July 27, 1943, with a diagnosis of dementia praecox, paranoid. The handicap estimated by the rating board is 100 percent. Action toward releasing payment on the veteran's behalf apparently is not to be expected until the facility is informed officially with respect to the character of the veteran's discharge. It seems quite evident that this veteran served honorably, but the authorization unit has refused to release the payments until officially reported that discharge was honorable.

Case 8: Discharge from service in this case was effected July 26, 1943. Decision by the rating board on October 7, 1943, recognized the veteran's entitlement to pensionable rating for weak feet. Release of payments in this case, as in the case to which reference is made immediately above, awaits the receipt of official information of the man having been discharged honorably.

Case 9: Claim for pension was filed by this veteran at the time of discharge on June 11, 1943. Order for examination was issued by the rating board July 30, 1943. Before conducting the studies the medical authorities thought it advisable to have a social-service investigation made. It seems probable that another 3 or 4 months will elapse before a decision can be effected in the circumstances that exist, due to the accumulated load and number of orders for investigations.

Case 10: Claim was filed June 17, 1943. Several follow-ups by a Veterans' Administration facility have not brought the receipt of War Department reports.

Case 11: This veteran enlisted October 25, 1941, and was honorably discharged on C. D. D., December 23, 1942. Form 526 was received in an office of the Veterans' Administration on January 4, 1943. On January 5, 1943, service records were requested from The Adjutant General's office and were received in this office on February 19, 1943. Under date of April 10, 1943, the rating board requested supplemental service records from The Adjutant General's office, which were received in the Veterans' Administration on May 7, 1943. A second supplemental Adjutant General's report concerning alleged treatment at Fort Custer was requested May 10, 1943, and on June 14, 1943, a third supplemental report of clinical records of treatment at Fort Custer was requested. Complete records of the claimant's treatment at Fort Custer were received in the Veterans' Administration on July 26, 1943. August 3, 1943, an examination and psychiatric social history were requested by the rating board and the latter was received on September 12, 1943. Then, on September 14, 1943, the rating board requested an examination based upon psychiatric social report. The claimant was examined at a Veterans' Administration facility on October 14, 1943, and report of this was received November 15, 1943, in the regional office. On November 20, 1943, the rating board rated the claim and granted service connection for a nervous condition, incompetent and in need of a guardian. On account of the claimant's having been declared incompetent, chief attorney requested that a fiduciary be appointed under date of November 24, 1943. No check has been issued as yet.

Case 12: In this case the veteran, totally blind, was discharged from an Army hospital on June 30, 1943; the Army service records were not received in the regional office until the week of November 22, 1943; therefore the veteran has not as yet, and probably will not for 30 days, receive the pension check to which he is entitled.

Case 13: This veteran was discharged from service March 31, 1943. Form 526 was submitted to the Veterans' Administration on August 9, 1943. The regional office has only a dummy file on this case. The principal folder was sent to the Index Division, Office of Chief Clerk, on August 9, 1943, for the reason that, in addition to the veteran's service in the Navy in World War No. 2, he had also had peacetime service in the Army, just prior to World War No. 2. Under date of September 14, 1943, the chief clerk advised the regional office that the veteran's file was being referred to the insurance claims council for attention to the veteran's claim for waiver of premiums.

Case 14: This veteran was discharged from service on March 4, 1943. He has been granted service connection for tuberculosis, pulmonary, active, under date of May 5, 1943, and has been rated 100 percent from March 5, 1943. His claim file was sent to the Director of Insurance on September 25, 1943 for action on a question of entitlement to waiver of premiums. The file has not been returned to this date, November 26, 1943, and no action has been reported by the insurance claims council.

Case 15: A recent survey of State hospitals for the insane in northern California alone showed 100 discharged veterans of World War No. 2 being confined therein because of lack of beds in Veterans' Administration facilities.

The point I make now is, and the point I made on November 11 was, that it is highly important that this Congress provide some sort of program which will bridge the gap when these men are discharged from the service.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. PLOESER. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. As I pointed out a while ago there is pending House Resolution 29 to amend the rules so as to give the Veterans' Committee jurisdiction of this legislation. There is a petition on the desk, petition No. 8, which Members

of the House are asked to sign in order to bring that rule before the House for consideration to clear up this question of jurisdiction.

The gentleman from Missouri has not signed it. I hope while he has his mind on the subject he will sign it and help us bring that legislation out and straighten out this question of jurisdiction.

Mr. PLOESER. Can my distinguished friend from Mississippi tell me whether that would develop the rule in such way that legislation similar to that which I introduced a year ago last October to extend the pay of these men in the service so as to bridge the gap between their dismissal from service and their economic rehabilitation would be considered by the gentleman's committee?

Mr. RANKIN. When the rule is amended we propose to have it cover also rehabilitation.

Mr. PLOESER. I want to be sure about it.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Missouri cannot be sure until the rule is brought out. I may say to the gentleman from Missouri that I have taken as much abuse because of my sympathy for the veterans and my work here in their behalf as any man in Congress. I have been chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation for 13 years and have done everything I could to take care of these disabled veterans. I have tried to get this rule adopted to give us this jurisdiction to do whatever is necessary to help. Frankly, I do not remember ever having seen the gentleman from Missouri before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation asking for the passage of legislation.

Mr. PLOESER. That is very true; the legislation introduced by me is before the Committee on Military Affairs. Let me say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the gentleman has been distinguished in his service to the veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. I would not say that.

Mr. PLOESER. I am one of his greatest admirers for the service he has rendered to the veterans over the many years. I do make the point, however, that there seems to be a deliberate procrastination in some of the recesses of the House of Representatives because one simply cannot get action on any sort of bill which will bring out an extended pay program for these men. I do not know whether that type of legislation directly belongs before the gentleman's committee or not.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Missouri can help to alleviate that procrastination by signing this petition and helping us to amend the rules.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman from Missouri is not a habitual signer of petitions.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not ask him to make it a habit, but he has made it a habit to criticize veterans' legislation. I thought he would not mind putting his name on the dotted line and helping us to alleviate some of the conditions of which he complains. The veterans remember the old saying, "By their works ye shall know them."

Mr. PLOESER. If the gentleman had been listening to what I said, or if the gentleman had been on the floor of the House and heard the remarks I made on November 11, the gentleman would know I have not been criticizing veterans' legislation. I have been criticizing the entire policy of the Democratic Party in this House for delaying a comprehensive over-all post-war program for the veterans of this war. So far as legislation for disabled veterans is concerned, I am not criticizing the law, neither am I criticizing the Veterans' Administration, as I have tried to make clear in these remarks today. I think I know from experience that with such a tremendous and voluminous mass of detail there are bound to be delays, slips and errors in a great many cases. I am stating that there is a way for this Congress to bridge the gap so that such a slip cannot be fatal to the individual veteran. I am not sure that this legislation belongs before the gentleman's committee. If he can assure me that this rule he now wants will definitely bring that type of legislation before his committee, I would feel right at home. There I should get action.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman realizes, however, he has not got action otherwise?

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman not only realizes that fact but he deplores the political procrastination he is getting from other sources.

Mr. RANKIN. It does not sound very well to hear one allege that this delay is caused by political procrastination. We have Democrats and Republicans on the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and I challenge any of them to show where we have had any politics in that committee.

Mr. PLOESER. Why does the gentleman insist on taking the burden of this accusation unto himself? I am not accusing the gentleman or his committee of procrastination.

Mr. RANKIN. I fear the gentleman from Missouri has got himself in an embarrassing position. He has shown that he has not done anything to help us straighten out this jurisdictional question.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman from Mississippi well knows that under the rules of the House the legislation which I have introduced does not go to the gentleman's committee and did not go to his committee, and that the committee it is before has procrastinated, either deliberately or through a lack of interest. Why, the leadership of the House has brought no definite program before this body to take care of these men, and I have every right to accuse them of political procrastination as long as they do not act. I am not accusing the gentleman's committee of political division. I do not think it has been guilty of that. This legislation is not before the gentleman's committee. Why should he feel as though he should have to take the burden of guilt upon himself? I did not invite him to.

Mr. RANKIN. But the gentleman is complaining of conditions which he says exists, and I have pointed out to him a way to help relieve the situation.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman knows me well enough during the time I have been here to know that he could not in his heart or mind believe that I had such a thought about him.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Missouri is standing there now complaining, when other Members on his own side of the House have signed this petition to straighten out this jurisdictional matter in order that we may move forward with veterans' legislation. This is the second time he has taken the floor, while other Members on his own side have signed this petition.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman assure me that the petition will bring before the House this particular bill he is talking about?

Mr. RANKIN. I think it will.

Mr. PLOESER. Does the gentleman know?

Mr. RANKIN. I will say one thing, if this rule is passed in the form we are going to ask for its passage, it will give this committee jurisdiction over rehabilitation of these veterans.

Mr. PLOESER. Will it give them the jurisdiction over extended pay?

Mr. RANKIN. That is rehabilitation, is it not?

Mr. PLOESER. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi that I do not know whether you would technically call it that under the rules or not.

Mr. RANKIN. I think that would be called rehabilitation.

Mr. PLOESER. I will say this to the gentleman: I introduced this bill in October 1942 and reintroduced it again in 1943, the early part of this year. I rewrote the title to the bill deliberately to try to get it before the gentleman's committee. There is where I would like the bill to be. If I think the gentleman's petition will do it, I will gladly sign it, but I have no assurance that it will. If it does not, then I think the gentleman should revise the petition so that it would. I know of no more friendly place to go with a veteran's matter than the gentleman's committee, and I want the distinguished gentleman to know that I feel that way about it and about him.

Mr. RANKIN. I think the gentleman does a violent injustice to the Members of this House when he accuses any of them of political procrastination as far as the disabled veterans are concerned, because I do not believe that statement has any foundation of fact whatsoever. I do not believe there is anybody on either side of this House who does not want to do what is necessary for the veterans.

Mr. PLOESER. The distinguished gentleman is talking about something I have not said. I did not say they were procrastinating on disabled veterans' legislation. I said they were procrastinating on an over-all post-war plan for all veterans. The law now provides for disabled veterans. As I said, and as the gentleman well knows I said, I want something to "bridge the gap." All we have had out of this administration and

all we have had on this entire matter is lip service.

I tried to amend the dependency allowance bill before this House a few weeks ago by inserting a provision to make a pay extension to these veterans, and I did not succeed in doing it. I tried to get before the gentleman's committee this very legislation that is before the Committee on Military Affairs. I did not succeed in doing it. If the gentleman can guarantee or assure me conscientiously that this petition of his will do it, I will join him and fight with him to the very end of the road. I did not accuse the gentleman of any such thing and he well knows it. Let not the gentleman get himself involved in a place of guilt where he does not belong.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Mississippi is able to take care of himself in this House at any time.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman from Missouri will take care of himself without any assistance.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If this bill provided that the expenses should be borne by the Veterans' Administration, would it not then go to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation for action?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that, not having the terms of the bill before him, it is very hard to answer a question of that sort.

Mr. PLOESER. For the information of the Chair and for the information of the distinguished gentlewoman, I may say that the bill does not provide that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No; but I say, If the bill did provide that, would it go to that committee?

Mr. PLOESER. I do not think that would be a proper bill. A bill which charged up to the Veterans' Administration the expenses of extended pay to men who are 100 percent physically and mentally able I think would be improperly placed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I was simply trying to see if we could get action at once on it. The gentleman has done a very aggressive piece of work, and I heartily commend him for it.

Mr. PLOESER. I appreciate the fine words of the gentlewoman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think we have passed laws for the disabled, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. PLOESER. That is right.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. However, the Veterans' Administration has been absolutely asleep, and the laws have not been carried out.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentlewoman knows I have voted for all such bills.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Is it intended that the overlapping pay shall be continued for those who have been wounded or incapacitated until the matter has been cleared up by the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. PLOESER. According to my bill, the pay would be extended. In my original bill I called for 15 months. I am not one to say that 15 months is the proper time. It may be 12 months, or longer; I do not know. That is something we shall have to decide. It would be a guaranteed minimum pay. If he had an earned income in addition to that, it would be deductible according to the procedure which I have outlined in the bill. This bill is in no sense a bonus or a gift, it is a measure to rehabilitate all of them.

In the case of the disabled veteran, this is how it would work. He would be receiving this extended or "bridging the gap" pay until he got his disability compensation. That gap, which is frequently 30, 60, 90, or 120 days, would be bridged by extended pay allowances in the meantime. He would suffer no penalty against his other disability compensation.

Mr. ROWE. Under the present situation, he is just suspended without earnings?

Mr. PLOESER. That is right. I say again that you cannot charge all of that neglect to the Veterans' Administration, if you can charge any.

In an operation of that size involving such a voluminous amount of detail, there is bound to be delay on certain items. There is bound to be error. I am fully aware of that. I say this, there is a way of bridging that gap. If pay is extended automatically the minute a man is discharged from the service the gap is bridged. The President chooses to call it muster-out pay. A year ago I chose to call it extended pay. I am not so sure it might not better be named "bridging the gap" pay.

My original explanation was not designed necessarily to have any particular effect on disabled veterans. It was with reference to all veterans. I want them all to have that gap bridged so that they can have an opportunity to go back into civilian life without being penalized and so they can go back and have decent, respectable jobs. If they happen to be disabled and are entitled to disability compensation, this operates effectively because, during the time of adjudication, they would receive this compensation.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield for a brief question, but not for a speech.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it not true that only disabled men are being discharged now? Only men who are entitled to disability compensation are being discharged now and the only ones who are calling for our aid are disabled men?

Mr. PLOESER. That is not true. That is not true. I read in the newspaper yesterday where the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs explained on behalf of the Army that some 25,000 officers would be retired in one way or another.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman does not want to extend their pay, does he?

Mr. PLOESER. My original bill extended very briefly their pay.

Mr. RANKIN. If you are going to extend the pay of 25,000 officers—many of them swivel-chair officers that the Army found they did not need after they got them into the service——

Mr. PLOESER. I am not talking about that. I yielded to the gentleman for a question. I wish he would speak on his own time as is customary.

Mr. RANKIN. I will be glad to speak.

Mr. PLOESER. I will say this to the gentleman. There are a lot of them being dismissed who are not swivel-chair operators. How about the men who are over 38 years of age who have been dismissed?

Mr. RANKIN. The men over 38 years of age, if they are disabled, are taken care of.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman please understand I am not alone talking about disabled veterans. Please stop twisting the situation. I yield no further to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is trying to get away from the point. If he really wants to help the veterans, there is a way to do it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan will please state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just want to inquire if Members should address the Chair before speaking.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is the customary procedure.

Mr. PLOESER. For the further benefit of the gentleman who has tried to twist this thing and take the blame upon himself, which he does not deserve, because of his distinguished service to veterans, particularly disabled veterans, I want to say again, here is a list which I now ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to extend in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. This is a list of horrible cases in which there is delay in adjudication. There may be many reasons for that delay which are perfectly justifiable; I do not know. But I say this. There is no excuse to leave those men stranded during that period of delay. It is within the power of this Congress to bridge that gap. If that action is not forthcoming soon before this House, I will not be the only one to accuse the majority in this House of political procrastination or purposeful delay. The entire American people will accuse them of purposeful delay. I cannot understand why during the year 1943, we cannot have action on these matters. Why do we have to wait until the summer of 1944 or even the spring? Can it be the election in 1944 has something to do with it? That is a question that I might ask any of the gentlemen

of the majority. I say this to you, that the minority side stands ready, I believe, certainly speaking for myself, I stand ready to go to bat all the way to get a constructive post-war measure through this House which will provide for the easing back into private life the men who come out of the service. I prefer to call it "bridging-the-gap legislation" which will take them over that period in which they have no money; they have no job; and in a great many instances are disabled, with their claims in adjudication.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to use that time which I did not use a while ago, and to revise and extend my remarks, and to include newspapers articles and a letter from Chester Bowles and a reply.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the legislative program of the day and any business on the Speaker's desk and other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the House earlier in the day several Members have had something to say about the statement issued by a Government bureau or agency to the effect that the farmers in Ohio and Michigan should have some Japanese sent to them to teach them how to farm, how to pack their fruit, and how to take a bath—wash themselves—not their clothing. In the first place I cannot get very greatly excited over that, because almost everyone who lives in this country knows that the people of Ohio and Michigan—and I am not saying this now for election purposes—are of the salt of the earth. How often they bathe, I do not know. I well recall my earlier days when I took a bath first in the old wooden washtub. Later on, when we got improvements, in the galvanized-iron washtub. We got the water hot by putting it on top of the stove, and finally, when mother and father got enough money we had a stove with a reservoir in the back and we heated the water there.

We did not have Sweetheart soap, which was supposed to be advertised by the First Lady of the Land before she went on this trip where she saw so many of the unwashed. We had soft soap. We made it in a big copper kettle out in the back yard. We had fats and ashes and lye, and we made crocks of soft soap, and we used it—to wash. I would say to some of the folks who use Sweetheart or Lux that if you really want to get the dirt off get a handful of good home-made old-fashioned soft soap. You can get into a wood tub or a tin tub or a galvanized-iron tub or a pink or blue or yellow marble tub, but you will not get any cleaner than you will if you take soft soap and the old wooden tub. Try it sometime. I would be willing to wager that Ickes' tub down in the Interior Building serves no more useful purpose than does the wash tub still in use on some farms.

Here is the point of the whole thing: Why say that our people are of good habits? Why say they are good farmers? Do our farmers need a defense from the charges, the insinuations of a bureaucrat? They need protection from the new dealers' fool rules and orders, but they need no defense from professors' innuendoes. Out in the Middle West is the breadbasket of the Nation—Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio. Why they left out Indiana and Illinois folks, the people of Iowa and Kansas, I do not know. Maybe that fellow who wrote that little piece did not know there were such States as Indiana or Illinois, or these other States named, or that there are such people as those who live there. His statement makes me think of Harry Hopkins. Do you remember what Harry said. He said: "People are too damned dumb to understand." Then you remember this other man—this other fellow; excuse me—Winchell; Walter, who has done more to bring discredit upon his race than all the anti-Semitic organizations or individuals in the whole United States. By that chatter of his, by the falsehoods, by the abuse, which he puts on the air and in the papers, he is, week after week, building up race prejudice where none existed. The wonder to me is that the concern which makes a product like Jergen's Lotion can employ him, when he does so much harm, when he does so much to create dislike of the race to which he belongs. Walter, you know, had something to say on a line similar to what Harry Hopkins said. There is a little group all of whom seem to have taken the same sort of mental bath; all have the same ideas. All seem to think the American people west of the eastern mountains are dumb, ignorant, lacking in every good thought and deed. They just make themselves ridiculous, and, were it not for their malice, we should pity them.

I asked the Navy to report on what Walter said in a certain broadcast. The Navy sent up an official report, and I am now reading from page 3:

> Walter Winchell was an officer of the United States Naval Reserves, with the rank of lieutenant commander, on active duty on January 31, 1943. According to the transcript given of his broadcast at 9 o'clock p. m., over the Blue Network on that date, he made the following statement—

Listen to this and keep in mind Harry Hopkins' statement that we are all too damn dumb; keep in mind the statement that we ought to have the Japs sent into Ohio and Michigan to teach us how to keep clean and note the thought that runs through all this. Here is what Walter said:

> You bet. I am prejudiced against those in high office who guessed so wrong before Pearl Harbor.

Now I heard the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. RAMSPECK, this morning. I like his criticism. It is always instructive. It always encourages a fellow to think to have something to say in reply either by way of contradiction or agreement. A lot of people made mistakes before Pearl Harbor. It seems a little useless for the pot to call the kettle black. The point I was trying to make this morning was this, that no matter what the President had been given, these white papers now disclose that the State Department had warned that the Japs were about to attack. I put in the RECORD myself a dispatch from a correspondent in China filed there the day before Pearl Harbor, in the afternoon, which called attention to the fact that the Japs were going to attack the next day. How that correspondent ever got it over there and sent it to the Chicago Daily News—not the Chicago Tribune, but the Chicago Daily News—I do not know; but there it was. So, no matter what they had, no matter who was to blame for what they did not have, the fact remains that the Army and the Navy were caught napping over there, and that the administration, the Commander in Chief, did not insist that the proper precautions be taken to meet the Japs who were coming.

Now, that is the way it was. That is the way it is. We never yet have been permitted to learn through court martial or inquiry or other proceedings who was to blame. And except as we can profit because of the knowledge of why it happened, an inquiry will be useless.

I might agree with the gentleman from Georgia and with many others as to where the responsibility rests. That makes little difference now, and as far as I am concerned, I would say nothing about it were it not for the fact that every once in a while somebody on the majority side of the aisle pops up and says: "Well, you did not vote for the fortification of Guam; you did not vote for this; you did not vote for that." As we all know—there is no question about it—the President did not ask to have Guam fortified and I know the record will show he did not. The record will show that those in the administration made just as many mistakes as did some of us—were as wrong in their conclusions—as were we on the legislative side. When the administration and the administration's spokesmen, as they did in a number of debates, on the repeal of the neutrality legislation and the transfer of the destroyers and all that, told us that if we would just do this, that, and the other everything would come out all right and there would not be any war, our men would not be sent across if the legislation they sought was enacted. But the

war came just the same. Now because circumstances have changed, because things are entirely different and we are in the conflict, it would be a good thing for everyone if we could forget all about those things, but charges get tossed back and forth across the aisle as much from that side as from this side. After the war is over will be time enough to determine who was mistaken. But I for one do not propose to let unfounded charges go unanswered.

Getting back to what Walter said. I quote:

They're still guessing wrong and not in the least affected by their confessions of ignorance.

Now listen to this:

What worries me most are all those damn fools who elected them.

Now, Winchell was speaking of the American people just as was Hopkins, just as this professor was speaking of the people of Ohio and Michigan, and you will recall Walter was referring to the election of 1942. He was referring to the election where there were more Republican votes cast than there were Democratic or New Deal votes combined. Millions of his fellow countrymen are so described by him. And Jergens expects the people of Ohio and Michigan to buy a product advertised by Winchell. The thing that worries Walter is all the damn fools, as he called them, who elected not only the Republicans on this side but the Members on that side. Now what do you think of a man—what do you think of any individual who will talk that way about the American people?

And then along comes this fellow—I do not know who he is—and he says we should have some Japs sent to the farmers of Ohio and Michigan to teach us how to farm, how to pick and pack our fruit, and how to wash up and get clean.

Mr. RAMEY. He was head of the poultry division of the extension service in Ohio State University, and by some persons he was called a professor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Ohio says that this man used to be a professor at Ohio State University but is now in the employ of the Federal Government. There you have it: Harry Hopkins who says we are too dumb to understand, next Walter who says that our people, millions of them, are damn fools, and this fellow who thinks we do not know enough to take a bath. All paid by the people they condemn—all on the Federal pay roll. The last elections, especially where Long John was engineer, show that the people are beginning to understand and evaluate Walter and Harry.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. POULSON. I should like to ask for information as to how clean the farmers of Michigan are, for I can tell the gentleman something for the sake of comparison as to how these Japs live in California.

When they move into a locality to raise farm produce and sell it at such a low price in order to run the rest of the farmers out of business, after which they, of course, increase prices, they live in huts and hovels, two or three families in each. I have seen them myself.

I wish to ask the gentleman if the farmers in Michigan are still worse off than that, that these Japs can teach them anything? Please answer that question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I will not answer that question; everybody knows our people. There are none better, none cleaner physically, morally, spiritually, mentally, than the folks of the Midwest. Why, do you not know, do you not know that these bureaucrats—and I imagine this professor from Cleveland too—depends on our farmers, for the food they eat, for the milk they drink, for the butter they eat, for the beef and pork that keeps them alive. These fellows would starve to death, they would shrivel up and blow away if it were not for the farmers in the great Midwest. I am not here defending the farmers of Michigan or Ohio; that is not necessary. What I am trying to do now is call attention to the mental quirks that these fellows had, and have, Hopkins, and Winchell, and this Weiss, or whoever he may be—I do not know what his name is. I do not know whether those three fellows belong in a home for the feeble-minded or in an institution where they treat the insane or the psychopathic cases. They belong somewhere outside of the group which is made up of real Americans.

I cannot get excited about being charged with not taking a bath. If I do not take a bath you know it. What of it? People will advise me.

Mr. RANKIN rose.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Even the people of the South, even the people in Texas, in Tupelo—I see the gentleman on his feet—I have been down there.

Mr. RANKIN. A point of order, Mr. Speaker; Tupelo is not in Texas.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I mean Mississippi, Mississippi. I have been down there in that courthouse just before you had those strikes that closed up your industries. You said you were not going to let them in there but they came in and closed your cotton mills for you. They wash down there and they do not go clear down to the Gulf to do it either. I can tell from the looks of those I saw and those with whom I have conversed, and in conversations I have had with the gentleman from Mississippi, that they wash in his district; that they are like our people clean, clear thinking, alert, patriotic Americans full of good sense and sound judgment. It is silly for a man to talk as did Spending Harry, Smearer Walter or the professor who does not know his Ohio or Michigan.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want to know first if the gentleman wants to talk about Willkie or whether he wants to talk about T. V. A. or about this advice on bathing?

Mr. RANKIN. No. I cannot talk about those two in the same breath.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Did I understand the gentleman from Michigan to say that this crazy crackpot who advocates having the Japs teach the people of the Middle West how to bathe and keep clean was a professor or is a professor in some college up there?

Mr. HOFFMAN. My friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] advises me that he is a former professor of the University of Ohio.

Mr. RANKIN. They got rid of him of course?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes?

Mr. RAMEY. Now he is on the Federal pay roll as a War Relocation director receiving a salary of $3,800 per year. He is on leave from Ohio State University. Ohio State University is a great institution being properly administered by good and reliable persons so his leave will likely be permanent.

Mr. RANKIN. I was afraid of that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. So much for that. The statement that gentleman sent out just discloses his ignorance, it just discloses his conceit, it just discloses the idea that they have here in Washington that they know more about everything than the people who are actually doing the things back home. That is what it shows. What we need is not a washing in Michigan; not more perfumed bath water. We need a washing out of the New Deal dirty linen down here, a cleaning out of the minds or the brains or the wheels that go around in the heads of these starry-eyed, fuzzy-wuzzy professors. We want to get back here in Washington to good, straight, sound ideas and practices that our people have had and used for a long time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I just want to point out to the gentleman from Michigan after what he has exposed here today about this crank trying to have the Japs teach the people of the Middle West how to wash up and clean up there is the additional danger of having crackpots like that trying to run our elections from Washington. That is one reason the Senate adopted the substitute for the so-called Lucas-Worley bill on last Friday.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I agree with the gentleman, and may I say further I have voted with you gentlemen who believe in States' rights. What gets me, though, is why you will not go along with us sometimes and get rid of some of these fellows like Harry and this professor. Get them off the pay roll. You are assured of reelection. Every single Democratic Congressman from the South is solid down there. He will be reelected and come back. You have the majority. You have control of legislation. So why do

you not help us clean house at the other end of the Avenue, why do you not go along with us? You are doing a good job handling Wendell Willkie. Why do you not turn on your own party and give your own party a cleaning up? I do not mean the Democrats. I mean the new dealers, the Communists who have stolen your national party machinery. The President's Harry and Willkie have similar ideas, only one of them thinks he can give it away quicker than the other. Willkie thinks he can give it away faster than the President. Before you know it, they will both be running for president of the world.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan that I voted to strike from the pay roll every person the Dies committee found to be subversive, and I expect to continue that policy as long as I am a Member of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. So did I. That is good. That is going part way. But what will the New Deal crowd do to that act of Congress?

If you go the rest of the way and give the New Deal "heck" all the way down the line, we will get somewhere, in spite of the statement over at the other side of the Capitol that we, the Democrats and Republicans, made an unholy alliance to defeat legislation which would have deprived the servicemen of an opportunity to cast a vote for State and county officers. You and I know that is not true. If there is any alliance, it is one that comes about because we are for America when it comes to the question of what is right and decent.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will yield, the trouble is that when we attempt to help you out you go the wrong way. Now, for instance, you have had a relapse on that subject recently.

Mr. HOFFMAN. On what?

Mr. RANKIN. On canceling the invitation to Mr. Sparks to come down and give you some real information on Willkie, nominated at Philadelphia in 1940.

Mr. HOFFMAN. On what? Be specific now, as Chester Bowles says.

Mr. RANKIN. This man Sparks, a former mayor of Akron, Ohio.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not belong to that Seventy-eight Club.

Mr. RANKIN. He had written this book on One Man Willkie, exposing the corruption of the Philadelphia convention in 1940. He was invited to come down here and address you Republican Congressmen.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not me. They will not let me in.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman was getting in by invitation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right; but I did not have an invitation.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, for some mysterious reason, they have canceled this invitation. I say, whenever we attempt to help you clean house, you run out on us.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I do not run out on you. I want to say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I will get hold of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] and I will speak to him about it, and I will ask him to pray over that situation and search his conscience and see if he cannot have that man down there. But you know that while those fellows came in later years, they are now getting some of our habits. They have been here, and they get frightened at the cars, as we say, and they may back up once in a long time. But they are just backing up to get started to go up the grade.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I suggest the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE] the chairman of the Seventy-eight Club.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. This colloquy does afford us some mirth.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There is a lot of instruction in it, too, as you will find if you will just listen carefully.

Mr. ROWE. I think I have, very carefully. I want to come to this rather serious point, that this thing is too serious to treat lightly. I think we ought to give the gentleman responsible for that statement in the paper yesterday the opportunity of appearing before a committee of this Congress and explaining why it was made, and from what source he got his authority. I think it is a good subject for an investigation, and I should like to see some of the older Members of the House see that that is brought to investigation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right. That is a good suggestion, too. But I have tried to talk to inmates of a home for the feebleminded and to people in asylums and I never got anywhere with them. I do not know where we would get by calling that professor. He is just that way. What are you going to do about him?

Mr. RAMEY. The tragedy of it is that these hard-working taxpayers of Ohio are paying taxes to support this so-called expert while their own sons are fighting to save us from such grotesque dictatorship.

Mr. ROWE. The serious thing about that is that if a person like that can make this sort of a statement, casting an aspersion on what I consider to be sturdy Americans, and there is included with it that in the House we are amused by the statement, for the great part it only encourages them to continue. I think something should be done to cause them to stop it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is amusing, also absurd, also unfortunate, that anyone would give such advice, but after our people's experience with the new dealers we do not expect common sense nor sound judgment from them. I have been trying for 8 years to get these birds out. I expect to continue to try. I hope that that club of the gentleman's will keep on, and will get this man down here to tell them about Willkie and what Willkie is doing so that everybody can know. Then we can all get together and join the gentleman from Mississippi and kick the whole outfit of new dealers and Communists off the Federal pay roll.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, last week the United States Marine Corps lost a commandant through retirement and also last week the Marine Corps accepted a new commandant. I, as a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, having known the retiring commandant for many years, want to pay tribute to him on the floor of the House. General Holcomb has served the Marines well. He has lived up to all the traditions and the history of the Marine Corps. He has been a fine commandant in the most trying times of our military history. He retired only because he had reached the age when he thought he should retire.

The only consolation the Nation has in the retirement of General Holcomb is that the new commandant will carry on. He is one of our great heroes of this war, Lieutenant General Vandegrift.

I think this House should pay tribute to one who is not only a fine gentleman but who is, in every sense of the word, a United States Marine, General Holcomb.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial on General Holcomb.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

TOUGH, QUIET—THAT'S THE OFFICER CODE OF MARINE CORPS UNDER HOLCOMB, RETIRING LEADER

(By John G. Norris)

One of the bloodiest battles in United States history has been won only because the men of America's amphibious "elite corps" knew how to fight and how to die.

Lesser troops probably would have failed at Tarawa. Those American marines won. They had what it took—high courage, perfect discipline, the know-how of landing operations, and the will to win.

Wake Island, Guadalcanal, and Bougainville also are evidence of the topnotch fighting ability of the corps.

What makes them so good?

TRADITION IMPORTANT

Tradition, say marine old-timers, has a great deal to do with it. Marines have fought in every war the United States has waged, and in numerous expeditions and campaigns in between. Down through the years a Marine Corps tradition has grown up which every leatherneck feels is his personal responsibility to carry on.

This has produced two things, a very high esprit and a corps of professional soldiers—noncom as well as officers—which has maintained a continuity of training technique and combat skill. Marine training today emphasizes two things, as it has for many years—marksmanship and the initiative of both the leader and the individual soldier.

But though the fighting ability of the marines thus is the work of many men through many generations, there is one man today who has had a very great deal to do

with the success of the corps in this war. He took a good weapon and with the help of aides made it very much better.

That man is Lt. Gen. Thomas Holcomb, commandant of marines for the past 7 years.

Because of his innate modesty and dislike of the limelight, few outside the corps know much about stocky, bespectacled Tommy Holcomb.

HE SET THE EXAMPLE

It took an announcement of his impending retirement last week to focus attention on the great job he has done as marine commandant. Holcomb not only has expanded his corps twentyfold, without lowering its spirit and fighting skill, but has exercised considerable personal influence on the service as well.

The latter was not through the force of a colorful personality, for General Holcomb is not colorful.

It has rather been through example and precept, and his selection of leaders.

Although he makes few public speeches, the marine boss makes it a point to address the graduating classes of the corps basic schools whenever he can. In such talks he set forth his ideas of what a marine leader should be—a concept which differs considerably from many people's ideas of military commanders.

Speak softly, he advises newly commissioned second lieutenants. Wear your bars with courage, with intelligence, and with due humility, practice self-control, and avoid swashbuckling and loud talk, he counsels. You must be tough, Holcomb says, but adds: "Tough does not mean bully or swaggering braggart."

SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY

General Holcomb's remarks on leadership before a group of Quantico graduates last September 22, in fact, are so well stated and expressive of the need of high character in military leaders that we quote them at some length.

"We must have men," says Holcomb, "who feel a sense of responsibility to their country, a sense of responsibility which makes them willing to take chances to risk their lives if necessary, in dangerous and different tasks.

"We must have men who want to learn; men who realize that discipline is essential for the best results, who recognize they have a responsibility to the men under them as well as to those above them. We must have men who realize that teamwork is important, that it pays dividends. And finally, we must have men who realize that they must cultivate ingenuity, inventiveness for the occasion when those qualities are required.

"A marine, you see, is therefore a man who disciplines himself and accepts discipline from others when required. He is a man who has practiced and learned self-control.

"Some of the best marines I have known are soft-spoken, quiet men. These are usually the qualities of the men with the most resolve and the most courage. Loud talkers are often those of little control, often the indication of an inferiority."

Holcomb emphasizes that leadership depends to a large extent on experience:

"With the proper character and this training you will gain confidence—and confidence you must have—confidence, not cockiness, and confidence comes from knowing how to do your job. It comes from training, from experience—it comes only from the hard way.

"You officers will be leaders in our future operations. Leadership is not easy, is not automatic. You must be possessed of those qualities of leadership which command respect and loyalty—which inspire in all hands the determination, and more important, the compelling desire to work together for a common end."

MANY ADVANCES

But General Holcomb's contribution and influence on the Marine Corps has not been alone in the field of developing better leadership. During his regime as commandant, many notable advances have been made in tactics, organization, and weapons of amphibious operations—that all-important phase of the present war and the marines' particular specialty.

Before the war, General Holcomb had difficulty convincing many ranking military and naval officers and others in official life of the vital importance of amphibious forces in American war plans.

Back in 1937 he argued that we would have to seize advance bases in the Pacific in the event of hostilities, and therefore should have adequate forces trained in this most difficult of operations.

Even after Pearl Harbor, it was some time before the Army launched a large amphibious training program.

But all the while, the marines under Holcomb's direction were perfecting the technique of landing operations, adapting modern weapons to their long-time specialty, and preparing a nucleus of highly trained troops in such tactics.

Perhaps the major achievement in this field was the publication, for the first time in history, of the first exhaustive and authoritative text on amphibious operations.

This official textbook on landing operations was largely prepared at the Marine Corps School at Quantico, Va., during 1935–36, while Holcomb was its director and finally issued in 1938, when he was commandant.

Kept up to date with the latest lessons from the war fronts, this document has been the bible of all Allied amphibious operations in the war.

"ALLIGATOR" PAYS OFF

Perhaps the most important amphibious weapon of modern days—the "alligator"—was developed and perfected during Holcomb's regime. This amphibious tractor—capable of carrying troops on both land and water, proved its worth a hundredfold at Tarawa. The "alligators" were able to reach the beach when the landing barges got stuck on the coral reefs.

Marine Corps aviation—with pilots and planes skilled and adapted to both carrier and land-based operations and specializing in covering and supplying landings—was greatly expanded during Holcomb's time.

The Marine Corps underwent a thoroughgoing reorganization during the past 7 years.

In prior years, the largest Leatherneck unit was a brigade. The first marine division was created under Holcomb—a self-contained fighting force combining power in landing attack with seaborne mobility. There are now four, soon will be five.

Another type of marine unit was also developed during this time. It was the defense battalion, a fighting force with carefully balanced artillery and antiaircraft support, especially designed for protecting a small island. One of these battalions stood off overwhelming Jap forces attacking Wake Island for weeks in December 1941, sinking seven enemy warships. Another held Midway Island.

During his tenure as commandant, General Holcomb has believed in bringing up younger men to positions of high command. He has strictly enforced the age retirement rule and when he reached the normal retiring age for generals—64—applied it to himself, even though fit and excepted under the law.

This successor—Lt. Gen. Alexander Archer Vandegrift, the hero of Guadalcanal—is cut from the same cloth. Vandegrift was General Holcomb's own choice to carry on in the job and fits exactly into the retiring commandant's definition of the ideal marine officer.

Holcomb, moreover, is not going on the shelf. Secretary Knox said last week that he will return to service soon. What his new post will be was not disclosed, but an amphibious expert of his caliber will certainly be invaluable in the high command during this amphibious war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH], be permitted to extend his own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement concerning the case of Jersey City and the Hudson & Manhattan Railroad Co.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1447. An act to remit claims of the United States on account of overpayments to part-time charwomen in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 7, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be an open meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Tuesday, December 7, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., for consideration of H. R. 2001, relating to penalty mail, at which time the Postmaster General and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, or their representatives, will be heard.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, December 7, 1943, for consideration of a post-war bill, to be held in room 217, Old House Office Building.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 156. An act relating to the status of retired judges; with amendment (Rept. No. 934). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2973. A bill to provide that no person shall publish or distribute any political statement relating to a candidate for election to

any Federal office which does not contain the name of the person responsible for its publication or distribution; with amendment (Rept. No. 935). Referred to the House calendar.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3241. A bill to implement the jurisdiction of service courts of friendly foreign forces within the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 936). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 80. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 11, 1944, as Edison Day, in commemoration of the birthday of Thomas Alva Edison; without amendment (Rept. No. 937). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Report on the investigation of certain transactions of the Tampa Shipbuilding Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 938). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GALE:

H. R. 3784. A bill to promote the sale of United States Savings bonds by means of a premium plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. R. 3785. A bill to provide for crop insurance on a self-sustaining premium payment basis; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 3786. A bill to protect the foreign relations and to promote the trade and commerce of the United States, to require the disclosure to the United States of information affecting such trade and commerce and to safeguard the security of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 3787. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. J. Res. 202 (by request). Joint resolution providing compensation for per diem employees for December 25, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. Con. Res. 60. Concurrent resolution declaring the American post-war economic policy of the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 374. Resolution requesting certain information from the President with respect to veterans' care and rehabilitation; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 3788. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bessie S. Edmonds; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 3789. A bill for the relief of Jack Williams and Mrs. Lora Sally Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 3790. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Ann Knight Gregory; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky:

H. R. 3791. A bill for the relief of the estate of Charles Noah Shipp, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WENE:

H. R. 3792. A bill authorizing the President to present a Distinguished Service Cross to John F. Haller; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILLEY:

H. R. 3793. A bill granting a pension to Frances Leonard Barnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3894. By Mr. CARLSON of Kansas: Petition of J. F. Schenck and 201 others, of Hays, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3895. Also, petition of George Lipp and 43 others, of Park, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3896. Also, petition of John J. Zeigler and 44 others, of Collyer, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3897 Also, petition of George Deger and 135 others, of Grainfield, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3898. Also, petition of Earl Smith and 28 others, of Quinter, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3899. Also, petition of Paul Depperschmidt and 42 others, of Park, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3900. Also, petition of Carl Schaible and Roy Richardson and 186 others, of Oakley, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3901. Also, petition of William Gibbs and 158 others, of Plainville, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3902. Also, petition of D. O. Tate and 35 others, of Luray, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3903. Also, petition of Dave Dumler and 26 others, of Russell, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3904. Also, petition of Joe M. Dreiling and 89 others, of Victoria, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3905. Also, petition of H. V. Bird and 44 others, of Lucas, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3906. Also, petition of J. H. Miller and 24 others, of Natoma, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3907. Also, petition of J. F. Wiesner and 74 others, of Ellis, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3908. Also, petition of S. W. Selbe and 88 others, of Wakeeney, Kans., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3909. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition favoring the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3910. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Joseph Keim and 18 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3911. Also, petition of John Mebes and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3912. Also, petition of Walter Russell and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3913. Also, petition of Arthur R. Bach and 21 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3914. Also, petition of Mrs. E. McLaughlin and 18 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3915. By Mr. GAMBLE (by request): Petition signed by Isaac Donen, president of the Board of Trade and 368 citizens of Rye, N. Y., urging the Congress to enact legislation to provide fair and equitable control of prices at the farm level; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3916. Also (by request): Petition signed by Thomas F. Garvey and other residents of New Rochelle, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2861; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3917. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 19 citizens of New Castle, Pa., urging the early consideration and favorable vote on the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, in order to bring about a suspension of the alcoholic beverage industry for the duration of the war, to reduce absenteeism, increase production, and eliminate sources of disorder and physical disability which are hampering our war effort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3918. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of G. A. Holden and 25 other residents of Spokane, Wash., protesting against the passage of legislation designed to bring about prohibition under the guise of a war measure or otherwise and request Congress to vote against such legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3919. Also, petition of Eleanor M. Hair and 19 other residents of Spokane, Wash., to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3920. Also, petition of Jean S. Finnell and 19 other residents of Spokane, Wash., to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3921. Also, petition of Mike Oftedahl and 25 other residents of Spokane, Wash., expressing approval of VITO MARCANTONIO's bill (H. R. 1732); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3922. By Mr. STEFAN: Petition of Otto Emrich, of Norfolk, Nebr., and 92 other citizens of Norfolk, Wisner, Carroll, Wayne, Winside, Foster, Randolph, Pierce, Osmond, Enola, Hoskins, Bloomfield, Battle Creek, Clarkson, Tilden, Oakdale, Pilger, Madison, Leigh, Stanton, Meadow Grove, Beemer, West Point, and Petersburg, Nebr., citing existing ceiling prices on hogs and proposed ceiling prices on cattle as detrimental to the livestock industry and productive of curtailment in the production of livestock, and urging immediate relief; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3923. By Mr. VOORHIS of California: Petition of Dama Holden, of Monterey Park, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3924. Also, petition of Eleanor Mandella, of San Gabriel, Calif., and 11 others, urging the

passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3925. Also, petition of Mrs. Daniel Marolin, of Alhambra, Calif., and 10 others, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3926. Also, petition of Eva C. Moran, of Alhambra, Calif., and 13 others, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3927. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Native Sons of the Golden West, Guadalupe Parlor, No. 231, urging that all the war relocation centers be placed under the control of the United States Army for the duration of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3928. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the Independent American Labor Party Club of Mount Vernon, N. Y., urging the formation of a House interracial affairs committee; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we lift lame yet pleading hands before the throne of Thy grace. As we come in the fresh mercies of another morning, purge our minds, we beseech Thee, on this day of bitter national remembrance. With scarred memories that dim our eyes and strangely stir our hearts, deliver us from evil—the evil of vows of vengeance which would stain our very souls, from the evil of a festering hatred which would poison our inner life. May we rather be sobered as we see perfidy and malice revealed as the deadliest explosives in Thy universe, blasting the very kingdoms which seize them as weapons. May we search our own hearts and repent of our own sins as we read the fiery letters of Thy righteous sentence against all aggressors: Thy kingdom of blood and plunder shall be divided and given to another.

In this day of destiny when the hammers of Thy purpose are beating out new shapes on the anvil of the world, may this dear land of ours not be weighed in the balances and found wanting. Fashion in us a mind forgetful of past ill will, a heart of forgiving love for true spirits in all nations, and a ruling passion to find a way of global concord in the flaming dawn of a warless world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, December 3, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he also announced that on November 28, 1943, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 321. An act to facilitate and simplify collection procedure in the Department of the Interior;

S. 364. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to settle certain claims;

S. 1336. An act to authorize the transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard under certain conditions, and for other purposes; and

S. 1354. An act to amend the act approved January 16, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for the retirement and retirement annuities of civilian members of the teaching staff at the United States Naval Academy and the Postgraduate School, United States Naval Academy."

TEHERAN CONFERENCE DECLARATION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the declaration of the three powers issued from Teheran on yesterday afternoon, embodying the statement issued by the heads of the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The declaration is as follows:

We, the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and the Premier of the Soviet Union, have met these 4 days past in this the capital of our ally, Iran, and have shaped and confirmed our common policy.

We express our determination that our nations shall work together in war and in the peace that will follow.

As to war, our military staffs have joined in our round-table discussions, and we have concerted our plans for the destruction of the German forces. We have reached complete agreement as to the scope and timing of the operations to be undertaken from the East, West, and South.

The common understanding which we have here reached guarantees that victory will be ours.

And as to peace, we are sure that our concord will win an enduring peace. We recognize fully the supreme responsibility resting upon us and all the United Nations to make a peace which will command the good will of the overwhelming mass of the peoples of the world and banish the scourge and terror of war for many generations.

With our diplomatic advisers, we have surveyed the problems of the future. We shall seek the cooperation and active participation of all nations, large and small, whose peoples in heart and mind are dedicated, as are our own peoples, to the elimination of tyranny and slavery, oppression, and intolerance. We will welcome them, as they may choose to come, into a world family of democratic nations.

No power on earth can prevent our destroying the German armies by land, their U-boats by sea, and their war plants from the air.

Our attack will be relentless and increasing.

Emerging from these cordial conferences, we look with confidence to the day when all peoples of the world may live free lives, untouched by tyranny, and according to their varying desires and their own consciences.

We came here with hope and determination. We leave here friends in fact, in spirit, and in purpose.

Signed: Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin.

Signed at Teheran, December 1, 1943.

NOTICE OF THE EXHIBITION OF THE PICTURE "VICTORY THROUGH AIR POWER"

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I give notice that on Friday of this week, at 4 o'clock p. m., in the caucus room there will be exhibited a very interesting picture entitled "Victory Through Air Power." The picture is produced by Mr. Disney, and is sponsored by Major de Seversky. The picture deals with the subject of the power of air facilities to win the war. It is hoped that Senators and their respective staffs may find it convenient to come to the caucus room and enjoy the picture.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1315) providing for the transfer to the custody and control of the Secretary of the Navy of certain lands comprising a portion of Croatan National Forest in the State of North Carolina.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2232. An act to amend sections 44 and 38 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act;

H. R. 2616. An act to enable the Secretary of the Interior to complete payment of awards in connection with the war minerals relief statutes;

H. R. 2976. An act to grant military rank to certain members of the Navy Nurse Corps;

H. R. 3449. An act to remit claims of the United States on account of overpayments to part-time charwomen in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3605. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in tents used as quarters by members of the Twelfth Naval Construction Battalion, Long Island, Alaska, on December 26, 1942, and May 26, 1943, respectively;

H. R. 3606. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire at the Outlying Degaussing Branch of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., on December 4, 1942;

H. R. 3607. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in tent L–76 at the Amphibious Training Base, Camp Bradford, Norfolk, Va., on March 15, 1943;

H. R. 3611. An act to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States, to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution to provide for the disposition of the proceeds to accrue as a result of the interlocutory judgment of the Court of Claims in the suit brought against the United States by the Menominee Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 199. Joint resolution to extend the time limit for immunity.

FREDERICK RODIEK, ANCILLARY EXECUTOR OF THE WILL OF JOHN F. HACKFLED, DECEASED, AGAINST THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 136)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting, in accordance with Senate Resolution 229, Seventy-third Congress, a certified copy

of the special findings of the court in the case of *Frederick Rodiek, Ancillary Executor of the Will of John F. Hackfled, deceased* v. *The United States* (Congressional No. 17745), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, and so forth, were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A radiogram from the United Chinese Labor Association signed by See Hing Chuck, president, Honolulu, T. H., expressing appreciation for the prompt action of Congress in repealing the Chinese exclusion acts; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

Resolutions approved by sundry organizations and citizens of the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, favoring an immediate increase in the price paid to producers for fluid milk in New England and also a raise in the ceiling price of corn; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the directors of the Cambridge (Mass.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring reciprocal relations with various countries relating to international agreements affecting air transportation; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Commission of the Department of Public Utilities, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, protesting against the enactment of House bill 3420, the so-called Lea aviation bill; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted at a meeting in Boston, Mass., of representatives of New England radio stations, favoring the enactment of legislation clearly defining and limiting the powers of the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITION

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I present for printing in the RECORD without the signatures attached, and for appropriate reference a petition signed by 43 citizens of the State of Delaware, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

To the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States:

We, the undersigned citizens of the State of Delaware, do respectfully petition you to defend the United States of America by defending the health and morale of the youth called out by your action under the Selective Service Act, from what Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, referred to as "a sordid business for the accumulation of money," the trade in alcoholic beverages including beer; and from the danger of venereal disease incident to prostitution, by passing S. 860.

FILING OF INCOME-TAX RETURNS BY TAX-EXEMPT COOPERATIVES — TELEGRAMS FROM KANSAS GROUPS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a telegram I have received from E. K. Dean, president, Kansas Farmers Union, protesting against the provisions of the tax bill, H. R. 3687, requiring tax-exempt cooperatives to file income-tax returns.

I also ask that a similar telegram I have received from C. W. A. Henke, secretary of the Farmers Union of Hollenberg, Kans., be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred. I am in sympathy with the petitions sent me by these Kansas groups.

There being no objection, the telegrams were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALINA, KANS., *December 3, 1943.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The provision in the present tax bill requiring tax-exempt cooperatives to file income-tax returns is unnecessary and is the first step by those opposed to cooperatives toward forcing double taxation on our cooperatives and their members. We urge the Senate to amend the present bill by eliminating this provision.

KANSAS FARMERS UNION,
E. K. DEAN, *President.*

HOLLENBERG, KANS., *December 3, 1943.*

Senator CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

Oppose income-tax bill as regards cooperatives.

FARMERS UNION LOCAL LIBERTY 1142,
C. W. A. HENKE, *Secretary.*

BILL REPORTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 3d instant,

Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, reported it on December 4, 1943, with amendments and submitted a report (No. 570) thereon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1504. A bill to extend the time for completing the construction of a railroad bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 571); and

H. R. 1616. A bill to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 572).

By Mr. WHITE (for Mr. JOHNSON of California), from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1233. A bill to authorize the construction and maintenance of Moss Landing Harbor (Monterey Bay), Calif.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 573).

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR BARBOUR

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 214, which authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Senate to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses in connection with the funeral of the late Senator Barbour. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 214, submitted by Mr. HAWKES on November 26, 1943), was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the Vice President in arranging for, and attending the funeral of, Hon. W. Warren Barbour, late a Senator from the State of New Jersey, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on December 4, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 861) to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard to the grades indicated for temporary service while serving in specific assignments, to rank from November 1, 1943:

Commodore Joseph F. Farley to rear admiral while serving as Assistant Chief of Operations; and

Capt. Philip B. Eaton (E) to rear admiral while serving as Assistant Engineer in Chief; and

Capt. Earl G. Rose to be a commodore for temporary service in the Coast Guard while serving as commander, Greenland Patrol, to rank from November 1, 1943.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Rear Admiral William N. P. Blandy, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 20th day of May 1942;

Rear Admiral George F. Hussey, Jr., United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years, from the 1st day of December 1943;

Capt. Humbert W. Ziroli, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy for temporary service, while serving as United States naval member with the Allied Control Commission, to rank from the 1st day of November 1943; and

Sundry officers of the Naval Reserve for appointment and/or promotion in the Navy.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unani-

mous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 1572. A bill for the relief of Frank Robertson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

S. 1573. A bill for the relief of Suffolk University; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 1574. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to permit service in the Medical Reserve Corps to be counted for pay purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1575. A bill declaring that the United States shall hold certain lands in trust for the Standing Rock Indian Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1576. A bill to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 1577. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Ann Knight Gregory; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 1578. A bill to reduce juvenile delinquency by providing for the care and prompt return home of runaway, transient, or vagrant children of juvenile age, going from one State to another without proper legal consent, through the use of funds appropriated under the provisions of the Social Security Act for aid to dependent children, under certain conditions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution to change the name of the Aleutian Islands to the Billy Mitchell Islands; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and a joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 2616. An act to enable the Secretary of the Interior to complete payment of awards in connection with the war minerals relief statutes; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

H. R. 3449. An act to remit claims of the United States on account of overpayments to part-time charwomen in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2232. An act to amend sections 44 and 38 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; and

H. R. 3611 An act to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States, to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2976. An act to grant military rank to certain members of the Navy Nurse Corps;

H. R. 3605. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in tents used as quarters by members of the Twelfth Naval Construction Battalion, Long Island, Alaska, on December 26, 1942, and May 26, 1943, respectively;

H. R. 3606. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire at the Outlying Degaussing Branch of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., on December 4, 1942; and

H. R. 3607. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in tent L-76 at the Amphibious Training Base, Camp Bradford, Norfolk, Va., on March 15, 1943; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution to provide for the disposition of the proceeds to accrue as a result of the interlocutory judgment of the Court of Claims in the suit brought against the United States by the Menominee Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT—REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I present a report made by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures on the number of civilian employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of October 1943.

Total number of employees for October 1943 is 2,961,068, which is the latest figure available as the last report of the Civil Service Commission was for the month of July 1943.

Since September 1943, 27 departments and agencies have increased the number of their employees by 20,644 while 37 departments and agencies have eliminated 30,759 employees, making a net decrease of 10,115 employees for this period. There has been a net decrease of 134,395 since the month of June 1943, when civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government reached the peak figure of 3,095,463.

Substantial reductions in the number of their personnel since September were accomplished by the following departments and agencies: War Department, 15,246; Agriculture Department, 2,014; Post Office Department, 6,164; Interior Department, 1,640; War Manpower Commission, 852; Tennessee Valley Authority, 840; Office of Price Administration, 715.

Greatest increases were made by the following departments and agencies: Navy Department, 15,399; Commerce Department, 909, mostly due to 763 cotton agents who are employed at this season; National War Labor Board, 524; General Accounting Office, 646; United States Maritime Commission, 307; National Housing Agency, 228.

I have heretofore pointed out that the War Department has continued to reduce the number of civilian employees, there being a net reduction of 15,245 employees since September 30; 10,610 of this reduction is from employees of the regular services of the War Department; 3,410 is a reduction in force account employees and 1,226 is a reduction in the number of employees in terminal leave status.

The committee hopes that the War Department will continue the good work it has accomplished in reducing the number of employees.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Federal civilian employment, by department and agency for months of September and October 1943, showing increases and decreases in number of paid employees

Department or agency	September 1943	October 1943	Increase	Decrease
Office of the President [1]	577	578	1	
State Department	8,567	8,288		279
Treasury Department	84,064	84,396	332	
War Department	1,257,988	1,242,742		15,246
Justice Department	30,445	30,289		156
Post Office Department	332,207	[2] 326,043		6,164
Navy Department [3]	683,966	699,365	15,399	
Interior Department	42,758	41,118		1,640
Agriculture Department [4]	86,122	84,108		2,014
Commerce Department [5]	32,386	[6] 33,295	909	
Labor Department	6,120	6,071		49
NATIONAL WAR AGENCIES				
Committee on Fair Employment Practice	92	100	8	
Division of Central Administrative Services	4,767	4,955	188	
National War Labor Board	2,784	3,308	524	
Office of Alien Property Custodian	1,052	1,041		11
Office of Civilian Defense	1,166	1,112		54
Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs	1,340	1,311		29
Office of Defense Transportation	4,753	5,002	249	
Office of Economic Stabilization	8	7		1
Office of Lend-Lease Administration [7]	720	706		14
Office of Scientific Research and Development	1,260	1,397	137	
Office of War Information	4,590	[8] 4,876	286	
Office of War Mobilization	13	12		1
Smaller War Plants Corporation	1,505	1,591	86	
War Production Board [9]	17,513	17,232		281
War Manpower Commission [10]	26,304	25,452		852
Selective Service System	24,514	23,934		580
War Relocation Authority	1,836	1,839	3	
War Shipping Administration	3,970	4,163	193	
Foreign Economic Administration	5,048	[11] 5,563	515	
Office of Censorship	12,147	11,979		168
Office of Price Administration	55,282	54,566		716
Office of Strategic Services	1,556	1,574	18	
Petroleum Administrator for War	1,468	1,446		22

[1] Includes only Bureau of the Budget and National Resources Planning Board.

[2] Includes estimate of the number of temporary substitutes.

[3] Includes 10,324 employees of stations in the hands of the enemy.

[4] Now includes Farm Security Administration committeemen.

[5] 2,900 part-time weather observers of the Weather Bureau are now estimated on the basis of 323 full-time employees.

[6] Includes 763 cotton agents paid seasonally.

[7] Transferred to the Foreign Economic Administration.

[8] Includes 255 employees abroad not previously reported.

[9] Does not include Smaller War Plants Corporation.

[10] Includes training within industry and U. S. Employment Service. Also includes the National Youth Administration which was ordered liquidated by Dec. 31, 1943. Does not include the Selective Service System.

[11] Formerly Office of Economic Warfare. Now includes Office of Foreign Relief Rehabilitation Operations, Office of Foreign Economic Coordination, and the Lend-Lease Administration. Lend-Lease employment figures are reported separately this month.

Federal civilian employment, etc.—Continued

Department or agency	September 1943	October 1943	Increase	Decrease
INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENTS				
American Battle Monuments Commission	2	1	------	1
Board of Investigation and Research—Transportation	91	86	------	5
Civil Aeronautics Board	308	314	6	------
Civil Service Commission	6,297	6,493	196	------
Employees Compensation Commission	540	528	------	12
Export-Import Bank	60	59	------	1
Federal Communications Commission	2,184	[12] 2,228	44	------
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,116	1,101	------	15
Federal Power Commission	686	682	------	4
Federal Security Agency	31,159	[13] 31,320	161	------
Federal Trade Commission	466	465	------	1
Federal Works Agency [14]	22,506	22,252	------	254
General Accounting Office	9,621	10,267	646	------
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,178	2,158	------	20
Maritime Commission	8,986	9,293	307	------
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	4,373	4,440	67	------
National Archives	344	343	------	1
National Capital Housing Authority	262	274	12	------
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	19	19	0	0
National Gallery of Art	248	257	9	------
National Housing Agency	20,304	20,532	228	------
National Labor Relations Board	795	788	------	7
National Mediation Board	96	93	------	3
Panama Canal	34,326	33,638	------	688
Railroad Retirement Board	1,572	1,560	------	12
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	8,376	7,776	------	600
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,263	1,251	------	12
Smithsonian Institution	405	418	13	------
Tariff Commission	301	301	0	0
Tax Court of the United States, The	127	121	------	6
Tennessee Valley Authority	27,075	26,235	------	840
Veterans' Administration [15]	46,209	46,316	107	------
Total	2,971,183	2,961,068	20,644	30,759
Net decrease	----------	----------	------	10,115

[12] Part-time and Hawaiian employees are estimated.
[13] Includes Howard University and Columbia Institute employees not previously reported.
[14] Does not include project workers.
[15] Includes force account employees and fee basis doctors not previously reported.

NOTE.—Employment figures now reported to the committee include dollar-per-annum employees and without-compensation employees of the consultant type who are allowed per diem in lieu of subsistence.

AMERICAN POLICY ON COMMERCIAL AVIATION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have in my hand an important joint statement by Alvanley Johnson, grand chief engineer, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, and A. F. Whitney, president, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, regarding American policy of commercial aviation. A copy of this statement has been given to each member of the Senate Committee on Commerce and to each member of the House Committee on Interstate Commerce. The statement is a most timely and challenging one. I wish to commend it to the study and earnest consideration of every Member of the Senate. The statement is of such importance that I ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

That post-war development of international air commerce will have a far-reaching effect upon our world society and the future of America is regarded as a major post-war certainty by nearly everyone. We believe that the time has come when our Government should assume a leading part in the shaping of America's future international and domestic air-transport policy. We believe that there should be a thorough public discussion of this important problem, and that its solution should not be left entirely to diplomatic negotiations. The people of the United States should move now to formulate and establish a comprehensive policy.

The urgency of this question is suggested by certain recent developments. In January 1943 the President appointed an interdepartmental committee to study our international air policy, past and present, and report recommendations. Meanwhile, it is reported that Britain has already formulated an empire policy. An imperial conference on the subject has been held.

We have given thought and study to the questions involved as they relate to labor, transportation service, national defense, and post-war peace. The following are our conclusions:

1. That present international and domestic laws which provide complete control and full air sovereignty for American and foreign international air transport are satisfactory; but the Congress in connection with further development of national policy should give consideration to and explore the legal possibilities of providing that all licenses issued to foreign-flag air lines contain adequate provision for the protection of American wage standards.

2. That American international air lines should not engage in domestic air traffic in the United States and American domestic air lines should not engage in international air traffic. Foreign-flag air lines should be licensed by our Government to discharge and pick up traffic only at gateway airports in the United States.

3. That international and domestic air transport should continue under strict Federal regulation.

4. That steamship lines, railroads, bus, and truck corporations and/or their subsidiaries and/or their holding companies, singly or collectively, should not be permitted to operate or control any air line.

5. That to protect America's position and to compete effectively in the post-war world against the great foreign air-line monopolies, the United States should concentrate its national effort in a single strong American-flag air line, organized according to a Government-approved plan, and in the private ownership of which all American transportation interests may be represented.

The present war has seen the development of air power as a third major branch of the military. Nations heretofore have competed principally in the building up of armies and navies. We have now three-dimensional warfare. If the United Nations fail to establish the machinery to a secure world peace, then a key issue in the preparation for the inevitable world war No. 3 will be that of air policy. Therefore, considerations of international air policy are not alone simple considerations of labor policy as such and of maximum service at minimum cost. International (and also domestic) air-transport policy is inextricably enmeshed with the issue of national safety and of war and peace.

"Sovereignty of the skies" describes the system under which all international air transport has been developed. It established that each nation shall have full authority or "sovereignty" over the air space above its own territorial domain. Under this system air lines carrying the American flag are now leading in the field of international air commerce. This principle means that foreign air lines cannot land, refuel, and do business in this country or fly their planes over it except as authorized in a specific franchise.

The term "Freedom of the air" would seem to imply the right of the international air carriers of all nations to fly anywhere and land anywhere and do business anywhere on the face of the earth without restriction of national boundaries. The British interests, who are now the leading exponents of the principle, have broken down the definition into three parts: First, the freedom of peaceful transit over all territories for the aircraft of all nations; secondly, the free access to airports and other air facilities; thirdly, the freedom to transport international traffic, including goods and passengers, under any flag from any point of origin to any destination.

In general we believe that the unsettled international situation and the unpredictable ultimate results of post-war peace plans call for a continued maintenance, in fact a "freezing," of our policy. We are therefore opposed to any relaxation of our present control of our air space. For the present we must consider complete sovereignty of the air as a necessary principle of national safety. Until the machinery of past-war peace has been designed and made operative it would be unrealistic, in fact national folly, to barter away any military and commercial protection or advantage which sovereignty now gives the United States.

Services of international and domestic air lines should terminate at gateway ports. Our American rail carriers, as well as domestic air carriers, must continue to receive their full share of the international traffic entering or leaving the United States. To that end, foreign air lines should be licensed by our Government, as at present, to discharge and pick up traffic only at gateway airports. Our American international transport service also should serve only such border airports. Domestic air lines should at the same time be restricted to interior services. Thus the present successful practice can be continued under which both American international and foreign-flag air-transport services serve as end-on connecting carriers with all types of American domestic transportation at gateway ports.

Federal regulation of both international and domestic commercial air transport should be continued. In the domestic field Federal policy should encourage reasonable competition and aim at service at a reasonable cost. In the international field the Government should not only regulate for these purposes but encourage development of American flag service in the interest of national defense as well.

The idea of a monopoly is repugnant to the people of America. This is a popular attitude, born of experience. While we support the principle of economically regulated competition in the field of domestic transportation, that policy cannot be practically applied in the domain of international air transport. There is every indication that American international air transport will be compelled to meet foreign monopolistic competition—a situation over which this Government has no control. This competition, for obvious reasons, must be met in kind.

Our international air transport service must be operated as a unit.

High wage standards are essential in a highly skilled industry like air transportation. Government policy should be devoted to the support of such standards and the protection of the American carrier, maintaining them against cheap labor of foreign powers. Such a policy will react to maintain wage standards in all other forms of transportation and the American standard of living. We have, therefore, suggested in point 1 above that the Congress study this problem.

It is by no means certain that the United Nations will be able to agree on a "decent and durable peace" after the Axis Powers are defeated. In any event, until such a peace is assured the American people should not sink their Navy; junk, abandon, or sell their merchant marine; barter away our large reserves of aircraft, or in any way relinquish their present advantages in commercial aeronautics and military air power.

Our No. 1 post-war objective is a just and a stable peace. The above outlined policies should be subordinate to this grand objective. Any projected plans for a secure peace will involve the knotty question of national sovereignty. Let's see the blueprints of the peace before we throw away any of the valuable tools which we can use to build it or any of the useful weapons which we must defensively keep if we cannot attain it.

CONTRACT TERMINATION—ADDRESS BY UNDER SECRETARY OF THE NAVY JAMES FORRESTAL

[Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on contract termination and related subjects delivered by Under Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal, at the University of Pennsylvania, November 23, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

OPPORTUNITY IN THE WEST FOR VETERANS—ARTICLE BY HON. HAROLD L. ICKES

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Veterans—Here's Your Empire," written by Hon. Harold L. Ickes, and published in the New York Herald-Tribune of December 5, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL TRIBUTE TO SENATOR McCARRAN BY THE INGLEWOOD (CALIF.) DAILY NEWS

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial paying tribute to Senator McCARRAN from the Inglewood (Calif.) Daily News of November 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY—STATEMENT BY DR. CLINTON N. HOWARD

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on juvenile delinquency made by Dr. Clinton N. Howard, editorial of Progress magazine and general superintendent of the International Reform Federation before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, December 2, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PLATFORM OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the platform adopted by the National Grange at its seventy-seventh annual meeting, at Grand Rapids, Mich., November 18, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARMY CONSTRUCTION WORK IN HAWAII—RADIO ADDRESS BY FULTON LEWIS, JR.

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address by Fulton Lewis, Jr., on the subject of Army construction work in Hawaii, made on December 2, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOHN CLIFFORD FOLGER—ARTICLE FROM FINANCE

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding John Clifford Folger, from the July 25, 1943, number of Finance, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESERVATION OF JEWISH PEOPLE IN EUROPE

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an appeal from the chief rabbi of the Holy Land on behalf of the remaining Jews in Europe, which appears in the Appendix.]

SILVER: A METAL OF GROWING IMPORTANCE—ARTICLE FROM THE MINING CONGRESS JOURNAL

[Mr. McCARRAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Silver: A Metal of Growing Importance," published in the Mining Congress Journal of November 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMENT BY LEXINGTON (KY.) HERALD ON SPEECH BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. CHANDLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial written by Tom Underwood, editor of the Lexington (Ky.) Herald, in tribute to an address by Hon. James A. Farley delivered at a Thoroughbred Club dinner, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PRIVATE MORRIS APPLEBAUM BY HERMAN GOLDSTEIN

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem by Herman Goldstein, written in Africa in tribute to the memory of his comrade, Morris Applebaum, killed in action at the front, which appears in the Appendix.]

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, and so forth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that committee amendments be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—General appropriations—Legislative," on page 2, after line 2, to insert:

SENATE

To enable the Secretary of the Senate to expend from the appropriation for "Salaries of officers and employees of the Senate," fiscal year 1944, the necessary amount to increase from $3,600 per annum to $4,200 per annum, beginning December 1, 1943, the salary of the chief bookkeeper so long as the position is held by the present incumbent, and the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, hereby is amended accordingly.

PAY OF NONOPERATING RAILWAY EMPLOYEES

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I should like to give notice that I shall move to make the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 91) to aid in effectuating the purposes of the Railway Labor Act the order of business after the appropriation bill shall have been disposed of.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have talked with the Senator from Missouri about the joint resolution, and we have an understanding with reference to it. I explained to the Senator, and I will explain further to the Senate, that I have no objection to making the joint resolution the unfinished business.

Mr. TRUMAN. I ask the Senator to let me finish my statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. Certainly.

Mr. TRUMAN. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who sat a part of the time as chairman of the subcommittee which heard the testimony, has requested that the joint resolution be not brought up for action until tomorrow. I should like to have the joint resolution made the unfinished business after the appropriation bill shall have been concluded.

Mr. BARKLEY. I explained to the Senator from Missouri that I am willing to have it made the unfinished business today after we finish whatever is necessary to be done today.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. BARKLEY. With the understanding that it will not be taken up for consideration until Thursday. It is not contemplated that we will have a session tomorrow. I will say to the Senator that the Banking and Currency Committee is in session every day all day on the commodity credit bill; the Finance Committee is in session all day on the tax bill; and it is desired that members of those two committees have a little time to attend the sessions. I thought no harm would come if the joint resolution were made the unfinished business today, and should go over until Thursday.

Mr. TRUMAN. I have no objection to that, if I may have the assurance of the distinguished leader of the majority that the joint resolution will be the unfinished business on Thursday.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will see, so far as I am concerned, that the Senate does not adjourn today until the Senator from Missouri has had opportunity to move to take up the resolution, with the understanding that we have just spoken about as to when it shall really be taken up for consideration.

Mr. TRUMAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The understanding, if I caught it aright, was that the joint resolution would go over until Thursday?

Mr. BARKLEY. That it would go over until Thursday.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Green	Overton
Austin	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bailey	Gurney	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Robertson
Barkley	Hawkes	Russell
Bridges	Hayden	Scrugham
Buck	Hill	Shipstead
Burton	Holman	Smith
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lodge	Tobey
Caraway	Lucas	Truman
Chandler	McCarran	Tunnell
Chavez	McClellan	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maybank	Walsh, Mass.
Davis	Mead	Walsh, N. J.
Downey	Millikin	Wheeler
Eastland	Moore	Wherry
Ellender	Murdock	White
Ferguson	Murray	Willis
George	Nye	Wilson
Gerry	O'Daniel	

Mr. HILL I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is detained on public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are asent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

THE READER'S DIGEST AND SENATOR BUTLER'S TRIP TO SOUTH AND CENTRAL AMERICA

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the unfair and humiliating position in which an American periodical, the Reader's Digest, has placed the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

This Senator recently made a trip to South America and submitted what were supposedly his impressions to this body in the form of Senate Document 132.

Unfortunately for the senior Senator from Nebraska he was not aware of the extent to which the editors of the Reader's Digest were abusing his trust and employing his personal prestige to foist on America and the world a mass of misinformation.

The Senator's trip was, in fact, undertaken under the auspices of the Reader's Digest. He was accompanied on his trip by a Mr. Maurice K. Mumford, a member of the Reader's Digest research staff.

As a rewrite man to put the Senator's report into acceptable magazine form, the Reader's Digest utilized the service of Dr. Stanley High.

Dr. Stanley High was, in fact, for a few months in 1936, employed by the Democratic National Committee, as a sort of secret weapon against Gov. Alf M. Landon, of Kansas.

His good-neighbor league—a happy choice of names—was a sort of political bazooka or Republican tank destroyer, in which we did not have to worry about the recoil or "kick back." Shortly after the election, Dr. High went his way and eventually popped up as a specialist in ghost writing magazine articles for the opposition party.

It is no criticism of the senior Senator from Nebraska that he did not realize that the editors of the Reader's Digest were making a cynical application of the opinion of another Butler, Samuel Butler, that "The great pleasure of a dog is that you may make a fool of yourself with him and not only will he not scold you, but he will make a fool of himself, too."

The Senator from Nebraska had a good time in the course of his trip, in which he visited 20 countries in 60 days and relied on the Reader's Digest and Mr. Mumford to take care of the facts. He felt he was in safe hands.

He ought to have been in safe hands and would have been, if the Digest had remained true to the ideals of Mr. and Mrs. DeWitt Wallace, who founded it. A whole generation of young Americans learned to rely on the Digest as a compact and objective presentation of facts and ideas worth knowing.

In the years of its growth, the Reader's Digest played fair with its readers by not playing politics with its influence. However, as so often happens, financial success and an immense circulation infected the Reader's Digest with a political bias, and for some time now this magazine has devoted itself to the purpose of overthrowing the present administration.

This is robbing it of its influence as a guide to American thought and has put it in the position of managing a cartel of information—an international cartel, with its Spanish and Portuguese, and other foreign-language editions, and with all but a handful of regular American magazines dependent on the Reader's Digest subsidies for financial solvency.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] undoubtedly did not realize the facts of the case when he went to South America, under such sponsorship, and undoubtedly did not realize that what the Digest wanted was not the real facts but facts which it might use against Roosevelt, against the New Deal, without heed for the effect on the good-neighbor policy, the foreign relations, and the international friendships cultivated by this administration.

So the Senator went, saw, and returned. He, himself, is modest about his qualifications. He admits that he had only visited Cuba and Mexico for short trips prior to his Reader's Digest tour. He does not claim to speak Spanish, Portuguese, nor any of the Indian languages currently spoken in Latin-America.

But his own comments in the report show him to be a man of singular powers of observation. Of Mexico he says, "Mexico is a land of beautiful mountains, colors, contrasts, and resources;" of El Salvador, that "This little country is picturesque." In Honduras he observes that "banana plants grow to a height of 20 feet," and of Colombia that "it is full of mountains."

The Senator from Nebraska reports that Chile is "long and narrow," that Uruguay "is almost entirely surrounded by water." Luckier than most, he locates two "Chicagos" on the east coast of South America.

"Sao Paulo (Brazil)," he says, "is the Chicago of the east coast of South America." Two pages later he remarks that "Buenos Aires is the Chicago of the east coast of South America." And in Santo Domingo he reports that "some of the best fishing is to be found off its coasts," while at Cuba he finds that "Morro Castle is located in Habana."

These observations are fresh and original and show what we might have expected if the Senator from Nebraska—who noted with distaste that alcoholism and prostitution are rife in Central America, after his research in that region—had not relied on the Reader's Digest for his facts.

O Mr. President, in all innocence and all good faith, the senior Senator from Nebraska went out for a hayride with Dr. Stanley High, Mr. Maurice K. Mumford, and Mr. DeWitt Wallace, of the Reader's Digest—and now he finds himself compelled to walk home.

That is because the editors of this cartel of information forgot another saying by Samuel Butler—no doubt a relative of Senator HUGH A. BUTLER—that "any fool can tell the truth, but it re-

quires a man of some sense to know how to lie well."

In this dubious company the Senator was hurried on the Blue network with a speech in which—and I hold the press release in my hands as I speak—he declared that President James G. Blaine initiated the Pan American Union.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GUFFEY. Some of us can remember the 1884 election, when "Blaine, Blaine, James G. Blaine, the continental liar from the State of Maine," was beaten by Grover Cleveland.

That was a close election and for some days there was doubt as to which candidate had been elected, but apparently news has not yet reached the research staff of the Reader's Digest that Cleveland and not Blaine became President of the United States.

It is true that, later on, when the Senator from Nebraska discovered this fact, he made a correction which now stands in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for November 29, 1943. The Reader's Digest should have saved him from this humiliation.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I will not yield until I finish my remarks.

The Reader's Digest exposed him to other ridicule. They have him giving the population of the Republic of Cuba, twice as 4,000,000, once as 44,164,000—a difference of more than 1,000 percent.

They, the editors of the Reader's Digest, put the senior Senator from Nebraska in the position of speaking of 30,000 pounds of rubber, when the correct figure was 20,000,000 pounds.

In this way they induce the Senator from Nebraska to charge that the rubber from Brazil costs us $500 a pound, as against 6 cents a pound before the war. Of course, the actual cost before Pearl Harbor was about 24 cents in the East Indies, where 98 percent of our rubber originated. Back in the period from 1910 to 1912, before plantation rubber came on the market and we depended on Brazil for wild rubber, the price was from $1 to $3 a pound. As recently as 1925 the price of rubber from the eastern plantations was $1.10 a pound. In 1932 and early 1933 it was only 4 cents a pound. This was when corn was 4 cents a bushel on Nebraska farms.

When Roosevelt pulled the world out of depression in 1933 the price of both corn in Nebraska and rubber in the eastern plantations rose—corn to 50 cents a bushel and rubber to 20 cents a pound.

When the Japs cut us off from the source of 98 percent of our supply of rubber we had to turn to wild rubber as the chief source of crude to mix with our synthetic. It costs several times as much to gather wild rubber as to gather plantation rubber. But adding in all costs, it seems that the wild rubber is costing us less than $1 a pound. One dollar a pound is much less than $500. Judging from these figures, the Reader's Digest apparently assayed out about one-fifth of 1 percent accurate for Senator BUTLER.

The Reader's Digest notes on the Senator's impressions of Mexico are even more humiliating to the Senator from Nebraska. Mr. Mumford has the Senator state that the American Embassy staff in Mexico City is first 674 and later 647—a small difference—and this puts the Senator in the position of listing among the Mexican complaints against the activities of the United States Government in Mexico that "the area of Mexico is one-fifth that of the United States but only 11 percent arable," and that the Mexican "population is increasing and now is close to 20,000,000."

Even with a large and extremely busy staff in our embassy, I doubt that the Mexican people believe that we can enlarge the size of Mexico or materially and rapidly increase their population figures.

And it seems to me rather sinister that the staff of the Reader's Digest should have put even so obliging a Senator as the honorable gentleman from Nebraska in the position of stating that health is one of the basic problems of Latin America and then complaining and criticizing our Government for attempting to improve public health conditions in Latin America.

I think I can detect the fine hand of that "political bazooka," Dr. Stanley High, in the complaint that—

> The health projects in Latin America include health centers, building hospitals, water supply systems, clinics, sewage systems, nurses' training, floating dispensaries, child-welfare centers, maternity centers, roving doctor squads, and several other types of health and welfare activities.

And I do not for one moment believe that the Senator from Nebraska is personally responsible for the statement in this Reader's Digest report that "they—the Latin-Americans—like it when we show them the meaning of the word 'tough'."

Finally, of course, is the total cost of all this, which the Senator—or Mr. Mumford—or Dr. Stanley High—or Mr. DeWitt Wallace—has clung to so vociferously in the article which Dr. High wrote for the Digest under the signature of Hugh Butler and which also appears in the radio broadcast which Mr. Maurice K. Mumford delivered via the senatorial tonsils on the Blue Network. I am referring to the famous $6,000,000,000, which we have heard so much about.

The editors of the Reader's Digest list the items of expenditure, citing as source material things they read in the newspapers and things which somebody told them over the telephone.

To get their figures, they also include the operating cost of running the Panama Canal, our annual purchases of sugar from Cuba, and the military pay rolls of our armed forces stationed in various parts of Latin America.

In my opinion, Mr. President, the editors of the Reader's Digest owe an apology not only to the Senator from Nebraska, whom they have made to appear as an international fool, not only to the Senate of the United States, one of whose Members the editors of the Digest have turned into the innocent conduit for unconscionable lies, but to the government and people of every friendly American nation, including the United States of America.

It is not for me to attribute motive, or to guess that the editor of the Digest hopes by overthrowing this administration to be relieved of a part of his income tax, or that he may have decided to cultivate pro-Axis circulation for his Spanish edition in the Argentine, but it is a matter of legitimate concern when a periodical which has become a cartel of information, subsidizing other periodicals throughout the Nation, and representing abroad the opinions of the people of this Nation through its many foreign-language editions, should seize upon a freshman Senator and make him the cat's paw in a bit of journalistic ghost writing which brings joy to the heart of every Axis agent in this hemisphere and is welcomed with delight by the Ramirez regime in the Argentine Republic. Our Ambassador to Chile, the Honorable Claude Bowers, reports officially that the appearance of this Digest article has led to anger and repudiation by newspapers and political leaders in that progressive-minded Republic. The State Department is undoubtedly in receipt of similar messages from our embassies and legations in other Latin-American republics.

I am fully prepared, Mr. President, to introduce a resolution requesting our great Secretary of State Cordell Hull, of Tennessee, to make available to this body all dispatches bearing on this incident and also on the extent to which the Reader's Digest have requested and obtained the aid of this Government in securing distribution of its Spanish and Portuguese editions in South and Central America. I hesitate to do so only because I wish to afford an opportunity to the Senator from Nebraska, who is the injured party in this monstrous abuse of his confidence and the public's good faith—to demand himself a public investigation. He owes it to himself, his party, and his country to demand an inquiry into all the circumstances under which he was befooled and befuddled into making his simple-hearted honesty of purpose into a tool and toy of a power-crazed publisher who has shown by this deed that he, as proprietor of the Reader's Digest, is willing to torpedo the solidarity of the Western Hemisphere and besmirch the leaders of the western republics if thereby he can contribute to the defeat of President Roosevelt's magnificent administration in the forthcoming national elections of 1944.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any documentary testimony submitted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee or to the Senate Finance Committee on this subject, as well as the text of this speech, be incorporated, as a part of Senate Document 132.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I did not understand

what the unanimous-consent request was. Will the Senator repeat it, please?

Mr. GUFFEY. I asked that my speech be included as a part of the matter which the Senator from Nebraska obtained unanimous consent the other day to have printed as Senate Document 132.

Mr. WHITE. Let me ask what Senate Document 132 is?

Mr. GUFFEY. The description by the Senator from Nebraska of his trip to South America.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I shall object until I have had a chance further to peruse the language used by the Senator from Pennsylvania, which I think in several aspects violates the rules of the Senate.

Mr. BUTLER obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BARKLEY. In that connection Mr. President, I am sorry the Senator from Michigan did not request a similar opportunity, the other day, in order that he might peruse the report of the Senator from Nebraska which contained many statements not in accordance with the facts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to reply at this time to the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I regret that it was impossible, or impracticable at least, in my estimation for me to be present when the Senator from Pennsylvania commenced reading his statement. I may say for the RECORD that I was busy checking the proof of Senate Document 132, which the Senator has mentioned. In fact, the proof has not as yet been thoroughly checked. I am doing the checking myself, personally. Being a member of the Finance Committee and the Banking and Currency Committee, my time has been rather fully occupied of late, and I do the proof checking at whatever opportunities are afforded me. That is the reason why I was not in the Chamber when the Senator from Pennsylvania commenced reading his statement.

Mr. President, I intend to make no reply at the moment to the Senator's statement. I doubt if I ever shall. However, I think it proper to say at this moment that I did not confer with a single Member on this side of the aisle or a single Member on the other side of the aisle with reference to the trip I made to South America. Neither was it in my mind to become an author or a specialist or an expert on South America, and I so stated in every statement I made publicly. I have been intensely interested in Latin-American affairs for a great many years, having spent weeks at a time in Mexico and Cuba. My recent trip was my first one to South America, however. Again I state that I do not pose as an expert, after spending a few weeks there.

In regard to the gentlemen the Senator from Pennsylvania has mentioned as having had something to do with planning my trip and organizing the statements, and so forth, I have never seen some of the gentlemen he has mentioned. I would not know them if they should appear in this Chamber today. I would have to be introduced to them.

So someone—either the Senator or someone who has prepared a statement for him—is simply "off" so far as those facts are concerned.

Furthermore, let me say that statements released by the Coordinator's office, or some other department of the Government, following the introduction of my report the other day, have been grossly exaggerated so far as my personal attitude toward the Latin-American countries is concerned. I would wager that personally I stand as well with those who represent the governments in Latin America as does any other Member of the Senate, or any man who poses as representing the United States Government. I know that from letters which I have received since the broadcast was released the other day. I am beginning to receive letters from those who have spent their lives in Latin America. I want it distinctly understood that I cast no slur against anyone in Latin America. When I shall have had time to review the statement of the Senator from Pennsylvania, which contains some rather unpronounceable words, perhaps I shall have something further to say in reply.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, for the information of the Senator from Nebraska and other Members of the Senate, let me say that since 1918 I have been in Mexico, Central America, Panama, Colombia, and Venezuela a great many times. I have had mining interests and oil business in Mexico, Venezuela, and Colombia. I think I am fairly familiar with the mind of the Latin American and South American. For that reason I thought someone should deny some of the statements made by the Senator from Nebraska in the Senate document, and in the broadcast release. There are many inaccuracies in those documents.

We are trying to build up good will. I was in Central and South America when the situation with respect to good will was very bad indeed. I am glad to say that since that time the good-neighbor policy has resulted in a change in the attitude of Mexican and South American peoples. I hope the improvement will continue. I am fearful of the damage done by the article of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the other day I stated that I had asked all the departments in Washington concerned with expenditures in Latin America, including the expenditure of moneys out of any fund at the disposal of the President, to furnish me accurate information as to every dollar which has been expended there, and for what purpose it has been expended. When that information is obtained I shall seek to have it made a Senate document. Until that information is obtained, I see no particular purpose in making a Senate document of anything else which any Senator may say because, to use the language used by Chief Justice Hughes in the so-called sick chicken case, it might be subject to a fatal infirmity.

Ex-parte statements about anyone's trip to South America, or anywhere else, may be subject to the fatal infirmity that they may be wrong, exaggerated, or for other reasons inaccurate. When we obtain the accurate information, I hope to be able to make a Senate document of it, which will not be subject to the fatal infirmity to which I have referred. In the meantime, it seems to me, we might let the matter rest where it is.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator from Kentucky has made a good suggestion. I believe that the information with regard to these expenditures should be made a Senate document. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that he will have the information as to all the expenditures of the Office of Inter-American Affairs and the Rubber Supply Corporation made public?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have asked for information from every Government agency, from the White House down, as to all the expenditures, and for what purpose they have been made, over the period covered by the statement of the Senator from Nebraska, which period, I think, embraced 3 years.

Mr. AIKEN. If those expenditures are listed in detail in a Senate document, I do not see what more we can ask.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that would be fair to the Senate, fair to the Government, fair to Central and South America, fair to everyone else, and fair to the truth.

That is all I have to say on the subject.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—PERSONAL STATEMENTS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on Sunday the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] issued a newspaper statement with respect to the passage of the Eastland-McKellar-McClellan soldiers' voting bill which contained deliberate misstatements.

He charged that (a) northern Republicans, under the leadership of Joe Pew, and southern Democrats, under the leadership of HARRY BYRD, had conspired to deprive the armed services of America of the right to vote; and (b) that this alleged conspiracy was the "most unpatriotic and unholy alliance that has occurred in the United States Senate since the League of Nations for peace of the world was defeated in 1919."

This statement was a gratuitous insult to 24 Democratic Senators and 18 Republican Senators, who voted their convictions in support of the soldiers' voting bill. I have reliable information that this misleading statement will be sent through various Government agencies to the members of the armed services at home and in various parts of the world. This will be done, I am told, under the guise of information to the soldiers, but the official dissemination of this misleading charge against United

States Senators is a contemptible and indefensible act.

It is but natural that the soldier who receives such a statement will believe that the facts alleged are true, and, unless he receives at the same time a contradiction of the charges falsely made, he will be led to believe that something evil has been done in the United States Senate; that some sinister political chicanery has been accomplished for the purpose of depriving him of his right to vote; and that this has been done not by fair and proper means, but by trickery.

This charge made against 42 Members of the Senate, Mr. GUFFEY did not have the courage and fairness to make on the Senate floor in the presence of those he maligned and misrepresented.

Never before, Mr. President, have I risen on the floor of the Senate to answer an attack made upon me, but never in my 10 years of service in the Senate has the provocation been so great as in this instance. There is not one iota of truth in a single part of the statement made by Senator GUFFEY as relating to me or my vote. I do not even know Joe Pew, and never had any communication with him, directly or indirectly. Senator GUFFEY'S charge of an "unpatriotic and unholy alliance" can have no other purpose than to mislead the public and the soldiers and to inject partisanship and bitter feeling in the efforts that every Senator is making to see that the soldiers have the right and opportunity to vote in the coming election.

The charge that northern Republicans, under Pew, and southern Democrats, under me, adopted the Eastland-McKellar-McClellan voting bill is, on the record itself, completely inaccurate. If Senator GUFFEY had taken the trouble to investigate the facts, he would have found that of the 42 votes cast in favor of this legislation, 17 were cast by southern Democrats and 6 by northern Republicans, making a total of 23, or less than one-third of those Senators voting. The balance of 19 votes came from 4 northern Democrats, 3 western Democrats, and 12 western Republicans.

I am further informed that this statement will be distributed as coming from Senator GUFFEY, the chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Committee, thereby giving a prestige and importance to the statement which it does not deserve. Senator GUFFEY is not, in my judgment, the choice of the Democrats of the United States Senate for chairman of the senatorial committee. He was never elected to this office. He was appointed. For some years he has been strutting around like a pouter pigeon in the reflected glory of an honor, in the administration of which he has shown very barren results.

In a newspaper interview accompanying his prepared statement, and which was generally printed, it was reported that Senator GUFFEY threatened to resign his position as chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Committee in protest against the action of the United States Senate in adopting a voting bill which he does not think will be as politically effective to his interests as the one he advocated. I want to say, Mr. President, that the sooner Mr. GUFFEY resigns from this position the better it will be for the Democratic Party. I say further that his successor should not be appointed, but should be elected by the Democratic Members of the Senate.

In all my experience in the affairs of the United States Senate I have never known a more deliberately offensive or a more untruthful charge to be made against a group of fellow Senators than this charge made by Senator GUFFEY.

I demand, Mr. President, that the Senator from Pennsylvania, JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, either prove the charge he has made, or rescind his statement. I will await his action.

Mr. President, I emphatically deny that the Eastland-McKellar-McClellan voting bill would deprive the members of the armed forces of America of the right to vote, as charged by Mr. GUFFEY. On the contrary, the purpose of the bill was to sustain the Constitution of America, and the constitutional control of elections. I do not believe that the boys who are fighting and dying in foreign lands to preserve the free institutions of America desire us at home to violate the Constitution of the United States. I speak as one who has three sons—all I have—in the armed services; one a private, one a sergeant, and one a lieutenant.

The bill as passed provides that the distribution and return of absentee ballots be expedited by the Federal Government. It further provides that the States deliver post cards to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy for transmittal to voters within the armed services wishing to apply for absentee ballots. With such Federal cooperation there would be no valid excuse for failure of the States to modify their laws governing elections, and, as I have said, there is plenty of time for the States to act.

I emphatically deny that the right of soldiers to vote in the election next November cannot be properly provided for by the action of the 48 States, in accordance with constitutional provisions. The States' rights of control over elections have never been successfully challenged in Congress. With the cooperation of the Federal Government in supplementing the machinery of elections as established by the States, suitable regulations can, and, I feel confident, will, be established by every State in the Union so that the soldiers will have an opportunity to cast their ballots.

A State can waive registration of its citizens in the armed services; it can change any and all barriers which now exist to voting by soldiers in the armed services. But under the Constitution of the United States, only the State and not the Federal Government can do so. Eleven months will elapse before the next election. There is ample time for the States to simplify absentee soldier voting, and to eliminate any barriers which now exist. It is my hope that, if necessary, a conference of Governors will be held so that uniform regulations may be adopted in each State, and I have urged the Governor of Virginia, Colgate Darden, to initiate a movement to secure uniform voting regulations among the States.

Instead of depriving the soldiers of a vote by the passage of the Eastland-McKellar-McClellan voting legislation, the voting privileges of soldiers would in fact, be enlarged by State control. Under the voting bill advocated by GUFFEY, the soldier could vote only for the President, Vice President, a Member of the Senate, and a Member of the House. He would be deprived of voting, under this machinery, for the Governor of his State, for all State officials, and for all local officials, although many of those officials will be elected in the election of next fall. Under a uniform plan of voting established by the States, a soldier could vote not only for Federal officials, but for his Governor and local officials, all at the same time.

I have full confidence that with the action taken by the Senate, the 48 States can be relied upon to perform the responsibility of the States, and to see that all soldiers in the armed services are given an opportunity to vote, not only for Federal officials but for State and local officials as well.

Mr. President, no Member of the Senate is more anxious that I to afford the privilege of voting to those who are serving in our armed forces. They should have such privilege, and they should have it under the Constitution. It should be made as simple as it is possible to make it, and any red tape or unnecessary restrictions should be eliminated. We should provide whatever machinery is necessary to allow the soldiers to fulfill their desire to exercise their privilege of voting in the elections next November.

(On request of Mr. EASTLAND, and by unanimous consent, the following speech subsequently delivered by Mr. BAILEY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD at this point, immediately following the speech by Mr. BYRD:)

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I rise to tender my thanks, my hearty and unreserved commendation, to the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] for his timely, his true, and his just but extraordinary remarks in the Senate today. I should feel that I were neither true to him and to the friendship which he deserves from me, nor true to myself, if I did not take my stand with him, and commend him with all my heart.

Consider the situation. Consider the accuser—and I do not intend to violate the rule of the Senate. I read the rule just now, and I shall keep within the bounds of it. Consider the accuser and consider the accused—a satyr to Hyperion.

Here is the Senator from Virginia, a man still in the prime of life, who has been Governor of his State, a leader of his party, an ornament to a great civilization there in Virginia 30 years and more. No man ever laid a charge against him. No man ever will. Here in the Senate he has borne himself in the high-minded character of a Roman Senator.

I wish to assure the Senator from Virginia that I do not think accusations from any source could affect him in his State or amongst the American people.

We know him, we love him, and we honor him.

Now I wish to say something for myself. I am one of the accused; but I am not greatly concerned. According to the accuser, I am guilty of having entered into an unholy alliance led by the Senator from Virginia and a Mr. Pew, of Pennsylvania. Well, that seems pretty bad. That is a terrible thing. But I plead before the Senate that at any rate I am not guilty of a holy alliance with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania. I think so long as that may be said I can be acquitted of many accusations and many imputations.

Something was said about southern Senators, and I know one of the Presidential candidates from the opposition in referring to the passage of the Connally-Smith bill, by way of a slur upon southern Senators, said that it was put through by southern Senators.

Mr. President, what is wrong with being a southern Senator? Why should anyone lay it to your account, Senator, or mine, or yours, or yours, or yours, or yours, or yours, or yours, or yours, or yours, or yours, or yours—that we are southern Senators? Let it be said for us that we do no traise sectional issues in the Senate. Let it be said that when the hour comes we undertake to maintain the Constitution of the United States, we do not fail; and let it be said that we are not ashamed, we are proud to be called southern Senators.

Mr. President, I would remind these gentlemen who speak of us as southern Senators, these Democrats, these high lights in the party, these beneficiaries of our victories during the last 12 years—10 years or more; nearly 12—I would remind them that southern Democrats maintained the Democratic Party and kept it alive in all the long years of its exile, when it had no place in the house which our fathers had built, when it was not permitted to serve around the altars which our fathers had made holy.

Down yonder across the Potomac, and the James, and all the way to the Gulf, and beyond the Mississippi, we kept the fires burning upon the altars of our fathers and of our country, and when there was nobody else to vote in the electoral college for the Democratic candidate, southern Democrats were sending 144 votes to the electoral college; and for that we are scornfully referred to as southern Democrats.

Now, there can be an end to that sort of thing, Mr. President. I think the Senate will bear witness that I do not often talk in the Senate in terms of politics. God knows that during this war I do not intend ever to have a political thought. And here on the anniversary of Pearl Harbor I would not raise any party issue, I would not talk about party matters. But when a man's honor is attacked, whether it be on the holiest of days, and whatever his contempt may be for him who touches it, he must answer, and the junior Senator from Virginia this morning answered.

There is a remedy, Mr. President. We are southern Democrats. We are southern Senators, and we have no apologies, and no shame, and no fear. They might possibly drive us out, in which event there would never again be a man elected President of the United States on the Democratic ticket. And yet we are charged with conspiracy and unpatriotic attitude toward our country and our soldiers by a Democrat from Pennsylvania. They say we have destroyed our party, and that we are untrue to our country, and we are southern Senators, southern Democrats.

The South has borne long and has been patient. Southern Democrats have borne long and have been patient. They know where the patronage goes in the day of victory, and they know who leads the way to the trough where the pigs feed and the swill is poured out. We know we are not in the number. We can stand for a great deal of that. We can have the contrast drawn between the holiness of a northern Democrat from Pennsylvania, and the unholiness of southern Democrats from Virginia, and North Carolina, and Georgia, and South Carolina, and Texas, and Arkansas, and Louisiana, and Florida, and Mississippi.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Do not forget Alabama.

Mr. BAILEY. And Alabama.

Mr. McKELLAR rose.

Mr. BAILEY. And Tennessee; yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. If it is an unholy alliance for 24 Democrats and 18 Republicans to vote together, what sort of holiness is it when 25 Democrats and 12 Republicans vote together?

Mr. BAILEY. I just now said it was a holy alliance led by the holy junior Senator from Pennsylvania, which God forbid I should ever be found to join.

Mr. President, I will be through in a moment. I merely want to say another word, and very solemnly. They can drive us out; yes, they can drive us out. There can be an end of insults, there can be an end of toleration, there can be an end of patience. We can form a southern Democratic party and vote as we please in the electoral college, and we will hold the balance of power in this country.

We can throw the election into the House of Representatives and cast the votes of 16 States.

We have been patient. We were tried. I am not going back into that. I do not think any of us should. There is a reason why the South has voted Democratic. I will not go into that. There is a reason why the South has been patient. I will not go into that, either. But, by the eternal gods, there are men in the South, and women, too, who will not permit men in control of our party to betray or to insult us in the house of our fathers. We will assert ourselves—and we are capable of asserting ourselves—and we will vindicate ourselves; and if we cannot have a party in which we are respected, if we must be in a party in which we are scorned as southern Democrats, we will find a party which honors us, not because we are southerners, and not because of politics, but because we love our country and believe in the Constitution from which it draws its life day by day, as you, sir, draw your breath from the atmosphere round about you.

I should hate to see the time come for that, but remember, I ask Senators on both sides of the aisle, Whence comes the offense? How long shall we endure, how long shall we be patient, how long shall we forbear to assert our self-respect, to demand our rights as men and Americans, and to find our place in the sun of this our blessed land? The boys from the South have volunteered in greater numbers in this war than have the boys from any other section of the country. I do not say that boastfully. God knows I do not say it invidiously. I was rather proud when the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] told me some months ago that North Carolina had led all the list in volunteers. Am I not correct about that?

Mr. RUSSELL. According to my recollection, the Senator is correct. I saw some figures to that effect.

Mr. BAILEY. The junior Senator from Georgia reminded me of it at the luncheon table.

And now our boys are dying in Italy and in the South Seas, and many of them are soon to die in Europe, in Burma and Siam, and the islands of the far Pacific, in ships of the air and ships on the water, and on the land itself. We are a part of this country, and I know we love it. I cannot understand why our sons are doing as they are doing if they do not love it; I cannot understand why our men and women are doing as they are doing unless they love it. We are not putting on strikes. We are not making demands at the point of a gun to get increased wages. We are not holding up our country in this hour of its struggle. We are not holding back against the call to arms.

We have our rights here. We thought, at one time, we had our rights within our party. We begin to be a little skeptical of late. I make no threats, but carry that far enough——

There is more of restlessness in the Southern States today than there has been at any period within my lifetime. I am just from down there. There is more of concern and there is more of misgiving. We have our historic reasons and we have our present call. I may say to those gentlemen who may think to take some comfort here—gentlemen on the other side of the aisle—that we might go very far, but we would not ever go far enough to follow a Presidential candidate of any party which accused us of passing the Smith-Connally bill because we were southern Senators or southern Democrats.

I will say the time will come, and I think it has, when the southern people will demand that there shall be no meddling with their affairs. Our destiny is in our hands, and has been all the time, and we intend so to maintain it. There shall be no aspersions upon our honor—least of all, last of all, and most grievious of all, from the party we kept alive, from the party whose victories we have won,

and the party which could not live 5 years without our support.

So, Mr. President, I do not care anything about this insufferable business. I do not even care enough about it to consider the source. I am unwilling to consider the source. I will not consider it. I do not care anything about it. I rose here, not to deny and not to protest, and I have not denied. What do I care if from that direction I am accused of conspiracy and unpatriotism or of anything else? I have never been indicted, nor has the Senator from Virginia, for embezzlement, nor have I ever had to extricate myself from the toils of the law with money borrowed from anyone. I have never been called to account for income taxes, nor has the Senator from Virginia—income taxes 20 years overdue. I have never interpreted my party loyalty in terms of pie, either, or in spoils.

Pennsylvania has produced some lofty men—Ben Franklin, William Penn—and, then, it has produced some others—Thad Stevens, Boies Penrose, Mr. Vare, and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. REVERCOMB subsequently said: Mr. President, I had always hoped, as a Member of this body, that I would never have to become involved in personal exchanges on the floor of the Senate. However, there are times when statements are made which cannot be left unchallenged. Such an occasion has now arisen with respect to statements made by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] when he charges those who voted against the so-called Green-Lucas bill with being unpatriotic and with voting as the result of a conspiracy entered into between Mr. Pew, of Pennsylvania, and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall consume only a few minutes, Mr. President. I prefer not to yield at this time.

So far as I am concerned, that charge is false and vicious. There is not a semblance of truth in it. I want the RECORD to show that my vote was my own and was cast on the basis of my own judgment. No person tried to persuade or induce me to vote one way or the other upon the bill. So far as I know, there was no conspiracy involving any Member of the Senate of either party.

I wish to implicitly repudiate the unfair and groundless charge which Senator GUFFEY has made against other Members of this body. The conduct of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] leads me to believe that he is not so much interested in the soldiers and sailors voting as he is in voting the soldiers and sailors as he may want their votes cast. I hope the RECORD will always be clear that the vote which I cast upon that subject was my own earnest vote. And I believe that vote was right and in the best interest of those in the armed services. It was not influenced by anyone who visited this Chamber or by any agent of anyone, or by any Member of this body.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks which I have made in repudiation of that charge may appear in the RECORD following the remarks of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia has correctly read my interview.

Joe Pew's agent was on the floor of the Senate twice last week at the time the soldier's voting bill was under discussion. He is a former Senator from Delaware, and chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee. He was in conference here and in an office in the House Office Building where the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee is located.

I shall be glad to cooperate with the Senator from Virginia. If he wants my history I shall give it to him. If he wants to know where it is referred to in the Congressional Directory I will give it to him and read it into the RECORD tomorrow.

The Senator will find that in 1928 a copy of an indictment was placed in the RECORD—volume 69, part 9, May 19, 1928, page 9153—by a former Senator from the deep South who was fearful at that time that the Pope of Rome was digging a tunnel by which to come into the United States. So he thought it would scare off my support of Governor Smith if he put a copy of that indictment into the RECORD.

I will give to the Senator the history of that indictment. In 1918, when the Republicans took possession of the Senate, they appointed 35 "smelling" committees. The House had about 80. The committees investigated, and smelled and smelled. They tried "to get" the Secretary of War, Mr. Baker, and the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Benedict Crowell, of Cleveland. They tried "to get something on" the Secretary of the Navy, Josephus Daniels, and his assistant, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who is now the Commander in Chief of our armed forces. They tried "to get something on" Mitchel Palmer, who was Attorney General, and also on Francis P. Garvin, who was Alien Property Custodian. They obtained nothing. When Harry Daugherty and his Ohio gang took possession of the Government they instituted three grand jury investigations, one in Washington, one in Boston, and finally a grand jury in New York voted 12 to 11 to indict me. I was indicted for the alleged embezzlement of $408,000, which I had paid to the Government when I resigned as Alien Property Custodian on March 8, 1921. The indictment was found on the 28th day of December 1921.

During the next 2 or 3 years, in which Daugherty was Attorney General, he sent a Special Assistant Attorney General to see me and offered to nolle prosse the case if I would give him some information in regard to Mitchell Palmer, or Francis P. Garvin. Of course, I would not, and I did not, because there was nothing to give. Six or seven years later the case was nolle prossed. I never engaged a lawyer. I filed a bond. At one time a lawyer came to Pittsburgh to see me and offered, for the sum of $25,000, to have the case nolle prossed. I did not pay a cent to anyone at anytime in that connection.

If the Senator desires to be informed as to my financial successes and reverses, to which I referred in the Senate several years ago, he will find that information in the speech I then made in the Senate. I will give the Senator the reference to it. It may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 2, 1941, volume 87, part 7, page 7594 et seq.

The Senator may go as far as he desires. No threats will deter me from doing what I think is my duty. The other day I did what was in my best judgment correct, and the Senator will have to do as he thinks best.

EXTENSION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS FOR TRIALS GROWING OUT OF PEARL HARBOR DISASTER

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as soon as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, arrives on the floor, he having been called out temporarily on official business, I wish to ask the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] if he will permit me to ask that the appropriation bill be laid aside for a moment in order to pass a joint resolution which has just come over from the House of Representatives pertaining to the statute of limitations as it may apply to anybody who may be responsible for the disaster that occurred at Pearl Harbor 2 years ago today. I will not discuss it now, but when the Senator from Massachusetts comes in I should like to make that request.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that it is my intention to object to the joint resolution, because I am opposed to congressional action to connive at the postponement of the trial of Kimmel and Short so that the delay may be availed of for the purpose of protecting others.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Massachusetts has arrived on the floor. I shall wish, therefore, to ask unanimous consent in a moment for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 199, for reasons which I shall explain.

As we all know, 2 years ago today, under a 2-year statute of limitations which expires today, certain things happened at Pearl Harbor because of which Admiral Kimmel and General Short were relieved of their commands and of their duties in the Navy and Army, respectively. Statements have been made from time to time in regard to the court martial not only of those officers and of anybody else responsible for any dereliction of duty, but trial and prosecution for any dereliction of duty that might be prosecuted under the laws of the United States. Because it has been thought that to go into those matters at this time during the existence of the war might involve the revelation of information or disclosures that might affect the prosecution of the war, no proceedings have been had in regard to either prosecutions or court martial. The law under which they could be proceeded against expires today, and, if it shall expire, neither the Navy Department nor the War Department

can proceed to hold a court martial against anybody in the Army and Navy responsible for any dereliction of duty there. The joint resolution does not apply simply to those in the Army and Navy, it applies to any prosecution of anyone else, even in civil life or in any official capacity against whom the statute of limitations might expire.

The joint resolution, which contains many whereases, which, as usual, are superfluous makes this provision:

Resolved, etc., That effective as of December 7, 1943, all statutes, resolutions, laws, articles, and regulations, affecting the possible prosecution of any person or persons, military or civil, connected with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe of December 7, 1941, or involved in any other possible or apparent dereliction of duty, that operate to prevent the court martial or prosecution of any person or persons in military or civil capacity, involved in any manner in connection with the Pearl Harbor catastrophe of December 7, 1941, or involved in any other possible or apparent dereliction of duty, are hereby extended up to and including 1 calendar year after the formal declaration of peace with Japan has been officially signed and ratified by the Senate of the United States.

So what the joint resolution does is to extend for 1 year after the conclusion of peace with Japan the statute of limitations in regard to any court martial or any prosecutions. I do not see how it could possibly protect anybody else, but it would extend the time within which they could be prosecuted.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not wish to impinge on the Senator's time; I would just as lief wait and speak in my own time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The situation is that there has been disgraceful dereliction of duty on the part of the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War in not bringing Admiral Kimmel and General Short to trial in the 2 years that have elapsed. Everybody knows that all the talk which has been indulged in about the United States being caught unprepared is just hokum so far as Pearl Harbor is concerned, and that these officers, if they had been performing their duty, if they had been instructed, perhaps, by their superiors in the War and Navy Departments—but if they had been performing their duty they had at their command adequate facilities for repelling the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Now because it has been feared that what these officers might say in their own defense might cast very serious reflection on some of their superiors, because of the fear of what their defense might develop, 2 years have now been allowed to elapse without these officers being brought to trial and the facts disclosed, facts which the American people are entitled to know, but now, forsooth, on the last day before the statute runs this joint resolution is brought in under whip and spur with the suggestion that if we do not pass it without dotting an "i" or crossing a "t" the statute will run today and those officers will escape unwhipped of justice.

I assert that it is an attempt to get the Congress of the United States to take the responsibility for extending the term for the statute to run. I assert that there is plenty of time today, the last day under the present statute, for the War Department and the Navy Department to prefer charges against General Short and Admiral Kimmel and bring them to trial. I further assert that if the incident at Pearl Harbor had involved a subordinate officer, a lieutenant or a captain or a sergeant or a private, who might have been accused of fatal dereliction of duty, bringing about great disaster to the American arms and the American people, he would long since have been brought to trial, long since been court-martialed, and there would not be any necessity of extending the time of the statute. I say this whole procedure has been disgraceful.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall yield in a moment.

This is not a Senate joint resolution.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand that.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was not instituted or initiated by either the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, or anyone in either Department. The joint resolution was introduced in the House of Representatives by a member of the Republican Party who is a Member of that House, Mr. SHORT, of Missouri. Certainly it could not have been done with any purpose to protect anyone.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will permit me——

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It does not make the slightest difference to me what the auspices are.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I say that the net effect of the joint resolution is to lend congressional sanction to an absolutely disgraceful neglect of duty on the part of the War Department and the Navy Department. I am not in favor of saving the faces of the War Department and the Navy Department. We know that a court martial a year after the war is over will not amount to anything. We will have won the war by that time, and the people will say, "Why open old sores?" A year after the war Kimmel and Short will be protected, and so will their superiors for whose protection this delay has come about. If these men were to have been tried, as they should have been tried, the proper time was immediately after Pearl Harbor, certainly the trial should be proceeded with now, and every day it is postponed to my mind brings a reflection on the whole American Government. Just why we should be called on, on the last day, when the statute is about to run, to relieve the War Department and the Navy Department of their continuing responsibility I cannot see. If they do not perform their duty today, I say Secretary Stimson and Secretary Knox should be impeached. Theirs will be the responsibility for this flagrant failure of justice. They have been in dereliction of their duty for 2 years today.

Mr. BARKLEY. What the Senator from Missouri states in his remarks covers of course matters about which there is widespread difference of opinion. The joint resolution was not introduced for the purpose of condoning or protecting either the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy in regard to anything that had not happened in the last 2 years.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. Just a moment. There has been widespread discussion and widespread difference among perfectly honest and patriotic people in the United States as to whether immediate proceedings should have been instituted against the general and the admiral and other naval and Army officers. There is nothing new about it. Months and months ago both Admiral Kimmel and General Short publicly waived their right to claim the statute of limitations as a bar to any proceeding. There is a very serious doubt whether that can be done legally.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. In order that Congress might implement its desire that the expressed wish of both these high officers of the Army and Navy be complied with, the joint resolution has been offered. We need not try the question here on the floor as to whether these officers should have been court-martialed, or whether the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy have been guilty of any dereliction of duty in not instituting courts martial. The statute of limitations expires today. Unless it is extended, they cannot institute proceedings, notwithstanding the fact that the Senator from Missouri demands that that be done before sundown today.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator deny that they would have plenty of time today? The War Department and the Navy Department are fully apprised of the whereabouts of Admiral Kimmel and General Short. There is nothing on earth to prevent them preferring the charges within an hour. I am not reflecting on the purposes of the Representative who may have introduced the joint resolution, or the men and women Members of the House who may have supported it; all I say is that it is devised in order that the officers in question may not be brought to trial until it is too late to do any good. Both they and their superiors will escape justice.

Mr. BARKLEY. If Congress shall not enact the pending joint resolution or some similar resolution the time within which anything may be done will expire today.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That may be the purpose of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. My reason for mentioning the fact that the joint resolution was introduced by a Republican in the House of Representatives was to refute what seemed to be the intimation of

the Senator from Missouri that the resolution was deliberately offered in order to protect someone.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will yield, it does not make the slightest difference to me who introduced the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Or what the reference may be. I am speaking about the effect of it, and the effect of it is to relieve Knox and Stimson and possibly other superiors of responsibility for their disgraceful neglect of duty, and for Congress to accept the responsibility of postponing the court-martial proceedings until it would be too late to do any good.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not agree that it relieves them of any disgraceful or any other responsibility. It merely extends their responsibility.

I now yield to the Senator from North Carolina, who was on his feet a moment ago asking that I yield to him.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I intended to speak on another matter. However, I will say that I am in thorough sympathy with the joint resolution. We all understand why court-martial proceedings were postponed. We all understand why they may not be had now.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me say then, that most of the Senators understand why the courts martial were not proceeded with at once; most of us understand why we cannot proceed now, and all of us feel that in the interest of all parties, the Admiral and the General and the country, the Army and the Navy, there should be a full investigation. But, just as if we had undertaken it sooner, if we should undertake it now, there might be disclosures, there would surely be debate and division, which would tend to aid our enemies, and which might involve us in disclosures greatly to our detriment.

There is no dishonor in postponing the courts martial under the circumstances. It is a national necessity. But we should be very derelict if, in the effort to protect our country, we permitted the statute of limitations so to run that there could never be justice done in a matter so grave. So I am in thorough sympathy with the Senator from Kentucky and I hope the joint resolution may be passed at once.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

The first question I intended to ask him he has largely answered already, in colloquy with the Senator from Missouri.

I understand the position of the Senator from Kentucky to be that unless the joint resolution shall be passed the statute of limitations will in fact run by midnight tonight.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it the Senator's understanding that if in fact the statute of limitations should run, no court-martial proceedings could be instituted against the men named?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true.

Mr. DANAHER. Does the Senator have any doubt as to our power or authority to extend the statute of limitations to make it possible for them to answer to a charge in a court martial ex post facto?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say in reply to the Senator that there is grave doubt of our authority even now, before it expires, to extend the statute of limitations for an offense committed heretofore; but no one has objected, and I do not object, and neither the Navy Department nor the War Department objects, on any such ground as that. But certain it is that unless we pass the joint resolution before the statute of limitations expires, there will be graver doubt as to whether we can, ex post facto, revive it so as to make it continue as though it had not lapsed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Just a moment. Has the Senator from Connecticut finished?

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator. I have listened very attentively.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] has been on his feet. I yield first to him.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut has asked, in part, what was in my mind. Whether there may have been laches in the past, whether there may have been dereliction in moving against parties wrongfully involved in what happened at Pearl Harbor, would not the effect of the joint resolution be not only to extend the period of time in which proceedings might be instituted against the persons who were at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 2 years ago—admirals, generals, captains, and men of whatever rank—but is it not also true that it would extend the time in which proceedings might even be instituted against the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. BARKLEY. Undoubtedly. Let us say, for the sake of argument——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Kentucky certainly does not accede to the proposition that it is necessary to extend the time in which impeachment proceedings might be brought.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No one has ever thought of trying the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy by court martial. The only way they could be tried would be by impeachment.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that, and that is a proceeding which the Senate cannot institute.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is perfectly true.

Mr. BARKLEY. As the Senator knows, it is a proceeding in which the Senate acts as a jury.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is undoubtedly true. If it were possible to institute such proceedings in the Senate, I should be very much in favor of instituting them for this particular neglect of duty.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is thereby expressing his opinion in advance as a member of the jury.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It remains to be seen whether I should disqualify myself when such proceedings arose.

The proposition has been advanced that we must either extend the period for a year after the war ends, or let the statute run today. The Senate is still a coordinate branch of the Congress, although the House sometimes does not act as though it were, when it sends bills over here on the last day of a session and says, "They must be passed today, or dire disaster will ensue." There is nothing to prohibit the Senate from extending the time 30 days, 60 days, or 90 days, laying the proposition squarely in the laps of the War Department and the Navy Department, and saying, "You said the other day, on the 7th of December, that you did not have time to start these court-martial proceedings, but we are giving you 90 days, plenty of time to perfect your proceedings." Why is it necessary to extend the time for a year?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not conferred with the author of the joint resolution, or with any other Member of the House about it; but I assume that the reason it was provided that it should run for a year after peace with Japan is the same reason given a while ago by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], that in his judgment it would not have been proper to have instituted proceedings during the past 2 years.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, when the State Department is issuing white papers, going into the intimate details of our relations with Japan, and ex parte explanations are being made, it is perfectly preposterous to say that there would be any impairment of the war effort if we should go ahead and try these men in a legally constituted court martial, and bring out the facts.

If the Senator will permit one further word——

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is entitled to the opinion which he so vehemently expresses. However, it is not necessary for us to agree that the trial of these cases, with all the publicity and public attention they would receive while the war is actually in progress, would not be harmful.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator has no doubt that if a sergeant had been guilty of dereliction of duty in Sicily, Tunisia, or Italy, he would have been promptly brought to trial by court martial, comfort to the enemy notwithstanding.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suppose that if a sergeant occupied a position which would make any revelations about him dangerous with respect to the effect on the war, the same treatment would be accorded to a sergeant that would be accorded to a general or an admiral.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator has no doubt that the Japs know as much about Kimmel's and Short's dereliction of duty—and possibly Knox's and Stimson's—as we do. They probably know

more. They are not under the same censorship.

Mr. BARKLEY. Suppose they do. That does not affect the situation that today the statute of limitations expires. I hope the Senator's irritation at the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy will not induce him to make it impossible ever to try these men.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was about to suggest to the Senator that if there could be an understanding to amend the joint resolution by extending the time for 90 days, or any other reasonable period, I should be glad to accede to such an arrangement. Otherwise, so far as the joint resolution is concerned, I intend to object to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Missouri, or any other Senator, may offer any amendment he desires to offer.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The joint resolution is brought to us with the alternative of taking it or leaving it. I am familiar with senatorial practices. If there could be an understanding in advance to amend it so as to provide a reasonable time limitation, I would withdraw my objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. I would not enter into any understanding with respect to an amendment, because frankly I think a 60-day or a 90-day extension would not accomplish any more than letting the statute of limitations expire now. The same reasons which have prevailed during the past 2 years will undoubtedly prevail in the next 60 or 90 days, so there would be occasion to ask for another extension. I think if an extension is to be made, it should be made until the war is over. If we are not to extend the time, let the matter die, and let the right to prosecute these men be waived. I am not in favor of that. That is why I have proposed that the joint resolution be not referred to a committee, but that it be taken up now and considered.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. If we should not pass the joint resolution, and the statute should run, we would have the situation to which the Senator from Kentucky alludes. What would happen if we should pass the joint resolution and the President were not here to sign it?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a matter about which the Senator from Connecticut need not worry.

Mr. DANAHER. Why? We have been informed that the President is out of the country.

Mr. BARKLEY. The President of the United States is functioning in regard to the approval or disapproval of legislation. I can say to the Senator that that is a matter which need not bother us in the least.

Mr. DANAHER. It bothers us a very great deal whether we do or do not take the position of the Senator from Missouri. That is a most important consideration. Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that I am somewhat surprised at his reply. I think it is a fundamental question for us to decide whether that prosecution can or cannot be held.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Connecticut knows that the President has signed bills in the situation to which he refers. He has also vetoed at least one measure under the same circumstances.

Mr. DANAHER. When he was out of the country?

Mr. BARKLEY. There will be no hiatus.

Mr. DANAHER. If in fact the Senator from Kentucky has information to the effect that the President is available for the purpose of acting on the joint resolution should we pass it, that is a most important consideration. If he is not, then it is clear that the joint resolution would not effectuate the purposes sought if we should pass it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I take the responsibility of saying to the Senator that the President is available for the purpose of either signing or disapproving the joint resolution, and he has exercised that availability with respect to other measures.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I understand that bills have been sent to the President and returned; but obviously this joint resolution could not be sent to him and returned.

Mr. BARKLEY. Why not?

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator is suggesting that he could sign the joint resolution here when he is somewhere else, I think he is stating a constitutional principle which does not exist.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a matter which will arise when it arises. It does not bother me at this time.

Mr. TAFT. So far as a veto is concerned, I see no reason why the measure could not be vetoed in his absence. It would simply involve ordering the measure returned to the Senate without the President's signature. It involves no necessary act. But when it comes to signing a measure, under the Constitution the President himself must sign it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the President of the United States can exercise his constitutional function to approve legislation as legally and constitutionally as he can exercise it with respect to the disapproval of proposed legislation.

Mr. TAFT. That seems to be an interesting question; but I do not at all agree with the Senator.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I do not know what is the significance of it, but the printed form which we all have was amended while it was pending in the House. On page 3, line 3, the House inserted after the word "That" the following language: "Effective as of December 7, 1943."

Of course, that is an effort, I believe, to escape the consequences to which the Senator from Connecticut has referred. Whether it effectively does so or not, I do not know.

Mr. BARKLEY. The insertion to which the Senator has referred is not in the copy which I have before me.

Mr. President, I do not wish to delay this matter further, or delay the Senator from Tennessee in taking up the appropriation bill.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may ask him one question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I have not read the joint resolution, and I have not seen the statute of limitations, but the question has arisen in my mind, namely, whether the 2 years have not already expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. The general feeling is that they have not.

Mr. TUNNELL. I can only say that I had pending a similar application in the United States court which was refused on the ground that the year had expired on the day before the anniversary. I am wondering whether that would not be possible in this instance.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a legal technicality which the courts will decide. But heretofore, on the same day on which a law expired, or on which any particular situation expired, we have reenacted the law so that it took effect from that day.

Mr. TUNNELL. I may say that my application was for a discharge in bankruptcy which had to be filed within 1 year. The court held that I had not done it within the time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider House joint resolution 199.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment which has been stated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 11, to insert:

For an amount to increase the salary of the assistant clerk of the Committee on Appropriations at $3,900 per annum to $5,000 per annum and $1,500 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent, beginning December 1, 1943, fiscal year 1944, $1,517, and the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1944, is hereby amended accordingly.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 17, to insert:

To enable the Secretary of the Senate to expend from the appropriation for "Salaries of officers and employees of the Senate," fiscal year 1944, so much as may be necessary to provide 2 additional clerks at $1,500 per annum each, 1 for each Senator from an additional State having a population of more than 3,000,000 inhabitants.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 23, to insert:

The Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1944 hereby is amended to enable the Secretary of the Senate to expend from the appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate so much as may be necessary to provide 2 additional clerks at $1,500 per annum each, 1 for each Senator from an additional State having a population of more than 10,000,000 inhabitants.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "House of Representatives," on page 3, after line 13, to insert:

For an additional amount for the appropriation "Mileage of Members and Delegates, House of Representatives, 1943," $1,500, such combined sum to be available for such mileage on account of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress incurred during the fiscal years 1943 and 1944.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, what disposition was made of the amendment on page 3? There was so much confusion in the Chamber that I did not hear the action taken on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment on page 3 was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator desire to ask a question about it?

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee to make a statement in regard to the amendments as they are reached, so that we may know what they are about.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very glad to do as the Senator desires.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask that the vote by which the amendments on pages 2 and 3 of the bill were agreed to be reconsidered, in order that the Senator from Tennessee may make an explanation of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, for the benefit of myself and other Members on this side of the Chamber, I ask the Senator from Tennessee for an explanation of the amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very happy to explain them.

The first amendment, on page 2, after line 2, provides for an increase from $3,600 per annum to $4,200 per annum in the salary of an employee in the Secretary's office. He is chief bookkeeper and has been paid $3,600 since 1929.

I have a memorandum from the financial clerk, which I will read for the benefit of the Senate. It reads as follows:

The position of chief bookkeeper has paid $3,600 per annum since 1929, and never has been filled more capably than by the present incumbent, Joseph C. Ellis. He is an expert bookkeeper and accountant and is responsible for the preparation of all pay rolls and the keeping of the several intricate sets of books relating to salaries of Senators and employees, and payments from the contingent fund.

As you know, all this work has multiplied many times during recent years, and more particularly since the percentage increase of salaries and the enactment of income-tax withholding. Indications are that the latter will become more involved if the proposed new revenue bill becomes law.

This recent tax legislation has created a tremendous demand everywhere for experienced accountants, and excellent salaries are being offered. The result is that it is going to become more and more difficult to retain our trained men at pre-war salaries. Mr. Ellis has an opportunity now to make a change of great financial advantage to himself, but perhaps could be persuaded to remain here if we could make a moderate readjustment of his salary in the next deficiency appropriation bill. Such an increase is thoroughly justified on the basis of additional duties recently assumed by him.

I ask that the entire memorandum be printed in the RECORD. It presents full justification for the proposed increase.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
DISBURSING OFFICE,
Washington, September 27, 1943.

Memorandum for the Secretary of the Senate:

The position of chief bookkeeper has paid $3,600 per annum since 1929, and never has been filled more capably than by the present incumbent, Joseph C. Ellis. He is an expert bookkeeper and accountant, and is responsible for the preparation of all pay rolls and the keeping of the several intricate sets of books relating to salaries of Senators and employees, and payments from the contingent fund.

As you know, all this work has multiplied many times during recent years, and more particularly since the percentage increase of salaries and the enactment of income-tax withholding. Indications are that the latter will become more involved if the proposed new revenue bill becomes law.

This recent tax legislation has created a tremendous demand everywhere for experienced accountants, and excellent salaries are being offered. The result is that it is going to become more and more difficult to retain our trained men at pre-war salaries. Mr. Ellis has an opportunity now to make a change of great financial advantage to himself, and perhaps could be persuaded to remain here if we could make a moderate readjustment of his salary in the next deficiency appropriation bill. Such an increase is thoroughly justified on the basis of additional duties recently assumed by him.

I would suggest that authority be included to pay an additional $600 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent, as was done in the case of Mr. Logan who recently was inducted into the Navy, and whose departure has resulted in a saving of $660 per annum. I am inclosing herewith for your consideration a proposed item for presentation to the Appropriations Committee.

It seems to me that we are asking for very little when it is considered that there are four positions in the office that formerly paid a total of $2,620 per annum more than is being received by the present incumbents. Regardless of that, we cannot afford at this time to let a few dollars a month cost us the services of a man who could not satisfactorily be replaced.

Respectfully,

OCO THOMPSON,
Financial Clerk.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Ellis has been with the Government for a long time, and the increase in his salary is necessary.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the items to which reference has been made relate to several employees of the Senate. Were justifications presented to the subcommittee for all the proposed increases?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; and the increases were unanimously approved by both the subcommittee and the full committee.

Mr. President, the committee amendment on page 3, beginning in line 14, deals with the mileage of Representatives who have newly come to the House.

I ask that the amendments on pages 2 and 3 be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments referred to, on pages 2 and 3 of the bill, are agreed to.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 4, to insert:

Contested-election expenses: For payment to the following contestant and contestee for expenses incurred in the contested-election case of *Sullivan* v. *Miller*, as audited and recommended by the Committee on Elections No. 3, namely:

John B. Sullivan, contestant, $566.86;
Louis E. Miller, contestee, $1,087.29;
In all, $1,654.15, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Executive Office of the President", on page 5, after line 7, to strike out:

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Budget, fiscal year 1944, including the objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1944, and including $20,000 additional for the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, $175,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "War Manpower Commission," on page 8, line 2, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$5,900,000" and insert "$6,233,000."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the able Senator from Tennessee give me an explanation of what is meant by the increase to the extent of $333,000 made by the Senate Appropriations Committee?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very happy to do so. We have a report as follows:

Since I appeared before your committee in support of the supplemental appropriation of the War Manpower Commission we have been advised that two additional States have increased their compensation plans. The changes require an addition of $333,000 in the United States Employment Office Facilities and Services appropriation to enable us to pay United States Employment Service employees at State salary rates.

The two States are Colorado and Michigan. The salaries there have been increased, and under the terms of the act the money should be appropriated so that the same rates or compensation paid by those two States shall be paid by the Government.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Do I understand correctly that payments to employees doing this work in the State of Colorado and the State of Michigan have been increased to such an extent that the Federal Government has to raise the pay of its employees?

Mr. McKELLAR. Not at all, but the present law provides that the Federal Government shall pay the same rate of compensation that is paid by the States. Two States have increased their rate of compensation, and the Government, under the law, has to increase the rates paid by it in the same way the States do.

Mr. REVERCOMB. When the Senator says "rate of compensation" does he mean the rate paid by a State Government to its employees?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

I ask to have a portion of the letter printed in the RECORD at this point so that the facts may be perfectly plain.

There being no objection, the extract from the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

DECEMBER 2, 1943.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: Since I appeared before your committee in support of the supplemental appropriation of the War Manpower Commission we have been advised that two additional States have increased their compensation plans. The changes require an addition of $333,000 in the United States Employment Office Facilities and Services appropriation to enable us to pay United States Employment Service employees at State salary rates.

The new adjustments are summarized as follows:

State	Nature of State action	Number of employees affected	Retroactive to—	Additional funds required for fiscal year 1944	Full total year requirement
Colorado	Revised compensation plan as approved by State civil service commission.	174	Sept. 1, 1943	$41,100	$49,320
Michigan	Compensation plan adjusted by Michigan State Civil Service Commission.	691	July 1, 1943	291,900	291,900
Total		865		333,000	341,220

If Congress approves the Federal pay scale as requested the need indicated above will, of course, be met. Otherwise, we must meet the new adjustments.

Lacking the Federal pay scale for U. S. E. S. employees, how do you advise us to meet unanticipated increases in State salary plans?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, before we leave this subject——

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may this particular item be passed over for the present?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection to its being passed over, if Senators desire to look into it a little further, but they will find that under the law we had to increase the amount paid in certain States because the States has increased the compensation paid by them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 8, to strike out:

Migration of workers: To enable the War Manpower Commission to provide, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Chairman of said Commission, for the temporary migration of workers from foreign countries (pursuant to agreements between the United States and such foreign countries) and from territories and possessions of the United States, for employment in the continental United States with industries and services essential to the war effort, including the transportation of such workers from the points outside the United States to ports of entry of the United States and return (including transportation from place of employment in the United States to port of entry of the United States in any case of default by an employer to provide such transportation to a worker, in which event the employer shall be liable to the United States for the cost thereof), reasonable subsistence and emergency medical care en route, and guarantees of employment while in the United States to the extent agreed upon with the foreign country from which the worker is imported, $2,125,000, of which not to exceed $125,000 shall be available for all administrative expenses necessary for the foregoing, including not to exceed $12,250 for temporary employment of administrative personnel outside continental United States, not to exceed $1,000 for printing and binding outside continental United States without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111), and not to exceed $26,880 for travel expenses: *Provided*, That no transportation of workers shall be allowed hereunder unless the employer and the worker have entered into a contract for employment approved by said Chairman or his designee, and unless said Chairman certifies that reasonably adequate use is being made of the local labor supply: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall remain available after June 30, 1944, to the extent necessary to provide for the return of the workers to the country from which they migrated under the provisions hereof: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the recruitment or transportation of workers for employment in agriculture.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 8, to insert:

WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

The amount that may be used for administrative expenses in the fiscal year 1944 under the head "War Shipping Administration, revolving fund," is hereby increased from $9,650,000 to $12,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have the Senator explain that.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. AIKEN. I was going to raise the point of order that legislation is pending in both Houses authorizing the appropriation for which this increase is intended. I understand, too, that this increase of $2,350,000 for the purpose indicated was thrown out on a point of order in the other House, on the ground that an appropriation could not be made until it was authorized.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand it is not subject to a point of order in the Senate, inasmuch as a standing committee has already reported the item.

Mr. AIKEN. But the bill is pending before the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; it is pending before the Senate, but, under the rules of the Senate, when a bill has been reported by a standing committee an appropriation under it is in order. That is my understanding. Am I correct, Mr. President?

Mr. AIKEN. Then will the Senator, as requested by the Senator from Nebraska, give us a further explanation of the item?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very happy to do so in the words of Admiral Land, who came before the committee. In a letter addressed to me he says:

WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, November 11, 1943.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Deficiencies, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: The First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944 (H. R. 3598) as reported to the House of Representatives included an item which was stricken out on a technical ground during House consideration (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Nov. 5, 1943, p. 9243). The language of the item as it appeared in the House reported bill (p. 8, lines 16 to 20) is as follows:

"WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

"The amount that may be used for administrative expenses in the fiscal year 1944 under the head 'War Shipping Administration, revolving fund', is hereby increased from $9,650,000 to $12,000,000."

The necessity for this item is set forth in detail in the hearings held by Subcommittee on Deficiencies of the House Committee on Appropriations (pp. 76–116, Oct. 1, 1943) and in House Report No. 822 (p. 18). The activity involved is that of securing a better control of repairs on War Shipping Administration controlled and lend-lease merchant vessels. This will result in a substantial reduction in the costs of repairs and, perhaps more important in time of war, will result in a saving in the ship time lost in repair yards.

The item is necessary to avoid a deficiency: that is, to avoid exceeding before the end of the current fiscal year the limitation on administrative expenses of War Shipping Administration now fixed at $9,650,000 under the National War Agencies Appropriation Act, 1944. No increase of the revolving fund of the War Shipping Administration is involved, but only a change of the limitation on the amount which may be used for administrative expenses.

As submitted by the President to the Speaker of the House of Representatives (H. Doc. No. 298) the estimate for the activity involved was $4,980,531.10. Subsequently we reduced our estimate to $2,465,000 for reasons shown in the attached copy of a letter to the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee under date of October 22, 1943.

The item involved is a very important one in the activities of the War Shipping Administration and the ability to go ahead promptly with this activity is a critical need. For that reason I request that your committee afford me an opportunity to be heard during your consideration of the bill with a view to the reinstatement of the item in question.

Sincerely yours,

E. S. LAND,
Administrator.

I ask that the letter enclosed by Admiral Land, addressed to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the other House, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, October 22, 1943.

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The War Shipping Administration has asked the Congress for an increase in the limitation of the funds available to it for administrative purposes by the amount of $4,980,531.10 to permit the closer control of maintenance and repair work on War Shipping Administration controlled and lend-lease merchant vessels. This request is now being considered by your committee as part of the first deficiency appropriation bill.

Because of the substantial savings, both in money and ships' time, which can result from this program, we have based our estimate of the funds needed on a broad over-all plan, with which you are familiar from the testimony, calling for about 5,000 men by the end of the fiscal year. We may need that number of men, but recognizing that the desired result may be accomplished in more than one way, and not wishing more employees than are necessary to the most effective handling of the work at hand, we are following the policy of testing our procedure as we go along. We are hopeful that we may be able to correct this serious ship-repair situation without the number of men called for by the program presented to you in our testimony.

Accordingly, we feel that it would be appropriate for your committee to lower the amount of additional administrative funds which you will permit us to use for this purpose to $2,465,000, which would permit a staff of about 1,500 men by the end of the fiscal year. The decrease in the funds required is disproportionate to the decrease in the number of employees because under the revised program the decrease in recruitment occurs largely in the fourth quarter. If it develops that we need more men and additional funds, we will come to you on the basis of accomplished savings and with a tested procedure which will permit us and you to determine more accurately the number of men and the funds required. I believe that this procedure is preferable to one which may result in a surplus of administrative funds arising from the inadequacies of any estimates which we can make prior to a more complete test of the procedures which we are now putting into effect.

Sincerely yours,

L. W. DOUGLAS,
Deputy Administrator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Admiral Land appeared before the committee and testified that it was absolutely necessary to have more inspectors to see that the work was done with dispatch. I will read a colloquy between Admiral Land and myself concerning it.

Admiral LAND. I am sorry to say that the gentleman is mistaken, because we not only have authority for it, but there is no violation of law. The whole objection revolves around the question of the uniform. I think the whole idea has been misinterpreted, and I think it is very unfortunate. We are attempting to correct the uniform part of it by a joint resolution.

Senator McKELLAR. Has it been reported favorably anywhere?

Admiral LAND. There is a hearing on it tomorrow in the House. I think it has been reported favorably by the Commerce Committee in the Senate.

Senator McKELLAR. If it has been reported favorably, that would make it in order.

That is true. Admiral Land testified that there would be an immense saving in time by having the ships repaired promptly, and the committee unanimously, as I recall, concluded that this appropriation was necessary to carry on the work of the Commission expeditiously. The Senator knows Admiral Land, who is one of the most active, efficient, and capable officers of the Government.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, am I to understand that this large number of new inspectors is required to protect the Government against fraud in the operation of shipyards in the repair and conversion of ships?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; to see that the work is executed expeditiously.

Mr. AIKEN. In the opinion of the War Shipping Administration, as outlined in the words of Mr. Murphy, chairman of the Price Adjustment Board, before the House Appropriations Committee on September 28, 1943:

As we are presently set up, we do not have an adequate check on either the time or the material used on our vessels. We don't know whether the time for which we are charged is actually spent on our boats or on some of the boats in the yards. We don't know if when a couple of 20-foot lengths of pipe are brought aboard one of our vessels and a 2-foot section cut off and used and the balance returned to stock, whether we are charged with the entire 20 feet or not.

Then Mr. Murphy, and I think his assistant, Mr. Williams, went on to tell the different things that were being done wrong in the shipyards, how they could save $50,000,000 a year if they could stop it.

Does the Senator from Tennessee realize that later on these same witnesses went before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House of Representatives and virtually took back all they had said, and stated that, to the best of their knowledge, everything was going fine?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know that they testified in the way the Senator just read. They testified before our committee, and they were doing it for Admiral Land, whom I have always found to be a very high-minded and honorable gentleman.

Mr. AIKEN. Did they explain how it happened that it took the War Shipping Administration 2 years to find out what was going on in their shipyards?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will read to the Senator from the testimony of Admiral Land:

I think the most important thing I can tell you is that we have started out and have now trained nine classes and placed them in five yards in New York and four in Boston. The reports from both management and labor indicate conditions have been improved; that the flow of material is better, the supervision is better, with less in the way of losses, and there is a more adequate check of the material going into the ships and the repairs.

Frankly, I recommended this because I believe it is well worth while. I don't have to tell you gentlemen that you cannot fix a price for a contract on repairs. In overhauling a main motor it may be that one screw is out, or maybe the whole armature is burned out. There is no way of fixing the thing definitely. This is an aid to more efficient operation, and a little check and balance on both management and labor.

He convinced the members of the committee, as did the other witnesses, that this increase in expenditure for this purpose should be allowed, in the interest of the Government, and in the interest of quick handling of shipping. That is why the amendment appears in the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. How many special inspectors and guards does the War Shipping Administration expect to hire with this appropriation?

Mr. McKELLAR. According to my recollection, 1,500.

Mr. AIKEN. I have the testimony which was given.

Mr. McKELLAR. Before the House committee?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; before the House committee, on the first supplemental deficiency appropriation bill for 1944. It was shown that for the first quarter of next year the Administration will hire 72, for the second quarter 1,300, for the third quarter 2,616, and for the fourth quarter, which I suppose means October, November, and December, 5,013. I do not know whether that averages 1,500 for the year or not.

Mr. McKELLAR. I myself do not know, but with all the work that is being done in our shipyards in different sections of the country in repairing vessels, it is absolutely necessary to have these inspectors looking after the work, or the Government will suffer. That is why this amendment has been reported by the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. When this new inspection program gets into operation, the annual cost is to be $12,467,140, instead of the smaller amount that is being asked for now.

Mr. McKELLAR. I sincerely hope it will not be asked for very much longer. Of course, that is merely a hope.

Mr. BURTON. Will the Senator from Tennessee yield? I might throw some light on the question raised by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I refer to the testimony of Admiral Land, found on page 152 of the Senate committee hearings, where he is reported to have said:

The Budget estimate as submitted by the President contemplated an increase in the administrative expense limitation of $4,950,000. This estimate was based on a broad over-all plan calling for about 5,000 men by the end of the fiscal year.

REDUCED NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES PROPOSED

On October 22, 1943, subsequent to the hearings before the House Appropriations Committee, a proposal was submitted that the increase in the limitation requested be lowered to permit a staff of about 1,500 men rather than approximately 5,000 men by the end of the fiscal year.

That is the figure upon which our provision was based.

Mr. McKELLAR. And it was reduced because they could not train that many men during the war.

Mr. AIKEN. Did not Mr. Radner, the general counsel for the War Shipping Administration, finally testify before the House committee that what they really wanted was to get some uniforms for the men? Do they not already have the authority to employ auditors, or checkers?

Mr. McKELLAR. There is no appropriation for uniforms.

Mr. AIKEN. Do they need $3,000,000 for uniforms?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; and there is no provision of that kind in the bill that I know of. They do need additional inspectors, and the amount in question is to pay the additional inspectors. Let me read to the Senator from the hearings:

> The program of recruitment and training of such a large force with the fiscal year so well advanced seemed to the committee impossible of accomplishment and upon restudy and revision of the plan, provision has been made for salaries and expenses of a force of 1,500 at a cost of $2,350,000 for this year.

Instead of the $5,000,000 that was originally asked for, because they could not get the kind of men they wanted during the year and train them.

Mr. AIKEN. This merely means adding eventually a few thousand appointees to the War Shipping Administration, whose duty is supposed to be to see that we do not pay for a 20-foot pipe when we get a 2-foot pipe, to see that we do not pay for time and a half for overtime when there really is not overtime, to see that 900 men do not get left out on a boat in a bay somewhere, as I noticed happened in one instance, and put in 9 hours out there without working, but apparently no one knowing anything about it, and the taxpayers paying for it. That is the real purpose of having these inspectors, is it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know all the particular details of shipbuilding, I cannot enumerate them, but it does mean that trained employees will look after both the labor side of the situation and the Government's side of it, and get the work done, and get it done as quickly as possible.

Mr. AIKEN. I notice that when Mr. Williams, of the War Shipping Administration, was asked what the training program of these men would be, he replied that they would have a basic course consisting of 6 days of visual instruction. I read from his testimony:

> They go into the yard under the direction and supervision of a field instructor. At first they go in merely as time and material checkers; then, by upgrading courses, correspondence courses, plus the assistance given them by field instructors and by marine surveyors, they are upgraded from time and material checkers to junior inspectors. The classification is actually junior examiner.

They are given a 6-day course, during which time the men are supposed to learn all about the conversion and repair of ships. Does that seem to be an adequate preparation?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think that was at all intended. We did not consider it that way at all.

Mr. AIKEN. That was the testimony of Mr. Williams, of the War Shipping Administration.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Williams made a mistake if he testified that they were to become experts in the shipping business in 6 days. We all know that could not happen.

Mr. OVERTON. Will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I have just entered the Chamber. Has the Senator pointed out that the purpose of the War Shipping Administration is to employ in this work men who have returned from service in the war?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; that has not been pointed out, but that was a part of the testimony.

Mr. OVERTON. Admiral Land testified:

> The experiment is to take the men returning, who are discharged from the service, and put them on as checkers and inspectors to reduce the cost of repairs and to get more efficiency in management and labor in the ship-repair yards.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that preference is to be given to servicemen. However, they are not to be selected under any civil-service program at all. It is purely up to the Shipping Administration as to whom they shall choose.

Mr. OVERTON. It covers men who have honorably served their country in this war.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; and there are going to be 10,000,000 of them.

Mr. OVERTON. We are not to have 10,000,000 in this work, but 1,500. Men who have honorably served our country in the war, have been honorably discharged, and have returned, are the men who are to be put on this work, 1,500 of them.

Mr. AIKEN. Why are they needed? Why cannot the Administration use the men they have now?

Mr. OVERTON. They are to be used for inspecting.

Mr. AIKEN. They are supposed to be taking care of these matters, and now, 2 years after this activity has been in progress, the Administration suddenly discovers that they need 1,500 or 5,000 men in these shipyards.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; the number has been decreased all the time, but they have not had a sufficient number, and have not been able to train them. This appropriation is merely for an additional number.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Will the Senator explain the pending bill to me a little, so that I may get a better idea of it? My understanding is that it is a deficiency bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Is it not true that last summer or last spring we appropriated for each of the agencies mentioned in the pending bill for the remainder of the year?

Mr. McKELLAR. We passed a general appropriation bill last spring.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. We covered the same items?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no. Occasionally that might occur, but such an instance is very rare. The pending bill covers deficiencies.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I notice one item in particular about which I know—"Crop insurance"—for which the committee is proposing to appropriate $2,000,000. But that does not go to the point I wish to have explained to me. If this is a deficiency appropriation bill, will the Senator tell me, by way of historical information, whether the Senate ever tried failing to take care of such deficiencies when the various agencies ran out of money?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I do not recall that the Senate ever failed to give officers or administrators of government the proper amount when adequate showing was made. When such officers come before the committees of the two Houses and make proper showing that the business of the Government will be interfered with, or not carried on properly unless additional money is appropriated, they have a right to do so, and when they make such proper showing the committee allows deficiency appropriations when there are deficiencies, and sometimes allows items which are not in a strict sense deficiencies, but which are absolutely necessary for carrying on the proper functions of the Government.

The two committees, the one in the House and the other in the Senate, have long labored with these matters. For instance, in the House on this very bill 1,600 pages of printed testimony were taken. In the Senate there were not so many pages of testimony taken, but in the 4 or 5 weeks we have been considering the bill nearly 800 pages of testimony have been taken by the Senate committee. We go into the minutest detail. We try to protect the Government in every possible way. We try to provide as small appropriations as possible to do the work. I think I can say that on all these items there was practical unanimity on the part of the committee. I do not believe that there was any material disagreement except as to one or two items, and I and those who sided with me were outvoted on those items. We come here with a unanimous report of the committee.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I hope the Senator will not misunderstand me. I am not criticizing. I am seeking information.

Mr. McKELLAR. I appreciate that.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. When consideration of an original appropriation bill is begun the committee determines as nearly as it may what a department or agency is going to use for the next fiscal year. Is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I was wondering, if the agency were informed at the time the matter was considered by the committee that only a certain amount of money would be appropriated for it, whether the agency would try to keep within the appropriation, instead of always having a deficiency.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator permit me to give him an illustration? I call his attention to page 5 of the bill, beginning at line 8:

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Budget, fiscal year 1944, including the objects specified under

this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1944, and including $20,000 additional for the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, $175,000.

The Senator spoke of the original bill making appropriation for Government agencies. In connection with the original bill which was passed in the spring of the year it was the duty of the Bureau of the Budget not only to make the estimates of its own necessities for that year, but the estimates of necessities for other departments. In this particular case the Bureau of the Budget presented quite a list of items, I think there were seven or eight, with respect to which it had made an error in making its estimates last spring. I will read them to the Senator. The matter I refer to is to be found on page 321 of the hearings.

On the question of estimates, the Bureau was allowed $538,810, and it made a supplemental request for $55,330.

For the Division of Statistical Standards, Congress appropriated $174,180 last spring, and the Bureau made a supplemental request for $29,930.

For the Division of Administrative Management the Bureau was given $309,770 last spring, and it has made a supplemental request for $35,790.

For the Fiscal Division appropriation of $183,570 was made last spring, and supplemental request has been made for $11,375.

For the Division of Field Service, $100,330 was appropriated last spring, and a supplemental request has been made for $92,690.

For the Public Works programing nothing was appropriated last spring, and a supplemental request has been made for $93,445.

For the Federal Board of Hospitalization nothing was appropriated last spring, and a supplemental request has been made for $20,070.

For the Division of Legislative Reference $58,480 was appropriated last spring, and no supplemental request has been made.

For the Administrative Office $187,360 was appropriated last spring, and a supplemental request is now made for $16,670.

The Bureau of the Budget has asked for an additional amount of $355,300. We went into that matter most carefully, and the House did also. The House cut down the amount requested from $355,000 to $175,000, and the Senate committee struck it out entirely, because we felt that the Bureau of the Budget by all means should have known what it wanted last year. We apply that rule as far as we can.

I wish to say to the Senator from South Dakota, and to all other Senators, that I believe the Appropriations Committee has with the utmost fairness and with a desire to effect economies and to provide for good administration, painstakingly gone into all these items.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I am sure of that.

Mr. McKELLAR. We have reported the bill with practical unanimity. I see the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] standing on the other side. I am quite sure he will agree with me that we have tried to get the very best bill both for the Government and for the taxpayer.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. NYE. I wish to concur with the acting chairman of the committee in his statement of the diligence with which the committee pursues its inquiry into the requested appropriations. But I think there is some misunderstanding concerning the War Shipping Administration item. There seems to be an impression that we have afforded an increased appropriation for the War Shipping Administration. That is not the case.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. NYE. We are only authorizing for administrative use a part of the moneys which were appropriated in the regular supply bills.

Mr. McKELLAR. Money which has already been appropriated; that is true.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Permit me to point out how directly contrary the testimony of the War Shipping Administration was in the House to the testimony presented before the Appropriations Committee in the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure that does not apply to the testimony of Admiral Land. I cannot imagine a man like Admiral Land testifying one way before one committee and another way before another.

Mr. AIKEN. No. The testimony was given by Mr. Murphy, who is Chairman of the Price Adjustment Board of the War Shipping Administration.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Murphy was not a witness before our committee.

Mr. AIKEN. No, but Mr. Murphy was a witness of the War Shipping Administration before the House committee. On page 115 of the House Appropriations Committee's hearings on this bill there appears the following colloquy, beginning at the bottom of the page:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I notice that you have some of the larger yards on the list here. There are all sorts of inspectors at those yards already, are there not, for the Navy, for instance? Is it not possible to have inspectors already on the job doing work for the Navy do work also for the Maritime Commission, and take off part of the load?

Mr. MURPHY. In time that might come.

And then there was discussion off the record.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You do not think that in the proposal before us there is any unnecessary duplication of inspection force?

Mr. Douglas answered—

The honest answer is that I cannot tell you. I presume on a given day there might be some duplication, and at another time there might be a deficiency.

Then he goes on to elaborate on that point.

In the hearings on House Joint Resolution 182, held before the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, we find the following colloquy——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the other testimony, let me say that I do not think that testimony is at all contradictory of the testimony given before our committee.

Mr. AIKEN. We find the following testimony on pages 85 and 86 of the hearings on House Joint Resolution 182, before the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

Mr. O'BRIEN. Has it ever come to your attention, and has it ever been observed by any of your men in the field, that there has been an unlawful use of materials?

Mr. Murphy, who is in charge of contract adjustment, replied—

No, sir.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Or a wastage of materials?

Mr. MURPHY. We have had no unlawful uses.

This testimony was given before another committee, the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, not before the Appropriations Committee. I read further from the testimony of Mr. Murphy:

The indictments that presently exist and the cases now in the hands of the Department of Justice came before our men got out there.

Mr. O'BRIEN. In other words, were your men instrumental in detecting that?

Mr. MURPHY. No. You see, when our men go out, and I hope this does not get publicity, we do not attach too much importance as to what they do or say the first few weeks, because we want to train them and indoctrinate them very thoroughly.

Mr. O'BRIEN. In the event that there has been any flagrant violation, those men would have been brought up.

Mr. MURPHY. Unquestionably.

Next, Mr. President, I turn to page 94 of the hearings, where the following colloquy is to be found:

Mr. WELCH. If you do not have in mind plain larceny, I suggest that you go to the Senate Committee on Commerce and the House Committee on Appropriations and ask to have your testimony changed.

Mr. MURPHY. I will be happy to do it.

Mr. WELCH. Go do it then.

That is exactly the opposite of what the War Shipping Administration told the Senate Appropriations Committee, according to what we are told today. They went to the House committee and told them one thing—that they found no wrongdoing in the repair yards. Then they came to the Senate committee, and said they must have money for 1,500 inspectors in order to detect and correct the frauds which are being perpetrated.

It simply does not make sense. While we are talking about economy, it seems to me this is a good chance to show whether we are merely talking about it or whether we mean what we say. This is a good time to show that we mean what we say, by our action on their request to provide funds for the additional inspectors whom they all at once find they need, after getting along 2 years without them.

Mr. President, I ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the question of agreeing to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 10, line 9.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. NYE. Before the question is put on this particular amendment, I should like to make the point that, while the Senator from Vermont has presented testimony which does raise grave question in my mind concerning the merit of some of the testimony given before our committee, nevertheless I am still impressed by the one thing which was outstanding in my consideration of the item in the committee. It seems to me that our whole decision there had to resolve itself around the question of whether we could save the Government money by affording the inspectors who were being asked for. I was convinced that we would save some of the money under the appropriations we have already made if only we would take the action requested. I am a little at a loss to understand what the Senator from Vermont meant by the "inconsistency in testimony," as the matter relates to the immediate request of our committee which we are now laying before the Senate.

I hope the amendment may prevail.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, I desire to read from testimony before the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. On page 152 the Senator will find the following colloquy:

> Mr. CANFIELD. Did you not testify that under existing law you can provide all the inspectors you need for this type of work?
>
> Mr. RADNER. We can provide as many inspectors as our appropriation will permit, without uniforms.
>
> Mr. CANFIELD. Then, coming down to it, this is a bill for uniforms?
>
> Mr. RADNER. As far as legal technicalities go, it is a bill for uniforms—

Three million dollars worth.

On page 155, Mr. WEICHEL, of the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, asked the following question:

> What you want is an appropriation?
>
> Mr. RADNER. That is all that is necessary.
>
> Mr. WEICHEL. An appropriation to buy uniforms?

Mr. President, I say again that we have talked economy. If there were a $1,000 fraud in the Farm Security Administration, we could talk for a week on it. Now we have a chance to show whether we really mean what we say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 10, line 9. [Putting the question.]

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. OVERTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Guffey	Overton
Austin	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bailey	Hatch	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hawkes	Robertson
Barkley	Hayden	Russell
Bridges	Hill	Scrugham
Buck	Holman	Smith
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Bushfield	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Lodge	Tobey
Capper	Lucas	Truman
Caraway	McCarran	Tunnell
Chandler	McClellan	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wallgren
Danaher	Mead	Walsh, Mass.
Davis	Millikin	Walsh, N. J.
Downey	Moore	Wheeler
Eastland	Murdock	Wherry
Ellender	Murray	White
Ferguson	Nye	Willis
Gillette	O'Daniel	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXTENSION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS FOR TRIALS GROWING OUT OF PEARL HARBOR DISASTER

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, earlier in the day I undertook, without success, to secure consideration of House Joint Resolution 199. I now ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside in order that I may make a further unanimous-consent request with reference to that joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and the unfinished business is temporarily laid aside.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have conferred with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and have reached an understanding with regard to the offering of an amendment, as follows:

On page 3, in lines 12, 13, 14, and 15, to strike out "up to and including 1 calendar year after the formal declaration of peace with Japan has been officially signed and ratified by the Senate of the United States" and insert in lieu thereof "for a period of 6 months."

The extension would then be for a period of 6 months from today.

With that understanding, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be taken up for consideration at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none.

The Chair is advised that the joint resolution has been read only once. Without objection, the joint resolution will be considered as having been read the second time.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 199) to extend the time limit for immunity.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I have suggested, on page 3, in lines 12, 13, 14, and 15, to strike out the language which I have read, "up to and including 1 calendar year after the formal declaration of peace with Japan has been officially signed and ratified by the Senate of the United States," and insert in lieu thereof the words "for a period of 6 months."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The joint resolution was a matter of great interest to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that I have conferred with the Senator from Michigan about this amendment, and it is agreeable to him. He feels that under the circumstances we ought not to let the joint resolution lapse. The amendment will give us a little more time in which to solve the problem, between now and the end of the 6 months.

Mr. WHITE. I hope the resolution will be agreed to as proposed to be amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 12, after the word "extended" it is proposed to strike out "up to and including 1 calendar year after the formal declaration of peace with Japan has been officially signed and ratified by the Senate of the United States," and insert "for a period of 6 months."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is also my purpose to move that the preamble be stricken out. I understand that must be done after the joint resolution is passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 199) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the preamble be stricken from the joint resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the appropriation bill is now before the Senate. Those who desire to vote for the committee amendment will vote "yea," and those opposed will vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 10, beginning with line 9, which will be again stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, after line 8, it is proposed to insert the following:

WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

The amount that may be used for administrative expenses in the fiscal year 1944 under the head "War Shipping Administration, re-

volving fund," is hereby increased from $9,650,000 to $12,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; they have already been ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, before the yea-and-nay vote is taken, I should like to refer to one point which has been raised.

It has been assumed that the additional appropriation asked for would provide for 1,500 men. However, as I understand, that is the number which is to be hired for the second quarter of the year. According to the testimony before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked the following question:

How many men are presently in the service as a result of your training?

Mr. Williams, who is assistant to Mr. Murphy, the Chairman of the Price Adjustment Board, replied as follows:

Approximately 450, sir.

The testimony continued as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. What is contemplated for the future?

Mr. WILLIAMS. One thousand and five hundred for the fiscal year.

The testimony of Mr. Douglas, of the War Shipping Board, before the House Appropriations Committee was to the effect that they would hire 72 men the first quarter; 1,300 the second quarter, at a cost of $3,229,580; 2,616 the third quarter, at a cost of about six and a half million dollars; and for the fourth quarter, beginning next October, 5,013 men, at a cost of $12,467,140.

I think those facts should be made clear before we proceed to vote.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I gladly yield.

Mr. BURTON. As I understood the situation when it came up in the committee, this item would not increase the appropriation at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, not at all.

Mr. BURTON. It is merely a change in the amount which may be used for administrative purposes, and is considerably less than the amount originally asked for, even on that basis, and there would be no increase in the appropriation by one dollar.

Mr. McKELLAR. No appropriation would be required at all. There would be merely a reallocation for the purposes specified.

Mr. AIKEN. It certainly would increase the appropriation for this purpose, would it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. There would be a reallocation, but no increase in the appropriation.

Mr. AIKEN. Why should not $3,000,000 be saved through allocation?

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. NYE. I wonder if the answer to the question is not found in Admiral Land's testimony, when he said:

We have a repair bill of some half a billion dollars, and we think with the expenditure of two to five million dollars in this program we could save many times more than that. I think it is definitely worth a trial.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is exactly correct.

Mr. NYE. I have read from page 155 of the committee hearings.

Mr. AIKEN. I was not aware of any testimony to the effect that $50,000,000 could be saved in the repair and conversion work in the shipyards, but Admiral Land's subordinates testified before the House committee exactly opposite to the way he testified before the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. As I understand, we are dealing with a revolving fund.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON. In his letter to the Senator from Tennessee, dated November 11, 1943, appearing at page 150 of the committee hearings, Admiral Land said:

No increase of the revolving fund of the War Shipping Administration is involved, but only a change of the limitation on the amount which may be used for administrative expenses.

Therefore, the item here involved does not go into the total of the appropriation bill for this year, and of course does not increase the amount over the amount which came to us from the other House, but is merely a change of allocation based on the justification set forth.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. WHITE. The amount carried in the bill is about $2,600,000 less than the estimate?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 10, beginning in line 9. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] and therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] are detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is detained on public business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on official business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

I also announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 16, as follows:

YEAS—55

Andrews	Guffey	Overton
Austin	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bailey	Hatch	Russell
Bankhead	Hayden	Scrugham
Barkley	Hill	Smith
Burton	Johnson, Colo	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Lodge	Truman
Capper	Lucas	Tunnell
Caraway	McCarran	Tydings
Chandler	McClellan	Vandenberg
Chavez	McFarland	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Walgren
Davis	Maybank	Walsh, Mass.
Downey	Mead	Walsh, N. J.
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Murdock	White
Gillette	Nye	
Green	O'Mahoney	

NAYS—16

Aiken	Hawkes	Tobey
Bridges	Langer	Wherry
Buck	Moore	Willis
Bushfield	Revercomb	Wilson
Danaher	Robertson	
Ferguson	Taft	

NOT VOTING—25

Ball	Glass	Reed
Bilbo	Holman	Reynolds
Bone	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brewster	Kilgore	Stewart
Brooks	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wagner
Connally	Murray	Wiley
George	O'Daniel	
Gerry	Pepper	

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, at this point in the bill I desire to call up an amendment the committee has approved, adding section 305. I ask the

clerk to state the amendment. It contains a legislative provision, and, for that reason, could not be reported in the bill.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I inquire if this is the amendment of which the Senator gave notice?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is. I gave notice of a motion to suspend the rule in regard to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 305. No part of any funds appropriated for the War or Navy Department, when it is found by the head of such Department that any part of such funds is not necessary for the completion of the purpose for which appropriated, shall be used for any other purpose without the specific approval of law by the Congress; and, notwithstanding any other provision of law providing for transfer of any part of such funds, when it is found by the head of such Department that such funds are not to be used for the purposes for which appropriated, such appropriations to that extent shall be rescinded and canceled and the Secretary of such Department shall certify the amount so reduced, rescinded, and canceled to the Treasury Department, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the President of the Senate: *Provided*, That no appropriation or part of any appropriation heretofore, herein, or hereafter made available for any executive department or independent establishment to construct any particular project shall be impounded, or held as a reserve, or used for any other purpose, except by direction of the Congress, and any part of such appropriation not needed to complete such project, or the part thereof for which appropriation has been made, shall be retained by the Treasury: *Provided further*, That section 3 of the Military Appropriation Act, 1944, approved July 1, 1943, is hereby repealed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think the amendment should be explained, and I desire to make an explanation now. The reason I offer it up at this time is that a goodly number of Senators are present, it is a matter of importance, and I want to have it understood. I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

We all read some time ago in the newspapers that the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, as I recall, gave out a statement that $13,500,000,000 or thereabout had been saved and would go back into the Treasury.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may we have order? This is a most significant amendment, and I think all Members of the Senate ought to listen to the explanation of it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope they will listen, for the reason that it is of very great importance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let there be order in the Chamber. Senators desiring to converse will please retire to the cloakroom.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope they will not leave the Chamber, because I want them to hear about this particular matter.

Mr. President, as I was saying, it will be recalled that several weeks ago a statement was given out to the effect that a sum of about $13,500,000,000 was being returned to the Treasury. The Secretary of War or some other official of the War Department made the statement. The next day that statement was challenged by the Budget Director, with the statement that the money would not go back into the Treasury, and would not affect the Treasury, because he had put it in a reserve to be disposed of by the War Department, with his approval if the War Department should need money for some other purposes than the ones for which it was appropriated.

A very large part of this sum accrued by a process I shall describe. I call the particular attention of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] to it to show how these matters arise.

When the appropriation was made last spring it was estimated upon the theory that we were to have an army of 8,200,000 men. Later our military authorities determined that we would not have an army of that number, but that the number would be reduced to 7,500,000, making a difference of 700,000 men, for whom we had appropriated, and the money was in the hands of the Department.

Taking the induction into the Army of those 700,000 men, their training, their clothing, their allowances, their pay, their food, the expenses of travel, all the expenses incident to such a number, we find the appropriation amounted to a very large sum, and a very large part of the $13,500,000,000 is comprehended in that item.

The Budget Director, under a provision which allowed him to approve the transfer of 10 percent of the fund, assumed the right to make what he called a reserve fund, and upon the recommendation of the Department he has the right, as he understands it, and as he testified he understood it, to apportion the fund to some other purpose in the War Department.

In the first place, there is no law which gives him the right to set up a reserve at all, but there was a section in the law which was enacted last July to which I shall call attention. I wish to read it so that Senators can understand the enormous proportions of what we are attempting to change. It reads:

SEC. 3. Not to exceed 10 percent of any of the appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1944 may be transferred with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to any other of such appropriations, but no appropriation or subappropriation, except the subappropriations "Claims for damages to and loss of private property, Army" and "Claims of officers, enlisted men, and nurses of the Army for destruction of private property" shall be increased more than 10 percent thereby.

Last year Congress appropriated for the Army $71,000,000,000 plus, and 10 percent of that is $7,100,000,000, so it is a very large sum we are considering. In the regular appropriation bill last passed a new sum of $59,034,839,673 was appropriated, and we reappropriated the unexpended balances of $12,472,000,000, making a total of $71,507,000,000.

It is easy to see, by a simple calculation, that 10 percent of that is $7,150,000,000. It is a very tidy sum, and one about which we should be careful.

So far as I am concerned, and so far as the committee is concerned, we want to appropriate every dollar that is necessary to provide for the Army. We do not want, and do not intend, to have the Army hampered in any way by lack of funds. I am sure the committee is a unit on that subject. We are in session practically all the time, and if there is any trouble about the appropriations, the department can come to Congress at any time.

Let me state the effect of these two provisions of the present law. They mean that we virtually turn over to the Bureau of the Budget the power to appropriate money, within 10 percent, at all events, and if the Director of the Budget is allowed to make reserves, of even more than that; from now until next June, the money will be apportioned as he may determine. In my opinion, we have not selected the Budget Director as the agent of Congress to make appropriations. Congress should reserve that right to itself, and I hope the Senate will agree that we should keep the appropriating power in our hands.

Mr. President, I have given a general outline of the situation, and the reason for the amendment. There are some other provisions to which I shall now refer, but I have stated the main object, so far as the War Department is concerned.

The next proviso is that—

No appropriation or part of appropriation heretofore, herein, or hereafter made available for any executive department or independent establishment to construct any particular project shall be impounded, or held as a reserve—

And so forth.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. This provision means that if there were 10 percent left in a given appropriation and it were not needed for the purpose for which it had been originally appropriated, the money would go back to the Treasury of the United States to await the further order of Congress?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CHANDLER. And could not be appropriated in any sense by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield. I shall be glad to answer any question propounded by any Senator.

Mr. WHITE. The effect of the amendment would be to prevent agencies of the Government transferring from one activity to another funds in cases in which the Congress had not specifically authorized the additional amounts?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct. I may give an illustration. We all know about the road that was constructed from somewhere in Montana, as I recall, through Canada to Alaska. It is supposed that it was constructed out of some reappropriation of funds. I do

not know what are the facts about it. We will investigate that in considering the next appropriation bill, and we will give the information to the Senate, but I cannot give the facts now.

Assuming what I have stated to be accurate, no bill was ever brought before the Congress authorizing the construction of that road. Congress might have allowed it; it might have been a perfectly proper project, but no department ever recommended to the Congress that an appropriation be made for that purpose. It was a very large outlay of money, which should have been examined into every carefully, it seems to me.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I am heartily in accord with the objective sought to be accomplished by the Senator from Tennessee. I ask his consideration of a proposed amendment to his amendment. The language would appear on page 1 of his amendment, in line 5, after the comma and before the word "shall," to insert the words "and no amounts withheld from any contractor as a result of the renegotiation of any contract", and a comma.

The clause then would read:

> No part of any funds appropriated for the War or Navy Departments, when it is found by the head of such department that any part of such funds is not necessary for the completion of the purpose for which appropriated, and no amounts withheld from any contractor as the result of the renegotiation of any contract, shall be used for any other purpose without the specific approval of law by the Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I want to say that this amendment will have to go to conference. There is nothing in the House bill about it. It will have to go to conference anyway, and so far as I am personally concerned I shall be very happy to accept the amendment and give it consideration in the conference.

I may say to the Senator from Connecticut that I know something about the renegotiation of contracts, as I happen to be the author of the law providing for renegotiation. I worked the matter out in the Committee on Appropriations a year or two ago, as the Senator will probably recall, and I am very familiar with it. Last year the Government received in cash and by way of reductions the enormous sum of $5,300,000,000 through the renegotiation of contracts. The item is a very important one, and I myself think it should be included in the bill, and I hope the Senate will agree. I will accept the suggestion for the purpose of carrying it to conference. I have not studied it with the degree of care with which it should be studied.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. As I understand, the question before the Senate is whether we will or will not agree to the amendment which the Senator from Tennessee has proposed.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. DANAHER. So the Senator need only modify his amendment by including the suggested language, and if he will do that he will accomplish precisely the result I seek.

Mr. McKELLAR. If there is no objection on the part of other members of the committee present, I shall be glad to accept it.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I wish to have it clearly stated why my amendment should be inserted in the Senator's proposal. When in April 1942 we adopted the renegotiation-of-contracts law on the recommendation of the Senator from Tennessee, it had come up on the floor as a piece of legislation on an appropriation bill. The Senator from Tennessee explained to us what was sought to be accomplished. The first phase of the bill authorized the recovery of certain sums allegedly constituting excessive profits, if the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy, or the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, should so decide. If the contract in fact had been terminated, or executed is the better word, and payment made the Government was authorized to bring suit for the excessive profits, and if the judgment recovered brought funds—of course, to the Government—they went into the Treasury, and the bill specifically so provided, and that is the law now.

But with reference to the amounts withheld—and I emphasize the word "withheld"—before payment is made on a contract, such sums are not paid back into the Treasury of the United States, but quite the contrary, they go back to the departments which did the renegotiating, with the result that the Army and the Navy both are able to renegotiate contracts and recover for themselves the amounts recovered, and they do not come back to the Congress at all to have those funds reappropriated.

Mr. President, I submit that every single word the Senator from Tennessee says with reference to the committee amendment applies with equal force and vigor to the suggested language which I have offered.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I think the provision in the committee amendment is sufficient to cover the objectives the Senator from Connecticut has in mind, because where money is withheld from the contractor on renegotiation of a contract it is a part of funds which have been appropriated, and the amendment as now phrased reads:

> No part of any funds appropriated for the War or Navy Department, when it is found by the head of such department that any part of such funds is not necessary for the completion of the purpose for which appropriated, * * * shall be used for any other purpose.

In the renegotiation of a contract, where a sum is withheld from a contractor because it is excessive, then it is not necessary for the completion of the project, and, therefore, falls within the purview of the amendment as now proposed by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me say to the Senator from Louisiana that if the language were to be given that construction it would definitely be strained for the reason that there is an amount involved in the completion of the contract. Indeed, under the renegotiation clauses there is nothing to show that the contract is not to be completed. Quite the contrary, it will be completed. And the point about the renegotiation recovery is that if the Secretary decides that the amount should be withheld on the ground that it is excessive, he is able to retain for himself funds to be appropriated under the blanket clause to which the Senator from Tennessee referred and which was contained in the military appropriation bill last June. I think we would give clarity to the whole expression and make it beyond peradventure of doubt if we should add this additional language. I think we are all agreed on the objective.

Mr. OVERTON. We are all agreed, and I am in sympathy with the objective the Senator from Connecticut has in mind, but the sum withheld is not necessary for the completion of the contract. I do not think it is necessary to insert the language. However, I have no objection to modifying the amendment in the manner proposed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, it seems to me there is no reason why it should not be done, for this reason: The larger portion of the savings of $5,300,000,000 made in the year and a half the law has been in effect has resulted from reductions in contracts. I am advised that the amounts saved in the War Department, for instance, are contained in the $12,000,000,000 which had to be reappropriated last July. But I can see no reason why we should not change the language so as to effect the purpose the Senator from Connecticut has in mind, because we all want to do the same thing.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. NYE. I express the hope that the acting chairman will accept the amendment to the end that we may be sure that when we have finished with this matter in conference we will have reached the very important accumulation of funds to which reference has been made.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I think we are discussing this question somewhat in the dark at the present time. As a member of the committee, I voted to report the amendment, and I approve of its purposes, but, of course, I do not foreclose my right, any more than any other Senator does, to

seek to perfect the provisions of the bill up to the last minute.

The War Department has made, I think, some very pertinent observations about the language of this amendment extending down in line 8, to the word "provided."

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand, the Senator is now talking about the entire amendment. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I received this morning from the Secretary of War dealing with this matter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 7, 1943.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Deficiencies, Senate Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: It is noted that an amendment intended to be proposed to the bill H. R. 3598 to be cited as the "First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944" provides for the insertion of a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 305. No part of any funds appropriated for the War or Navy Department, when it is found by the head of such department that any part of such funds is not necessary for the completion of the purpose for which appropriated, shall be used for any other purpose without the specific approval of law by the Congress; and, notwithstanding any other provision of law providing for transfer of any part of such funds, when it is found by the head of such department that such funds are not to be used for the purposes for which appropriated, such appropriations to that extent shall be rescinded and canceled and the Secretary of such Department shall certify the amount so reduced, rescinded, and canceled to the Treasury Department, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the President of the Senate: *Provided*, That no appropriation or part of any appropriation heretofore, herein, or hereafter made available for any executive department or independent establishment to construct any particular project shall be impounded, or held as a reserve, or used for any other purpose, except by direction of the Congress, and any part of such appropriation not needed to complete such project, or the part thereof for which appropriation has been made, shall be retained by the Treasury: *Provided further*, That section 3 of the Military Appropriation Act, 1944, approved July 1, 1943, is hereby repealed."

Because of continually changing requirements with respect to classes and types of munitions and implements of war and ever-recurring changes in the strategical situation, it is necessary to make frequent and important changes in procurement programs. During the fiscal year 1943 savings which resulted from changed requirements totaled over $12,000,000,000. This amount was reported to the Congress and reappropriated to meet 1944 requirements in lieu of appropriating new money.

At this time it appears that substantial amounts of the appropriations available for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1944 will not be obligated. Authority for procuring agencies to obligate such savings has been withdrawn and the Congress has been apprised that it is reasonable to anticipate that the amount of such savings will be over $13,000,000,000. Except in the event of an urgent unforeseen military requirement, no part of this savings will be used. However, should such emergency arise, it is most important that the War Department have both the authority and the means to meet it without delay. War is a precarious uncertainty, and the War Department's efforts to conduct this war energetically and successfully should not be impaired or endangered.

If section 305, as proposed, be enacted into law the War Department would find itself in a position of not being able to finance any requirement, however urgent, which arose from changes in the strategical situation or from the need for new types of munitions and implements of war, not foreseen at the time the War Department estimates were presented to the Congress. It is hoped you will appreciate this and will realize it is imperative that the War Department be left with sufficient authority to use its funds for urgent requirements caused by such changes.

In view of the foregoing it is urged that the restrictions imposed on the War Department by section 305 which, if enacted, might seriously interfere with and retard the proper conduct of the war, be not favorably considered at this time.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. McKELLAR. I presume the Senator from Massachusetts is talking about the amendment as a whole, not the proposal made by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LODGE. The proposal of the Senator from Connecticut relates to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee. Perhaps the proposal of the Senator from Connecticut suggests a good procedure to follow. Of course, other changes could be made which would further perfect the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee. I think we ought to realize that there are some other changes in prospect which would improve it very much. It is not a question of going against the purpose of the amendment; on the contrary, it is a question of better achieving that purpose. I wanted to make that point clear because it may be necessary to incorporate the language of the Senator from Connecticut in other changes we may make on the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the distinguished Senator from Tennessee tell me what part of the amendment deals with the Alaskan Highway?

Mr. McKELLAR. There is nothing whatever in it which refers to that highway in any way.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator tell me how much money the Alaskan Highway is going to cost?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not the slightest notion.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator tell me where the money with which to pay for it is to be obtained?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not the slightest notion.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator know they are building another highway at the present time?

Mr. McKELLAR. No, sir; I do not.

Mr. LANGER. They are building it from Haines to 40 miles north of Champaign. Does the Senator know about that?

Mr. McKELLAR. No, sir; I do not. That is why I am offering the amendment. I think the Congress ought to be advised as to the use of such appropriations. I sincerely hope the amendment will be agreed to. By the way, a two-thirds majority will be required to suspend the rule. I hope Senators will remain in the Chamber, and will vote to suspend the rule. Of course, only a simple majority is required in order to agree to the amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, am I to understand that if the Senate agrees to the amendment it will be impossible to repeat what happened in connection with the Alaskan Highway?

Mr. McKELLAR. If the amendment is agreed to, it would not be possible.

Mr. LANGER. It would make it impossible to do what has been done, would it?

Mr. McKELLAR. Except by approval of the Congress.

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that I understand the amendment, if agreed to, would not have any effect on the War Department in connection with the building of the Alaskan Highway, but would only provide that if any money were left after that project was completed, it would go back into the Treasury.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am frank to say that I know very little about that. I used it as an illustration, because it is familiar to everyone.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Alaskan Highway was not specifically authorized by act of Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. The money for the Alaskan Highway was obtained from funds appropriated for military purposes; and that undertaking would stand in the same position as that of any other project built with money coming from an appropriation made by Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. No, Mr. President, it would not. If it were needed by the Army, and if it were built as a military road, it would be perfectly proper.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Army could build it and could use money coming from military appropriations, without having an act of Congress telling them they could build a particular road.

Mr. McKELLAR. That has been done, and, I think, no doubt, legally done; but in my opinion such projects as that should come before the Congress and should be passed upon by the Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have had opportunity to read the amendment only hastily, because of the multiplicity of other things I have had to do. It has been my feeling all along that when Congress appropriates a lump sum of money for use by the War Department, for instance, to do certain things not specified in the appropriation, if in their discretion they undertake a certain project and enter into a contract with someone to carry out that project, under the law permitting renegotiation they have a right to

renegotiate the contract; and, as Under Secretary of War Patterson testified yesterday, as I recall, before the Committee on Finance——

Mr. McKELLAR. He did.

Mr. BARKLEY. Which meeting the Senator from Tennessee attended as a sort of amicus curiae, not as a curious amicus, I should say [laughter]——

Mr. McKELLAR. I was very curious.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Tennessee manifested great interest, and I think properly so. It was testified that under that law they have been able to save more than $5,000,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. The amount is $5,300,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. Five million three hundred thousand dollars has been recovered. In most cases it was money which had not been paid out. A little of it may have been paid out.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, Mr. President, a very large proportion of it—33 percent of it, I think—was actually paid back in money.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. I have had a feeling—it is not a dogmatic feeling; it is subject to change, if I could be convinced—that in cases in which we appropriate a lump sum to the War Department or the Navy Department, if they enter into contracts in a hurry—as they must, because war does not wait on detailed, meticulous negotiations across a table; the contracts have to be entered into in a hurry—and if subsequently they are able to enter into a renegotiated agreement which results in having the contractor receive less money than he would have received under the contract, that money should remain subject to expenditure by the Department, just as if no contract which was subject to renegotiation had been entered into up to that time, on the theory that when we appropriate the lump sum of money to the Department we have to trust them for its judicious expenditure.

As I understand the amendment, its effect would be that in a case such as that—one in which, under a lump-sum appropriation, the Department in its discretion entered into a contract because it had to proceed without delay, and then later renegotiated the contract, and saved $1,000,000 or $5,000,000 or $100,000,000 on it——

Mr. McKELLAR. Five billion dollars.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the total, but I am talking about a single contract. If the War Department saves any particular amount, instead of having that amount available thereafter for use by it in entering into some other contract, either for the same thing or for something different, the money must go back into the Treasury, and must be reappropriated, before the War Department can use it again. Is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. No. Under the amendment, whenever the Secretary of War reported that the money was not necessary, it would go back into the Treasury. The Secretary of War would have to report it.

Mr. BARKLEY. He would have to report it as not being necessary; would he?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; he would have to report that to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that. But he would have to report it as being unnecessary for that particular project; would he?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Whereas the Congress had not appropriated money for that particular project, if he had entered into the project, and if thereafter he found he could save any part of the money, and so reported to Congress, he could not use for other projects what he saved; is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. No, Mr. President; the Senator is mistaken. That was one of the reasons why I was willing to take the matter to conference. The proposed amendment says:

> No part of any funds appropriated for the War or Navy Departments, when it is found by the head of such Department that any part of such funds is not necessary for the completion of the purpose for which appropriated.

There would have to be a purpose for which it was appropriated.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I understand that; but that language would cover, would it not, over-all appropriations with respect to which the object of the expenditure or the particular form of the expenditure was not set out in the law, but was left to the Department to determine?

For instance, if we appropriated $100,000,000 for aviation, without saying how much should go to any particular company, and if the War Department saved a certain amount of money on renegotiation, it could not be used for——

Mr. McKELLAR. Road building.

Mr. BARKLEY. For road building; it would have to be used for aviation. Is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. But so long as the Secretary of War needed all the money for aviation, even though a part of the money was recaptured by renegotiation, he would not have to turn it back, and he would not have to report it to Congress; is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. President, let me say that while the amendment represents some limitation, and while what the Senator from Kentucky has said is correct, the situation is that last year, the first year we were in the war, the War Department had a surplus of more than $12,000,000,000, and it had to be reappropriated. This year it will have a larger surplus. So the Congress will not be denying to the War Department the money needed by it in carrying on its functions. We are more than living up to our purpose to furnish all the money that is necessary to carry on the war; but it should be done in a way which is fair to the American taxpayer and to the American Government.

That is all the amendment proposes to do. I regret very much that there is any objection to it. It may be that upon consideration in conference some changes will have to be made. Naturally, in dealing with the House conferees, some changes perhaps will have to be made. But I am sure no change will be made which would in any way prevent the War Department from having all the money necessary to conduct the war, and even more; because that is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. WHITE rose.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I promised to yield first to the Senator from Maine, I believe. In a moment I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I express no opinion as to the merits or demerits of the amendment as a piece of draftsmanship. I have in mind that the amendment, in its full sweep, will go to conference, and that the conferees will have a very substantial authority with respect to its terms. I am quite confident that it should be that way.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHITE. I cannot help adding one word. My experience on the Appropriations Committee has been relatively very brief, but I have been shocked over and over again to find instances of the transfer of funds to various agencies of the Government, in amounts far different, far in excess of what the Appropriations Committee had thought was necessary for a particular bureau or division or activity of the Federal Government. So far as I am concerned, I wish to join with the Senator from Tennessee in any effort that can be made to recapture and bring back into the Treasury funds which cannot be spent in the specific way which Congress has authorized. Unless we do that I think we shall, in truth and in fact, in large measure surrender our control over appropriations.

I hope the amendment of the Senator will be adopted.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the senior Senator from Tennessee if he did not accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER].

Mr. McKELLAR. So far as I can do so, yes. We are not talking about that feature of it now.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I should like to discuss my viewpoint on this amendment. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has been acting as chairman of the Appropriations Committee for 2 or 3 years. The Senator from Tennessee will recall that in 1941, when the appropriation bill for 1942 was under consideration, the War Department had an unexpended balance of $35,000,000,000. I tried my level best

to get the Appropriations Committee to find out why that $35,000,000,000 should not be gone into in detail by the Appropriations Committee to determine the reason why that money was left over and not spent.

Under the same circumstances, in 1942, when the 1943 appropriation was under consideration, there was an unexpended balance of $12,000,000,000, and I made the same effort to find out why it was necessary to reappropriate that $12,000,000,000.

I am in sympathy with what the Senator from Tennessee is trying to do, but I think he has gone at it wrong-end-to. I have made very careful studies on this question. I am sorry that I have been unable to attend the meetings of the Appropriations Committee to as great an extent as I should like, but I have too many other things to do. I am on too many busy committees, such as the Committee on Military Affairs, the Interstate Commerce Committee, the Committee on Appropriations, and a special committee which keeps me very busy. I wonder if the Senator from Tennessee will bear with me while I make a statement of my views with respect to this amendment, and what I think it would do from a legislative standpoint.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to hear the statement of the Senator.

Mr. TRUMAN. Because of the pressure of other business I have not been able to give as much study to this bill as I would like, but I have been able to skim through the hearings and read the bill and the proposed amendments. In the printed transcript of hearings I read a statement by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget concerning the practice of the Budget Bureau to set up reserves against appropriations.

Good business practice requires a constant review of financial programs in the light of changing conditions. When the Congress acts on one of the regular appropriation bills, it is passing on a program to finance activities over a year in the future. It is acting on a budget prepared over 18 months in advance of the end of the fiscal year concerned.

Estimates for the annual budget are submitted to the Bureau of the Budget in September of each year. The programs proposed have generally been prepared in the field several months earlier. The funds involved are not available until the following July; that is, about a year later. Exigencies may cause long delays before the actual projects can be placed under way. Should the review of the Senate in connection with the appropriation bill be the last consideration of the project until it is built? No sound business enterprise could be so dogmatically operated. Regardless of other considerations, a review of authorized programs must be maintained so that full advantage can be taken of all changes in circumstances.

There is no way for the chairman of the Appropriations Committee or the chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee to supervise these projects and find out whether or not they are being carried on as they should be. It is our object to find out where the money goes, and why. That is one of the things which the Senate has authorized the special committee of which I happen to be the chairman to do. That is the reason I know to some extent about what this amendment might do to other appropriations besides those for the Army and Navy. I am perfectly in sympathy with what the Senator is trying to do, but I do not think it ought to be done in this way. I think it is a legislative matter which requires a great deal of careful consideration so as not to upset the whole budget system.

After funds are appropriated and control has temporarily left the hands of Congress, there are two principal changes which may take place in a program and which, it seems to me, call for action in the offices of the President rather than in the agency concerned. The first is a change in conditions which might require that the project priority be changed and the work deferred a short while, or even for an indefinite period. When this comes about, the Executive should set the funds aside for later use. The second is a change in conditions which might eliminate the need of a part or all of the program. When such a condition comes about, a saving should be effected, and this can best be accomplished by the office of an objective reviewer detached from the agency concerned.

In Government this review and control should be made in the office of the Chief Executive because that Executive is not properly performing his job if he permits the agencies to execute a program no longer needed even though it has been authorized. Lacking a legislative termination of the work, who but the Chief Executive can determine that the work is no longer needed at that time in the over-all program?

Particularly in times like these when the picture of our Federal program changes in detail almost every week, it is a matter of good judgment that some agency in Government keep a control of the fiscal changes which the new conditions require. What looks like a good program one day may be completely unnecessary 6 months later. We know it is contrary to human nature for an individual himself to determine that his good idea has outlived its usefulness before it has been actually effected. It is the same with our Government agencies. They are generally reluctant to curtail their programs as rapidly as changing conditions might warrant. Consequently, some agency in Government should keep on top of the programs so that only those expenditures essential to Government are made. The committee of which I am chairman, investigating the national defense program, finds frequent examples of the need for project control and review by another agency.

I could name instance after instance of tremendous sums which would have been wasted had not the project been stopped before it got a good start.

When the Congress appropriates funds it gives the executive branch an authority to incur obligations. Certainly none of us hold that we give a mandate to expend the funds appropriated. We expect the funds to be used only where needed, and not in excess of the amount appropriated, to carry out some phase of law.

I believe that the pending amendment would tend to make Government agencies spend the money before we catch up with them. I think it would do exactly the opposite of what the Senator from Tennessee hopes it would do. I should like to see the objective accomplished, but I believe it will be necessary to make a complete and thorough investigation of the situation. Unless we do so, when we make an appropriation we shall encourage administrative officials to spend it for fear that it will be taken away from them and put back into the Treasury. There are specific instances of expenditures having been held up, to a good purpose. I think there ought to be a proper way to get that money back into the Treasury without warning the agencies that unless they spend it they will have to give it up.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator is asking me the question, I should very much dislike to have that opinion of our administrative agencies.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I think the pending amendment would do just what I have suggested.

Mr. McKELLAR. I dislike to think that the administrative agencies would spend the money merely because it was appropriated. I do not believe they would. I believe that the amendment would result in an enormous saving. If I did not think so I would not be for it.

Mr. TRUMAN. Let me say to the Senator that I have come in contact with spending agencies of the War Department which have urged their employees to spend the money before the year is out so they could say that it was gone.

Mr. McKELLAR. If that be the case, we had better change the system. I did not know that that was the case.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is exactly what I am trying to get at. I do not think this is the way to do it.

It is proper that the President exercise through his offices control over these appropriations to see that no nonessential expenditures are made. In the administration of appropriations which are made available until expended, such as many for public works, it is fully desirable that the President through his offices control the programing required to undertake these works. We know that we cannot undertake everything at once. There are not enough men, materials, equipment, or money to let us prosecute the war to our utmost ability and concurrently undertake the many desirable general improvements unrelated to the war.

Having determined that some project or activity should receive a low priority and not be initiated as soon as funds become available, it then becomes incumbent on the Executive to see to it that those funds are saved for that particular purpose and not left unearmarked and free for such use as the agency may legally make of them. The mechanics of setting the funds in reserve seems

to me to be an excellent method of holding them aside for future specific use.

It is in part because we in the Senate feel that this necessary control is not always as effective as it could be that we have set up committees such as that of which I am chairman and the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. The latter committee has expressed itself on the very subject now before us. In its first report it stated:

> The committee recommends that legislation be enacted which would authorize the Director of the Budget to set up reserves out of any future appropriation, at such times and in such amounts as the Director may determine.

Are our committees now working at cross purposes? While we are striving for more economy in Government shall we also drop what controls we have and merely ask the agencies to turn back the funds they said they needed but really did not need? How many agencies will be anxious to show that they overestimate and overstate their needs? The amendment before us proposes no time limit in which an agency shall determine whether or not it needs the funds available. No machinery of control is proposed. That a control would be needed is only too evident from what comes before us every day.

The proposed amendment would remove the incentive on the part of the executive branch to reserve funds for savings and contingencies. It would give the impression that the Congress desires that appropriations made for construction and for other purposes shall be expended, and that no authority should defer such projects regardless of the fiscal situation confronting the Nation. The departments must assume that when the appropriations were made Congress was satisfied that all such projects were essential to the war effort, and that critical materials and manpower must be made available. Many of the construction projects for which appropriations have been made were authorized before the beginning of the present war. Numerous other projects have been appropriated for since the beginning of the war, and while such projects were fully justified at the time, it is to be expected that the rapidly changing conditions facing the country, and the need for eliminating or deferring all nonessential projects at a time when the Nation is under heavy financial, material, and manpower strain fully warrant the deferment of many projects at this time. It is essential that all appropriations once made be given a continual review by the executive branch, and that reserves against such appropriations be set up pending such time as the Nation is in a better position to afford such expenditures which the President and the executive branch might determine are not absolutely essential to the war effort.

The proposed amendment repeals the specific authority of the War Department to transfer funds between appropriations.

Since the beginning of the war Congress has authorized the heads of certain departments to transfer funds from one appropriation to another within specific limitations in order that the departments may be in a position to meet emergencies and contingencies without the delay of reporting to Congress and securing appropriations on each occasion. The repeal of this authority would result in a definite handicap to the prosecution of the war.

An argument as to prerogative is out of place at this time. Whether it be by the legislative or the executive branch, we need more effective management to accomplish economies in government. The machinery of the Bureau of the Budget establishment of reserves has been available since 1921. From a practical standpoint, this is not the time to abandon the existing procedure for establishing economies and savings to set up a new scheme. Rather, if anything need be done at this time, let us follow the recommendation of the Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures and strengthen the control now available.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I was and still am very much in favor of the stated purposes of the proposed amendment, one of which is to promote economy, and another to preserve the right and power of Congress in the question of appropriations.

I was also glad to join in an amendment which sought to validate and regularize the action of the War Department so far as the $13,000,000,000 surplus was concerned. I am still in favor of those objectives; but as I have said before, Mr. President, no Senator forecloses his right to seek to perfect an amendment. It is in that spirit that I make these few remarks today.

The plain fact of the matter is—I have only recently learned it—that the first part of the proposed amendment as it now stands, down to the word "provided" in line 8, would hamper the prosecution of the war. It could be very simply amended to carry out the purpose of the committee and prevent any hampering effect on the war. But, in its present form, it would compel the War Department to come to Congress for appropriations. The need might arise in a moment of crisis at a time when Congress was in recess, as it was for 2 months last summer, and even if it were not in recess it might take a long time to agree on an appropriation. It took us almost 8 weeks to enact the War Department appropriation bill last year.

In war we should be able to move fast. While I do not wish the Bureau of the Budget to have any more authority than it is supposed to have, I do not believe it is sound practice to cancel appropriations if they are not spent at once, and compel the War Department to come to Congress and go through the long procedure which is necessary before action is taken.

Another respect in which I think the amendment should be perfected is that any discretionary percentage would be eliminated. I subscribe to the final proviso, which strikes out section 3 of the Military Appropriation Act of 1944, because according to that provision the 10-percent differential had to go through the Bureau of the Budget.

I still believe that it is necessary in time of war for the head of the War Department to have the right to transfer not to exceed 10 percent of an appropriation to meet unforeseen contingencies. I am informed that last year the War Department used that power once to transfer funds for the Military Academy at West Point, which was necessary because of the fact that the number of cadets had been increased. That certainly was a proper use of a discretionary power.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the Senator believe that the Senate and the House would instantly agree to a bill if it were necessary to enlarge the academy? Why could not the departments ask Congress to do its duty rather than take the matter to the Budget Director and have the increase provided for in that way?

Mr. LODGE. I do not think that Congress is capable of doing many things instantly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Congress can sometimes do things with great speed—in a matter of days.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; Congress can do some things very fast, but I do not think speed is one of its most prominent and distinguishing characteristics. The fact is that the War Department appropriation bill, which we were all in favor of and voted for, required 8 weeks to be enacted. Hitler and Tojo will not wait 8 weeks while we in Congress, in a rather leisurely way, push appropriations along. That is the point I wish to make.

I have some language to suggest which I believe would carry out the purpose of the Senator from Tennessee, with which I am in complete accord, and would at the same time prevent us from doing any military damage. I read the language to which I refer:

> No part of any funds appropriated for the War or Navy Department, when it is found by the head of such department that any part of such funds is not necessary for the general purposes for which appropriated for the prosecution of the war, shall be impounded or held as a reserve, except by the head of the department concerned, who shall report such action to the chairman of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, or used for any other purpose without the specific approval of law by the Congress; except that the Secretary of War may transfer not to exceed 10 percent of any of the appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1944 to any other such appropriation, but no other appropriation shall be increased more than 2 percent thereby.

That is the proposal which I have in mind. With it I should like to incorporate the thought which the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] advances. In order that he may not lose out by reason of any changes we may make here, I would add a paragraph to the following effect:

> Amounts withheld from any contractor as a result of the renegotiation of a contract

shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

That would simply carry into my suggested amendment the thought regarding renegotiation the Senator from Tennessee accepted in his original amendment.

I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee if the language I suggest would not meet his views, and, at the same time, prevent any harm being done to the war effort?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I do not think it would meet the purpose the committee had in mind in adopting this provision. The Senator says such a thing occurred only once last year, so it is not of the greatest importance; but discretion might be added, and I think, if it should be, the conferees could work it out. I hope the Senator will allow the amendment to be adopted as we agreed upon it in the committee. The question of what percentage of leeway the Secretary should have if he should have any, might be easily arranged in conference. The Senator will be one of the conferees and will have every opportunity to present the matter in conference. I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment as it has been reported by the committee.

Mr. LODGE. As I understand the portion of my suggestion to which the Senator objects is the portion giving the Secretary of War 10-percent leeway. Is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. The committee worked out this language with great care. It went over it time and time again. I do not believe the Senator was present during all the time, but he was present a part of the time. We went into it and worked it out very carefully, and I believe that the best course would be to adopt the amendment the committee has proposed, and if there is any change that the Senator cares to bring before the conferees it would be entirely proper for him to do so, and the fact that he will be a member of the conference committee will make his right all the stronger in that regard.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it is true I was not present when the first portion of the amendment was drafted, but I think the Senator will agree I took quite an active part in drafting the second proviso.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; the Senator did. The report was unanimous and I think the Senator agrees with the main purpose or with the entire purpose of the provision, which is to be exceedingly careful about appropriations, to the end that the Congress may continue to have the appropriating power rather than to transfer it to another branch or some official of the Government.

Mr. LODGE. I am glad to agree to that, and I hope the Senator from Tennessee will agree that in the middle of a war we do not want to subject the Army to an 8 weeks' delay because they have not sufficient money.

Mr. McKELLAR. We would never do that in this world; I assure the Senator, so far as I have anything to do with it, that will never happen. The Secretary does not have to make the report until he desires; there is more than $13,000,000,000 leeway now; there was a $12,000,000,000 leeway last year; and, with all that money floating around, I believe that the Army can get along; but if it could not get along, I should be the first to help it in every possible way.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. I shall yield in a moment. I wish first to respond to one remark of the Senator from Tennessee before I forget it. The Senator from Tennessee surely does not want to encourage the departments when they have a surplus to keep it to themselves, and not tell anybody about it, so that they will have enough when the times comes. They can always do that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not want to encourage them to do any such thing; but when the Secretary of War makes a statement that the Department has $13,500,000,000 which was appropriated for some purposes and which ought to go back into the Treasury, it is not right that another officer of the Government should say, "Oh, no, that $13,500,000,000 cannot go back into the Treasury because I have the right to put it in a reserve," and he undertakes to do so. I am opposed to that; I believe, from what I know of the Senator from Massachusetts, that he is opposed to it, too; and I hope he will not put anything in the way of the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. LODGE. My amendment rules that out, too. My amendment would prevent the Director of the Budget from taking $13,000,000,000 and setting it up as a reserve. But I think it is just as important to keep the War Department in such a condition that it can meet sudden emergencies which may arise in war as it is to prevent the Budget Director from usurping authority he should not have.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I merely wanted to correct the figures quoted by the Senator from Tennessee. A few days ago we all read in the newspapers the statement that the War Department or some official—it never was really fastened on any particular person—had given out information that there would be turned back into the Treasury $13,000,000,000 which had been appropriated for the War Department, and there was a speculative statement made that the Navy Department would be able to turn back about five or six billion dollars.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; as I recall it, it was $1,200,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. The newspapers said five or six billion dollars.

The Secretary of the Treasury, in testifying before the Finance Committee the other day, from figures given him by the Director of the Budget, stated that the public debt for this fiscal year ending the 30th of June would be about $7,000,000,000 less than had been anticipated; in other words, that the public debt at the beginning of July would be $7,000,000,000 less than we had thought it would be. That was not necessarily in cash turned back to the Treasury, but the expenditures themselves would be approximately $7,000,000,000 less than had been anticipated at the beginning of the year.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think whoever gave the figures to the Senator was entirely mistaken. Let us assume, however, that he was not mistaken. Is $7,000,000,000 so inconsequential that we will now just let it be put in a reserve by some official of the Government?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not opposing the Senator's amendment; I simply wanted to correct his figures.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. I rise to obtain some information, as I am not a member of the Committee on Appropriations. Are there occasions created by changes in the strategical situation or by new types of ammunition suddenly required which were not foreseen at the time the War Department sent its estimates to the distinguished committee and for which there must be funds available and ready?

Mr. LODGE. There most certainly are. War is full of the unforeseen, and it is quite possible, as I was saying, that during the next fiscal year we will have, let us say, more than we need in ordnance, and not enough for our quartermaster and engineer items. To my mind it is inconceivable that the Senate should seek to impose a system under which the War Department may be without funds, and not be able to get funds for a period of 6 or 8 weeks, which is the time it takes to get an Army appropriation bill through Congress.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the Senator yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Utah in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR rose.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have two or three questions to ask.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wanted to answer the question the Senator from Vermont has just asked. In connection with the bill before us, among all the departments asking for additional money, there are no requests from the War Department for any funds, showing that the Congress has made full appropriations for that Department.

Mr. AUSTIN. I would comment at this point that the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee has not yet become the law, and such a request might be made if it were the law.

I desire to ask the Senator from Massachusetts what would be the condition after the adoption of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee? Would there be any revolving fund available to the Secretary of War to answer the emergency calls which must be answered before the Department can come to Congress and go through the machinery involved in obtaining an appropriation? Would there be any such rotating fund left?

Mr. LODGE. There would be no rotating fund, and the only recourse the Secretary of War would have would be to come to Congress for another appropriation.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Would one of the effects of the amendment be to cut off that cushion, which was intended to be provided in the power to transfer 10 percent of an amount appropriated from one use to another in case of an emergency? Would that all be cut off, too?

Mr. LODGE. That would be cut off. I have an amendment, which I have read, I do not know whether the Senator heard it——

Mr. AUSTIN. I heard it.

Mr. LODGE. Which I think would meet the very proper objection the Senator from Tennessee has to some of the things which have been going on, and at the same time would prevent the occurrences which the Senator from Vermont has indicated with such clarity and power of analysis.

Mr. AUSTIN. Looking at the Senator's amendment, of which I think I have a copy, does not his amendment provide that such funds as were retained under the exclusive control of the head of a department shall be limited or prohibited from use for any other purpose than that for which they were appropriated, by the clause "or used for any other purpose without the specific approval of law by the Congress"?

Mr. LODGE. That is the second proviso to which the Senator refers?

Mr. AUSTIN. No; it is not in that; the clause is in the first proviso.

Mr. LODGE. Yes. I think that carries out the whole purpose the Committee on Appropriations has in mind, which I think is a proper purpose.

Mr. AUSTIN. If the Senator will yield for a further question, on the point of diversion from one use to another and different use, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts is an absolue prohibition, without the intervening action of Congress. Is that correct?

Mr. LODGE. That is correct; yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. With respect to the funds proposed to be permitted to remain impounded, I want to know whether the Senator interprets his suggestion as meaning that they shall be held for the use for which the Congress appropriated them.

Mr. LODGE. Except for the 10-percent leeway.

Mr. AUSTIN. Except for the 10-percent leeway the funds held, then, would be funds properly appropriated for a specific use, and those funds would be prohibited from use for any other purpose until after Congress should again act upon the appropriation?

Mr. LODGE. That is entirely correct, and it seems to me it is exactly what the Senator from Tennessee desires. At the same time, it does not involve the grave dangers incident to leaving the War Department without money.

Mr. AUSTIN. In other words, I gather that the difference between the proposal of the Senator from Tennessee and the proposal of the Senator from Massachusetts is that in one case there is a cushion provided, and that is the case of the amendment suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts, yet in both cases the objective of preventing the diversion of funds would be accomplished?

Mr. LODGE. Absolutely. My amendment would prevent the diversion of funds. I think anyone who reads it must agree to that. But instead of canceling the appropriation so that there would be no money left for unforeseen emergencies, it would leave the money in the control of the Department. It must be reported at once to the Committee on Appropriations. It could then only be expended according to the provisions of law, except for the 10-percent leeway, which would be allowed in order to meet the unforeseen emergencies which are inevitable in time of war.

Mr. OVERTON. Will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. When the Senator was answering the questions propounded by the Senator from Vermont either I misunderstood the Senator from Vermont or misunderstood what the Senator from Massachusetts said. The amendment suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts does permit the Secretary of War to take 10 percent of any appropriation and add it to any other appropriation for any other purpose, provided it does not increase such appropriation by more than 2 percent. If that is the understanding, then I thoroughly understand it.

Mr. LODGE. That is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. What the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts proposes——

Mr. LODGE. But it does not have to go through the Budget.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct; it carries out the purpose of the committee amendment, it does not have to go through the Budget at all, but is left entirely to the Secretary of War; just as the Senator's amendment gives discretion to the Secretary of War——

Mr. LODGE. Of course it does.

Mr. OVERTON. To withhold unnecessary funds, and not use them. That is a discretionary authority.

Mr. LODGE. Absolutely.

Mr. OVERTON. And such discretionary authority is now vested in the Budget, but by the Senator's amendment it is proposed to lodge that authority in the Secretary of War.

Mr. LODGE. With provision for a report to the Committee on Appropriations of every such item, and with expenditure subject to provisions of law, and with the 10-percent leeway.

It may be of some interest, I think, to note a few words which the War Department has expressed regarding the original draft of the amendment. I quote:

> Except in the event of an urgent unforeseen military requirement, no part of this savings will be used.

That refers to the $13,000,000,000—

> However, should such emergency arise, it is most important that the War Department have both the authority and the means to meet it without delay. War is a precarious uncertainty; and the War Department's efforts to conduct this war energetically and successfully, should not be impaired or endangered.
>
> If section 305, as proposed, be enacted into law, the War Department would find itself in a position of not being able to finance any requirement, however urgent, which arose from changes in the strategical situation or from the need for new types of munitions and implements of war, not foreseen at the time the War Department estimates were presented to the Congress. It is hoped you will appreciate this and will realize it is imperative that the War Department be left with sufficient authority to use its funds for urgent requirements caused by such changes.

I think that states the situation very well, and it seems to me the amendment I have submitted meets the needs of both the interests which are involved.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it the Senator's purpose to offer as an amendment to his suggested amendment the language which I gave him, which will cover the point I raised?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator further tell us why he strikes out lines 8 to 18 on page 2 of the committee amendment?

Mr. LODGE. I do not propose to strike them out.

Mr. DANAHER. I understood the Senator to propose to strike that language in the amendment he proposed.

Mr. LODGE. No; I wish to leave that language in the bill. I am heartily in favor of the two provisos, and in this part of the amendment I have offered I simply have not included the words, because I mean to leave them in the bill.

Mr. DANAHER. So that it is the Senator's purpose to move a substitute, in effect?

Mr. LODGE. No; it is amendment. I move an amendment, striking out from line 1 to line 7 on page 1, and from line 1 to line 8, to the word "Provided," on page 2.

Mr. DANAHER. I understand.

Mr. LODGE. At that point I offer the provision which I have already described. The situation appears to be rather complicated at first, but I have done my best to make it clear to the Senate. It is one of those unusual situations in which one can accomplish all the things one wants to accomplish without doing violence to any of them. For that reason I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. President, I ask that my amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut withdraw his amendment?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I am happy to withdraw my amendment for the purpose of having it appear in the amendment suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

Mr. BARKLEY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Before the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee can be considered, the rule must be suspended if the point of order is made. Has the procedure gone to the extent that the amendment is now before the Senate?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, no point of order has been made against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No point of order has been raised. The amendment is offered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understood that the point of order had been made, or that it would be made. That is why the Senator from Tennessee gave notice of his motion to suspend the rule.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, of course I had to give the notice, but I did not expect any Member to make the point of order, and I hope it will not be made.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not expect to make it.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have given notice in writing that I would ask for a vote on the question. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Green	Overton
Austin	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bailey	Gurney	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Robertson
Barkley	Hawkes	Russell
Bridges	Hayden	Scrugham
Buck	Hill	Shipstead
Burton	Holman	Smith
Bushfield	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lodge	Tobey
Caraway	Lucas	Truman
Chandler	McCarran	Tunnell
Chavez	McClellan	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maybank	Wallgren
Davis	Mead	Walsh, Mass.
Downey	Millikin	Walsh, N. J.
Eastland	Moore	Wheeler
Ellender	Murdock	Wherry
Ferguson	Murray	White
George	Nye	Willis
Gerry	O'Daniel	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in accordance with the notice heretofore given, I move that the rule be suspended, and that the amendment be considered.

Mr. TRUMAN. On that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may ask the Chair to have read at the desk the amendment which I have proposed to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask that my amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read as requested.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all down to the word "Provided" on page 2, line 8, of Mr. McKELLAR'S amendment, and to insert:

SEC. 305. No part of any funds appropriated for the War or Navy Department, when it is found by the head of such department that any part of such funds is not necessary for the general purposes for which appropriated for the prosecution of the war, shall be impounded or held as a reserve, except by the head of the department concerned who shall report such action to the chairmen of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, or used for any other purpose without the specific approval of law by the Congress; except that the Secretary of War may transfer not to exceed 10 percent of any of the appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1944 to any other such appropriation, but no other appropriation shall be increased more than 2 percent thereby. Amounts withheld from any contractor as a result of the renegotiation of a contract shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. For the benefit of Senators who have just come into the Chamber, I will say that the amendment just read at the desk is one which I am offering to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee regarding which we are asked to suspend the rule. My amendment seeks to accomplish the same purpose as that of the Senator from Tennessee, without involving the cancelation of unexpended appropriations, with the attendant risk that the War Department might be left without enough funds at a time when Congress was not in session, and might therefore not obtain the needed money.

In order to meet the views of the Senator from Tennessee I will modify my amendment so that the figure of 2 percent will be the leeway given to the Secretary of War, instead of 10 percent, which I understand is a proposition acceptable to the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts may modify his amendment if the motion to suspend the rule is sustained.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI, pursuant to the notice given by him on Friday last.

Mr. TRUMAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, I wish to make a very brief statement about the amendment. I am in complete sympathy with the idea that in cases in which Congress makes an appropriation for a definite project, such as a dam or a military training camp or something of that sort, when the project itself is specified in the appropriation, if the agency concerned does not expend all the money which is made available for that purpose, or if it finds that the entire amount of money so appropriated is unnecessary, the surplus left over from such project should not be transferred to some other project wholly separated from and unrelated to the particular project for which the Congress appropriated the money and earmarked it, without there being an act of Congress authorizing some other project, which it might or might not be willing to advocate, on which the money might be expended.

But in cases in which Congress appropriates lump sums of money, as we have had to do in the present war, and as has been necessary in all wars, for the use of the Executive or the departments, without being able to go into detail as to where the money shall be spent, we are bound to express our confidence in the department involved by allowing it discretion as to how the money shall be spent for war purposes. That is particularly true of the War Department and, in some degree, of the Navy Department.

However, in cases in which we have appropriated lump sums of money to the War Department or the Navy Department, without specifying the location of the project or without specifying the contractor involved—which, of course, we could not do—and in cases in which the contracts have been entered into in more or less of a hurry, as I said a while ago, because we could not afford to have the representatives of the department sit down at a conference table and haggle over a few dollars, at a time when, from all the fronts on which our men were fighting, calls for equipment were coming, and when later, under a law enacted by Congress, the War Department or the Navy Department has renegotiated the contract, and has saved some money, it seems to me that money should be treated as if it never had been involved in the contract, whether it had actually been spent, or whether it was saved without having been actually expended.

In other words, suppose the Congress appropriates $100,000,000 to the War Department for aviation, let us say. Of course, it has appropriated much more than that. Suppose the War Department enters into contracts with the aircraft manufacturers, and that the contracts absorb the entire $100,000,000. Suppose that later on the War Department renegotiates the contracts, and saves $5,000,000 of the $100,000,000. I feel that the War Department should have the right to spend the $5,000,000 it had saved, not spend it for tanks, not spend it for anything other than aviation, but that it should have the discretion and power to spend the $5,000,000 for aviation, for which Congress originally appropriated the money.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Following the Senator's thought in that respect, I take it the Senator would not approve of a policy on the part of the Bureau of the Budget by which that Bureau would say it was going to impound the money and hold it in reserve for some purpose which the Bureau of the Budget itself would devise. Would the Senator favor such a policy?

Mr. BARKLEY. No. I would not favor the transfer of that money from aviation to some other department of war activity, whether by the Bureau of the Budget or by the Secretary of War or by any-

one else. But under the amendment, as I understand it, out of the $100,000,000 for aviation—the amount I have used merely as an example—if the War Department were to save $5,000,000, and not expend it, or if it were to make contracts for all of it, and subsequently by renegotiation was able to recover $5,000,000, it could not thereafter expend that $5,000,000, even for aviation, without coming back to Congress and requesting specific authority. I do not believe that should be done. I think the War Department and the Navy Department are to be commended whenever they are able to save money. Under Secretary of War Patterson, testifying before the Committee on Finance yesterday, I believe, stated that they had been able to recover $5,300,000,000 by renegotiating contracts, and that that money of course was saved to the Treasury.

I believe that if the Department has been able to save that much money, if it later proposes to spend the money saved for whatever purpose for which Congress appropriated it—whether for aviation or for tanks, or for whatever purpose it was earmarked—out of that earmarking, as to the amount of money saved in any category, the Department should not be required to come back to Congress and to say, "While we have saved this amount of money on tanks or on aircraft or guns, for which it was originally appropriated, we cannot make a contract with another contractor, for the same purpose, without requesting authority."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator does not mean to say, however, does he, that when the $5,000,000 he has stated as an example is saved in connection with the renegotiation of a contract, it is actually a saving unless that money actually goes back into the United States Treasury?

Mr. BARKLEY. I mean to say it is an actual saving in connection with the things for which the contract was made. The money may go back into the Treasury, but if a part of the money was saved in connection with contracts for aircraft, for which Congress has appropriated large sums of money, I think the Department should be allowed to enter into contracts for more aircraft than it would have contracted for if it had not saved the particular amount of money, without having to ask Congress whether it could expend for additional aircraft the money it had saved from a previous appropriation for aircraft. In other words, by saving that amount of money, and by later expending it on other aircraft, the Department would get more aircraft than the number Congress appropriated for, but not more than are needed.

Mr. BRIDGES. It would mean that the Department could buy aircraft cheaper and actually it would be getting a better buy for the money. But the money would not actually be saved, because it would not go back into the Treasury.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would be saved if, in the case of appropriations for aircraft, the subsequent appropriation for aircraft would be reduced by the amount of money thus saved.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator from Kentucky is now addressing himself to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BARKLEY. In part, what I said applies to that amendment more than to the language of the bill. I understand that the language of the bill itself, as unamended, would prohibit the subsequent expenditure for any other purpose than that specified, without additional congressional authority, of any money appropriated for a definite purpose and for a particular project. I illustrated the point by referring to a dam across a river. If we were to appropriate $50,000,000 for a dam which might be necessary for war purposes, and if the dam were built for $45,000,000, the remaining $5,000,000 would go back into the Treasury. It could not be used for some other purpose. I favor that idea. I would not want the Department to be able, without congressional authority, to use for the building of tanks or fortifications somewhere along the coast the $5,000,000 of the original $50,000,000 appropriated by Congress for the building of the dam.

But in cases in which, under a lump-sum appropriation, we have given it authority to use its discretion, and in connection with which it is able, either by renegotiation or by economy, to save money under contracts which it is considering or into which it has actually entered, I think it is entitled to the same discretion in connection with the expenditure of what it saved as it would be in connection with the expenditure of the original amount. That is my opinion.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not know that I entirely agree with the Senator. Take the War Department, for example. It makes an estimate as to the number of planes it needs, and the cost thereof. The estimate is approved by the Bureau of the Budget. It is presented to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate, which hold hearings thereon, and an appropriation is made, on the basis of the estimate as to the number of planes needed and the cost thereof. Suppose the Department has overestimated. To use the Senator's illustration, suppose the Department has overestimated by $5,000,000. Had the Congress had that information at the outset, it would have appropriated $95,000,000 instead of $100,000,000. So, by an overestimate, the War Department or any other department is simply giving itself a leeway to spend money which was not in reality intended to be appropriated by the Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize, of course, that all these things are subject to the frailty of human judgment. We must give ourselves a leeway in the appropriation of money; but after we have appropriated money and the Department has entered into contracts and is able to save money on the contracts already entered into—which is a commendable thing, and one which we have approved—I doubt the wisdom of requiring the Department to come back to Congress and obtain authority to spend what it has saved out of a fund which we appropriated for a definite purpose, such as aviation, tanks, antiaircraft guns, or anything of that kind, without undertaking to say how much should be paid for each unit.

Mr. OVERTON. If the departments must render such an accounting, they will not be so anxious to save.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know about that.

Mr. OVERTON. I would not make that statement. However, that suggestion has been made. I do not accede to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the departments must come back to Congress for authority to spend what they have saved, I do not think the officials of the departments are unpatriotic or unfair enough to say, "Very well; if we must do that, we will not be so careful to save anything." I think they would do the same as they are now doing.

Mr. OVERTON. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I believe the Senator wants to save money He will recall the last War Department appropriation bill, containing an appropriation of $71,000,000,000 which passed by unanimous vote. We want to give the War Department, the Navy Department, and all the other agencies of the Government sufficient money with which to prosecute the war; but I believe we have reached the point, with the tremendous spending, bond sales, taxes, and so forth, where we should start some orderly procedure to save money.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not in disagreement with the objective; but because I entertain these views, especially with respect to that part of any funds which our Government, through its departments, has saved, I do not believe we should require a department to come back to Congress for a further appropriation before it can spend the money for the same purpose. Frequently contracts are renegotiated over the objections of contractors, and the Government has been able to recover large amounts, as the Senator knows if he heard the statement made yesterday by Judge Patterson. I do not believe it is in the interest of the war, or in the interest of economy and speed, to require the departments to come back to Congress and say, "You appropriated this money for us 6 months ago, thinking that we would spend all of it. We have saved this much out of it, but now we must come back and ask you to reappropriate it before we can spend it for the same purpose."

Mr. BRIDGES. Suppose the Senator should give his son $50 with which to buy a suit of clothes——

Mr. BARKLEY. I am afraid if I were to do so my son would drop dead of heart failure. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. Let us assume that the Senator gave his son $50, and that his son bought a $40 suit. If his son came home and returned $10 to the Senator, the difference between the $50 which the Senator gave him and the cost of the suit, the Senator would save $10. But if his son, having spent $40 for the suit, kept the $10 or spent it for other wearing apparel, the Senator would not be saving any money.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator assumes that I would give my son $50 with which to buy a suit of clothes, which is purely speculative. I thank the Senator for the compliment. I am sure my son will be grateful to him for the suggestion. [Laughter.] But if I were to give my son $50 with which to buy a suit of clothes, and he were to spend only $40 for the suit of clothes, I would expect him to come back and say, "I spent only $40, and here is $10. I am willing to give it back to you, or if you want me to spend it for something else, all right." But if I should give him $50 without telling him what he should spend it for, and he should spend $40 for a suit of clothes, I would not expect him to give me back $10.

Mr. BRIDGES. Even if he spent only $40 for a suit of clothes, if the Senator did not get the $10 back, he would not save $10.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I would not save $10. I could save $50 by not giving him anything.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing an amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee if I correctly understand the agreement between him and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] which I think was made near my desk. My understanding of the agreement is that if in the proposal of the Senator from Massachusetts the 10 percent is reduced to 2 percent, the Senator from Tennessee will accept the proposal of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggested to the Senator from Massachusetts that instead of 10 percent, the figure should be 2 percent, and I stated to him that I would have no objection to that figure going into the amendment; but the wording of the amendment is a different thing. His wording of the first part of the amendment is different from mine. If we vote to suspend the rule, I am perfectly willing to fix the amount at 2 percent. I am sure that can be arranged. I hope the rule will be suspended, and that the matter can be adjusted in that way. The Parliamentarian tells me that I would have no right to accept an amendment to the language reported by the committee. However, I told the Senator from Massachusetts that I would be perfectly willing to allow a 2-percent leeway to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, so that funds could be used interchangeably to that extent.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHITE. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee a question with regard to the understanding.

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. Is it contemplated, if the motion to suspend the rule is agreed to, that we shall then adjourn or take a recess, or is it hoped that this question can be disposed of this afternoon?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to call a meeting of the committee for tomorrow morning. I am quite sure that the Senator from Massachusetts and the committee can agree. The Parliamentarian tells me that I have no right to accept the amendment. The committee has reported the other language. However, I shall be glad to call a meeting of the committee for tomorrow morning. I will agree to support the Senator from Massachusetts in connection with the leeway of 2 percent instead of 10 percent, as proposed.

Mr. WHITE. If the motion to suspend the rule should be agreed to, would that conclude the session this afternoon? I ask that question of either the Senator from Tennessee or the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McKELLAR. That would be my purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am perfectly willing that the Senate take a recess.

Mr. WHITE. It seems to me that we could make substantial progress on the bill tonight.

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of the present situation, I think it would be impossible to conclude consideration of the bill today.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I think it would be unwise for the Senate to proceed to vote on this question at this time, in view of the confusion about what led up to the present parliamentary situation. Of course, it is not the proposal of the Senator from Massachusetts to make the cushion 2 percent, as implied in the statement of the Senator from Tennessee. That is the proposal of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I said that I suggested it to him, and that he accepted it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Very well. He accepted it upon a consideration. I understood there was a definite understanding that if 2 percent instead of 10 percent were adopted, as suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts, his proposal would be accepted. I ask him if he did not so understand.

Mr. LODGE. My understanding was that my amendment would be agreeable to the Senator from Tennessee if I should alter the 10-percent leeway to 2 percent.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is the way I understood it. I will ask the Senator from Connecticut if that is not his understanding.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Vermont is trying to put me in a very awkward position, which is not in accordance with the facts.

Mr. AUSTIN. No; I am not.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say to him that what occurred is this—and he will remember it, as will other Senators—I suggested to the Senator from Massachusetts that the amendment could be put into the bill by way of a proviso. He said that he could not get in touch with the military officials with whom he had been in touch, and that he could not tell me whether he would be willing to handle the amendment in the way I suggested. I thought we would suspend the rule, and that I would call a meeting of the committee tomorrow. At that time we could have the military men appear and we could agree on the language of the amendment. That is the whole sum and substance of it.

I told the Senator from Massachusetts that I had been informed by the Parliamentarian that I had no right to make an agreement, and I merely made a suggestion to the Senator to the extent which I have stated.

Mr. LODGE. I did not understand there were any rules which would prevent the Senate from adopting my amendment if the Senate wished to do so.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is nothing in the rules which would prevent it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The point of order having been made against the original amendment, it cannot be before the Senate without a suspension of the rule. Therefore, an amendment to change the language of the original amendment cannot be considered by the Senate until the Senate first agrees to suspend the rule so that the amendment can be offered. That is the parliamentary situation.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I am not trying to raise the question of veracity. I am raising the question of accuracy of my own memory. I have had it verified by one Member of the Senate and differentiated by another.

At the time of the conversation the situation was different than it now is. The parliamentary question had not been raised at that time. But we are now confronted with the question of whether we shall waive the rule, and on that question I believe it is very important for the Senate to know what is pending, and to understand it thoroughly. The difference between the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee and the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts should be clearly understood before we vote on the pending motion. I trust that the leaders will allow this question to go over until tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I will state that I concur in the suggestion. I have just made the same suggestion to the Senator from Tennessee. What is to go into the amendment may determine how some of us shall vote on the motion to suspend the rule.

Mr. AUSTIN. It would certainly control my vote in that respect.

Mr. BARKLEY. For example, if the language which has been written in in pencil on page 5, after the word "appropriate," namely, "and no amounts withheld from any contractor as a result of renegotiation of any contract," is to be put in I should not vote for the suspension of the rule, because I do not believe in doing that. That question ought to be settled, and I think that in view of the fact it is now almost 5 o'clock the best thing to do is to suspend the proceedings of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have no objection to suspending at the present time, but I wish it distinctly understood that the amendment is not mine at all. It is an amendment of the Committee on Appropriations. The Parliamentarian informed me—and I so stated to the Senator from Massachusetts, and I thought the Senator from Vermont heard it because it was in his hearing, but I am sorry he did not hear it—that I have no right to make an agreement about the amendment; that it is a committee amendment and not mine. If it had been my amendment I should have been very happy to act on it in the way suggested. I am sure the Senator from Massachusetts understood it in the way I have stated. I am sure the Senator from Connecticut also understood it in that way, because that is the fact. That is all there is to it. It is a fact.

I shall call a meeting of the committee tomorrow.

Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont is smiling at me as though he did not believe me. I do not care a particle whether the Senator from Vermont believes me or not, but I assert that what I have said is the fact, and he will not dare to say that it is not.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I regret that any feeling has been exhibited in connection with this matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not like the way the Senator was smiling about it.

Mr. AUSTIN. I was not at all smiling at what the Senator was saying.

Mr. McKELLAR. In my judgment, the Senator was smiling at what I had said.

Mr. DANAHER. It might be that he was smiling at the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, if he was, that is a different thing. But I do not like that kind of humor.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure the Senator from Tennessee will agree that it is much easier for the Senator from Vermont to laugh at the Senator from Connecticut than to laugh at him.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not saying one way or the other.

Mr. AUSTIN. There is nothing to it.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator says there is nothing to it, and I am willing to accept his explanation.

Mr. BARKLEY obtained the floor.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to be clear in my own mind as to what is the program. We are not to vote on the motion to suspend the rule until tomorrow; is that correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to announce to the members of the Appropriations Committee who are present in the Chamber that I have asked the clerk of the committee to invite all members of the committee to be present at a meeting of the committee tomorrow. I should especially like to have the Senator from Massachusetts, who offered the amendment, appear at the meeting. The meeting will be at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE COAST GUARD

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, certain Coast Guard nominations have been reported favorably from the Committee on Commerce, which the chairman of the committee, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], wishes to have taken up at this time and acted upon. As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the nominations were unanimously reported from the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHITE. In those circumstances, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the clerk will state the nominations.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Commodore Joseph F. Farley to be rear admiral in the Coast Guard while serving as Assistant Chief of Operations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Capt. Philip B. Eaton to be rear admiral while serving as Assistant Engineer in Chief.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Capt. Earl G. Rose to be commodore, for temporary service, while serving as commander, Greenland Patrol.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nominations confirmed today, as well as those which have been confirmed by the Senate previously and not heretofore sent to the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the President will be notified forthwith.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Utah in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States nominating Capt. Willard A Kitts 3d to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, to rank from December 1, 1943, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN JOINT RESOLUTION DURING RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senate today passed House Joint Resolution 199, having to do with the statute of limitations in connection with Pearl Harbor. I ask unanimous consent that during the recess the Vice President be authorized to sign it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 8, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate December 7, 1943:

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Capt. Willard A. Kitts 3d, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, to rank from the 1st day of December 1943.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 7, 1943.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Joseph F. Farley to be a rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as Assistant Chief of Operations.

Philip B. Eaton (E) to be a rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as Assistant Engineer in Chief.

Earl G. Rose to be a commodore, for temporary service, while serving as commander, Greenland Patrol, to rank from November 1, 1943.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, on the anniversary of the grimmest hour in American history, give ear to Thy words and consider our meditation; grant that our fellow countrymen may harken unto Thy voice: "Fret not thyself because of evildoers, neither be thou envious against the workers of iniquity." Through the dreary desert of suffering and sin, we pray for a highway for the march of all emancipated peoples. "Commit thy way unto the Lord and He shall bring it to pass."

Heavenly Father, universal is the hand of justice that holds the eternal scale. As we meet the challenge of today, grant that we may keep enthroned within the spirit of humanity, which is the

merciful endowment of our Master. Allow us not to relax the divinity of our immortal souls, nor treasure up wrath against any nation which forgets God. O let us labor for the advancement and the release of man from the chains of tyranny and the promise of future days will assume for us fresh meaning and power in all the vicissitudes of this world. Inspire all to bring to this Chamber tithes of time, of energy, and of understanding. O come and reign above all treaties that the Christian precepts may be augmented in all lands and thus they will be brought into closer relationship with Thee and become the garden of our Lord. In the name of Him who is the Prince of Peace and the Son of man. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, December 6, 1943, was read and approved.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSION OF THE HOUSE—COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may sit today during the time the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

CASH PAYMENT TO MEN AND WOMEN OF ARMED FORCES UPON DISCHARGE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I heartily approve and endorse the statement made yesterday by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Minority Leader MARTIN, calling for immediate action on legislation to grant a cash payment to the men and women of our armed forces at the time of their discharge. He will have my full cooperation in a determined effort to get action on this proposal before Christmas.

Even dishonorably discharged men, on their release from a sentence of confinement, are given a suit of clothes. Honorably discharged personnel are paid up to the date of their discharge and must then drift for themselves until they are able to establish a claim for disability, if they have such a claim, before the Veterans' Administration.

Certainly it is not the intention of either the Congress or the American people to shirk our joint responsibility for assisting the discharged veteran to readjust himself to civilian life.

We have a duty to perform for these discharged service men and women, who are being returned to civil life by the thousands. It is an obligation which we cannot conscientiously postpone any longer.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, Minority Leader MARTIN, sounded the call to action when he urged the passage of suitable legislation before the Christmas holidays. This job must be done eventually. Why not now? No American service man or woman should be permitted to suffer because of any failure on our part to act immediately.

This is an American responsibility—not a partisan issue.

I believe all Members of Congress will approve of the purpose of the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE MARTIN, to deal justly and generously with the honorably discharged veterans of this war, and will be happy to join with him in his effort to take this first essential step toward the rehabilitation of the members of our armed forces.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

[Mr. McCORMACK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Washington Daily News, of Washington, D. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein an address delivered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] before the Tennessee Farm Bureau Association, at Memphis, Tenn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks with reference to two subjects and to include an article in reference to each.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a speech I made before the national executive committee of the American Legion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House after the special orders today for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include a very brief editorial from the Pathfinder on the subsidy bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WASTAGE BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, the following is from George E. Hardy, known as Old Man River, former clerk of the courts in Lucas County, Ohio:

In Port Clinton, Ohio, Dr. Poole passed on recently. He was the head of Poole Hospital. Among the things he left was a 5-gallon container of alcohol needed by the Army and the Navy and every hospital in the country. The alcohol, according to the ruling, could not be sold nor given away. How to dispose of it? An officer or employee of the Internal Revenue Department came from Cleveland and poured the 5 gallons of good grain alcohol down a sewer.

The Unicast Co., of Toledo, remodeled and enlarged the American Bridge Co. plant out East Broadway Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.

When one of the jobs was finished a goodly amount of good lumber was left over. It could not be sold or given away. How to dispose of it? The decision was to burn it, and it was burned.

I want a little information. I tried to find out the why and wherefore. I have not learned how to phone or go down to departments and find out some of these things. I was told to look into the short range; look into the long range; take a broad view. If X equals pi and is divided by the cube root of something nobody understands, you get the usual evasive answer, but is it right to thus fool the Representatives of the people?

In God's and country's name, will someone show me what to do to no longer get the run-around and a smile in answer to miles and miles of errand running for constituents who want unequivocal answers based on facts and common sense?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

ABSENTEE VOTING BY SOLDIERS AND SAILORS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this morning's issue of PM, the uptown edition of the Communist Daily Worker, which is being financed by the tax-dodging fortune of Marshall Field, and which

is supporting the Lucas-Worley bill to set up Federal machinery to control the elections of this country, comes out and denounces those of us who are trying to pass a real soldier absentee voting bill, such as the substitute passed by the Senate on last Friday.

This yellow sheet quotes a statement from a Negro woman named Mary McLeod Bethune, whom the Dies committee said belonged to four Communist organizations that had been denounced by the Department of Justice as being both dangerous and subversive. She is quoted as denouncing what she calls poll-tax Democrats and Northern Republicans, for passing the Eastland-McKellar-McClellan substitute for the so-called Lucas-Worley bill.

That substitute will enable our men in the armed forces to vote, and have their votes counted, without destroying the election machinery of every State in the Union.

Today I am receiving a great many letters and telegrams from people in New York, largely from Brooklyn, urging me to vote against this substitute. Let us take a glance at them. Here is one from Mrs. Lillian Kapnik, who is opposed to this Eastland-Rankin bill, as she calls it.

You know I introduced it in the House.

Here is a telegram from Mr. Julius Reisman. He is opposed to the Eastland-McKellar-McClellan-Rankin bill. He wants one passed that will take control of our elections away from the States, and concentrate it into the hands of a Federal bureau.

Mr. William Liebowitz writes me that he is opposed to this substitute. Mrs. K. L. Lowenstein writes me that she is opposed to it. Ethel Siegel, Mrs. Rothman, Miss Pearl Priess, Mrs. Ethel T. Surowitz, Hirsch Zibman, and Mrs. Rubenstein, are all opposed to this bill which we are trying to pass, giving the soldiers the right to vote by absentee ballots, and leaving the election machinery in the hands of the various States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

TAXES ON MARSHALL FIELD ESTATE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] would do a little more to get this money that Marshall Field is using to support PM and put it into the United States Treasury by way of tax, he would not have these attacks on measures which would give the soldiers the right to vote.

A long time ago, I remember the gentleman was advocating some sort of tax that would recapture or put into the Treasury some of the Marshall Field millions; millions that are backing, subsidizing PM and the Chicago Sun. If the gentleman will continue that program and get that inheritance money into the Treasury, some of our troubles would all be over, and it would not be necessary for you and I every day to talk about PM, the Chicago Sun, the Daily Worker, the publications which attack Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. That is one thing I am driving at, because this Communist paper called PM is financed with money that is escaping taxation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thought you had forgotten about it. You mean you want to get this Marshall Field money into the United States Treasury?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. I want to get that money into the Treasury before it is all wasted on PM.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is all right, just so we understand each other.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1285. An act to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Would it be in order, Mr. Speaker, to ask unanimous consent to take this bill up and put it on passage at this time?

The SPEAKER. Not at this time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two informal addresses made by the President to the soldiers at Teheran.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I had a special order for today of 15 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that this order may be transferred to tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I had a special order for today. I ask unanimous consent that it may be transferred to Friday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE SOLDIERS' VOTE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I cannot remain silent any longer; I want to tell the House how I feel about this question of letting the soldiers vote. I do not care who is on one side and who is on another; the thing looks very plain to me. If we really believe, as I most certainly do, that any man who is good enough to fight for his country should have the right to cast a ballot in a national election, we ought to give him that right in the simplest, most direct way we possibly can. It is my judgment that a mere pronouncement on the part of the Congress suggesting that the States make provision in some manner for the soldier vote is meaningless evasion of the issue.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. It cannot be done legally otherwise.

Mr. RANKIN. That is not all our bill does. It also directs the Army and the Navy to transmit these ballots to them and gives them free air-mail service.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does the gentleman know there are many States that do not even have an absentee ballot system?

Mr. RANKIN. It is the only legal way in which it can be done.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

ELECTION CONTEST: E. O. CLARK AGAINST JACK NICHOLS, SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, OKLAHOMA

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read and, together with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Elections No. 3 and ordered printed:

DECEMBER 6, 1943.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to lay before the House of Representatives the contest for a seat in the House of Representatives for the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States for the Second Congressional District of the State of Oklahoma, E. O. Clark against Jack Nichols, notice of which has been filed in the office of the Clerk of the House; and also transmit herewith original testimony, papers, and documents relating thereto.

In compliance with the act approved March 2, 1887, entitled "An act relating to contested-election cases," the Clerk has opened and printed the testimony in the above case, and such portions of the testimony as the parties in interest agreed upon or as seemed proper to the Clerk, after giving the requisite notices, have been printed and indexed, together with the notice of contest, and the answer thereto, and original papers and exhibits have been sealed up and are ready to be laid before the Committee on Elections.

Two copies of the printed testimony in the aforesaid case have been mailed to the contestant and the same number to the contestee, which, together with the briefs of the parties, will be laid before the Committee on Elections, to which the case shall be referred.

Yours respectfully,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein letters I wrote to the Secretaries of War and Navy, and their answers.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE BATTLE OF TARAWA

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. DISNEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Gov. John J. Dempsey, a former Member of this House, to the other Governors of these States on the subject of the price of crude petroleum, and a list of the Governors who responded.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST AIRPLANE FLIGHT BY WILBUR AND ORVILLE WRIGHT

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 175, commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the first airplane flight by Wilbur and Orville Wright, with a Senate amendment and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, as I understand, the effect of the Senate amendment is merely to strike out the preamble.

Mr. BARDEN. Yes; the matter stricken out is not material to the bill. It leaves the resolution in form authorizing the commemoration of the fortieth anniversary.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Strike out paragraphs 2, 3, and 4 of the preamble.

The Senate amendment was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] may address the House for 15 minutes at the conclusion of other special orders today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

ARTHUR C. NORCUTT

The Clerk called the first bill on the Private Calendar, S. 648, for the relief of Arthur C. Norcutt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,000, to Arthur C. Norcutt, of Mason City, Nebr., in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the death of his son, Roger Thaine Norcutt (CC7-280466), who died on July 17, 1937, as the result of a disease contracted by him while an enrollee in the Seven Hundred and Fifty-ninth Company, Civilian Conservation Corps, at Mitchell, Nebr.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEADOW BROOK CLUB

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1001, for the relief of the Meadow Brook Club.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of the Meadow Brook Club, of Westbury, Long Island, N. Y., for reimbursement of the cost of removing a 160-foot flagpole from its premises on or about December 20, 1941, at the request of the commanding officer at Mitchel Field, and to allow in full and final settlement of the claim not to exceed $500. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the claim: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VERNA MAE ROSSELL AND WINIFRED ROSSELL MOONEY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1038, for the relief of Verna Mae Rossell and Winifred Rossell Mooney.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Verna Mae Rossell, of Mount Holly, N. J., the sum of $3,420.50, and to Winifred Rossell Mooney, of Fort Monroe, Va., the sum of $575, in full satisfaction of their respective claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained and for reimbursement for medical and hospital expenses incurred by them when the automobile in which they were riding as passengers was struck by a United States Army truck on State Highway No. 39 near Fort Dix, N. J., on January 18, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD H. SMITH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 213, for the relief of Edward H. Smith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edward H. Smith, Glasgow, Ky., the sum of $25, such sum representing the amount earned by Edward H. Smith for services as United States Conciliation Commissioner for the District Court of the Western District of Kentucky between February 25, 1939, and June 1941, during which period he served as a de facto officer, his appointment as commissioner having expired previous to the former date and his new commission not being effective until after the later date.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "as a de facto officer" and insert "without a de jure status."

Page 2, after line 4, insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WASHINGTON, BRANDYWINE & POINT LOOKOUT RAILROAD CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 990, for the relief of the Washington, Brandywine & Point Lookout Railroad Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to accept the sum of $50,000 in full settlement and discharge of the indebtedness of the Washington, Brandywine & Point Lookout Railroad Co., a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Maryland, to the United States, including unpaid interest, evidenced by a note dated July 6, 1918, in the principal amount of $50,000 executed by the company pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Control Act, approved March 21, 1918, and to release all evidences of indebtedness and collateral held as security therefor.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILDRED B. HAMPTON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1412, for the relief of Mildred B. Hampton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mildred B. Hampton, of Baltimore, Md., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained as a result of being struck by a United States Army truck, at the intersection of Wilkins Avenue and Monroe Street, Baltimore, Md., on July 7, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,000."

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment, offered by Mr. McGREGOR: Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,000."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

W. J. COX

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2097, for the relief of W. J. Cox.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to W. J. Cox, the sum of $10,000, in full settlements of all claims for damages for personal injuries received by him when he was struck by a United States Army ambulance, license No. W-7795 U. S. A., on United States Highway No. 11, about 6½ miles east of Christiansburg, Va., on June 3, 1940, which ambulance was operated by the Sixteenth Regiment Medical Corps by Pvt. Claude Roberts: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after "Cox", insert "of Roanoke, Va."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,661."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "for damages" and insert in lieu thereof "against the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MINERVA C. DAVIS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2109, for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Minerva C. Davis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to C. Bayard Davis, Alton, Ill., administrator of the estate of Mrs. Minerva C. Davis, the sum of $1,654.30. Such sum represents an amount equal to the additional amount of pension which Dr. Charles Davis, a Civil War veteran, was entitled to receive under the provisions of section 2 of the Pension Act of May 1, 1920, for the period from May 1, 1920, to August 12, 1926, the date of his death. A claim for the amount of such pension was made after his death and his widow, Mrs. Minerva C. Davis, received notice of its approval. The check in payment arrived after her death, and was therefore returned to the Veterans' Administration and canceled.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "to", strike out "C. Bayard Davis, Alton, Ill., administrator of."

Page 1, line 6, after the figures "$1,654.30", strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a comma.

Page 1, beginning with line 7, strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the following: "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the amount of check No. 308977, which was made payable to Mrs. Minerva C. Davis on account of pension due, but arrived at post office of the addressee after her death and was returned to the Treasury for cancelation: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BESSIE EASON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3537, for the relief of Bessie Eason.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bessie Eason, Meridian, Miss., the sum of $350, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for certain veterans' allotment checks assigned to her by Henry Noel Eason during the years 1917, 1918, and 1919, which were never received: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$350" and insert "$306.33."

Line 8, after "by" insert "her sons", and after "Eason" insert "and John Logan Eason."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OSWALD L. SAWYER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2690, for the relief of Oswald L. Sawyer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States of America, for personal injuries sustained by Oswald L. Sawyer as a result of an accident involving a United States Army truck near Camp Battle, New Bern, N. C., on December 21, 1942.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after "appropriated", insert ", to Oswald L. Sawyer, of New Bern, North Carolina."

Line 8, after "injuries", insert ", medical and hospital expenses incident thereto."

Line 9, strike out "by Oswald L. Sawyer."

Page 2, at the end of the bill, insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF JOHN H. CATHCART

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1062, for the relief of the estate of John H. Cathcart.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. H. Cathcart, doctor of medicine, of Gaffney, S. C., as administrator of the estate of John H. Cathcart, the sum of $1,742.19. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of damages to lands and crops of the said estate resulting from the activities of First Army maneuvers in Fairfield County, S. C., in the fall of 1941.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH SCARPELLA AND DOROTHY SCARPELLA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2390, for the relief of Joseph Scarpella and Dorothy Scarpella.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the author of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

DAVID HICKEY POST, AMERICAN LEGION

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2457, for the relief of David Hickey Post No. 235 of the American Legion.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the David Hickey Post No. 235 of the American Legion, of St. Louis, Mo., the sum of $292.50, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for expenses incurred in the buying and erecting in David Hickey Park, St. Louis, of a memorial monument, which later had to be removed from David Hickey Park, at the expense of said American Legion Post No. 235, when such park was commandeered by the United States Government: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$292.50" and insert "$275."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUTH E. P. PHILLIPS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2804, for the relief of Ruth E. P. Phillips.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ruth E. P. Phillips, Rockingham County, Va., widow of the late Amos Russell Phillips, the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Ruth E. P. Phillips and of the estate of the said Amos Russell Phillips against the United States arising out of a collision, on November 21, 1942, at the intersection of Fourteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C., between the vehicle in which the said Amos Russell Phillips was riding and a vehicle in the service of the Army of the United States, resulting in the death of the said Amos Russell Phillips.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after "Virginia" strike out the remainder of the bill and insert the following: "as executrix of the estate of Amos Russell Phillips, deceased, the sum of $6,427.80, in full settlement of all claims of the said Ruth E. P. Phillips and of the estate of the said Amos Russell Phillips, deceased, against the United States for property damage, medical and hospital expenses, and for the death of said Amos Russell Phillips, arising out of a collision on November 21, 1942, at the intersection of Fourteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C., between the vehicle in which the said Amos Russell Phillips was riding and a vehicle in the service of the Army of the United States, resulting in the death of the said Amos Russell Phillips: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Ruth E. P. Phillips, as executrix of the estate of Amos Russell Phillips, deceased."

LLOYD L. JOHNSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3157, for the relief of Lloyd L. Johnson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lloyd L. Johnson, of Dallas, Tex., the sum of $4,398.90. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Lloyd L. Johnson against the United States for personal injuries sustained when a United States Army truck collided with an automobile in which he was riding on United States Highway No. 81, approximately 2 miles south of San Marcos, Tex., on January 12, 1943.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after "sum of" strike out the remainder of line 6 and all of lines 7 and 8 and insert the following: "$1,500; to pay the sum of $1,250 to P. B. Hume, of Dallas, Texas, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and property damages."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "he was" and insert "they were."

At the end of the bill insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Lloyd L. Johnson and P. B. Hume."

DEPENDENTS OF DR. ARTHUR B. WYSE, AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3377, for the relief of the dependents of Dr. Arthur B. Wyse, and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 5, secs. 751–791), the late Dr. Arthur B. Wyse, Dr. Charles R. Hoover, Dr. Lawrence S. Moyer, and Israel H. Tilles, who died as the result of the collision of naval aircraft which occurred June 8, 1942, off Lakehurst, N. J., while engaged in scientific research for the United States, shall be deemed to have been civil employees of the United States within the purview of said act, at the time of their deaths, and compensation for death payable under said act shall accrue from the date of their deaths and shall be payable to such dependents of such decedents as may qualify under section 10 of said act, under the conditions therein provided, such compensation to be computed in the manner prescribed by said act upon the basis of the monthly pay respectively of such decedents in their employment under the direction of the Office of Scientific Research and Development of the Office for Emergency Management, or upon the basis of monthly pay of

$175 in the event that at the time of death any such decedent was serving without compensation. Any compensation for death received by any such dependent under any other workmen's compensation law shall be credited against any compensation which such dependent may receive by reason of this act. No right to benefits shall accrue under this act unless a written claim for compensation is filed under such act of September 7, 1916, as amended, within 1 year from the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DALE McNEAL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1410, for the relief of Dale McNeal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BUFFETT, Mr. MOTT, and Mr. McGREGOR objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

RUTH E. STUDLEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1839, for the relief of Ruth E. Studley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR, Mr. MOTT, and Mr. BUFFETT objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

RICHARD ZIELINSKI AND HIS PARENTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1847, for the relief of Richard Zielinski and his parents.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Richard Zielinski and his parents, of Toledo, Ohio, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000, for personal injuries suffered as a result of being struck by a United States mail truck at 6:10 p. m. on April 12, 1933, while the driver of said truck was in the performance of his duty in connection with the pick-up and delivery of the United States mail.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "to Richard Zielinski and his parents, of Toledo, Ohio, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000," and insert "out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Richard Zielinski, of Toledo, Ohio, the sum of $1,000 in full settlement of all claims against the United States."

At the end of the bill insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Richard Zielinski, a minor."

KENNETH E. SHEPARD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2189, for the relief of Kenneth E. Shepard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Kenneth E. Shepard, of Washington, D. C., the sum of $668.88. Such sum shall be accepted in full settlement of all claims against the United States for services rendered as an employee of the Department of Agriculture from October 12, 1941, to November 24, 1941, inclusive, for which he has not heretofore been compensated: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWIN FOLEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2772, for the relief of Edwin Foley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edwin Foley, of Mukwonago, Wis., the sum of $126, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of said sum paid by him for clerk hire in the post office at Clinton, Wis., for the period May 12, 1942, to June 30, 1942, during which period he mistakenly considered himself as postmaster, on leave on account of illness, when, in fact, his tenure as postmaster had expired on May 12, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADELARD DEMERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2875, for the relief of Adelard Demers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Adelard Demers, Lowell, Mass., the sum of $1,250. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Adelard Demers against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained on January 6, 1942, in Lowell, Mass., when the automobile which he was operating was involved in a collision with a United States Army truck.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,250" and insert "$572."

At the end of the bill add the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

G. F. ALLEN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3661, for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, in an amount not to exceed $4,796.85, for items suspended or disallowed, as enumerated in House Report No. 909, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session.

SEC. 2. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of former officers of the Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, for items suspended or disallowed, not to exceed the amounts stated, as enumerated in House Report No. 909, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session: E. C. Bailey, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Santa Fe, N. Mex., $5; J. F. Cannon, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Atlanta, Ga., $123.37; W. F. Cramer, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, District of Columbia, $773.81; J. J. Gallagher, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, New York, N. Y., $66.44; J. M. Haynes, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Jackson, Miss., $146.27; F. A. Holmes, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Chicago, Ill., $14.32; J. B. Lappin, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Boston, Mass., $10; P. J. Larkin, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, New Haven, Conn., $51.35; D. E. Love, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Santa Fe, N. Mex., $12.41; J. H. Nichols, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Newark, N. J., $35; A. H. Williams, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Raleigh, N. C., $5.96; L. V. Witcombe, former disbursing clerk, Treasury Department, Harrisburg, Pa., $127.32, together with the amounts of any additional payments which have been or may be suspended or disallowed in the said account more

than 3 years after such payments were made: *Provided,* That the Secretary of the Treasury shall certify that in his opinion there is no evidence of fraud on the part of the individuals making such payments.

SEC. 3. No charge shall be made against the certifying officer responsible for the certification of vouchers pursuant to the provisions of Executive Order No. 6166, dated June 10, 1933, and any charge heretofore made against any such officer, shall be removed, for the amount of any payment for which credit shall be allowed under sections 1 and 2 of this act, where the head of the department or establishment concerned, or his duly authorized representative, shall certify to the Comptroller General of the United States that the payment appears to have been made without fraud on the part of the certifying officer.

SEC. 4. The Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of H. T. Tate and W. O. Woods, former Treasurers of the United States, and W. A. Julian, Treasurer of the United States, for sums not to exceed $735, $4,154.63, and $16,638.26, respectively, representing unavailable items in their accounts as former Treasurers and Treasurer of the United States, as enumerated in House Report No. 909, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session: *Provided,* That any recoveries heretofore or hereafter made in respect of any of the foregoing items, may, in the discretion of the Comptroller General of the United States, be applied to offset unavailable items of a similar character hereafter arising in the accounts of the former Treasurers and Treasurer, respectively, upon a showing that such unavailable items have occurred without fraud on the part of the former Treasurers or Treasurer.

SEC. 5. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $575.75, which amount shall be credited to the Treasurer's account in order to adjust unavailable items resulting from overpayments and a check paid on forged endorsement which check was lost in the Office of the Treasurer of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNA MATTIL AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3729, for the relief of Anna Mattil and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Anna Mattil, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $20,000; to Mildred Reed, Coldwater, N. Y., the sum of $10,000; to John A. Mattil, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $4,000; to John H. Mattil, Sr., Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $1,500; to Edward Kolb, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $5,000; to Anna Fritz Starr, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $1,000; to Deloris Clow, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $5,000; to Julia Valentine, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $3,000; to the legal guardian of Betty Jane Mosher, a minor, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $10,000; to the legal guardian of Mary Ann Thesing, a minor, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $5,000; to the legal guardian of Marjorie St. John, a minor, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $20,000; to the legal guardian of George Mattil, a minor, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $20,000; and to the legal guardian of Susie Spier, a minor, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all their claims against the Government of the United States for personal injuries sustained by them as the result of an explosion and fire caused by agents of the Bureau of Prohibition during a raid in the city of Rochester, N. Y., July 7, 1933: *Provided,* That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claims. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claims, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "$20,000"; insert in lieu thereof the figures "$1,250."

Page 1, line 7, strike out the figures "$10,000"; insert in lieu thereof the figures "$300."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the figures "$4,000"; insert in lieu thereof the figures "$300."

Page 1, line 9, strike out the figures "$1,500"; insert in lieu thereof the figures "$250."

Page 1, line 10, strike out the figures "$5,000"; insert in lieu thereof the figures "$300."

Page 2, line 1, strike out the figures "$1,000"; insert in lieu thereof the figures "$300."

Page 2, line 2, strike out the figures "$5,000"; insert in lieu thereof the figures "$300."

Page 2, line 3, strike out the figures "$3,000"; insert in lieu thereof the figures "$100."

Page 2, line 4, strike out the figures "$10,000"; insert in lieu thereof the figures "$750."

Page 2, line 6, strike out the figures "$5,000"; insert in lieu thereof the figures "$500."

Page 2, line 8, strike out the figures "$20,000"; insert in lieu thereof the figures "$1,500."

Page 2, line 9, strike out the figures "$20,000"; insert in lieu thereof the figures "$1,000."

Page 2, line 11, strike out the figures "$5,000"; insert in lieu thereof "$750; to legal guardian of Richard Ormsby, a minor, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $1,500, and to Richard Smith, Rochester, N. Y., the sum of $250."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARDEN CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3747, for the relief of the Marden Construction Co.

Mr. MOTT, Mr. McGREGOR, and Mr. BUFFETT objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

STANDARD OIL CO. OF CALIFORNIA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2508, to authorize the payment of additional compensation to special counsel in the case of United States against Standard Oil of California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute a similar Senate bill, S. 1049.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $15,000, to John W. Preston, of Los Angeles, Calif., and the sum of $10,000, to Annette Abbott Adams, of Los Angeles, Calif., as additional compensation for services rendered by them between October 1, 1935, and September 30, 1941, as special counsel and assistant special counsel, respectively, for the United States, in the action of United States against the Standard Oil Co. of California, for an accounting and to quiet title to sections 16 and 36, township 30 south, range 23 east, Mount Diablo meridian, located in the Elk Hills oil field in California: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 2508) was laid on the table.

REV. C. M. McKAY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 544, for the relief of Rev. C. M. McKay.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Rev. C. M. McKay, Leesburg, Fla., the sum of $1,290.10. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Rev. C. M. McKay against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by him on August 16, 1941, in Jacksonville, Fla., when the automobile in which he was riding was in collision with a United States Navy bus.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,290.10" and insert "$1,000."

On page 2, after the word "bus" insert "*Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF LORRAINE NOVAK

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3173, for the relief of the legal guardian of Lorraine Novak, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $4,500 to the legal guardian of Lorraine Novak, a minor, of New York, N. Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained on January 28, 1942, when she was severely burned by steam as the result of project operations of the Work Projects Administration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$4,500" and insert "$2,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERIC W. RODGERS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1282, for the relief of Eric W. Rodgers.

Mr. BUFFETT and Mr. MOTT objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

WILLIAM CARROLL KNOX

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1290, for the relief of William Carroll Knox.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William Carroll Knox, of Winchester, Tenn., the sum of $186.65, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for services rendered as United States commissioner at Winchester, Tenn., for the period from October 22, 1942, to November 23, 1942, inclusive, such claim having been disallowed by reason of the fact that his term of office as such commissioner expired prior to the time such services were rendered: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PACIFIC DRY DOCK & REPAIR CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 610, for the relief of Pacific Dry Dock & Repair Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the claim of Pacific Dry Dock & Repair Co., a corporation, created by and existing under the laws of the State of California, the legal owner of a drydock and repair yard, including marine railway No. 1, at Oakland, Calif., which said marine railway was seriously damaged on or about June 13, 1941, by collisions of the United States tug *Colonel Ernest H. Agnew* and the barge *Pacific* in tow of said tug with said marine railway No. 1, for damages caused by said collisions may be sued for in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California and that said court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine such suit according to the principles of law and rules of practice obtaining in like cases between private parties at common law and to enter a judgment or decree for the amount of such damages and costs, if any, as shall be found to be due against the United States in favor of the said Pacific Dry Dock & Repair Co., upon the same principles and measures of liability and damage as in like cases between private parties and with the same rights of appeal: *Provided*, That such notice of the suit shall be given to the Attorney General of the United States as may be provided by order of the said court, and it shall be the duty of the Attorney General to cause the United States attorney in said district to appear and defend for the United States: *Provided further*, That said suit shall be brought and commenced within 6 months of the date of the passage of this act.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General of the United States is authorized to arbitrate, compromise, or settle any claim on which a suit at law would lie under provisions of this act, and for which a suit at law has actually been filed.

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated such sum as may be necessary to pay the amount of any judgment rendered by said court or of any amount fixed by arbitration, compromise, or stipulation in respect to settlement, of the claim upon which this act has authorized suit.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IRVING L. JONES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 929, for the relief of Irving L. Jones.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Irving L. Jones, Utica, N. Y., the sum of $195.15. Such sum includes $57.65 as reimbursement of transportation costs incurred by him, and per diem allowances totaling $137.50 due him, in connection with service performed by him as an industry consultant for the Conversion Section of the Plumbing and Heating Branch of the War Production Board from March 10, 1942, to March 24, 1942. The said Irving L. Jones has not received payment for such costs and allowances because, through no fault of his own, his appointment did not become effective until March 24, 1942.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$195.15" and insert "$180.15."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "$137.50" and insert "$122.50."

Page 2, line 5, insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERRING JURISDICTION ON THE COURT OF CLAIMS TO HEAR, DETERMINE, AND RENDER JUDGMENT UPON THE CLAIM OF THE McCULLOUGH COAL CORPORATION AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the next bill on the calendar, H. R. 1519, conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the McCullough Coal Corporation against the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine, notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, a suit brought within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act against the United States by the McCullough Coal Corporation, a Maryland corporation with its place of business at Friendsville, Md., on account of depreciation in value of its properties as a result of the abandonment of the railroad lines of the Confluence & Oakland Railroad Co. in order to enable the War Department to construct a flood-control project. After such hearing and determination judgment shall be rendered in favor of the McCullough Coal Corporation in an amount equal to the amount, if any, which the court determines the properties of such corporation have depreciated in value as a result of such abandonment.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated such sum as may be necessary to pay the amount of any judgment rendered pursuant to this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MATHILDE B. MEISTER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2183, for the relief of Mathilde B. Meister.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mathilde B. Meister, of Washington, D. C., the sum of $2,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and medical and other expenses sustained by her as the result of a fall from a stairway in the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway, a National Capital Park, in Washington, D. C., on August 24, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the

contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM M. TUCKER AND NELDA M. TUCKER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2639, for the relief of William M. Tucker and Nelda M. Tucker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,221.97, to William M. Tucker and Nelda M. Tucker, for property damage incurred by them, and the sum of $2,500 to Nelda M. Tucker, for the death of her mother, Mrs. Mary K. Engler, as result of explosion of a gas pipe which led into their home, caused by work on a Work Projects Administration project, located in the vicinity of their home on March 31, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$5,221.97" and insert "$3,000."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$2,500" and insert "$500."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

H. G. TOOLEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2880, for the relief of H. G. Tooley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for the employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 5, secs. 767 and 770), are hereby waived in favor of H. G. Tooley, of Greer, S. C., who is alleged to have sustained injuries on May 12, 1942, at Columbia Air Base, Columbia, S. C., while employed as foreman in the camp of the Civilian Conservation Corps, Soil Conservation Service, at Saluda, S. C., and his claim for compensation is authorized to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended and supplemented by the act of February 15, 1934, if he files such claim with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC 2. The monthly compensation which the said H. G. Tooley may be entitled to receive by reason of the enactment of this act shall commence on the first day of the month during which this act is enacted.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of individual bills on the Private Calendar.

ERIC W. RODGERS

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 352, the bill (S. 1282) for the relief of Eric W. Rodgers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Eric W. Rodgers, of Scotland Neck, N. C., the sum of $52.38, in full settlement of his claim against the United States for expenses incurred October 24, 1935, in transporting his dependent wife and children, and household goods, from his official station in Salisbury, N. C., to his official station at Raleigh, N. C., while employed as district manager of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain quotations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein information concerning national, State, and county elections in Illinois for 1944.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. PLOESER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONKIEWICZ] that he may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by the president of the National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

MEDICAL BUREAUCRACY

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time today to bring to this House and to the country a few statements which I trust will stimulate the thinking of the Members of the House and the people of the country generally. No speech is worth the effort nor the paper it is written on unless it does stimulate thinking and stirs to action. I expect to address a part of my remarks to S. 1161, the Wagner-Murray bill and a similar bill introduced by Representative DINGELL in the House. I shall also speak on the subject of regimentation of which these bills are only an example.

The practice of medicine under the free institutions of this country of ours has advanced the healing art until it is the envy of the whole world. In the short space of 150 years it has so improved the health of this Nation that the life expectancy has been nearly doubled. Where it was 35 years it is now 63 years. New technics for treating disease have been developed and new drugs have been discovered. The sulfa drugs and penicillin are just the latest examples. Free men with great minds have founded medical schools and colleges and established laboratories for research. There has been a ceaseless probing and searching of the unknown for the purpose of curing disease. Many of the terrible diseases of the past have been rendered almost harmless. Today, twice as many of our wounded now recover than in the last World War.

Under the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bills the Federal Government would set up a political control of the practice of medicine. It would be a step in which not only the physician but the individual would be regimented, pigeonholed, blueprinted and made to do a physical, mental, and ritualistic goose step. The first move in a socialistic government has always been to deal with the health and the welfare of the Nation.

I am sure the motives of the sponsors of these particular measures are entirely honorable and wholly altruistic. The arguments in support of them are plausible and alluring but the adoption of these measures would certainly lead to the erection of another bureaucracy to administer them. The resulting regimentation would first hamper the physician and then break down his morale, his initiative, and his effectiveness. The Director of the Public Health Service would be a czar over physicians. In him would be the power to direct where and when, and finally how to practice his

art. Rules and directives would be promulgated in the central office that would progressively put the practice of medicine in a strait jacket. The patient could be told to what physician he must report. If you do not believe this just pay a visit to any Social Security Board and see how those who are compelled to come to it for help are herded around and made to fill out endless forms. The physician's fingers would be stained with ink instead of iodine.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman referred to the progress that had been made in the practice of medicine in the last 150 years. How much of that progress, if any, has been made by reason of Government bounty or Government supervision or through subsidizing?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The progress in the practice of medicine has been made wholly by individual initiative and enterprise by individuals practicing and ferreting out the causes of disease and putting those things into effect. Progress has been made because there has been little interference by Government.

Mr. CURTIS. I am utterly opposed to the Wagner bill, but suppose that Congress should enact it and turn the health of everybody in the United States over to the politicians and bureaucrats rather than to the individual's own family physician, can we expect the same amount of progress in the future that we have had in the past?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. This act would stifle individual initiative, it would stifle the progressive development of the medical profession or of any profession. I will bring that out a little further in my remarks, if the gentleman from Nebraska will permit.

If I am any judge of the feelings of the American people I am sure they do not want to see the extension of bureaucracy. They want to recover their right of individual initiative and freedom of enterprise. They are tired of being bossed around by Washington. They certainly want the right when they are sick to select their own physician. One of the most powerful aids the physician has is the confidence his patient has in him. Many times it is more valuable than his most potent medicine. The controls set up under these bills would eventually destroy that precious aid.

And how is this system of socialized medicine to be paid for? The best answer I can give to this question is contained in an editorial appearing in the December 1 issue of the North Platte (Nebr.) Telegraph, written by the editor. It is entitled "A Fraud," and reads as follows:

> One phase of the Wagner-Murray bill now before Congress, to broaden the Social Security Act, of which not too much is said by its supporters, is cost of the proposal. The old fallacy has been encouraged that a magnanimous government stands ready to "give" something to the people once the measure is passed. Provisions for medical and hospital care contained in the bill are heavily stressed with the inference that they too will be free.
>
> Such high-pressure sales tactics are fraudulent. The Government will never give anything away because it can give nothing until it first takes it from the people. If the Wagner bill is made into law, the Government will begin immediately to collect additional billions of dollars in taxes to pay for the "benefits" it will later hand out. As a doctor recently told a patient: If you earn $200 a month, your (social security) bill will be $12 a month, six times more than is now taken out of your pay check—or $144 a year. Your employer will pay a like amount, which means that your bread, your car, your refrigerator, and everything else you buy would have more hidden taxes wrapped up in it. * * * If you are self-employed, you deduct 7 percent. * * *
>
> Every time a deduction is made from the salaries and wages of the people and turned over to Government, the power of the Government over the people grows accordingly.

We might pause here to ask what has become of all the billions of dollars that have been collected in this era of the social planners to meet the obligations of the Government in the matters of retirement pay, old-age pensions, and unemployment benefits that are provided for in the present law. The fact is, this money, collected from employees and their employers alike has been used to pay the current expenses of this extravagant regime. When the time comes to meet the purposes for which it was collected the people will again be taxed to supply it.

Mr. Speaker, we must not foist upon the American people a system of medical practice of inferior quality and at a constantly increasing cost with a huge administrative expansion. The question is: Shall medicine continue to be practiced by men and women scientifically trained and devoted to the relief of suffering humanity and with the freedom to perfect themselves in their art or shall the practice of medicine be taken over by a group of untrained bureaucrats who will use the medical profession as a tool and the sick as clay in molding a huge political machine?

For a number of years now there has been a growing tendency for the Federal Government to take from the States and the people the responsibilities that have heretofore been theirs. By the extension of Federal spending it has brought more and more governmental functions to Washington. During the past decade this tendency has veered in the direction of shepherding the individual from the cradle to the grave. The social planners are busy finding ways to take from the people those responsibilities which they consciously accepted when they set themselves up as freemen. But when the people surrender their responsibilities they soon surrender their rights. We will grant that in an emergency like the present war more power must be given to the Central Government. The way in which this power is now being exercised and the fundamental rights it is taking away from the people is a good example of what they can expect if the present bureaucratic controls are made permanent and expanded. It is impossible to set up a system of medical practice as suggested in the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill without creating a class of bureaucrats whose selfish interests maintain them in office. They possess the poisonous virus of all bureaucracy, that unquenchable desire for increased power.

There is another side to this picture of regimentation and "the glorious decade" recently referred to by the Chairman of the National Committee of the Democratic Party. On that side can be seen the skyrocketing national debt, the loss of the individual rights and the undermining of the constitutional principles upon which this Nation has advanced in the past.

This Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill may well become the war cry of the New Deal politician for a fourth term for the President and his coat-tail riders. In the past 10 years of this "glorious decade" we have seen more regimentation by the New Deal, with the individual being subjugated to the rights of an all powerful bureaucratic regime in Washington. Bureaucracy grows and feeds upon itself. It produces dictators with absolute power and people are reduced to serfdom.

Under this "glorious past 10 years" free men and women are losing their rights to live their lives under the moderate restraints of our Constitution as they see fit. A new philosophy of government is born, an alien and foreign notion, in which this bureaucratic monster in Washington governs and the citizen has no rights they need observe. Yes; there is a dangerous trend in this past 10 years. Many good things have been accomplished, but if we lose our fundamental rights under our Constitution in gaining these social reforms the cost will be too great.

Before I finish my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I want to bring one more thought for the consideration of the Members. I can best do it by quoting from an article recently written by the Honorable Joseph B. Ely, former Governor of the State of Massachusetts, a Democrat who had the vision to see the road down which his party was traveling. He said:

> Under the comparatively simple set-up of the early years of our national life and down to 1933 the interest of the city and State politician in Federal politics was slight because the patronage was slight. * * *
>
> When in 1933 the Congress went over in a big way for the prepared program of social legislation, business regulation, agricultural control, and $3,000,000,000 of spending money, the city government became extremely interested in national politics. The favor and patronage of Washington were looked upon with covetous eyes. These measures created the politician's paradise. Here was plenty to give the boys that they would not otherwise get. This combination of local machine politics and humanitarian measures reached its full flower at the Democratic National Convention of 1940, when Kelly of Chicago, Hague of Jersey City, and Flynn of New York sat down in a room in the Blackstone Hotel with the social workers of Hopkins, Ickes, and Perkins to trample underfoot the third-term tradition and renominate the President as leader of the social-viewpoint movement for another 4 years' control of this Government.

Let me repeat, Mr. Speaker, the American people, after this conflict is over,

want to get back to freedom of individual initiative and enterprise. Too long have they been living in the narcotic fumes of those who have been smoking the pipe of socialistic ideas. They are beginning to fear they will become addicts to the narcotic and will thereby lose their self-reliance and self-respect.

It may seem a little old fashioned to say we should not be doing things to and for people which they can do for themselves. But it is sound.

Regardless of the party in power we must weed out of Government the dead, useless bureaus and get back to those tried and tested fundamentals of constitutional government which in the past has made this Nation great. We must decide whether democracy shall survive this war, or whether Government dictatorship in the form of socialism or communism will be substituted.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I want to congratulate the gentleman on the very fine statement he has made. I would also like to apprise the House of the fact that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] who has just concluded a very fine speech is a medical doctor and surgeon of very fine reputation in the State of Nebraska. He not only conducted a great hospital out there but he has traveled and healed the sick in many corners of our State. The gentleman knows whereof he speaks and I believe he brings the sentiments to us in the House of Representatives from the American home as we know it on the prairies of Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank my colleague the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] for his kind remarks about my ability as a physician and surgeon. I sometimes feel that I am a better physician than I am a Member of Congress. I am convinced, however, that if the bureaucratic control of this Nation continues, not only medicine, but all the professions and the people we serve will suffer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THAT THIRTEEN BILLION

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in asking for this time was to talk about that $13,000,000,000 recently announced as savings in the War Department. When I made the request for time, it did not occur to me that the day would fall upon the 7th of December nor that it would come the day following the announcement of the agreements reached at Teheran. I cannot go directly into my subject without making an observation on these events.

The 7th of December, Mr. Speaker, may not be a celebrated day in American history but it is a date the world will never forget.

I do not care to review the events leading up to Pearl Harbor nor to recall what happened there. I do not need to do so. I do desire, however, to say that whenever December 7 rolls around Americans everywhere should search their souls and ask themselves wherein they can improve the quality of their service to their country. When the time arrives that the day of infamy becomes a day of public observance, it should be heralded as a day for dedication of citizenship.

A treacherous attack by Japan at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, made Americans one in thought and purpose. I hope that every recurrence of the day renews the unity of the United States.

A PURPOSE TO THE WAR

It is too early, Mr. Speaker, to assess the results of the Teheran conference. People who live in times like these, however, can sense that they are living in days of destiny even though we may not be able to measure their meaning.

Speaking personally, the pronouncements following the conference encourage me. Unconditional surrender is a broad, bold goal, and, perhaps, an adequate one for sheer military movement. Unconditional surrender of the enemy, however, has seemed to me utterly inadequate as an answer to the sacrifice the people of the United Nations will be called upon to make if it be achieved and wholly unproductive as a weapon against the enemy. Someone has said that the way to win is to divide and conquer. Unconditional surrender drives the enemy together in a do-or-die stand. The costly 6 weeks' delay in Italy which enabled Hitler to seize positions we should have had is abundant evidence of the inadequacy of an unconditional-surrender formula as a weapon.

Now comes Teheran, and with it, that challenge:

> We shall seek the cooperation and active participation of all nations, large and small, whose peoples in heart and mind are dedicated, as are our own peoples, to the elimination of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance. * * * We look with confidence to the day when all the peoples of the world may live free lives untouched by tyranny and according to their varying desires and their own consciences.

There is something to fight for. It is also something that tired enemy peoples can quit for.

And I hope, Mr. Speaker, that it will not be considered treason if I say that I take more pride in the statement that we will seek and welcome the cooperation of like-minded nations in establishing a world where people can live free from the scourge of war than in the report that half of Berlin has been destroyed. For to me, Mr. Speaker, the eventual measure of our capacity to have lived in these days will be the degree to which we may have lifted the spirits and souls of mankind rather than the extent to which we may have destroyed cities.

If we were big enough, if we were great enough, if we could put enough into the effort, if we had enough of the spirit of Christ in the world, we should raise a high standard and lift all men to it.

FIGHTING TAKES MONEY

In the meantime, however, because we still live in a world where the law of the claw and the jungle pretty much hold sway, we have a rough, nasty, dirty job to do. We have a very real war to fight and win. And a part of that job involves spending huge sums of money that will be collected in the toil and sweat and tears of taxpayers, often angry with Congress, possibly tired at times, possibly bowed with grief, but never quitting. We ought in justice to them to spend no more than we need to spend in prudence; and that is why I have undertaken to speak a bit about that $13,000,000,000 which the chairman of my Subcommittee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] recently announced was being impounded from appropriations that had been made to the War Department.

I am led to make this talk because of the tendency in various quarters to scold the War Department and the Appropriations subcommittee for saving this money, or if saving it, for saying anything about it.

A few days after that announcement was made, a leading Washington paper in an editorial headed "Pap in the House," said:

> Suppose the War Department had requested an appropriation of one hundred billions instead of fifty-nine billions. Representative SNYDER might then have gleefully announced that it had saved fifty-four billions instead of thirteen billions. (Washington Post, November 21, 1943.)

And a widely read columnist assumed to say that the saving of thirteen billions resulted from a tongue lashing given the Director of the Budget Bureau by a Member of Congress at a hearing of the Committee on Ways and Means. Of course, that is absurd. The fact is that ten billion plus was proposed by the War Department for a budget reserve when our subcommittee opened its inquiry 3 weeks ago. Something over two billion was added as the result of study and questioning during the hearing, to bring the total above thirteen billion.

Many other comments have shown a similar lack of understanding of the real nature of the savings. The result has been that instead of encouraging the War Department or any other department to make savings, they have been encouraged either to keep silent about savings or to spend whatever money they get their hands on. The comment of editors and columnists can be excused on the ground that they do not have access to the facts behind the savings because the hearings of the War Department Subcommittee have not yet been printed. The comment and actions of Federal officials, however, cannot be so excused—particularly the attitude of the Director of the Budget and the Secretary of the Treasury.

A week after the editorial above mentioned appeared, an article in the same paper reported that Budget Director Smith blasted congressional hopes that the Navy would follow the lead of the Army in spending less money than had

been appropriated for it, and in the current number of the United States News this paragraph appears:

Influence from high sources has delayed the Navy in giving assurance to Congress that it will not need $5,000,000,000 of funds now appropriated for it. Executive branch of the Government blames the Army announcement that $13,000,000,000 of appropriations would not be needed for a large part of Congress resistance to much higher taxes.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that influence from any source will seek to discourage savings in appropriations by any department of the Government, or by withholding knowledge of their possibility making their expenditure likely or easy. It is a sad day in government when departments are encouraged to spend or even keep silent about funds they have and find they do not need.

Departments should be encouraged to save and should be commended for it. And for that reason I want to talk about the Army's thirteen-billion saving—what it is, how it came about, and where it now is.

The exact figure for the thirteen billion, incidentally, is $13,163,519,000.

FIVE SOURCES OF SAVING

When we presented the 1944 appropriation bill for the War Department last June it carried approximately $59,000,000,000 in new money and $12,000,000,000 in reappropriation of unexpended balances.

The exact estimate of unexpended balances actually was $12,472,913,200, and was made up of estimates gathered from fiscal officers of the Army scattered throughout the world and gathered some weeks in advance of our hearings in May. Actually, when the final figures on expenditures up to June 30 were compiled, it was found that the funds previously appropriated to the War Department in regular bills, deficiency and supplemental bills, were unexpended in the amount of $15,064,480,718.

That is, the actual unexpended balances exceeded estimates by $2,591,567,518.

So, first of all, two and one-half of the thirteen billion represents an increase in the unexpended balances of prior appropriations made in the days following Pearl Harbor, when we were expanding arms and armies to the fullest extent of the country's capacity.

BETTER MANAGEMENT

When the 1944 bill was presented to the House, the subcommittee made some specific recommendations on the fiscal organization of the War Department. We were of the opinion that better controls on funds and less looseness would result from a centralizing of control within the General Staff.

And we have noted with satisfaction the adoption by the War Department of significant changes. During the summer the Budget officer became a member of the General Staff and retains an over-all reserve on funds, allocating to the various commands certain amounts as the need arises. Incidentally, we have a very efficient Budget officer in the person of Brig. Gen. George J. Richards. His centralized bookkeeping has saved time and paper work for men in the field and has produced definite economies.

So, better management of funds should be listed as a second source of savings as well as the agent of recovery for the larger unexpended balances scattered here and there throughout the several commands.

REDUCED REQUIREMENTS

The third thing that should be mentioned is the reduction in requirements. This applies to men. It also applies to equipment. When the 1944 estimates were prepared they were based on having an Army of 8,248,000 persons. Subsequently, along in the summer, you will recall, the Chief of Staff indicated that a minimum strength of 7,700,000 officers and enlisted personnel, male and female, could be considered adequate for the time being.

Now, you can translate 548,000 officers and enlisted personnel into dollars and cents. It takes so much for pay, so much for clothing, so much for equipment, from cups to tents and from guns to trucks. The amount estimated to be saved directly by the reduction in size of the Army to be provided for came to $1,946,039,000.

CUTS IN COSTS

A fourth factor has been reduction in costs. This has been due to better pricing. The over-all figure of three billions has been estimated as the saving to the Army in renegotiation of war contracts from May 1942 to the end of December 1943. A part of that saving falls within the current fiscal year and its effect is spread throughout all categories of procurement. During our hearing the following exchange took place:

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SNYDER). The table, Mr. Secretary, has taken into account the latest unit costs. I assume that would cover reduced costs as developed by renegotiation?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes, sir; a large part of our savings on renegotiation are in the reduction of forward pricing on existing contracts. * * *

Mr. SNYDER. * * * Would you say that the table reflects pretty closely revised costs in consequence of renegotiation?

Mr. PATTERSON. * * * I do not think it takes into account cash recoveries made from contractors on past payments made them. I think the proportions are about these: One-third actual cash recoveries from companies, due to overpayments on excessive prices and about two-thirds reflected in reductions in costs on undelivered orders.

The fifth factor to be mentioned is reduction in quantities and, coupled with that, changes in emphasis.

CHANGES IN QUANTITIES

Modern warfare has been likened many times to a football game. You try one play and then another, feeling for a soft spot in the opponent's line, feeling for a type of attack against which he has a poor defense or at least in which you have a superior offense. As gains demonstrate where you have strength, you concentrate plays in that direction. You discard the plays with lesser results. You put more and more effort into the plays that roll up the score.

That is certainly true in this grim game of war. It is no secret that the initial emphasis on tanks has been reduced. It is no secret that we are building fewer types of airplanes and are concentrating on those which have shown the greatest usefulness. These things take place quickly in the heat of this war. Estimates made in the spring cannot measure fully the change in needs that a summer's campaign may have created. Naturally it is impracticable to state publicly just what changes in machines and quantities have been made, but changes have been made and are being made to meet the realities in a fluid war, conducted under every conceivable condition of climate and terrain.

Moreover, the tide of battle itself has changed the character and quantity of machines and ammunition required. Yes; it has changed sharply and radically since the War Department's Budget estimates of last spring.

And those changes, fortunately, have contributed in terms of billions of dollars saved in the probable cost of the war to the people of the United States. That is why, during the debate on the tax bill, I made the statement that basically the credit for these $13,000,000,000 in savings should go to the armed forces of the United Nations on every front. They have changed the military picture and have changed it for the better, both militarily and financially.

Surely everyone can recall the military prospect last May. The experts predicted and a prudent direction of our effort could only count upon a bitter battle on the Russian front, with some loss of territory, some loss of factories, and possibly some loss of oil in the Caucasus.

MILITARY PICTURE LAST SPRING

Last April, when the War Department reviewed its own estimates, last May when our subcommittee held its hearings on the 1944 bill, last June when the House and Senate passed the bill, the latest figures available showed submarine sinkings at a new high.

Our replacements in ships did not equal what we were losing by sinkings. And we were losing not merely ships but cargoes.

And those cargoes took time and money to replace. Every estimate of a military operation had to allow a certain percentage for losses in transportation as well as in the battle. Prudence demanded estimates based on experience then available.

It was naturally to be assumed at that time that the Germans were about to launch their usual spring and summer offensive in Russia. In fact, the War Department estimates were obliged to recognize, and realistically so, that during each of the previous two summers, the German Armies had made ever deeper penetrations into Russian territory. These successive deeper thrusts had almost enveloped Moscow, forcing removal of the Soviet capital to Kuibyshev. They had reached the banks of the Volga, and had threatened the entire Caucasian oil

supply, by the capture of Maikop, and by pushing to within 40 miles of Grozny.

Although the Russians had demonstrated their indomitable spirit some months earlier by lifting the siege of Stalingrad, there was in early June, no indication of the tremendous offensive which now has the Axis backed up to within a scant hundred miles of the old Polish frontier.

Hamburg and Berlin had not yet become symbols of the combined striking power of the American and British air arms. Indeed, the major 1943 summer operations against German industrial targets had not even started at the time the Army Air Forces were justifying their portion of the estimates before representatives of the Budget Bureau. Too few of the many raids with which we are now familiar, had been made from the British Isles, to attempt any firm analysis of the results of saturation raids. In short, the bombing offensive against Germany was only beginning to begin.

Pantelleria had received its first bombing only 3 days before the committee hearings began. American and British Empire troops had yet to set foot on the European Continent; the invasion of Sicily by glider-borne and parachute troops did not start until the night of July 9.

In the Aleutians, Kiska was still occupied by the Japanese; the final stages of the engagement for the repossession of Attu were then in progress.

In Burma, our forces were on the defensive not far from the Indian frontier. We had tried to take Akyab by a small offensive, but had not succeeded.

In China and southeast Asia, our Chinese allies, supported by the Fourteenth United States Air Force, had just begun to conduct counter offensives against the Japanese at Ichang and Tunting.

In the Southwest Pacific theater, our newly won acquisitions in New Guinea and adjacent islands could be counted on the fingers of one hand. Our troops at Port Moresby and Milne Bay in New Guinea, and at Henderson Field on Guadalcanal, were subjected to Japanese bombing raids of varying intensities. Our forces in the Solomon Islands has not yet fully consolidated their positions.

THE PICTURE CHANGES

These conditions and circumstances confronted the Nation when the hearings relating to the War Department appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 were conducted. Happily, conditions have changed. History now records accomplishment and performance.

Sicily comes to mind, captured and taken over in 37 days. We proceed further—one-third of the Italian boot is now in Allied hands; Mussolini has fled; and the Italian people have declared themselves cobelligerents.

On the eastern front, it was the Russians, and not the Germans, who produced the summer offensive of 1943; an offensive which has almost reached the Polish and Rumanian borders; an offensive which has deprived the Axis of territory on which it had counted heavily for grain, and which has dispelled any plans they might have had for the exploitation of oil in the Caucasus. This magnificent forward thrust, this continuing offensive, is establishing for the Russians, a most effective springboard for further winter and summer offensives, with a badly battered German capital as the objective.

Operating from their bases in the British Isles, the R. A. F. and United States Eighth Air Force have subjected the heart of the European fortress to a pounding hitherto undreamed of.

Hamburg was made a ghost city in nine successive raids which began on the 24th of July. Plenty of attention was, and is, being paid to other German industrial centers such as Cologne, Wilhelmshaven, Rostok, Kiel, Essen, and even as far to the southeast as Kassel and Oscherslaben.

Throughout the fall, Germany has been hit again and again. Last week, Berlin received the heaviest raids yet made in this war. From numerous bases in Italy and north Africa spectacular bombing raids are now being made on vital points in the Balkans, such as Ploesti and Sofia, and on the Brenner Pass and southern France.

On the other side of the world, the Japanese have been entirely driven from the Aleutians. The Japanese outer defense ring of island fortifications has been attacked by General MacArthur and Admiral Halsey, aiming at Rabaul. Other island outposts, shch as the Gilbert Islands, have been captured. From bases in China, our air force has recently bombed Formosa, part of Japan itself. Combined operations under Mountbatten are preparing for a thrust to regain the Burma Road. The Chinese are continuing to deny to the Japanese any appreciable military gains.

Submarine warfare—an integral part of the Axis strategy—has been rendered steadily less predatory. From February through April, and especially in March, our shipping losses were precarious.

What a change has come about since then! Secretary Knox recently announced that our 3-months' toll of Axis submarines was more than 60. The Allied navies are drawing the sea wolf's fangs. Supply lines for troops in every theater are becoming safer and shorter.

Sea lanes now in use are selected more and more for economy of distance rather than to avoid Axis pressure. The new base on the Azores, our control of the Mediterranean, and occupation of the Gilberts have all contributed to this.

These remarks, though encouraging, should not be made the base for an attitude of "It is all over but the coup de grâce." Except for the Russians, and Chinese, Allied land forces have yet to meet the main body of enemy troops. Our foes have been hurt, but they are far from defeated.

AND STRATEGY CHANGES

Here and now the strategy has changed. We and our allies have lifted the siege. It is an offensive warfare from here on in. Naturally, study and replanning of our over-all requirements must go on continuously.

And it was such study and replanning based on the changing military picture that made possible the revision in financial requirements.

In the defensive areas of the continental United States—Panama, the Caribbean bases, Alaska, and Hawaii—it has been possible to adjust our military manpower and matériel requirements to conform to the changes in the strategic situation.

On the other hand, battle experience reveals certain trends in losses to which the procurement program must be adapted.

We know that during the 37 days of the Sicilian campaign 46 percent of all the 57-millimeter guns were destroyed; 36 percent of the motor carriages of our 75's and 22 percent of the carriages of the 105-millimeter howitzers were lost. We are reminded that 60 bombers were lost over Schweinfurt.

Certain yardsticks of measurement, such as the maintenance factor, the day of supply, and the complement of spare parts, have been tried out in the light of experience; and have been found true, or subject to adjustment.

Reports from the battle fronts now describe the use, value, and expandability of war matériels. The findings are immediately utilized by the Army's planners. They now have a better knowledge of the effective life of matériel, the desirability of certain types of equipment and the need for standardization of many hundreds of items. Unnecessary items of supply are no longer procured. Weapons, ammunition, and supplies, which our theater commanders know from experience are effective, are purchased in more accurate quantities.

Better knowledge of needs has led to closer estimates of quantities. Improvements in manufacturing processes have led to appreciable reductions in cost.

So, the House Subcommittee on War Department Appropriations followed these and other favorable developments closely. During the summer the chairman of the committee exchanged letters with the Secretary of War upon the meaning of these things in a financial way. On August 13, 1943, the budget officer for the War Department called upon the estimating services for revised estimates of obligations for the fiscal year 1944 to reflect the latest major developments. The House Subcommittee on War Department Appropriations conducted hearings on November 15, 16, and 17, 1943, to analyze the War Department's latest budgetary and financial position. It is from these sources and these investigations that the War Department placed in the Bureau of the Budget reserve, the sum of $13,163,519,000.

STATUS OF THE RESERVE

What is the status of that reserve? Is it under the control of the War Department? Is it under the control of the Congress? Those are natural and logical questions.

On that point, I believe that the following testimony from the record during our hearings will be of general interest. I quote:

Mr. CASE. On the basis of what you have stated here today, it would appear that as to the fund set over for the reserve to the Bureau of the Budget's control, approximating $11,000,000,000, you really do not anticipate calling for any part of it; is that correct?

Mr. PATTERSON. At the present time I believe it is likely that it will not be called for.

Mr. CASE. Your statement to the committee has been that it will not be called for except by justification to the Bureau of the Budget, and a report——

Mr. PATTERSON. And consultation with the committee.

Mr. CASE. Does that consultation imply getting the approval of the committee for it?

Mr. PATTERSON. Certainly. It might not be formal, but it would be informal, because you could cancel it if you wanted to. We are in your hands on that.

Mr. CASE. There is a sound reason for raising that question and having a definite understanding on this point. When discussion has occurred about the amount that has been saved under renegotiation, where money has not been actually expended but there has been a reduction in the total amount to be paid on the settlement of a contract, the thought has been expressed in both Houses of Congress that that saving should be recaptured through the Treasury by reducing the appropriation by that specific amount. Under present procedure the Treasury does get what has been paid, and is later recovered; the savings by reductions, however, have been available for expenditure, technically, until the end of the year. Is that not correct?

Mr. PATTERSON. We cover into the Treasury cash recoveries.

Mr. CASE. It seems to me that unless we have some definite understanding about the $11,000,000,000, that the same logic which has been set forth in both Houses saying that there should be a specific recision of appropriations to the extent of those savings will come up here and there will be a movement started to ask for a recision of these appropriations to the extent of this proposed Budget reserve.

Mr. PATTERSON. Gentlemen, all I can say is that I do not think it is logical; and in the next place I am told by our fiscal officers that it would introduce complication in bookkeeping.

Mr. CASE. It seems to me that the best answer to that argument, if the question arises, will be for the War Department to say not merely that you will secure the approval of the Bureau of the Budget but that you will ask approval of the Appropriations Committee that deals with these items.

Mr. PATTERSON. That is a good idea, too.

(Further discussion off the record.)

EXPENDITURE LAGS COMMITMENT

Of the $13,000,000,000 placed in reserve, certain portions represent immediate and continuing reductions in funds drawn from the Treasury.

For example, officers and men receive their pay monthly. The reduction in strength of the Army means a corresponding immediate reduction in the sum of money drawn from the Treasury to meet the monthly pay roll. Other reductions are more distant. Typical of these are contracts for airplanes which will be signed next spring.

Many of the airplanes purchased under these contracts will not be delivered until after the end of the present fiscal year, and withdrawal of funds from the Treasury to pay for them will not take place until late in 1944 or early in 1945.

The appropriation of money by the Congress to the War Department for any given fiscal year is based upon a well-integrated plan which has as its basis the size of the Army or the troop basis. The pay and allowances, travel, food, clothing, implements of war, and so forth, are all built around this so-called troop basis and take into consideration the disposition and activity of the troops in the various theaters of operations.

The effect of an appropriation of money by Congress to the War Department is to set up a credit in the Treasury—by appropriation warrant—against which the War Department may create obligations—let contracts—in the implementation of its program for the fiscal year in question.

For the fiscal year 1944 the Congress appropriated to the War Department $59,034,839,673 new money and all the unobligated balances in the War Department on June 30, 1943. These unobligated balances proved to be $15,064,480,718 and added to the $59,034,839,673 made a grand total of $74,099,320,391 legally made available to the War Department for obligation during fiscal year 1944. By agreement between the War Department, the Bureau of the Budget, and the subcommittees on War Department Appropriations of the Congress, unobligated balances as of June 30, 1943, in excess of $12,472,913,200 were not to be obligated by the War Department in fiscal year 1944. The total amount available for obligation during fiscal year 1944 was thus $71,507,778,873.

To put it another way, the total credit to the War Department, for fiscal year 1944, in the Treasury was by this agreement limited to $71,507,778,873.

As stated above, $71,507,778,873 is the amount which the War Department program, as submitted to and approved by Congress, justified for obligation by the War Department during fiscal year 1944. That is, the War Department proposed to actually spend in cash or enter into contracts for a total of $71,507,778,873 during the fiscal year 1944.

Thus, except for the 1943 unobligated balances in excess of the $12,472,913,200 allowed by Congress which the War Department had previously agreed not to obligate, the $13,163,519,449 placed in reserve in the Bureau of the Budget represents savings from the program for fiscal year 1944. This is true in spite of the fact that actual contract deliveries for some items to be procured notably airplanes, ran over into fiscal year 1945.

NO RIGID RELATIONSHIP

Now the rate of withdrawal from the Treasury of the War Department credit of $71,507,778,873 set up in the Treasury by Congress for obligation by the War Department in fiscal year 1944 bears no rigid relationship to the obligation—letting of contracts—of this credit by the War Department. The rate of withdrawal depends in a large measure—except for pay, travel, and so forth—on the ability of industry, which already has large contracts carried over from prior fiscal years, to produce the materials and services desired by the Army, to deliver them and to present vouchers for payment after final inspection and approval.

The time lag involved in this process varies from 1 month in the case of pay and allowances to perhaps as much as 2 years in the case of airplanes of certain types. That part of the $13,163,519,449 savings which is represented by such items as pay, travel, food, and so forth, resulting from reduction in personnel would have been withdrawn from the Treasury during fiscal year 1944, and to that extent withdrawals will be reduced.

On the other hand, many contracts placed in fiscal year 1944 will not result in Treasury withdrawals until fiscal year 1945 or later. Conversely many contracts let—obligations—in fiscal years 1942 and 1943 will require Treasury withdrawals in fiscal year 1944.

When the President presented his budget recommendations to Congress in January 1943, the War Department Treasury withdrawals were estimated at $62,000,000,000. The budget summation sent to Congress by the President on August 1, 1943, showed a reduction in estimated Treasury withdrawals from $62,000,000,000 to $56,000,000,000, a difference of $6,000,000,000. This figure of $6,000,000,000 has to do partially with components such as pay, but largely with paying vouchers resulting from deliveries under contracts whether let in this or some previous fiscal year.

The part of the $13,163,519,449 which will result in lower Treasury withdrawals in fiscal year 1944 will be measured to some extent by such items as pay, but in the main by the ability of the War Department to procure during the fiscal year 1944, the equipment and munitions included in the fiscal year 1944 program. Obviously reductions in such items as pay and allowances, travel, food, clothing, and manufactured items easily procured, will result in lower Treasury withdrawals for the fiscal year 1944.

DIFFICULT TO DIVIDE BY YEARS

Due to the tremendous number of items procured by the War Department by contract, any attempt to divide the $13,163,519,449 savings into that part accruing in fiscal year 1944 and that part accruing to later fiscal years can be only a rough approximation, possibly 50 percent in fiscal year 1944 and 50 percent in fiscal year 1945.

Bearing all this in mind, it is hoped that my remarks may lead to a clearer and more general understanding of the problem of War Department financing. Let me restate that these thirteen billions plus, are accumulated out of reductions in contemplated military personnel strength, reductions in unit costs, and modification, and possible deferment, of requirements for equipment and munitions of war. Should there be an armistice tomorrow, a further substantial portion of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1944 might well be placed in reserve. Conversely, should the war go badly with

use, a sizable portion of this large sum of money might still have to be obligated.

I understand that the question of taking the thirteen billions from the Budget Reserve and reverting it to the Treasury has been proposed in another body and may appear as an amendment to the pending deficiency appropriation bill. As will be noted, I proposed recision of the appropriations by the thirteen billion figure during the hearings of our committee. Certainly, if there should be any attempt to spend these funds without securing the approval of the Appropriations Committee, I would favor a passage of an appropriate resolution for positive recapture.

It will be understood, of course, that the funds not expended by the end of the fiscal year will revert to the Treasury automatically. Moreover, constitutionaliy, Congress may not appropriate funds for the Army for more than 2 years at a time.

WILL REPORT WITHDRAWALS

It is entirely possible that no part of the thirteen billion will be needed by the War Department. As things appeared at the conclusion of our hearings, no part of it would be needed. The military situation could, of course, change for the worse or change in some way that would create a renewed demand for some items now shelved. Personally I feel sure that either the committee or the Congress as a whole would be responsive to those needs, whether the funds be asked for by withdrawal from the reserve now established, or by new appropriation if that be necessary.

At the same time, I want to express my confidence in the good faith of the budget staff of the War Department. They have given us information frankly and freely whenever called upon. I have no reason to think they will not do so in the future and I shall expect them to ask the committee's approval for any withdrawals from the reserve, in line with the discussion with Under Secretary Patterson which I have taken from the record of our hearings.

And I personally assure the House that any withdrawals will be reported by dollars to the House, so that it will be fully informed in the matter.

LET US HAVE MORE SAVINGS

Now, then, with this understanding of the nature of the $13,000,000,000 savings, let us have done with influence by anyone in the executive branch of the Government against retrenchment of funds by the Navy Department or any other department of the Government where savings can be made. Let us have done with scoldings of Congress for taking note of economies. Let us stand the shock of having a department say, "We are going to return unspent some of the money you appropriated. Conditions have changed and we find we do not need it all."

Yes; and let us be grown up about our tax responsibilities.

Estimates of revenues given during the consideration of the tax bill placed the annual income of the Treasury as in the neighborhood of $45,000,000,000. Current revised estimates of expenditures indicate an outgo of approximately $90,000,000,000. Oh, I know the estimates vary one or two billions up and down in both cases, but those figures—45 and 90—are easy to remember, because one is half the other, and the half is the income.

We shall spend twice what we take in, this year. Reason enough for raising all the money that can be raised by taxes. The average American citizen is able to understand that, and there is no need for the Treasury or any other agency to fear the impact of savings announced by any agency of the Government.

Let us have savings, budget reserves, or whatever you want to call them, more and more of them.

EACH HAS HIS PART TO PLAY

Now, then, in closing these remarks, on this day, I cannot refrain from saying that only by the dedication of each of us to whatever tasks fall our way in these times can we justify our right to be among the living.

I have read the story of Tarawa, the most terrible fight in the history of the Marine Corps of which I once was an active, and am now a Reserve member. I have read the news from Italy, where the battle for high ground is compared to the epic struggle at Verdun. I read of tankers sunk, where men die alone, denied even the glory of a known hero's death.

I can never read such stories of sacrifice and heroism and not ask myself: "Am I worth it? Is our way of life worth this? There, among those boys and men, but for the inscrutable scheme of things, I would be." Out of this world sorrow and travail must come the day when men and women and children can live without fear of the terrible scourge of war. I can feel easy only when I try to do my best on the particular tasks which come my way.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a brief excerpt from the hearings before our subcommittee, and other small excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes this afternoon at the conclusion of the other special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

CONSUMER SUBSIDIES

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about food in general and the O. P. A. in particular. Daily, in the press, over the radio, and here in Congress the controversy rages. The administration appears to be doing its best to create the idea in the public mind that it is actually controlling this inflation—inflation which it created—and that it must do it with consumer subsidies.

Well, now, that is an artistic job of misinformation. Congress passed the Price Control Act. It gave the administration a free hand, even to the point of tacit agreement to the kangaroo courts set up under O. P. A. Congress, however, meant control of prices and not control of the people. The Congress never intended to endorse practices which in themselves are inflationary, nor pass on the grocery bill for our grandchildren to pay.

Twice, now, this Congress has denied consumer subsidies. Today pressure is being brought to have our decision altered. An unsubstantiated threat of a 10-percent increase in the cost of living is shouted by every medium of Government information around the country in an attempt to engineer this pressure.

Now I am one of those who insists that inflation can be controlled, the cost of living held down and production kept up—and all without resorting to increasing the common debt by means of consumer subsidies.

I am convinced that we can do this by pointing out the common purpose that exists among Americans. Now, what has been the record of the O. P. A.? Under the first Administrator this agency took an attitude toward the price-control job—which Congress had given it—that came closer to operating under military, than civil law. By their conduct and regulations they indirectly accused every producer of being a profiteer even before he had produced the goods to be offered for consumption.

Naturally, ill will—both private and public—was generated with this approach. And, today, an attempt is being made to regiment the housewives and pit them against the farmers of this Nation. I say to you that the common purpose of this Nation can only be served by stressing the things we have in common—not the things we have in conflict.

We were all encouraged when the second Administrator took hold of the Office and publicly stated that he was going to invite business in to help run and achieve the purposes for which the Office of Price Administration was set up.

Then there followed the little internal scraps which resulted finally in bringing Mr. Bowles into the Administration.

Mr. Bowles said much about calling in the people to help achieve the purposes for which Congress had set up the O. P. A. under the Price Control Act. I believe that Mr. Bowles is sincere, and I have been encouraged when isolated incidents have occurred which seem to bear out this intention. But there is something wrong in the bureaucratic mechanism. It seems to be unable to achieve anything without the use of money. We all know what happens when money is employed to achieve an end.

The power of the purse becomes manifest and the spirit of self-government disappears. Must we always surrender to a policy of gaining an objective by forever increasing the common debt?

Then, too, there have been the instances when minor officials of the O. P. A. have been sent out to contact various industries only to have their commitments overridden when they showed danger of bypassing the power-of-the-purse policies by which O. P. A. seeks to run the economic America. I think it is unfortunate that Judge Fred M. Vinson, one of the most courageous men in public life today, had to make the statement which was quoted on this floor last week. Judge Vinson said:

I am aware of the promises and commitments of O. P. A. officials and have taken them into consideration, but these were commitments of minor officials. In my opinion they are without standing or authority, particularly when the Commander in Chief directs otherwise.

Now I insist that the objectives of O. P. A. can only be had with the active good will and cooperation of our productive America. Commitments made by officials on the ground where production occurs must be held sacred by the higher officials.

How else can we promote faith in government?

How else can we gain a confidence in our leadership?

As it is, the record of O. P. A. is very poor. That agency has simply failed to hold down the cost of living. It has operated ruthlessly on a few commodities but has allowed others to rocket beyond the realm of reason or the safety of the producers. Any of you who have made the rounds in Christmas shopping must certainly have come in contact with goods low in value but extremely high in price.

In the realm of fruits and vegetables, the O. P. A., because it failed to go to the men and women in industry and talk as man to man about things that could be done, has held down the price of some commodities and allowed others to skyrocket into the clouds. To me, the remedy is simple. It begins with the basic principle of self-government. It is founded upon my conviction that our American people are patriotic and honest. It is a simple formula of having the O. P. A. appeal to every single industry to hold prices high enough to maintain production and yet low enough to assure maximum distribution and consumption.

But we must appeal to every productive industry. If the industry price schedules are out of reason—let O. P. A. act—that will be soon enough. As it is, O. P. A. has evaded the placing of this responsibility with the actual producers. It has tried to run the economies of this Nation all from one centralized point—by the "pencil packin' papas" that the gentleman from Wisconsin mentioned a fortnight ago.

The result has been just what you might expect—they are always behind.

Crops grow by the sun, and there "ain't no Joshuas" in the O. P. A. This adds to the chaos.

You may laugh at having industries participate in setting their own price schedules, yet from my own experience and observation, given the common purpose to be done, I am certain that they will set prices that, in the aggregate, will produce a decrease, not an increase, in the cost of living: The reason is because we can thus have price control over everything, not just a commodity here and a commodity there, with those unregulated commodities going hog-wild as they now do under the present lack of policy. O. P. A. has a job to do that O. P. A. is not doing. I might mention that I personally produce three types of pome fruits—Bartlett or canning pears, which are under a ceiling, and should sell—if the supply was adequate—at a retail-store price low enough for all of us to enjoy this fine fruit. That is my security—your purchase of my fruit. I produce apples which have a ceiling; a ceiling which today guarantees the producer something like 6⅛ cents a pound for growing, picking, washing, sorting, and packing, and which according to O. P. A.'s own regulation should sell today any place in the United States for a flat price of 10 cents, and yet Maj. C. E. Chase, managing secretary of the Washington State Apple Commission, in a letter to C. W. Kitchen, Chief, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, has this to say:

Sorry to relate that my observations in retail outlets in Washington, New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, and San Francisco on this trip would indicate almost without exception that group stores are the only ones observing the apple price order. In other retail outlets apples are selling at from 12½ to 17 cents a pound, which is far above the zone consumer retail price. Variations seem to be quite general, not only among the retailers but distributors as well.

Now, mind you, this is an O. P. A. regulated commodity.

This is what comes from bureaucracy which produces so many regulations that the Bureau itself becomes so muscle-bound that it cannot enforce its own regulations. This is a clear case where O. P. A. is efficient as far as the farmer is concerned but fails utterly on the consumer end. The producers' ultimate security is on the consumer end.

Another letter from a fruit company in Wenatchee, Wash. This letter was sent by Mr. L. D. Dix, of Mobile, Ala., to Schons Fruit Co., as follows:

GENTLEMEN: I am just curious or interested, if you will. Your Delicious apples are selling at 20 cents each for the largest and 15 cents each for the next smaller on Mobile fruit stands; $1.80 to $2.46 a dozen. What does the grower get for them? I'm not an investigator for anybody—just a lover of your fine apples in distress when the price is out of reach. I'll be grateful for a reply.

Fifteen and twenty cents for apples. That is $17.60 a box, and under the O. P. A.

What I am getting at is that the apple grower and every other producer is just as aggravated about the high cost of living as any housewife, white-collar man, or labor leader could be. It is his bread and butter too.

I also raise winter pears—and there is no ceiling. These pears are almost all out of our growers' hands today, and, gentlemen, while I have seen the day when they sold too low—today they are selling entirely too high.

I fear for the future. I fear because right now folks are either not buying at all or they are buying sparingly.

Months ago the O. P. A. should have gone to those winter-pear growers and said: "Boys, you've got a job to do for your own good and for the good of the Nation."

I know those men in that industry.

They would have come through, and today winter pears would still be within the realm of reason for those who grew them and for those who would like to eat them.

But O. P. A. did not act.

The people who raise food did not shut up shop during the depression. They planted every year, and they sold in poor markets. They knew then and they know now that consumption is the one and only object of production, and they know that only when you eat what they raise, when reasonable prices promote full demand, is there continuous security for them.

This is part of the farmer's wisdom—a wisdom gleaned from the drab harvests of the panicky thirties.

This knowledge is one of our richest national resources. A resource yet untapped but without which the O. P. A. can never succeed. A resource without which O. P. A.'s objectives can never be gained. And it was those objectives, let us remember, which induced this Congress to set up the Price Control Act. There is another field where the cooperation of the industry is essential, and where absolute decentralization of price control must be had.

I am talking now about the Nation's milksheds.

We cannot milk every cow in America from Washington, D. C., and we cannot make every milkshed set a uniform pattern.

The prices of feed, the length of the winter season, the length of the pasture season, the variations of the wage scales and the flow of population, up or down, demand that prices and regulations be administered on a purely local basis.

Milk is absolutely essential to the Nation's health, yet a farmer living near Spokane, Wash., a community whose population has precipitously increased, an area where more cows are needed, sent me these auction slips. He collected these in the last 3 months. They came to his rural mail box.

I like the letter he sent me because it is not vindictive although it is written in the midst of personal trouble.

He said:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Under separate cover, I am sending you some auction bills that have come to me through the mail. These

are all from sales held in our community this fall. This will show you what is happening to our dairy industry. Some are being bought by wheat farmers who had no milk cows before.

Some go to towns and city folks who want to be sure of milk for their own use.

Others go to the slaughterhouses. My neighbors here are thoroughly disgusted with O. P. A. and Government regulations. So much so that they would rather give up a lifetime ambition rather than continue under present conditions.

I am sending these bills to you because I think you understand our problems.

The farmers around here are very glad that the subsidy bill was killed. And I want to thank you for your part in killing it. But that alone will not save our milk cow. We must have a price for our milk that will give use cost of production plus wages for our time or labor. To my way of thinking it will be up to Congress to pass some bills that will bring this about because the President does not care what happens to the farmers.

Thanking you again, I remain,

Sincerely,

H. A. SUDHOFF.

I do not think we need any more legislation, although I do hope to see the Fulmer bill passed. But I want to see the O. P. A. go to the people whom they wish to serve and enlist those people man to man in this job of controlling inflation and holding down the cost of living.

It can be done, and it has to be done.

It has to be done because we must unite the people of this Nation in a common cause. Our housewives, our mechanics, our teamsters, clerks, and factory workers, carpenters—all these, and all others who eat are not the enemies of management and farmers.

They eat and wear what he raises.

They consume what he produces.

That phrase contains the fundamentals of our security and what that phrase means is better understood than the administration is willing to admit.

We must capitalize that understanding. It is our greatest resource.

Let me close with this. The other day one of my colleagues on this side of the aisle said to me, "The O. P. A. will elect a Republican Congress next year."

Then he said, "Perhaps we should just let them pursue their headstrong way."

"But," he continued, "I cannot because I know what their policies, based on the power of political money, will do to our Nation. I do hope that by constructive criticism we can effect the intent of Congress when it passed the Price Control Act a year ago."

I was proud of my colleague—proud to sit in Congress with a man like that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

MESSRS. LOVETT, DODD, JR., AND WATSON

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, last Friday three Federal employees—Dr. Robert Morss Lovett, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Goodwin B. Watson—whom Congress has declared unfit for Government employment, filed suits in the United States Court of Claims contesting the constitutional right of Congress to refuse to appropriate any money to pay their salaries after November 15. The amount of money involved in these three suits is of little or no consequence. Dr. Lovett is seeking to recover $211.18, Mr. Dodd $79.75 and Mr. Watson $148.50, which represent the respective amounts alleged to have been earned by each since November 15, the date Congress set for the discontinuance of their salaries. The cost of the suits to the individuals will be greater than the amounts they could recover. Even assuming they are successful, the most they can secure from the court is a judgment which can be paid only by an appropriation by Congress for the purpose.

These three suits challenge the right and the power of the people's Representatives in Congress to stipulate by solemn legislative enactment how money we appropriate may or may not be spent. While the suits are brought by three individuals, it is surely recognized that in reality it is the executive branch of the Government which is here challenging a basic right and power of Congress.

If not in name, certainly in fact, the Executive is seeking through these suits to limit the constitutional power of Congress by judicial decree. And, ironically, unless we take some special action, we will be represented in the court by the Attorney General or by the very branch of the Government which is challenging the power of Congress.

Under normal procedure when a suit is brought in the Court of Claims the defense is handled by the Attorney General of the United States. Accordingly, copies of the petitions filed by Dr. Lovett, Mr. Dodd, and Mr. Watson were served on the Attorney General. It is my contention, Mr. Speaker, that in these particular cases, representing a constitutional contest between the Executive and the Congress, in which the individuals and the money involved are merely incidental, the Attorney General is not the proper person to represent the defense. I consider the circumstances in these suits to be such that the Congress should by resolution name the counsel who will prepare and argue the defense.

It will be recalled that for several years by a series of legislative enactments we have sought to remove from the Federal pay rolls all individuals who engaged in or associated themselves with organizations that engaged in subversive activities. We have sought to rid the Federal Government of people who do not believe in the principles of our Government. Largely because we received practically no cooperation from the executive branch of the Government, general provisions of law dealing with the problem were ineffective. Time and again we called attention of the departments to the activities of certain individuals employed by the departments, but without any action taken. We were simply told to "mind our own business," so to speak, the departments will employ whomever they wish, whatever Congress may say about their beliefs and qualifications.

Not being able to secure results in any other way and recognizing our responsibilities to the people, we were unfortunately forced to resort to the extraordinary procedure of stipulating in appropriation bills that funds appropriated shall not be used to pay the salaries for certain named individuals whom we found, after most careful investigations and hearings, unfit for Government service because of subversive teachings and affiliations. For a number of years, in spite of the opposition of the Executive, we have had the Dies committee conduct investigations of un-American activities, and on February 9 of this year we set up by resolution the special subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, under the chairmanship of the able gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], to examine into all allegations or charges that certain individuals employed in the several departments or agencies are unfit for Federal employment because of subversive activities.

The Kerr subcommittee conducted an investigation of the charges against Dr. Lovett, Mr. Dodd, and Mr. Watson, as well as several other individuals. It called them before the committee and gave them full opportunity to answer the charges. On April 21 the committee filed its formal report, finding Mr. Dodd and Mr. Watson unfit for Government service, and on May 14 it filed another report in which it found Dr. Lovett unfit.

Acting on the committee's recommendation, after extensive debate on the floor, we wrote into the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, H. R. 2714, a provision prohibiting the payment of a salary to these three individuals out of any funds Congress appropriated. It was an outright prohibition, constituting a limitation on the use of appropriations. As finally enacted, the provision provided that the appropriations could not be used to pay their salaries after November 15 unless prior to that date they were appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The bill was signed by the President on July 12, and it will be recalled that when he signed the bill he publicly criticized us for this particular provision.

However, between July 12 and November 15 the President could have appointed these three individuals and, if confirmed by the Senate, they could continue to receive compensation as Federal employees. In other words, the Congress did not completely bind the President, but left with the Executive the power of appointment.

But the President did not see fit to exercise the power, and on November 15 the compensation of Dr. Lovett, Mr. Dodd, and Mr. Watson stopped. The departments could not legally pay their salaries after that date. If they had attempted to do so, the Comptroller General of the United States, who is an agent of Congress, would have prevented any evasions of the prohibition.

There thus evolved this planned attack on the power of Congress. The President ignored the right to appoint the

three individuals and instead of the Federal Communications Commission dismissing Mr. Dodd and Mr. Watson and the Secretary of the Interior dismissing Dr. Lovett on November 15, they were retained in office so that they could then sue to recover compensation for services rendered. Indeed, the Secretary of the Interior showed his intention to ignore the wishes of Congress and his contempt for the Congress when, on October 12, about 1 month before the November 15 dead-line date set by Congress, he transferred Dr. Lovett from the position of government secretary to that of executive assistant to the Governor of the Virgin Islands.

In brief, Mr. Speaker, the executive branch of the Government has deliberately planned these three suits in the Court of Claims in an effort to limit the power of Congress over the expenditure of public money. I repeat that in this challenge to Congress the Attorney General, who is the personal representative of the President, is not the proper person to prepare and argue the case in court. It behooves us to select a special counsel so that we may be certain that the rights and powers of Congress are properly advanced in the court.

As I indicated at the outset, I am not concerned about the money involved in the suits. It is of no consequence. Nor am I concerned about the individuals. They were given a hearing by us, and the President could have appointed them subsequent to the enactment of the prohibition in question. But I am deeply concerned about the fundamental principle of constitutional government that is brought in issue.

The power over the purse is a basic power. As Col. O. R. McGuire states in his book, Americans on Guard:

> The Government spending and taxing power in a Nation of 130,000,000 people and in a territory of 3,000,000 square miles is a tremendous power, second to none.

This power over the purse belongs to the people and must be kept in the hands of the people. It is a safeguard to personal liberties. Our Constitution recognizes that fact by providing that all revenue measures must originate in the House, and inasmuch as the power to appropriate is incidental to the power to tax, all appropriation bills originate in the House, which is the body closest to the people. It is this basic power that is challenged.

Let me quote here, Mr. Speaker, the words of the Honorable John Randolph Tucker in a speech he made on the floor of the House about 65 years ago. He is recognized as one of our greatest constitutional lawyers.

> The power over the purse of the people is a part of those inherited privileges vested by the people in this House and in the Senate, by means of which the people's representatives in the legislative department may check Executive usurpation and constrain a redress of grievances. This money power was the lever by which the Saxon people upheaved the solid centralism of the Norman polity and transferred the monarchy of the Conquest into the noblest type of constitutional government in the Old World. This power over the purse in the hands of the Commons made the sword impotent in the hands of the king. The power was used there—in England—as the medicine of the constitution.

It has been argued, Mr. Speaker, that in writing such a limitation the Congress is transgressing upon the rights of the Executive. I ask that section 2 of article II of the Constitution be carefully read. It sets out what offices the President has the right to fill by appointment and goes on to say:

> But the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments.

In other words, it is not to be assumed, as so many apparently assume, that the Executive has full right without any limitation to fill all executive offices. The Constitution clearly expresses a contrary intention. Moreover, the courts have held that, "while the power of appointment to office is essentially an Executive function, Congress has power to prescribe conditions to the complete investiture of an office"—*United States* v. *LeBaron* (19 How. 73, 78 (1856))—and "Qualifications for office"—volume 13, Opinions of the Attorneys General, 516, 524 (1871)—and Congress "may control appointments through the control of appropriations for salaries"—*Foote* v. *United States* (23 Court of Claims 443 (1888)).

"This control may take effect in the refusal of appropriations"—*Bennett* v. *United States* (19 Court of Claims 379 (1884)).

The above citations appear on page 395, Constitution of the United States of America, Revised and Annotated, 1938.

The case of *Myers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52), has been frequently cited as authority for the lack of power in Congress to remove an inferior executive officer from office. But the case is not authority for the action taken in the instance of these three individuals. Congress did not remove them from office. Congress simply stipulated that if they are to continue to draw compensation in office after November 15 they must be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. There is, therefore, a fundamental distinction to be made between the cases.

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, with what I said at the outset. It is not Dr. Lovett, Mr. Watson, and Mr. Dodd who are challenging the power of the people's representatives in Congress. It is the Executive, acting in their name. It is our sworn duty to protect our powers in the name of the people, and it behooves us therefore to select for ourselves the ablest obtainable counsel to answer this challenge in the courts.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of the regular business on the Speaker's table and any other matters before the House, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on Friday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATION PROVIDING MUSTERING-OUT PAY FOR SOLDIERS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute at this time and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago—last week, I believe—the President of the United States sent the Congress a message recommending that legislation be enacted to provide mustering-out pay for our soldiers.

As chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs I have been extremely busy with important matters of legislation, but notwithstanding that I have scheduled hearings on this legislation for tomorrow morning, 10 o'clock, Room 1310, House Office Building, at which time the Committee on Military Affairs will proceed to take the matter up for hearing. I hope to have it in such form as to be able to report it some time during the week. If we are able to do that, I am hopeful that we may be able to dispose of it promptly in order that discharged soldiers who are wounded and disabled may have something to go along on.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. When does the gentleman expect to ask for a rule on that bill?

Mr. MAY. I do not know exactly. As soon as we can get it reported.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman have it ready by next Monday?

Mr. MAY. I hope to have it ready by Friday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. If it is reported by the Committee on Military Affairs, we are hopeful that the necessity for applying for a rule will not exist.

Mr. FISH. It will go through by unanimous consent?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. This is legislation that both sides thoroughly recognize the importance of passing.

Mr. FISH. This is nonpartisan, but I understand the minority leader was the one who called the attention of the House to the necessity for this legislation. It is nonpartisan, in my opinion, and I think everybody will support it.

Mr. McCORMACK. The President of the United States recommended it, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and myself have made statements on it. The gentleman asked about a rule, and, addressing myself to that question, it is my hope that no member

of the Rules Committee will be so technical as to object to a unanimous-consent request for the consideration of that bill. I am sure my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] agrees with me in that expression.

Mr. FISH. I agree we should expedite it in any way we can. It is a little late, but let us get it through.

Mr. MAY. An objection to the unanimous-consent request for its immediate consideration when the bill is reported out will bar it from immediate consideration. Of course, if I make that kind of request we will then find out the temper of the House. I do hope no one will object and that we may send the bill to the Senate promptly where I hope it may receive prompt passage.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not think the gentleman will have any difficulty in getting the bill before the House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Las Vegas Daily Optic dealing with pending legislation with reference to promoting to a higher rank the soldiers who were taken prisoner at Bataan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF DISCHARGE PETITION

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, I have signed discharge petition No. 8. I find that my predecessor, Mr. Van Zandt, also signed it. I ask unanimous consent that his name be stricken from the petition and that mine remain.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time today to discuss for a few moments a question that I think should be given quite a lot of consideration and thought in addition to that which has heretofore been given it by committees of the House and Senate; that is, the question of a reduction in the number of personnel in the Federal Government.

For many months intensive studies have been directed toward the problem of reduction in Federal spending. The kind of legislation to submit to accomplish the needed saving has also been given attention. It is evident that the various departments are overstaffed. That conclusion is undisputed. The Byrd committee has proposed on two occasions that the executive branch of the Government reduce the number of its employees. To these admonitions little has been done. It is only a request that the departments reduce the number on their rolls. These agencies will immediately set to work in an attempt to justify the number employed by them and try to convince economy advocates in Congress that it is essential to the war effort and that many are irreplaceable. That is the same argument department heads used when we members of the Costello committee—a special committee of the House Military Affairs Committee—held hearings on draft deferment of Government workers. Largely the Costello committee was interested in curbing draft boards from deferring Government workers and to stop the practice of Government asking special treatment of its employees.

The increase in the number of civilian employees of the Federal Government since August 1940 has been astounding. In August 1940 there were approximately 1,039,451 Federal civilian employees. In May 1943 there were 3,030,658 civilian employees of the Federal Government. In a little more than 3 years the employees of the Federal Government have nearly trebled. A great deal of attention has been given the reduction in Federal personnel by not only the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, headed by Senator BYRD, of Virginia, but by the Ramspeck Committee on Investigation of Civil Employment. The Byrd committee has issued at least 2 interim reports on this question, and recently the Ramspeck committee filed its first report on the question of the investigation of civil employment. The Byrd committee filed a report on June 18, 1943, in which it concluded that only 1,349,000 persons, or less than 45 percent of all the civilian Government workers, were employed in actual war-essential production. According to the report filed by the Ramspeck committee, "Workers themselves have complained of idleness." Complaints have come to Congress from employees in the executive branch of the Government who are now working the full day on Saturday that they were at their desks but that it was needless for them to attempt to work the full day Saturday since there was no work for them to do. These employees are drawing time and a half for overtime for this additional half day of work. A reduction in the personnel of the Federal Government would assist the war program and abolish wasted effort, duplication, red tape, and a multitude of regulations and forms with which the executive agencies of the Government continue to harass the people of the country.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Perhaps we may take encouragement from the fact that whereas the June peak of Federal employment was slightly over 3,000,000, the figure for November 1 shows a decrease of about 135,000, so there is some progress, although slow, in separating from the rolls the unnecessary employees toward whom the gentleman is directing his thought-provoking remarks.

Mr. GATHINGS. I thank the gentleman. He is entirely correct that there has been an appreciable reduction in Federal employees. I think that is largely due to the first report on this subject that was filed by the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Spending, which is headed by Senator BYRD, and the House Civil Service Committee report issued last summer.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I wish to compliment the gentleman on the very important statement he is making in regard to economy of personnel. If this Nation is short on any one thing, I believe it is in willing hands to do this war work. Every private industry is doing its utmost to get along with fewer men and to make those fewer men produce more, yet, in the Federal Government, even with the start that is now occurring in the way of a decrease, I believe we have merely scratched the surface. It is up to the departments downtown and to the committees of Congress to urge and demand and insist on further economy in personnel. I again compliment the gentleman on his very fine statement.

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman from Oklahoma has continuously worked for a reduction in the cost of operation of the Federal Government. Time and time again he has come on this floor and urged that we retrench and that the expenses of the Government be cut down. I thank the gentleman very much for his contribution.

Mr. RANDOLPH. If the gentleman will yield further, he very properly commends the work of Senator BYRD and the joint committee.

Mr. GATHINGS. I do.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think, however, that at this point the gentleman would not knowingly overlook the work done by the House Committee on the Civil Service under the leadership of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]. This committee, through its hearings and surveys, carried on in a thorough manner and with no partisanship, has been doing a real job in connection with wiping out the nonessentials of Government and releasing those employees who are not contributing to the prosecution of the war.

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes. The House Committee on the Civil Service, of which you are the ranking majority member, has done a great work along that line. It has filed one report, and I understand additional reports will be forthcoming. I intend to ask permission to insert some of the tables prepared by that committee. I would like to say at this time that the gentleman from West Virginia vigorously advocated many months ago that Federal personnel should be reduced by 300,000.

After careful study of this whole problem, the Byrd committee has repeatedly

urged that Federal personnel in the various agencies be reduced by at least 300,000 employees. A sizable saving would be the result of such a reduction of personnel if it were put into effect. Various estimates have been made of the amounts that could be saved, but it is reasonable to assume that by this reduction, which is approximately 10 percent of the total Federal civilian employment, the saving would amount to at least $600,000,000 or more per year.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert three tables at this point in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The tables referred to follow:

TABLE 1.—*Federal employment increase (paid employees in executive branch)*

	Personnel	Monthly pay roll
Nov. 11, 1918	917,760	(1)
August 1939	933,386	$141,733,064
August 1940	1,039,451	159,260,975
August 1941	1,444,985	217,772,054
August 1942	2,450,759	391,502,171
March 1943	2,978,824	638,926,265
April	3,003,539	634,324,484
May	3,039,412	610,675,661
June	3,095,463	657,791,453
July	3,093,495	(1)
August	3,020,814	(1)
September	2,964,405	(1)

[1] No figures available.

Source: Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Nov. 22, 1943, Doc. No. 131, 78th Cong., 1st sess.

A history of 25 years of Federal Government employment

NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES AT SELECTED DATES

1918: Nov. 11	917,760
1920: July 31	691,116
1923: June 30	515,772
1926: June 30	528,542
1929: June 30	559,579
1933: June 30	572,091
1936: June 30	824,259
1939: June 30	920,310
Aug. 31	932,953
1940: June 30	1,002,820
1941: June 30	1,370,110
Nov. 30	1,545,131
1942: Mar. 31	1,926,074
June 30	2,206,970
Sept. 30	2,549,474
Dec. 31	2,810,871
1943: Mar. 31	2,978,824
May 31	3,029,483

Source: Chamber of Commerce of the United States booklet, How Many Too Many?

	Number of employees		Percent increase over the period	Percent of the total increase
	August 31, 1939	May 31, 1943		
War Department	115,114	1,382,490	1,101.7	60.5
Navy Department	87,979	634,530	621.2	26.0
Total War and Navy	203,093	2,017,020	893.6	86.5
Other departments and independent establishments	729,860	1,012,463	38.7	13.5
Grand total	932,953	3,029,483	224.6	100.0

Source: Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Department of Governmental Affairs, booklet entitled, "How Many Too Many."

Mr. GATHINGS. It is undisputed that there are entirely too many Government workers in Washington and over the country, and that the number should be sizably reduced. The Byrd committee makes certain suggestions in reducing the number of Federal employees. I am of the firm opinion that legislation is required in order to accomplish the results which should be put into effect. To say to the executive branch of the Government that "you have too many employees and should reduce them," is not enough.

I have today introduced a bill which would amend the Classification Act of 1923 and offer a solution to the problem of how to obtain a sizable reduction in the overstaffed Federal agencies. My bill is concise and unambiguous and I quote from the bill:

If in any administrative unit in any department, agency, or instrumentality in the executive branch of the Government there is effected at least a 15-percent reduction in personnel (determined with reference to the number of personnel therein on July 1, 1943) by the abolition of any position or positions classified under this act, the position of the head of such administrative unit shall, so long as such reduction remains in effect, be classified in the next higher grade under this act.

That is practically the essence of the bill. That sentence is really the whole bill.

Under this bill any head of an administrative unit who supervises employees would be given an increase in salary to the next pay grade should he effectuate at least a 15-percent reduction in the number of employees in his unit. The increased salary paid such supervisors would be a small consideration when you consider the great saving that would result from such a reduction in employees in the various branches of the executive department. These heads of the various administrative units are in a better position than anyone to put into effect a reduction program, since under their supervision the actual work in the agencies is being performed. They realize that more efficiency would result by employing fewer Government workers. Just how would the bill operate? Let us take an example.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert tables 4 and 5 in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

The tables referred to follow:

Civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government, by months

Month	Number of employees	Net increase
1942:		
January	1,703,099	
February	1,805,186	102,087
March	1,926,074	120,888
April	1,970,969	44,895
May	2,066,873	95,904
June	2,206,970	140,097
July	2,327,932	120,962
August	2,450,759	122,827
September	2,549,474	98,715
October	2,687,093	137,619
November	2,739,815	52,722
December	2,810,871	71,056
1943:		
January	2,864,021	53,150
February	2,944,922	80,901
March	2,978,824	33,902
April	3,005,812	26,988
May	3,030,658	24,846

The average monthly increase for the 7 months prior to Nov. 1, 1942, was 108,717 employees. The rate of increase slowed down to an average of only 49,081 employees per month during the 7-month period after Nov. 1, 1942.

United States Civil Service Commission—Classification pay scale

Service and grade		Basic pay rates							Service and grade	
P	CAF	Minimum	Intermediate					Maximum	CPC	SP
		$720		$780	$840	$900		$960	1	
		1,200	$1,260	1,320	1,380	1,440		1,500	2	
		1,200	1,260	1,320	1,380	1,440	$1,500	1,560		1
	1	1,260	1,320	1,380	1,440	1,500	1,560	1,620		
		1,320	1,380	1,440	1,500	1,560		1,620	3	
		1,320	1,380	1,440	1,500	1,560	1,620	1,680		2
	2	1,440	1,500	1,560	1,620	1,680	1,740	1,800		3
		1,500	1,560	1,620	1,680	1,740	1,800	1,860	4	
	3	1,620	1,680	1,740	1,800	1,860	1,920	1,980		4
		1,680	1,740	1,800	1,860	1,920	1,980	2,040	5	
	4	1,800	1,860	1,920	1,980	2,040	2,100	2,160		5
		1,860	1,920	1,980	2,040	2,100	2,160	2,220	6	
1	5	2,000	2,100	2,200	2,300	2,400	2,500	2,600		6
		2,040	2,100	2,160	2,220	2,300	2,400	2,500	7	
		2,200	2,300	2,400	2,500	2,600	2,700	2,800	8	
	6	2,300	2,400	2,500	2,600	2,700	2,800	2,900	9	7
2	7	2,600	2,700	2,800	2,900	3,000	3,100	3,200	10	8
	8	2,900	3,000	3,100	3,200	3,300	3,400	3,500		
3	9	3,200	3,300	3,400	3,500	3,600	3,700	3,800		
	10	3,500	3,600	3,700	3,800	3,900	4,000	4,100		
4	11	3,800		4,000	4,200	4,400		4,600		
5	12	4,600		4,800	5,000	5,200		5,400		
6	13	5,600		5,800	6,000	6,200		6,400		
7	14	6,500		6,750	7,000	7,250		7,500		
8	15	8,000		8,250	8,500	8,750		9,000		
9	16			See note 3 below						

NOTES

1. The rates for the clerical-mechanical service are as follows:
   CM-1, 66 to 72 cents an hour;
   CM-2, 78 to 84 cents an hour;
   CM-3, 90 to 96 cents an hour;
   CM-4, $1.02 to $1.14 an hour.
2. The rates for part-time charwomen and part-time head charwomen are 65 and 70 cents an hour, respectively.
3. P-9 and CAF-16 have no explicit pay rates. They include positions for which Congress, in individual cases, expressly fixes a pay rate in excess of $9,000 a year.
4. For within-grade pay advancement purposes, the fourth rate in CPC-2 and in CPC-3 is considered the middle rate of the pay scale.

Source: House Committee on the Civil Service, October 13, 1943 report, Report No. 766, 78th Cong., 1st sess.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, in the Department of Agriculture there are many separate and distinct branches. There are directors of these various branches. All of these directors are under the direct supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture. Should there be at least a 15-percent reduction in the total number of employees in the Soil Conservation Service, for instance, the Director of the Soil Conservation Service would be given an increase to the next pay grade. Each of the administrative unit heads in the Soil Conservation Service would receive the increase in salary by "lopping off" 15 percent of the employees in such unit. The Classification Act of 1923 refers many, many times in setting up the various pay grades, under the classified civil service, that in order to draw the higher salaries such employees should, and I quote from the act, "supervise a large or important office organization." Many times in the act the words "large organization" are used. As long as the Classification Act of 1923 is left intact in this respect, there will never be any sizeable reduction in Federal personnel. The employees in the higher pay grades will not recommend that the top-heavy pay roll be reduced, because they fear that they could not be given a higher grade and would do well to continue to receive the same salaries that they are now being paid.

Now, as never before in America has there existed a greater need for the conservation of our manpower. The armed forces have called on the Selective Service System to provide a continuous flow of at least 300,000 young men each month. There is a great turn-over in personnel in many war industries. The farmer is short handed and faces a desperate situation for 1944 since his hired hands have been lured away to defense plants or inducted into the armed service. Mr. Speaker, it should not be necessary to offer any form of inducement to the agencies of Government to put into effect economy, efficient operation of their departments and the principles of conservation of the manpower resources of the country. They should accept the recommendations of the Byrd committee and make these reductions without the necessity of legislation. This has not, however, been the result.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Arkansas on the very meritorious idea which he has presented to the membership here this afternoon. If I understand it, he would reward a supervisor in one of the departments for making an effort to reduce his personnel rather than to continue a practice which has been followed in many instances of rewarding one for increasing his personnel?

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman is right. He has been a member of the Committee on the Civil Service of the House of Representatives for many years and he has studied this problem. My bill would provide that should any one of the administrative heads, who supervise employees in various branches of the Federal Government, reduce the personnel under him by a 15-percent reduction in number, that party would be given a higher pay grade.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I feel that the practice the gentleman has mentioned certainly has been prevalent in a number of the departments. I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Arkansas on the consistent fight he has made in behalf of economy in Government. The gentleman and I came here at the same time and I am aware that he certainly has put up a forthright fight all along for economy in Government. The gentleman is exactly right with reference to his desire to see that the number of employees on our Federal pay roll be reduced; with him I agree that efficiency in many of our governmental departments could be brought about by reducing the number of employees.

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman from Texas has done likewise. He has advocated the elimination of waste of public funds for many years past.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman. The gentleman and I have visited a number of departments together, and at times we have often deplored the idleness which is prevalent in some of these departments. It certainly is my opinion if action of the type the gentleman has suggested here this afternoon were taken it might be conducive to cutting down a considerable amount of idleness which has prevailed from time to time in a number of departments.

No doubt, much of this idleness stems from the fact that there has not been enough work to keep all the employees busy or from the fact that poor management has prevented proper assignment of the work. I have always believed that a person should give a dollar's worth of service for a dollar's worth of pay, and it is my sincere hope that those of us who believe in and advocate more economy and less waste in Government will have more help in the future.

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes; and I want to say to the gentleman that in the report filed by the Ramspeck committee it was brought out emphatically that many complaints have been received from these various employees themselves about the idleness and the loafing going on in Federal agencies, particularly in Washington. The gentleman from Texas has done yeoman service to his district and country in being one of the first Members of this House to tirelessly strive to cut down excessive spending by the Federal Government.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am not ready to say that the formula which the gentleman has proposed would in all instances be equitable for an increase in salary. I do say, reaffirming what the gentleman has said, that your House Civil Service Committee has found that in many instances raises to those in supervisory capacities did come about by these individuals enlarging the number of employees who worked under their supervision.

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman is correct, because the Classification Act of 1923 specifically brings out that particular language.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I would not want to take my seat without stating what I am sure is in the gentleman's mind as well as my own, and that is that we should make no blanket criticism of the employees of our Federal Government whether they work in Washington or in the field. By and large they certainly are capable and loyal, and although instances occur such as the gentleman has presented here to the House today, I can say that those I have come to know are interested in their jobs and sometimes when they have a lack of work to do it is not their individual fault.

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman is entirely correct. I say that the act of 1923 should be amended by Congress. That is the reason I have introduced this bill, and I am not in any way attempting to cast any reflection upon the patriotic employees in Washington and all over the country. Congress alone can remedy this situation by amending this act and saving millions of dollars at the same time.

The outmoded system of pay raises in Government should and must be eliminated. The present system of pay grades is based on the theory that the civil-service employee must build a large organization before his pay can be raised. The bill I present would change that theory and say, reduce your personnel by 15 percent and you will be rewarded by receiving a higher pay grade. Efficiency in getting the work done should be used as a criterion instead of setting to work to build up every agency of Government as soon as it comes into being. If the executive departments of the Government would spend more time in conscientiously doing the work they are called upon to perform instead of attempting to justify their expansion into other fields of endeavor—foreign and far afield to what they were set up to accomplish, a more efficient operation would be the result. A great part of their time is spent in research and formulating data for presentation to the Appropriation Committees of the House and Senate, asking for more money to continue their functions and for expansion.

There is another reason for reducing Government employees that should be considered by this Congress. Less Government interference with the citizen is desired rather than stack on new bureaus, new duties, more controls and additional supervisors to supervise supervisors. This bill will put an end to building up the Federal Government at the expense of the individual freedom and liberty of the taxpaying Nation.

In May 1943 there were 6,202,200 employees of Federal, State and local governments. For every 21 people in America we have an employee paid from the public till. It is time to apply the brakes if we want to remain a free people.

Estimated Federal, State, and local governmental employment, by selected Federal agencies and States, May 1943

[In thousands]

State	Total governmental employment	State and local	Federal					
			Executive service					Legislative and judicial services and Government corporations [5]
			Total	War Department [1]	Navy Department [2]	Post Office Department [3]	Other [4]	
United States total	6,202.2	3,069.6	3,091.1	1,444.1	634.5	315.2	697.3	41.5
Washington, D. C. metropolitan area	303.0	15.8	280.3	58.7	48.3	7.9	165.4	6.9
Other areas	5,899.2	3,053.8	2,810.8	1,385.4	586.2	307.3	531.9	34.6
Outside continental United States	170.7	----------	163.7	64.3	52.9	.5	46.0	7.0
48 States	5,728.5	3,053.8	2,647.1	1,321.1	533.3	306.8	485.9	27.6
Alabama	110.9	45.7	64.8	49.7	.1	3.4	11.6	.4
Arizona	28.2	11.8	16.4	9.6	----------	.9	5.9	(6)
Arkansas	57.2	31.8	25.3	15.1	----------	2.9	7.3	.1
California	459.9	218.5	239.6	117.1	74.2	17.4	30.9	1.8
Colorado	62.1	34.6	27.5	16.5	(6)	2.8	8.2	(6)
Connecticut	51.5	42.0	9.5	1.3	1.4	3.7	3.1	(6)
Delaware	10.1	7.0	3.1	1.8	.2	.6	.5	(6)
Florida	108.8	49.0	59.8	29.1	20.1	3.6	7.0	(6)
Georgia	130.4	55.3	73.9	55.9	.8	6.4	10.8	1.2
Idaho	23.6	13.8	9.8	2.7	1.0	1.1	5.0	(6)
Illinois	290.3	152.5	134.6	77.1	7.8	26.6	23.1	3.2
Indiana	111.9	75.4	36.4	17.9	3.9	6.8	7.8	.1
Iowa	77.7	61.9	15.7	4.7	(6)	5.6	5.4	.1
Kansas	69.7	49.0	20.1	9.9	(6)	4.3	5.9	.6
Kentucky	87.0	45.9	40.5	21.4	.1	5.3	13.7	.6
Louisiana	99.8	50.9	47.4	31.4	3.4	3.7	8.9	1.5
Maine	55.8	26.6	29.2	3.6	20.0	2.2	3.4	(6)
Maryland	100.9	38.3	62.1	31.4	10.7	3.4	16.6	.5
Massachusetts	259.0	127.8	129.7	50.8	53.4	13.6	11.9	1.5
Michigan	193.7	135.5	58.1	34.0	2.0	10.2	11.9	.1
Minnesota	95.8	73.7	20.5	3.0	.1	8.6	8.8	1.6
Mississippi	69.7	41.7	27.8	19.4	.1	2.5	5.8	.2
Missouri	127.1	73.2	51.0	25.6	.8	11.8	12.8	2.9
Montana	25.7	16.2	9.5	2.1	----------	1.4	6.0	(6)
Nebraska	55.3	34.1	20.4	10.1	.2	4.3	5.8	.8
Nevada	9.5	3.8	5.7	.8	1.6	.3	3.0	(6)
New Hampshire	21.2	17.1	4.1	1.3	.1	1.2	1.5	(6)
New Jersey	195.6	97.1	98.5	76.6	5.0	7.7	9.2	(6)
New Mexico	30.2	12.6	17.6	10.4	----------	1.0	6.2	(6)
New York	648.0	379.3	265.3	90.3	82.7	47.7	44.6	3.4
North Carolina	108.5	64.6	43.8	21.8	3.1	4.5	14.4	.1
North Dakota	21.9	16.0	5.9	.8	(6)	1.7	3.4	(6)
Ohio	289.5	153.6	134.6	95.9	4.5	18.3	15.9	1.3
Oklahoma	86.3	53.9	32.3	19.4	1.4	4.0	7.5	.1
Oregon	55.6	30.3	25.3	13.5	.4	2.6	8.8	(6)
Pennsylvania	414.4	200.8	212.5	91.1	72.2	21.5	27.7	1.1
Rhode Island	42.4	19.5	22.9	1.9	18.3	1.3	1.4	(6)
South Carolina	89.6	35.2	53.9	20.2	26.2	2.1	5.4	.5
South Dakota	32.3	21.7	10.6	5.4	----------	1.7	3.5	(6)
Tennessee	104.7	54.9	49.3	21.2	.7	4.7	22.7	.5
Texas	275.7	124.3	149.4	106.4	8.7	11.9	22.4	2.0
Utah	55.4	17.0	38.4	32.8	.4	1.1	4.1	(6)
Vermont	14.0	10.6	3.4	.4	----------	1.1	1.9	(6)
Virginia	177.7	57.2	119.7	27.9	72.6	5.2	14.0	.8
Washington	136.3	50.6	85.2	33.0	34.7	4.4	13.1	.5
West Virginia	50.9	39.4	11.4	2.1	.1	3.4	5.8	.1
Wisconsin	93.3	74.3	19.0	4.9	.3	5.6	8.2	(6)
Wyoming	13.4	7.8	5.6	1.8	(6)	.7	3.1	(6)

[1] Geographic distribution based on station report for December 1942.
[2] Geographic distribution based on station report for March 1943.
[3] Geographic distribution based on retirement report to the U. S. Civil Service Commission of June 1940.
[4] Geographic distribution based on reports for March 1943 for Selective Service System and U. S. Employment Service and on study of June 1941 for all other agencies.
[5] Geographic distribution of employees of Government corporations based on study of June 1941 and that of employees of the judicial service on study of December 1938.
[6] Fewer than 50 persons.

Source: U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment and Occupational Outlook Branch, Division of Construction and Public Employment.

The pay roll of the Federal civil service in 1942 was $4,396,000,000—think of it—this almost equals the pay rolls of all State and local governments combined in that year. In 1929 the Federal pay roll was less than one-third of that of the State and local governments.

With mounting taxes which have been imposed almost to the point of diminishing returns, it is necessary that we, as representatives of the American people, should put into effect a concrete plan to cut out the waste in public funds by reducing the employees on the rolls and in so doing more efficient operation of governmental affairs will be the result.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an extract from an article by ex-Governor Ely of the State of Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] is recognized for 15 minutes.

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF PEARL HARBOR

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the indulgence of the House for a few minutes today in order to give expression to some thoughts that arise from very deep feelings as this Nation stands poised on the threshold of a third year of total war.

If I could have the answer to a prayer today it would be that here in this Chamber, in every public office, every enterprise, every home and every heart, we might recapture the spirit that called us to such high purpose and firm resolution 2 years ago.

Like a cleansing flame the inferno that blazed at Pearl Harbor burned out the self-interest impulses from our souls. The bombs that burst on the quiet beaches of Hawaii blew to bits the bodies of American soldiers, sailors, and civilians, but they bound together the souls of all Americans.

All of us can recall today with what unanimity of purpose and opinion we gathered here on December 8, 1941, to make a formal declaration of the war which literally had dropped out of the sky upon us.

In that war resolution we pledged every resource of this Nation, human and material, to the successful prosecution of the war.

Two days later, with the same spirit of unanimity, we met in this Chamber and accepted the declarations of war that had been declared against us by Japan's Axis partners, Italy and Germany. In that resolution we once more pledged the entire resources of the Nation behind the Commander in Chief.

Today, 2 years later, we stand amazed at the manner in which these human and material resources have been marshaled, mobilized, and deployed against our enemies.

Under the Constitution the Congress is charged with the responsibility of raising and equipping an army and providing and maintaining a navy. It is altogether unnecessary here to review what this Congress has done in discharging that responsibility. The record in that respect speaks for itself, and it is a record of unparalleled achievement.

From jungles and desolate isles of the Pacific we can hear today the triumphant shouts of American fighting men as they close in on the Japanese wolf pack and press relentlessly on toward the time and the place of complete destruction of these stabbers in the back.

And on old and historic battlefields of Europe our forces with those of Russia and Britain are forging rings of steel and courage around the Nazi butcher birds and driving them to their day of doom.

Marshal Stalin is quoted as saying in the meeting with Mr. Roosevelt and Mr.

Churchill that without American production the war would be lost by the United Nations. With that statement we are in full accord, and we gratefully acknowledge the united contribution of the American people, the Government, industry, and labor, in the almost incomprehensible achievement thus far in production for war.

Our production curves and all the curves that chart our material progress have moved steadily upward and are rising *still*.

But on this day of retrospection and introspection I think we should give some serious examination to the curve that charts our spiritual position from month to month to determine whether it is keeping pace with the other curves that show our progress in producing the physical and material necessities of war.

When that gracious lady, Mme. Chiang Kai-shek addressed this body with such eloquence and sincerity a few months ago, she said:

> Man's mettle is tested both in adversity and success. Twice is this true of the soul of a nation.

And I think in these days we will do well, all of us, in the Government and out of the Government, to ask ourselves very frankly whether we are standing up as well under our success in gearing for this war, as we did in the adversity of disaster after Pearl Harbor.

We will do well to learn, if we may, whether our will, our resolution, and our unity of purpose curves move upward in the same degree as the assembly-line curve which in November reached its highest point.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, no one expected that the white heat of anger and indignation that characterized our thoughts and feelings in the early hours and days after Pearl Harbor, to continue as we proceeded with the grim business of preparing for and fighting a global war.

But, Mr. Speaker, the millions of American fighting men, Democrats and Republicans, and members of any and all other political parties, who are now about to be hurled in great strength and numbers against the most ruthless foe we ever fought, have a right to demand that we in the Congress, other branches of the Government, and the people of the Nation, find and maintain the same unity of purpose that they have found as they face common dangers against a common enemy and fight and die together.

Let us consider the tragic truth that since this House convened at noon today, American boys, Democrats and Republicans alike, have looked for the last time on the scenes of this world, and have died in strange lands far from the shores of this America they loved and served with all they had.

Over their graves now the wild winds of winter will sing a sorrowful requiem; above their dust their comrades-in-arms will fight on with valor to victory; and tonight in more windows gold stars will attest to the hushed grief of saddened homes.

We are nearing the end of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress. We recall today the words of the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], when, in presenting the distinguished Speaker to the House on the opening day, he described this as the Victory Congress. With what accuracy he predicted then only time and circumstances will tell.

In January we shall open the second session of this Congress, and in the months that will follow we will be confronted with a program of war legislation in every sense as important as has been the program during the year soon to end, and equally as important as that which came before us in the first year after Pearl Harbor.

The mighty military movements already agreed upon for both the European and Pacific theaters will begin to unfold early in the coming year. If perchance these military operations should prove completely successful within the year ahead, then our problems here will be magnified and multiplied manyfold.

Against a background of indescribable horror and bloodshed we here in the Congress and the millions whom we represent in the months immediately ahead of us must play the part that is assigned to us as stoically and heroically as those who are cast in sterner and more tragic roles in which the exit so often is death.

If we are to do that, then indeed we must recapture or be recaptured by that spirit that possessed us on the day after Pearl Harbor.

What kind of a spirit was that?

Was it not in the first place a spirit of utter unselfishness?

Was it not a spirit that lifted all of us far above the petty differences that are rooted in different political philosophies and parties?

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that every one of us here in this war Congress will agree that, compared with the importance and the destiny of America, the importance of the Democratic Party or the importance of the Republican Party, or of any and all parties, is very negligible.

In the course of time during the coming year the American people under constitutional processes will elect a President, Vice President, 435 Members of the House of Representatives, and one-third of the membership of the United States Senate.

But that time is almost a year in the future. The third anniversary of Pearl Harbor will be only 1 month away at the time of the national election in 1944.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, is it expecting too much to express the hope that we here in the House of Representatives, will refrain from holding sessions of the Democratic and Republican National Conventions?

The spirit on the day after Pearl Harbor was not a spirit that sought, found, or permitted a place for petty partisan political considerations by any party.

It was not a spirit that seized upon minor and often unavoidable irregularities to magnify them all out of proportion to their relative importance in the whole stupendous program of hurling back the most serious threat in the history of the world to the very existence of a free people.

It was not the spirit that would embarrass great military leaders by attributing to them political aspirations and ambitions in an hour when they are called upon to do the job of a soldier.

It was not a spirit that thrived on rumor, suspicion, distrust, and doubt.

It was a spirit that said: "What can I do to help?"

If we are at all realistic today we cannot escape the feeling that more blood is yet to be shed than has been spilled thus far in crushing our enemies and freeing the world for this and other generations.

And I am very serious in expressing the hope today that we may reexamine our spiritual and moral charts, and if the curves are not moving upward to meet the demands of coming events, we in the Congress will cut a new pattern for ourselves. And if we do I am confident that a great people joining hands with their Government, will flash the message to men who stand ready for the charge with gun in hand and helmet on head, that we are one for victory.

The SPEAKER Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF PEARL HARBOR

Mr. FISH. I was so much impressed by the remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] that I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I made in the House of Representatives on December 8, 1941, on the declaration of war be added at the end of my remarks today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, today is the second anniversary of the dastardly attack by the Japanese on our armed forces at Pearl Harbor. The American people are united and determined to win the war as quickly as possible and with the least casualties. We are on the march to victory in Europe and Asia and hope before another six months to be completely victorious in Europe and in another year in the Far East.

To cover up its own blunders and accountability, efforts have been made by administration and New Deal spokesmen during the last 2 years to deceive the American people into believing that the Congress had some responsibility for the disaster that occurred at Pearl Harbor when our warships were sunk and our men killed. I want to go on record as saying that no Democrat or Republiuan in the Congress or in the House of Representatives had anything to do with that disaster at Pearl Harbor. No Member of Congress, Republican or Democrat, even knew that our fleet was at

Pearl Harbor and they had no control over its goings or its comings at any time.

I, along with many other Members of Congress, have been accused of being partly responsible for the sinking of our fleet at Pearl Harbor. I want to emphasize on this second anniversary of Pearl Harbor, that no Member of Congress had anything to do with the tragedy there. Certainly the Representative from the Twenty-sixth District of New York was the last person in Congress who could be charged with any such responsibility. On January 30, 1939, I introduced a resolution in this House to prohibit the sale and shipment of scrap iron to Japan, which was opposed by the administration. The record shows that 8,000,000 tons of scrap iron went to Japan between then and our declaration of war. Much of it was turned into Japanese bombs that on December 7, 1941, poured out of the skies upon our warships and destroyed or damaged some 18 warships and killed 3,000 American soldiers and sailors.

The American people are entitled to know all the facts about the disaster at Pearl Harbor and to definitely ascertain the responsibility and accountability for our greatest naval defeat. There is no longer any military or naval reasons for further delay in court-martialing Admiral Kimmel and General Short and telling the truth to the American people. Why is the administration afraid to start court-martial proceedings, unless higher-ups are afraid of being involved in the testimony of both Admiral Kimmel and General Short? Why is every effort being made, 2 years subsequent to the event to hush up the facts and to protect those responsible unless to cover up the real culprits in the seats of the mighty? In the spirit of fair play to Admiral Kimmel and General Short I urge that they be permitted to appear before a court martial in open session and defend their own actions—let the chips fall where they may.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative HERMAN EBERHARTER, yesterday denounced former Governor Landon and said, "He has reached a new political low," for criticizing President Roosevelt's foreign policies. I know of no reason why former Governor Landon should not, as a free sovereign American citizen, criticize any or all our foreign policies in time of peace or war.

We are not in Nazi Germany or in a Fascist or Communistic state but in free America. Even President Wilson denounced those who attempted to stifle criticism of our foreign policies in time of war. That is the essence of Americanism and free institutions as opposed to totalitarianism and dictatorships. There is apparently a New Deal conspiracy aimed to prevent any criticism of our foreign policies and to call every American who speaks out in honest criticism a Nazi or traitor. I know of nothing that could be more harmful to the Nation than to seek by name calling to frighten or muzzle men in public life from expressing freely their honest convictions on past, present, or future international policies and issues.

We are not a Nation of slaves, but of free men and women and it is the fireside privilege of every American home to criticize President Roosevelt, the fourth term, the New Deal, the wasteful, and bungling power-greedy bureaucrats, the palace guard, and our foreign policies as much as any other issue. Millions of Americans still remember the pre-election words of President Roosevelt, delivered on October 30, 1940, at Boston:

> And while I am talking to you mothers and fathers, I give you one more assurance, I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again: Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] advances a new political doctrine that it is un-American and subversive to criticize the foreign policies of President Roosevelt. It is not a question of whether Gov. Alfred Landon was right or wrong in his condemnation of the President's international policies and commitments, but of his unquestioned right and duty to voice honest and constructive criticism openly in the traditional American way. Any other course would be supine, cowardly, and un-American.

There is and has been a brazen conspiracy for a number of years, emanating from the Communists, "reds," "pinks," and radical organizations, columnists, newspapers and magazines, to disparage the Congress and to blame it for everything that goes wrong in order to undermine the faith of the American people in the Congress. The best answer to these charges is the sincere and eloquent speech of Speaker SAM RAYBURN, at Muhlenburg College, recently:

> The Members of Congress are today under attack, and it seems in some quarters there is a studied attempt to destroy the faith and confidence of the American people in their elected representatives. Congress cannot run this war, but it has done its duty. It has given the administration every law and every dollar it has asked for, for the purpose of defense of the Nation.

I also want to call attention to an amendment I offered 6 months ago to an administration bill on the floor of the House of Representatives, which amendment was adopted and reads as follows:

> Nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent any citizen or citizens, or any newspaper or other publications, at any time, from freely discussing or openly criticizing the domestic or foreign policies of the administration or the Federal Government, or any public official, or from discussing or criticizing any existing or proposed law, regulation, directive, or Executive order.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to read at the conclusion of my remarks the speech I delivered in the House on the declaration of war on December 8, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection, to the request of the gentleman from New York.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

> Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow and deep resentment against Japan that I rise to support a declaration of war.
>
> I have consistently opposed our entrance into wars in Europe and Asia for the past 3 years, but the unwarranted, vicious, brazen, and dastardly attack by the Japanese Navy and air force while peace negotiations were pending at Washington and in defiance of the President's eleventh-hour personal appeal to the Emperor, makes war inevitable and necessary.
>
> The time for debate and controversy within America has passed. The time for action has come.
>
> Interventionists and noninterventionists must cease criminations and recriminations, charges and countercharges against each other, and present a united front behind the President and the Government in the conduct of the war.
>
> There can be only one answer to the treacherous attack of the Japanese, and that is war to final victory, cost what it may in blood, treasure, and tears. This unprovoked and senseless aggression by the Japanese armed forces upon our possessions must be answered by war.
>
> Although I have consistently fought against our intervention in foreign wars, I have repeatedly stated that if we were attacked by any foreign nation, or if the Congress of the United States declared war in the American and constitutional way, I would support the President and the administration to the bitter end.
>
> Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad. The Japanese have gone stark, raving mad, and have by their unprovoked attack committed military, naval, and national suicide.
>
> I shall at the proper time volunteer my services as an officer in a combat division, as I did in the last war, preferably with colored troops (which I have done).
>
> There is no sacrifice too great that I will not make in defense of America and to help annihilate these war-mad Japanese devils.
>
> Now that we are to fight, let us go in with our heads and chins up in the American way, and let us serve notice upon the world that this is not only a war against aggression and in defense of our own territories but a war for freedom and democracy all over the world, and that we will not stop until victory is won.
>
> I appeal to all American citizens, particularly to the members of my own party, and to noninterventionists, to put aside personal views and partisanship, and unite behind the President, our Commander in Chief, in assuring victory to the armed forces of the United States. (I have supported every administration measure to win the war.)
>
> "Our country! In her intercourse with foreign nations, may she always be right; but, right or wrong, our country!"

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 10 minutes after the other special orders today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

EMPLOYMENT OF WAR PRISONERS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, war prisoners now being held in the United States should not remain in idleness. German and Italian prisoners in this country ought to be doing needed constructive work. The taxpayers have paid huge sums to build and equip modern prison camps. The health and welfare of these men would be better if they were

doing constructive work and such a program is in accord with international agreements and law.

There are two prison camps in the First Congressional District of Nebraska. One of them is located in Red Willow County, and the other in Phelps County. Both camps now have German prisoners. There is work nearby that should be done. It so happens that the Red Willow County prison camp is located near the Republican River. This river has throughout the years been a bad actor so far as floods were concerned. Every year there is a tremendous loss to property, particularly to farm land, by reason of the floods on this stream. In addition to harnessing the water to prevent floods, irrigation is greatly needed in the Republican Valley. Within a very short distance of where the prison camp is located, the Army engineers have recommended certain definite and specific flood-control works. The Bureau of Reclamation has studied the same territory for many years. They, too, have a definite plan of development, calling for important construction near this prison camp.

The problem of getting these men to work on projects that the Government has already planned and authorized is most difficult because of the countless bureaus and agencies through which the matter must clear, such as the War Production Board, that has charge of the materials, the Judge Advocate Corps, that has charge of the prisoners, the War Food Administration, the Army engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Agriculture, and countless others. As soon as an obstacle is overcome with one agency, we find a directive or regulation from some other agency still standing in the way. In the interest of food production, the red tape should be cut and these prisoners put to work.

The other prison camp that I mentioned in Phelps County is near the tri-county irrigation district. There is much work to be done in this area. The major part of the irrigation system, including the huge dams, is completed and in operation, but there is much to do in land leveling and the like. The extension and enlargement of the tri-county irrigation district would be one of the cheapest, quickest, and most efficient ways of increasing the food production that could be found in any part of the United States.

To bring irrigation to the west two-thirds of Nebraska, whether it be in the Republican Valley, the tri-county area, or any other portion of the State, means to place that area on a sound basis and assure its future productiveness and prosperity. The entire United States ought to be interested in irrigation. Whenever dry lands and semidry lands are irrigated, the people of that area become producers and taxpayers. Government payments by reason of drought and crop failure are no longer necessary. Irrigation pays its own way. It creates a productive territory that is a splendid market for everything that the rest of the United States has to sell.

Considerable attention has been given to our post-war economy and to those activities that will benefit the men in our armed forces when they return to civilian life. In the old days the discharged soldiers went to the frontier and homesteaded. There they found homes, built civilizations, and became the Nation's leading citizens. The only available frontier within the United States where more homes, more lands, and more farms can be had is through the expansion of irrigation. It means that the same number of acres can support many times more people, support more families, and provide more homes. The way for the United States to provide a frontier for our returned soldiers is to expand and extend irrigation. This Congress should make provision now for the planning of the maximum post-war irrigation program.

The production of food is going to be an important factor for many years. That job will not end with the ending of the war. For a long time there will be hungry masses throughout the world. It must also be borne in mind that irrigation means diversity of crops as well as a certain production of crops, thus eliminating the problem of surpluses. Each year this Nation suffers the loss of millions of acres of growing crops by floods and by drought. Both are devastating. Controlled water supply or irrigation is the only sure method of maximum production.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the program of irrigation and flood control in the entire Republican Valley and the extension and enlargement of irrigation in the tricounty district can be moved forward as rapidly as possible, because it means much not only to that area but to the Nation at large. That which can be done now with prison labor should proceed at once, and that which must wait should be started as soon as the war permits.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

ABSENTEE SOLDIERS' VOTES

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt has just concluded conferences with leaders of Britain, Russia, and China. Those conferences, if the reports are accurate, mean one thing: that a gigantic offensive will be launched against the Continent of Europe in the not far distant future.

American people have never wanted to be kept in ignorance. They know, and we know, that that offensive is imperative. But they also know that in the next 6 months American dead may run close to the figure of a half million. Our wounded will be counted not in the tens of thousands but in the hundreds of thousands.

When the election of 1944 takes place a minimum of 12,000,000 young Americans will be in our fighting forces. Five to six million of them will be overseas. Several million of them will be in actual combat, face to face with the enemy. These are the brutal, blunt, stubborn facts that we, as elected representatives of the people, must consider when the soldiers' vote bill comes to this floor.

I cannot believe that any Member of this House would knowingly and deliberately vote to disfranchise the men whose heroism today preserves this Nation, without whose actions we could not meet, without whose sacrifices this Nation could not endure.

The Federal Government has reached into every home in America. More than half of the entire population has blood relations in the armed forces. No one will be able to explain to them why their kin are unable to vote in the 1944 elections.

The Federal Government has the power to raise an army. It is inconceivable that it does not have the power to protect the rights of those whom it has drafted.

If soldiers are required to cast their ballots under the unwieldy registration and absentee-voting laws of the 48 separate States, every man in this Chamber knows that their votes will be counted only in the hundreds, possibly in the thousands.

It is a matter of record that only 28,000 men in the armed forces voted in 1942 out of a total of seven to eight million men. This is a shameful situation. Today I pledge to the men in the armed services and to their families that I shall do everything in my power to obtain the passage of a workable soldier-vote bill based directly on a Federal ballot.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. I want to agree with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio in his statement. Are we going to get a bill that will guarantee every soldier everywhere the right to vote, and are we going to get it soon?

Mr. BENDER. That is the kind of bill we should have. I believe that the soldiers have a right to vote by names of candidates; not only by party, but names as well. I believe that is the kind of a bill that must be enacted.

Mr. RAMEY. That is right, and it should be soon so that we know that the ballots are out in time, and that all may vote; no technicalities or equivocations, but let us see that all of them vote.

Mr. BENDER. I thank the distinguished gentleman, Representative of the Ninth Ohio District, for this contribution. The bill is of no value unless ample time is afforded, and unless opportunity for a full and complete suffrage on the part of the armed forces everywhere in the world is provided. Unless it is done thoroughly and properly it is not the kind of bill that is desirable. I believe in giving every soldier ample opportunity, and I am sure that under our laws and with the transportation situation as it is, ample opportunity and ample time is had so that the soldiers can vote intelligently. There is no point in merely designating a group by title; there should be listed under the party banner the names

of the various candidates for Federal offices.

Mr. RAMEY. You mean that the soldier in the South Seas will have the same right to vote for every candidate, from President down to coroner, that any citizen has, and that is what we should have.

Mr. BENDER. That is correct. He will be able to vote for all Federal officials.

Mr. RAMEY. And that everyone may vote for every candidate.

Mr. BENDER. He has a right to fight, no matter where he comes from; he should be given the right to vote with the opportunity to fight.

Mr. RAMEY. I agree with the gentleman.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I was detained at the time my special order was called. I now ask unanimous consent to reestablish my special order for 15 minutes following the other special orders of the day.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 199. Joint resolution to extend the time limit for immunity.

EXTENDING TIME LIMIT FOR IMMUNITY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 119 to extend the time limit for immunity, with Senate amendments and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution and the Senate amendments as follows:

Strike out all of the preamble.

Page 3, line 13, strike out all after "extended" down to and including "States" in line 15 and insert "for a period of 6 months."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF PEARL HARBOR—AMERICA, BORN TO SERVE MANKIND

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, permit me to say that I feel confident that I voice the sentiment of every Member present when I say we deeply appreciate the very brilliant and timely address so eloquently delivered here this afternoon by the distinguished and able gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]. I wish that every Member of this House, as well as every citizen of this country, might have heard him. His address so inspired me that I immediately requested a few minutes' time for some things on my heart and mind. Two years ago today this Nation was shocked and stunned at the unprovoked, cowardly, sneak attack on Pearl Harbor by the traitorous Japanese.

This second anniversary of the beginning of the most colossal war since the beginning of time is by no means a day of rejoicing or one of celebration by American citizens. But this day does remind us once more of Japanese treachery. Today is a solemn and grim reminder of her heinous infamy and utter shame. Japan and her coconspirators in crime have fully demonstrated that they are not only the enemies of liberty and freedom but the enemies of mankind everywhere.

December 7, 1941, found America and Americans decidedly unprepared for war. Our peace-loving but complacent citizens could not bring themselves to believe it could happen here. Our people did not want war with Japan, Germany, or any other nation; it was the one consuming desire of Americans to remain at peace with all mankind. But, alas, we found that mere wishful thinking is no guaranty of perpetual peace; neither was the passing of extended peace resolutions by well-meaning but impractical peace groups the pathway to peace. Many of such beautiful platitudes actually cluttered up the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In short, while Americans talked, yearned, and prayed for world peace, we failed miserably to prepare for a world war.

For weeks after Pearl Harbor it was impossible for many to realize that we were faced with a long, bitter, tough struggle. We underestimated the strength of our enemies, especially the Japanese. We had been taught to believe they were a third-rate power. Americans, for the most part, had been lulled into a state of false security. "If we do not prepare for war, then we will never have war," was a familiar slogan of the so-called peace advocates and extreme isolationists.

When word was flashed that the treacherous Japs had returned thousands of tons of American scrap iron and steel in the form of bullets, shells, and bombs, and had all but paralyzed the United States Navy in the Pacific, it marked the beginning of the end of American isolationism and of the unrealistic and impractical philosophy of maintaining peace by mere wishful thinking and pretty peace platitudes. Yet it is strangely significant that a few leading isolationists and so-called peace advocates who were blind to our danger as a Nation in the pre-Pearl Harbor days, are so free with their advice now on how to run the war. Especially are they still bitter in their criticisms of our Commander in Chief. I have not always agreed with the President in connection with his domestic policies. But had the Congress and the country followed him on matters of preparedness rather than the bitter-end isolationists, I am convinced there never would have been a Pearl Harbor.

Two years ago today found our people in a state of confusion and almost hopelessly divided on international policies, but the dastardly attack at Pearl Harbor, while the Japanese emissaries were pretending to be on a peace mission in Washington, was a shock that aroused us from our lethargy. But despite its horrors and heartaches, Pearl Harbor left America no alternative except to fight, and the slogan "Remember Pearl Harbor," was soon echoed and reechoed throughout the length and breadth of this land.

Tojo and his millions of deluded subjects are no doubt again celebrating today as they celebrated 2 years ago, but it is a day that future generations in Japan will want to forget. It is a day that they will wish to erase from their history books, if indeed, Japan has any history as a nation when they are beaten into humble submission and annihilated as a future world power.

What has transpired on the production front in America in 2 short years is, to say the least, phenomenal. Two years ago when Americans were bombed from their lethargy and peaceful dreams, as well as dreams of peace, combined production of all American airplane factories was less than 1,000 planes per month. This was about one-half of Japanese production and less than one-fourth of plane production of Germany alone. We were not relatively as well prepared in the production of tanks, guns, antiaircraft guns, and merchant shipping. But a united America went to work as only aroused and indignant America can. Results have been epoch-making. Within 1 year American workmen had produced 49,000 planes, 32,000 tanks, 17,000 antiaircraft guns, and a total of 8,200,000 tons of merchant shipping. Last month more than 8,700 planes rolled out of American factories, of which more than 1,000 were the giant modern bombers.

During the next year it is confidently anticipated that considerably more than 100,000 of the finest, fastest, and most powerful American planes of all types will be constructed, while Axis production has been reduced by considerably more than one-half.

Today more than 5 modern cargo vessels slide into the water from the various American docks every 24 hours. The production of tanks, guns, antiaircraft guns, and modern war materials and ammunition are being turned out in enormous and unprecedented quantities. I am today advised that we are now constructing 1,680,000 dead-weight tons of shipping per month, or a total of 17,150,000 dead-weight tons per year. The total over-all average percentage of increase in production since Pearl Harbor, so I am officially advised this afternoon, is 648 percent.

On the many far-flung fronts of the world our gallant, serious-minded, and determined men in uniform are passing

the ammunition in an effective and devastating manner that the enemies of liberty, freedom, and fair play will long remember. Every loyal, red-blooded American is justly proud of the marvelous record of all of our armed forces, whether they be on land, on sea, or in the air. Our triumphs at Coral Sea and Midway, in the Solomon Islands, in Guadalcanal, Bougainville Island, Tarawa, and other islands of the Pacific strongly fortified by the enemy are glorious pages in American history. But they have been long, tedious, and desperately contested battles, and much more hard fighting is in store for our gallant forces in the Pacific area as on other battle fronts during the coming year. We are equally proud of the victories our forces won in north Africa, Sicily, and in Italy. Every man or woman in uniform who is doing his or her duty, whether at home or abroad, on land, in the air, or on sea, whether in the far-flung, ice-covered Aleutian Islands, or in the hot sands of Africa, Egypt, or China, is rendering an important part in preserving for ourselves and posterity the sacred cause of liberty and freedom.

In this solemn hour, our thoughts must needs turn to the tragic cost of war. Not only are we thinking of the material cost, the enormous cost in dollars and cents, the heavy load that this and future generations must pay, but we are thinking of a far greater cost, the toll we have paid and must continue to pay in precious American lives. Such a cost cannot be measured in dollars. Their precious lives and their deeds of valor shall forever be enshrined in our hearts and minds.

Although we now feel that we can see the beginning of the end, there is nothing to be gained in trying to deceive ourselves. As the Nation has finally come to realize that isolationism and beautiful peace platitudes were no safeguards for the security of our people in time of peace, it is doubly true that mere wishful thinking will not win this tragic war in which we find ourselves engaged. We must realize that we are up against a total war that will take the first and the best that is in us, not only on the foreign fronts but here on the home fronts. In order to defeat definitely and decisively the Axis criminals, America must suffer more sacrifices. The road of blood and tears will be long, at best, but, thank God, America, together with our allies, will find the end of that road. We confidently look forward to the day when General MacArthur and his fighting men will return to the Philippines, when our gallant and heroic prisoners of war will be released and returned to the land they love and for which they were willing to give their last ounce of strength and devotion.

Some day, and we pray it will be in the not far distant future, we can now envision an army of khaki-clad soldiers triumphantly marching down the streets of Berlin, if there be any streets left through which to march, in that much bombed German capital. As we hear the tramp, tramp of our brave men, we see Old Glory, the emblem of liberty that has never known defeat, fluttering in the breeze. When that glorious day comes and all the other Axis wretches of despotism, the murderers of innocent women and children, who had visions of controlling and dominating the world, shall have also met ignominious defeat, the next most important world-wide problem facing America and the world will be securing a just and durable peace.

When the Fulbright peace resolution was pending before this House a few weeks ago, I made it plain then that the winning of the war is by all odds our first objective. I have repeatedly said that all other issues sink into oblivion as compared to the one issue of winning this death struggle. But then I added that "next to winning the war, a lasting peace is not only uppermost in the minds of our fighting men on the many far-flung fronts of the world but it is also the one consuming thought and innermost desire of the fathers and mothers of all those men in uniform." I also expressed the hope then, as I have many times previously, that a determined, unified effort will be put forth by representatives of the decent, liberty-loving, civilized nations of the world to create appropriate international machinery with real teeth in it that will make future wars unprofitable and impossible. We all recognize that it will not be an easy task, but it must be done if civilization is to endure In the same speech I also stated:

> It will be recalled that too much partisan politics and jealousies of certain well-known isolationists and Woodrow Wilson haters got into the discussion of setting up such international machinery after World War No. 1 and thus defeated President Wilson's dream of world peace via the League of Nations and World Court.

Mr. Speaker, I have also repeatedly suggested, and I want to urge again today, that when the Axis Powers are defeated and sue for peace, that one of the prerequisites for a durable peace is the total disarmament of the Axis Powers. It would be utterly futile to set up any international machinery in an effort to guarantee either a just or a lasting peace if we should permit the gangster nations to retain their planes, guns, tanks, ships, and other war materials. This must be done not in the spirit of revenge, not in order to punish the people of Axis Nations, although their leaders certainly must be brought to trial and made to account for their heartless and despicable atrocities. We must disarm the outlaw powers that they may know once and for all that they will never again have an opportunity to be placed in a position of being a strong military threat to the peace and security of the world. We must have no "softies" or "sob sisters" at the peace table if the ideals of the Atlantic Charter, the Moscow Conferences, and other more recent conferences, are to become a reality. America must be realistic in peace as in war. And in order to make certain that we have a just and durable peace, may I again express the sincere hope that representatives of the armed forces have a voice in writing the peace. Surely those who have staked their lives for freedom's cause are justly entitled to play a leading role in making that freedom forever secure.

The able and eloquent gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], in his forceful and inspiring address here this afternoon, quoted in a very appropriate manner from China's charming and lovable first lady, whose appearance in this House Chamber will long be remembered.

In her masterly address delivered here, you will recall that Mme. Chiang Kai-shek said:

> We of this generation who are privileged to help make a better world for ourselves and for posterity should remember that, while we must not be visionary, we must have vision so that peace should not be punitive in spirit, but universal in scope and humanitarian in action.

She closed that memorable address with these words:

> May I not hope that it is the resolve of Congress to devote itself to the creation of the post-war world? To dedicate itself to the preparation for the brighter future that a stricken world so eagerly awaits.

So, as we review the past 2 years with its heartaches and tears, with its disappointments as well as its unprecedented achievements, let us turn our hopes, our thoughts, our hearts, and our energies to the future. Let us here and now propose in our hearts to reconsecrate and rededicate our all to the cause of freedom and liberty for which brave men are this day fighting and dying. Let us forget for at least the duration petty partisan politics, hatreds, and ambitions, and be Americans first. Let us stand four-square by the millions of courageous young men who stand today as a mighty bulwark of defense to make certain that we shall never be an enslaved people.

Let us solemnly breathe a prayer of thanksgiving to the God of the universe for the heritage that is ours and for the bountiful blessings our beloved Nation has long enjoyed; and when the glorious day of peace shall be achieved, let us hope and fervently pray that America will once more demonstrate to the world that she was born to serve mankind.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Pearl Harbor Day makes us especially anxious to meet our responsibility and perform our sacred duty and to give every help and protection we can to the disabled service men and women of the war.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks a very fine statement made by Commander Warren Atherton of the American Legion regarding World War No. 2 claims.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The statement referred to follows:

A telegraphic and air-mail survey of American Legion service officers on pending World War No. 2 claims shows that there has been and still is considerable delay from the time these men are released from service, file their claims, and receive the first check in settlement thereof. This delay is attributable to a number of circumstances, according to these service officers. Some States report no undue delay, but most of them have cases of record filed 3 to 7 months ago and not yet settled. The American Legion feels that all Government agencies concerned should coordinate their activities to the end that men and women released from service because of disabilities shall not be subjected to inconvenience, embarrassment, and at times distress because their claims for disability compensation are not settled promptly. The American Legion has clearly in mind that a great number of these claimants have been in service for several months, have become incapacitated in training or combat, and are now back in civil life or back in hospitals and institutions because the armed services have no further use for them. While they were in they made allotments to their dependents to which was added the Government allowance. This benefit is discontinued in each case upon discharge. Having no other income the disabled dischargee must rely on financial assistance from private or charitable sources. Such a situation, especially for the combat disabled, should not be tolerated. Based upon the findings of the survey just completed, and upon the experience of the organization in claims and rehabilitation, the following recommendations are made by the American Legion to the Federal Government:

1. Every serviceman whose disabilities or physical condition are reparable should be retained in the armed services to receive the maximum benefits of hospital and medical care. If there is need for further convalescent or institutional care the liaison between the Army and Navy on the one hand and the Veterans' Administration on the other should really function and be applicable in each case. Men should not be returned to civil or State authorities unless so desired expressly by the folks at home.

2. The Veterans' Administration hospital bed capacity, especially for the nervous and mental cases and the tuberculous patients, should be enlarged so that all those released from service and in need of further care may be accommodated. The American Legion is committed to the proposition that the Veterans' Administration be a war agency for the duration of hostilities and 6 months thereafter, to assure its proper place in the priorities rating for construction material, equipment, personnel, and supplies.

3. As a direct contribution to the informational and advisory service to prospective dischargees the Veterans' Administration should have contact representatives at the larger discharge centers especially those handling combat troops.

4. To obviate delays in adjudicating claims for obvious and indisputable disabilities the War and Navy Departments should permit the assignment of Veterans' Administration rating boards at the larger discharge points or demobilization centers.

5. Mustering-out pay in amounts dependent upon length of service should be made available with a portion payable at discharge and the balance within 30 and 60 days thereafter. The national commander of the American Legion testified before a Senate committee on such a proposal December 1, 1943.

6. The furnishing of medical and clinical records from service hospitals at which the disabled person may have been treated before he reached the discharge center must be speeded up. It is understood that such records may be essential in the adjudication of many cases, but in many others they would contribute little or nothing to the identification and evaluation of the disability causing discharge. Another bottleneck was found in the furnishing of photostat copies of induction or enlistment examination reports. As the result of a former survey made by the American Legion the War Department was furnished with findings upon which officials took action. It has been reported that this bottleneck is now eliminated and that requests for these photostat records will be handled within 5 days from date of receipt.

7. The present arrangement of sending records and reports of disabled dischargees to the nearest regional office of the Veterans' Administration should be changed so that these records are dispatched promptly to the Veterans' Administration Office having jurisdiction in the man's home State. This change may require Veterans' Administration contact people at the different discharge points as recommended above.

8. The lack of sufficient trained personnel in the adjudication field is a cause of delay in handling these cases in most stations. The manpower situation is recognized, but yet the Legion cannot refrain from urging and exhorting the Veterans' Administration to authorize the additional help requested by field offices, and to immediately step up recruitment and training programs for this purpose.

9. Some service officers have reported that the lack of complete and clarifying instructions from the central office of the Veterans' Administration to the regional offices on the adjudication of the new claims has been an element of delay. Certainly this should be overcome immediately.

10. Each claim is assigned a C number. So far this is done by the central office. Complaints have come in that the delay in assigning these numbers has held up adjudication of cases for as long as 2 or 3 weeks. The Legion feels this is an administrative problem that could and should be met and solved right now.

11. The present fiscal arrangement whereby disbursement on vouchers and rolls certified by the Veterans' Administration are made at disbursing offices, one in each Federal reserve district, also contributes to delay the issuance of the initial check and settlement of the claim. Up to about 8 years ago the Veterans' Administration had its own disbursing officers. Reverting to that arrangement now should serve to expedite the payment of individual and new claims.

These conclusions rest upon observations sent in by trained service officers in 34 States. They cited by name and number (if assigned) 1,535 cases of disabled men. It is understood that many cases may require development of pertinent information, but that should not be permitted to slow down the whole rating machinery. Another factor cited is that of settling the question of waiver of premiums on insurance during period of total disability. Also the payment of insurance benefits and pension to the dependents of those dying in service. The jurisdiction over both these is in central office, and the many delays reported call for prompt improvement in the system of disposing of these cases.

There may be many other considerations touching upon the broad question of delays in the settlement of disabled veterans' claims. The American Legion submits, however, that if all Government agencies concerned would redouble their efforts to effect complete coordination much will have been accomplished toward the goal sought by the dischargees themselves, their folks at home, their representatives, and the Federal Government.

Attached hereto are brief summaries of cases taken from those submitted in the survey. They illustrate many of the points set forth above.

Related to this question are those other important programs of employment and unemployment protection. As to these, the American Legion has proposals which are being introduced in Congress and on which further detailed data will be given.

Case 1: In this claim the veteran served honorably in the Navy from March 4, 1932, to February 8, 1938. He reenlisted on May 4, 1938, and was honorably discharged on medical certificate on account of active tuberculosis, incurred in line of duty, on April 6, 1943. The Form 526 was received in an office of the Veterans' Administration on April 21, 1943, and it has not been adjudicated as yet on account of the fact that complete records have not been received from the Navy. Contact was made with the adjudication officer about the delay in this claim on October 22, 1943, and again on November 29, 1943.

Case 2: This veteran was discharged insane, unable to sign his discharge. Claim was filed April 12, and we have not yet been able to get this veteran examined. While it is true that the Veterans' Administration wrote to the sister and a service officer, no letters were written to either or anyone in the months of September and October. Request was made for an attendant by this office on August 2 and the Veterans' Administration, under date of November 9, finally complied with this request and wrote the veteran.

Case 3: This boy enlisted on July 13, 1940, and was declared unfit for service on January 13, 1943, with this notation: "Patient was struck in the head while in combat against the Japanese in Guadalcanal, penetrating wound, right parieto-occipital region produced by grenade. Dignosis, hemiplegia, spastic, left.'" He was honorably discharged on C. D. D. July 3, 1943, and his claim was filed the same date. He was rated 50 percent disabled October 25, 1943, and advised of this rating on November 4, 1943, with rating effective from July 5, 1943. Vocational rehabilitation recommended.

Case 4: Claim was filed in this case July 3. The case file was transferred to Central Office for consideration by the Veterans' Claims Service on October 6, 1943. One reason for the delay in this particular case is that the veteran had a claim pending for officer's retirement pay which had to be disposed of.

Case 5: This claimant was discharged from the hospital on August 16, 1943, and on November 11, 1943, an office of the Veterans' Administration had to make a second request of the War Department for a medical report. He was examined at a Veterans' Administration hospital and some adjustment was made.

Case 6: This claimant was discharged August 15, 1942, from the Army Nurse Corps, and claim was filed February 4, 1943. Reports from The Adjutant General's Office, for which requests had been made several times, were not received until the latter part of August 1943. The decision has been deferred until completion of the requested neuropsychiatric examination by the Veterans' Administration.

Case 7: This veteran was discharged from service July 27, 1943, with a diagnosis of dementia praecox, paranoid. The handicap estimated by the rating board is 100 percent. Action toward releasing payment on the veteran's behalf apparently is not to be expected until the facility is informed officially with respect to the character of the veteran's discharge. It seems quite evident that this veteran served honorably, but the authorization unit has refused to release the payments until officially reported that discharge was honorable.

Case 8: Discharge from service in this case was effected July 26, 1943. Decision by the rating board on October 7, 1943, recognized the veteran's entitlement to pensionable rating for weak feet. Release of payments in this case, as in the case to which reference is made immediately above, awaits the receipt of official information of the man having been discharged honorably.

Case 9: Claim for pension was filed by this veteran at the time of discharge on June 11, 1943. Order for examination was issued by the rating board July 30, 1943. Before conducting the studies the medical authorities thought it advisable to have a social-service investigation made. It seems probable that another 3 or 4 months will elapse before a decision can be effected in the circumstances that exist, due to the accumulated load and number of orders for investigations.

Case 10: Claim was filed June 17, 1943. Several follow-ups by a Veterans' Administration Facility have not brought the receipt of War Department reports.

Case 11: This veteran enlisted October 25, 1941, and was honorably discharged on C. D. D., December 23, 1942. Form 526 was received in an office of the Veterans' Administration on January 4, 1943. On January 5, 1943, service records were requested from The Adjutant General's Office and were received in this office on February 19, 1943. Under date of April 10, 1943, the Rating Board requested supplemental service records from the Adjutant General's Office which were received in the Veterans' Administration on May 7, 1943. A second supplemental Adjutant General's report concerning alleged treatment at Fort Custer was requested May 10, 1943, and on June 14, 1943, a third supplemental report of clinical records of treatment at Fort Custer was requested. Complete records of the claimant's treatment at Fort Custer were received in the Veterans' Administration on July 26, 1943. August 3, 1943, an examination and psychiatric social history were requested by the Rating Board and the latter was received on September 12, 1943. Then on September 14, 1943, the Rating Board requested an examination based upon psychiatric social report. The claimant was examined at a Veterans' Administration facility on October 14, 1943, and report of this was received November 15, 1943, in the regional office. On November 20, 1943, the Rating Board rated the claim and granted service connection for a nervous condition, incompetent and in need of a guardian. On account of the claimant's having been declared incompetent, chief attorney requested that a fiduciary be appointed under date of November 24, 1943. No check has been issued as yet.

Case 12: In this case the veteran, totally blind, was discharged from an Army hospital on June 30, 1943; the Army service records were not received in the regional office until the week of November 22, 1943; therefore, the veteran has not as yet, and probably will not for 30 days, receive the pension check to which he is entitled.

Case 13: This veteran was discharged from service March 31, 1943. Form 526 was submitted to the Veterans' Administration on August 9, 1943. The regional office has only a dummy file on this case. The principal folder was sent to the Index Division, office of Chief Clerk, on August 9, 1943, for the reason that, in addition to the veteran's service in the Navy in World War No. 2, he had also had peacetime service in the Army, just prior to World War No. 2. Under date of September 14, 1943, the chief clerk advised the regional office that the veteran's file was being referred to the insurance claims council for attention to the veteran's claim for waiver of premiums.

Case 14: This veteran was discharged from service on March 4, 1943. He has been granted service connection for tuberculosis, pulmonary, active, under date of May 5, 1943, and has been rated 100 percent from March 5, 1943. His claim file was sent to the director of insurance on September 25, 1943 for action on a question of entitlement to waiver of premiums. The file has not been returned to this date, November 26, 1943, and no action has been reported by the insurance claims council.

Case 15: A recent survey of State hospitals for the insane in northern California alone showed 100 discharged veterans of World War No. 2 being confined therein because of lack of beds in Veterans' Administration facilities.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] is recognized.

SOME FURTHER OBSERVATIONS ON FALANGISTS

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, toward the close of the last session I brought before this body some of the facts and charges made in an important new American book, Falange, the Axis Secret Army in the Americas, by Allan Chase. At that time I suggested that it had become incumbent upon this House to investigate the charges made by Mr. Chase in his book.

The book offered an imposing body of facts and documents which pointed to only one conclusion: That Franco, Hitler's puppet, is an enemy of the United States who can no longer be appeased or ignored. Mr. Chase subsequently expanded upon the charges made in his book in a series of articles written for the New York Post. One of these articles has had serious repercussions in Latin America.

The article I refer to dealt with two doctors and a magazine. The doctors were Enrique Cervantes and Ramon Castroviejo; the magazine was America Clinica, an American medical journal printed in Spanish and distributed all over Latin America. The magazine was an official organ of the New York Academy of Medicine and its editor, Cervantes, made his headquarters in the academy's own building. In his article Mr. Chase dealt with the Fascist background of both doctors and illustrated his story with a reproduction of a letter written by Enrique Cervantes on the letterhead of the Academy of Medicine. The letter, written in Cervantes' own handwriting, contained, among other things, these choice sentences:

> I am going to start and carry on * * * a big fight. I think I will get excited on this and in consequence enjoy plenty as I'm * * * sure I shall crack to pieces a bunch of dirty and filthy Jewish doctors. Isn't it swell?

The publication of this letter evoked a storm in American medical circles. Ten days after the article appeared, Col. Mahlon Ashford, executive secretary of the academy, told reporters for the Post that he had ordered Cervantes to suppress the next number of America Clinica and to move out of the Academy building as soon as possible. The Academy took no action on Dr. Castroviejo, the backer of the magazine, although it withdrew its own sponsorship of the periodical when it kicked Cervantes out.

The case, however, must not be permitted to rest at that point.

Cervantes represents a challenge. His letter was the letter of a man who accepts completely the Nazi way of life. This is not strange in view of the Nazi control of the Falange, Spain's Fascist ruling party. Sentiments such as those revealed in the Cervantes' letter are thoroughly proper in Berlin and in Falangist circles in Madrid. But they happened to have been written in New York by a guest of this Government—and it is my intention to ask the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization to have this letter-writing guest investigated and then deported on an early boat.

The deportation of Enrique Cervantes, however, will not answer all of the questions his stay in this country has raised. Thousands of doctors in Latin America and in our own country, earnest friends of hemispheric unity on both sides of the Rio Grande who have been taken in by the aura which surrounded America Clinica and its editor, have a right to an explanation.

Before Cervantes departs from our shores I think we should know the exact circumstances under which America Clinica was founded, was financed, and was given the sponsorship of the New York Academy of Medicine. I think we should also find out how and why this magazine was given the franking privileges of the Smithsonian Institution for a mailing of thousands of free copies of the periodical to doctors all over Latin America. The fact that this magazine had such franking privileges led hundreds of medical leaders in Latin America to assume that the publication had the backing of the United States Government. Needless to say, Falangist agents in Latin America helped to strengthen and sustain this illusion.

I think we should know, too, the complete details of Cervantes' relations with the Fascist government of Argentina. Just a few weeks ago Mr. Walter Winchell devoted a complete radio broadcast to the amazing account of how the government of Dictator Ramirez has been aiding the Nazi submarine wolf packs in the South Atlantic. Mr. Winchell's timely exposé adds urgency to the need for investigating Cervantes' ties with the Argentine Government.

During the Spanish war, Cervantes joined Serrano Suner and other leading Fascists who were hiding from the Republican government in the Argentine Embassy in Madrid. Cervantes fled to the Argentine Embassy after the Spanish Republic had jailed him as a Franco spy. On February 28, 1937, Cervantes was one of the Fascists smuggled on board the Argentine torpedo boat *Tucuman* at Alicante, Spain. Cervantes left the Argentine warship at Marseilles, from which port he returned to Franco territory and took a commission as a captain of Moroccan troops fighting side by side with Nazi and Italian divisions against the Spanish Republic.

The Secretary of the Argentine Embassy in Madrid at that time was a man named Jardom. He now occupies a simi-

lar post in the Argentine Legation in Lisbon. Jardom makes many trips to New York. On all of these visits he sees Cervantes. As a matter of fact, Jardom was in New York in November.

Since reaching this country in 1940, Cervantes has made many trips to Washington. On many of these trips, Cervantes has made himself at home in the Argentine Embassy—and written letters on the letterhead of the Embassy.

Just who is this Enrique Cervantes, the obscure young Spanish citizen who can enjoy the protection and the hospitality of the Argentine diplomatic service?

Is Cervantes just a young physician trying to make a career in medicine? Then perhaps he can explain his intimate relationship with Col. Juan Beigbeder of the Spanish Army—a man who not without some success has been attempting to palm himself off on Washington circles as the "Spanish Badoglio." At an early date, I expect to have much more to say on this floor about Beigbeder and his friends in Spain and Nazi Germany. Right now, I think it is Cervantes' turn to explain his ties to Beigbeder.

While Cervantes is making his explanations, I think it would not be amiss if he explains the circumstances under which he won deferment from the draft. Nor should he be allowed to leave this country until he explains how and why he maneuvered an invitation to tour our Army camps as a guest of the Medical Corps.

If Cervantes were a solitary individual, I would not take up the time of this House with these remarks. But Cervantes is both a symbol and a warning: a symbol of the Fascist character of Falangist Spain and a timely warning to all of us here that the time has come to start a full dress investigation of the Falange in the Western Hemisphere. The Fascist activities of Cervantes while a guest of this country have already beclouded our prestige as a democracy in Latin America. It is time that we made clear to our friends in Latin America that Cervantes never did have the backing of our Government. It is time to prove, by the deportation of Cervantes among other things, that a Spanish accent still does not make Fascist doctrine acceptable in the United States.

Within the next few weeks, Maj. Gen. Manuel Benitez, Chief of the Cuban National Police, will visit the United States. General Benitez, faithfully carrying out the orders of President Batista and the mandate of the Cuban people, has won the admiration of all of Latin America by his spectacularly successful drive against the Falange and its tools in Cuba. We ourselves owe General Benitez and his organization a great personal debt for their role in the discovery and execution of Heinz August Luning, the Nazi-Falangist spy who for eleven months in 1941 and 1942 guided Nazi submarines across the paths of United Nations freighters in the Caribbean and the South Atlantic.

I am certain that General Benitez will be more than willing to present to a special committee of this House some of the sensational documentary evidence now in the files of his department—evidence which will prove that Hitler is using his Spanish puppet government as a weapon against the United Nations.

When he arrives in the United States, General Benitez too will be a symbol: A symbol of the determination of all friends of democracy in Latin America to maintain an unceasing war against the Hitler-Franco Falange. Before he reaches this country, let us ourselves make a positive move against the Falange, a move which will tell the world that we also see through the Franco myth.

The investigation and deportation of Enrique Cervantes would be just such a move.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. FULBRIGHT, for 9 days, on account of official business.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1285. An act to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 8, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Wednesday, December 8, 1943, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 2001, relating to penalty mail.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 3794. A bill creating a stock pile of post-war work by facilitating deferment of current maintenance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 3795. A bill authorizing a per capita payment of $25 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from any funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to their credit; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3796. A bill to confer military status upon certain persons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 3797. A bill providing means for effecting a reduction in personnel in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 3798. A bill to amend the first proviso to section 3 of the act of June 15, 1943 (Public Law 73, 78th Cong.); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 3799. A bill to provide for payment of mustering-out pay to members of the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FAY:

H. R. 3800. A bill to grant each member of the armed forces an additional month's base pay upon his discharge or release from active duty to enable him to purchase clothes and other needed articles; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. J. Res. 203. Joint resolution to establish a Department of Aviation, to provide for a Secretary of Aviation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution to provide a policy for the Federal Government with regard to the acquisition of privately owned land; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia:

H. R. 3801. A bill for the relief of Richard G. Munson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 3802. A bill for the relief of John M. Grady; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEAL:

H. R. 3803. A bill for the relief of Fred J. Lichtefeld and Josephine Lichtefeld; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 3804. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Keizer; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3929. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Mrs. C. Ray Harris and 28 other citizens of Oklahoma City, Okla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3930. Also petition of Rev. Arthur D. Personett and 60 other citizens of Lebanon, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3931. Also, petition of Alice H. Allen and 77 other citizens of Winnebago, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3932. Also, petition of W. D. Mason and 42 other citizens of Nash, Okla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce

absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3933. Also, petition of Gladys Opal Burrier and 120 other citizens of Denver, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3934. Also, petition of Charlotte Gallion and 36 other citizens of St. Helena, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3935. Also, petition of Mrs. J. Reardon and 60 other citizens of Danvers, Mass., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3936. Also, petition of Elizabeth N. Kippax and 79 other citizens of East Providence, R. I., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3937. Also, petition of Edith M. Cocks and 130 other citizens of Long Beach, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3938. Also, petition of Martha Lawrence and 69 other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3939. Also, petition of Mrs. S. J. Pennings and 71 other citizens of Stickney, S. Dak., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3940. Also, petition of 20 members of the Woman's Service Club of Sandwich, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3941. Aso, petition of Annie Lee Perry and 125 other citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3942. Also, petition of Mae Storck and 41 other citizens of Dayton Ohio urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3943. Also, petition of Mrs. E. W. Allen and 22 other citizens of Celina, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3944. Also, petition of Mrs. O. S. Brinker and 41 other citizens of Lakewood, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3945. Also, petition of E. R. Stephens and 57 other citizens of Marion, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3946. Also, petition of Mrs. Claude Harvey and 32 other citizens of Sheridan, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3947. Also, petition of Mary Parks and 61 other citizens of Marion, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3948. Also, petition of Sarah Bortz and 60 other citizens of Muskegon, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3949. Also, petition of Rev. Grant Whitenack and 25 other citizens of Elwood, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3950. By Mr. ROLPH: Petition of the South San Francisco Parlor, No. 157, Native Sons of the Golden West, regarding War Relocation Authority, Japanese situation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3951. Also, resolution of the Supreme Pyramid Ancient Egyptian Order of Sciots, adopted at San Francisco, November 2–4, 1943, that the best interest of our Nation in the successful prosecution of the war, and in the protection of its inhabitants, demands that the return to the Pacific-coast area of all evacuated Japanese be prohibited, and that all Japanese labor be utilized for the present on an equitable basis in suitable and essential employment in areas where sabotage and subversive activities can be adequately controlled; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3952. Also, resolution of the Supreme Pyramid Ancient Egyptian Order of Sciots, adopted at San Francisco, November 2–4, 1943, that proper and immediate steps be taken by the proper agencies in this country, to cancel and conclude the United States citizenship of all native-born Japanese citizens who have proven themselves disloyal to this country and unworthy of United States citizenship, and that all Japanese aliens be deported from this country as undesirable aliens as soon as same can be accomplished; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

3953. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Charles W. Griesser and others of Joplin and Jasper Counties, Mo., protesting against consideration of House bill 2082, and requesting the Senators and Representatives to vote against any and all legislation of this type; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3954. By Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Petition of 53 residents of Franklin County, Ohio, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3955. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of Anna Frazer and many other residents of New Providence, Iowa, urging passage of House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3956. By Mr. IZAC: Petition of sundry residents of southern California and of San Diego County, emphatically protesting against any permission being given for the return of the evacuated Japanese to any part of the west coast area; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3957. By Mr. WILLEY: Petition of 192 residents of the State of Delaware, favoring House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3958. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the chairman, Committee on Public Affairs, Joint Council of the Associated Engineering Societies of St. Louis, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to House bill 2100; to the Committee on Patents.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, December 7, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who drawest asunder the dark veil of night when purple morning breaketh and rejoiceth our eyes with

the fresh wonder and gladness of life and light, we pray not for tasks suited to our strength but for strength suited to our tasks. We hear Thy call in the thunder of these tumultuous times. We sense Thy judgments in the fierce flames which leave the garnered treasures of the ages but smoking ruins.

Save us from a dullness of soul, conscious of the thunder and of the devouring fire but which hears not the still small voice of a quiet and contrite heart. Breathe on us, breath of God, the benediction of Thy restraining and sustaining grace that strengthened with might we may walk with holy confidence the rough and rugged ways our feet must tread. Fit us to be the channels of Thy healing mercy to a world distraught, uncertain, groping, and in desperate need of Thy guidance. Give us this day a quick awareness to the unseen and the eternal. And may the Love which came down at Christmas be cradled in our waiting and receptive hearts. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day, Tuesday, December 7, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 648. An act for the relief of Arthur C. Norcutt;

S. 990. An act for the relief of the Washington, Brandywine & Point Lookout Railroad Co.;

S. 1001. An act for the relief of the Meadow Brook Club;

S. 1038. An act for the relief of Verna Mae Rossell and Winifred Rossell Mooney;

S. 1049. An act to authorize the payment of additional compensation to special counsel in the case of United States against Standard Oil Co. of California;

S. 1282. An act for the relief of Eric W. Rodgers; and

S. 1290. An act for the relief of William Carroll Knox.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 175) commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the first airplane flight by Wilbur and Orville Wright.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 199) to extend the time limit for immunity.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 213. An act for the relief of Edward H. Smith;

H. R. 544. An act for the relief of Rev. C. M. McKay;

H. R. 610. An act for the relief of Pacific Dry Dock & Repair Co., Ind.;

H. R. 929. An act for the relief of Irving L. Jones;

H. R. 1062. An act for the relief of the estate of John H. Cathcart;

H. R. 1412. An act for the relief of Mildred B. Hampton;

H. R. 1519. An act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the McCullough Coal Corporation against the United States;

H. R. 1847. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Richard Zielinski, a minor;

H. R. 2097. An act for the relief of W. J. Cox;

H. R. 2109. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Minerva C. Davis;

H. R. 2183. An act for the relief of Mathilde B. Meister;

H. R. 2189. An act for the relief of Kenneth E. Shepard;

H. R. 2457. An act for the relief of David Hickey Post, No. 235, of the American Legion;

H. R. 2639. An act for the relief of William M. Tucker and Nelda M. Tucker;

H. R. 2690. An act for the relief of Oswald L. Sawyer;

H. R. 2772. An act for the relief of Edwin Foley;

H. R. 2804. An act for the relief of Ruth E. P. Phillips, as executrix of the estate of Amos Russell Phillips, deceased;

H. R. 2875. An act for the relief of Adelard Demers;

H. R. 2880. An act for the relief of H. G. Tooley;

H. R. 3157. An act for the relief of Lloyd L. Johnson and P. B. Hume;

H. R. 3173. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Lorraine Novak, a minor;

H. R. 3371. An act for the relief of the dependents of Dr. Arthur B. Wyse, and others;

H. R. 3537. An act for the relief of Bessie Eason;

H. R. 3661. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3729. An act for the relief of Anna Mattil and others.

CASES OF MESSRS. DODD, WATSON, AND LOVETT SEEKING JUDGMENT FOR EARNED PAY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Attorney General, relating to petitions which have been filed in the Court of Claims on behalf of Messrs. Dodd, Watson, and Lovett demanding judgment for pay alleged to have been earned after November 15, 1943, for services rendered the respective departments by which they are employed, the cases arising under the act of July 12, 1943, Public, No. 132, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, and stating, in part, that "I shall be glad to suggest to the court that anyone you may select be given the right to file a brief and to argue on behalf of the position of the Congress. I shall also be glad to confer with whomever you name for the purpose of working out the best procedures finally to dispose of these cases. * * * I regret that in these cases I find it impossible to advocate with conviction the views of the Congress," which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, and so forth, were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Federation of Labor, protesting against the proposal to relocate Japanese in districts where a manpower shortage exists; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A statement in the nature of a memorial by the committee on public affairs of the Joint Council of the Associated Engineering Societies of St. Louis, Mo., remonstrating against the enactment of pending science-mobilization legislation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

TELEGRAM FROM SECRETARY OF NATIONAL COOPERATIVE MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION — TAXES ON OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a telegram from Charles W. Holman, secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, advising me of the action taken by that federation at their recent annual convention in Chicago, urging defeat of the Maybank bill, which proposes legislation as to the coloring of oleomargarine.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *December 2, 1943.*

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Three hundred delegates, representing 300,000 organized dairy farmers in 41 States, attending twenty-seventh annual convention of our federation here today unanimously adopted resolution urging defeat of Maybank bill suspending color taxes on oleomargarine, called for its divorcement from internal revenue bill, and protested against what appeared to them as unseemly rush on part of Senate Finance Committee to force this bill into general tax legislation, thereby violating congressional custom in effect since 1886.

CHARLES W. HOLMAN,
Secretary, the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation.

RESOLUTION OF WICHITA (KANS.) INDEPENDENT BUSINESSMEN'S ASSOCIATION—UNIFIED NATIONAL SOCIAL INSURANCE SYSTEM

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Wichita Independent Businessmen's Association at a meeting held by that organization on November 4, 1943, expressing their opposition to Senate bill 1161, known as the Wagner-Murray bill, establishing a unified national social insurance system.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the board of directors' meeting of the Wichita Independent Businessmen's Association held on November 4, 1943, the various phases of the Wagner-Murray Senate bill 1161 were discussed.

It is the sincere feeling of the board members that this bill (1161) will discourage the incentive of the professional men to improve themselves in medicine and other branches of the profession.

That the passage of this bill, or any like bill, is the very movement that we, as the Wichita Independent Businessmen's Association, are fighting to prevent—that of jeopardizing individual initiative and free enterprise. Be it therefore

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Wichita Independent Businessmen's Association wish to go on record as being unalterably opposed to this bill in its entirety, or any revision of said bill, and requests that our Senators and Representatives do all in their power to prevent its passage.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution to provide for the proper observance of the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of the adoption of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights; without amendment (Rept. No. 574).

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 1418. A bill to provide for the adjustment of maximum prices on milk, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 575).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 1335. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 576); and

S. 1576. A bill to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases; with an amendment (Rept. No. 577).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 1417. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to donate and convey on behalf of the United States, to Jack Henry Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, Anchorage, Alaska, the wood-frame building, known as the Telephone and Telegraph Building, located on lots 7 and 8 in block 17, Anchorage town site; without amendment (Rept. No. 578).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Several assistant dental surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons in the United States Public Health Service.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma (for himself and Mr. MOORE):

S. 1579. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma," approved January 27, 1933; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1580 (by request). A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands heretofore acquired for the nonreservation Indian boarding school known as Sherman Institute, Calif.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 1581. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire lands and provide facilities to replace Indian fishing grounds submerged or destroyed as a result of the construction of the Bonneville Dam (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. SCRUGHAM (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and Mr. MAYBANK):

S. 1582. A bill to assure an adequate supply of strategic and critical minerals for any future emergency by holding intact in the post-war period all stock piles surviving the present war owned by Government agencies and by necessary augmentation thereof primarily from domestic sources; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 213. An act for the relief of Edward H. Smith;

H. R. 544. An act for the relief of Reverend C. M. McKay;

H. R. 610. An act for the relief of Pacific Dry Dock & Repair Co., Inc.;

H. R. 929. An act for the relief of Irving L. Jones;

H. R. 1062. An act for the relief of the estate of John H. Cathcart;

H. R. 1412. An act for the relief of Mildred B. Hampton;

H. R. 1519. An act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the McCullough Coal Corp. against the United States;

H. R. 1847. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Richard Zielinski, a minor;

H. R. 2097. An act for the relief of W. J. Cox;

H. R. 2109. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Minerva C. Davis;

H. R. 2183. An act for the relief of Mathilde B. Meister;

H. R. 2189. An act for the relief of Kenneth E. Shepard;

H. R. 2457. An act for the relief of David Hickey Post No. 235 of the American Legion;

H. R. 2639. An act for the relief of William M. Tucker and Nelda M. Tucker;

H. R. 2690. An act for the relief of Oswald L. Sawyer;

H. R. 2772. An act for the relief of Edwin Foley;

H. R. 2804. An act for the relief of Ruth E. P. Phillips, as executrix of the estate of Amos Russell Phillips, deceased;

H. R. 2875. An act for the relief of Adelard Demers;

H. R. 2880. An act for the relief of H. G. Tooley;

H. R. 3157. An act for the relief of Lloyd L. Johnson and P. B. Hume;

H. R. 3173. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Lorraine Novak, a minor;

H. R. 3371. An act for the relief of the dependents of Dr. Arthur B. Wyse, and others;

H. R. 3537. An act for the relief of Bessie Eason;

H. R. 3661. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3729. An act for the relief of Anna Mattil, and others.

AMENDMENTS TO THE REVENUE BILL

Mr. BAILEY submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3687) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

SALE OF SERVICE DISCHARGE BUTTONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was very much interested yesterday in reading in the Washington Post of December 7, page 17, an advertisement reading:

For World War No. 2 veterans—

Then there was a picture of a medal, and the statement:

WE HAVE THEM

New official honorable discharge buttons, lapel style, gold plated, 35 cents.

NOTE.—To purchase button, discharge papers or orders of separation must be shown.

LEWIS & THOS. SALTZ,
1409 G Street NW.

Not connected with Saltz Bros., Inc.

After reading that advertisement, Mr. President, I wrote the Secretary of War, as follows:

DECEMBER 7, 1943.

Hon. HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am enclosing a clipping from the Washington Post of this date, page 17, which I feel sure will interest you.

It is my understanding that these buttons may be purchased wholesale by anyone who cares to buy them, despite notices that to obtain the button discharge papers or orders of separation must be presented.

Recently a young man of my acquaintance found two places on West Forty-second Street in New York City where the buttons were available on presentation of 25 cents without credentials.

Inasmuch as these buttons are available through any of the services, free of charge, steps must be taken at once to prohibit their display by any except discharged members of the armed services. Since they are an official emblem of service with the armed forces, their sale should be prohibited and they should be issued only through designated offices of the various armed services. Proper endorsement should be made upon the individual's discharge papers.

These buttons must mean something to our veterans and to the public at large. Surely we are destroying their value by permitting them to be offered at public sale.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

Mr. President, this may seem to be an unimportant matter, but it is not. It is simply another example of the casual manner in which we are treating our returning war veterans. I say "casual" because, to a large extent, it has been thought by some that by passing out to each veteran a hundred or two hundred or three hundred dollars the job of compensation, if there can be such a thing, would be done. We cannot compensate them, and, as I have said on the floor of the Senate three times previously in recent days, we cannot fulfill our duty to America by that kind of action.

As all of us know, a good many of the boys who are returning to civilian life before an armistice are self-conscious and mentally distressed. We must have known that for we have taken steps to issue to them a lapel button which designates honorable active duty in the armed services of World War No. 2.

These buttons are issued officially and free of charge through designated branches of the Army, Navy, Coast

Guard, and marines. However, we completely destroy the value of these buttons or medals by allowing them to be manufactured and placed on sale so that anyone may get them. Of course, there is an alleged formality of presenting papers showing honorable discharge or severance from active duty, but it might be pointed out that a man may return time and time again, present his service papers and obtain as many of these buttons for distribution to unauthorized persons as he may desire. In fact, I doubt very much if unscrupulous persons would be too adamant in demanding credentials of discharge before selling the buttons.

As I have stated, I have protested this matter to the Secretary of War and I have read the letter which I addressed to him.

The United States Code, section 1425, title 10, prohibits the manufacture, sale of insignia or medals of the United States service. Other new legislation should be passed immediately regarding the issuance of these service buttons and their protection as a medal of honorable service, or proper authorities must be instructed immediately to take whatever steps are necessary to prohibit their becoming a common token for use by anyone who has 25 cents or 35 cents to spend, whether or not he has an honorable service record.

CRISIS ON THE HOME FRONT—ADDRESS BY WAR MOBILIZATION DIRECTOR BYRNES

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered on December 7, 1943, by Hon. James F. Byrnes, War Mobilization Director, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WHITE COLLAR WORKER—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Forgotten Man—the White Collar Worker," delivered by him over Wisconsin broadcasting stations on December 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE ASSOCIATION OF THE OLDEST INHABITANTS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by him before the Association of the Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia on December 7, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUBSIDIES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ELLENDER

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of subsidies, delivered by Senator ELLENDER on December 7, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

DON'T TEAR OLD GLORY DOWN—ADDRESS BY COL. ROBERT R. McCORMICK

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Don't Tear Old Glory Down," delivered by Col. Robert R. McCormick, editor and publisher of the Chicago Tribune, at the launching of a patrol craft for the United States Navy by the Pullman-Standard Car Manufacturing Co., at Lake Calumet, Ill., November 14, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION AND SUBSIDIES—STATEMENT BY EDWARD A. O'NEAL

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by Edward A. O'Neal, president, American Farm Bureau Federation, before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, on November 30, 1943, dealing with continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation and Government funds for consumer subsidies, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SUBSIDY PROGRAM—EDITORIAL FROM BATON ROUGE ADVOCATE AND LETTER BY C. A. IVES

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Baton Rouge Advocate, and a letter by C. A. Ives, addressed to the editor of the Baton Rouge Advocate, and published therein, on the subject of the subsidy program, which appear in the Appendix.]

INCIDENCE OF VENEREAL DISEASES—ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. O'DANIEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Public Warned of Soaring Rate in Venereal Ills," published in the Washington Times-Herald of December 8, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI, in accordance with the notice given by him on Friday last, in order that he may offer a certain amendment to the pending bill, on which motion the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations has just met, and by a majority vote has agreed to the amendment just as it was proposed, with one exception. The committee has accepted an amendment by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] on line 8 of page 2 of the amendment, reading as follows:

Except that the Secretary of War may transfer not to exceed 10 percent of any or all of the appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1944 to any other such appropriation, but no other appropriation shall be increased more than 10 percent thereby.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I think the Senator would phrase it more accurately if he said that the committee accepted a small part of my amendment. It did not accept it in toto.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it did not. The Senator from Massachusetts offered an amendment virtually striking out the first part of the amendment I had offered, which I now read:

SEC. 305. No part of any funds appropriated for the War or Navy Department, when it is found by the head of such Department that any part of such funds is not necessary for the completion of the purpose for which appropriated, shall be used for any other purpose without the specific approval of law by the Congress; and, notwithstanding any other provision of law providing for transfer of any part of such funds, when it is found by the head of such Department that such funds are not to be used for the purposes for which appropriated, such appropriations to that extent shall be rescinded and canceled and the Secretary of such Department shall certify the amount so reduced, rescinded, and canceled to the Treasury Department, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the President of the Senate.

Then this portion of the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts would be inserted:

Except that the Secretary of War may transfer not to exceed 10 percent of any or all of the appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1944 to any other such appropriation, but no other appropriation shall be increased more than 10 percent thereby.

Mr. OVERTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The rest of the committee amendment remains intact?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; all agreed on the rest of the committee amendment.

Now I may state what the action of the committee means. Seventy-one billion dollars have been appropriated for the Military Establishment for this year. A fund of 10 percent of that entire amount is set up as an emergency fund, to remain available unless some of it may be returned. Of course, any part of it may be returned by the Secretary, who, of course, knows more about the needs than anyone else, or he should know, and I have no doubt he does. The enormous sum represented by 10 percent of the huge appropriation is set up as a fund against any emergency. It seems to me that that should be sufficient. There appeared before the committee two Army officers, General Richards and Colonel Moore, and they seemed to be in considerable doubt about the matter. They wanted the language to stand just as it was, except that they felt that the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts should be inserted, which would merely prevent the Budget Director from having any control over the matter; any changes or transfers would not have to be approved by the Budget Director, under the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, that is the issue. The committee voted 9 to 6, as I recall, in favor of the amendment as I have read it. It seems to me that we should suspend the rule and that the entire amendment should be agreed to as now reported by the committee.

I hope the Senate will vote to do that and let us take the matter to conference. If there shall be any inequalities about it, they can be handled in conference. I believe we have worked out an excellent

amendment. It is not just what the Senator from Massachusetts desired, it is not just what the Army wishes, it is not just what we want, and I do not think it is what some others may desire, but, after all, it is a fair and just amendment and it means greater economy and greater care in the expenditure of public money by the departments. It seems to me we should take the course suggested. We all know that there have been some very unusual expenditures made by the departments, and when we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars a year, it is our duty to scrutinize the expenditure of the money to the best of our ability.

The committee has passed on the amendment and reported it favorably, and I earnestly hope the rule will be suspended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to state my position on this question.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Gillette	Overton
Austin	Green	Radcliffe
Bailey	Guffey	Reed
Bankhead	Gurney	Revercomb
Barkley	Hatch	Robertson
Bridges	Hawkes	Russell
Brooks	Hayden	Scrugham
Buck	Hill	Shipstead
Burton	Holman	Smith
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lodge	Tobey
Caraway	Lucas	Truman
Chandler	McCarran	Tunnell
Chavez	McClellan	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maybank	Wallgren
Davis	Mead	Walsh, Mass.
Downey	Millikin	Walsh, N. J.
Eastland	Moore	Wherry
Ellender	Murray	White
Ferguson	Nye	Wiley
George	O'Daniel	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is detained on public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is absent on public business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS—PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. NYE. On Friday, November 12, I obtained the leave of the Senate to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an article on the League of Nations, written by Oswald F. Schuette, of Washington, D. C. He was a war correspondent in World War No. 1, and is an authority on international affairs.

The article was written in August 1920 during the Harding-Cox presidential campaign, and was issued by the Republican National Committee at that time as its campaign handbook on the subject of the League of Nations. At the time I offered the matter for the RECORD I failed to make note of the date of its origin.

I placed the article in the RECORD as a document important in its recording of vital history. I am told that the Republican National Committee printed 750,000 copies in the campaign of 1920, and that it was an important factor in making the League of Nations the decisive issue in that campaign. The pamphlet recited a history of the international negotiations and domestic politics of 1919 and 1920 which may well prove a deadly parallel to the situation which might develop when the present war comes to its close. If question is now raised about the propriety of putting this article into the RECORD, because it contains vigorous criticism of the late President Woodrow Wilson, of his part in writing the Covenant of the League and the Treaty of Versailles, and, particularly, of his efforts to induce the Senate to accept the League and to ratify the treaty, then I only plead that the criticism of Wilson was not what prompted my request for the printing of the article.

It might be suggested that some of its statements should be eliminated from the text printed in the RECORD. But if that were done, it would no longer be the historical document which had played an important part in the early twenties. Even President Wilson's friends will admit that he did not hesitate to criticize, sometimes with bitter words, the motives and the conduct of the Senators, and of others who opposed his advocacy of the League.

As late as March 1920 he vetoed a formal congressional resolution declaring the war at an end. As a result, the final peace treaty was not ratified by the Senate until October 18, 1921, in the administration of President Harding.

If this article had been written after the death of President Wilson, its author, with whom I have visited, might well have softened the criticism it contains. But it was written in the heat of a Presidential campaign when President Wilson was not only alive, but was still the President of the United States.

I ask that this comment of mine be printed also in conjunction with the article I inserted in the RECORD on November 12, when the permanent RECORD is printed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have called the attention of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] to what seemed to me to be offensive and objectionable statements in the article which he had inserted in the RECORD, reflecting upon the integrity and the honesty and good faith of President Wilson. It is easy enough to argue the merits of the League of Nations without impugning the motives of anybody connected with it on either side. I had forgotten at the time the article was published in the RECORD that it was a part of the Republican campaign literature in 1920, written by this man named——

Mr. NYE. Schuette.

Mr. BARKLEY. Schuette. It is not an inappropriate name, I think, in view of the character of his article. The article went on to state that President Wilson made the trip to Europe and that he advocated the League of Nations, not because of his belief in it, not because of his efforts to bring about a better world through a world organization of peace, but directly in order that he might satisfy a vainglorious pride and ambition on his own part.

Now we have gotten far enough away from those events and those unhappy days to recognize the fact, however much anyone might disagree or might have disagreed with President Wilson as to the wisdom of his course, that it is a violent slander upon his good name at this time, 25 years afterward, to be digging up articles written in the heat of a campaign, which reflect upon his personal honor and his integrity as President of the United States. That is the part of the article to which I objected and which I resented, and still resent, on the part of the writer.

I do not see any good purpose to be served at this time, when we are in the midst of another great crisis, by attempting to drag out again the bitter controversies which raged at that time, and, especially, to bring in an article of the type that reflects upon the honor, and the integrity, and the good name, and the character of a man whom the people of this country chose as President of the United States in two elections, and who bore a burden at that time greater than anyone since Lincoln, and of a wider nature, because it involved more world-wide questions. I regarded it then as unfortunate, and I regard it now as unfortunate that the Senator from North Dakota saw fit to dig up—or somebody dug it up for him, I presume, and it does not make any difference who dug it up—and put that thing into the RECORD, as a reflection upon the honor, the good faith, the integrity, of a

man who as President of the United States was revered by millions of our people, and whose memory now is revered by millions of our people, of whom I am proud to be one. I appreciate what the Senator has said in the statement he has just made, but I still think it was very unfortunate to go back 25 years and revive unhappy memories which involve the personal character, honor, integrity, and good faith of one of the great men of this country.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I should like to proceed for just one moment, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. LODGE. I have the floor, and should like to discuss the pending bill. However, if the Senator will be brief——

Mr. NYE. I have just one remark to make.

Mr. LODGE. I did not realize I was yielding for a debate. I thought the Senator was going to request unanimous consent to have some matter printed in the RECORD. If the Senator will assure me that he will not launch upon a long flight of oratory, I shall yield.

Mr. NYE. I can assure the Senator I will be very brief.

Mr. President, I can fully appreciate the attitude of mind which the Senator from Kentucky has recorded in his remarks, and I am sure that others share the view he entertains with respect to the item. On the other hand, there are others who feel that the reprint of the article was of extreme value at this particular time. With the statement I have made, I am leaving it a matter for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for yielding to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] and those made by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] will also be printed in the RECORD at the point indicated by the Senator from North Dakota.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, today we are confronting a motion to suspend the rule, which, I understand, requires a two-thirds vote of the Senators present and voting, in order that we may consider the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] to the pending appropriation bill. The amendment embodies three basic thoughts. The first would require that when the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy finds he has more money than he needs, he will certify that fact, and the appropriation will thereupon be canceled and rescinded, and cannot subsequently be expended. That is the first provision.

The second provision would require any branch of the Government, not merely the War Department or the Navy Department, to construct any particular project for which money shall have been appropriated, and would deny to such branch of the Government the right to impound the money.

The third thought or provision would repeal a section of the last military appropriations act which authorizes the Bureau of the Budget to provide a 10 percent leeway on military expenditures. Those are the three concepts in the amendment.

I voted to report the amendment from the committee because I am always in sympathy with the idea of having Congress retain its functions, because I am opposed to any form of usurpation, whether it be usurpation of congressional prerogatives by the Executive, or vice versa. I also regarded the committee amendment as an attempt to obtain economy in public expenditures—an objective which I always favor. Of course, I naturally reserve the right, which every other Senator reserves, to seek to perfect these propositions and to change them so that they may more nearly achieve their purpose.

Yesterday the Secretary of War addressed a letter to the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the senior Senator from Tennessee, the letter being printed in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 10360. In the letter the Secretary of War addressed himself to the first of the three concepts in the amendment; that is to say, the proposition that if the Secretary of War finds he has more money than he needs for a certain activity, that appropriation is thereupon canceled and gone. In the letter, which Senators can read for themselves, the Secretary pointed out that war is full of unforeseen emergencies, full of crises, that he must be in the position of having available funds which will enable him to meet the unforeseen situations, and that if a surplus develops in a certain department of the military structure, for instance, in ordnance, if he cancels that appropriation, 3 months later he may be confronted with a demand for a great deal more ordnance—for a different type of shell, let us say—and then he will not be able to obtain the necessary money without coming to Congress.

It might be said, "Why should he not come to Congress?" Mr. President, there are two arguments to be made in that connection. One is that for 2 months last summer the Congress was not in session; so, in such event, our military activities would have to wait for 2 months until Congress returned or until a special session was called.

The other consideration is that last year when Congress was in session it took between 6 and 8 weeks to pass the military appropriations bill, a bill which every Member of the House and every Member of the Senate favored. Congress, with all its splendid attributes as an instrument of our Government, is not always noted for its speedy action; and during a war it must be possible to meet unforeseen emergencies with speed.

So, Mr. President, yesterday I proposed an amendment to the first part of the committee amendment, which is all that is at stake today, insofar as I am concerned. In my amendment I provide that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall be given the right to impound any extra amounts which might develop, reporting the action each time to the chairmen of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees; and my amendment would forbid them ever to use the extra amounts for any other purpose except the purpose specified, but would give them a 10-percent leeway in transferring amounts from one appropriation to another.

Incidentally, Mr. President, the amendment to the amendment can be found at page 10366 of the RECORD, but I shall read it because it is very brief and I think it is very clear. It provides that—

> No part of any funds appropriated for the War or Navy Department, when it is found by the head of such Department that any part of such funds is not necessary for the general purposes for which appropriated for the prosecution of the war, shall be impounded or held as a reserve, except by the head of the Department concerned who shall report such action to the chairman of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, or used for any other purpose without the specific approval of law by the Congress; except that the Secretary of War may transfer not to exceed 10 percent of any of the appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1944 to any other such appropriation, but no other appropriation shall be increased more than 10 percent thereby. Amounts withheld from any contractor as a result of the renegotiation of a contract shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

I felt that was an extremely important matter. The question of having the War Department in such a situation that it can meet unforeseen events in the middle of a war which threatens our whole national existence is certainly just as important as the question of having a proper control by Congress in reference to the expenditures of Government. Some persons may say it is more important, but certainly it is just as important.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Assuming that the Senator's version of this amendment should be adopted, is it the Senator's interpretation of his own amendment that the action of reporting to the Appropriations Committees of both branches of the legislature might result in either the cancelation of the balance of unused or unnecessary appropriations, or might result in an appropriation of that balance for some other use? Is that the Senator's interpretation?

Mr. LODGE. No; except for 10 percent.

The situation which we have to meet is one in which, for example, in January the Department might find that it had more money than it needed for ordnance. Let

us assume that it had all the 30-caliber ammunition it needed. Suppose it had $10,000,000,000 left over. That amount would be impounded. Four months later it might find itself in such a situation that it needed siege guns and a great quantity of large ammunition, and there would be another unforeseen call on the same appropriation. My amendment would permit impounding of the money from January until August, and then in August the money could be used for the same purpose for which it was originally appropriated, namely, ordnance.

Mr. AUSTIN. From the answer of the Senator I gather that it is not the purpose of the Senator from Massachusetts to suggest action by the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses on the report being made.

Mr. LODGE. No; I do not suggest action. I suggest that the committees be kept informed. The possibility of an individual Member obtaining an idea from this information which might cause him to demand congressional action is always present, but that is not what I contemplate. I contemplate that the Congress should be constantly informed of such impoundings. But no Member of Congress and no one in the Army knows exactly the kinds and amounts of ammunition which will be needed in September 1944.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let us suppose that the Secretary of War has made such a report, and that it involves a large sum of money appropriated but not used, and with no foreseeable use for it. Has the Senator any doubt that the two committees could at once act in the passage of such a resolution as that of the Senator from Tennessee to cancel the balance at that time? Is there any doubt in the Senator's mind?

Mr. LODGE. None whatsoever. I am very grateful to the Senator for bringing up a point which had not occurred to me, and that is, if we are to cancel appropriations, it is much better to consider each one on its merits as it comes along, at the proper time, instead of trying to put into effect a blanket cancelation applying to everything, for a period of time in which no man can foretell the future.

Mr. AUSTIN. From the Senator's experience does he not think that it is better to act with knowledge of the facts; or, to put it another way, if we are to cancel, to cancel with knowledge of the conditions at the time of cancelation, rather than to cancel in advance, before we know what the facts will be?

Mr. LODGE. That is the time to make the cancelation. In my judgment it is much better to have a system under which we seek congressional action to effect cancelations, rather than a system under which, in the midst of war, we must seek congressional action to obtain emergency appropriations. I think we have the cart before the horse.

Mr. WHITE and Mr. OVERTON addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. LODGE. I yield first to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I find myself somewhat confused by the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts. The Senator provides in his amendment that no part of the funds appropriated which is found by the head of the department not to be necessary for the general purposes for which the funds are appropriated shall be, first, impounded; second, or held as a reserve; and, third, or used for any other purpose, without the specific approval of law by the Congress. I cannot see the practical difference, in the ultimate effect, between the cancelation of an appropriation which is not needed for the particular purpose specified when the appropriation is made, and this provision of the Senator's amendment, which says that no part of the funds shall be used for any other purpose than that for which they were originally appropriated, without the specific approval of law by the Congress. I wish the Senator would clarify the situation for me. I cannot see any difference, in ultimate effect upon the War Department, between canceling an appropriation, or that part of an appropriation not needed for the specific purpose for which it was made, and a provision that no part of it shall be used for any other purpose than that for which it was specifically appropriated.

Mr. LODGE. The sense of the language in line 3 on page 2 is, "nor shall they be used for any other purpose."

Mr. WHITE. That is what I understand. So the third limitation is that no part——

Mr. LODGE. It is not a third limitation.

Mr. WHITE. That is the way I read it.

Mr. LODGE. It is not a third limitation. If the Senator will bear with me, he will find that my amendment was defeated this morning in the Appropriations Committee.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts contains this provision:

> Except that the Secretary of War may transfer not to exceed 10 percent of any of the appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1944 to any other such appropriation, but no other appropriation shall be increased more than 10 percent thereby.

I should like to ask the Senator's interpretation of that provision in his amendment. Is it not correct to say that the Secretary of War would be limited, in the transfer of any appropriation, to 10 percent of the total appropriation? That is the first limitation, is it not?

Mr. LODGE. That is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. And he could not transfer it except to some other appropriation which has already been made.

Mr. LODGE. That is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. He could not transfer it so as to increase such an appropriation more than 10 percent.

Mr. LODGE. That is correct. There are very severe limitations in the interest of economy and prudent, economical management. It is my effort to meet the wishes of the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. OVERTON. The committee amendment contains the same provisions.

Mr. LODGE. The committee amendment is very different.

Mr. OVERTON. I mean with that exception. The words which I have just read are incorporated in the committee amendment, are they not?

Mr. LODGE. Those words have been incorporated——

Mr. OVERTON. In the committee amendment.

Mr. LODGE. They have not been incorporated, but they were agreed to by the Appropriations Committee, and the understanding is that if the rule is suspended, that language will be offered. That is the parliamentary situation.

Mr. OVERTON. That is the controlling feature of this whole provision.

Mr. LODGE. That is where I differ with the Senator from Louisiana. I do not think it is the controlling feature. There is the other feature, that of cancelation of the appropriations.

Mr. OVERTON. Who would cancel? It would be the Secretary of War, would it not?

Mr. LODGE. Yes. I presume the Secretary of War would act in good faith. In fact, I know he would, knowing him as I do. He would be put in a very unsound position, because, as I stated to the Senator from Vermont, if a situation should develop in which there were a surplus in a certain activity of the Army in January, and in August there were a shortage in the same Army activity, in the meantime the appropriation would have been canceled, and the August emergency could not be met promptly.

Mr. OVERTON. It is to be assumed, is it not, that the Secretary of War would not cancel any part of any appropriation if he thought an emergency might arise whereby he would have to use the 10 percent provided for in the 10-percent clause?

Mr. LODGE. Of course, following out the reasoning of the Senator from Louisiana, the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy might say to himself, "I do not know what is going to happen; therefore, I will not certify any surpluses." I believe the Secretary of War is entitled to commendation for having frankly told the other House 3 or 4 weeks ago that he had a $13,000,000,000 surplus. I thought that was very fine.

I like to encourage that type of candor on the part of our Government officials. I do not like to see language written into the law which would be practically a mandate to them not to reveal any surpluses which they may have. I believe that the language of the committee amendment defeats its own purposes. I believe that the language of my amendment would make for candor, and not only a more efficient situation from a military standpoint, but a much more candid and frank situation insofar as the fiscal aspects of the matter are concerned.

Mr. President, this morning I offered my amendment in the Appropriations Committee and it was defeated by a vote of 9 to 6. I hope I have convinced the Senate that I feel very strongly about the matter, and that I believe it to be the most important factor in the whole amendment.

As I have said to the members of the committee, in approaching a vote such as we are about to take on whether we shall suspend the rule, the decision of a Senator as to how he will vote will naturally be determined by the reason for suspending the rule. If the proposal on which he votes after the suspension of the rule is one which he approves, he will vote to suspend the rule. If it is a proposal which he does not approve, he will vote against suspending the rule.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. As I understand, only the members of the Appropriations Committee have authority to establish a basis for appropriations. If money is appropriated to the War or Navy Department, and if 10 percent of it is held in a reserve fund, as I understand, no money may be transferred from such fund for any purpose except that already authorized by Congress as the subject of the appropriation. The Secretary of War could not in any event spend money for something Congress had not heretofore agreed was a proper subject for which to appropriate money.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. CHANDLER. And under the Senator's amendment no single appropriation would be entitled to receive more than a 2 percent increase.

Mr. LODGE. I had provided for 10 percent.

Mr. CHANDLER. I was confused about that, and I should like to ask the Senator to correct the amount, if necessary, in the copy of the amendment appearing on the RECORD on page 10366, which states 2 percent.

Mr. LODGE. The correct figure is 10 percent.

Mr. CHANDLER. Very well.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I believe this to be a very important distinction. I am in favor of economy. I am also in favor of Congress retaining its control over its own projects and expenditures. I am opposed to usurpation of authority by the Bureau of the Budget. When we want a particular project constructed, and vote for it, I do not want the Bureau of the Budget, merely because it may not like the project, to impound the funds and prevent construction of the project. I am in favor of all those things. If the Senator from Tennessee or the Senator from Louisiana should propose the adoption of the two provisos and leave out the first part of the language, I should vote with a great deal of pleasure to suspend the rule.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I believe that the first thing for the Senate to decide is whether we shall suspend the rule. If the rule should be suspended, that in itself would not mean the adoption of the committee amendment. The Senate would then proceed to the consideration of the amendment offered by the committee. The Senator from Massachusetts could then offer his amendment.

Mr. LODGE. I believe that I probably would offer it.

Mr. OVERTON. And the Senate would vote on it. If the majority of Senators voting should agree to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts, his amendment would be adopted. Any other Senator may offer an amendment. However, the first thing to do is to suspend the rule. Until that is done no amendment may be considered.

Mr. LODGE. The parliamentary situation would be, if the rule were suspended, that it would merely give us the right to consider the amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. OVERTON. If we suspend the rule we can then consider the amendment.

Mr. LODGE. To tell the truth, Mr. President, I have been somewhat surprised at the resistance to accepting a change in the language which I believe would carry out the purposes we have in mind, and which are so absolutely essential if we are to fight the war efficiently and make it possible for the War Department quickly to meet unforeseen conditions.

I wish we could agree to eliminate the first part. I know from my experience of yesterday afternoon, and in the committee this morning, that we cannot do so. If we could agree to do it and adopt the last two provisos we would then have something on which I believe every Member could agree. I cannot understand why, in the midst of war, we must pick on the Army and the Navy in imposing conditions of economy. It seems to be a very upside-down, cart-before-the-horse way of doing things. The first part of the amendment mentions the Army and the Navy. If public money is being spent by any department of the Government for any necessary purpose at all, it is being spent by the Army and the Navy, which are using the money to protect the very existence of this country. Every Senator could mention governmental agencies other than the Army and the Navy in which real economy might be instituted, but they are not mentioned at all. We bear down only on the Army and the Navy for economy. Of course, it should be exercised there.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. The proviso which follows the insertion of the last seven lines of the Senator's proposed amendment reads as follows:

> That no appropriation or part of any appropriation heretofore, herein, or hereafter made available for any executive department or independent establishment to construct any particular project shall be impounded—

And so forth. That would meet the Senator's observation that there are other departments of the Government in which economy should prevail.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; but that provision has nothing at all to do with economy. That provision is the one which requires the construction of river and harbor works, and public works of all types. That proviso has nothing to do with saving money. It is for the purpose of eliminating usurpation by the Bureau of the Budget in refusing to build projects. I have never heard it contended that the proviso beginning on page 2, in line 8 of the amendment had anything to do with economy. I do not think it has.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this is not the right way to approach the subject. I am in favor of sound budgetary and fiscal practices, but I am, above all, for winning the war. For that reason I very reluctantly must oppose the committee amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate. I wish only to make an observation which I hope will not consume more than 5 minutes.

I hesitate to question any motion authorized by the Committee on Appropriations to suspend the rule. If I felt sure that nothing would be done except to agree to the amendment of the Appropriations Committee, I might resolve my hesitation.

The trouble is that when we suspend the rule we open up the amendment to any other amendment which may be offered from the floor of the Senate, just as though we did not have to suspend the rule.

There is one amendment which may be offered, to which I should very much object. There are two reasons for my fears if it were adopted. I tried to express them yesterday. I am not making this statement because of any influence which I expect it to have on other Senators, but merely to explain my own position and the vote which I may cast.

The Committee on Finance is now considering the question of the renegotiation law as a part of the tax bill sent over by the other House. We have had a hearing on it. What the committee will do with it, I am not in a position to predict but it was testified that already renegotiation has been instrumental in saving $5,300,000,000 on contracts heretofore entered into.

If the Senate should adopt the amendment the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] suggested, which was written into the amendment yesterday, as I have it, and is still in it, providing that the money saved by the various departments in renegotiating contracts may not be expended for the same purpose for which it was originally appropriated; in other words, that the departments may not take advantage of the savings they make to buy the same type of equipment from somebody else or even from the same contractor, I think it would be most unfortunate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator mean that if the Congress of the United States appropriates, say, $100,000,000 for the War Department or the Navy Department to purchase 10,000 planes, for example, which is all they need, and they are able to buy 10,000 planes for $90,000,000, the other $10,000,000 should not go back into the Treasury?

Mr. BARKLEY. The estimates, as the Senator knows, are made frequently a year and a half before the expiration of the fiscal year for which the appropriations are made. If last July, August, or September or October, prior to the time when the House of Representatives began its hearings on appropriations for airplanes, we will say, the Department decides that they only needed 10,000, and that they would pay $100,000,000 for them—of course that is merely an illustrative figure—and that much was appropriated, and during the interim they were able to renegotiate the contracts and save $10,000,000 out of the $100,000,000, my theory and belief is that if they find in the meantime that they need more than 10,000, they ought to be allowed to use the amount saved for the purchase of additional airplanes, because the number needed at the time the Budget made its estimate was speculative. As the Secretary of War said in his letter to the Senator from Tennessee yesterday, war is a mobile thing; it is necessary to be ready every day and every week to decide what is needed as compared to last week or last month. My belief is that when they are able to make savings out of contracts already entered into under renegotiation, they ought to be allowed to spend what they save for the same thing, if they find they need it. I would not favor letting them spend money appropriated for airplanes to buy tanks, guns, or automobiles; it should be spent for the same type of equipment. I think they are to be commended for their effort to save money, and they ought to be given the right to spend the money which they save for the same type of equipment if they have need for it. For that reason I fear and would seriously oppose any such amendment as that.

That is only an illustration of the fact that if we suspend the rule, then, the proposition is opened up to all kinds of amendments.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am not quarreling with the Senator's theory or point of view; I differ with him; but that is all right. There is one point, however, that I do not believe he can question and that is that when taking the illustration we have just used of the purchase of 10,000 airplanes for $90,000,000 instead of $100,000,000, the $10,000,000 which is saved is not saved to the notion of the taxpayers unless it is returned to the United States Treasury.

What has happened, if the Senator will allow me to finish, is that, through shrewdness or ability, the War Department or the Navy Department have been able to buy the planes $10,000,000 cheaper; but the money is not actually saved to the taxpayers and the public of the country until it reverts to the Treasury.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the question of whether $10,000,000 was saved, in my judgment, is not so important as the question of the War Department having power to use the $10,000,000 to procure equipment of the same type if they need it without coming back to Congress. We have already said we will give them $100,000,000 for airplanes, say. Suppose they estimated 18 months ago, 6 months ago, or a year ago, that they needed 10,000 airplanes. As the Senator knows and everyone else knows they begin to prepare their estimates long before the appropriations are passed, long before the Committee on Appropriations of the House even begin hearings on them. In a war such as this the situation may change in 30 days, and certainly it may change in 6 months or a year. We have been emphasizing the importance of aircraft in controlling the air, and it is not at all unreasonable that, whereas last October a year ago, or in December 1942, they may have thought a given number of airplanes was all they needed, they may find now that they need more than that number, indeed twice that many; and if out of the appropriations they have been able by renegotiation to save on the original cost a sufficient sum to buy additional airplanes, it seems to me they ought to be allowed to purchase as many as they can without having the Congress reappropriate the amount they have been able to save out of the original appropriation.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator and I might agree if he would distinguish between saving money and ability to buy at a cheaper price, but I think it is very unfortunate to mix them up and to say we have saved $5,000,000,000 on renegotiation when we have not saved it. We have saved for the taxpayers only that part which has been returned to the Treasury.

Mr. BARKLEY. It has been saved as compared to the original terms of the contract which had been entered into in a hurry. Congress took that into consideration when it authorized the departments to renegotiate contracts. Of course, it is a saving if Congress does not have to appropriate an equal amount for the same purpose in addition to what it has heretofore appropriated. Of course, it would not be a saving in the sense that dollars and cents come back into the Treasury, but in the sense that that money is available for things for which we might have been called upon to appropriate an additional amount for the same purpose, it certainly is a saving.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I discussed the other day with the head of one of the divisions of the War Department why a certain contract was not given to a low bidder. I got the impression that there has been a consistent policy in the awarding of public contracts that the low bidder should always get the contract if he is competent; but I was told—and I shall not embarrass the man by mentioning his name—I was told that it was rather immaterial as to the figure at which the contract was awarded and to whether it went to the low bidder, because, after all, they would renegotiate it and they would probably save a substantial amount by renegotiation. I am wondering how many contracts have been awarded on that rather slipshod basis. I think the official who awarded the contract is honest; I think he is an able man; I do not question his integrity or the good work he and his department are doing; but I do question his theory and this basis of awarding contracts. This basis cannot be justified except on the theory of time if the low bidder is competent to do the work and will post a bond to complete it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator it may depend a good deal on how much of a hurry they are in for the things they need. In my judgment, in a war such as this it would be much better not to waste time and not to spend time in advance of awarding the contract for things which are needed just as quickly as they can be manufactured, so that the contractor could go ahead with the production of whatever he is to make and not lose any time in haggling over the price. Under the renegotiation law 6 months from then, or a year from then or whatever the time may be under the terms of the act, they can sit down in more deliberation and go over the terms of the contract to see whether the contract they had entered into in a hurry to get production in a hurry was too liberal to the contractor. That is the theory upon which Congress passed the renegotiation law. As between spending the time on entering into a contract for materials which are needed at once, and spending the time on renegotiation later on, when it can be done in a more leisurely manner, but when the production has already started, I think it is better to do it later than to do it in advance, even though a few dollars might be saved.

Mr. BRIDGES. I agree with the Senator, and I agree with the position taken by the General to whom I have referred that time is of the essence.

Mr. BARKLEY. It does not necessarily involve the question of honesty, either on the part of the Government officials or the contractors. We all know how we had to reconvert our whole economy and industry to a war basis, almost overnight. I have no doubt that many contractors who had to convert their establishments into plants for the production of war materials could not themselves tell what the cost would be of a given article of equipment. There was no dishonesty about it. Naturally they wanted to give themselves a margin so that they would not lose money, and the Government did not want anyone to lose money in the construction of the plants, or in the manufacture of the articles required. It may involve a question of judgment, it may involve a question of accounting. All these may enter into

the consideration, matters which do not in any way impugn anyone's honesty or integrity. It is a question of getting what we need as fast as we need it, and taking up the slack a little later, if that is necessary

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I think what the Senator has said was true in the early stages of the war effort, when men who had made peacetime supplies had never in their lives made machine guns or bombs, or had loaded bombs, and no one could tell what things were going to cost; but certainly now we know what things are going to cost. Not many new implements of war are now being required, and the argument which has been presented by businessmen all over the country has been that the time has come, at long last, when they would like to be able to negotiate contracts and have them stand, without the uncertainty of the possibility of renegotiation afterwards. I think that, in the main, the time is past when the departments can haphazardly, because of some emergency, enter into a contract with the idea that they must have the material contracted for, no matter what the cost may be.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree in part with what the Senator says. Undoubtedly the experience of the last 2 years has resulted in a stabilization, to some extent, of methods and costs, but new contracts are still being made, with new contractors, and it may be that in some cases, due to improvements and changes in the mechanical devices, which are constantly being studied by a large group of men interested in improving an implement with which we are fighting the enemy, it may be just as important to get a particular article out in a hurry as it was originally to get out some tanks, which we are now producing in large quantities. Undoubtedly there has been a stabilization, but I would not call it a complete stabilization, to the point where we can abandon the theory altogether.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. We are off on a subject different from the one we were starting out to discuss.

Mr. BARKLEY. That frequently happens in the Senate, as the Senator knows.

Mr. BROOKS. As I understand, there is no desire on the part of any member of the Committee on Appropriations to limit the appropriations necessary for the War Department. As a matter of fact, it was suggested in the committee that if the Department wanted a separate subsection which would provide $10,000,000,000 for unforeseen emergencies, we would comply. The desire was, as I understand, to have some certainty now, and some limitation on the juggling of funds within the War Department itself, and as I understand, there was no desire to curtail in any matter that was necessary.

Mr. BARKLEY. It has not been my understanding that in the appropriation bills which have heretofore been enacted, where a definite amount was appropriated for airplanes, we will say, the War Department had the right to transfer the appropriation to some other item for some other purpose. As the Senator knows, there have been funds which the Secretary could allocate here and there.

Mr. BROOKS. Has he not still such a fund?

Mr. BARKLEY. He has a fund, but it is not so great as it was at the start. I have never understood, however, that when we earmarked an amount for any particular type of equipment, that earmarking could be ignored, and the money spent for something ese.

Mr. BROOKS. I wanted a point cleared up, if the Senator will yield further. I do not believe there is any desire on the part of the Committee on Appropriations to limit the amount of money which should be provided for the armed services. It is purely a matter of bookkeeping arrangement, and as I recall—and I shall be glad to have the acting chairman of the committee correct me if I am wrong—we started out to keep a hand on the Director of the Budget Bureau, to determine what is to be done with the money that goes to surpluses.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am completely sympathetic with any effort to economize and to reduce expenditures wherever possible. I do not feel that now, in the midst of the present situation, when we are on the verge of a supreme drive to win the war on all fronts, and as fast as possible, so that we cannot only quit spending money for war, but can get our men back to their homes, we should be too meticulous about making it impossible for the War and Navy Departments to spend money which they through their own efforts would be able to save, for the same purposes for which we appropriated originally.

Mr. BROOKS. I am in complete accord with the Senator's last statement.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am somewhat confused by the argument of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am really not making an argument; I am explaining my hesitation and embarrassment over the question of suspending the rule, because it would open the amendment to any sort of changes the Senate might see fit to put in the bill. That is the difficulty. I do not mean by that to reflect on the Senate, but we have already had a sample in one amendment which it is stated will be offered, and there may be others.

Mr. LANGER. What troubles me may be illustrated by the expenditures on the Alaskan Highway, for example. The Department has spent between $100,000,000 and $200,000,000 on that highway, which was built by the Bureau of Public Roads. They did a good job. Then, out of a clear sky, the War Department steps in, they throw out the Bureau of Public Roads, and say, "We are going to build a road from Haines to 40 miles north of Champaign." Congress was not consulted at all. They are building the road long after the Japs are out of the Aleutian Islands, when they have had every chance in the world to come back to Congress, when they could go to the Bureau of Public Roads, that could build the roads, and build them cheaper. It seems to me that after the Japs are out, as the Senator said a moment ago, there need be no haste in building the road.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not commented on that road.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator did yesterday.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I did not refer to the Alaskan Highway.

Mr. LANGER. Perhaps it was the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am somewhat familiar with the construction of the original Alaskan Highway, because the Senator from North Dakota offered a resolution to investigate the construction of that road, and the resolution went to the Committee on Foreign Relations, which considered it and held a hearing on the subject, and did not approve the Senator's attitude.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator is correct. There were two hearings on it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not sufficiently familiar with the details, or the progress which has been made in the construction of the second highway, to comment on it, and I shall not discuss something about which I do not know anything, if I can help it.

Mr. LANGER. But the Senator agrees with the general principle I have suggested?

Mr. BARKLEY. It would depend on whether we gave the Department a lump sum, out of which they had the right to make the expenditure. I do not recall that originally we appropriated any amount for the construction of the highway in Alaska, but out of a lump-sum appropriation for war purposes the Department did construct it. If they had authority to construct one, they probably had authority to construct the second one. I would not attempt to pass on the wisdom of the second construction because I have not looked into it. But I will say that if we had appropriated a hundred million dollars, let us say—that is a familiar figure, and it is one I can understand. When we go above that I get into the stratosphere—if we had appropriated a hundred million dollars with which to build a single highway to Alaska, and that highway was built for $75,000,000, I would doubt whether the Department would have had the authority to build another one with the $25,000,000 remaining, because we would have earmarked a certain amount for a single highway. But if we said, "For highways for military purposes, $100,000,000," merely giving the Department a blanket, lump-sum appropriation, or

blanket authority, I do not see any reason why under the law they could not build two roads as well as one, if they thought they were needed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, yesterday in the Senate the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] made a statement which appears in the final paragraphs of his argument in opposition to the committee amendment, on page 10473, as follows:

> Since the beginning of the war Congress has authorized the heads of certain departments to transfer funds from one appropriation to another within specific limitations in order that the departments may be in a position to meet emergencies and contingencies without the delay of reporting to Congress and securing appropriations on each occasion. The repeal of this authority would result in a definite handicap to the prosecution of the war.

That, Mr. President, seems to me the burden of the argument of the proponents of the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

In the concluding paragraph of his statement the junior Senator from Missouri made a statement relative to a recommendation by the chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] who is now in the Senate Chamber. I should like to ask him a question based on the following statement made by the Senator from Missouri yesterday:

> From a practical standpoint, this is not the time to abandon the existing procedure for establishing economies and savings to set up a new scheme. Rather, if anything need be done at this time, let us follow the recommendation of the Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures and strengthen the control now available.

I do not have before me the recommendation referred to. I suppose it is somewhere in the RECORD, and I have not seen it, but I should like to ask the junior Senator from Virginia if the recommendation which the junior Senator from Missouri mentions would strengthen the control if we adopted the committee amendment which has been presented by the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]? Would it strengthen government control, and should it be done through adoption of this amendment, or should we use the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Nebraska that I do not think the recommendation made by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is directly applicable to the proposal made by the Senator from Tennessee. It seems to me that there can be no question with respect to the first portion of the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee. I believe that when the funds are not needed by the Army and the Navy they should revert to the Treasury. I am in entire agreement with that.

I have some question in my mind with respect to the latter part of the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee, which provides that no funds appropriated can be impounded except by the direction of Congress. I think there are probably some construction appropriations which have been made, and perhaps it might be wise that those appropriations revert to the Treasury, especially in this emergency, and could be deferred by the action of the Bureau of the Budget, and that the Bureau of the Budget should have the authority in those cases, of actually making a reversion of the money into the Treasury.

So I do not think the recommendation the Senator referred to is entirely applicable to the proposal made by the Senator from Tennessee. Certainly it does not apply to that part relating to the unneeded balances of the Army and the Navy.

Mr. President, in that connection I wish to say that the Army and the Navy have on hand unexpended appropriated balances of approximately $180,000,000,000 as of this date.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. May I inquire if that sum includes the $30,000,000,000 allocated to lend-lease?

Mr. BYRD. Yes, I think all allocations in that category are included.

Mr. AIKEN. It includes the $30,000,000,000 allocated to lend-lease last summer and not spent?

Mr. BYRD. Yes, the balance of approximately $180,000,000,000 includes all the funds within that category.

Mr. President, no one is more anxious to provide every single dollar that is necessary for the prosecution of the war than the Senator from Virginia, but I do not think that the Army and the Navy should be permitted to have such great appropriated unexpended balances, because in that case the control of appropriations is practically removed from the authority of Congress. So I am in thorough accord with the first part of the proposal of the Senator from Tennessee. I have some reservations with respect to the second section relating to projects which it may be possible to defer in this emergency, but which could not be deferred if the sole power is designated in the agency to which the appropriation has been made. I hope the amendment will be modified in this respect.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, since the Senator's advice has been asked, and very appropriately asked, by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], I should like to ask him an additional question. Does not the Senator think that at this time the rule of the Senate should be suspended and the matter taken up as recommended by a mojority of the Appropriations Committee, and if there are any inequalities or objections to the proposal, amendments might be offered?

Mr. BYRD. I agree with the Senator from Tennessee. I shall vote to suspend the rule and take up the amendment.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I am happy to hear the Senator say that.

Mr. President, if no other Senator wishes to speak on the subject, I should like to have a vote on the pending question. I hope the rule will be suspended. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Revercomb
Andrews	Hawkes	Robertson
Austin	Hayden	Russell
Bailey	Hill	Scrugham
Bankhead	Holman	Shipstead
Barkley	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Lodge	Tobey
Byrd	Lucas	Truman
Capper	McCarran	Tunnell
Caraway	McClellan	Tydings
Chandler	McFarland	Vandenberg
Danaher	McKellar	Van Nuys
Davis	Maybank	Wagner
Eastland	Mead	Wallgren
Ferguson	Millikin	Walsh, Mass.
George	Moore	Walsh, N. J.
Gerry	Murray	Wherry
Gillette	O'Daniel	White
Green	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Guffey	Overton	Willis
Gurney	Reed	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI. On that question the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. NYE's name was called). I regret to announce that since the opening of the session the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] has been obliged to leave because of illness. It is anticipated that he will be absent for possibly a week or 10 days.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HOLMAN (after having voted in the affirmative). I have been reminded that I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. I have also been advised that if he were present he would vote as I have voted. I, therefore, permit my vote to stand.

Mr. REED (after having voted in the affirmative). I transfer my pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and let my vote stand.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] are detained in Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is detained on public business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is paired on this question with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is absent on public business. If present he would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], if present, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is necessarily absent. If present he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 10, as follows:

YEAS—62

Aiken	Gillette	Robertson
Andrews	Green	Russell
Bailey	Hawkes	Scrugham
Bankhead	Hayden	Shipstead
Bridges	Holman	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Langer	Tobey
Byrd	McCarran	Tydings
Capper	McClellan	Vandenberg
Caraway	McFarland	Van Nuys
Chandler	McKellar	Wallgren
Chavez	Mead	Walsh, Mass.
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Walsh, N. J.
Danaher	Moore	Wherry
Davis	O'Daniel	White
Eastland	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Ferguson	Overton	Willis
George	Reed	Wilson
Gerry	Revercomb	

NAYS—10

Austin	Hatch	Truman
Barkley	Lodge	Tunnell
Guffey	Lucas	
Gurney	Murray	

NOT VOTING—24

Ball	Ellender	Nye
Bilbo	Glass	Pepper
Bone	Hill	Radcliffe
Brewster	Kilgore	Reynolds
Burton	McNary	Stewart
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Taft
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Downey	Murdock	Wheeler

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI is agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert a new section reading as follows:

SEC. 305. No part of any funds appropriated for the War or Navy Department, when it is found by the head of such Department that any part of such funds is not necessary for the completion of the purpose for which appropriated, shall be used for any other purpose without the specific approval of law by the Congress; and, notwithstanding any other provision of law providing for transfer of any part of such funds, when it is found by the head of such Department that such funds are not to be used for the purposes for which appropriated, such appropriations to that extent shall be rescinded and canceled and the Secretary of such Department shall certify the amount so reduced, rescinded, and canceled to the Treasury Department, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the President of the Senate: *Provided*, That no appropriation or part of any appropriation heretofore, herein, or hereafter made available for any executive department or independent establishment to construct any particular project shall be impounded, or held as a reserve, or used for any other purpose, except by direction of the Congress, and any part of such appropriation not needed to complete such project, or the part thereof for which appropriation has been made, shall be retained by the Treasury: *Provided further*, That section 3 of the Military Appropriation Act, 1944, approved July 1, 1943, is hereby repealed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the clerk did not read the amendment on the side. That will have to be offered separately. I will offer that amendment now, or I will yield to the Senator from Massachusetts and let him offer that part of it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the pending amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, as I understand, the amendment read by the clerk, which was offered by the Senator from Tennessee, the acting chairman of the committee, was not read in full. In other words, there was an omission.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it was read as originally presented; but the amendment which the committee authorized this morning was not read. I ask the Presiding Officer if that part should have been read, or only the portion which was originally offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The part which was set out in the original notice should be read at this time.

Mr. McKELLAR. It should be read first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I offer, as an amendment to the amendment, the language, in part, offered by the Senator from Massachusetts this morning and adopted by the committee at its meeting. I ask that the amendment to the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Massachusetts withhold his amendment?

Mr. LODGE. I withhold my amendment. I presume that the amendment to which the Senator from Tennessee refers can be agreed to, and then my amendment will be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may the amendment which I have offered to the pending amendment be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 8, of the amendment, after the word "Senate", it is proposed to insert "except that the Secretary of War may transfer not to exceed 10 percent of any or all of the appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1944 to any other such appropriation, but no other appropriation shall be increased more than 10 percent thereby."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee to his amendment offered on behalf of the committee.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, as I heard the amendment read, it stated "10 per centum of any or all of the appropriations." Am I correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. So, if we should appropriate in one bill $71,000,000,000, let us say, for the War Department, 10 percent of that amount, which is, of course, $7,100,000,000, might be covered by this additional language.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will leave it to the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, no human being could answer the question definitely or accurately.

Mr. DANAHER. The question certainly can be answered if we do not put in the words "or all."

Mr. LODGE. No; because it is not clear from the language whether the 10 percent shall be computed on the amount existing before or after the surpluses are had.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, why in the name of heaven, are we trying to legislate by using language concerning which no human being in the world can make answer? I respectfully make that suggestion.

Mr. LODGE. That is one of the arguments for the amendment which I propose. I am proposing it in order to make the language clear.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. LODGE. If I have the floor, I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. As I heard the amendment read at the desk it stated further as follows:

But no other appropriation shall be increased more than 10 percent thereby.

Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LODGE. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Yesterday the language at that point was "2 percent."

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

Mr. LODGE. No; I believe the Senator is in error. Yesterday I was quite sure that I understood, perhaps erroneously, that if I should make a modification down to 2 percent all the rest of the language of my amendment would be acceptable. Consequently, in the interest of economy, and in order to reach a meeting of the minds, I accepted the suggestion. However, 10 percent was my original figure. I do not think it was too high.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have in my hand the language of the amendment which has been placed on our desks, intended to be proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts, and on page 2 in line 9 it states "2 percentum." That amendment was placed on our desks this morning, and I assume it was consequent upon what the Senator from Massachusetts suggested yesterday afternoon.

Mr. LODGE. It was consequent upon it, but I do not know anything about it. The language of my amendment is the language which I proposed, which I should like to have read. The modification of 2 percent was not authorized by me. I do not know how it occurred.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Will someone tell me whose idea it was to insert after the word "any" the words "or all"?

Mr. LODGE. That was my idea.

Mr. DANAHER. Then, what is the Senator trying to accomplish by it?

Mr. LODGE. I am trying to prevent the Senate from adopting language which will hamper the war effort, or prevent the War and Navy Departments from meeting a crisis in an emergency. In my judgment that is more important than any budgetary or fiscal reform, however desirable it may be.

Mr. DANAHER. What does the Senator think can be done by inclusion of the words "or all"?

Mr. LODGE. I think that under those words it would be possible to compute 10 percent of a total appropriation for some one item in the bill. But as I have told the Senator, I am not completely satisfied in my own mind as to what is the meaning of this amended language. That is why I am urging my own language. If I may have my own amendment considered, I should like once again to present the argument for what I am trying to accomplish. I am not the one to defend this particular language because it is not the language I wanted.

Mr. DANAHER. Even though the Senator from Massachusetts suggested it?

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; I did not suggest it.

Mr. DANAHER. Well, a while ago I asked whose idea it was. I understood the Senator from Massachusetts to say that it was his idea.

Mr. LODGE. The language "or all" is mine. I want the War Department to be in position to meet emergency situations which may arise. I do not like the first part of the language, and I was trying to improve it by an amendment so that the War Department would have as much discretion and authority as it is possible to give them. However, I am frank to say to the Senator from Connecticut that when that language is applied to the first part of the committee amendment it is very difficult to know precisely what it would accomplish. I always try to perfect an inferior proposal if I can do so.

Mr. DANAHER. Of course; and the Senator is perfectly right in doing so, and I commend him for it. I wish to thank the Senator from Massachusetts for having brought the matter along this far. At least we now know that if anyone accepts responsibility for inserting the two words to which I have referred it must be the committee. I will ask the acting chairman of the committee what he had in mind when inserting the two words "or all."

Mr. McKELLAR. They were not inserted by me, but were inserted this morning in a meeting of the committee, on a motion. I will ask the Senator from Louisiana, whom I believe suggested the insertion, to explain it.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator from Connecticut is a very able lawyer. If he can point out any difference between the phrase "not to exceed 10 percent of any of the appropriations" and the phrase "not to exceed 10 percent of any or all of the appropriations" I should be very glad to have him do so. There is no distinction whatever. If we should adopt the language "not to exceed 10 percent of any of the appropriations" it would embrace all the appropriations. Therefore the Senator from Massachusetts himself in the committee suggested "or all" and I stated I had no objection to the incorporation of the words "or all" because they do not change the meaning of the amendment as originally presented.

Mr. DANAHER. Allow me to ask the Senator another question. Suppose there are 10 items in a given appropriation bill, and that the accounts on 9 of them have been completely exhausted. It would follow, in view of the language which the Senator from Louisiana has said he suggested, that if the Secretary of War may transfer not exceeding 10 percent of any of the appropriations, the only item left on which the 10 percent clause may operate is the tenth item as yet not exhausted. Therefore, 10 percent of that item may be transferred. The Senator will agree to that statement, will he not?

Mr. OVERTON. Under either language the Secretary of War could take 10 percent of the total appropriation.

Mr. DANAHER. That brings us to the second question. Surely, if the answer to the first question is "Yes," it follows that if the tenth item should comprise only one-tenth of the total, the Secretary could still transfer 10 percent of the total, which would mean the entire amount represented by the tenth item.

Mr. OVERTON. With the limitation that he could not thereby increase the tenth item to which the Senator refers by more than 10 percent of the original appropriation. The language of the amendment is:

> But no other appropriation shall be increased more than 10 percent thereby.

Mr. DANAHER. What does the Senator hope to accomplish by inserting the words "or all"?

Mr. OVERTON. I do not hope to accomplish anything. To my mind the words do not add or detract. If we should insert the words "10 percent of any appropriation," it would be the same as if we insert the words "any or all of the appropriations."

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Louisiana. I will observe further while we are thinking about the answers which we have elicited, that if we approve 10 appropriations for the Military Establishment in a given year the authority to transfer 10 percent of any one of them is one thing. The authority to transfer 10 percent of all the appropriations is a very different thing. When we say transfer 10 percent of any or all appropriations for the Military Establishment for fiscal 1944, I respectfully suggest, Mr. President, that we go far beyond the limitations of the original appropriation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, of course, what the provision does is merely to establish a revolving fund of 10 percent of the total of unexpended appropriations of the War Department, and let the Director of the Budget expend the funds as he pleases.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; the Director of the Budget is left out entirely.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator from Missouri thinks it goes further than I thought it went.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. They are to be allowed to use 10 percent as a revolving fund to do with as they please; in other words, it is a question of marching up the hill and marching down the hill again. If we adopt this amendment, we completely nullify and eliminate the original amendment.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Congress establish as the basis 10 items of appropriation there would not be any left. Ten items would be all the items that would be eligible to take a part of the residue. There could be transferred under the amendment of my friend from Massachusetts not more than 10 percent, but in the case supposed by my friend from Connecticut there would only be 10 percent, for everything else would be gone.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator from Kentucky may be right in his mathematics; I will not pass judgment on that particular question. I will simply point out to him that 10 percent of the State of Connecticut is one area and 10 percent of the whole United States is a very different area; and 10 percent of one appropriation is a very small amount, but 10 percent of all appropriations is a very vast sum. It means that much to me.

Mr. CHANDLER. But in the case supposed by my friend there was only 10 percent left. That was on the tenth item, and there would not be any eleventh item if Congress only authorizes 10 items. Under this, no appropriation could be made to an unauthorized agency, but the money would be subject to the provisions of this amendment, and could be transferred among existing items not in excess of 10 percent.

I wish the Senator had heard the Senator from Massachusetts this morning. I do not think the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy are under any duty to tell Congress when they have money left, but they have established the policy of making known to Congress that in one instance they have $13,000,000,000 unexpended. We may create a situation where they will have it, and will not tell us, then they will use it, and there will be nothing we can do about it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say, Mr. President, that if there is not any legal obligation to tell us, there ought to be, and this act ought to be amended to require them to report to Congress at regular intervals.

Mr. LODGE. That is just what my amendment does.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts will accomplish that purpose.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But there is also established a revolving fund, and they will have 10 percent to use as they please.

Mr. LODGE. That is true.

Mr. CHANDLER. But no agency that has not been heretofore authorized by Congress is the subject of a transfer.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, would it not clarify the situation if my amendment was read at the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all down to the word "Provided" on page 2, line 8 of Mr. McKELLAR'S amendment, and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 305. No part of any funds appropriated for the War or Navy Department, when it is found by the head of such Department that any part of such funds is not necessary for the general purposes for which appropriated for the prosecution of the war, shall be impounded or held as a reserve, except by the head of the Department concerned who shall report such action to the chariman of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, or used for any other purpose without the specific approval of law by the Congress; except that the Secretary of War may transfer not to exceed 10 percent of any of the appropriations for the military establishment for the fiscal year 1944 to any other such appropriation, but no other appropriation shall be increased more than 10 percent thereby.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I do not understand the parliamentary situation, and would like to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the clerk merely read the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts. The pending question is on the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee to his original amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Tennessee a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. BRIDGES. The committee amendment which the Senator has reported, I understand he has reported as a result of his duty as acting chairman of the committee, not because he believes in it, but because that is his duty to perform.

Mr. McKELLAR. The committee decided that way this morning.

Mr. BRIDGES. And the Senator is performing his duty as acting chairman.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is all I am doing.

Mr. BRIDGES. If the amendment is adopted, it means that on a $71,000,000,000 War Department appropriation bill they can play around with over seven thousand million dollars.

Mr. McKELLAR. I would not like to say "play around," because I hope the Government departments do not do that, but it would mean a revolving fund of $7,000,000,000, or about that, of the entire appropriation.

Mr. BRIDGES. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. BRIDGES. In that case, if any department, regardless of what it is, has the power to transfer at will $7,000,000,000, we might as well have no Appropriations Committee hearings.

Mr. McKELLAR. The committee directed me this morning to report the amendment, and I have done it, and I submit it to the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. If I have the floor, I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want to ask the Senator from Tennessee a question. I do not care three hoots about the formal action of the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee; but I have very great respect for the opinion of the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee.

I voted to suspend the rule a while ago in order to consider the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee in his own right and also on behalf of the committee. Now I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee—and I think the Senate is entitled to know—does the Senator from Tennessee himself believe in this thing or not, irrespective of the action of the Appropriations Committee. I think we are entitled to know that.

Mr. McKELLAR. The committee reported an amendment last Friday and also directed me to give notice in writing of a motion to suspend the rule for what I thought was the correct amendment to be adopted. I approved that fully then, and I approve it fully now. But this morning in an effort to get together the amendment was adopted by a majority of 9 to 6; the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] was voted down, as well as the previous amendment, and the one submitted was approved by a majority vote.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am still not so much interested in the formal action of the Appropriations Committee as I am in the opinion of that splendid expert on these matters, the Senator from Tennessee. I asked the Chief of Staff of the Army at one time a very pertinent question when I was a member of the Military Affairs Committee. He said the opinion of the General Staff of the Army is so and so. I said to him, "I do not care three hoots about the opinion of the General Staff of the Army, because I know that on a controverted matter the opinion of the General Staff of the Army is the opinion of the Commander in Chief. I have great respect for the opinion as an expert of Gen. Malin Craig, under whom I once served. Do you think so and so?" He banged his big fist on the table and said, "You know damn well I don't." [Laughter.] I am asking the Senator from Tennessee not what the vote of the Appropriations Committee was, but what is his own expert opinion for which I have great respect.

Mr. McKELLAR. My own expert opinion is not worth a hang.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say, Mr. President, that a good many of us if we had had any idea that this amendment on which we are to vote to suspend the rule was to be tied down to such a nefarious scheme as a $7,000,000,000 revolving fund, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, in his discretion, in my opinion the motion to suspend the rule would not have carried; it certainly would not have had my vote.

Mr. McKELLAR. I may say to the Senator from Missouri and all other Senators that my opinion is that what ought to go into this law is represented by the amendment the committee reported last Friday and is now reporting.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is the amendment on which the Senate voted by a very substantial majority of 6 to 1, I think, to suspend the rule.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think so and I hope so. Therefore, in reporting the amendment, I am merely acting in obedience to the action of the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, I understand the Senator from Tennessee has to act in a ministerial capacity, in view of his chairmanship.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am attempting to ascertain the opinion of the Senator from Tennessee, and I think it is sufficiently disclosed by this conversation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have given it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, my amendment which has just been read at the desk does not provide for a $7,000,000,000 revolving fund. It provides that the Secretary of War may transfer 10

percent from any one of the appropriations to any other appropriation, provided it does not exceed 10 percent of the appropriation.

I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Missouri, because I think I can respond to two observations he has made which struck me as being very good. My amendment does not bring in the Budget Bureau. It requires a report to the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations. It does not provide for a $7,000,000,000 revolving fund. It gives the department a 10 percent leeway on each appropriation, gives them a right to transfer 10 percent from one appropriation to another, provided that in turn does not bring the other appropriation above a 10-percent increase. That would be the effect of my amendment. I believe it is much more in the interest of economy, and I am convinced that it is much more in the interest of efficient military operation.

The moment there is an effort to get away from the thought I have tried to convey, there develops immediately such a situation that we are driven into a large revolving fund, because every Senator must admit that the War Department has to have some leeway to meet unexpected situations. If we do not give them the right to go back and dip into previously authorized appropriations, in which there may have been a surplus two months ago, but in which a need might develop two months from now, if we insist on canceling the appropriations in which there is a surplus, then the only other alternative is to set up a huge revolving fund. So in my opinion the amendment I have offered is much more in the interest of true economy and a realistic and sensible procedure.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I sat through the hearings on the last appropriation bill for the War Department. As chairman of the subcommittee we have the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. He was very painstaking and very thorough. He knows the situation, and I should like to ask the Senator, with his permission, whether or not the committee amendment, and substantially the Lodge amendment, are not covered now in the present law?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, this particular matter was given extensive consideration and considerable attention in connection with the last military appropriation bill. It has been gone into in connection with every appropriation bill since I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

After full consideration of the matter, the law from year to year has carried a provision giving power to the Department to transfer funds, and I now ask unanimous consent that there be read from the desk section 3 of the present appropriation law, the one passed last year for the present fiscal year. It provides for not to exceed 10 percent, the same provision exactly. The amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts is substantially the same as the provision of the present law. It continues the present law in existence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Not to exceed 10 percent of any of the appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1944 may be transferred with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to any other of such appropriations, but no appropriations or subappropriation, except the subappropriations "Claims for damages to and loss of private property, Army" and "Claims of officers, enlisted men, and nurses of the Army for destruction of private property," shall be increased more than 10 percent thereby: *Provided*, That as to the appropriation "Engineer service, Army," not to exceed 12½ percent may be transferred from the subhead "Military posts" to the subhead "Barracks and quarters, Army."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I shall make one further statement, Mr. President. The Lodge amendment is to the same purpose and effect as the present law, save in one particular. Under the present law the Department can transfer 12½ percent to the Corps of Engineers. Under the Lodge amendment that could not be done in excess of 10 percent. So the Lodge amendment reduces the possibility 2½ percent, but the principle and effect are the same as in the present law.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Section 3, which has been read, is the same section, is it not, referred to in the last proviso of the proposal now before the Senate, namely—

Provided further, That section 3 of the Military Appropriation Act, 1944, approved July 1, 1943, is hereby repealed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It was the intent of the amendment to repeal that section, and not have two sections on the statute books on the same subject which might be in the least contradictory.

Mr. AUSTIN. So that the law which has just been read would not be in effect if the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee should be agreed to?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The amendment now pending, if agreed to, would repeal section 3 of the existing law, but the same law would be in effect, save in one particular, reducing 12½ percent down to 10 percent in the instance to which I have referred.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Oklahoma that if the Senate had desired to continue the present law it would not have been necessary to suspend the rule, by a vote of 6 to 1, to make in order an amendment to change the present law. The very purpose of the motion to suspend the rule was that we might change the present law, and it is no argument, so far as I am concerned, to say that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts is to restore the present law. That is precisely what we are trying to do, through the very unusual course of saving some money in an appropriation bill by suspending the rule for that purpose, so as to make in order the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I know the Senator from Oklahoma was referring to one portion of my amendment when he said it did not change the present law. It must be obvious to anyone who reads my amendment that it changes the present law very materially insofar as the provision that is made for the handling of the surpluses is concerned. So when the statement is made that it does not change the present law, that applies only insofar as the 10-percent leeway is concerned.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is what I had reference to, which was the point in controversy. Of course, the section is all-embrasive; it includes many things. We have oftentimes found that in submitting estimates the War Department is not clear as to the purpose for which money is requested. Last year we found requests for money which were marked "secret." We asked for explanations as to why funds were needed, and the answers which were given were off the record, and some of our questions could not be answered because it was feared that the disclosure of the information would not be for the best interests of the war effort.

For example, the last bill carried funds for the completion of drilling for oil in Canada, it carried funds for the construction of a 600-mile pipe line from the oil wells in Canada to White Horse, Alaska, and it carried funds for the completion of a refinery at White Horse, for the purpose of providing oil for our planes in Alaska, and for our ships which might be sailing from the Alaskan coast.

When we came to that item we found that it was marked "secret," and, of course, we could not go into it, and no effort was made to do so until after the expenditures had been made. I am doubtful if the committee would have recommended that item had it been fully advised.

The pending amendment, as I understand it, is to eliminate the possibility of future amendments of that kind, and of future appropriations of that kind. It is now obvious and evident, from the hearings we have held, that the War Department is spending large sums of money, in the conduct of the war, for emergencies which cannot be foreseen. I might say that recently a request was made for a large sum of money for the purchase of locomotives and railroad equipment for a foreign government which is now actively engaged in the war. That could not have been foreseen, and unless the War Department had funds with which to furnish the locomotives and the railroad equipment, of course they could not be furnished. It was held to be in the best interests of the

war effort that the locomotives and railroad equipment should be provided.

In order to provide funds to supply that equipment the War Department had to search and find where savings have been made, and, as I understand, the Department found where savings have been made, and the money from those savings was applied to that purpose, and the equipment either has been furnished or is being furnished.

Of course, in the conduct of the war we cannot tell where it may be necessary to build a small landing field, or where it may be necessary to spend a sum of money, large or small. So, there must be in the Department somewhere a reserve fund, or a liberal provision of the law, under which the Department can secure funds to do the things which are necessary to be done. It is obvious that the Department cannot come to the Congress directly. Before the Department can come to Congress it must go to the Bureau of the Budget, which makes recommendations to the Congress. It is obvious that the Department cannot go to the Bureau of the Budget, and then obtain money on the Bureau's recommendation from Congress, with which to do something which is needed to be done on the fighting front.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have read, printed, and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read, as requested.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided further, That a fund not to exceed $5,000,000,000 be created from the funds already appropriated but not expended, from which the Secretary of War during a recess of the Congress and with the approval of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives may use in part, or entirely, for emergencies or unforeseen contingencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Oregon will lie on the table, and be printed.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At the present time the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations to the amendment proposed by him, is pending.

Mr. LODGE. That is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. LODGE. And that is the amendment which inserts the words "except that the Secretary of War may transfer not to exceed 10 percent of any or all of the appropriations"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, that amendment was adopted by the committee this morning. It represents an attempt to make the committee language workable. Without some exception of this kind such a situation could develop as to cause a stoppage of our military effort due to inability to obtain funds.

I do not regard the method of simply adopting this amendment as the ideal solution. I shall vote for it without a great deal of enthusiasm because without something of this kind the whole committee proposal might have a very deleterious effect on the war. Of course, if appropriations are to be canceled, as the Committee on Appropriations seeks to do, we must have a large revolving fund. I prefer to have the more economical approach of not canceling appropriations, and of not having the large revolving fund. I propose to vote to adopt this amendment because without it the committee amendment is in my opinion impractical. But I should like to make it clear that I believe that my amendment, which is next in order, which strikes out the language which would provide for cancelation, and which does not provide for a large revolving fund, is the better way of doing it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the fact that the illustration used by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] as a justification for the proposed discretion in the War Department seems to me to be the most conclusive argument I know of against granting such discretion. The Senator referred to the expenditure for oil wells in Canada and the building of a refinery at Whitehorse, which has been denominated by the Truman committee, after full investigation, as an absolute squandering of over $100,000,000 of public funds.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I intended to leave the impression that I condemn that appropriation and the use of those funds. Then I gave a second illustration of where in the prosecution of war it is found necessary to have $150,000,000 for furnishing of railway equipment for use by a foreign government actively engaged in fighting the war on our side. I think that is a proper thing to do. I approve of that. But I disapprove of the expenditure of money for development of oil fields in Canada.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the point is that for 4 years Congress has been in continuous session, with the exception of a comparatively few weeks last summer. When the departments need money they can come to Congress, and if the requested appropriation is an emergency appropriation, they can obtain it almost instanter.

What I am opposed to and what, in my opinion, the Senator from Oklahoma is opposed to, is permitting the War Department, or the Navy Department, or any other department to build up huge balances of unexpended appropriations and to permit them to spend the money as they please for some purposes not contemplated by Congress at all, and Congress powerless to do anything about it.

It has been developed before the Truman committee, with respect to this Canadian oil deal, that that money was expended at the whim of one distinguished general in the Army, because his old commanding officer wrote a one-page memorandum recommending the production of oil in Canada, but the Truman committee, after full and frank investigation holds that the project has resulted in squandering in excess of $100,000,000 of the public money. In view of such presentation of fact as that, I assert that the War Department and the Navy Department ought not to be put in possession of huge unexpended balances to play with at the whim of some distinguished general. If they have a bona fide deficiency and bona fide purpose which the Congress would approve they can come before the committees of Congress which are in almost continuous session, and obtain the appropriations almost instanter. To accomplish the purpose of supplying the necessary sinews of war, it is not necessary to overappropriate, as we have done, and this whole controversy comes up because Congress did overappropriate in lump sums without looking at the items, without requiring the specifications and purposes for which the money was to be spent. We have overappropriated, and having overappropriated, in order to recover the huge unexpended balances which were not needed, it is now necessary to pass extraordinary and special legislation. The very illustration used here to my mind emphasizes why these departments ought not to be entrusted with such tremendous balances, so that any general, at any time he happens to want to favor a friend, can write a memorandum and commit the United States to the expenditure of $150,000,000.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I want to ask the Senator what is his understanding of this "10 percent of any or all." As I understand, "10 percent of any" means 10 percent of any one appropriation, but "10 percent of all" means 10 percent of the aggregate of all appropriations.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. My understanding of that, Mr. President, is that that would be a "kitty" taken out from the total of all military appropriations with which the War Department could do as it pleased, within the 10-percent limitation.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I am just as anxious as is any other Senator to save the public money. I am anxious that we shall never appropriate more money than is necessary to do the job at hand. I was once Governor of my State, and I received all the opprobrium, scorn, and

contempt that a budget-balancing Governor could earn, but I always had my books balanced at the end of the year, never spent more than I took in, and never believed that one could be prosperous who continued such a practice for any length of time. But I am tremendously interested in seeing to it that the Army and the Navy shall have sufficient money to do even unforeseen things in order to meet an emergency.

The Senator from Massachusetts earlier today suggested that during the summer we were in recess for 2 months. I do not know what the Army or the Navy would have done if in a given situation they had been required to obtain money immediately in order to do an important job. They certainly would have been obliged to wait.

As I understand the amendment, it gives the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy the right to transfer not in excess of 10 percent to an agency, the subject of an appropriation which has been authorized by Congress, and in a case such as suggested by my friend the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], where all the money in nine appropriations has been spent, and there was only 10 percent left in one appropriation, then he could not make an eleventh appropriation, but he could give a little to all the other nine, not exceeding 10 percent, or he could give all the 10 percent in the one that was left to one of the other nine. If I understand it correctly——

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, that is correct. It would not set up a $7,000,000,000 pool at all.

Mr. CHANDLER. Not at all.

Mr. LODGE. My amendment, I should say, is not the pending amendment. I desire to make that clear.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Both the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Massachusetts are talking about the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts to the committee amendment.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am talking about the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the pending amendment is one which was reported favorably by the committee. I did not vote for it in committee; I did not vote against it; because I do not approve of the proposed method of handling such matters.

However, the pending amendment would make the committee language workable insofar as not having a stoppage of military activities is concerned. Unless we add something of the sort, the way the matter stands now, the appropriations will be automatically canceled, and until an agency of Government made application to Congress, it could not obtain more money.

Mr. CHANDLER. For example, Mr. President, if we had in one appropriation provision for the War Department to buy 100,000 airplanes, and if thereafter it suddenly developed that they needed 125,000 airplanes, but all the money for airplanes had been used, yet if in another fund they had money with which to buy .30-caliber ammunition or tanks, if the amendment was not agreed to, they could not transfer that money from the tank fund or the ammunition fund to the airplane fund. In that event, if Congress were not in session for 2 months, as was the case during the past summer, they could not get the airplanes, because they would have to wait until they could come to Congress and make application for money for them.

I do not agree that that should be done. I do not want to stop the war effort in any degree or any particular at all. I do not want to handicap it or to cause the military authorities to be unable to use a full effort because of some delay in Congress. Ten percent is not very much with which to meet contingencies, but it would give the military authorities enough money so that they could piece out between appropriations. For that reason, I intend to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts to the committee amendment.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I simply desire to say that I think this argument amply demonstrates the fact that legislation on an appropriation bill only causes argument, and usually gets nowhere. I also desire to say that my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] made a correct statement about the Canol project. I shall present very shortly a report on the Canol project, which is only one instance of the waste of $100,000,000 by arbitrary use on the say-so of certain individuals in the Army set-up.

I think the objective intended to be reached is a laudable one, and one we all desire to reach, but it is one which should be very carefully considered by one of the legislative committees of the Senate. The objective we want to reach can then be reached without hindering the war effort and without hamstringing some of the boards and bureaus of the Government which ought not to be hamstrung. There are more Canol projects, and very soon we shall tell the Senate about them.

I had hoped that the rule would not be suspended, and that the proposed legislative action on the pending appropriation bill would not be necessary. The Senate saw fit to do otherwise, and that is perfectly all right with me. But if we are going to legislate in this way, we shall continue to have difficulties over which we have no control.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I should like to say a further word before the vote comes on the 10-percent proposal. It must be remembered that last year the military appropriations bill came to the Senate only a few days before the end of the fiscal year, which is the 30th of June. Had the bill not been passed before that time, there would have been a period between the 30th of June and the time when the bill would have become effective. The Congress always desires to pass the bills within the prescribed time, so the Senate Committee on Appropriations reported the bill carrying $71,500,000,000.

If we stop to think a moment, we must conclude that it is impossible for any person to understand in detail the purposes for which $70,000,000,000 are requested. The committee must take some things on faith.

The record shows that at one time the War Department, in planning the conduct of the war, had an ambitious program for the building of passenger-carrying gliders. A sizable sum was appropriated for the building of glider planes. However, later on it was decided that in the opinion of the high command such program was not necessary, and the money appropriated for the building of glider planes was not used. Thereupon, the money became a surplus fund.

The last military appropriation bill carried a sizable sum for the construction of tanks. At the present time, so I am advised, the demand for tanks is not so acute, and the tank-production program has been curtailed. So there is a large saving in the funds heretofore appropriated for the building of tanks. The money is still available, but is now a surplus fund.

Since the last appropriation bill was passed, it has been found that landing craft are in great demand. When our armed forces come to invade foreign lands, means to get our soldiers to the land must be available. There must be some way to get our soldiers from the ships to the land, and oftentimes there is no convenient harbor. The ship goes as close to the land as it can, and then the soldiers must get across the strip of water between the ship and the land. That makes necessary at this time an increased number of landing craft, and now the steel mills are being urged to speed up production so that the factories can obtain the steel with which to make the landing boats in which the soldiers, the tanks, the jeeps, and whatever is needed can be taken from the ships, over to the sand bars, to where the soldiers can get on the land.

That development was an unforeseen one. It is impossible for anyone to know now what will be in demand 30 days from now. In fact, we do not know exactly where the war will be 30 days from now. Certainly it will not be where it is today.

So, Mr. President, obviously it is necessary for the Senate to provide a flexible provision of law so that the War Department can have the things which are necessary, and can have them now, without having to go to the Bureau of the Budget to get an estimate, and then come to the House and Senate committees, and finally have the money appropriated. Such a procedure is not thinkable, in my opinion, in the conduct of a war. In peacetimes we could have plenty of time to consider such items. In peacetimes we can appropriate with definiteness. That cannot be done in wartimes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee, on page 2, line 8, after the word "Senate," to insert certain language.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Gillette	Overton
Austin	Green	Reed
Bailey	Guffey	Revercomb
Ball	Gurney	Robertson
Bankhead	Hatch	Russell
Barkley	Hawkes	Scrugham
Bridges	Hayden	Shipstead
Brooks	Hill	Smith
Buck	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Butler	La Follette	Tobey
Byrd	Langer	Truman
Capper	Lodge	Tunnell
Caraway	Lucas	Tydings
Chandler	McCarran	Vandenberg
Chavez	McClellan	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Walsh, Mass.
Danaher	Maybank	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Mead	Wherry
Downey	Millikin	White
Eastland	Moore	Wiley
Ellender	Murdock	Willis
Ferguson	Murray	
George	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, this is an amendment to set up a $7,000,000,000 revolving fund, which is made necessary by the language of the McKellar amendment, because it automatically provides for the cancelation of every appropriation as soon as a surplus develops. I believe the whole procedure is wrong. I think it is wrong to cancel surplus appropriations in January when we may have need for them in August, and I think it is wrong to set up a $7,000,000,000 revolving fund.

My amendment, which I shall offer as soon as this one is disposed of, provides that surpluses shall be impounded, and may be used later for the purposes for which they were originally appropriated, and provides a leeway of only 10 percent within each appropriation.

I shall vote against the pending amendment, and hope to offer my amendment when the pending amendment shall have been disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee to the amendment offered by him on behalf of the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, is this vote on the committee amendment to the McKellar amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I am not clear just what the question is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Last Friday the Senator from Tennessee gave notice that he would move to suspend the rule today, to enable him to offer a certain amendment. The rule has been suspended. That amendment is now open to amendment, and the committee has submitted an amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Tennessee. That is the question at this time.

Mr. AUSTIN. Is that the amendment to insert certain language in line 8 on page 2 of the McKellar amendment? Is that the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. I understand that if he were present he would vote as I will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. NYE's name was called). I repeat the announcement made earlier in the day, that the Senator from North Dakota is absent because of illness. It is anticipated that he will be absent for possibly a week or 10 days.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have a pair with with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who is detained downtown on most important business. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] are detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is detained on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] are detained in Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is necessarily detained, and is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—28

Austin	Holman	Russell
Barkley	Lucas	Scrugham
Caraway	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	Mead	Truman
Ellender	Murray	Tunnell
Green	O'Daniel	Van Nuys
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Wallgren
Hatch	Overton	
Hayden	Radcliffe	

NAYS—42

Aiken	Ferguson	Revercomb
Ball	George	Robertson
Bridges	Gerry	Shipstead
Brooks	Gillette	Smith
Buck	Gurney	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Hawkes	Tobey
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Tydings
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Vandenberg
Capper	La Follette	Walsh, Mass
Chandler	Langer	Walsh, N. J.
Clark, Idaho	Lodge	Wherry
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	White
Danaher	Millikin	Wiley
Davis	Moore	Willis

NOT VOTING—26

Andrews	Glass	Pepper
Bailey	Hill	Reed
Bankhead	Kilgore	Reynolds
Bilbo	McKellar	Stewart
Bone	McNary	Taft
Brewster	Maloney	Wagner
Burton	Maybank	Wheeler
Connally	Murdock	Wilson
Downey	Nye	

So the committee amendment to Mr. MCKELLAR's amendment was rejected.

Mr. TYDINGS subsequently said: Mr. President, on the vote just preceding the last vote, on the committee amendment to the McKellar amendment, I happened to come into the Chamber very late, as my colleague and I had been meeting with a delegation from Maryland, and at the time I came in the roll call was nearly completed. So I did not have a chance to familiarize myself with the amendment. Had I been familiar with the amendment I should have voted "nay" instead of "yea." I, therefore, ask unanimous consent, inasmuch as the result will not be affected, to change my vote on that roll call from "yea" to "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITE subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to say a brief word about the unanimous-consent request preferred by the Senator from Maryland just a few moments ago, and which the Senate agreed to.

I think that the changing of a vote after the result has been declared is not in accordance with the rules of the Senate. I did not object because my attention was diverted, but I think I should say that we are guilty of committing very

serious breach of our rules, and establishing a precedent which I think is altogether unfortunate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Before asking consent, I conferred with the parliamentarian, and he said the request was in order. The alternative would have been to move for a reconsideration of the vote. In that case I would have delayed the Senate unduly. Inasmuch as one vote one way or the other would not change the result, I took the least cumbersome course to accomplish the desired result. I realize that what the Senator says is, generally speaking, sound, but if he had objected, I would have been forced to move a reconsideration of the vote in order to make my position plain.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if the views of the parliamentarian as announced by the Senator from Maryland are correct, and I have no doubt of their correctness, then I am in error. I had assumed, however, that after a vote had been cast and after the announcement of the result had been made, it was not in order to change the vote. I merely wanted to file a caveat, so to speak, against further occurrences of the sort.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think that, even if such action is permissible, it is something to be used rarely. But the Senate can do anything by unanimous consent, and it was only because I did not want to delay the Senate by moving a reconsideration that I took the course I followed.

Mr. WHITE. Passing by the question whether the Senate can do anything by unanimous consent, there are certainly some things the Senate should not do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the benefit of the Senator from Maine, the Chair will read a part of paragraph 1 of rule XII, which states:

> No Senator shall be permitted to vote after the decision shall have been announced by the Presiding Officer, but may for sufficient reasons, with unanimous consent, change or withdraw his vote.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I now offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all down to the word "provided," on page 2, line 8, of the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and to insert:

> SEC. 305. No part of any funds appropriated for the War or Navy Department, when it is found by the head of such Department that any part of such funds is not necessary for the general purposes for which appropriated for the prosecution of the war, shall be impounded or held as a reserve, except by the head of the department concerned who shall report such action to the chairmen of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, or used for any other purpose without the specific approval of law by Congress; except that the Secretary of War may transfer not to exceed 10 percent of any of the appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1944 to any other such appropriation, but no other appropriation shall be increased more than 10 percent thereby.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. On page 2, the Senator qualifies the language as applying only to the Secretary of War. In the first part of the amendment he speaks of both the War and Navy Departments. Am I correct?

Mr. LODGE. We were advised that the Secretary of the Navy did not require the provision to apply to his Department.

Mr. President, allow me to describe what the situation will be if we do nothing further. We have provided that as soon as a surplus occurs in any category the amount of the surplus shall be canceled immediately so that it shall be no longer available. We have stricken out the provision in the present law which permits the Director of the Budget to authorize an increase of 10 percent in a specific appropriation.

So the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy will either certify the surpluses and have them canceled immediately, leaving him unable to meet any emergency or any crises, or he will feel it to be his duty to spend up to the full amount for which appropriations have been made so that he will not be in a position to turn back a surplus, and will be unable to meet an emergency. That is a situation which will exist if we leave the McKellar amendment as it now stands.

My amendment is very simple. It provides that if a surplus develops in any particular activity of the War Department, such surplus shall be impounded by the Secretary of War, and that it can be expended thereafter only for purposes for which it was originally appropriated. In other words, in the case of an appropriation for ordnance, if, in January, for example, the War Department decides that it has more .30 caliber ammunition than it will use, the fund will be impounded. Then, during the following August if our armies are besieging mountainous territory and the War Department determines that it needs many more of the 105's, they can then take that money and spend it for 105's, but it must be spent for ordnance. It is provided in the amendment that the amount may be varied up to 10 percent.

Mr. President, that is the proposition in a nutshell. I cannot believe that the Senate will agree to the McKellar amendment in its present form. To do so would be in effect to say that the winning of the war is of so little concern to us that we are willing to create a situation in which the War Department would be unable to meet a crisis or an emergency.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Does the amendment being proposed by the Senator have the approval of the War Department?

Mr. LODGE. Well, I may say that it does.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Do I understand correctly that the amendment would apply to the War Department but not to the Navy Department?

Mr. LODGE. I believe it would apply to the Navy Department so far as surpluses are concerned.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In view of the Senator's answer a few minutes ago to the question of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] why is not the Secretary of the Navy included?

Mr. LODGE. We were advised in the committee that he was not desirous of being included.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Is it not true, may I interpolate, that the same situation with respect to the needs in prosecuting the war might arise in the Navy as well as in the Army?

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection to including the Navy. After the amendment is adopted, if the Senator wishes to move to amend it by inserting "the Secretary of the Navy," it will be agreeable to me.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Why does not the Navy Department desire the language of the Senator's amendment to apply to it as well as to the War Department?

Mr. LODGE. The Navy Department desires it insofar as the accumulation of surpluses is concerned, but I am told that the Navy Department does not particularly desire it so far as the 10-percent clause is concerned.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. It is my information that he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHITE. I repeat the announcement made earlier today that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] is absent because of illness.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] are detained in Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Florida [Mr.

PEPPER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] is detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is detained on public business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have a general pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. He is necessarily detained.

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—19

Austin	Danaher	O'Daniel
Ball	Eastland	Tunnell
Barkley	Gurney	Vandenberg
Brooks	Hill	Walsh, Mass.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Walsh, N. J.
Chandler	Lodge	
Clark, Idaho	Murray	

NAYS—55

Aiken	Hatch	Robertson
Andrews	Hawkes	Russell
Bailey	Hayden	Scrugham
Bridges	Holman	Shipstead
Bushfield	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McCarran	Tobey
Chavez	McClellan	Truman
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Tydings
Davis	McKellar	Van Nuys
Ellender	Maybank	Wallgren
Ferguson	Millikin	Wherry
George	Moore	White
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Gillette	Overton	Willis
Green	Radcliffe	
Guffey	Revercomb	

NOT VOTING—22

Bankhead	Kilgore	Reynolds
Bilbo	McNary	Stewart
Bone	Maloney	Taft
Brewster	Mead	Wagner
Burton	Murdock	Wheeler
Connally	Nye	Wilson
Downey	Pepper	
Glass	Reed	

So Mr. LODGE's amendment to Mr. MCKELLAR's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] on behalf of the committee.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, before the vote is taken on the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee I should like to say that if we adopt it as it now stands, we will take the greatest step toward extravagance that I have seen taken in one day since I have been here, because all the War Department or the Navy Department will have to do to avoid the intent of this language is not to find a surplus, and we know how easy it is not to find a surplus; it does not take much effort to do it. The second part of this language, of course, has nothing to do with economy. It is a commendable effort to reassert the power of Congress, but it requires expenditures. So I merely want the RECORD to show that, so far as I am concerned, I do not regard the committee amendment as it now stands as a step toward economy. On the contrary, it is a very definite step toward extravagance in the expenditure of public funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent executive agencies—Civil Service Commission," on page 10, after line 15, to strike out:

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, fiscal year 1944, including the objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1944, $683,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 19, to strike out:

Printing and binding: For an additional amount for printing and binding, Civil Service Commission, fiscal year 1944, $26,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Employees' Compensation Commission," on page 11, line 9, after the numerals "1944", to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$3,700,000"; and in line 12, after "(42 U. S. C. 1701)," to insert "as amended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Security Agency—Office of the Administrator," on page 12, line 7, after the word "January", to strike out "1" and insert "2"; in line 11, after the name "National Youth Administration" to strike out "the unexpended balances of the appropriations made to the National Youth Administration for the purposes of liquidation in the War Manpower Commission Appropriation Act, 1944, and the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943, are hereby continued available until June 30, 1944, for payment of all such obligations incurred prior to January 1, 1944."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 1, before the word *"Provided"* and the colon, to insert "fiscal year 1944, $300,000", and in line 3, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "$5,600 a year" and insert "the rates applicable to classification grade CAF–13 or the equivalent."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I should like to propound a question to the able Senator from Tennessee with respect to the change to $300,000, dealing with the liquidation of the National Youth Administration.

Congress has put an end to the National Youth Administration. If I recall correctly, in the last appropriation bill we appropriated some $3,000,000 to enable them to wind up their affairs. Is not that correct?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I do not remember the exact amount, but a considerable sum was appropriated. If the Senator will notice the recommendation which came from the Budget, it was to appropriate the unexpended balances of appropriations to wind up the Youth Administration, and they agreed to wind up their affairs by the 1st of June. The Senator will recall that I was the author of the movement to repeal the National Youth Administration law. I am very much interested in that matter, and I regret greatly that they have not finally finished winding it up.

The amount stated in the amendment was recommended after direct agreement on the part of those who are in charge of the Administration that there would not be any further requests in this regard, but they said they could save some money by going on with it, and finishing by the 1st of July. This is the last word, they said, and our committee told them they had to close this activity by the first day of July.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What is the remaining amount, as compared with $300,000?

Mr. MCKELLAR. They have already turned back some $500,000.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does this mean that we are appropriating definitely $300,000 to end this whole affair, and wind it up?

Mr. MCKELLAR. That is exactly what was agreed to in the committee.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does it mean that if we did not make this appropriation they could use some $500,000 to wind it up?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. REVERCOMB. But this is $300,000 added?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does not the Senator, whose views and mine on this subject are identical, think we should put an end to spending money for something which we terminated and ended some months ago?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I felt as the Senator did, and I feel as he does now, but they have a good deal of real estate and other property which they are disposing of. They say that with this amount of money they can dispose of absolutely all of it by the 1st of July and will do so.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MCCARRAN. The record discloses certain damage actions and certain claims which have to be taken care

of during the course of closing up this Administration. Then there must be a marshaling of the records and an answering of certain questions pertaining to certain claims. All those things are in the course of the Administration being wound up.

The Senator from West Virginia knows that the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Tennessee, the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, have been exceedingly zealous in winding up this Administration, and refused to join in recommending an appropriation for its continuation, and we are advised that this $300,000 will be the last word on the subject.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator from Nevada feels that the $300,000 additional is justified in winding up this terminated agency?

Mr. McCARRAN. I think it is, in that I believe it will be wound up with this appropriation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It cannot be wound up without it?

Mr. McCARRAN. I doubt very much that it could be wound up without it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Further answering the Senator's question, let me read from the record:

Senator McKELLAR. Are you ready to wind up completely on the 1st of January 1944?

Mr. LUND. No, sir; we will not. We will by January 1, 1943, have done everythihng that can possibly be done under the existing legislation.

* * * * *

Senator McKELLAR. Now, what we intended to do was to complete this by January 1, 1944, and why cannot these three matters that you speak of be handled by the organization in the Treasury Department, namely, the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department? Why cannot they perform these services without putting the Government to the enormous expense of keeping up this organization?

Mr. LUND. Probably I should clarify the situation. We do not propose to continue the National Youth Administration after January 1.

The suggestion has been made that the unliquidated balances be continued under an existing agency, the Federal Security Administration, for the purpose of accomplishing the intent of Congress, because the existing law made impossible the final liquidation. We have saved, out of the appropriation, money to finish the job and were hopeful that existing legislation would be enacted that would make possible the directive of Congress in an orderly manner.

They wanted $560,000, and, instead of that, we recommended $300,000 for them. That is the situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Works Agency," on page 17, after line 1, to insert:

Office of the Administrator: Not to exceed $4,500 of the funds appropriated by the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938 shall be available to the Office of the Administrator, fiscal year 1944, for administrative expenses of said Public Works Administration, including personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 7, to insert:

War public works (community facilities): For an additional amount to enable the Federal Works Administrator to carry out the functions vested in him by titles II and III of the act of October 14, 1940, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1531–1534 and 1541), $50,000,000, to remain available during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, of which amount not to exceed $2,250,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, including the objects specified under the head "Defense public works (community facilities)" in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, and the joint resolution approved December 23, 1941 (Public Law 371).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 19, to insert:

Work relief in Puerto Rico: For all expenses necessary to enable the Federal Works Administrator to carry out the provisions of S. 981, Seventy-eighth Congress, entitled "A bill to assist in relieving economic distress in Puerto Rico by providing work for unemployed persons, and for other purposes," if and when enacted, fiscal year 1944, $9,000,000, of which not to exceed 5 percent shall be used for administrative purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to refer back to the second amendment on page 17, which was just agreed to. I was trying to follow the clerk as he stated the amendment, but could not hear clearly. I should like to ask the acting chairman of the committee the purpose of the $50,000,000 provided in the amendment. In the first place, why is it necessary in connection with the funds which are available for war public works to have this special fund under the Federal Works Administrator?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will read the statement by General Fleming, Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, which appears on page 129 of the hearings:

General FLEMING. That is a request for additional Lanham Act money, Senator. On March 16, 1943, the Federal Works Agency submitted to the Bureau of the Budget an estimate for an additional appropriation of $300,000,000 in respect to title II of the Lanham Act to provide for additional community facilities and services. This estimate was supported by forecasts made by the regional staff of this Agency as to the apparent future need of facilities and services in their respective territories.

Since the submission of that estimate, the forecasts have been subjected to periodic reviews as time went on, and it has been found that they were sound and defensible.

He gave the figures, and proceeded further:

Consideration of the estimate as submitted brought forth a recommendation by the Bureau of the Budget and a presentation to the Congress toward the end of June for an appropriation of $100,000,000.

The committee went into the matter very fully. It was argued pro and con for several days, off and on, and the committee finally reached the judgment that the necessities at this time did not require more than $50,000,000, and that amount was agreed to.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, let me ask a further question. Can the Senator tell us what emergency situation was presented to the committee which was not in existence at the time the estimate was made for the regular appropriation bill? What emergency condition developed between then and now?

Mr. McKELLAR. Not any particular one, that was not in existence then. The Senator will recall they asked for a very much larger appropriation; they asked for $100,000,000 at the time, and the Congress would not agree to it. They came before us and said that the various departments—not the Navy Department or the War Department—but various departments demanded that houses be built for the workers.

Mr. GILLETTE. But there was no evidence of any changed situation?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; except that they needed the money to build the houses. They had only $9,000,000 left.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may I propound a question? Was any part of this $50,000,000 to be used outside the United States of America?

Mr. McKELLAR. No. As I understand no part of it was to be used outside the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 3, to insert:

Work relief in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands: The funds made available for administrative expenses in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943, for work relief in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are hereby continued available until June 30, 1944.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 20, to insert:

Public Roads Administration: For the payment of claims for damage to roads and highways under section 10 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (23 U. S. C. 3), as amended by the act of July 13, 1943, Public Law No. 146, as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 112, Seventy-eighth Congress, $2,191.70.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Housing Agency," on page 20, line 14, after "54 Stat. 1115)", to strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$100,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Labor Relations Board," on page 20, line 24, after the numerals "1944", to strike out "$75,000" and insert "$149,224."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Veterans' Administration," on page 21, after line 1, to insert:

Printing and binding: For an additional amount for printing and binding for the Veterans' Administration, fiscal year 1944, $225,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 15, to insert:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

CONTINGENT AND MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

Refund of erroneous collections: For an additional amount for refund of erroneous collections, fiscal year 1944, including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1944, $125,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 21, to insert:

COURTS

The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia: For an additional amount for personal services, including pay of retired judges, fiscal year 1944, $5,961.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 22, to insert:

WATER SERVICE

Water Department: For an additional amount for the refunding of water rents and other water charges erroneously paid in the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1944, including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1944, $2,000, payable wholly from the revenues of the Water Department.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 7, to insert:

AUDITED CLAIMS

For the payment of the following claim, certified to be due by the accounting officers of the District of Columbia, under appropriations, the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874 (31 U. S. C. 713), being for the service of the fiscal year 1941 and prior fiscal years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 15, to insert:

Water Department, distribution system, expenses, District of Columbia, 1941, all other expenditures, payable wholly from the revenues of the Water Department, $4,808.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 18, to insert:

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The foregoing sums for the District of Columbia, unless otherwise therein specifically provided, shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and the Treasury of the United States in the manner prescribed by the District of Columbia appropriation acts for the respective fiscal years for which such sums are provided.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 23, to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

EMERGENCY RUBBER PROJECT

For an additional amount for emergency rubber project, fiscal year 1944, $4,100,000, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944, and the total amount available for this purpose shall be available until expended.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, may I ask the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to explain the appropriation, on page 23, of $4,100,000 for emergency rubber project.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is for guayule. Experiments have been made of its use primarily for the Army, but also for use generally. What will ever come of it I cannot assure the Senator. The committee, however, reported an additional $4,100,000.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I had in mind that that was for the purpose of development of guayule and cryptostegia, but I could not understand how the appropriation of $4,100,000 could be for emergency projects, in view of the particular project to which the Senator refers.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to refer the question to the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], an expert on guayule. It is grown in his section of the country, and I will let him answer the Senator's question.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I will state in answer to the Senator from Iowa that this sum of money was strongly recommended by the Rubber Director's Office for two reasons. That organization has never been able to develop a synthetic rubber which would make a satisfactory tire for heavy trucks or anything that carried a great weight. It has been able to make a synthetic tire which does fairly well for limited distances on small, lightweight cars. It is necessary to mix real, live rubber with it. We were told in the committee, for example, that not yet in this war has a German plane been shot down and analysis made of the tires, which did not show that the tires had some natural rubber in them. It is simply impossible to put a big bomber on the ground with a tire which does not have some rubber in it. It was the deliberate judgment of the Rubber Director's Office, in view of the enormous demand which has been built up for motor vehicles, that after the war for 4 or 5 years we will still need a great deal of natural rubber to mix with the synthetic rubber to make the tires to be placed on the cars which people who have saved up the money want to buy. So it is not for the war alone, but for after the war period, that the natural rubber is being developed.

Mr. GILLETTE. May I make this comment: The conclusions reached by the members of the subcommittee with whom I have had the privilege of working for a couple of years on the subject of rubber were not quite in accord with the situation presented by the Senator from Arizona. But that is beside the point.

I have no objection to the development of guayule, or cryptostegia, or golden rod, or anything else from which natural rubber can be obtained. The question is whether this $4,100,000 is to be used for the development of guayule alone, or can it be used for the development of some other type of plant, or for development of synthetic rubber?

Mr. HAYDEN. That could be done under the text of the law. As a matter of fact, the greater part of the money is contemplated for guayule, because the language simply says "for emergency rubber project," including the researches with respect to natural rubber to which the Senator refers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment at the top of page 23.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to the amendment on page 17 for a few moments. I refer to the amendment dealing with war public works, which provides $50,000,000 for the Federal Works Administrator. There seems to be some dissatisfaction with the amendment, and we desire to discuss it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee if the provision of $50,000,000 in the amendment would make a total appropriation of $100,000,000 to be used for housing?

Mr. McKELLAR. The amendment provides $50,000,000 for war public works. That is for schools, hospitals, and various other buildings.

Mr. WHERRY. I desire to discuss the amendment pertaining to housing. Have we come to the provision with reference to the National Housing Agency? Is that the pending amendment?

Mr. McKELLAR. That has been agreed to, but we can return to it.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the one to which I should like to return. I wish to ask if the amendment provides for an increase of $100,000,000 in the appropriation for the National Housing Agency?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator explain why that is necessary?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the Senator from Nebraska refers to the item on page 20. That is the one with respect to which the representatives of the National Housing Agency appeared before our committee last spring. We granted an appropriation of $50,000,000. They have spent all of that except $9,000,000. They say they are obliged to have the additional amount, that the whole program for housing the workers of the country will be stopped unless the requested appropriation is made.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not have before me the hearings on this matter. I should have read them before the Senate commenced the discussion of the item. I know it has been my experience that in some of the States I have visited this housing is not needed. I wonder what kind of a showing was made before the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. They made quite a favorable showing.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to hear from the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to have the explanation, because the proposal is

to increase the appropriation by $100,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. They requested $200,000,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there are districts in the United States where perhaps additional housing is not required, and where more housing than is needed is available. However, there are other districts where, by reason of changed conditions and changes in production of war materials, additional housing is needed. It is impossible to make the demand for housing and the supply of housing in each district balance. In districts where additional housing is needed—for instance, districts in which, as the war changes, certain items essential to the war effort are being produced—it is imperative that additional housing be made available at once. There are other places where, as the Senator from Nebraska has said, ample housing is available, and additional housing is not needed.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. There are certain districts in which an ample supply of houses is available. But the houses cannot be moved to places where they are needed. I think that, by and large, it is more economical to go ahead with the program of providing houses, with the limitation on the sum we have given them, rather than not to provide them at all. It is difficult enough to obtain the necessary manpower; but if, when it is finally obtained, adequate housing is not available, the workers say, "We have no place to live," and they leave. We are up against the matter of the production of items absolutely essential to the successful prosecution of the war. For some reason or other, many persons have taken the attitude that the war is about to come to an end. But it is not. I think the assumption that the war is about to come to an end is a terrible mistake. I do not see that at all.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is true that in the rush to make necessary developments in the production of items essential to the war effort it is impossible to determine how long housing at such centers of production will be needed.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is perfectly true.

Mr. BARKLEY. Because no one knows when the situation will change, and the demand for housing be eliminated. Consequently, there is no inducement to private capital to build houses at such places for the workers. Of course, they must live somewhere.

Mr. McCARRAN. What the Senator has said is correct, of course.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada about the immense appropriation of $100,000,000 for housing. Most of the plants and factories which heretofore have been greatly expanded, in order to provide the materials necessary to the war effort, and for which great numbers of workers have been moved, have settled down in their activities. Today they are not expanding to any great extent. It seems to me that an enormous appropriation of $100,000,000 for the continuation of the building of houses over the country is difficult of justification. I do not want to set my views and opinions against those of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] or the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. I know the war is not at an end; but at the same time we do know that today many of the war contracts are being terminated, which means that workers are being put out of employment. With that situation occurring today, we are asked to appropriate $100,000,000 for the construction of houses for workers at places where the population has had to be centered. I should like to know some real, factual basis for the request for an appropriation of $100,000,000 for the building of houses at, I presume, the various war centers, at a time when certainly they are not growing larger, but, on the contrary, many of them are growing smaller because of the termination of contracts.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in many cases they are not at war centers. They are at production centers.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I mean at war production centers.

Mr. McCARRAN. In many cases the need is at terminal points. Let me give the Senator an illustration. The war effort is largely drifting toward the West, because I think the next great effort will be in the Pacific. The Union Pacific Railroad Co., in the State of Nevada, has been asking and praying for housing at a terminal point where the shops are now congested, and where they would put on more men if they could house them. The project has been delayed because they do not have the money needed to enable them to go forward with the housing. The problem is one of transportation. It would continue indefinitely if some provision were not made. It would not continue if it were possible to obtain houses in which to house the workers needed at that point. I could give other illustrations, but I give only that one.

In my judgment there was no member of the committee who more carefully scrutinized the item than did the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. In my judgment we should go forward with it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me say that, as I recall, I received a letter or a telephone message from Mr. Forrestal to the effect that additional housing was absolutely necessary at several naval production plants and naval enterprises, and urging that it be furnished.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me inquire where the workers are living now, and where they have been living for the last 2 years.

Mr. McKELLAR. It seems that, as the Senator from Nevada has said, contracts with some of the plants are being terminated, and other plants are being established at other places. The workers are being moved about because of that situation.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there is one other consideration, which I should like to bring to the Senator's attention. That is the manpower problem. Workers can be brought to a war plant, as has been done along the Pacific coast and in other sections of the country; but if they find they cannot get a decent place in which to live, they leave. There is a continual problem because of that situation. Unless a man can find adequate housing for his family at a place where one of the plants producing ships for the Navy, for instance, or other essential items for the war effort is located, he will not stay. That is all. That is exactly what is happening. There is a tremendous turn-over of manpower. The testimony of Mr. Blandford, who handles the National Housing Agency, was that $140,000,000 was actually needed between now and March in order to take care of that situation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I know how carefully and conscientiously the Senator studies questions of finance. For my information, and the information of the Senate, I should like to know how much money has been appropriated for the purpose of providing national housing?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think at least a half million dollars has been appropriated—easily that much. The sum is a very large one.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is a very large one.

Mr. HAYDEN. However, the point is that so long as we continue to be at war, and, in particular, when the war effort is drifting toward the Pacific coast, and so long as we have the tremendous congestion of population there, we want to have contented workers at such places, to do the jobs which must be done. If homes for the workers and their families to live in are not provided, they will not stay, and a tremendous problem will face us.

In the judgment of the Navy Department, the money is needed, and Mr. Blandford said he ought to have $140,000,000 between now and next March; but the committee voted to recommend that a smaller amount be appropriated.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me make another suggestion to the Senator. A moment ago he asked how much money has been appropriated, and both the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and I said that the amount which has been appropriated is a very large sum. It is a very large sum. It is $1,315,000,000.

Mr. REVERCOMB. $1,315,000,000 for building houses for workers to live in?

Mr. McKELLAR. For building houses.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That should be sufficient to build a great many houses.

Mr. McKELLAR. It certainly should.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a tabulation showing how that total amount is constituted printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LANHAM ACT AUTHORIZATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS THEREUNDER—COMPILED NOVEMBER 11, 1943—DEFENSE HOUSING

Authorizations

Public Law 849, approved Oct. 14, 1940, 76th Cong	$150,000,000
Public Law 42, approved Apr. 29, 1941, 77th Cong	150,000,000
Public Law 409, approved Jan. 22, 1942, 77th Cong	300,000,000
Public Law 723, approved Oct. 1, 1942, 77th Cong	600,000,000
Public Law 119, approved July 7, 1943, 78th Cong	300,000,000
Total, defense housing	1,500,000,000
District of Columbia: Public Law 522, approved Apr. 10, 1942, 77th Cong	30,000,000
Total, defense housing, including District of Columbia	1,530,000,000

Appropriations

Public Resolution 106, approved Oct. 14, 1940, 76th Cong	$75,000,000
Public Law 25, approved Apr. 1, 1941, 77th Cong	75,000,000
Public Law 73, approved May 24, 1941, 77th Cong	150,000,000
Public Law 371, approved Dec. 23, 1941, 77th Cong	300,000,000
Public Law 763, approved Oct. 26, 1942, 77th Cong	600,000,000
Public Law 140, approved July 12, 1943, 78th Cong	100,000,000
	1,300,000,000
Public Law 650, approved July 2, 1942, 77th Cong	15,000,000
Total	1,315,000,000

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the members of the committee--the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and any other members of the committee who are present—whether I correctly state the situation. While it is true, as the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] has said, that contracts have been canceled because it has been found that certain plants have produced more of certain items than it was thought they would produce, and therefore cuts were made in contracts for the further production of such items—and that is commendable; that should have been done. In other places they are still trying to speed up production. A day or two ago the War Manpower Commission issued a statement that they still need 1,000,000 men in industry in this country. That is a reduction from the 2,500,000 men needed 6 months ago. They still need 1,000,000. If those 1,000,000 are obtained in industries where they are needed, where they are still not only producing war materials, but are trying to speed up the production of war material and are making new contracts, it involves the question whether those men can be obtained at points where they cannot find decent housing. The fact that there have been cancelations does not mean that war production on the whole is not still on the increase. I have in mind two or three plants where, for instance, more TNT was produced than was anticipated. The plants are more efficient and more productive. In one case the construction of a new plant was canceled, and in another, instead of putting in four units, they put in two, because they turned out a larger quantity per unit than was anticipated. That is proper. They ought not to go ahead and complete the full capacity if they need only half of it. While that is true in some cases, in many others they are still seeking to increase production in other categories, and seeking to obtain more employees.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, it seems to me that we have gotten along pretty well in the operation of these plants. Industry and the men who perform the labor have done a great job in turning out materials for war and for domestic use. The question that is in my mind is, Why must Congress appropriate $100,000,000 when up to this time we have managed to get along pretty well?

Mr. BARKLEY. They have had funds with which to build housing facilities.

Mr. REVERCOMB. We are proposing to appropriate $100,000,000 more.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct. I am not a member of the committee, and I did not get the details. I understand that $50,000,000 is being appropriated.

Mr. WHERRY. It is $100,000,000.

Mr. MCKELLAR. They have spent all but $9,000,000, and from this bill they would get $50,000,000 more.

Mr. BARKLEY. The mere fact that in some categories contracts are being canceled does not mean that war production on the whole is declining. It may be increasing at some other point and in the manufacture of some other war material.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The point I wish to make is that, in my opinion, we have reached the point where the Congress must stop spending money in such huge sums. My feeling is that we have gotten along pretty well. There may have been inconveniences. Why can we not cut this amount down and stop spending for additional houses, when apparently they are not so much needed?

Mr. MCKELLAR. The responsible authorities came before us this time and asked for $150,000,000, and we cut it down to one-third of that amount.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I know the amount has been reduced. The question is whether it has been sufficiently reduced.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Was there any other showing made before the Appropriations Committee than that which is contained in the record of the committee hearings on page 695?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes. Our hearings on this subject begin on page 33——

Mr. WHERRY. On national housing?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes; and they continue to page 49. So the Senator can see that a good deal of testimony was taken. In addition, as I recall, Mr. Forrestal wrote me a letter. My secretary has not been able to find it, but Mr. Forrestal wrote me a letter urging that $100,000,000 be appropriated, and the committee recommended an appropriation of $50,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. I simply wish to call this to the attention of the Appropriations Committee. I will abide by whatever the committee's recommendations are, because the committee has gone into the subject thoroughly. On page 700 of the record of the hearings the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] asked Mr. Edelman, who I understand represents the C. I. O. or some other industrial organization, the following question:

Senator OVERTON. Do you know where there has been too much housing?

Mr. Edelman replied that there had been too much housing in one or two places. I know it to be a fact that there is too much housing in more than one or two places. Housing is overbuilt in more than one or two places in this country. I know of towns which have had to tax their facilities to the utmost in order to provide additional housing. I know of not only one or two places but dozens of places where the local authorities do not wish any additional housing, but pressure has been brought to bear to continue to build houses.

I appreciate very much the statement of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. He has gone into the subject thoroughly. If there is an absolute need, and if there are areas where we must build housing, I want to go along with the war effort, as he does. However, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate—because it may not have been brought out in the hearings—to the fact that there are many places where it is felt that housing has been overbuilt. I think the time has come to call a halt on any further expenditures for housing. If it is needed on the west coast, I will not object to the appropriation. But when the House rules it out, and we add $50,000,000 to the appropriation, it seems to me there ought to be more justification than there is printed in the record. I hope the Appropriations Committee has such justification, because in my judgment, we are already overbuilt on housing.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, as a member of the Appropriations Committee I approached this question with my mind opposed to any further appropriations; but the hearings seemed to show that it was very much worth while, and that it would be dangerous not to go forward with it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is this temporary housing or permanent housing, or both?

Mr. MCKELLAR. It is temporary housing.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask one further question. Is this the kind of housing which will be removed at the end of the war?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. I presume most of it will not be useful after that time.

Mr. FERGUSON. How can we tell from the record whether it is temporary or permanent housing?

Mr. McKELLAR. We cannot tell, except that it is all temporary housing which is being built around war plants throughout the country.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it solely for the war plants? Does it have anything to do with slum clearance?

Mr. McKELLAR. It has nothing in the world to do with slum clearance.

Mr. FERGUSON. None of it is being used for slum clearance?

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is this housing to be built in the neighborhood of war plants, for war-plant purposes alone?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. A great deal of it is needed in cities such as my home city, and the Senator's home city.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 7, to insert:

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

Administrative and operating expenses: For an additional amount for operating and administrative expenses under the Federal Crop Insurance Act, approved February 16, 1938, as amended, fiscal year 1944, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944, $2,428,656: *Provided*, That the proviso contained in the paragraph headed "Federal Crop Insurance Act" in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944, is hereby repealed: *Provided further*, That no part of the appropriation shall be used for or in connection with any contracts of insurance executed prior to July 12, 1943, except for the liquidation of insurance on crops for 1943 and prior years, or in connection with any new contracts of insurance for winter wheat of the 1944 crop except with the holders, on July 12, 1943, of 3-year contracts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 24, to insert:

LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

For an amount in addition to the $20,000,000 appropriated under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944, and for the same objects and subject to the same conditions, $6,500,000; and the limitation of $60,000,000 in the authorization and direction to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make advances, contained under this head in said act, is hereby increased to $97,500,000.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, earlier in the day the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] had to leave the Chamber because of illness. As he left he handed me a brief statement on this amendment. It is about three pages in length. I told him that if there should be discussion on the amendment, I would read his statement. I have been over it. I do not see anything in it which should cause Members of the Senate to object to having it placed in the RECORD as his statement. If there be no objection, I should like very much to have the statement of the senior Senator from North Dakota inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will put it in the RECORD.

Mr. AIKEN. If it is desired to have it read, I shall be glad to read it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have it read, and I should like to have an explanation from the acting chairman of the committee as to why the authorization to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is proposed to be raised from a limit of $60,000,000 to $97,500,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. We do not propose to raise the limit at all. As I recall, the committee simply approved the estimates which were sent in.

Mr. WHERRY. What are they for?

Mr. McKELLAR. I refer the Senator to the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is an expert on agricultural matters, and who can answer any questions which may be asked.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I will yield the floor to the Senator from Georgia, and then read the statement of the Senator from North Dakota after the Senator from Georgia shall have concluded. Some of my colleagues seem to think that I should have the statement read at this time.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let the clerk read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read the statement.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

It has been pointed out in the discussion of the farm-security item in this bill that the $6,500,000 for administrative funds requested is absolutely essential for the continuation of that agency. There is one other point, however, which I consider of equal importance, and that is the request for authority to lend additional funds to small farmers of this country.

The approval of an additional $37,500,000 authorization to the Farm Security Administration for loans means simply that 50,000 more farm families can increase their war-food production. What will this mean in terms of food? It will mean 127,000,000 pounds of milk more than we can produce otherwise. It will mean an additional 6,500,000 dozen eggs and an additional 22,300,000 pounds of pork, and about the same proportion of increases in other essential foods.

That's a lot of food for the money, especially when that money will be paid back, as present F. S. A. borrowers show they will do. The additional milk that this $37,500,000 would bring forth next year is enough to supply about 266,000 active men. The increase in eggs is enough to supply 384,000 men for a full year, and the additional pork is enough for 186,000 men.

Surely this production in itself is reason enough to answer for an authorization of $37,500,000 that will be repaid. There are others. There has been a lot of talk about keeping farm workers on the farms. This the Farm Security Administration is doing. It is keeping thousands of tenants and landlords in business. It is keeping thousands of farm operators on the land. By making loans where other credit is not available it is keeping all these thousands of farmers where they are and enabling them to work full time and increase production for war needs.

Another thing. We cannot look into the future. We have no crystal gazers who can tell us what the post-war world is going to be like. We do know that we'll face some fairly tough readjustments. The more low-income farmers we can get on their feet now when their production is needed, the less of a problem we're going to have later.

Today's world-wide demand for American-produced food has given many small farmers their first real chance to produce for the commercial market. For this reason the demand for F. S. A. loans has never been heavier. And for the same reason this Government has never had a better chance to protect itself against the possibility of a future flood of relief checks.

So far Congress has not been very realistic about getting production from the type of family farmers served by the Farm Security Administration. Even the 50,000 we can put to work with this additional loan authorization constitute only a small portion of the 500,000 to 750,000 farmers who could increase production but would have to have F. S. A. help to do so.

In the last 2 years we have limited Farm Security's funds to such an extent that we have been able to cash in on only a small part of the production that is possible through this medium. Last year the agency's funds were exhausted by the 1st of April. Several million applicants had to be turned down. This year the situation already is acute. In most regions funds for new loans already are running short and applications are being rejected. The $60,000,000 made available through a compromise agreement in June provided funds for only ten to fifteen thousand new loans in addition to the amount necessary for financing families who are already on the program and in a position to make real production increases.

The $37,500,000 supplemental request we are now considering would bring Farm Security's funds for loans up to the level of last year's—the amount previously voted by the Senate for this year—and the absolute minimum that Congress should provide for so important a part of the war food-production program.

The authorization of this additional amount is the cheapest way the Government can find of getting production. Fifty thousand more loans can be handled by the present F. S. A. field staff. It would mean the making of an average of 25 more loans in each of the 2,000 county offices, and it would enable the county offices to extend their lending activities until later in the planting season than will otherwise be possible.

There can be no question about the ability of the Farm Security Administration to get increased production. It demonstrated what could be done in 1942, when F. S. A. families produced 38 percent of the Nation's total increase in milk and made other increases well beyond their proportionate share. The families this program reaches have the labor and resources. To develop into war food producers, they need only sufficiently liberal credit and practical supervision.

The Senate not only should vote this $37,500,000 for additional loans but it should also insist upon full agreement on this amount. If this amount is not authorized, it will simply mean that what has already started will become more acute—that is, farmers who want to increase food production and can increase food production, if given a chance, will be turned down in increasing numbers as the planting season nears.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia explain the amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator will recall that when the regular appropriation for the Department of Agriculture was pending last spring the Senate, by a record vote on either three or four different occasions, overwhelmingly approved an appropriation of $29,600,000 for grants and administrative expenses of the Farm Security Administration, and the sum of $97,500,000 to be made available for loans.

We encountered certain difficulties with the other House in the conferences on these items. At the time the conference committee was meeting on the bill a special committee which had been appointed by the House of Representatives was examining into all phases of the Farm Security Administration with the view to either recommending the discontinuance of the agency or submitting legislation which would place it upon a statutory basis.

In view of the uncertainty which surrounded the action of the House of Representatives the conferees finally agreed on an appropriation of $20,000,000 for administrative expenses, with the provision that for the first 4 months of the fiscal year the agency could not spend more than one-twelfth of that amount. There was an implied if not a definite understanding between the conferees on the part of the House and those on the part of the Senate that the House committee would report prior to November 1 of this year. There was certainly a very strong inference that the House conferees would be bound by whatever the House committee suggested.

The House committee has not yet made its report. However, the members of the House committee who were investigating the Farm Security Administration came before the Senate committee and unanimously recommended this appropriation.

I wish to point out, Mr. President, that the sum allowed in this item is $3,100,000 less than the Senate approved for administrative expenses on four record votes taken last spring, and is the same amount which was approved by the Senate for loans to farmers on four separate occasions on record votes.

There is no question about the importance of this item in the bill. In the first place, the Treasury of the United States has $430,000,000 invested in farm loans. The failure to appropriate would have the effect of abolishing the agency because for 4 months its expenditures have been on a $29,000,000 basis, and we should certainly have to make some provision for the collection of the loans.

Mr. President, I wish to point out the amazing record of collections which has been compiled with respect to the poorest people of the country, people who under the law are unable to obtain credit from any source other than the Govment. Last year when farm prices advanced, the Farm Security Administration collected $130,000,000 at a time when the loans were less than $100,000,000. In other words, the collections amounted to $30,000,000 more than the total amount of the loans. Today we are undoubtedly facing a critical condition with respect to the production of some foods. We cannot expect the large farmers to increase their production of foodstuffs. They cannot obtain labor on the farms at any price. We must in this emergency turn to the man who has more labor available than funds. These loans are made to people in order to enable them to buy more cows so they can produce milk, to enable them to buy more poultry to produce eggs, on the family-sized farms where surplus labor is already available.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I want the junior Senator from Georgia to know that all I wanted was an explanation as to what the appropriation was for. He has given me that explanation, and I thank him. I should like to ask one more question, however. The Senator said the members of the House committee came before the Senate committee and asked for this identical appropriation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not the Committee on Appropriations, but the members of the House special committee that was appointed for the express purpose of investigating all phases of the Farm Security Administration, all activities of that Administration.

Mr. WHERRY. Am I to understand, then, that the Senate committee has suggested this appropriation on their own recommendation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; we also had before us Budget estimates that were submitted, and representatives of the Farm Security Administration appeared before the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Senator tell us what the administrative expense of this Administration is?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; the administrative expense for the year 1942 was $58,000,000. For 1943 it was $42,000,000, and if this deficiency is allowed, as I hope it will be, the appropriation will be around $26,000,000 for this year. I challenge any other agency of the Government maintaining its activities upon the same scale to show as great a reduction in administrative expense as in the case of this agency in the past 2 years. The number of employees of the agency has been reduced from about 19,000 to around 10,000, and they are now liquidating the projects which have caused so much adverse criticism.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the cost referred to indicate an improvement over the amount of money handled in the years when the administrative cost was $58,000,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator mean compared with the amount of funds handled?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. It shows a very sharp reduction. As a matter of fact, the administrative expense figure is approximately $26,000,000, as compared with the total of last year of $43,000,000, as I recall. This covers just salaries and expenses. The same amount is available for loans this year as last, and a greater amount is being collected of money that has been loaned heretofore.

Mr. WHERRY. This has reference to another agency, the Regional Agricultural Corporation. Have their loans increased in proportion to the Federal Farm Security loans also this year?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry I cannot answer the Senator's question. I have not gone into that question since the regular appropriation bill was pending before the Senate committee.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I should like to point out for the RECORD that it is really a misnomer to lump all these expenses under the term "administrative expenses," as it is usually interpreted, because with the rehabilitation plans of the Farm Security Administration there is extended a service in the form of what might be called vocational guidance assistance in making the farm a success, which is lumped in under administrative expenses but I do not believe ordinarily it should come under such a heading.

I merely wished to make that statement because at first blush it might seem that the administrative expenses were unduly high, but it is because vocational guidance and the farm supervision are included under the item of administrative expense.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I did not mean to take the Senator from Georgia from the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yielded the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Would it be possible to make these Federal rehabilitation loans to farmers through the farm agencies scattered throughout the whole United States?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In my opinion this type of loan could not be made by any other agency. As a matter of fact, it is the province of the Administration to make certain that those who are clients for rehabilitation loans are unable to secure credit elsewhere.

Furthermore, let me say that during the recess of the Congress I took occasion to go to many of the farms of rehabilitation clients of the Farm Security Administration in order that I might make a personal investigation of the manner in which the program was being conducted. I may say that again and again I was informed by the county supervisors of the Farm Security Administration that they were in many instances, because of improved agricultural practices, able to refinance loans which they had previously extended through the commercial banks and other loan agencies, and it was their policy, whenever possible, to refinance the loans through commercial agencies.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator well knows that provision was made in the law for the current year that these loans should be made only to those who could not obtain them in the immediate locality, from some other source.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator is correct. I merely wanted to make it known that I can state on my own responsibility, as a result of my own observations, that not only is that policy being rigidly enforced, but also in many counties in my State it is now found possible to refinance the loans through private agencies. I may say that I was very much gratified at the splendid record which I found had been made by the organization in the counties which I had the time to visit.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield again?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate very much the statement of the Senator's experience, and I thank him for it. The point I wanted to raise as to the administrative cost, and to bring to the attention of the junior Senator from Georgia, was that it seems to me that we have entirely too many administrative agencies administering loans to farmers throughout the country. We have 20 Government lending agencies lending money to farmers today. If the Senator would like to have the names, I can give them to him.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The chairman of the House committee, mentioned by the Senator from Georgia, which is investigating this problem, stated that it was the purpose of that committee, in bringing in proposed legislation, basic legislation governing loans of the kind we are discussing, to see that only one agency of the Government made direct loans to farmers, and he stated that the legislation would cover that point. So there would be a consolidation.

Mr. WHERRY. I deeply appreciate that statement, because I want to go along with the agricultural appropriations as they relate to loans to farmers. I come from a rural section, as the Senator from Georgia does, and as the Senator from Wisconsin does. It seems to me that we should combine the administrative costs of the agencies lending money. There are the F. S. A. and the R. A. C. C., and 18 or 19 other organizations. We are paying entirely too much for administrative costs, and the money is not getting to the man who really needs the loan. I think something can be worked out. I should like to see one big agency, if possible, all the agencies consolidated into a streamlined agency to handle all loans to farmers.

I helped organize the first F. S. A. in my county, and served as a director for 2 years, and I know of instances in which it did good. But we had the R. A. C. C., then the triple A, and this and that. We have 20 agencies which seem unnecessary, piling up administrative costs. I think the time has come when we should give the utmost consideration to streamlining that into one activity, and let the agency make the long-time and short-time loans with the smallest administrative cost possible.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there were two important factors which led me to acquiesce in this important appropriation. The first was that the agency had reduced the personnel from about 19,000 persons to less than 10,000. The other was that we have a new Administrator who was a former Representative in Congress, and who made an excellent impression upon me and caused me to think that he would continue the work which had been begun, as the Senator from Nebraska said, to streamline the organization.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. I think undoubtedly the Administrator who is now serving will undertake to carry out the intent of Congress.

Mr. President, has the pending amendment been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 24, beginning with line 1.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] had prepared a statement with respect to the amendment. It is brief, being less than four pages in length. The Senator was called out of the city due to very serious illness of a member of his family. I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The chief argument against the Farm Security Administration seems to be based upon economy. I have never heard such ridiculous rot delivered with a straight face by seemingly responsible persons. Farm Security is, in fact, one of the greatest forces for real economy and one of the most essential war agencies in the Government today.

Farm Security has put the Nation's small farmers into full food production at a time when every quart of milk, every egg, every pound of meat are as important as bullets. Take any set of production figures you want, and you will find that farmers who have worked with F. S. A. have expanded food production far more than any other type of farmer—20 percent more milk as compared with 3 percent by farmers in general; 31 percent more eggs as compared with 15 percent by all farmers; 36 percent more chickens as compared with 14 percent by all farmers; 38 percent more beef and 29 percent more dry beans, as compared with the general average of 6 and 7 percent, respectively. Those figures are approved by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Now, we have been hearing and reading a great deal about economy in relation to the Farm Security Administration. Our national debt is now $166,000,000,000. Our estimated expenditures for the current fiscal year total $113,500,000,000. The Department of Agriculture alone claims about $800,000,000. It is costing us more than $166,000 a minute—that's $10,000,000 an hour night and day—for the prosecution of the war. Consider the billions upon billions of dollars this Nation has donated to big industry, big growers, and big business because we need their full efforts to win the war. We have given those billions away with few if any strings attached. Billions. Billions upon billions.

But we have done precious little to keep small business and the small farmer going. Can we call it economy to force these typical American operators to the wall when the Nation never needed their production so much as it does now? Maybe the trouble with the Farm Security is that it asks only for a few millions. It might have less trouble if it came in here and asked for a few billions. But it's merely asking for lending authority here for an additional $37,500,000—less than the cost of the war during an average afternoon session of the Senate, and this will be repaid. Small farmers do pay their debts.

I would like to make it clear that these are millions—not billions. And I want to emphasize that this is a loan to working farmers—not a gift. This is a loan to small farmers who need seed, feed, fertilizer, machinery, livestock, and all the essentials of food production. This is a loan to farmers who cannot get bank credit. The banks won't have anything to do with Farm Security borrowers, because these small farmers don't have the collateral that banks require, and they can't meet other terms of bank and bank-type credit. If they can't get loans from Farm Security, they can't get loans from any source of credit. They have their choice of paying impossible high-risk interest and being wiped out of business by usurious rates and terms—or of remaining partly idle on idle land. And let me tell you that nothing could be more tragic than to prevent these large families from contributing fully to the war effort. They have given their sons to the armed services, and they still have plenty of labor left in their youngsters under 18, in their womenfolk, and in their men who are overage or otherwise ineligible for the draft.

These small farmers are repaying to the Treasury the money they borrow from Farm Security. F. S. A. borrowers last year repaid the Government 30 percent more than F. S. A. loaned during the current fiscal year. Counting even the pre-war years of poor markets and prices, F. S. A. borrowers have repaid on all rehabilitation loans more than 92 percent of the total due. In the face of this, can we tell our American farmers that we have no confidence in them and that we will not lend them the money they need to produce food?

Last year Farm Security was allowed to loan $97,500,000 to these farmers. So great was the demand for credit that F. S. A. ran out of loan funds 3 months before the end of the fiscal year and right in the middle of the lending season. That cost this Nation tremendous quantities of food.

This year small farmers who are eager to serve their country have created a demand for credit even greater than last year. The $60,000,000 F. S. A. was permitted to loan is one-third less than last year but it is going out 40 percent faster than a year ago. At the very time loans will be most needed this agency will be broke.

Gentlemen, we who legislate for the people command a responsible position in the bucket brigade that has been created to put out the fires of war and famine throughout the world. Labor, industry, commerce have positions in that bucket brigade. Agriculture mans a station—a fundamental, a vital, an essential position. If any man in that brigade fails to do his duty the flames may rise up to envelop us all. If we in Congress are derelict in our duty we shall embarrass others in line—deprive them of their functions.

I am asking you to allow America's small farmers to do their full job in this war. They need credit to do it. They need the practical guidance that has proven so effective among Farm Security borrowers. They need cooperatives so they can purchase their equipment and market their goods efficiently and economically. They need medical care to enable them to continue to work 14 and 16 hours a day—as is necessary. They need Farm Security—more Farm Security—and still more Farm Security. The funds

this agency asks will not begin to do the job. There should be no question about them. These funds are a bare minimum to keep less than a half million farmers doing their work. At least three times that number should be helped to produce food.

This is not exclusively a farm problem. Farm Security means food production. Farm Security means strength for consumers here and our soldiers and allies abroad. Farm Security food means winning the war and writing the peace. This small appropriation should be only a beginning. Let us pass it quickly so that farmers may have some stop-gap help in their herculean job. And then let us get down to giving them some real help—some real farm security—which they need so urgently and have earned so well.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee does not object, I should like to call up a committee amendment relating to the Public Health Service at this time. The amendment has been approved by the committee, and I was authorized to offer it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 16, after line 8, under the heading "Public Health Service" and in the item "Emergency health and sanitation" it is proposed to strike out "$1,350,000" and to insert the following: "$1,695,000: *Provided*, That the Surgeon General is authorized, on application of a city, county, or other local subdivision of government duly approved by the State health department having jurisdiction over said city, county, or other local subdivision of government to enter into agreements with private practicing physicians and dentists under which, in consideration of the payment to them of a relocation allowance of not to exceed $250 per month for 3 months and the actual cost of travel and transportation of the physician or dentist and his family and household effects to the new location, such physician or dentist will agree to move to and engage in the practice of his profession in such area for a period of not less than 1 year: *Provided, however*, That no such contract shall be made with any physician or dentist unless such physician or dentist shall be admitted to practice by the State authority having jurisdiction of such new location: *Provided further*, That each such applicant subdivision shall contribute $100 to the total cost of such relocation allowance, travel, and transportation costs of each such physician or dentist and his family obtained by said applicant."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is this the amendment with respect to which the Senator gave notice of intention to move to suspend the rule?

Mr. RUSSELL. This is the amendment.

Mr. President, in the committee the amendment was modified in line 5 and in line 7 by striking out the word "city" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "municipality." I ask that the pending amendment be modified in that respect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right so to modify the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the evidence before the committee disclosed what is common knowledge to every Member of the Senate; that is, that there is a great scarcity of physicians and dentists in the Nation, particularly in the rural areas in the poorer communities, as well as in some of the boom towns which have been created by the location of war industries. Out of a total of approximately 185,000 doctors in the United States, 50,000 of the most active have been called into the Army and the Navy. There are left 135,000. That includes all of them; one being 101 years of age. Many of those that are left are too old to engage in active practice, and there are actually entire counties in the United States where there is not an active physician available to attend cases of serious illness in those counties.

The amendment merely provides an appropriation of $340,000 to be made available to the Public Health Service in an attempt to remedy the most serious deficiencies in this shortage of medical attention for the people of this country.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHITE. Am I correct in my understanding that this amendment simply authorizes voluntary agreements with physicians, or is there some mandatory force to it?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is altogether voluntary. It provides, Mr. President, that on the application of the municipality or the county to the Public Health Service, if the Surgeon General knows of any doctor who is available, he may offer him the sum of $250 a month for 3 months—it cannot exceed $750—and pay his transportation expenses to the community in which the doctor is needed. Under an amendment which was adopted by the committee on the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] it is necessary for the community in each instance to defray $100 of that expense.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. And it was specifically provided by the committee that nothing of what was done should be construed as being what is sometimes called socialized medicine.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not think that under the wildest flight of human fancy that anything in this amendment could be construed as pertaining to socialized medicine. It is purely a humanitarian effort on the part of the United States Government to assist communities which have no medical attention at the present time. The Federal Government has taken 50,000 doctors out of the communities and placed them in the Army and the Navy. Surely we have some responsibility to the people who live in remote areas, and who have no doctors to attend them in their sickness and distress.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to say in further reference to the excellent statement made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, that since we agreed to this amendment in committee last Saturday I have had the privilege of talking to Dr. Parran. Dr. Parran tells me that the Public Health Service has known of doctors who for physical reasons could not be taken by the Army. He also tells me that doctors are now being discharged for physical reasons by both the Army and the Navy, and that some of them would be available for this work.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I supported the amendment in the committee, and I feel, as does the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, that it has nothing to do with socialized medicine, to which I am as much opposed, perhaps, as anyone else, but it is a provision which deals with the State. Applications must be made by the State itself, or by local subdivisions.

Mr. President, in this connection I ask to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a table showing the number of physicians in each State of the United States as of January 1, 1942, and as of June 1, 1942. The table shows the reduction in the number of physicians due to the Army and the Navy taking many of them. The table also shows the persons per physician throughout the United States, in each State, as of January 1, 1942, and as of June 1, 1943.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated number of physicians in active civilian practice, and civilian population per physician, as of Jan. 1, 1942, and June 1, 1943

State	Number of physicians		Persons per physician	
	Jan. 1, 1942	June 1, 1943	Jan. 1, 1942	June 1, 1943
United States	133,250	87,470	1,000	1,466
Alabama	1,480	1,040	1,980	2,671
Arizona	440	270	1,150	2,125
Arkansas	1,380	1,030	1,440	1,756
California	9,140	5,940	820	1,245
Colorado	1,300	810	840	1,306
Connecticut	1,990	1,370	910	1,280
Delaware	270	160	990	1,698
District of Columbia	1,580	910	570	922
Florida	1,890	1,270	1,050	1,620
Georgia	2,190	1,520	1,400	1,984
Idaho	330	230	1,400	2,033
Illinois	9,300	6,000	880	1,274
Indiana	3,270	2,170	1,100	1,570
Iowa	2,450	1,640	1,010	1,399
Kansas	1,630	1,150	1,060	1,485
Kentucky	2,060	1,420	1,360	1,817
Louisiana	1,770	1,040	1,400	2,259
Maine	780	540	1,060	1,466
Maryland	2,080	1,350	960	1,455
Massachusetts	5,720	3,680	750	1,129
Michigan	4,710	2,970	1,220	1,774
Minnesota	2,530	1,650	1,050	1,542
Mississippi	1,130	860	1,910	2,361
Missouri	3,840	2,650	990	1,352
Montana	410	300	1,260	1,575
Nebraska	1,300	960	950	1,248
Nevada	130	90	1,040	1,479
New Hampshire	520	370	920	1,227
New Jersey	4,700	2,940	920	1,395
New Mexico	310	200	1,650	2,450
New York	21,000	12,840	610	996
North Carolina	2,150	1,550	1,620	2,196
North Dakota	430	330	1,370	1,626
Ohio	7,200	4,690	980	1,452
Oklahoma	1,740	1,260	1,230	1,669
Oregon	1,100	720	970	1,585
Pennsylvania	10,550	6,940	930	1,371
Rhode Island	760	520	960	1,345
South Carolina	1,110	770	1,740	2,384
South Dakota	360	280	1,590	1,974
Tennessee	2,080	1,430	1,430	2,002
Texas	5,170	3,390	1,260	1,869
Utah	450	320	1,280	1,825
Vermont	410	300	840	1,074

Estimated number of physicians in active civilian practice, and civilian population per physician, as of Jan. 1, 1942, and June 1, 1943—Continued

State	Number of physicians		Persons per physician	
	Jan. 1, 1942	June 1, 1943	Jan. 1, 1942	June 1, 1943
Virginia	2,170	1,470	1,330	1,883
Washington	1,710	1,080	1,010	1,707
West Virginia	1,340	910	1,390	1,915
Wisconsin	2,680	2,020	1,200	1,469
Wyoming	210	120	1,080	1,908

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I welcome the statement made by the Senator from South Carolina, and I am happy to hear that there may be some doctors available. My chief apprehension concerning the amendment has been that it was not sufficiently liberal to enable the Surgeon General to attract doctors away from established practices and go to the more remote areas where their services are so badly needed. It is unfortunate that any doctors should be discharged from the Army or the Navy due to physical disability, but certainly they could manifest no finer form of patriotism in this time of crisis than to move, when they are discharged from the armed services, to some of the remote areas where there are no doctors available.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If I recall correctly, this very question arose earlier in the present session. If I recall correctly, the proposal was defeated at that time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to have the Senator from West Virginia point to the time when an amendment similar to this has been pending?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I may be incorrect——

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has made the statement that the amendment has been pending previously.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I may be incorrect in my statement, but whether I am correct or incorrect makes no difference. The proposal is before us now.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I do not mean to be critical with respect to the amendment, but is it true that this amendment, or substantially this amendment, was before the Appropriations Committee either in the first of this session or in a preceding session?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to answer the Senator.

Mr. WHITE. It seems to me I have a very distinct recollection of it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Nevada had charge of the bill. I shall ask him to answer the question.

Mr. McCARRAN. In that respect it was in an entirely different situation. It was then under the Department of Labor, and it had attached to it some other matters, which did not make it as emphatic or as positive in its direction as the present proposal would.

Mr. WHITE. But in substance is it not the same proposition?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, Mr. President; as I recall the amendment which was pending before, it provided for having the Public Health Service employ doctors, put them in uniform, and send them into communities where doctors were needed.

There is absolutely no comparison between paying for a doctor's transportation and assisting a community in paying 3 months' nominal compensation to attract a man to move into a community and to become a citizen of the community. He would have no contact whatever with the Public Health Service after he moved into the community.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment, so that I may explain?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. When this request came before the committee, the first time, it contained an item relative to uniforms, I think, and some other items. All that was stricken out.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure the Senator will corroborate what I say relative to that matter.

I am very much opposed to what is known as socialized medicine; and the Senator in charge of the amendment very properly, as I thought, agreed to strike out all of the item relative to taking the doctors into the Service in a voluntary way and putting them in uniform. The committee voted to strike all that out.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not offer such amendment in the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true. The amendment was printed, but it was stricken out.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. As I understand the amendment offered by the able junior Senator from Georgia, it provides that the Government with public funds shall pay doctors who desire to go into certain communities which have not been designated or which may be designated. I wonder by whom they would be designated.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, Mr. President; it would be done upon application of the local community. It must originate with the local community. The Public Health Service would have no authority whatever to take any step in the matter until a local community had requested the Public Health Service to help it find a doctor to move there.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then, upon application of any community in this country which might want a doctor, the Government would pay a doctor a monthly salary, would pay his travel expenses, and would establish him in a new community. By whatever name that might be called, whether it be called socialized medicine or State controlled medicine or State aid to doctors, it seems to me the provision is not a good one. There are several matters at which we may look, several viewpoints to be taken, in connection with the proposal. The first is that the Government is beginning to pay doctors, to send them out into the communities of the country, which is something entirely new. The Government would be going into the business, upon the application of various communities, of sending a doctor to each of such communities, and of paying his expenses for 3 months. We may call that a temporary thing, if we desire to do so; but we know that if the doctor goes there and begins the practice of medicine, there is at least a possibility that he will stay there.

It has been said that the real cause for the shortage of doctors is the fact that many doctors have entered the armed services. They have. If there is one group of men to whom the people of the country owe the highest tribute, it is the doctors who have left their private practices and have entered the service, both in the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps. Those men—and I know many of them—without being compelled to do so, but simply in order to answer a call of their country, left their private practices, left their families, and went into the service. Some day they will want to return. When they return, they will find established there doctors whom the Government sent there while they were away performing their service to their country. Mr. President, I do not say that that is any reason, during this interim of the war for depriving people in need of medical attention of the medical attention they need; but I do say it would be a great wrong to the men of the medical profession who have gone into the service—and there is no higher calling in life, no calling of higher service, no men who have been more unselfish in this war—to ask the Government behind their backs to send in doctors to take their places, and to establish them there. From that viewpoint, I think the proposal is wrong.

Secondly, let me say that if any community desires to have a doctor, and if there is a doctor who desires to go there and to practice, there is nothing in all the law of the land to prevent him from doing so. But to have the Government provide that that shall be done, and to foster it, and to pay salaries to such doctors to invite that that be done, I say is wrong. It approaches an interference of the State into the question of the practice of medicine. It is denied that that would be socialized medicine, but it would approach close unto it, I must say.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. With reference to the last expression made by the able junior Senator from West Virginia, let me invite the Senator's attention to two safeguards which were inserted by the Appropriations Committee against the very development the Senator has been discussing. On page 1 it is stated—

Provided, That the Surgeon General is authorized, on application of a city, county, or other local subdivision of government duly approved by the State health department * * *.

Then, when we turn over the page, we find the further proviso—

Provided, however, That no such contract shall be made with any physician or dentist unless such physician or dentist shall be admitted to practice by the State authority having jurisdiction of such new location.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That means that he must be a qualified doctor or dentist under the examination or standards of the State; does it not?

Mr. McCARRAN. Under the standards of the State. If the State does not admit by comity, he cannot go there. If the State admits only by examination, he must pass the examination. He must meet the qualifications prescribed by the State authorities. Then, again, it must be done on the request of the locality or community where such service is so badly needed.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I understand that it must be on the request of the locality.

Mr. McCARRAN. Those two safeguards were inserted, I say to the Senator from West Virginia, at the suggestion of some of us on the committee who are always opposed to anything which approaches State medicine.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Nevada that I do not consider those safeguards with respect to the question I have raised. Of course, a community has a right to call in a doctor. When a community believes it needs the services of a physician or a surgeon, it can invite any physician or surgeon in the country to come there, and can make it sufficiently attractive for him to come. Of course, he must be a qualified doctor under the standards of the State to which he moves.

But that does not answer the question I raise—namely, that here for the first time, the Federal Government would be going into the business of supplying doctors. Let the doctors move freely within their profession. Let those who remain in our country move freely about the country. Let the communities invite any doctor in the land to come there and to practice among those in the community. Let the doctor go there, if he desires to do so, and if he can meet the standards of the State to which he moves. But do not let the Federal Government foster the removal of doctors from one community to another, and do not let the Federal Government use public funds to pay such doctors—not for 3 months, but for any length of time—to live there. That would be rather close to State control. If it would not be State control, it would be State influence in the practice of medicine.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that question?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I simply wish to recall that the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia stated that this would be the first time the Federal Government had contributed toward the payment of the salaries of doctors. In South Carolina the Federal Government, through the State health department, for many years has made contributions toward the salaries of employees of county health units and the salaries of county health doctors. That has been done entirely through State control, as the bill would provide, as was stated by the Senator from Nevada. In other words, not only would the control be had by the county, the State itself, and the medical profession itself, but, in addition to all that, even the location must be determined by the medical profession itself. That situation has existed for some time in South Carolina, where the salaries of the members of the medical profession in rural areas have, in certain instances, been added to by payments made by the Government.

I am as much opposed as is the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia to socialized medicine, and I never would vote for the amendment if I so construed it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, let me say to the able junior Senator from South Carolina that I know what he has said is correct. For years, where there has been need for a doctor for a public undertaking—local, or State-wide in some instances—of course public funds have been used to pay for the doctor's services. But never, so far as I know, have we undertaken to move doctors from one community to another, to foster their moving, and to pay them salaries, which I believe under the pending measure would be $250 a month, for the purpose of sending them into a community for the general practice of medicine, not to go there on salaries to perform some public medical service, but to establish themselves in practice there, to charge their patients, as I understand, just as any practicing doctor would charge for services performed.

The whole sum and substance of the proposal is that we are asked to have the Federal Government induce or offer opportunities, if you please, to doctors to go into communities at the expense and with the aid of the Federal Government, and to establish themselves there. I think that would be carrying the question of Federal aid a little too far. I think we would be stepping quite close to State influence in the practice of medicine. For that reason, Mr. President, I cannot agree to the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. WHERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should like to complete the discussion on this point first; therefore, I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator construes this amendment as fostering the moving of doctors. I must say that I do not so construe it, because if my information is correct—and I believe it is—there are now being released from the Army and Navy some younger men, who, for physical reasons, can no longer serve. One such doctor who had served honorably overseas, and had been discharged, came to see me the other day.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is the Senator speaking of doctors?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; they are being discharged for physical reasons.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Under our rehabilitation measures for soldiers, they will be looked after.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am not questioning that in the least. My only thought is that they could render valuable service if, through Dr. Parran or the Public Health Service, they knew where the opportunities are to enable them to be of assistance to communities which are without doctors. To the best of my knowledge there is no way that they can get such information first hand.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say to the Senator that there is nothing at all to prevent doctors who have rendered honorable service in the Army and who have been discharged from going back and taking up where they left off, or taking up new work. The doctor to whom the Senator refers would be in a very unfortunate position if he should go back to the community where he once lived, to resume his practice, and find that he had been supplanted by a doctor whom the Federal Government had moved in while he was away.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have enough faith in the communities of the United States, and enough faith in the States over those communities, to believe that such a thing would not happen. I hope I am justified in that faith.

Mr. REVERCOMB. On the very point which the Senator has raised, this question has been addressed to me: A number of doctors have come into this country as refugees from the war-torn countries of Europe. I have nothing to say against them, or against any contribution which they may make, or any aid they may render to our sick in their practice. I want that done; but I do not want the Government to be moving those doctors into communities. When a community says, "We want a man sent here to practice medicine," I do not want the Government to place a refugee doctor in that community to build up a practice, so that when the doctor from the Army or the Navy returns to resume civil life, he will find himself ousted and another planted in his place. I think those things should be taken into consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, the Senator stated that one of the needs arises because communities in which doctors are needed cannot afford doctors. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I did not say just that. I said there was a shortage of doctors in many remote areas.

Mr. WHERRY. There is a reason, aside from the military effort, for the shortage, is there not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, when there is a shortage in any profession, men naturally go to the places where more people are living and the practice is more lucrative.

Mr. WHERRY. If a doctor is located in a community where the revenue does not support a doctor, what will be the

next step? Will the Government support the doctor?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no provision in this amendment for that.

Mr. WHERRY. Is not this an entering wedge?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think so. I wish to point out, with respect to what the Senator from West Virginia says, that this amendment specifically provides that no contract shall be made with any physician unless such physician shall be admitted to practice by the State authority having jurisdiction of such new location.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think that is beside the point which I discussed. Of course he must qualify, just as any lawyer who went there to practice would have to qualify under the State law. That is not the question. It is proposed that we subsidize doctors for 3 months. Talk about subsidies! This is one of the most unusual subsidies I have seen proposed. It is proposed that we subsidize doctors to move into communities, and pay their way for 3 months while they are establishing themselves in the new communities. Let us keep the Federal Government out of that field. If the people of a community want a doctor, they can offer him an inducement to come there, and he has a perfect right to go there and settle, provided he meets the standards of the State.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. The need for doctors in various communities is urgent, and certain, largely because of the fact that doctors have been called into the Army and are performing a magnificent service all over the world in administering to our soldiers. As I understand the amendment, the need must be made known to the Surgeon General or the Public Health Service officials, by the local community. The local community must first recognize its need for a doctor, and ask for one. Then the proposal is not to subsidize them, but, in order to move a doctor from one place to another, to give him $250 a month for 3 months, $100 a month of which will be paid by the local community. All that would do would be to enable him to pick up his belongings and transfer them. That is little enough to pay a man to go into a new community which is almost entirely without good medical service.

Mr. RUSSELL. Many communities have no medical service at all.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is true all over the United States.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Kentucky has concluded his remarks, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. We say that this is not socialized medicine, and is not State-controlled medicine; but the Federal Government would pay the doctor's way to the tune of $250 a month, and then the community would pay $100 of the $250. It is pretty nearly community practice of medicine. The community would hire the doctor to practice.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator must remember that the request must come from the community or the State.

Mr. REVERCOMB. We cannot stop the communities from asking for a doctor.

Mr. CHANDLER. Where would the community find a doctor? If the community knew where a doctor was to be found, of course it would not be necessary to take advantage of this plan. The Surgeon General and the public health authorities usually know where doctors are. I know of thousands of small communities which would have no idea where to get a doctor if their people were sick. We are not talking about something that may happen. We are talking about something that is actually happening in the United States. The people need medical services. Under this plan the communities would go to the Federal Government or some agency thereof, and say, "We need a doctor. Will you get one for us?" An appropriation would be made whereby, in the aggregate, the Federal Government would pay $250 a month for 3 months, and the local community would furnish $100. After that the doctor would be on his own. He must earn his living by administering to patients. If he is a good doctor, he will live. If he is not a good doctor, he will have to go somewhere else, because the people will not have him. It is a simple proposition, entirely controlled by the State laws. The object, of course, is to bring about a better health condition among people who are now suffering because they have no doctor.

I ask the Senator from Georgia whether or not that is a fair statement?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is, except that the Senator is in error as to the contribution by the local community being on a monthly basis. It is a flat contribution of $100, to show good faith.

It must be remembered that the communities referred to are the poorest communities in the United States. They do not have doctors because the doctors have gone where the money is, just as anyone else would do.

Mr. CHANDLER. In any event, the amount spent would not exceed $650.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If the communities are so poor, what is the doctor to do for a living after 3 months?

Mr. RUSSELL. Doctors have practiced medicine in those communities and have made a living, but they are now going where they can make more money.

I appreciate the interest of the Senator from West Virginia in doctors returning from the Army. It so happens that my youngest brother—the youngest of seven brothers—is a doctor. He was practicing in a small country community, and he gave up a practice which yielded him four or five times the amount he received as an Army officer. He left his wife and four small children to enter the Army, and has been in the Army for approximately 2 years. I am more interested in that boy than I am in myself. I certainly would not do anything that might injure him.

Mr. President, he has a different idea about the ideals of the medical profession than that held by the Senator from West Virginia. It would hurt him, anywhere he might be in the world, to know that the people to whom he had undertaken to administer, oftentimes without pay, driving through the night, were suffering for want of a doctor. He would rather go back there and meet the competition of half a dozen doctors than to know that the people were suffering and dying merely because of the lack of medical attention in this enlightened age, when we boast of the greatest civilization on earth.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Under the proposed arrangement, no doctor would be compelled to go to a community?

Mr. RUSSELL. Absolutely not. There would be nothing compulsory about it.

Mr. CHANDLER. The plan would be purely voluntary.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true.

Mr. CHANDLER. Where is there a doctor who would not take advantage of the opportunity to be of service to the people of a community who are without medical attention? Many doctors believe that it is their duty to go into the country and administer to the people in the country. Under this amendment arrangements would be made so that they could do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. As matters now stand, if a man wanted to go to one of those communities and make a sacrifice to administer to those people, there is no clearinghouse where he could obtain all the information, without going through his medical association and the Public Health Service. So certainly there should be some means of communication and some assistance to the poor communities which have no doctors, at least to the extent of paying the expenses of a man who severs his connections where he is and moves into a new community.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have listened to the remarks of the Senator with respect to his younger brother. I know that his brother must be all the Senator says he is. He certainly is if he is like his older brother, the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. He is much more.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I would not give a hang for a doctor who did not have ideals of service to the sick. That is all the more reason why we who are not doctors ought to have some consideration for them on the material side, so as to enable them to live and make headway in this world, and to perform the great service to which they are so devoted.

So far as the clearinghouse is concerned, there is no objection to using the office of the Surgeon General for the purpose of providing a method whereby

the community may apply for a doctor, and find one who is available; but let us not have the Federal Government paying the way. Let us not have the Federal Government walking one step toward influencing, controlling, or moving doctors of this country into a community which may ask for them. The communities can find out where to obtain doctors. The Surgeon General's office is open to them at all times. But let the doctor go to the community voluntarily and make his own way after he reaches it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator has attacked the provision as an onslaught of socialized medicine. I wish to point out that the American Medical Association has not been noted for its activities in sponsoring socialized medicine, but they are sponsoring this amendment. I wish merely to read a brief statement from a letter written by the president of the American Medical Association. It reads as follows:

An appropriation is justified to furnish this type of service on a temporary basis.

He was referring to medical services for which he has reported a great need.

Funds will be needed to defray the expense of moving a doctor from one community to another and of guaranteeing his salary for 2 or 3 months until his practice is established. This action was approved by the War Participating Committee of the American Medical Association and subsequently by the house of delegates at their meeting in June of 1943.

I have been reading from a letter from Dr. James E. Paullin, president of the American Medical Association.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. A moment ago I asked the Senator if there were not other reasons besides being called into the military service for the shortage of the members of the medical profession in certain areas, and he said the doctors would go where there was money to pay them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there is nothing in the amendment which would underwrite the income of any doctor who should move into any of the communities about which we have been speaking. Of course, after he arrives in a community he has to take a chance on earning a livelihood there.

Mr. WHERRY. Did not the Senator say a moment ago that doctors were leaving the poorer communities and moving to places where they could secure more lucrative practice?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that undoubtedly some of them are.

Mr. WHERRY. Well, if a doctor should be moved in accordance with the Senator's amendment, and he were paid 3 months salary, and it should result that his practice was not sufficient, how would the doctor be induced to remain in the community unless he were subsidized?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I can not guarantee the effectiveness of the amendment. I am afraid that it does not go far enough to obtain doctors for the purposes provided by the amendment. The Congress of the United States has some responsibility of furnishing doctors to replace those taken into the service. I feel that we should take some step in the proper direction, and I am willing to take the one proposed, even though it is not entirely effective. So far as I am concerned, I should be willing even to guarantee $2,000. I know of a county in my own State where the money would be well spent, where there is but one doctor and his health is so poor he cannot answer calls at night.

Mr. WHERRY. It is the opinion of the Senator that we should go to the extent of paying the salaries of the doctors and therefore federalizing them?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska cannot put words in my mouth, and his statement is not justified by anything I have said.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not care to put words in the Senator's mouth, but I understood him to say that he would go so far as to guarantee a salary of $2,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I said I should be willing to guarantee a moving fee up to $2,000, and I believe the Congress would be justified in so doing.

Mr. WHERRY. And that would be the same as a $2,000 salary?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would be a moving fee of $2,000 in order to move the doctor into the community. I should be willing to have that done. My statement does not warrant any conclusion on the part of the Senator that I am advocating socialized medicine. The American Medical Association does not advocate socialized medicine, and they are certainly capable of having some idea on the subject.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I cannot go along with the Senator, because I am one who would be apprehensive of guaranteeing up to $2,000 to move a doctor into any community, and then say to that doctor, or to a group of them, that we cannot afford to pay them. But we would then already have opened the door, and would then have to make an appropriation to maintain them in the communities. That would be the next step, if we moved doctors into the communities.

Mr. RUSSELL. If that question should ever be raised we will meet it when it comes up. It is not involved in the pending amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I understand consideration of the amendment requires suspension of the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TRUMAN in the chair). No point of order has been raised against the amendment so far.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I concede the point of order, and call up my motion to suspend the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI so he may offer the amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Gerry	Overton
Austin	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bailey	Green	Revercomb
Ball	Guffey	Robertson
Bankhead	Gurney	Russell
Barkley	Hatch	Scrugham
Bridges	Hawkes	Shipstead
Brooks	Hayden	Smith
Buck	Hill	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Holman	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Butler	La Follette	Tobey
Byrd	Langer	Truman
Capper	Lodge	Tunnell
Caraway	Lucas	Tydings
Chandler	McCarran	Vandenberg
Chavez	McClellan	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Walsh, Mass.
Danaher	Maybank	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Mead	Wherry
Downey	Millikin	White
Eastland	Moore	Wiley
Ellender	Murray	Willis
Ferguson	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI pursuant to notice given by him last Friday.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HOLMAN (after having voted in the affirmative). I have been reminded of my general pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. I am informed that if the Senator from Tennessee were present, he would vote as I have voted. Therefore I permit my vote to stand.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have a general pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] which I transfer to the Senator from Utah [MURDOCK] and vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is absent on official business. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are detained in committee meetings.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent. I am

advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is detained on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senators from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK and Mr. THOMAS] are detained in Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senators from Utah and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hamphire would vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Bridges] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I am advised that if present the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay," and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is necessarily absent. He has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

I repeat the statement concerning the absence of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] as made on a prior vote.

The result was—yeas 43, nays 20 as follows:

YEAS—43

Aiken	Hill	Radcliffe
Andrews	Holman	Russell
Bankhead	La Follette	Scrugham
Barkley	Langer	Shipstead
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Lucas	Tunnell
Chandler	McCarran	Tydings
Chavez	McClellan	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Wallgren
Downey	McKellar	Walsh, Mass.
Eastland	Maybank	Walsh, N. J.
Ellender	Mead	White
Green	Murray	Wiley
Guffey	O'Mahoney	
Hayden	Overton	

NAYS—20

Brooks	Gerry	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	Gurney	Tobey
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Truman
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Vandenberg
Danaher	O'Daniel	Wherry
Davis	Revercomb	Willis
Ferguson	Robertson	

NOT VOTING—33

Austin	Bilbo	Bridges
Bailey	Bone	Burton
Ball	Brewster	Bushfield
Byrd	Kilgore	Reynolds
Connally	McNary	Smith
George	Maloney	Stewart
Gillette	Moore	Taft
Glass	Murdock	Thomas, Utah
Hatch	Nye	Wagner
Hawkes	Pepper	Wheeler
Johnson, Calif.	Reed	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI is agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I rise to express the hope that the Senate may continue in session and that Senators will remain on the floor, so that we may dispose of the pending bill this afternoon. It is very important that we do so if possible, and I urge Senators to remain here until consideration of the bill shall have been concluded.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I now offer my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 16, line 8, under the heading "Public Health Service" and in the item "Emergency Health and Sanitation," it is proposed to strike out "$1,350,000", and insert the following: "$1,695,000: *Provided*, That the Surgeon General is authorized, on application of a city, county, or other local subdivision of Government duly approved by the State Health Department having jurisdiction over said city, county, or other local subdivision of government to enter into agreements with private practicing physicians and dentists under which, in consideration of the payment to them of a relocation allowance of not to exceed $250 per month for 3 months and the actual cost of travel and transportation of the physician or dentist and his family and household effects to the new location, such physician or dentist will agree to move to and engage in the practice of his profession in such area for a period of not less than 1 year: *Provided, however*, That no such contract shall be made with any physician or dentist unless such physician or dentist shall be admitted to practice by the State authority having jurisdiction of such new location: *Provided further*, That each such applicant subdivision shall contribute $100 to the total cost of such relocation allowance, travel, and transportation costs of each such physician or dentist and his family obtained by said applicant."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 25, after line 4, under the heading "Department of Commerce—Bureau of the Census," on page 25, after line 4, it is proposed to insert:

Census of agriculture: For all necessary expenses incident to preparation for the quinquennial census of agriculture of the United States, to be taken during the fiscal year 1945, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere without regard to the civil-service and classification laws; construction or rental of tabulating machines; travel expenses; and printing and binding, fiscal year 1944, $650,000, to remain available until December 31, 1946.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, with the permission of the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I desire to call up a legislative amendment which has been reported favorably by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 23, after line 7, it is proposed to insert the following:

That the section of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1944, approved July 12, 1943 (Public Law 133, 78th Cong., p. 22), which authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to purchase United States Treasury War bonds for the membership of the Shoshone Tribe of Indians is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed, with the consent of the business committee of the Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming, to purchase one United States Treasury Series E War bond of the denomination of $500 for each member of said Shoshone Tribe according to a roll of said tribe prepared as of July 12, 1943, and approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and to pay the total cost of the bonds so purchased out of the principal of the judgment fund of said tribe in the Treasury. Each bond shall be registered by the Treasury Department in the name of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in trust for the enrolled member of the Shoshone Tribe for whom purchased and shall be held by the United States until the date of maturity, whereupon said bond shall be redeemed and the proceeds thereof paid to the Indian owner free of any trust or restriction. In the event of the death of the Shoshone owner, the proceeds of said bond at maturity shall be distributed to his devisees or heirs or next of kin as provided by existing law. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to grant permission to the county chairman of the War bond purchase program of Fremont County, Wyo., in which county the Shoshone Tribe resides, to include the total amount of bonds purchased for the members of said tribe in his quota of War bond sales."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was about to explain the amendment.

Mr. WHITE. May I ask, is this a committee amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is; yes.

Mr. WHITE. It carries new legislation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. It is a legislative amendment.

Mr. President, I was about to say that the amendment is offered by my colleague the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] and myself to correct an error in the Interior Department appropriation bill which was passed earlier in the year. The Shoshone Indians in Wyoming received a judgment through the Court of Claims. There is in that fund approximately $850,000. The Indian tribe, through their tribal council, last spring voted to request the Congress and the Government that they be permitted to invest a portion of that fund in Government War bonds. Each one of the enrolled members of the tribe

was to have purchased in his name by the Secretary of the Interior one $500 bond. The amendment provides merely that the fund now on deposit in the Treasury shall be transferred from the open account bearing interest in which it is carried, to War bonds, one for each member of the tribe.

The provision was enacted in the Interior Department bill, but it provided that the purchase should be made out of the interest on the judgment fund. There is not sufficient interest to make the purchase. The desire is to have the purchase made out of the principal of the fund, and the purpose of the amendment is merely to make that correction. The purchase is being made out of the principal instead of out of the interest. The Indians have unanimously endorsed the proposal, and the matter has been approved twice by the Appropriations Committee, and substantially once by the Congress of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming on behalf of his colleague and himself.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 25, after line 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics," on page 27, after line 8, to insert:

Development of civil landing areas: For the construction, building, completion, and development of landing areas and public airports, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission as to the availability of manpower and subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Production Board as to the availability of critical materials, including construction previously undertaken by the Work Projects Administration and for all necessary engineering and administrative expenses in the field, $9,907,890, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be construed as precluding the use of other appropriations available for any of the purposes for which this appropriation is made: *Provided further*, That any or all of the foregoing appropriation of $9,907,890 may be transferred to any other Federal agency organized to undertake the work herein provided for either by contract or by force account, and such agency is authorized to proceed with such work.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Interior—Solid Fuels Administrator for War," on page 28, line 8, after the numerals "1944," to strike out "$950,000" and insert "$3,550,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Fishery Coordination," on page 30, line 2, after the numerals "1944", to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Indian Affairs," on page 30, after line 17, to insert:

Payment to Frank O. Jones, Sac and Fox Indians, Oklahoma (tribal fund): For payment to Frank O. Jones for services performed while a member of the Sac and Fox, Oklahoma, Tribal Council, $36.32, payable out of funds on deposit in the Treasury to the credit of said tribe of Indians.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 22, to insert:

Expenses of attorneys, Chickasaw Nation of Indians, Oklahoma (tribal funds): For expenses of attorneys of record for the Chickasaw Nation of Indians, Oklahoma, employed under authority of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 537), $1,000, payable out of funds on deposit in the Treasury to the credit of said tribe of Indians.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 3, to insert:

Support of Osage Agency and pay of tribal officers, Oklahoma (tribal funds): For the employment at the rate of $4,500 per annum of a tribal attorney, fiscal year 1944, $2,625, payable from funds held by the United States in trust for the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the committee amendment on page 31, at the end of line 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 31, at the end of line 8, after the word "Oklahoma" it is proposed to insert, "Provided that said attorney be appointed by the Osage Tribal Council."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, this is a claims matter, but being a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs I offer the amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I suggest that the amendment to the committee amendment be modified slightly by inserting after the word "appointed" the words "with the approval of the Osage Tribal Council." I am doubtful if the Indians can make the appointment. The appointment must be made by the Secretary of the Interior. I think the appointment should be made with the approval of the Council, and I suggest that that modification be made.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I accept the suggestion of the Senator from Oklahoma, and modify the amendment accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] to the committee amendment, on page 31, at the end of line 8.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 8, to insert:

Expenses of attorneys, Creek Nation of Indians, Oklahoma (tribal funds): For expenses of attorneys of record for the Creek Nation of Indians, Oklahoma, employed under authority of the act of May 24, 1924 (43 Stat. 139), $2,000, payable out of funds on deposit in the Treasury to the credit of said tribe of Indians.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 14, to insert:

Expenses of attorneys, Seminole Nation of Indians, Oklahoma (tribal funds): For expenses of attorneys of record for the Seminole Nation of Indians, Oklahoma, employed under authority of the act of May 20, 1924 (43 Stat. 133–134), $2,000, payable out of funds on deposit in the Treasury to the credit of said tribe of Indians.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 20, to insert:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Water conservation and utility projects: For an additional amount for water conservation and utility projects, fiscal year 1944, including a total limitation of $800,000 for surveys, investigations, plans, and specifications, and administrative expenses in connection therewith (of which not to exceed $30,000 shall be available for departmental personal services), as authorized by the act of August 11, 1939 (16 U. S. C. 590y and 590z), as amended by the act of July 16, 1943 (Public Law 152), to remain available until expended, $2,800,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Mines," on page 32, after line 16, to strike out:

Economics of mineral industries: The limitation upon the amount that may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia in the fiscal year 1944 is hereby increased from $322,500 to $333,780.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Economics of mineral industries: For an additional amount for economics of mineral industries, fiscal year 1944, including the objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1944, $18,500; and the limitation upon the amount that may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia is hereby increased to $350,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Fish and Wildlife Service", on page 35, after line 4, to insert:

Construction of byproducts plants, Pribilof Islands, Alaska: For the enlargement of the byproduct plant, for the utilization of fur-seal carcasses, on St. Paul Island, and the construction of a similar plant on St. George Island, including the purchase and installation of machinery and other equipment, fiscal year 1944, to remain available until expended, $275,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 36, to insert:

GOVERNMENT IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, government of the Virgin Islands, fiscal year 1944, including the objects specified for the appropriation for this purpose in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1944, $18,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 6, to insert:

Agricultural experiment station and vocational school: For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, Agricultural Experiment Station and Vocational School, Virgin Islands, fiscal year 1944, including the objects specified for the appropriation for this purpose in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1944, $4,675.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 12, to insert:

PUERTO RICO HURRICANE RELIEF

The limitation of $20,000 upon the amount that may be expended for administrative expenses, Puerto Rico hurricane relief, contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1944, is hereby increased to $25,350.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Justice," on page 36, after line 18, to insert:

LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Claims Division: For an additional amount for salaries, Claims Division, Department of Justice, fiscal year 1944, $30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Bureau of Investigation," on page 37, line 6, after the word "in," to insert "Senate Document Numbered 127 and"; and, in line 7, after the name "Congress," to strike out "$253.58" and insert "$379.20."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Labor—Office of the Secretary," on page 37, line 24, after the word "stations", to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$125,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 38, to insert:

WOMEN'S BUREAU

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, Women's Bureau, fiscal year 1944, $125,000, including the objects under this head and items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriations for contingent expenses, traveling expenses, and printing and binding, in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1944.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, may I have the attention of the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations? On page 38, in the item of the Women's Bureau, an additional appropriation of $125,000 is provided. I wish to call the attention of the Senator to that item, and ask him if he will impress upon the House conferees the importance of the item. The Women's Bureau was created during the last war, in 1918, to look after the women working in industry. Approximately 18,000,000 women are now working in industry in the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. We went into the matter very fully, I will say to the Senator from Minnesota, and, of course, the importance of the item will be impressed on the conferees on the part of the House.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. What I wanted to point out is that under the act of 1918 the Women's Bureau is the only organization established by law which has charge of policing, and inspection, and helping women who are working in industry. The Bureau has only about $190,000 this year. I am told that this amount provided by the committee amendment will be absolutely necessary, and I hope the House conferees will concur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Navy Department—Office of the Secretary," on page 38, line 16, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 114 and"; and in line 18, after the name "Congress", to strike out "$12,997.86" and insert "$17,707.30."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Supplies and Accounts," on page 38, after line 19, to insert:

Pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel: The number of officers above the rank of captain, who may receive flight pay during the fiscal year 1944, is increased from 45 to 60.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 2, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$750,000,000" and insert "$500,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Yards and Docks," on page 39, after line 8, to strike out:

The appropriation "Public Works, Bureau of Yards and Docks," shall be available for the payment of compensation of those employees of contractors who are known to have been taken by an enemy as a prisoner, hostage, or otherwise, while employed on Wake Island, at such rates as the Secretary of the Navy may determine to be equitable and just (not to exceed the rates of wages being paid for comparable positions to employees of the Navy Department in areas nearest to the places of employment of such contractors' employees at the time of their having been taken by an enemy), until such time as such employees may be returned to such places as may be provided for in their contracts of employment: *Provided*, That no compensation shall be payable after the death of such an employee has been established or can be legally presumed to have occurred: *Provided further*, That compensation paid in pursuance hereof, to be effected by or through the contractor, shall be in lieu of any payments authorized by Public 784, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 2, 1942.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, after line 2, to insert:

The act entitled "An act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes," approved December 2, 1942 (42 U. S. C., sec. 1701), is amended by adding:

(a) To the last paragraph of section 101 (b) (1) of such act, after changing the final period therein to a colon, the following: "*And provided further*, That where such person is found to be missing from his place of employment, whether or not such person then actually was engaged in the course of his employment, under circumstances supporting an inference that his absence is due to the belligerent action of an enemy or is known to have been taken by an enemy as a prisoner, hostage, or otherwise, the amount of benefits to be credited to the account of such person under this subsection, and for the purposes of this subsection only, shall be 100 percent of the average weekly wages of such person, except that in computing such benefits such average weekly wages (a) shall not exceed the average weekly wages paid to civilian employees of the United States in the same or most similar occupation in the area nearest to the place of employment where such person was last employed, and (b) shall not exceed the average weekly wages of such absent person at the time such absence began, and 70 percent of such average weekly wage so determined shall be disbursed to the dependent or dependents of such person, irrespective of the limitations of section 9 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, but should there be more than one such dependent, the distribution of such 70 percent shall be proportionate to the percentages allowed for dependents by section 9 of such Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, and if such manner of disbursement in any case would result in injustice or excessive allowance for a dependent, the Commission may, in its discretion, modify such percentage or apportionment to meet the requirements of the case."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 13, to insert:

(b) To subsection (c) of section 105 of such act, the following:

"Where any person specified in section 101 (a), or any dependent, beneficiary, or allottee of such person, or the legal representative or estate of any such entities, after having obtained benefits under this title, seeks through any proceeding, claim, or otherwise, brought or maintained against the employer, the United States, or other person, to recover wages, payments in lieu of wages, or any sum claimed as for services rendered, or for failure to furnish transportation, or for liquidated or unliquidated damages under the employment contract, or any other benefit, and the right in respect thereto is alleged to have accrued during or as to any period of time in respect of which payments under this title in such case have been made, and in like cases where a recovery is made or allowed, the Commission shall have the right of intervention and a lien and right of recovery to the extent of any payments paid and payable under this title in such case, provided the cost of such wages, payments in lieu of wages, or other such right, may be directly or indirectly paid by the United States; and any amounts recovered under this subsection shall be covered into the fund established under section 35 of such act of September 7, 1916, as amended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, after line 12, to insert:

The amendment in paragraph (a) shall become effective the first day of the month next following the approval of this act. The amendment in paragraph (b) shall become effective as of the effective date of title I of such act of December 2, 1942.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, after line 17, to strike out:

MARINE CORPS

General expenses: The appropriation "General expenses, Marine Corps, 1944," shall be available for civilian clothing, including an

overcoat when necessary, the cost of all not to exceed $25 per person to enlisted personnel given discharges for bad conduct, undesirability, unsuitability, or inaptitude.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, after line 23, to insert:

INCREASE AND REPLACEMENT OF NAVAL VESSELS

Subject to authorization by other law, the appropriations "Construction and machinery" and "Armor, armament, and ammunition," shall be available for the acquisition and conversion or construction of additional auxiliaries, when such acquisition and conversion or construction has been directed by the President, and for the acquisition and conversion or construction of additional landing craft and district craft as the Secretary may determine to be necessary for the conduct of the war.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Coast Guard," on page 43, line 17, after the word "in" to insert "Senate Document Numbered 113 and"; and in line 19, after the name "Congress," to strike out "$3,061.09" and insert "$3,145.57."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General provisions," on page 44, after line 2, to insert:

On and after July 1, 1943, the limitation on the cost of civilian clothing per person, including an overcoat when necessary, for enlisted personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard given discharges for bad conduct, undesirability, unsuitability, or inaptitude is hereby increased to $30.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "War Department—Rivers and Harbors," on page 52, line 5, after the word "enlargement", to insert "subject to the approval of the Chief of Engineers."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, after line 13, to insert:

Reimbursement for damages on the Illinois River, Ill.: For reimbursement on account of damages arising as a result of projects on the Illinois River, Ill., as authorized by Public Law 168, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved October 23, 1943, $303,500, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, after line 19, to insert:

GENERAL PROVISION

Damage claims: For the payment of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death adjusted and determined by the Secretary of War under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army," approved July 3, 1943 (Public Law No. 112), as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 111, Seventy-eighth Congress, $31,960.75.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments to the items claims and judgments beginning on page 54 and ending on page 80, be adopted en bloc.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, are these all claims which are in the form of judgments?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; that is true.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments to the claims and judgments will be adopted en bloc.

The amendments agreed to en bloc, are as follows:

Under the heading "Title II—Judgments and authorized claims—Property, damage claims," on page 54, line 1, after the name "Federal Works Agency", to strike out "$1,060.12" and insert "$1,085.12."

On page 54, line 12, after the words "In all", to strike out "$22,622.70" and insert "$22,647.70."

On page 54, after line 12, to insert:

(b) For the payment of claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the following respective departments and independent establishments, under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in the sum not exceeding $1,000 in any one case", approved December 28, 1922 (31 U. S. C. 215), as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 115, Seventy-eighth Congress, as follows:

Executive Office of the President:
Office for Emergency Management:
Division of Central Administrative Services, $87.29;
Federal Works Agency, $78;
National Housing Agency, $32.09;
Department of Agriculture, $356.03;
Department of the Interior, $201.80;
Department of Justice, $6.75;
Navy Department, $6,949.60;
Treasury Department, $97.81;
In all, $7,809.37.

Under the subhead "Judgments, United States Courts," on page 56, line 7, after the word "in," to insert "Senate Document No. 117 and"; in line 11, after the name "War Department," to strike out "$3,045.38" and insert "$4,766.25", and in line 12, after the words "In all," to strike out "$3,178.83" and insert "$4,899.70."

Under the subhead "Judgments, United States Court of Claims," on page 57, line 1, after the word "in," to insert "Senate Document No. 116 and."

On page 57, after line 3, to strike out:

Independent establishments: Veterans' Administration, $2,496.56;

On page 57, after line 5, to strike out:

Federal Works Agency: Public Buildings Administration, $23,732.66;

On page 57, after line 7, to insert:

Independent establishments:
Veterans' Administration, $2,496.56;
Federal Works Agency:
Public Buildings Administration, $23,732.66;
Work Projects Administration, $49,192.31;

On page 57, after line 12, to insert:

Executive Office of the President:
Office for Emergency Management:
War Production Board, $21,095.96;

On page 57, after line 16, to insert:

Post Office Department, $754,888.32.

On page 57, line 20, after the words "In all", to strike out "$84,991.83" and insert "$910,168.42."

Under the subhead "Audited claims," on page 68, after line 8, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 204. (b) For the payment of the following claims, certified to be due by the General Accounting Office under appropriations the balances of which have been carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874 (31 U. S. C. 713), and under appropriations heretofore treated as permanent, being for the service of the fiscal year 1941 and prior years, unless otherwise stated, and which have been certified to Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884 (5 U. S. C. 266), as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 119, Seventy-eighth Congress, there is appropriated as follows:

Legislative: For public printing and binding, Government Printing Office, $48.

The Judiciary: For fees of commissioners, United States courts, $350.

For contingent expenses, United States Customs Court, $31.

For fees and expenses of conciliation commissioners, United States courts, $550.

For miscellaneous expenses, United States courts, $15.

Independent offices: For Securities and Exchange Commission, $15.65.

For miscellaneous expenses, Railroad Retirement Board, $38.19.

For salaries and expenses, Federal Communications Commission, 70 cents.

For miscellaneous expenses, National Labor Relations Board, $2.80.

For contingent expenses, General Accounting Office, $20.82.

For conservation and use of agricultural land resources, Department of Agriculture (transfer to General Accounting Office), $4.81.

For youth work and student aid, National Youth Administration, $16,416.56.

For pay of personnel and maintenance of hospitals, Public Health Service, $7.29.

For disease and sanitation investigations, Social Security Act, Public Health Service, 42 cents.

For disease and sanitation investigations, Public Health Service, $2.

For disease and sanitation investigations, Public Health Service, $1.

For cooperation with the American republics (transfer to Federal Security Agency, Public Health Service), $278.80.

For maintenance, National Institute of Health, Public Health Service, $25.16.

For salaries and expenses, Social Security Board, $17.23.

For salaries and expenses, National Youth Administration, $296.03.

For repair, preservation, and equipment, Public Buildings, Procurement Division, $252.04.

For repair, preservation, and equipment, Public Buildings Administration, $77.50.

For salaries and expenses, public buildings outside the District of Columbia, Public Buildings Administration, $5.31.

For repair, preservation, and equipment, public buildings outside the District of Columbia, Public Buildings Admnistration, $8,485.10.

For general administrative expenses, public buildings branch, Procurement Division, $1.25.

For salaries and expenses, public buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia, Public Buildings Administration, $465.90.

For administrative expenses, Home Owners' Loan Corporation, Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, $219.66.

For administrative expenses, United States Housing Authority, Federal Public Housing Authority, $23.96.

For administrative expenses, Federal Housing Administration, $8.39.

For salaries and expenses, Veterans' Administration, $3,420.05.

For printing and binding, Veterans' Administration, $378.50.

For Army and Navy pensions, $50.

Department of Agriculture: For salaries and expenses, library, Department of Agriculture, $124.97.

For special research fund, Department of Agriculture, $90.

For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry, $862.75.

For National Industrial Recovery, Resettlement Administration, submarginal lands (transfer to Agriculture), $9,664.32.

For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Dairy Industry, $14.22.

For salaries and expenses, Soil Conservation Service, $1,201.83.

For salaries and expenses, Forest Service, $137.14.

For loans and relief in stricken agricultural areas (transfer to Farm Credit Administration), $520.

For New England hurricane damage, Forest Service, $31.56.

For acquisition of lands for protection of watersheds of navigable streams, $299.95.

For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, $8.40.

For control of emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases, 27 cents.

For control of emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases, 70 cents.

For exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, Department of Agriculture, $7,204.18.

For exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, Department of Agriculture (transfer to Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, act June 28, 1937), $94.92.

For exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, Department of Agriculture (transfer to Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation), $1,792.58.

For retirement of cotton pool participation trust certificates, Department of Agriculture, $9.24.

For administration of Sugar Act of 1937, Department of Agriculture, $18.85.

For administration of Federal Crop Insurance Act, Department of Agriculture, $10.

For conservation and use of agricultural land resources, Department of Agriculture, $3,283.09.

For land utilization and retirement of submarginal land, Department of Agriculture, $626.30.

For submarginal land program, Farm Tenant Act, Department of Agriculture, $12.

For salaries and expenses, Farm Credit Administration, Department of Agriculture, $4.65.

For salaries and expenses, Rural Electrification, Department of Agriculture, $2.30.

For rural rehabilitation loans, Department of Agriculture (advances from Reconstruction Finance Corporation), $4.

Department of Commerce: For establishment of air-navigation facilities, Civil Aeronautics Authority, $281.99.

For maintenance of air-navigation facilities, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, $239.85.

For traveling expenses, Department of Commerce, $2.

For salaries and expenses, Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce, $1.16.

For salaries and expenses, Weather Bureau, $1.

For coastal surveys, Coast and Geodetic Survey, $749.25.

For civilian pilot training, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, $2,651.48.

For establishment of air-navigation facilities, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, $4,135.57.

For maintenance of air-navigation facilities, Civil Aeronautics Authority, $50.

For salaries and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Authority, $30.

For air-navigation facilities, $20.

Department of the Interior: For migratory bird conservation fund, Fish and Wildlife Service (receipt limitation), $201.62.

For salaries and expenses, Biological Survey, Fish and Wildlife Service, $28.86.

For inquiry respecting food fishes, Bureau of Fisheries, Department of the Interior, $3.66.

For propagation of food fishes, Bureau of Fisheries, Department of the Interior, $2.40.

For National Park Service, $34.85.

For National Industry Recovery, Interior, National Park Service, recreational demonstration projects, $10.45.

For library, Department of the Interior, $16.65.

For expenses, Division of Territories and Island Possessions, Department of the Interior, $60.

For Geological Survey, $8,466.22.

For historic sites and buildings, National Park Service, $136.55.

For administrative expenses, Bituminous Coal Division, Department of the Interior, $10.15.

For inquiry respecting food fishes, Fish and Wildlife Service, $12.80.

For emergency conservation work (transfer to Interior, Indians, act February 9, 1937), $43.52.

For Indian boarding schools, $51.88.

For Indian school support, $84.25

For purchase and transportation of Indian supplies, $2.13.

For Civilian Conservation Corps (transfer to Interior, Indians), $101.22.

For conservation of health among Indians, $728.23.

For agriculture and stock raising among Indians, $13.33.

For maintenance, Fruitlands irrigation project, Navajo Reservation, N. Mex. (reimbursable), $14.10.

For Indian service supply fund, $311.96.

Department of Justice: For salaries and expenses, lands division, Department of Justice, $340.49.

For salaries and expenses of marshals, and so forth, Department of Justice, $84.69.

For salaries and expenses, Federal Bureau of Investigation (national defense), $35.52.

For fees of witnesses, Department of Justice, $13.70.

For miscellaneous expenses, United States courts (transfer to Justice), $119.42.

For support of United States prisoners, $465.

For Federal jails and correctional institutions, maintenance, $12.64.

For contingent expenses, Department of Justice, $59.75.

For salaries and expenses, Federal Bureau of Investigation, $5.

For traveling expenses, Department of Justice, $5.92.

For miscellaneous salaries and expenses, field, Department of Justice, $396.

For penitentiaries and reformatories, maintenance, $419.36.

Department of Labor: For traveling expenses, Department of Labor, $263.61.

Navy Department: For Naval Training Station, San Diego, Calif., $498.94.

For miscellaneous expenses, Navy, $342.73.

For rebuilding and repairing stations, and so forth, Coast Guard, $40.50.

For pay, Marine Corps, $1.20.

For general expenses, Marine Corps, $10,742.85.

For aviation, 1938 contracts, Navy, $71,348.96.

For general expenses, Lighthouse Service, Coast Guard (Navy), $37.18.

For fuel and transportation, Navy, $63.

For maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks, $5,851.75.

For pay and allowances, Coast Guard, $216.

For engineering, Bureau of Engineering, $94,119.36.

For Naval Reserve, $1,426.17.

For engineering, Navy, $44,098.25.

For pay and allowances, Coast Guard (Navy), $220.65.

For general expenses, Coast Guard (Navy), $4,034.02.

For ordnance and ordnance stores, Navy, $695,404.01.

For aviation, Navy, $555,518.89.

For maintenance, Bureau of Ships, $809,942.76.

For salaries, lighthouse vessels, Coast Guard (Navy), $2,179.69.

For pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy, $8,773.98.

For maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, $9,450.82.

For National Industrial Recovery, Navy allotment, $186.17.

For ordnance and ordnance stores, Bureau of Ordnance, $896.

For rebuilding and repairing stations, and so forth, Coast Guard (Navy), $300.

Post Office Department: For indemnities, domestic mail, $172.12.

For operating supplies for public buildings, Post Office Department, $2.72.

Department of State: For transportation, Foreign Service, $1,154.44.

For contingent expenses, Foreign Service, $354.25.

For foreign service pay adjustment, appreciation of foreign currencies (State), $88.46.

Treasury Department: For collecting the revenue from customs, $81.26.

For salaries and expenses, Division of Disbursement, $1.94.

War Department: For Army transportation, $195.16.

For National Guard, $30.53.

For working fund, War, ordnance, $20,582.31.

For pay of the Army, $742.70.

For subsistence of the Army, $8.85.

For barracks and quarters, $2.40.

For replacing clothing and equipage, $277.44.

For replacing regular supplies of the Army, $10.08.

For clothing and equipage, Army, $47.52.

For cemeterial expenses, War Department, $2.02.

For Civilian Conservation Corps (transfer to War), $2,001.86.

For emergency conservation work (transfer to War, act Feb. 9, 1937), $36.40.

For emergency conservation fund (transfer to War, act Mar. 31, 1933), $51.47.

For loans and relief in stricken agricultural areas (transfer from emergency conservation work to War, act June 19, 1934), $8.65.

For emergency conservation fund (transfer to War, act June 19, 1934), $73.97.

District of Columbia: Washington Aqueduct, District of Columbia, $2.84.

Total, audited claims, section 204 (b), $2,419,868.84, together with such additional sum due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in the foreign currency and interest as specified in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office.

On page 80, line 4, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document numbered 118 and"; and in line 5, after the numerals "317", to strike out "$2,880.82" and insert "$3,217.92."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment on page 8, in line 2, was passed over. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8, line 2, after "expenses" it is proposed to strike

out "$5,900,000" and to insert "$5,233,000."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope the committee amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, by direction of the committee, I now offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 306. No funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for the War Department shall be used directly or indirectly for or devoted to the purpose of the cancelation of existing certificates of authority with respect to the manufacture and distribution of Army insignia and no such funds shall be used directly or indirectly either to enforce or announce the provisions of order AR 600-90, as amended, or any amended or similar or comparable order or regulation restricting the manufacture and distribution of Army insignia.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment to the amendment: At the end of the section, strike out the period and add a semicolon and the following: "*Provided*, That this section shall be effective as of date March 1, 1943."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

Without objection, the amendment as amended is agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. Immediately after the heading "War Department," it is proposed to insert the following:

MILITARY ACTIVITIES

SEC. —. Nothing contained in this act or in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1943, shall be construed to prevent or to interfere with the instruction, education, training, transportation, or service of class IV-E conscientious objectors within or outside of the United States, its Territories and possessions, when such instruction, education, training, transportation, or service is conducted and paid for by a religious or philanthropic agency for the purpose of carrying out relief operations, or to prevent persons paid from appropriations made by the said acts from incidentally facilitating the said instruction, education, training, transportation, and relief services.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in support of the amendment, I submit a statement which I will not read, but which I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This amendment is being presented to permit the sending of 70 trained ambulance men, classified IV-E (conscientious objectors), to serve with the Friends ambulance unit in China.

This proposal to send such men to China has been approved by Major General Kirk, Surgeon General of the United States Army, and Lieutenant General Stilwell, commander of the United States Army in China. This request was cleared with President Roosevelt, with Secretary of War Stimson, and with Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, head of Selective Service. The request was endorsed by Loo Chi Teh, Surgeon General of the Chinese Army, by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Chungking and by the Chinese Ambassador to the United States, Wei Tao-ming.

The Friends ambulance unit has been working in China for 2 years, under the auspices of the Chinese Government. It ferried medical supplies on the Burma Road until that was closed. Now it is engaged in the transportation of drugs and medical supplies and in rendering medical aid to Chinese troops on the Yunnan front. Since the Friends ambulance unit went to China, it has lost 4 men by death, 6 men have been invalided out of the service and 6 have been withdrawn for other reasons. Not only is the need most urgent but it is anticipated that impending military operations will greatly increase it. As a result, the unit, now totaling 95 members, is in urgent need of replacements and enlargement. This was recognized a year ago when the Chinese Ambassador and the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs endorsed the proposal to send out 70 additional Americans. The matter was considered by the President and the Secretary of War with a favorable recommendation in January 1943 that the men should be released from the civilian public service camps.

Accordingly, training courses were organized for selected men and the first seven men embarked for China in June 1943. The entire expense of this project was borne by funds administered by the American Friends Service Committee as is the total operations of the Friends ambulance unit in China. This amendment is not asking for a penny of appropriations but merely the removal of one obstacle to carrying out this request for increased medical aid by the Chinese authorities.

In June 1943 a clause was attached to the Military Appropriations Act stating that none of the military appropriations shall be used for overseas relief activities of men classified IV-E nor should such funds be used for the compensation of persons assisting their training, transportation, or relief work.

On first evidence it did not seem that the clause attached to the Military Appropriations Act had any bearing on the work of the Friends' ambulance unit in China which is financed by private funds and does not require the assistance of personnel who receive compensation from the military appropriations. However, the fact that the officers of the Selective Service System are compensated from military funds has been interpreted to prohibit them from signing the necessary papers to authorize the transfer of the men from civilian public service camps to the auspices of the American Friends Service Committee.

In view of this interpretation, the seven men who sailed in June were halted in their journey at Durban, South Africa, and were ordered by the Department of State to return to the United States. They are now on their way home. In the meantime, the Chinese Government through its Ambassador, Foreign Office and Office of the Surgeon General of the Chinese Army, has expressed its strongest wish that the men should be permitted to render medical relief service in accordance with the plans that have been laid.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I now request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the President of the United States, a letter from the Surgeon General, a letter from the Surgeon General of China, and a letter from the Ambassador from China. I ask unanimous consent that the letters be printed at this point in the RECORD, in support of the amendment just read.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 13, 1943.

Mr. CLARENCE E. PICKETT,
Executive Secretary, American Friends Service Committee,
Philadelphia, Pa.

MY DEAR MR. PICKETT: I am conscious of the benevolent work of the Society of Friends and have read with interest the narrative report on the activities of the Friends' ambulance unit in China. I approve your request to obtain 70 volunteers from civilian work camps for medical relief, sanitation, and public-health work in China, and I have taken the matter up with the Secretary of War. He tells me that he has discussed this matter with you and that at his request the National Director of Selective Service has agreed to cooperate with you in securing the volunteers you desire and in procuring passports for them.

It is understood that these volunteers will function under the auspices of the Society of Friends and will not, while so engaged, become an active part of the armed forces of the United States or other nation.

I suggest that you contact the Director of Selective Service, Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, for further information and assistance in your undertaking.

Very sincerely yours,
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL,
Washington, November 12, 1943.

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: On the cabled recommendation of Lieutenant General Stilwell, we are glad to support the efforts of the American Friends Service Committee to secure the release of 70 trained ambulance men who are classified IV-E (conscientious objectors) and now in civilian public-service camps. These men are needed in China for the medical and transport work of the Friends ambulance unit, which is aiding the Chinese forces in Yunnan.

The President and Secretary of War approved the proposal to send these men last January, but a clause in the Military Appropriations Act of 1944 now restricts them to the United States. We understand that you are prepared to introduce an amendment to the forthcoming deficiency appropriation bill which will permit these men to engage in overseas relief work at the expense of private agencies. It may be of assistance to you in this effort to know that the War Department is in accord with such an amendment and that Lieutenant General Stilwell approves the work of the Friends ambulance unit.

Members of the Friends ambulance unit gave valuable medical assistance to the Chinese and American forces under Lieutenant General Stilwell during the Burma campaign. They are now doing essential work for the Chinese forces and urgently need additional personnel to carry out their duties. American Army officers in China have had many opportunities to observe the Friends in action and highly commend their skill and devotion.

We believe that the use of conscientious objectors as medical and ambulance personnel in war zones is entirely appropriate. In the case of the Chinese Army, the Friends help to meet urgent needs which otherwise could not be met.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN T. KIRK,
Major General, United States Army,
The Surgeon General.

CHUNGKING, *October 21, 1943.*
AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE,
Philadelphia, Pa.:

Fau proposed contribution needed implement our medical-service plan Yunnan. Strongly endorse their request for additional personnel.

LOO CHI DEH,
Surgeon General.

CHINESE EMBASSY,
Washington, D. C., January 8, 1943.

Mr. CLARENCE E. PICKETT,
Executive Secretary,
American Friends Service Committee,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MR. PICKETT: In reference to your letter of December 11, I take pleasure in informing you that I have received a message from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs stating that the project of the Friends ambulance unit has the support of the Chinese Government.

In brief, it is our understanding that your committee proposes to send in 1943, 70 additional American men to augment the Friends ambulance unit in China. The new personnel would include medical doctors, engineers, auto mechanics, and public-health and sanitation technicians. They will work in collaboration with the Chinese official and private agencies in the field of civilian relief, control of epidemic diseases, and public health.

I wish to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation of the valuable services your committee has rendered to the Chinese people, and I sincerely hope that the project of sending additional men to China can be successfully carried out.

Sincerely yours,

WEI TAO-MING,
Ambassador.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have no further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 3598) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Chair appointed Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 648. An act for the relief of Arthur C. Norcutt;

S. 990. An act for the relief of the Washington, Brandywine & Point Lookout Railroad Co.;

S. 1001. An act for the relief of the Meadow Brook Club;

S. 1038. An act for the relief of Verna Mae Rossell and Winifred Rossell Mooney;

S. 1049. An act to authorize the payment of additional compensation to special counsel in the case of United States against Standard Oil Co. of California;

S. 1282. An act for the relief of Eric W. Rodgers;

S. 1290. An act for the relief of William Carroll Knox;

S. 1315. An act providing for the transfer to the custody and control of the Secretary of the Navy certain lands comprising a portion of Croatan National Forest in the State of North Carolina;

H. R. 247. An act for the relief of the estate of Richard Dodge Beale, deceased;

H. R. 937. An act for the relief of the estate of Luther Clyde Nanny;

H. R. 1973. An act for the relief of Albert Ferguson and Ozelle Ferguson;

H. R. 2188. An act to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2190. An act for the relief of Marguerite R. McElroy;

H. R. 2299. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of W. M. Hurley and Joe Whitson;

H. R. 3070. An act to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3309. An act to suspend temporarily the application of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended;

H. R. 3363. An act extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made;

H. J. Res. 175. Joint resolution commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the first airplane flight by Wilbur and Orville Wright; and

H. J. Res. 199. Joint resolution to extend the time limit for immunity.

DEATH OF MAJ. VINCENT F. HARRINGTON

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, it is my misfortune to announce that I have just had confirmed by the Adjutant General's Department the passing of a very distinguished statesman, a former Representative from my home district in Iowa, Representative Vincent F. Harrington, who resigned to become a major of the Army Air Transport, and has been serving in England. He died a few days ago from a heart attack, and the Adjutant General's Office has just confirmed the news.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR BARBOUR BY THE RADIO CORRESPONDENTS

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the executive committee of the Radio Correspondents' Association adopted a resolution in commemoration of our late colleague, Hon. W. Warren Barbour, which reads as follows:

Whereas Hon. W. Warren Barbour, Senator from New Jersey, has been called by death; and

Whereas Senator Barbour, with Senator GILLETTE, of Iowa, sponsoded the resolution adopted by the United States Senate establishing the radio correspondents' gallery and during his life maintained a friendly interest in the gallery, its members, and its activities: Therefore be it

Resolved by the executive committee of the Radio Correspondents' Association, That it extends its sympathy to the members of the family of the late Senator Barbour; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the family of the late Senator Barbour and extended upon the minutes of the executive committee of the Radio Correspondents' Association.

EARL GODWIN,
Acting President.
RICHARD HARKNESS,
Secretary.

REINSTATEMENT IN CIVIL LIFE OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—MEMORANDUM BY COL. LEWIS SANDERS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, at my request, Col. Lewis Sanders, Chief of the Reemployment Division of the Selective Service System, has prepared a memorandum presenting an account of the actual current operations of the armed forces and other Government agencies in preparing members of the armed forces for reinstatement in civil life when their service in the armed forces is completed. I ask unanimous consent to have the memorandum prepared by Colonel Sanders printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To: Senator LISTER HILL.
From: Col. Lewis Sanders, F. A., Chief of Reemployment Division, the Selective Service.

The following memorandum was prepared in response to your request of November 30 to present an account of the actual current operations of the armed forces and other Government agencies in preparing members of the armed forces for, and reinstating them in, civil life. This is supplemental to the memorandum introduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 14, 1943, pages 8323–8329, by you, which memorandum covered the organizational set-up and the interrelationship of the agencies established by the Government for the above purpose.

All of the agencies concerned have been giving each other full cooperation. Their work is thoroughly coordinated, and there is no duplication of effort.

There are still several sections of the field of operations involved in this large task that are not yet covered by the program. Some of the most important of these are being covered by expansion of the activities of the existing agencies under the coordinated program, and others, which cannot be effectively covered from existing agencies, are being taken care of by organizations now in process of formation. There is still a portion of the program under study and experimental research, so as to develop the most effective means of handling the particular section of the work.

The actual work of replacing veterans in civil life with jobs is in full operation and has

been for many months past. It is not perfected, and it is doubtful if any program could have been perfected by this time, since any task of this sort has, as an essential factor in developing it into an efficiently working program, the indispensable element of experience, which takes time and for which there is no known substitute. The encouraging facts in the situation are that the plans have all proved to be soundly conceived, and that the changes that have to be made on the basis of experience, in order to correct defects, have been in details of procedure and not in basic plans.

While none of the organizations concerned are satisfied with their progress or complacent over the results, the records indicate that under existing circumstances of ready employment, only 1 or 2 percent of the veterans returning to civil life have encountered real difficulties. This is indicated by the small number of cases being brought to State Headquarters of the Selective Service System on complaint of veterans, and on the records of the Army Emergency Relief and the Red Cross as to the number of returning veterans to whom they have had to afford assistance.

Steady progress is being made in perfecting the machinery for returning veterans to civil life through the constant search for defects in procedure and their prompt correction, as well as the cooperative spirit in which all departments of the Government concerned with this problem are coordinating their efforts.

The work of returning a veteran to civil life may be divided into several phases, as follows:

(a) Completing his records, compiling all the information on his civilian and military occupational experience, education, desires as to a job, etc., and determining his aptitudes for employment.

(b) Making this information available to the agencies that will be concerned with the actual placement of the veteran in a job, or of providing vocational rehabilitation or hospitalization, or job training, as may be necessary.

(c) Closing his final military records, and giving him his terminal physical examination.

(d) Transferring him from the armed forces to civilian life, and placing him in contact with the proper agencies.

The men being discharged fall into categories as follows, and require the services indicated:

1. Dishonorably discharged men. Not entitled to any of the special services rendered veterans.

They have available to them the same services as any nonveteran civilian can also obtain, but no others. Fortunately, only an extremely small group of men fall into this category, and they are a negligible problem from any standpoint.

2. Honorably discharged veteran with a physical disability or wounds requiring extensive hospitalization.

He goes to the Veterans' Administration hospitals, where he receives the best of care for as long as is needed, plus pension, in accordance with the extent of disabilities and other factors.

3. Honorably discharged veterans having a service-connected disability exceeding 10 percent and requiring vocational rehabilitation before they can obtain suitable employment.

These men are primarily channeled through the Veterans' Administration for their vocational rehabilitation and for their pension claims. They may also require the service of the reemployment committeeman or the Veterans' Employment Service and the U. S. E. S. in the procurement of a job.

4. Honorably discharged veterans having a service-connected disability of 10 or more percent not requiring vocational rehabilitation. Their pension claims are the province of the Veterans' Administration, and the preparation and prosecution of these claims may be done by any one of the recognized veterans' organizations or the Red Cross, any of whom perform this service without cost to the veteran, and all of whom have long experience in handling these matters.

For those veterans wishing employment assistance, their interests are handled through their reemployment committeemen, who handle directly reinstatement in an old job, or for a new job places the case in the hands of the Veterans' Employment Service and the United States Employment Service.

In the event they are unable to place the veteran, the reemployment committeeman then undertakes direct placement, which at present he does personally, and later will do through the clearing-house committees. All such direct placements are coordinated with and channeled through the Employment Service.

5. Honorably discharged veterans with a non-service-connected disability.

The reemployment committeeman sees that all necessary information is on hand, and makes necessary contacts to place the case in the hands of the State vocational rehabilitation agency, which provides vocational rehabilitation for such cases, free of cost, and when needed also provides a limited amount for subsistence, under recent act of Congress. (It is believed that not all States have yet enacted the necessary legislation to enable them to take advantage of this service, provided in the act of Congress, Public Law 135, 78th Cong., ch. 221, 1st sess., entitled "Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1944.") For these veterans' employment rights, the reemployment committeeman handles them, as in the preceding cases.

6. Honorably discharged veterans without disabilities. These men fall into the following categories:

(a) Those having a job to which they wish to return.

(b) Those not having a job to which to return or desiring a new job.

(c) Those who wish to take training for a special trade or occupation.

(d) Those who wish to complete their education.

All of the above should have their cases handled through their reemployment committeemen to insure proper coordination. For the man returing to his old job, the committeeman handles this directly, or through the clearing-house committee. For the veteran seeking a new job, he is referred first to the United States Employment Service, and its Veterans' Employment Division. For the man desiring to acquire a special skill or an occupation, there are provided courses through the United States Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, which are available without cost to returning veterans, the courses being conducted in some 200 colleges. No allowances or subsistence are furnished with these courses, however, the Government paying only the tuition. Information regarding the courses is available through the reemployment committeeman, and at discharge points. For the man wishing to continue his education, there is no present provision—this being one of the major fields not yet covered, which subject has been laid before the Congress for consideration by the President.

Following is the circular covering the educational courses available to veterans, as set out above, which has been distributed to all reemployment committeemen and to all discharge points in the Army.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION—ENGINEERING, SCIENCE, AND MANAGEMENT WAR TRAINING

E. S. M. W. T. training in colleges available to veterans—tuition free—short intensive courses to train engineers, physicists, chemists, and production supervisors.

Qualifications for admission: Applicants must be high-school graduates or possess equivalent training and experience. College training and even college degrees may be required for some of the more advanced courses.

Types of courses: Full- and part-time courses averaging from 8 to 16 weeks are available and are given on campus at more than 200 colleges or at conveniently located centers in more than 1,000 cities.

Job opportunities: Demands are many and continuing for draftsmen and designers; radio technicians; inspectors of ordnance, radio equipment, aircraft matériel, etc.; industrial supervisors and accountants; chemists; ship layout men; jig, fixture, and template designers; and similar technical personnel in numerous war-production enterprises.

Pay status while learning: Many private employers as well as certain governmental agencies and branches of the armed services make provisions for the payment of wages to persons taking E. S. M. W. T. courses. The E. S. M. W. T. institutional representatives at specific colleges and universities can advice applicants concerning these opportunities.

Placement opportunities; Courses are organized only when there is a disclosed need in war industries for trained personnel; therefore little difficulty is encountered in placing those who successfully complete them. The facilities of college placement bureaus, the United States Employment Service, the Veterans' Placement Service, and the Selective Service System are available to assist trainees to secure jobs after completing E. S. M. W. T. courses. Placement, however, cannot be guaranteed.

How and where to apply: Applications for enrollment must be made to the college or university concerned. A list of the names and locations of participating institutions where application for training can be made is as follows:

ALABAMA

Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn.
University of Alabama, University.

ARIZONA

University of Arizona, Tucson.

ARKANSAS

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville.

CALIFORNIA

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena.
Claremont Colleges, Claremont.
College of the Pacific, Stockton.
Occidental College, Los Angeles.
San Jose State College, San Jose.
Stanford University, Stanford University.
University of California, Berkeley.
University of Redlands, Redlands.
University of Santa Clara, Santa Clara.
University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

COLORADO

Colorado School of Mines, Golden.
Colorado State College, Fort Collins.
University of Colorado, Boulder.
University of Denver, Denver.

CONNECTICUT

University of Connecticut, Storrs.
Yale University, New Haven.

DELAWARE

University of Delaware, Newark.

FLORIDA

John B. Stetson University, De Land.
University of Florida, Gainesville.

GEORGIA

Atlanta University, Atlanta.
Georgia School of Technology, Atlanta.

IDAHO

University of Idaho, Moscow.

ILLINOIS

Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Peoria.
Central Y. M. C. A. College, Chicago.
De Paul University, Chicago.
Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago.
Northwestern University, Evanston.
University of Chicago, Chicago.
University of Illinois, Urbana.
Wheaton College, Wheaton.

INDIANA

Butler University, Indianapolis.
Indiana University, Bloomington.
Purdue University, Lafayette.
Rose Polytechnic Institute, Terre Haute.
University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame.

IOWA

Drake University, Des Moines.
Iowa State College, Ames.
St. Ambrose College, Davenport.
State University of Iowa, Iowa City.

KANSAS

Kansas State College, Manhattan.
University of Kansas, Lawrence.

KENTUCKY

University of Kentucky, Lexington.
University of Louisville, Louisville.

LOUISIANA

Centenary College of Louisiana, Shreveport.
Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Ruston.
Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge.
Loyola University, New Orleans.
Southern University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, Scotlandville.
Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Lafayette.
Tulane University, New Orleans.

MAINE

Bates College, Lewiston.
University of Maine, Orono.

MARYLAND

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.
University of Baltimore, Baltimore.
University of Maryland, College Park.

MASSACHUSETTS

American International College, Springfield.
Boston College, Chestnut Hill.
Boston University, Boston.
Clark University, Worcester.
Harvard University, Cambridge.
Lowell Textile Institute, Lowell.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge.
Massachusetts State College, Amherst.
Northeastern University, Boston.
Simmons College, Boston.
Smith College, Northampton.
Tufts College, Medford.
Wellesley College, Wellesley.
Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester.

MICHIGAN

Detroit Institute of Technology, Detroit.
Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo.
Lawrence Institute of Technology, Highland Park.
Michigan College of Mining and Technology, Houghton.
Michigan State College, East Lansing.
University of Detroit, Detroit.
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
Wayne University, Detroit.

MINNESOTA

St. Olaf College, Northfield.
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

MISSISSIPPI

Mississippi State College, State College.
University of Mississippi, University.

MISSOURI

Lincoln University, Jefferson City.
Missouri School of Mines and Metallurgy, Rolla.
St. Louis University, St. Louis.
University of Missouri, Columbia.
Washington University, St. Louis.

MONTANA

Montana School of Mines, Butte.
Montana State College, Bozeman.

NEBRASKA

Doane College, Crete.
University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

NEVADA

University of Nevada, Reno.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Dartmouth College, Hanover.
University of New Hampshire, Durham.

NEW JERSEY

Newark College of Engineering, Newark.
Princeton University, Princeton.
Rider College, Trenton.
Rutgers University, New Brunswick.
Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken.
University of Newark, Newark.

NEW MEXICO

New Mexico College, State College.
University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.

NEW YORK

Brooklyn College, Brooklyn.
Canisius College, Buffalo.
City College, College of the City of New York, New York.
Clarkson College of Technology, Potsdam.
Columbia University, New York.
The Cooper Union, New York.
Cornell University, Ithaca.
Hofstra College, Hempstead.
Hunter College, College of the City of New York, New York.
Long Island University, Brooklyn.
Manhattan College, New York.
New York University, New York.
Niagara University, Niagara University.
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, Brooklyn.
Pratt Institute, Brooklyn.
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy.
St. Bonaventure College, St. Bonaventure.
Syracuse University, Syracuse.
Union College, Schenectady.
University of Buffalo, Buffalo.
University of Rochester, Rochester.
Vassar College, Poughkeepsie.

NORTH CAROLINA

Agricultural and Technical College, Greensboro.
Duke University, Durham.
North Carolina College for Negroes, Durham.
North Carolina State College, Raleigh.
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

NORTH DAKOTA

North Dakota Agricultural College, Fargo.
University of North Dakota, Grand Forks.

OHIO

Antioch College, Yellow Springs.
Case School of Applied Science, Cleveland.
Fenn College, Cleveland.
Heidelberg College, Tiffin.
Miami University, Oxford.
Ohio Northern University, Ada.
Ohio State University, Columbus.
Ohio University, Athens.
University of Akron, Akron.
University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati.
University of Dayton, Dayton.
University of Toledo, Toledo.
Western Reserve University, Cleveland.
Wilberforce University, Wilberforce.
Youngstown College, Youngstown.

OKLAHOMA

Langston University, Langston.
Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Stillwater.
Oklahoma City University, Oklahoma City.
University of Oklahoma, Norman.
University of Tulsa, Tulsa.

OREGON

Oregon State College, Corvallis.

PENNSYLVANIA

Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr.
Bucknell University, Lewisburg.
Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh.
Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia.
Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster.
Grove City College, Grove City.
Haverford College, Haverford.
Lafayette College, Easton.
Lehigh University, Bethlehem.
Muhlenberg College, Allentown.
Pennsylvania Military College, Chester.
Pennsylvania State College, State College.
Swarthmore College, Swarthmore.
Temple University, Philadelphia.
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh.
Wilson College, Chambersburg.
Villanova College, Villanova.

RHODE ISLAND

Brown University, Providence.
Rhode Island State College, Kingston.

SOUTH CAROLINA

The Citadel, Charleston.
Clemson Agricultural College, Clemson.
Colored Normal College, Orangeburg.
Furman University, Greenville.
University of South Carolina, Columbia.

SOUTH DAKOTA

South Dakota State College, Brookings.
University of South Dakota, Vermillion.

TENNESSEE

Fisk University, Nashville.
Tennessee Polytechnic Institute, Cookeville.
University of Tennessee, Knoxville.
Vanderbilt University, Nashville.

TEXAS

Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, College Station.
Baylor University, Waco.
East Texas State Teachers College, Commerce.
Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene.
North Texas State Teachers College, Denton.
Rice Institute, Houston.
Southern Methodist University, Dallas.
Texas Christian University, Fort Worth.
Texas College of Arts and Industry, Kingsville.
Texas College of Mines and Metallurgy, El Paso.
Texas Technological College, Lubbock.
University of Houston, Houston.
University of Texas, Austin.
West Texas State Teachers College, Canyon.

UTAH

Brigham Young University, Provo.
University of Utah, Salt Lake City.
Utah State Agricultural College, Logan.

VERMONT

Norwich University, Northfield.
University of Vermont, Burlington.

VIRGINIA

College of William and Mary, Williamsburg
Hampton Institute, Hampton.
University of Richmond, Richmond.
University of Virginia, Charlottesville.
Virginia Military Institute, Lexington.
Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg.
Virginia State College for Negroes, Ettrick.
Virginia Union University, Richmond.

WASHINGTON

Gonzaga University, Spokane.
State College of Washington, Pullman.
University of Washington, Seattle.

WEST VIRGINIA

West Virginia State College, Institute.
West Virginia University, Morgantown.

WISCONSIN

Marquette University, Milwaukee.
University of Wisconsin, Madison.

WYOMING

University of Wyoming, Laramie.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Catholic University of America.
George Washington University.
Howard University.

The work of preparing men in the armed services for their return to civilian life commences within the armed services themselves. As all know, until within recent months the entire attention of all officers and officials of the armed forces was required for the vital work of creating an effective armed force capable of first resisting and ultimately defeating the enemy. Time was of the essence in this task lest we lose the war before we were prepared to win it.

The moment that any officers were available for release from this priority task the armed services started preparations for discharging their responsibilities to the men under their control in successfully reintegrating them into the civilian life from which they were taken. At first it was physically only possible to provide for the hurry-up filling out of questionnaires on occupation, at the time of discharge, but as facilities and personnel have become available this is being constantly expanded with the ultimate aim of having each man as completely processed as possible at the earliest practicable date and of making this information fully available to those agencies actively concerned with the veteran's reinstatement in his civilian environment.

In the statement introduced by you in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 14, page 8324, there is given the chronology of the expanding operations in the procedures being worked out for the reintegration of discharged veterans into civil life. There was not covered in that statement the actual work going on within the armed forces to prepare men for this transition.

In the Army, the initial steps were taken within the Air Force since this has the most difficult and critical problems. Any procedures which met the needs of the Air Force personnel would in consequence include within it all procedures necessary for ground force personnel, and the Air Force was then the obvious field in which procedures should be inaugurated.

Procedures developed here compass both the rehabilitation of men for combat service and for return to civilian life. During the continuance of hostilities the major flow from these installations will obviously be men returning to active duty after being properly reconditioned. After the termination of hostilities the major flow will be those returning to civil life which transition involves no basic change in the operational procedures that have already been developed. This program commences with a physical and mental rehabilitation program in the hospitals which commences within 2 days after an operation. This procedure might be termed "active convalescence" contrasted with past practice which might be accurately termed "passive convalescence." The results are startling as shown in the following report, wherein in the case of virus pneumonia the recovery period of the active convalescent group averaged 31 days against 45 days' hospitalization for the passive group, and with a 3-percent recurrence of the malady in the active group against 30-percent recurrence in the passive group. This physical and mental reconditioning is accompanied by occupational instructions, the objective of the entire course being to recondition the maximum number possible for further service in the armed forces in their original assignment if suitable, otherwise in that position to which they are most fitted, and for those men whose condition requires their return to civil life the maximum preparation mentally and occupationally to facilitate their return to a satisfactory civilian status. There follows herewith the statement of this program prepared by the Chief of the Convalescent Rehabilitation Branch of the Medical Services Division of the Office of the Air Surgeon:

DECEMBER 2, 1943.

Memorandum to: Colonel Sanders, Chief of Reemployment Division, Selective Service Headquarters, Washington, D. C.

Subject: The Army Air Forces Convalescent-Rehabilitation Training Program.

The following is a brief summary of the first year's experiences in the operation of a convalescent training program among the hospitalized personnel of the Army Air Forces:

On December 1, 1942, the Air Surgeon, Maj. Gen. David N. W. Grant, approved the principle of convalescent-rehabilitation training in Army Air Forces hospitals. On December 14, 1942, Gen. H. H. Arnold, Commanding General of the Army Air Forces, directed that such a program be established in all Air Forces hospitals. To date, some 25,000,000 man-hours of physical and educational training have been given in Army Air Forces hospitals. The teaching rate at the present time is approximately 2,750,000 man-hours per month.

The convalescent training program is designed for the ordinary sick soldier in our station hospitals. Physical reconditioning is accomplished by a systematic, graduated series of calisthenics and corrective exercises. These are first given in their mildest form even to bed patients. The exertion is gradually increased to a full organized period of close-order drill, outdoor games, recreation, and ward fatigue. Exercises begin in bed 2 days postoperatively to prevent muscles from becoming flabby. A pneumonia patient will begin deep breathing, hand, arm, and chest exercises as soon as his temperature is normal. This simple, early, exercise routine improves the muscle tone of the patient and is an excellent morale factor. It continues him as a part of the group.

Conditioning camps have been established under medical supervision, in our basic training centers, to strengthen recently inducted, under-par soldiers, unable to keep up with the regular program, and ambulatory patients requiring a long period of convalescence. These conditioning camps function in the same manner as a spring training camp for a baseball team. Patients in Army Air Forces hospitals have been able to benefit from heliotherapy, as well as physical exercise, by the planting and tending of over 250 Victory gardens. Some in the desert areas have even had an irrigation system built by convalescent patients.

The educational portion of the convalescent training program is organized to meet the needs of all special types of Army Air Forces installations. In the basic training centers the emphasis is on self-protection, gas warfare, camouflage, booby traps, land mines, map reading, judo, and first aid, as well as military courtesy. The motto is "While you are sick in the hospital today you may learn something that may save your life 6 months from now." All types of training, orientation, and morale films are used daily in the educational program. Training aids, visual aids, and handicraft with model airplanes, tanks, ships, and camouflage nets have proved of excellent educational and corrective therapeutic value.

Special classes have been organized for the teaching of illiterates and for review courses in mathematics and physics. A daily summary of current events and an orientation course in world geography plays a lively part in the curriculum.

In the technical schools the program is modified to meet special needs. At the radio schools, for example, special code receiving sets and sending keys have been placed in the hospital wards so that men may continue to practice even while in bed. During certain periods of the day the wards are blacked out, and the men send and receive blinker code from bed to bed. Formerly, it was noted that men would lose their code speed after a week without practice. Now our patients are leaving the hospital with maintained and, in many cases, increased speed.

In the hospitals serving the flying fields and tactical units, geography, geopolitics, airplane identification, reptile-insect-pest-control lectures, lectures on arctic and tropical medicine and field sanitation are the subjects stressed. Medical officers have designed a series of patient-doctor talks to give the men a knowledge of the symptoms, cause, treatment, and prevention of various tropical diseases. This has been of tremendous help in orienting these soldiers in their new environment and allaying the fear that comes, naturally, when going into unfamiliar surroundings.

Phonographs and records for the teaching of 30 languages and dialects, designed to teach a man a vocabulary of 150 words in 7 hours of study, have been made available to all Army Air Forces hospitals. The soldiers have shown great interest in this particular field. Special classes in aquatics, life saving, and advanced first aid are given in all installations, where practicable.

Patients about to be released from the Army on a certificate of disability discharge are given orientation lectures encompassing their relationship to the Army when they return to their homes. They are also instructed in the uses of WBAGO Form 53, covering such subjects as duties, rights, assistance, and advice covering Government insurance. They are invited to attend lectures on first aid, gas warfare, etc., in the hospital, so that upon their return to civilian life they may participate in the program of civilian defense. Also, these men are interviewed by the medical officer in charge of their case. They are told why they are being discharged from the Army; their disability is frankly discussed with them. Recommendations are given as to further medical treatment and the medical contacts that should be made after their return home. It is felt that in this way the Army Air Forces doctor can help educate the patient as to his physical condition and assist his family doctor on the home frone in seeing that he gets adequate medical care.

In addition to the regular staff, instructors in the convalescent training program are obtained from volunteer officers assigned to the medical department, or airfield, but by far the largest source of supply is from the patients themselves. Seventy-five percent of the instructors used in the program are convalescent patients who have seen foreign service or who are specialists in military or related civilian subjects.

Summary: The results of our experience with the convalescent training program have been most gratifying. Spot checks in various hospitals have shown hospital readmissions reduced because men are being sent back to duty in much better physical condition. The period of convalescence in certain acute, infectious, and contagious diseases has been definitely shortened. One hospital reported a reduction from 18 to 11 days in patients with measles and a drop from 33 to 23 hospital days in convalescents with scarlet fever. A recent study of 350 cases of virus pneumonia, running two parallel groups, revealed that the group permitted to convalesce in the routine manner averaged 45 days of hospitalization, with 30 percent recurrence. The group that was very carefully supervised and integrated into the physical reconditioning program averaged 31 hospital days, with only a 3-percent recurrence. The necessity for granting sick leaves has been abolished almost entirely. With travel conditions as they are, it was found that many soldiers going on convalescent leave became ill en route and at home; now when they leave the hospital, they are immediately ready to step into a full training

schedule. The educational phase of the training program has been enthusiastically received by the soldiers in the Army Air Forces hospitals, and a wealth of additional military knowledge has been disseminated to them.

We have reached the peak of training in this present global war. Each day finds greater numbers of soldiers overseas in the theaters of operation. Military operations mean battle casualties. The war-weary and wounded are now returning in ever-increasing numbers. Convalescent training must of necessity change to the rehabilitation training of casualties.

ARMY AIR FORCES REHABILITATION TRAINING PROGRAM

The Army Air Forces is establishing eight rehabilitation centers at strategic areas throughout the continental United States. Already units are in operation at Coral Gables, Fla., Santa Ana, Calif., and Jefferson Barracks, Mo. Very shortly one will be opened at Pawling, N. Y. Staffs are being assembled and provisions made for the remaining four units at Denver, Colo., San Antonio, Tex., Montgomery, Ala., and Fort George Wright, Wash., to be prepared to function within 24 hours' notice. At these units every facility is being utilized to bring about the mental and physical rehabilitation of the soldiers. Every skill and effort will be centered on the task of reconditioning all possible casualties for return to military service. Five principles are mandatory; in order of possibility, they are:

1. Reconditioning of the man for return to his original Army Air Forces assignment.

2. Reconditioning of the man for return to the Army Air Forces in a different assignment than his original.

3. Reconditioning of the man for return to assignment within the Army.

4. Reconditioning of the man for optimum return to civilian life as a self-sufficient individual, both socially and economically.

5. Providing the man every possible advantage prior to discharge to the Veterans' Administration.

Special broad courses in transitional vocational training are being offered, for those in the fourth and fifth categories, to enable the man to integrate from one type of job to another. Physicians, educators, physical therapists, physiotherapists, psychologists, and psychiatrists, who have already demonstrated their ability in the convalescent training program, are used to staff these centers.

To further orient these physicians to the field of rehabilitation, post-graduate courses for psychiatrists, orthopedists, and other specialized medical personnel are given at the Institute for the Crippled and Disabled, 400 First Avenue, New York City. Every facility is being used to assist the physically and psychologically wounded soldiers to make a new place for themselves in military or civilian life. Trained psychiatrists, familiar with the psychology of flying personnel and the convalescent soldier, are being utilized for psychotherapy and for consultation service in readjustment problems. The flight surgeon has a paramount place in the rehabilitation center. For years the flyer has been taught to look upon the flight surgeon as his family doctor and as a man to whom he can come with all of his personal problems. This has been of primary importance in the maintenance of the high morale of the flying crew and will be invaluable in their rehabilitation.

In the post-war days ahead it is hoped that such a program may find its counterpart in many civilian hospitals, so that the medically, surgically, and psychologically handicapped will not be subjected to endless days of boredom and worry about their future security. Instead they will begin, in the early days of hospitalization, a planned physical and vocational retraining regime that will enable them to return to a self-respecting, self-supporting, useful life.

ARMY AIR FORCES REDISTRIBUTION CENTERS

Working in close liaison with the above program are the Army Air Forces redistribution centers. They are now established in three strategic areas in the continental United States. The purpose of these centers is to examine, reevaluate, and reassign casuals returned from overseas in line with the five outlined principles of the rehabilitation program. The centers serve both enlisted and officer personnel. Whereas the first two programs are under the direct charge of Maj. Gen. David N. W. Grant, the air surgeon, the redistribution work is directed by the Office of the Assistant Chief of Air Staff, personnel. Headquarters for the work is at Atlantic City, N. J.

It is a primary function of the redistribution centers to complete the first period of the Air Corps man and stimulate his appetite for return to active duty. The service thus guarantees individual planning for each man.

Vocational guidance: Personnel officers work with men who are to be discharged to civilian life because of physical disabilities. These officers are selected because of civilian experience in job analysis—vocational placement work. They will coordinate their program with other organizations engaged in similar work: Veterans' Administration, the War Manpower Commission, the Selective Service System, the United States Employment Service, etc.

Careful research has been done in correlating Army Air Corps jobs with civilian job categories. Such information is carefully considered with the military personnel about to return to civilian life.

Throughout, the plans of the Army Air Forces redistribution program are flexible. They will be geared to the load placed upon them in salvaging men for return to Air Corps or Army assignments, or transition to civilian or veteran status.

HOWARD A. RUSK,
Lieutenant Colonel, Medical Corps; Chief, Convalescent-Rehabilitation Branch; Medical Services Division, Office of the Air Surgeon.

INDUSTRIAL DEMOBILIZATION

(The following extracts are from a talk by Brig. Gen. William F. Tompkins before representatives of industry and labor on September 28, 1943.)

Because of the enormity of the task of stopping the war-production machine, advance planning for industrial demobilization has been under way, while, at the same time, we have not yet completed mobilizing for the greatest effort of the war. This is essential so that jobs for demobilized soldiers and war workers can be made available with a minimum of delay and contracts terminated and settled promptly and equitably.

I would like to give you a brief summary of our planning procedures. Initial work consisted of an intensive research of the subject, including an analysis of the procedures followed by this and other governments following the conclusion of World War No. 1. We have attempted to highlight the mistakes that were made then in order that we may avoid them when we face the problems this time. We then systematically proceeded to define and list the various problems for which we must have a solution when we demobilize the Army and the industrial activities of the War Department. Each of these problems is being carefully studied by the agencies who are expert on the subject. Obviously, our plans must be flexible, in order that they can be adjusted to future military contingencies, and in order that they may be fitted into any over-all plans that may be adopted by the Federal Government.

One important principle has been established and will be of universal application. Procedures which will be used at the time of the greatest demobilization rate should, as far as practicable, be the same procedures that are now being used to effect the same results on a reduced scale. For example, we are currently demobilizing a comparatively large number of men. These are men who were discharged for being more than 38 years of age, and those who have been sick or wounded but who, though now recovered, should no longer be continued on active duty. Discharges for this reason are, of course, continually taking place. We can to a large extent perfect today, through actual experience in current operations, the demobilization procedures which we expect to employ when the rate of demobilization increases to its highest tempo. By this practice, we will insure that we have a smooth-working, time-tested demobilization machine, and will avoid the hiatus that would inevitably result if we were to attempt to formulate new and unfamiliar practices to be placed suddenly in effect when the problem becomes critical.

You will be interested in the plans that are being made for the employment of demobilized personnel. Although the reemployment of these men is not a function of the War Department, the Department is vitally interested in the problem and desires to extend every assistance possible. Plans are being made now by the War Department to work in cooperation with the several Federal agencies charged with reemployment. Upon induction into military service, men were carefully classified as to skills and aptitudes in order to insure that best use would be made of their service. This procedure will be thrown in reverse gear; before leaving the service, all men will be reclassified in order to have their records reflect the skills acquired by them while in military service.

These records, with appropriate translations as to the civilian jobs for which a soldier's military training has prepared him, will be made available to the employment agencies. We plan, prior to demobilization, to aid these agencies in every way in furnishing all the men with full information as to how to proceed to obtain reemployment on return to civil life.

We have also recognized that the returning soldiers face the difficult problems of readjustment, particularly those who will have been in the Army for a long time or who went directly from school into the Army and who have never known an independent self-sustaining civilian status. We are taking steps to see that they are prepared for their transformation to post-war civilian life, as far as the War Department can do so prior to discharge, by such means as furnishing expert advice on future employment and, where practicable, by advance vocational training in preparation for the type of employment they may select.

The War Department is also greatly interested in the welfare of civilian employees in its war plants. We recognize that there are many problems of the future security of the worker which are incidental to the conversion from war to peace. The War Department would like to assist as far as its authority permits.

Following up the success of the active convalescent program in the Air Force hospitals, the Surgeon General of the Army has issued instructions to install this system of active convalescence in all military hospitals.

The Army has under study plans for extending as far as may prove practicable vocational rehabilitation and vocational training within the armed services.

The War Department is perfecting procedures for revising the Army classification system. When men were inducted into the Army they went to a reception center where they generally remained 2 to 5 days. At these centers they were interviewed by teams of trained interviewers and their educational and occupational history recorded on a qualification form (A. G. O. Form 20), which accompanies a man throughout his military career and to which is added his military experience. At the reception center in addition to the interviewing, aptitude tests were given and the classification officer determined the man's best type of assignment based on his experience and qualifications. The experience gained will be used in preparing a record based on his military experience directed toward the man's best opportunities in civilian life. In this record there will be information as to those military experiences, trainings, and qualifications which have a bearing on civilian occupations. This record will be prepared for the benefit of the man in assisting him in proper job placement upon his return to civil life.

The Navy has from the beginning concerned itself with the placement in civic occupations of their discharged veterans. Primarily the Navy has sought to place as many of its men as possible on its own civilian employment list as in its machine shops, arsenals, and so forth. Recently, it has inaugurated an experiment in cooperation with an industrial concern in the New York area of giving men in the hospitals occupational training to equip them for employment in specific jobs in this plant. If this is successful it will probably be extended. Recently the Navy organized a Board to coordinate all of its demobilization procedures. This Board is composed of officers having previous experience with various phases of this work. The Marine Corps has also recently established a similar Board.

In the War Department the Special Services Division currently provides educational courses by the correspondence-school method available to troops in any part of the world. It is making plans to have available occupational training and educational courses to troops during the period of demobilization. This is not based on any plan to retain men in the forces for the purpose of taking such courses. It is intended to place at the disposal of those men desiring it the opportunity of preparing themselves for their return to civil life during the period that will be required between the cessation of hostilities and the demobilization of many of the units who would be engaged in garrison duty or who for other reasons could not be immediately demobilized and where the men would have available time for such courses which would not interfere with the performance of their military duties.

It is important to appraise at this time the effectiveness with which the machinery established by the Government is functioning in returning our veterans to civil life. Unfortunately, our reporting machinery is not yet sufficiently perfected as regards giving us direct information on each man after his return to civil life to permit of the giving of an accurate detailed report based on positive knowledge of each individual. We can, however, make a reasonably accurate appraisement of the success with which operations are being conducted from those reports which we do have and the number of complaints which we receive.

The Reemployment Division of the Selective Service System has received reports from hospitals on 179,506 men discharged for physical disabilities. Of these, 107,633, of 59.9 percent, are reported as reemployed or undergoing rehabilitation or the men stated that they needed no assistance. Cases awaiting reports are 71,873. Of these, 20,000 to 25,000 would be men discharged from the hospitals within the preceding 4 weeks' period and on which there is hardly time to have received reports. Approximately 1,800 reports a week are received from reemployment committeemen regarding the job placement of the men whose records have been sent to them. To each of the men discharged from the 288 hospitals reporting to the Reemployment Division, except where the man states that he does not wish assistance, is sent a letter from his local reemployment committeeman proffering the committeeman's service in assisting him in job placement or in procuring the service of other Government agencies of whose facilities he may have need should the veteran desire such assistance. The great majority of the cases on which we are awaiting reports represent those men who do not respond or in any way acknowledge the letters from their reemployment committeemen. It is a fair inference that at least the great majority of this 50,000 have placed themselves in jobs.

Evidence on the negative side is the fact that Reemployment Division headquarters generally has less than 20 open cases on hand from men complaining of difficulties in obtaining employment. The number of complaints forwarded through Members of Congress do not average 2 a week. Inquiry of the American Red Cross and the Army Emergency Relief as to the amount of assistance that they have had to render to discharged veterans indicates that they have had to furnish assistance to less than 5 percent of the men being currently discharged from the armed forces. The average amount of financial assistance rendered by the Army Emergency Relief was approximately $35 per man and of the Red Cross $48 per man. There is undoubtedly some duplication in that the same man might have been served by both agencies, and we know definitely that in some cases some men have been served several times by the same agency. Some of the money furnished has been for the purchase of tools and other expenses connected with taking a job. The amount advanced per capita does not indicate acute distress but rather a helping out over a temporary difficulty where a man may have no funds for civilian clothes or has expended all his funds before reaching home and needs additional travel money and items of this type.

The writer visited the State Farm in Indiana in his capacity as Chief of the Reemployment Division of the Selective Service System to interview a group of 18 veterans whom he had learned had been sentenced to the farm. There were 21 veterans all sentenced to this farm of whom the 18 interviewed held honorable discharges. Every one of the 18 had obtained a job shortly after discharge, 17 of them were working at that job at the time they got into difficulty with the law. All of them blamed themselves exclusively for their troubles.

The Reemployment Division, however, holds itself accountable for at least 50 percent of the responsibility of these men having gotten into difficulties as after interviewing them the writer felt reasonably certain that if all of these men had been handled completely through the procedures established by the armed forces and the civilian agencies in connection with returning a man to civil life that 75 percent of these men might have been kept out of difficulties through proper conselling and suggestions. Of the 18 not 1 had received full information as to the service provided by the Government. Not 1 had seen a Reemployment committeeman. Only 2 had been interviewed by the Red Cross and they had been informed only of the service rendered by the Red Cross. Only 1 had been to a United States employment office. The reasons for their not receiving full information were from causes previously known and which steps had already been taken to remedy, that in the Army now being in operation, so that in a short time it should be physically impossible for a man to get out of the armed services without being fully informed upon all of the services available to him. Only 2 of the 18 were hospital discharges and were quite likely from smaller hospitals not yet covered by the hospital interviewing service which now covers 288 hospitals.

Originally in the Army all men discharged, whether from hospitals or camps filled out a questionnaire on their occupation and were given a letter of instructions regarding their return to civil life. Due to the amount of work entailed in discharging a man and the physical conditions surrounding many of the discharge points other than hospitals the records reached the Reemployment Division after the man got home when they were of little use in solving his problem. This part of the service was therefore discontinued, except for hospitals, as loading the Army with paper work which was not effective and new procedures worked out with the War Department to cover this situation which has now been done by the development in the War Department of new Separation Form (AGO Form 53) which simultaneously furnishes not only the Reemployment Division but the United States Employment Service and its Veterans' Employment Division, the Veterans' Administration, the local board of registration promptly with information concerning the discharged men and also provides him with a copy which makes available services of the various agencies without waiting to obtain his other papers. This at the same time has materially decreased the amount of paper work connected with discharging a soldier.

The cooperation existing between the various Government departments concerned in this field of activity and the manner in which they have been coordinating their activities is deserving of particular emphasis.

The United States Employment Service, through its Occupational Analysis Division, has been cooperating with both the Army and the Navy in working out conversion of military jobs to civilian jobs, and has already produced several booklets of job conversion which are being used to assist men to get the best advantage in their civil occupations of the skills they have developed in their training in the Army and Navy.

The Veterans' Employment Division of the United States Employment Service is conducting interviews in hospitals of men about to be discharged, in cooperation with the Surgeon General's offices of the Army and Navy, with the Red Cross, and with the Reemployment Division of Selective Service. The divisions charged with working out demobilization procedures for the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps are all in close consultation with the Reemployment Division of Selective Service, the Veterans' Employment Division of the United States Employment Service, and the Veterans' Administration, as well as with employer organizations. By request of The Adjutant General, an officer from the Reemployment Division of Selective Service is assisting in simplifying discharge records and procedures so as to facilitate both the work of the Reemployment Division, the Veterans' Administration, and the United States Employment Service.

The War Department and the Veterans' Administration are jointly working to reduce the time necessary to process a veteran's claim for pension for service-connected disabilities. Progress has already been made, one element in the procedure having been reduced from 35 to 10 days, and it is expected to bring it down to 6 days.

In addition to the voluntary cooperation and coordination of work which has existed among the various departments enumerated

for more than 2 years, the President recently appointed a coordinating committee to study the entire program and to recommend any additional procedures that might be found necessary. This committee consists of the Director of the Veterans' Administration, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, and later appointed the Director of War Mobilization as coordinator of all such activities.

Some examples of actual services rendered veterans will serve to illustrate the operating procedures involved.

A Negro, discharged from the Infantry after hospitalization, because his knee gave way under heavy marching, was rejected for reemployment by his former employer because of a loose cartilage in the knee joint, which might have slipped, locking the leg rigidly without warning and causing an accident if the man was driving a truck—which was his occupation with the employer. The matter was referred to the reemployment committeeman and simultaneously to the United States attorney. The two cooperated. The case was forwarded to national headquarters, Reemployment Division, at Washington, which asked the employer for a full history of the case. Two previous injuries to the same leg while in the service of the employer, prior to entry in the armed service, were disclosed. Neither injury had resulted in more than a few days' lay-up, when work was resumed, the injury apparently leaving no permanent ill effects.

This would have been a very difficult case to decide as to whether the man came under workmen's compensation, for injuries sustained prior to entry in the armed service, or whether it was a service-connected disability. Obviously, however, the immediate need of the veteran was a place on a pay roll, as he was in no position to await adjudication of such a case. The employer was requested to have a full investigation made and to see what could be done toward immediate rehabilitation of the veteran. The employer sent the man to an excellent surgeon, who made a complete examination and forwarded his diagnosis, with recommended treatment, length of time for proper hospitalization, and a prognosis of recovery with complete use of the leg. With this information in hand, the case was taken to the Veterans' Administration, which immediately arranged for hospitalization and the necessary operation. The man has now been operated upon and his employer has promised him his old job.

A veteran who was one of the top men with a public utility power plant, operating under a closed-shop agreement, returned to find himself excluded from reinstatement by the group within the plant, three of whom would have been stepped down in their jobs to readmit the veteran. The veteran placed his case in the hands of the United States attorney, who at once called in the reemployment committeeman, and the case was sent to the reemployment division at national headquarters. From here it was taken up with the representative on the national clearing-house committee of the major labor organization of which the local in question was a member. He immediately got in touch with the national president of the union, who held a conference with the chief of the reemployment division on the case, after which the president got in touch with the head of the local, got their side of the story, which indicated that the veteran himself had been to a substantial degree at fault in causing his own exclusion from the plant. The result of the discussion between the national president and the president of the local was that they sent a representative to see the reemployment committeeman, with instructions to cooperate with him, and, after an interview with the plant force, the veteran was voluntarily reinstated in his old job by the same men who had initially excluded him.

Man reported reemployed by old employer without assistance, but due to housing shortage, reemployment committeeman located available living quarters for him.

Mother of veteran writes of deep appreciation of interest shown in her son, and effective aid and advice rendered.

Man reemployed in old job at higher pay, but wife and family worried over business being discontinued and that work too hard for his condition. Placed in training program at State university under the E. S. M. W. T. of United States Department of Education and listed with United States Employment Service for eventual placement. Case being followed up by committeeman to family's gratification.

Man reports to committeeman that he is more than satisfied with job as farm hand and appreciates all the interest on his behalf that was shown him.

Man reemployed, and through committeeman transferred to another department at a higher salary where his injury does not handicap him.

Man referred for needed medical attention with Veterans' Administration and placed with a large corporation as soon as he is able to work.

Reemployment committeeman reports that men placed on farms have been replaced in defense industries after the harvest season, and that all cases were being checked on at regular intervals.

One reemployment committeeman in a country district has reported on the satisfactory disposition of 53 cases, few of whom needed aid, but all of them or their families were checked on to the heightened morale of the community.

Not all cases are decided in favor of the veteran, however. Where the veteran is in the wrong, the decision is rendered against him.

In one case a veteran, upon return to his old job, failed to perform his duties satisfactorily, became obstreperous, when his deficiencies were called to his attention, failed to respond to any suggestions for improvement, and finally was dismissed by his employer.

The case was appealed to National Headquarters, and the Reemployment Division sustained the employer and requested the reemployment committeeman to seek a new job for the veteran and give him some advice as to his proper conduct, and point out to him that in failing to properly fulfill the duties of the job he undertook he was not only injuring himself and his own future, but was damaging the employment opportunities of other veterans.

It is sought to make the term veteran a hallmark of quality, through the superior performance of which veterans are capable.

The following letter from a reemployment committeeman is inserted, not as being typical, but as being of the type of service that the best reemployment committeemen are now rendering to returning veterans, and the type of service which the Reemployment Division hopes to have rendered ultimately by the great majority of the reemployment committeemen, most of whom are rendering loyal service to the returning members of the armed forces:

"DEAR SIR: Supplementing my call on you Wednesday night, October 20, 1943, I am at the request of your mother stating in writing some of the conversation we had.

"My call was at the insistence of Selective Service Reemployment Division, to offer reemployment aid, if needed, and to see that you are properly serviced by the Government agencies set up to help you.

"I was very much surprised to find you in your present condition and would advise that you file a claim for benefits with the Veterans' Administration immediately. This can be done by designating and giving power of attorney to either the Red Cross or the American Legion for proper filing and handling of your claim. This cannot be done without authority from you.

"By filing this claim you may be able to establish your disability as incurred or aggravated in service and as a pensionable disability, which is the first requirement to make a veteran eligible for vocational rehabilitation. The purpose of this training program is to restore employability lost by virtue of a disability incurred or aggravated by service in the armed forces. Maintenance to the amount of $80 per month will be paid while pursuing a course of instruction.

"The Veterans' Administration will pay the cost of instruction, including tuition fees, books, supplies, and equipment. Medical care will also be furnished.

"Training to be (a) in private and public schools such as universities, colleges, and vocational schools, (b) in business and industrial establishments which will be used to provide training on the job. I would suggest that you give earnest consideration to the above proposal as your entire future may depend upon your action today.

"I would also inquire if you have continued your national service life insurance. This insurance may be continued after discharge by forwarding within 31 days from the end of the period for which deduction was last made to the Collection Subdivision, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., check or money order payable to the Treasurer of the United States.

"This is the cheapest insurance one will ever get, and I would urge that you keep it in force at least until you know definitely what you would like to do with it.

"Also at your earliest convenience take your discharge papers to the county register of deeds and have them registered for safety's sake. There is no fee for this as the office is required to register them by law.

"It is my duty to serve as your agent and counselor, with the direct responsibility to see that you are properly rehabilitated, therefore, do not hesitate to call on me at any time that I can serve you.

"With best wishes for a speedy recovery, I am,

"Very sincerly yours,

"_____,

"Reemployment Committeeman,
Local Board No. 1."

The United States Employment Service and its Veterans' Employment Division have 1,500 offices and some 3,500 visiting offices throughout the United States. The reemployment committeemen maintain close touch with these offices for the purpose of referring veterans to them where new jobs are the objective. Before Pearl Harbor some complaints were received of failure of the Employment Service to find jobs for servicemen, but no such complaint has been sent to this office in at least 10 months.

The reports received from the reemployment committeemen show that the United States Employment Service is doing a highly successful work in placing in satisfactory jobs the discharged veterans going to it for placement.

Current operations are summarized as follows:

1. No veteran, with those few exceptions impossible to avoid in any organization of human beings, is being turned adrift to shift for himself. Practically without exception all cases of veterans in difficulties, where they were not receiving adequate assistance, are those of veterans who have failed to

avail themselves of any of the Government agencies set up to assist them in their return to civil life.

2. In 288 hospitals, all patients about to be discharged are interviewed by the Red Cross personnel to ascertain whether they need assistance on their return to civil life, and their cases are reported to the Reemployment Division of the Selective Service System which, in turn, forwards the information to the reemployment committeeman in the proper locality. He writes a letter to those veterans indicating that they desire service, placing himself at their disposal to assist them in their return to civil life Such interviews have been given to over 6,500 men a week, and the total number of interviews so far given is 179,506. Fifty-nine and six-tenths percent or 107,633, of these cases either indicated they needed no assistance or that they have already been placed in jobs or are undergoing rehabilitation.

3. The Veterans' Employment Division of the United States Employment Service has its interviewers available for consultation by those being discharged who wish such interviews in 58 out of 61 Army general hospitals, in 327 out of 371 Army station hospitals, and in 43 out of 50 naval hospitals.

The Veterans' Employment Division is not yet in receipt of accurate statistics, but, according to the best data they can assemble from their field reports at present, they are interviewing approximately 3,000 men a week. Of these, about 60 percent, and in some cases more, go to the employment offices after their return home. Jobs have been found, it is estimated, for 80 percent. Other men have needed rehabilitation or further training before employment or desire to continue their education before seeking a job.

4. The returning veteran has awaiting his return, ready to assist him, the following:

(a) Fifteen thousand reemployment committeemen attached to 6,450 local boards in as many localities.

(b) The Veterans' Employment Division, which has a Federal representative in each State and a special United States Employment Service representative in each of 1,500 United States employment offices who are there to serve the veteran's interest.

(c) The United States Employment Service, with 1,500 regular offices and 3,500 visiting offices ready to serve his employment needs.

(d) The Veterans' Administration, with administrative offices and hospitalization facilities well distributed over the United States, prepared to provide the veteran with hospitalization, surgical operations, prosthetic appliances, vocational rehabilitation for service-connected disabilities, and pensions for service-connected permanent disabilities.

(e) Vocational rehabilitation agencies operated under the State departments of education and financed with Federal funds, through the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, through which vocational rehabilitation may be had for any veteran, regardless of whether his disability is service connected or not, and in connection with which allowances according to needs may be made for subsistence during the course of training.

(f) Limited college courses, for which tuition only is paid, conducted in 200 colleges and universities through arrangements made with the Office of Education of the Federal Security Agency, and information regarding which may be obtained by veterans from their reemployment committeeman.

(g) The Army emergency relief, furnishing temporary financial aid for discharged veterans in cases not eligible for assistance from the Red Cross or other agencies.

(h) American Red Cross, prepared to assist the veteran and his family, both financially and with advice and guidance when needed.

(i) The American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which have posts in practically every community, stand ready to assist the returning veteran in preparation and prosecution of pension claims through their experienced organizations, which have been doing this work for veterans for many years without cost.

(j) To support the work of the reemployment committeemen attached to the local boards, clearing house committees are being organized. These committees are independent groups which provide a means of placing the combined organized resources of local communities at the disposal of returning veterans. The committee's activities are closely coordinated with the work of the reemployment committeemen and are especially concerned with creating public opinion favorable to assisting handicapped veterans in securing employment, and they help to create a veteran preference in private employment. This preference, however, must be based upon veteran performance. As autonomous organized groups, the clearing house committees are able to render valuable assistance in adjusting disputes and other difficult problems relating to reemployment and employment of returning servicemen. Cases which cannot be adjusted by the clearing house committees are referred to the officials of the Selective Service System for settlement. In close cooperation with local agencies, the clearing house committees help to develop employment opportunities in the community.

The national clearing house committee is organized and is supervising the formation of State clearing house committees. Some county and city clearing house committees have been formed, and hundreds of additional local groups will be organized in the near future.

The clearing house committees at the national, State, and local levels will demonstrate the value of a closely integrated program, and it is apparent that through such combined strength, local communities will be able to solve many problems which, without the clearing house committees, would be extremely difficult to handle.

The majority of these committees should be in operation in the first half of 1944.

5. The success of current operations is indicated by the following reports:

(a) The hospital interviews on an average of 6,500 cases per week, indicating just under 60 percent satisfactorily taken care of. The 40 percent remaining represent those not heard from, and do not represent men not placed or in need of assistance.

(b) The Veterans' Employment Service on their hospital interviews and the resulting placement through the United States Employment Service indicates successful placement of returning veterans with the exception of those cases where difficulties arise from the condition or attitude of the man, the principal difficulty being physical or mental condition.

(c) With a total of 700,000 separations from the armed services, and 6,500 interviews with men being discharged weekly, the Reemployment Division of Selective Service has never run a current load of over 20 unsettled complaints from veterans regarding obtaining employment. In all of the closed cases, the rights of the veteran have been successfully sustained. The total number of cases in which the veteran has been in the wrong, and in which, in consequence, the reemployment division did not attempt to sustain him, are less than 20 cases.

(d) To October 31, 1943, the Veterans' Administration had filed with it only 2,864 claims for vocational rehabilitation. Of these, 433 were found to be physically or mentally unfit to take training at that time, 278 men are undergoing rehabilitation, and the other cases are in process. This is a good indication of the ease with which veterans are finding jobs. It is the general opinion that many veterans are taking advantage of present high wages and are postponing vocational rehabilitation for a later date.

(e) The combined reports of the Army Emergency Relief and of the American Red Cross as to the amount of assistance they are furnishing monthly to discharged veterans indicate less than 5 percent of those discharged during the month are receiving assistance, with an average amount per case of about $43. (There are known to be duplications in the list, of which there is no way of avoiding, so that the actual number of cases is undoubtedly less and the average amount to individual cases higher.) The amount of assistance indicates meeting only temporary emergencies. It is known that some of the assistance is for expenses in reentering civil life rather than for the relief of distress.

The above indicates about as complete a coverage of the needs of the returning veterans as seems to be possible under any system dealing with a large number of people. There is no known example of organized human effort that does not have a percentage of failures, and the efficiency of the present effort should be measured by comparing its failures with its degree of performance. If the failures are viewed without their background, we lose our sense of proportion and will be led to many erroneous conclusions.

While the combined performance of the existing agencies is excellent, it is not adequate, and nobody is more keenly aware of this than the agencies concerned. They are far better informed of their deficiencies than are those who are offering criticism without first troubling to obtain information—because they know the gap between what they are doing and what they feel able to do when tuned up to maximum efficiency.

For example, the Reemployment Division is completely dissatisfied with its record, and will not be satisfied until it has achieved very close to the 100-percent mark on knowing definitely of the proper placement of all veterans. It is not accepting as proof of performance its present positive information on 60 percent of the men being placed, coupled with an almost infinitesimal number of complaints. For the existing gaps in the coordinated program, the following steps are now in process:

1. The financial needs of veterans reentering civil life for reequipping themselves and for those entitled to pension for disabilities for carrying themselves during the period of adjudication of their claims, there is now before the Congress a bill providing for mustering-out pay. Based on the present-known facts, this bill will adequately—and even liberally—take care of this phase of the problem.

2. Because many of the men in the armed forces have been found not to read the instructions and information given them, or to read and then forget them, there is being arranged through the clearinghouse committees a personal house-to-house visit on all returned veterans, to make certain that they have full information as to their rights and the Government services at their disposal. This will be conducted by the veterans' organizations for the reemployment committeemen, and the results made available to all the other Government agencies concerned.

3. Through the clearinghouse committees, means will be established in each community, known to the entire community, through which any veteran in that community can be placed in contact by them with all of the Government agencies ready to serve him, and through which the mobilized resources of that community will be made

available for solving his particular personal problems.

4. The only difficulty of importance so far encountered in finding jobs for the veteran is the fear shown by a number of employers in taking on men with physical disability discharges. Veterans have been handicapped by demands that the results of their medical examination on discharge be made available to their employer before he will consider engaging them. This is being met by orders that will prohibit the furnishing of this information to employers—even upon request of the veteran (such a request is made under compulsion, since there is no greater compulsion in modern society than jeopardizing a man's employment opportunities). The use of the exit-medical examination would be equivalent to establishing a system of more severe medical examinations for veterans seeking employment than for nonveterans.

The Civil Service Commission has cooperated by arranging to determine the veteran's employability by the same physical examination as that given to any nonveteran applicant, and not to use an exit-medical examination of the armed forces for this purpose. The Federal Security Agency has cooperated by adopting the same policy. An educational campaign will be conducted among employers, showing them that they take less risk with a veteran than with a nonveteran, and that the Employment Service and the Reemployment Division both take all possible precautions to avoid referring veterans to jobs for which they are in any way unsuited.

5. Plans are now being studied for providing, by the time any large demobilization takes place, trained screening interviewers, and augmenting, as far as may be possible, the trained specialists on interviewing with the objective of screening out those not needing the services of highly skilled interviewers and reducing the load on our limited supply of skilled occupational guidance experts and skilled employment interviewers, so that the latter may be able to efficiently carry the load.

6. A pilot test has been under way for many months, in New York City, through the cooperative efforts of the Regional Director for the War Manpower Commission of New York State and the Director of Selective Service for New York City, as well as the Reemployment Division, the United States Employment Service, the Veterans' Employment Division, numerous social welfare agencies in New York, and the hospitals of New York, under which program medical and psychiatric examinations, occupational guidance interviews, etc., are being made available to returning veterans. This pilot operation is expected to furnish information as to the extent and type of services of this nature that may be needed by the time of a major demobilization, and to enable adequate provision to be made for meeting the need.

7. The needs of those members of the armed forces for completing interrupted education and the needs of those who require training in skilled operations are now before the Congress in a message from the President, transmitting recommendations of committees which have been studying these matters.

Present needs are therefore being met, with the exception of a minor fraction of cases, and active steps are now under way to pick up even these cases where the failure is primarily the fault of the veteran and not of the Government agencies. The one exception to the adequate provision for present needs is that covered by the current bills before the Congress on mustering-out pay. The additional needs that will become of ever-increasing importance as we approach the termination of hostilities are all being covered by the amplification of the existing plans or by the recommendations now before the Congress.

It cannot be too positively stated that there is:

(a) Complete cooperation between all the Government agencies concerned with the problems of returning veterans to civil life.

(b) Adequate coordination between these agencies, and this is being steadily improved through joint studies of the operations of agencies whose records form the basis of operation of another agency.

(c) There is no overlapping or duplication in the fields of these agencies.

(d) There very definitely is someone to do the necessary things for the proper return of the veteran to civil life, and they are and have been doing them.

(e) The cases cited as proof that the Government is doing nothing for the returning veteran are so minute a fraction of the total number of veterans separated from the service that they indicate that the veteran, under present conditions, is having practically no difficulty in his return to civilian status. (It is misinforming the public to have the small number of cases of veterans who are in difficulties presented as if they constituted the entire picture, with no mention of their relative proportion to the total number of returning veterans, and no mention of the fact that in the vast majority of these cases the veteran has failed to avail himself of the service of any of the Government agencies established for his benefit.)

It is significant that without exception people who have been publicizing statements of the Government's neglect of its veterans have, without a single exception failed to take the trouble to get any information on what was actually occurring from the Reemployment Division of Selective Service, which, because of the responsibility imposed upon it by the Congress, has to maintain close liaison with all the other Government agencies and keep posted on their operations.

One author after writing some 12 stories on the subject of the handling of returning veterans, finally took the trouble to come to the Reemployment Division to find out what was going on. In the case of 21 veterans sentenced to the State farm, the view the public got of the matter was that they constitute 10 percent of the commitments to that farm. What was overlooked was that they constitute 21 out of 28,000 veterans returned to that State, the current rate of return being over 2,100 per month.

There are two approaches to problems of the type of caring for the returning veteran—the emotional and the realistic.

The statements that have been made as to a present lack of attention to veteran needs are almost entirely from the emotional approach, which in all fields of endeavor habitually views the ills and faults people suffer from as the whole of the picture, and fails to reduce them to the proper perspective in regard to the entire situation.

An extreme example of the emotional approach was the case of one man who made public announcement of the fact that hundreds of returning veterans were being denied their jobs by their former employers. When called upon to assist by furnishing the names of some of the men so that their cases could be taken up for handling with the employer, the gentleman frankly admitted that he did not have a single specific case to hand over.

The emotional approach is useful in stimulating public action, and often no action has been taken on a vital subject until people with the emotional approach have blasted the public conscience into action on it.

The emotional approach, however, is a very poor operating medium, and the most successful operations are conducted on a realistic approach, which is the basis on which all the agencies concerned have been cooperating to provide adequate means for our returning veterans to secure positions in civilian life. All of these agencies are well aware of their weak points, and their deficiencies in operation, and are correcting them as rapidly as possible. Over all the President has set up a committee and a Coordinator to further assure the successful consummation of these objectives.

The primary reason why the public has so little knowledge of the work of the coordinated Government agencies reinstating the veteran in civil life is that there have been so few failures, and in this type of enterprise it is the failures that constitute news.

In conclusion, attention is called again to the four problems in current operations which have not yet been satisfactorily solved but all of which are in process of being handled through the development of adequate means and procedures. These are:

(a) The need for funds to reestablish themselves on a civilian status by discharged veterans. This is being provided for by several bills providing mustering-out pay. (Not over 5 percent of returning veterans appear to be presently acutely inconvenienced by present lack of such funds.)

(b) The time required to process veterans' claims for pensions due to the time required to complete records. This is in process of elimination through the joint efforts of the Veterans' Administration and the War and Navy Departments. Progress has already been made, and it is expected that before long this will be on a satisfactory basis. Not over 10 percent of veterans discharged have been adversely affected.

(c) Difficulties experienced in finding jobs for veterans with certain employers who interpose objections to engaging men discharged for physical disabilities without having complete medical histories. The number of employers in this category is very small and is being reduced through a combination of educational and administrative measures. This situation has affected only a small fraction of 1 percent of veterans discharged, as far as we are able to estimate.

(d) Veterans discharged for emotional upsets not sufficiently serious to need institutional care and who in fact would probably not benefit from such care, and who are at present in a sort of "no man's land," without adequate provision for reintegrating them into their civilian occupations.

This group needs primarily guidance and channeling back to a proper occupation through giving them initial jobs which will facilitate their readjustment to civil life. The pilot operation that has been going on for a number of months in New York City of providing such guidance and assistance to this group is expected to lay the foundation for an effective procedure in handling their interests.

Possibly as much as 10 percent of the men discharged may come within this category. Only a portion of these, however, are having real difficulties. The task with the others is to make easier and more efficient the readjustment which they are now accomplishing unaided, in the hard way.

The above constitute the current problems, all of which are in process of solution, none of which constitute a major problem, but all of the agencies concerned approach this work in the spirit that even one case of failure is one too many.

LEWIS SANDERS,
Colonel Field Artillery; Consultant,
Committee on Military Affairs,
United States Senate.

DECEMBER 3, 1943.

Coordinator of Veteran Activities (the Coordinator)—The Director of War Mobilization (Coordinating Committee)

Secretary of War	Secretary of Navy	Chairman, War Manpower Commission		Director, Veterans' Administration
Surgeon General	Surgeon General	Director, Selective Service.	U. S. Employment Service.	Hospitals.
Hospitals	Hospitals	Chief, Reemployment Division.		Pensions.
Surgeon, Air Force hospitals.	Discharge center	Reemployment Committees.	Veterans' Employment Division.	Vocational rehabilitation.
Convalescent centers				
Redistribution centers		Local clearing house committee (autonomous).	State vocational rehabilitation agency	
Discharge centers				
(Classification and interviewing sections).			(Federally financed)	

DISCHARGED VETERANS, ROUTING

Permanent hospitalization: Direct to Veterans' Administration.

Vocational rehabilitation: Service connected, Veterans' Administration, direct or with assistance reemployment committeemen.

Vocational rehabilitation: Nonservice connected, State Vocational Rehabilitation via reemployment committeemen.

Pension claims: Veterans' Administration claims can be presented and prosecuted without cost, through the accredited veterans' organizations or the Red Cross. Reemployment committeemen will see that veterans know where to present claims.

Return to old job: Through reemployment committeeman; assistance of local clearing house committee.

New job: Through United States Employment Service and its Veterans' Employment Division; Reemployment Division serves as liaison agent and follow-up man and is assisted by clearing house committee in finding jobs for filling through U. S. E. S. when needed.

Perfecting records and preliminary occupational guidance and training (to extent practicable, which will vary with time and place) within armed forces. Liaison with Reemployment Division and United States Employment Service through its Veterans' Employment Division.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to give notice to the Members of the Senate that it is my purpose on tomorrow to request that the Senate proceed to consider measures on the calendar to which there is no objection. If, on the call of the calendar, the railway-labor wage joint resolution is not passed, it will then be the purpose of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of that resolution separately.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

DEATH OF DANIEL B. LLOYD

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it is with very deep and sincere regret that I arise to announce the death of my good friend and the friend of every Senator and employee of the United States Senate, that venerable reporter, Mr. Daniel B. Lloyd. He was 83 years old, having been born in Maryland in 1860. He lived a full life right up to the last, and died on his way from this Chamber to his office, in the performance of his reportorial duties. Mr. Lloyd first became a member of the Official Corps of Reporters of the Debates of the United States Senate in October 1877, and served in that capacity in this body for more than 66 years. During all that time he was absent only 3 single days.

He carried himself like a Senator; he looked like a Senator, and was endowed by nature and disposition with a very fine presence and a very great dignity. His genial personality here and his constant words of encouragement will be remembered by all of those who were fortunate enough to be associated with him.

He has always lived in the State of Maryland where, in addition to his work here, he operated several farms very successfully. He was a very great reader, and was familiar not only with the proceedings of his own times, but with the proceedings of the Senate since this Government came into existence.

I know we shall all miss him, for his like does not come upon this earth with great frequency.

He is survived by a widow, a son, and two daughters. Each Member of this body and every employee of the Senate, I know, wishes the fullest and deepest sympathy extended to them in their great loss.

Therefore, Mr. President, I request that the Secretary of the Senate be directed to prepare on behalf of the membership of this body on both sides of the aisle, as well as of the employees of the Senate, an appropriate message of sympathy, expressing our friendship and reverence for our departed friend, and that it be transmitted to his widow.

I have lost not only a valuable constituent but a very fine friend, and the Nation has lost a great character.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the message will be transmitted as requested by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I share fully in the expressions of regret and distress which my colleague from Maryland has voiced so impressively and so eloquently. Certainly, Mr. Lloyd in the course of a long life has faithfully, conscientiously, and most efficiently performed the duties which came to him.

Most assuredly it can be said of him that in the performance of those duties his heart was always eager, his hands always ready for the work.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I share with the Senators from Maryland and all other Senators the grief that they have expressed and that we all feel over the sudden death of Mr. Lloyd. It seems almost incredible that he or any man would serve in the capacity in which he has served this body for a period of more than 66 years, which means that he became associated with the Senate before I was born and before most of us who now occupy seats in this Chamber were born.

Mr. Lloyd not only possessed those qualities of gentility and breeding to which the Senators from Maryland have referred, but he was a scholar in the real sense of the word, making a specialty of the study of English literature. This emphasizes the fact that day by day and year by year here in the Senate men come and go in the routine performance of their duties without most of us knowing anything about their real lives, frequently without most of us even knowing their names for years and years, because the performance of their duty comes and goes day by day. Yet who can say that Mr. Lloyd and men like him, whose names are never heralded on the front pages of the newspapers; whose names may not get into any history or any biographical treatise, have not, after all, rendered a greater service to their country and to the cause of liberty and of efficient legislation upon which the people depend than any of us who sit here with the right to speak for our constituents?

I rejoice that in America a man can devote his life to the legislative process. He can make it a career, just as he would make a career of medicine, law, education, the ministry, or any other calling. I am deeply grieved over the death of Mr. Lloyd. I wish for his family and friends that consolation which comes only from the knowledge that he lived a long, useful, and upright life.

In addition to the request made by the Senator from Maryland that a message be sent to the family of Mr. Lloyd, I believe that a man who served this body continuously for 66 years is entitled to have us authorize the Secretary, the Sergeant-at-Arms, or whoever has charge of the fund, to send an appropriate floral wreath to be placed upon his bier from the Senate of the United States, the cost thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate. I make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Kentucky is approved.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the news of the death of our associate of many years comes with tragic suddenness and brings to each of us a sense of personal loss.

I have heard this afternoon that Mr. Lloyd entered the service of this body 66

years ago. I know of my own personal knowledge that he was here in 1900, 43 years ago. Through all those years he has brought to his tasks rare technical skill, a most profound knowledge of parliamentary processes and history, and, as the Senator from Kentucky has said, a knowledge of all that is best in the literature of English-speaking peoples.

He served always with patience, kindliness, courtesy, and with profound fidelity to this great legislative body.

Mr. President, in behalf of all the minority Members, I assume the privilege of expressing the sense of our deep regret, and assuring the family of the deceased of our abiding and deep sympathy.

Mr. TYDINGS. If there be no further remarks by Senators, as a further mark of respect to the memory of Mr. Daniel B. Lloyd, Reporter of Debates of the Senate, I now move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, December 9, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 8 (legislative day of December 7), 1943:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Richard W. Byrd, of Virginia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

John Goodyear, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 8 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

THE JUDICIARY

Emil C. Peters, of Honolulu, to be associate justice of the Supreme Court, Territory of Hawaii. (Judge Peters is now serving in this post under an appointment which expired August 5, 1943.)

Albert M. Cristy, of Honolulu, to be second judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii. (Judge Cristy is now serving in this post under an appointment which expired August 5, 1943.)

Willson C. Moore, of Hawaii, to be fourth judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Hon. Francis M. Brooks, term expired.

Cable A. Wirtz, of Hawaii, to be judge of the Second Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Hon. Daniel H. Case, term expired.

The following-named assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the date set opposite their names:

Ray H. Vanderhook, October 21, 1943.
William D. King, October 21, 1943.
Roy E. Wolfe, October 16, 1943.
Clarence B. Mayes, October 14, 1943.
William B. Hoover, October 4, 1943.
Paul W. Lucas, October 16, 1943.
William J. McAnally, November 20, 1943.
Clarence K. Aldrich, October 16, 1943.
Steve F. Price, October 14, 1943.

The following officers are now serving under temporary commissions issued in accordance with the provisions of the First Deficiency Appropriation Act of March 18, 1943:

Ray H. Vanderhook
Roy E. Wolfe
Paul W. Lucas

These officers have passed the examination required by law and the regulations of the Service.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL

Brig. Gen. Patrick Jay Hurley (colonel, Infantry Reserve), Army of the United States.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Johnie L. Jones, Cottondale, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Thomas P. Marchman, Daleville, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Etta L. Hambrice, Dixiana, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Annie H. Chastain, Glencoe, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Maude C. Brown, Eastaboga, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Martin V. Marsh, Gordon, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Roma H. Parker, Killen, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

William L. Adams, Letohatchee, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Lidie T. Minter, Tyler, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

ARIZONA

Juanita I. McEwen, Whiteriver, Ariz., in place of C. W. Montgomery, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

George T. Provine, Napa, Calif., in place of Rodney McCormick, retired.

Stanley R. McLean, Sutter, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

COLORADO

Vina M. McMullen, Boone, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Emmett O. Smith, Merino, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Gladys Hininger, Olney Springs, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

CONNECTICUT

Christina Rowan, Pomfret, Conn., in place of F. F. Slattery, removed.

Thomas Joseph Curran, Jr., Saybrook, Conn., in place of Edward A. Bowes, deceased.

FLORIDA

Evelyn V. Morrow, Deerfield Beach, Fla., in place of C. C. Smoak, resigned.

GEORGIA

Johnnie A. Webb, Damascus, Ga., in place of H. R. Whitehurst, resigned.

Marcus G. Keown, Mount Berry, Ga., in place of M. G. Keown. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1941.

INDIANA

Eva C. Brown, Burlington, Ind., in place of Fern Smith, resigned.

Ina Belle Manges, Lapaz, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

IOWA

W. Forrest McGregor, Corning, Iowa, in place of A. C. Peterson. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1940.

Hermann Onken, Tipton, Iowa, in place of P. T. Belgard, resigned.

LOUISIANA

Martha C. Wimberly, Castor, La., in place of R. B. Matthews, retired.

Muse W. Keller, Palmetto, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MAINE

Mae C. Lord, Charleston, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MARYLAND

Lola M. Kilby, Conowingo, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

George A. Dressman, Long, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

MASSACHUSETTS

Priscilla C. Turner, Greenbush, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Rufus O. Case, Halifax, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Loring Goodspeed Jones, Jr., Marstons Mills, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Fred T. Webb, North Westport, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Fred L. Strong, Stow, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ernest G. Barnes, Sturbridge, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Edmund F. Peck, West Wareham, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MINNESOTA

Peter L. Geris, Carlos, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Carl W. Appelquist, Dunnell, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Clifford E. S. Gunderson, Waubun, Minn., in place of A. C. Peterson, resigned.

William D. Banta, Wyoming, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MISSISSIPPI

Victor L. Weilenman, Stoneville, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Daniel Clarence Selby, Tinsley, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEBRASKA

George H. Summers, Creston, Nebr., in place of V. F. Palmateer, deceased.

NEVADA

Olive G. Houghton, Luning, Nev. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Harland L. Goodhue, Bristol, N. H., in place of H. B. Worthen, resigned.

Carroll N. Young, West Stewartstown, N. H., in place of C. N. Young. Incumbent's commission expired December 6, 1941.

NEW JERSEY

Pearl S. Richman, Malaga, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

John C. Wiltsee, Monroeville, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Jennie Kapner, Mount Freedom, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Robert Francis Murray, New Market, N. J., in place of A. G. Nelson, deceased.

Edgar Kerris, Pine Brook, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEW YORK

Norman R. McNamara, Deansboro, N. Y., in place of J. W. Metcalf, resigned.

Robert H. Doyle, Kerhonkson, N. Y., in place of R. M. Schoonmaker, resigned.

Frederick B. Pulling, Lagrangeville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Lewis F. Bennett, Niagara University, N. Y., in place of F. X. Desmond, resigned.

Francis P. Reilly, Penn Yan, N. Y., in place of F. P. Reilly, Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

George W. Woods, Pulaski, N. Y., in place of F. M. Daly. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Jacob C. Kopperger, Stottville, N. Y., in place of J. C. Kopperger. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

James D. Desmond, Waddington, N. Y., in place of J. D. Desmond. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Preston A. Abplanalp, Youngsville, N. Y., in place of J. E. Abplanalp, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Belmont H. Winters, Elk Park, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ancil W. Melvin, Lakedale, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

T. Damon Sutton, Seven Springs, N. C., in place of J. W. Ivey, transferred.

OHIO

Norman S. McConnell, Berlin Center, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

John W. Turner, Bettsville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

George M. Schmidt, Carroll, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Joseph A. Link, Carthagena, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Stella G. Cleaver, Clarksville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Fred Reichelderfer, Cridersville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

George F. Burford, Farmdale, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Everett Vine, Garrettsville, Ohio, in place of F. A. Loomis, transferred.

Cora O. Shick, Huntsville, Ohio, in place of J. C. Wyllie, resigned.

Iva D. Bachtel, Lagrange, Ohio, in place of A. L. Wyllner, resigned.

Blanche M. Watkins, Lower Salem, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Howard H. Lesh, Middlebranch, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Robert H. Gano, Newport, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Jessie Dell, North Bend, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Lesta C. Murphy, Rogers, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Barton F. Truster, Seven Mile, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Laura W. Spellman, Williamsfield, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

OKLAHOMA

James E. Ward, Camargo, Okla., in place of Frank Ferguson, not commissioned.

Erma E. Johnston, Gore, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Frank James, Hartshorne, Okla., in place of C. M. Surry, resigned.

OREGON

Lois M. Brown, Langlois, Oreg., in place of E. W. Black, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Anna J. Spisak, Dixonville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ethel M. Goodwin, Folsom, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Olive M. Harkness, Gillett, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Clara V. Snyder, Glenmoore, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Carl Seyler, Luthersburg, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Alexander Bubel, Middleport, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

William L. Doebler, Mifflinburg, Pa., in place of S. B. Miller, deceased.

Lena C. Beers, North Bessemer, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Luther L. Hadden, Duncan, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

TENNESSEE

James A. Hudson, Brownsville, Tenn., in place of H. S. Dupree, deceased.

Harry B. Gillespie, Limestone, Tenn., in place of A. K. Broyles, transferred.

Bertha M. Cooper, Powell Station, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Gladys B. Kyle, Rogersville, Tenn., in place of K. P. Hale, deceased.

John V. Kendall, Troy, Tenn., in place of J. O. Bennett, deceased.

TEXAS

Vera B. Elkin, Channing, Tex., in place of A. J. Denman, resigned.

Charlie B. O'Bryan, De Berry, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ollie Elaine Burditt, La Ward, Tex., in place of A. L. Burditt, resigned.

VIRGINIA

Robert H. Bear, Churchville, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in this hour of tumult and tempest, of temptation and trial, we rejoice that the Christ is our peace. In Him is our fortress and high tower and through faith we look forward to a time when wisdom shall be justified upon the earth and the dreams of the nations shall come true and shape the whole world again.

In the countless cross-currents of life give us to understand that right is right and never yet was expediency the wise rule for man or nation. We praise Thee that life is too great, too solemn and holy to be spent on anything but the things which abide. May the blessed Lord reign and guide our leaders that righteous peace may emerge out of chaos and confusion and lay again the foundations of free government. We pray that our country may not be a victim of that prosperity which ultimately causes discontent and begets the folly of extravagance. Lead our people to conduct themselves wisely and think of their surplus as another's need. Because Thou hast given us this wonderful land, dowered it with many gifts of rich abundance, and because of our sacred duty to sacrifice for the help of the whole world, O spirit of our Master, inspire us to toil and save unsparingly for the future federation of mankind. In the name of the Man of Galilee. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

FOOD SUBSIDIES

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt in his longest message to Congress discussed the question of subsidies and what they meant to the American housewife. His message was heard by the Congress but apparently not taken very seriously, at least not by a great many Members who were more anxious to please the interests opposed to subsidies than to follow the constructive leadership of our great Commander in Chief.

It has taken the women of the country a long time to understand the relationship of subsidies to the cost of living. May I say that it is the first time women have felt that they were directly affected by a subsidy. Judging from the thousands of letters and telegrams received by me, and I have no doubt by many other Members of the House, during the past week, they find it difficult, very, very difficult, to understand why subsidies are paid for everything important to win the war except the most important thing of all, food. They are aroused as never before, because they see in the attempt to kill the food subsidies a threat to the American home, and this at a time when their husbands and sons are fighting and dying to protect their homes.

Mr. Speaker, I have always hoped for an issue which would unite the women of America and also would permit them to know what great power and strength they have, and here it is.

The housewives of America are the practical economists of the home front. They are not interested in selfish lobbies but they are fast learning how lobbies and pressure groups function. I predict the lesson they are learning will make them realize their potential power and how to use it most effectively. One woman writes me:

> Is it wrong to subsidize milk—the prime necessity to children—and right to subsidize cotton to the tune of a billion and a quarter dollars?

The League of Women Voters, a national nonpartisan organization, is doing a very constructive job in teaching women the use of the ballot. This organization is on record in favor of food subsidies. Also listed in favor are the American Association of University Women; the American Home Economics Association; the New Jersey Y. W. C. A.; the National Consumers League; the National Council of Negro Women; The National Federation of Settlements; and the League of Women Shoppers—also many labor organizations and church groups—all of which proves that when the American home is threatened, women can be depended on to protect it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a resolution from the Brooklyn Bar Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from this morning's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

RATIONING OF MEAT

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the following bill:

A bill to provide for the suspension of the point-rationing system with respect to meat for 60 days

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any provision of law or any regulation promulgated by any Government agency, no ration points shall be required to be used in connection with the purchase, sale, transfer, or other acquisition or disposition of meat during the period of 60 days immediately following the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this matter is one that deserves the earliest and most serious consideration of the Members of this House. Thousands of pounds of meat are spoiling due to the O. P. A. point-rationing system. Millions of pounds of beef and pork on the hoof that are ready for market are consuming feed which the farmers had intended to use to produce meat next year.

COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS NO 3

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, at the direction of Committee on Elections No. 3, I ask unanimous consent that that committee be permitted to sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman for that purpose because a bill will be read for amendment this afternoon. The committee may sit during the general debate this afternoon, however, if the gentleman desires to submit that request.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a news item and two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge that the leadership bring to the consideration of Congress legislation that will, first, give to the men and women of our fighting units the right to vote; and, second, legislation that will give a cash payment at the time of their discharge.

The legislation relative to voting should allow them the franchise with a minimum of red tape and trouble. Since they are fighting to save our country, they want to vote to save our country.

Thousands of men are being discharged practically penniless. Let us give them immediate financial assistance to help them get readjusted to civilian life. These are obligations that we cannot conscientiously postpone any longer.

Let us give the veterans a real Christmas present by the passage of these two bills.

SUBSIDIES A TANGLED NET

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the statement of the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON], who has just preceded me, that at last the women of the United States were united on an issue in favor of food or consumer subsidies. It is apparent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey was not informed of the statement from the largest consumer area in the United States which refutes her allegation.

I want to read to the House a statement of the New York Federation of Women's Clubs on this same subject. It appeared in the December 3 issue of the Orion Review, a weekly paper published at Orion, Oakland County, Mich. It is entitled "A Bitter Lesson":

Subsidies are the tangled net in which a free people become so enmeshed that they become helpless pawns of a dominating centralized government. Farmers have learned that they who control the finance of farmers' business, control the farmers' liberty, and freedom of action. Farmers have learned this through experience with the misdirected government activities in recent years, sorrowful experience with the arbitrary, autocratic exercise of power by Government administrative agencies. Subsidies, given with the idea of encouraging production, defeat and destroy much of the incentive that should come with increased returns because farmers fear the government domination that accompanies subsidy payments.

This is signed by the New York Federation of Women's Clubs. It calls for sober thinking and challenges the attention of those who have been swept away by a wave of hysteria created by newspaper accounts and radio commentators, based on the false premise that the Government supports the people instead of the people supporting the Government.

RAILWAY WORKERS

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, last night War Mobilization Director James Byrnes, the Assistant President, with his offices in the White House, made a Nation-wide radio address. In this address he pleaded for national unity behind administration hold-the-line policies and at the same time charged American railway workers with "pointing a pistol" at the head of Uncle Sam to obtain wage increases by threat of strike.

I agree with most of what Byrnes said about the need for holding the line against inflation. I only wish the administration had recognized this need sooner and practiced what it preached. However, neither unity can be served nor the line held by charging 1,500,000 of America's most patriotic citizens with assault with intent to kill or with armed robbery. The greatest thing the administration could do to promote home-front unity would be to quit accusing anyone who does not agree with it as being guilty of various high crimes and misdemeanors.

What are the real facts in this railway labor dispute and where does the fault really lie?

Simply stated, for over a year the railway workers and management have followed the procedures of the Railway Labor Act in asking for a modest raise to correct gross inequalities. An agreement for an 8 cents per hour increase was duly approved. Then this agreement, arrived at in the way provided by law and not in any way violating the Little Steel formula, was set aside by a change made by some executive board appointed by the President. Not only has the President broken his promise to the railroad workers, for he approved the original agreement, but now through a personal panel he attempts to set aside a contract made in a lawful way. In doing so he attempts to shift the burden of responsibility to railroad workers because they do not want to accept the wholly inadequate and illegal recommendations of this board which would set aside the procedures established in law by the people's elected representatives in Congress.

I am reminded of the old story about the thief who attempted to prevent capture by pointing at some innocent individual in the crowd and yelling hysterically, although not over a Nation-wide radio hook-up, "Catch that thief."

I am suspicious that some of the long-haired Socialists in Washington would like to provoke a railroad strike so that the Government could take over the railroads.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a letter from a constituent of mine relating to post-war planning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars, to include a speech by the Reverend John A. Ryan, and also to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include a statement by the Director of Industrial Relations of California.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD with reference to rural electrification, and to include therein an address by the Honorable Clyde Ellis, a former Member of the House from Arkansas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

FEED GRAIN, DUTY FREE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution No. 171, to permit the importation from foreign countries free of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 171, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of House Joint Resolution 171.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under previous order of the House 1 hour has been allowed for general debate, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I do not know how wide the interest is in this, what I would call, rather important piece of legislation. Would it be possible to extend the time for debate by unanimous consent, inasmuch as there have been requests for time? I do not know how many requests the Chairman has had.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that that cannot be done. It could have been done in the House, but it cannot be done now.

Mr. REED of New York. That is satisfactory to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee has correctly answered the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield myself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. House Joint Resolution 171 permits the free importation for a period of 90 days of certain grains and other products when used for feed for livestock and poultry. As is known to all of you, the farmers have been called upon to increase the production of livestock and poultry, and of course, in order to do that an adequate supply of feed is necessary. It is also known that in certain sections of the country last year there was a serious drought and it caused a very considerable shortage of these feeds. The purpose of this resolution is to admit, free of duty, into the United States, these mentioned feeds in order that the farmers may have, especially in drought-stricken sections of the United States, sufficient and adequate supplies of feed to produce the food they have been called upon by the Government to produce. It is limited to a period of 90 days.

This resolution has the support of the Food Administrator, Hon. Marvin Jones, whom you all know well and favorably. I have a letter from him approving the legislation. It is too long to read and it is not necessary, but I will quote a few lines:

> I am, of course, strongly in favor of any legislation which would be effective in making available to producers feed in greater quantities or at lower prices, and to the extent that House Joint Resolution 155—
>
> Now, House Joint Resolution 171—
>
> would be effective in this respect, I favor its enactment.

Later on he says:

> While I am entirely in accord with the objective of House Joint Resolution 155, to make feed available to livestock producers in greater quantities and at lower prices, the resolution may not accomplish as much as we would like, except as to hay. At the same time, we favor its enactment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. HALE. Will the gentleman explain why corn is not in this resolution? There is a great deal of need in my section of the country for corn.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I believe that question might be answered better by the author of the resolution, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], so I yield to him to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. As far as corn is concerned, there is not any corn available anywhere in the world that would be expected to come in during this 90 days. There is a possibility of getting corn at a later time when the crop in South America is harvested, but there is no available corn, so I am advised by the War Food Administration at this time.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further for an observation?

Mr. DOUGHTON. The time is short, but I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALE. Would it not be advisable to amend the resolution so that corn might be admitted if it should subsequently become available?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That matter can be taken up under the 5-minute rule when amendments will be in order.

In conclusion, I believe the adoption of this resolution will have a tendency to relieve an acute shortage of feeds necessary in the livestock, poultry, and dairy industries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], the author of the resolution.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this resolution is to make every effort to provide feed for the livestock producers of this country. It is necessary to go back to March 15, and if you are interested in reading the RECORD of that date, you will note that when I first called the attention of Congress to this coming feed situation, the very best quality of wheat was only 84 cents—United States money—a bushel in Canada, and other feeds were cheap accordingly. On April 29, as I remember it, the President by proclamation provided that wheat feed could be imported, duty free. I am informed that up to this time, this has brought in somewhere between thirty-five and forty million bushels of wheat. This feed wheat that has been brought in has all had to be funneled through a Government agency—in this case through the Commodity Credit Corporation. In other words, the wheat feed that has been brought in has first had to go through this organization, and possibly much more feed would have been imported if it had been admitted to the farm cooperatives, the feed dealers, and individual farmers all over the country, to secure this feed for themselves and on equal terms.

I realize that, as a person who has made a few remarks on tariff and duties during his lifetime, it might look rather inconsistent to my colleagues, but I am sure it is not inconsistent as far as I am concerned myself. My particular ideas about the tariff are of little consequence at this time.

Through Secretary Wickard, he asked the livestock people of this country to increase the production of livestock, and they have done a magnificent job, and if we keep on spending as much time talking about roll-back subsidies as we have in the last couple of months, I am not sure but that we will have to get Mr. Wickard back here to get this production program into operation again. In other words, at this time, I think each and every one of us is an American before we are Republicans or Democrats. What my opinion in peacetime is with regard to the tariff has nothing to do with what it means to provide sufficient feed during this war. For that reason I am willing to accept all the insinuations and all the criticisms that might go along with it.

The only reason I did not bring this resolution in last March was because I did not think I had any chance of getting it to this floor. But after I was

home this summer and saw what happened and heard all this talk that we have heard so much about with respect to corn feed, I thought at least, I would make an effort to introduce this resolution. You will remember that on the floor, I asked the majority leader, Mr. McCORMACK, if he would not try to help get this on the floor of the House. I might say that Mr. McCORMACK did not only promise to do it but he did lend his assistance. He wrote a letter to the Food Administrator, Mr. Jones, and we had a splendid report back from Mr. Jones.

The Ways and Means Committee at that time, of course, had the tax bill under consideration. I tried not to become impatient or irritated, because I realized the importance of the tax measure. I might say that the Committee on Ways and Means has brought this measure out at the first moment they had the time after they got rid of the tax bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to point out that herds of cattle are being killed because of shortage of feed. If the herds are killed, there will be no market for feed. It is essential for every reason to keep the cattle alive during this crisis. That is vital also to western food growers; also, has the gentleman considered including corn in his resolution? We are very short of corn feed in New England. Should it not be included in case we might get it from the Argentine?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will answer by saying that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST] pointed out the possibilities of securing cottonseed meal from Mexico in the spring of the year at lambing time, which surely should have been incorporated if I had been cognizant of its importance. As to corn, I personally know of no reason why corn should not be included. The only reason I had for not including corn was the fact that I was advised by the War Food Administration that there was no available corn. There may be some in South America when the crop is harvested within the next few months and becomes available.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I understand, the Commodity Credit Corporation is permitted to bring in wheat for feed from Canada.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes; from any country, not necessarily from Canada only.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes; from any country: and it comes in duty-free.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And, as the gentleman from Wisconsin has suggested, we have brought in thirty-five or forty million bushels by that method.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes; between thirty-five and forty million bushels.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Is it not a fact that we have established a quota system by which we are not allowed to bring in more than a certain number of bushels from Canada, for instance? How is this measure affected by the quota system, or vice versa?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The quota system is in effect purely on wheat that is imported for milling purposes. The quota on this wheat is 800,000 bushels a year; but that has nothing to do with feed wheat, and that is what this resolution deals with.

I realized that this resolution should come from our side of the House because I can see the criticisms that might be leveled at the President if he had just made a blanket lifting of this duty. For that reason we are not doing anything that is not being done now as far as wheat feed is concerned; we are just extending it to these other feeds.

Mr. REES of Kansas. My understanding is that the Commodity Credit Corporation is bringing in just about as much wheat as it can bring in, in view of limited transportation facilities. What is the gentleman's reply to that?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Having received part of my salary from the Government for many years I never would come to the conclusion that just because a Federal agency could not do a job that it could not be done otherwise. I believe that possibly if you give the farm co-ops, feed dealers, and individuals that are handling feeds in the Nation an equal chance with our governmental agencies I think there is a possibility at least that much greater amounts of feed could have been brought in. As to what may be brought in hereafter I have no way of knowing, and assume no personal responsibility.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman from Wisconsin has given this matter considerable study, and that was the next question I was going to ask: About what increase does the gentleman expect from this measure if it is adopted?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I cannot answer that question because there are too many factors affecting it. I can well see where many agencies might stymie it. I can see how the Office of Defense Transportation may not let them have a car; I can see where they may not let them have even a ship to bring in the feed. I will not assume responsibility for the amount that is brought in. I feel I have made my own personal contribution to this, that I have made the effort at least to provide this feed to help these people finish the job we have asked them to do. Our governmental agencies asked for more hogs, more milk, more chickens; we should be willing to help these producers secure the feed to finish this job.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, a member of my committee.

Mr. RIZLEY. I notice the resolution does not contain any language that defines wheat for feed as the term is used in the resolution. I ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if he does not think that possibly with this letting down of the bars they may bring in all the milling wheat duty-free from Canada for the 90-day period that anyone wants to bring in?

And I might say in connection with that that the War Food Administrator certainly takes that view in a statement that was inserted in the RECORD under date of October 7, 1943, in which he pointed out that you included flax, and he states that flax was seldom used for feed.

He points out in the same letter that under the terms of the resolution wheat could very well be brought in for milling purposes. Would the gentleman be willing to confine his resolution to wheat, or just what is the purpose of the resolution? Is it to let down the bars so that wheat regardless of what it may be used for may be brought in duty-free from Canada or any other country for a period of 90 days?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Personally I do not think there is any more danger of bringing it in under this resolution than the way it is being operated at the present time. If anyone wants to protect that situation, it certainly is agreeable as far as I am concerned. Referring to the letter that Mr. Jones wrote about flax, of course, he does not write every letter he sends out. It may be just as well to let flax come into this country without duty at this time as anything else. I may say it is coming in at the present time. I will not say it is all coming in from Canada, but it is coming in. It provides a high protein feed, as well as oil.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to discuss details of this bill because that has already been done to some extent. Every Member on this floor knows the purpose of the bill. There is an imperative demand in the Northeastern States for livestock feed. Take New York and the New England States, some 12 States other than New York, they are in desperate need of more milk and more eggs.

In the State of New York the shortage of feed is at the present time jeopardizing not only the production of dairy products but the life of 1,500,000 dairy cows and heifers. In the State of New York alone there are some 12,000,000 chickens. Milk, dairy products, and eggs are a fundamental necessity to the normal development of the child life of this Nation.

The purpose of the pending bill is to permit feed to come into this country duty-free for 90 days. There is a food emergency, and it is a serious emergency. We cannot afford to have these tested herds in the Northeastern States, particularly in my State of New York and in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, destroyed or starved or used for beef be-

cause it takes too long to develop a dairy industry.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Will the gentleman yield? If he would include Vermont in his statement, I would be more than satisfied.

Mr. REED of New York. Vermont is included. I said 12 States other than New York. I know the gentleman's State produces a very fine high-grade milk.

Mr. Chairman, I am not here to quibble over whether this should or should not include corn. We know there is a shortage of corn in this country. The Northeastern States, including the State of New York, have done everything humanly possible to draw upon the corn supply, whatever it is and no matter how much it may cost. They have tried to get corn from the Middle West to feed the stock and poultry. Nobody is criticizing the Middle West, because, according to the available figures, they have not the corn to send east. There is a shortage of corn, as the distinguished author of the bill stated, all over the world.

We have 6,000,000 children in this country who are undernourished. We have from 45,000,000 to 50,000,000 babies in this country dependent for their normal development upon eggs and milk, which must come from well-fed dairy herds.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. In reference to the point raised by the gentleman from Oklahoma, I invite attention to the fact it is very clearly stated on the face of the bill as follows, line 8: "To be used as, or as a constituent part of, feed for livestock and poultry." That is what the bill itself says.

Mr. REED of New York. I was going to bring out that limitation. Every one of you know that at the present time we can ship babies' diapers over to north Africa by the hundreds of thousands. We can spread our billions everywhere. But the most vital thing in this country today as our soldiers are dying on the battlefields is to see that we develop a strong, virile, hopeful youth to take the place of those who are going to be sacrificed in this struggle. This cannot be done without a minimum of the fundamental diet for the proper development of these children.

I would be the last man in the House of Representatives to stand up here and ask for a reduction in the tariffs for I have fought reduction of tariffs in season and out of season. I am going to insert in the RECORD certain figures showing exactly what we will be up against as a result of lowering these tariffs as a post-war problem. But the time has come for action and even if this bill does not accomplish all that we think it ought to accomplish, it may assist materially in getting feed for livestock. I am not one of those, and I do not think you are, who in this critical stage is going before the country without saying that we have at least tried to get livestock feed in here from Canada and other countries where it can be found.

The point has been raised that it will cost a high price for the feed because of certain differentials in Canada and all that, but that has nothing to do with the situation. In the State of New York where we are trying to save our dairy herds with which to supply the cities with milk they are willing to pay almost any price for feed rather than sacrifice their herds, hoping to nurse their dairy cattle along until the next crops are produced.

But just remember this. There will be men on the floor who will say they do not object to hay coming in, but anybody who is familiar with the dairy business knows that all you can do with hay is keep your cows alive and get a subnormal production of milk and dairy products. That just keeps them alive, but that is not enough, because the milk supply is falling in these cities, and the people in your hospitals, your old people, and your children are suffering as a result of it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman, I know, is only supporting this bill as a measure of necessity. The gentleman has never lost an opoprtunity to fight for our home markets for the protection of labor, industry, and agriculture. Already physicians have stated that the health of the country has been lowered.

Mr. REED of New York. There is no question but that the health of this country is breaking down. I repeat, no matter how much we sympathize with the people abroad, we must protect the children and the babies of this country for they are the America of tomorrow.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman think the emergency will be over in 90 days, or is this just an opening wedge to make it permanent?

Mr. REED of New York. It is not an opening wedge for anything.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It is 90 days.

Mr. REED of New York. Ninety days will possibly make the situation such that they can nurse their herds along and keep the production up for 90 days, or get in enough during the 90 days to carry them over until they can get feed from their own farms in this country. I am not worried about that. The people will see to that. When the time comes, if they want a tariff to protect our farmers, they will put on a tariff. They are not worried about taking this off. This cannot by any stretch of the imagination be a precedent for lower tariffs hereafter.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Is it not a fact that the farmers, whom some would seek to protect, are more interested in this resolution than anybody else?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes; there is no doubt of it.

I have here some very interesting facts which I should like to bring out just to show you the danger the gentleman points out. I can give you the wage per hour figures of every one of the countries in South America. I have them listed and I am going to ask the privilege of including them in my remarks. But I do hope that in view of this emergency, no matter what your views may be on the tariff question, you will realize that the cities, in the East particularly, are dependent upon our dairy herds in these States, and will vote for this bill to give our farmers a fighting chance for some feed, no matter what it costs, in order to protect this industry that is so essential to the health of this Nation.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE. I wish to commend the learned gentleman from New York for his position on the bill, and to add that in my section of the United States, the Pacific Northwest, the situation is equally acute with that of New York and New England. We feel the need for this legislation just as does the section of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Of course, this does not apply only to the East, it applies to every dairy section in the country. This bill is just as valuable to the State of Texas or any of the Western States, unless it might be right in the heart of the Corn Belt, as it is to the East. Certainly I can see no reason why the farmers of one section of the country should line up against the farmers of another section in a vital time during a great war.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Does the gentleman feel that this resolution would be necessary if so many thousands of acres had not been taken out of production by the so-called planners for the food program?

Mr. REED of New York. Of course, the gentleman knows exactly how I feel on that question, but I am not trying to inject any comments here that would cause any friction or ill feeling. What I am after now is just what I have stated. It is absolutely necessary that we have the supply of milk that is necessary, unless we want to bring up a generation of children with rickets and destroy the bone-building processes which are necessary. Of course, then we can oppose this bill on many grounds. I believe this bill will bring some relief, I do not know how much. For what relief it will bring I am for it.

A report from the State of New York indicates that failure to obtain this feed will result in a 15- to 20-percent drop in production. Such drop in production will mean a cut of 1,300,000 to 1,700,000 quarts a day in the New York State milk production.

There is not the slightest hope of getting dairy feed from the Corn Belt.

There seems to be no doubt whatever that the amount of corn left over from last year is less than the amount left over a year ago from 1941. I am informed that the corn carry-over in the United States was less than 400,000,000 bushels, compared with a 600,000,000-bushel carry-over a year ago.

The only recourse in obtaining feed for dairy herds and poultry now seems to be to import it. This bill seeks to encourage the importation of feed by eliminating the tariff for 90 days.

Mr. Chairman, there is no justification for failing to act on this measure on the theory that it may not accomplish all that may be desired. Why, in an emotional burst of humanitarian enthusiasm, should we direct our attention solely to the undernourished children abroad and in doing so ignore our underfed children at home? The children of today will be the citizens of tomorrow. There are estimated to be at the present time 6,000,000 children in the United States who are improperly nourished. Then, too, there are the thousands of tubercular children whose chance for recovery depends in large part upon an adequate supply of wholesome milk, cream, and eggs. Are we to add to the 300,000 crippled by depriving children of bone-building dairy products?

I repeat that if ever there was a time in our history when a strong and virile youth is needed to supply our future leadership it will be at the conclusion of this war. We must not, by our shortsightedness in the matter of our home food supply, destroy or weaken millions of our potential citizens—now in their infancy—who will be needed to replace the young men now on the battle fronts who, had their lives been spared from the holocaust of war, would have supplied the Nation with gifted civic leaders for tomorrow.

I believe it far more important for this Government to produce milk and eggs for our forty-five or fifty million children than to send 600,000 diapers under lend-lease to North Africa.

I would be the last man on the floor of the House to advocate the lowering of the tariff on farm products in normal times. So far as I am concerned this 90-day exemption of tariff duties on feed for livestock will not be a precedent binding upon me on the question of tariff duties. There is no Member of the House who fears a low-tariff policy, now embodied in the trade agreements, as a post-war danger more than I do. But under a program of lease-lending everything from diapers to shorts and promising to furnish a quart of milk a day to every Hottentot in the world, our own citizens must turn to extraordinary means in order to live.

I am well aware of the danger of further lowering tariffs because our farmers will eventually be urged as a good-neighbor policy to permit imports from this hemisphere where the wage rates are as follows:

According to domestic statistics, intelligently gathered by the C. T. A. L.—a pioneer in this worthy task—the average hourly wage of a United States worker in at least 10 of the most common occupations—construction work, carpentering, mining, unskilled labor, printing, driving, painting, and so forth—is $1.33. In contrast, the average hourly wage in other republics of the hemisphere for more or less the same group of workers is: Canada, 56 cents per hour; Argentina, 30 cents; Uruguay, 25 cents; Cuba, 20 cents; Colombia, 14 cents; Mexico, 13 cents; Costa Rica, 11 cents; Bolivia, 9 cents; Chile, 6 cents; Ecuador and the Dominican Republic, 5 cents each. From $1.33 to 5 United States cents—a nickel, a package of chewing gum—so goes the scale of hourly wages, unevenly distributed among similar workers of our hemisphere. The data show, not what the workers of the hemisphere comparatively earn, but what they buy with what they earn.

Let us consider only some of the essential items of food, such as bread, beef, milk, eggs, and sugar. In the United States the average worker earns, per hour, enough to buy 7.8 kilos of bread, while an hour's work by a Canadian worker in substantially the same occupation earns enough to buy only 4.3 kilos of bread; by an Argentinean, 3.2; Uruguayan, 2.9; a Cuban, 1.7; a Chilean, 1.4; a Mexican, 1.1; a Colombian, 1.0; a Costa Rican, 0.9; a Dominican, 0.5; an Ecuadorian, 0.4; and Bolivian, 0.3. Thus, to take the two extremes only, a United States worker is paid, in bread, some 20 times as much as his fellow worker in Bolivia. In terms of beef, the situation is as follows:

United States, 2 kilos; Canada, 1.1; Argentina, 1.6; Uruguay, 2; Mexico, 0.6; Colombia, 0.3; Chile, Ecuador, Bolivia, 0.2 each; Dominican Republic, 0.1. That is to say, United States workers are paid, in terms of beef, 10 times more than some of their fellow workers in Latin America.

In milk, United States workers' pay is good for more than 12 times the amount that can be purchased by their Latin-American brothers.

In sugar, the situation is still favorable to the United States workers. They can buy with their wages 30 times as much sugar as, for instance, the workers of the Dominican Republic. It is sad to say that even in Cuba, which exports sugar in large amounts, workers can purchase only one-fifth of the amount which United States workers can buy with their wages. Finally, in terms of eggs, the hourly wage of the United States worker allows him to buy 53.4; Canada, 21.5; Argentina, 24.4; Uruguay, 16.6; Colombia, 8; Mexico, 7.5; Costa Rica, 6.4; Chile, 4.5; Ecuador, 3.3; Bolivia, 2.9; and the Dominican Republic, 2.4.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the objective of H. R. 171 is to make feed available for our livestock producers in greater quantities and at lower prices. This is a worthy objective at a time when our livestock, dairy, and poultry producers find it most difficult to secure a sufficient quantity of feed for maximum food production.

Personally, I am as interested in securing maximum food production as those who favor this bill. A study of this resolution, plus several conferences with officials in the departments charged with the responsibility of purchasing feed grains from foreign countries, convinces me that the approval of this resolution would impair present satisfactory importations.

The approval of this resolution would—

First. Set a most dangerous precedent by removing tariff on wheat, oats, barley, hay, flax, and cottonseed.

Second. It would not make available greater supplies of feed grains.

Third. The Federal Treasury would be forced to pay large sums of money in the form of equalization fees to the Canadian Wheat Board.

Fourth. It would add another type of wheat and other grains to the regular trade. At present we have feed wheat and regular wheat. Now we would add regular imported wheat for feed.

Fifth. It would remove the tariff protection that farmers, laborers, and industry must have if we are to carry our national debt and present tax burden in order to assist our allies and our own Nation in the full prosecution of the war.

I do not impugn the motive of those who favor this legislation—in fact, I fully understand their concern. This proposed resolution will not help the American livestock, dairy, and poultry producers. It will, however, be a financial boon to the Canadian farmer. It will set a dangerous precedent by removing the tariff on wheat, oats, barley, rye, flax, hay, and cottonseed. This bill does not apply to Canada alone. It removes all tariffs and duties on the commodities listed and places the American farmer in competition with the farmers of every nation in the world that produces these crops. I cannot believe the sponsors of this legislation would favor the enactment of a bill that would place the American wheat grower in direct competition with the wheat producers of Argentina, Canada, and Australia, or that would place the American farmer who produces oats, barley, and rye in competition with the farmers of every other country that produces these grains.

During the past 2 years our Government has used incentive payments to secure additional acreage of flax; now it is proposed that we remove the tariff from flax, and these farmers who have received Government aid for flax production will be placed in competition with the world. We would remove the tariff from cottonseed and tell the farmers of the South that they must now meet the competition of the cottonseed producers of Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, and Uruguay.

Let us not be carried away by emotional appeal. Let us analyze this bill. We have a real shortage of butter, milk, cheese, and other dairy products. Would it not be as reasonable to suggest that we remove the tariffs on these products? We could use more dairy products. I am sure the sponsors of this legislation would

oppose most vigorously the removal of the tariff protection on those commodities. More than that, I would help them in their opposition to protect the farmers and dairymen from the direct competition of dairy producers in every country in the world. If we believe in this policy, then why not remove all tariffs and let the farmers, laborers, and industry compete with these same groups in every nation?

Personally, I want to retain our American standard of living for the American people. Our citizens are assuming a national debt which may reach $300,000,000,000; they are carrying a tax load that approximates one-third of our national income in order that we can aid other nations fighting with us to save the world from dictatorship and despotic rule. Does anyone believe we could carry the present tax burden on the income of the farmers with the cheap lands and the peon labor of foreign countries? It is a dangerous step to take.

I stated the approval of this bill would not be of assistance to the livestock, dairy, and poultry producers of the Nation. On April 13, 1942, the President, by Presidential proclamation, amended the import quotas of grain so as to permit the entry of additional imports which might be used for distress purposes resulting from war developments. On April 29, 1943, the quota regulations were amended to permit imports by the War Food Administrator or his designated representative. Today the Commodity Credit Corporation is actively purchasing and importing every item specified in this bill. They have sufficient funds and an effective organization to make these purchases. The tariff is no factor. Importations are limited only by the quantity of grain available and transportation. Despite the transportation problem we have imported enormous quantities of grain during the past few months. We purchased and imported over 100,000,000 bushels of oats and barley from Canada during the 12-month period, ending July 31, 1943. Barley has also come in from Argentina. Fifty-four million bushels of wheat have been purchased in Canada and delivered in the United States. Options have been secured on 6,000,000 bushels of Canadian wheat which is now being delivered. Arrangements are being made to import 150,000,000 bushels of wheat from Canada during the period from October 1, 1943, to October 1, 1944. In addition to these purchases of wheat from Canada, we have received about 2,000,000 bushels of wheat from Argentina. They are producing a record crop of wheat and unlimited quantities can be secured in that nation. These large importations prove that the tariff is no obstacle to the movement of this grain needed for distress purposes.

We have imported 5,000,000 bushels of rye, large shipments of hay, and arrangements are being made to purchase Canada's surplus flax of about 10,000,000 bushels.

Cottonseed is now being imported from Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay. The tariff of $6 per ton has no effect on the amount being brought in.

I stated that the approval of this bill would be a financial boon to the farmers of Canada. The Canadian Government has authorized the collection of an equalization fee which removes any price spread between Canadian prices and the United States prices on grain at United States ports. For instance, in September barley was sold at Buffalo, N. Y., at $1.19 per bushel. The Canadian ceiling price for barley was 59 cents per bushel. You add 6 cents per bushel freight and 15 cents per bushel duty, which makes a total of 80 cents per bushel at Buffalo. The Canadian Government added an equalization fee of 39 cents per bushel, or sold this Canadian barley at Buffalo for $1.19 per bushel. The money accumulated by this equalization fee is distributed among the farmers of western Canada. As our Government sells Canadian wheat for feed at corn parity prices, the Government would sustain an additional loss if the present tariff of 42 cents were added to the Canadian price as an equalization fee. The livestock producers, dairymen, and the poultry raisers would not receive their feed at a lower cost. The taxpayer would be forced to make up this difference, and the only one to benefit would be the Canadian farmer—or the farmer of any country that might take advantage of the same system. In other words, our Government would be sending equalization-fee checks to the farmers of Canada. When there is no gain for our own producers, why should we assume this additional financial burden?

The practical thing to do is to defeat this bill. Furnish the War Food Administration and the Commodity Credit Corporation with sufficient funds and personnel to purchase the grains needed under existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask for 2 more minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. I do not have the time to yield. I wish I had, but I am sorry.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST].

Mr. WEST. Mr. Chairman, I think my friend from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] made a mistake a few moments ago when he said that the cost of administration would be so much. To save me, I cannot see where there would be any cost to the Government for administration. The bill merely provides that if you desire to go into Canada and into Mexico and buy feed, you have the right to do it. There is nothing compulsory about it. There is no cost to the Government, not even a 5-cent charge. It merely waives the duty on it when you bring it in. Customs officers are already on duty at these ports of entry. They are paid a monthly salary and they are on duty so many hours out of the day. There is no cost attached to it.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield just for a correction?

Mr. WEST. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. The gentleman from Texas misunderstood, I think, equalization fee for administration charges. The administration will not amount to anything, but the equalization fee may and will.

Mr. WEST. If I need the feed badly enough to feed some of my starving cattle and want to pay that equalization fee, I see no objection to it. To give you an illustration, last spring in a section of my district, west San Antonio, where they raise a lot of sheep, we had one of the worst droughts we had in 50 years. It was the lambing season. There was absolutely no feed available for the ewes. There was no cottonseed cake and meal which is necessary to feed them at that period in order for them to give milk. There was plenty of feed available across the river in Mexico, cottonseed cake and meal. We took it up with the O. P. A. The ceiling price of the O. P. A. was $50 a ton. Cottonseed cake and meal in Mexico was $50 a ton. The duty was four or five dollars a ton. We took it up with the O. P. A. and asked them to let ranchers go into Mexico and buy feed and pay the duty. They said, "No, you cannot do that because it will cost above the ceiling price of $50."

As a consequence those ranchers in that section lost about 80 percent of the lamb crop. The increased cost per day would have been from 1 to 2 cents per ewe. Instead of letting those ranchers do that they refused to do so, and, as I say, the result was that we lost about 80 percent of the lamb crop.

There is nothing compulsory about the bill. If you are engaged in the cattle business or in the dairy business and need feed and it is accessible, you can cross the border and buy it and bring it back.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEST. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is making a very interesting statement, but if this bill is passed there would not be anything to prevent the importation, without any limitation at all, of all of these grains that are mentioned in the bill, by the dealers in those foreign countries. It would not be a question of the consumer here or the fellow who wanted to use it, but the bars would be down for the fellow engaged in that business, dealing in those grains, to dump them in this country.

Mr. WEST. The gentleman will remember the bill is limited to 90 days.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is correct.

Mr. WEST. It is my understanding that now there is a black market in cottonseed meal and cake, which normally sells for around $50. It is now bringing around $90 in the black market. It is strictly and purely a war-emergency measure.

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I suggest this: In my own State we have a tremendous surplus of wheat. As a matter of fact, we cannot market it. We do not have storage facilities for the wheat we have, and if we open the doors to Canada to dump it in the United States, we are just

increasing the difficulties that the farmers now find themselves in with reference to this surplus of wheat.

Mr. WEST. Why is it you cannot sell it, with such a terrific shortage?

Mr. O'CONNOR. We have no transportation facilities, in the first place.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST] has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have a letter showing that unless you are close to where there is an elevator you cannot get your wheat in in time to unload it, and in many instances they have to unload it on the ground, because they have not sufficient transportation facilities to take the wheat out of storage and put it on the market.

Mr. WEST. Does not the gentleman think that one fact would prohibit the large importation of feeds from a foreign country?

Mr. O'CONNOR. But there is danger. I am in sympathy with the object of this bill, as far as that is concerned, but I am fearful what will happen to the man who is raising wheat, upon whom we have to depend to pay the tax bill.

Mr. WEST. I think your statement that there is such a limitation on transportation is a safeguard against that happening.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Then the condition about storage facilities is another situation that we cannot solve.

Mr. WEST. That is another reason why they will not flood the market in this country.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We cannot get any lumber to build granaries. We cannot get priorities for the lumber.

Mr. WEST. And that would apply to the man who wanted to import it in large quantities, just as well.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do not know what he would do with it, if he brought it in.

Mr. WEST. So you have nothing to fear on those two scores.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEST. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The trouble in Montana is that there are no railroad facilities. I mean there are not sufficient cars to move the concentrated grains from the elevators, thereby making room in the storage elevators for grain to come in from the farms? Is that the difficulty?

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is part of the difficulty.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What other difficulty could there be? Let us see if this trouble lies with the Office of Defense Transportation or does it lie with some other part of the Government.

Mr. O'CONNOR. There are several factors involved. There is the transportation problem. There is the lack of storage facilities which the farmers do not have, because they have not been able to get priorities for lumber to build granaries, and lack of elevator storage.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the farmer has the grain ready to move to the elevator, and the Office of Defense Transportation will furnish the cars to move it from the elevator, then that straightens the whole line. Now, what is the trouble?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Well, we cannot get cars. You have no place to unload the wheat until you get the cars. Consequently, when the farmers take the wheat to town, they have to haul it back or dump it on the ground.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, that is an O. D. T. job. Let them get the cars.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I simply want to call attention to the situation we have there. We have plenty of wheat in Montana if we could get it moved.

Mr. WEST. Does not the gentleman think the big dealer would have the same trouble that your farmer has, and as a consequence, there would not be any large importation? We along the border when we have dry spells could take our trucks, go into Mexico, get a truckload of feed and save our livestock.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman has instanced some very fine cases, but suppose the dealers on the other side of the line, over in Canada, put the stuff into this country? What are we going to do with it?

Mr. WEST. They would be faced with identically the same transportation problems we have. I believe the gentleman is just trying to scare up a bugaboo.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am concerned. I am trying to look at it from the point of view of those who are going to have to pay the tax bill in this country.

Mr. WEST. We are trying to protect the livestock in this country if we can.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEST. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. This question may have been answered before I came into the Chamber, and if it has been I ask the gentleman's pardon, but I notice this bill makes no provision for the importation of corn. In my country corn is a very scarce article of feed. I am wondering why corn is not included.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEST. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. That question has been raised and was discussed here rather generally before the distinguished gentleman from Virginia came in. The information given us was that no corn is available to be brought in and will not be available until the South American crop is ready, and that will not be ready until after the 90 days have expired.

Mr. WEST. I hope that answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEST. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Is it not a fact that anything at this time that helps the livestock industry and the poultry industry and the dairy industry helps the people of the entire country?

Mr. WEST. The gentleman from North Carolina is absolutely right. That is the situation that needs correcting.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST].

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein some tables I have prepared.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be necessary for the gentleman to get permission in the House to insert extraneous matter.

The gentleman may have permission to revise and extend his own remarks if there is no objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, this bill is a tariff bill, to take tariffs off of agricultural products. Both parties are for tariffs at the present time; they have declared so in their platforms and in their votes on this floor. This bill is not a protective-tariff bill, for it injures those who raise these products and does not protect them from foreign importation but encourages foreign imports duty free. It is not a reciprocal trade tariff, for we get nothing by way of reciprocity from Canada, Mexico, or whatever country the imported article may come from. Therefore anyone who believes in the tariff principle or in the reciprocal trade principle cannot support this bill consistently.

For many years, fifty, sixty, or a hundred, the farmers of the Middle West, and especially those in Iowa, have supported custom duties commonly called tariffs. During these days it was argued that when you have a thing on an export basis the tariff on that thing does no good; that is to say, if the country was an exporter of corn there was no use of a tariff on corn and such tariff was inoperative. That kind of argument prevailed for many, many years. Finally both parties agreed on an agricultural tariff. They put a tariff on corn of 25 cents in 1930. It has done much good, for very little corn is exported.

The very folks who have always wanted tariffs are against them now insofar as they apply to something the farmer raises; they come in now and desert the tariff principle. They desert it now. That is what this bill does. Overnight, just because these deserters say there is some shortage in feeds, they think we ought to import, free of duty, the feeds they wish to buy. This will cut short the profits which the farmers should get. It is all right for us to vote tariff protection on the things they raise or produce or manufacture, but it is all wrong for the farmer to get this same protection.

Let us look for a moment at the figures that were given out the other day and came to our desks yesterday from the Department of Agriculture, and issued in October of this year. This shows that the stocks of wheat on farms in this country in the month of October were higher than the 10-year average from 1932 to 1941, much higher. The 10-year average was 81.6 percent higher than then, but at the present time, 1943, it is 81.9 percent higher. The quantity of wheat is in the same condition. The

stocks of wheat on the farms in October were about 57 percent higher than the 10-year average, as shown by this pamphlet here. The 1942 crop is not a fair crop by which to measure because it was an unprecedented crop. You can go on down through the rest of the grains. Let us take oats: There is a 14-percent increase in the stock of oats on farms. The old wheat in the internal mills and elevators and warehouses this year is much more than it was during the period from 1935 to 1941.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. My time has about expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will not the gentleman yield for one brief question?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I yield briefly.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is there any shortage of any of the commodities mentioned in this bill in this country today?

Mr. GILCHRIST. It is not so stated in the articles and publications of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Then it is a question of price.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Oh, it is just a question of price. People who have profited by the tariff all these years now see a chance to make money if they can escape paying tariff duties on what the farmers produce. They want to import from Argentina or Canada duty-free.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I also yield the gentleman 5 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, in order to keep the record straight and to keep everybody on the beam I would like to correct our good friend and colleague from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], because if you heard his statement the way I did you might infer that all this feed is coming in at the present time without any duty on it. I am sure it is the wheat feed that is coming in without duty.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I think the gentleman states my position correctly. All this feed can be brought in duty free under the President's proclamation.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes; maybe it could, but it is not being brought in by this governmental agency. If it is the position of any individual or any group that the Government should be the only one in business, if that is their position, and up to this time I have never heard anyone stand up here on the floor and criticize what is taking place at the present time with this feed coming through one governmental agency, they surely have a right to take that position.

I happen to be one who believes that the farm cooperatives, the feed dealers, the individual farmers themselves are entitled to the same consideration in the markets of this country as is any Government agency. A lot of the pressure and a lot of the criticism against the Commodity Credit Corporation could have been and would have been avoided if these private farm cooperatives and feed dealers and individuals had had the same opportunities that have been accorded to our governmental agency. Of course, that is not the fundamental reason why we should pass this bill. That is incidental to it. I am willing to subscribe to a program that the Government shall handle all of it if I thought the Government could do it better than having it handled in any other way, but I do not subscribe to that position. As far as the gentleman from Kansas is concerned, it is not necessary for him to take this floor, or for anyone else, and state what my position is, but in case he should take it upon himself to attack my position in reference to a duty on dairy products, a pretty good way to find out would be to introduce a resolution and he would not have to work on it so many months because it would be referred to his committee. In that way he can find out whether I am interested in trying to furnish the food to win the war or I am just trying to look after the people in my particular district and State.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. If I at any time inferred that the gentleman had stated taking all tariffs off of all products, I want to remove that doubt. I say that, if an effort were made to amend this bill to include dairy products, I would be very glad to help him.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, as far as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST] is concerned, I realize I am in a very embarrassing position today. I think a lot of the gentleman. If all this feed is in storage in this country that he says there is, why is it that no one can get to it? What do we hear every day in this House? Now, let us analyze this thing, and I am not going to give a lot of information about these imports. I keep pretty close track of them. You and I know they are not supposed to be given to the public. Do you realize how much of these feeds is going into commercial channels today that never did in normal times? Under normal times, 55 percent of the commercial corn comes from Iowa and Illinois. What percentage of the corn for commercial and not livestock-feed purposes do you think Iowa and Illinois are now called upon to furnish? What is the amount of wheat going into alcohol and the amount of corn going into alcohol? What is supplying the market for the former imports of the material to provide tapioca pudding? Just think of the demand there is for these foods. You cannot think of this in terms of some past years' accumulation; you must think of it in terms of our commitments and of our expended use of these grain products at this particular time.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman mentioned something about the question why dairy products were not included. Why did he not include dairy products? There is a shortage.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentlewoman wants to know why I did not include dairy products?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That was not the point under consideration.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It is in this bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. We produced more milk in the past year than ever before in the history of the country, except the year previous. Our commitments are not for grains. Our commitments of a foreign nature are for livestock products. The production of livestock and livestock products is what is giving us the trouble. That is where we are going to have our trouble and that is where our commitments are for lend-lease and to foreign sources.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman would not say there is a shortage of dairy products in this country?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. No; I do not think there is a shortage when it is the second biggest production in history.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Why did not the gentleman include them?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The second greatest production of dairy products occurred in 1943, exceeded only by 1942. In this last month they jumped up to 27,000,000 pounds of powdered milk. There are increasing commitments and demands. Every pound of that powdered milk is going to the armed forces of this country scattered all over the world. If we do not provide the feed, the commitments will of necessity have to be curtailed. In addition, we will have to further limit the consumption of livestock products in our own country, too. We are naturally going to be shorter and shorter of dairy products, and we must have the feed in order to produce these products anywhere near our needs.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Why is the gentleman coming here with a bill that favors the dairymen and that does not provide for importing dairy products, when people are hungry for milk and dairy products?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am sure the gentlewoman would be fair-minded enough to be for dairy products when she realizes that the dairy cow is the most efficient farm animal you can feed to, that she will produce three to four times as much human food as would be produced if the feed was fed to some other animals. I am not defending the dairy industry any more than to say that the product that is needed in the war effort today is dairy products.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. That is what I say. Why do you not let us support it?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. We are committed to sending a quart of milk to every person in the world, and we are sending our products abroad. That is one reason why we are short of many things. We must produce more not only for ourselves but for many countries abroad.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. As far as Canada is concerned, its supply of hogs and dairy products that are exportable would be insignificant as far as coming into this country is concerned at this time and in the face of the world needs.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. We are not doing this just for the benefit of Canada, I hope.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I should like to have one thing straightened out, and I think a lot of other Members of the House would, too. It is conceded that if the amount of grain we have in this country now were properly distributed we would have a sufficiency for everybody. Is not that a fact?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not subscribe to that, because there are industrial uses of grain this year that I do not believe the average one of us takes into consideration.

Mr. JENSEN. The record showed there was sufficient.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The record showed what happened to be on hand, but the record did not show the commitments.

Mr. JENSEN. The commitments are about the same as they were.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I beg the gentleman's pardon. We had better look abroad and see what the commitments are. The commitments on some of these products are 100 percent for lease-lend and for the armed forces. They are taking nearly 100 percent of some commodities, like powdered eggs, of our country today.

Mr. JENSEN. That may be, but the fact still remains that we have a bumper crop this year of almost all products.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. And a superabundant demand.

Mr. JENSEN. I do not know whether I would say superabundant demand or not. We have had a big demand for 3 years and we still have a big surplus in the granaries and on the farms.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Our stock pile has just gradually gone down. I will not say it has disappeared, but it has disappeared pretty much. If the gentleman will look up the figures as to the Western Hemisphere, he will find that if we end up this year with 300,000,000 bushels of wheat we may be fortunate. I am pretty sure that we would all be pretty well pleased if we could know that we will have that much wheat left on hand on July 1, 1944.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I have been wondering why the gentleman does not put corn on this list. After all is said and done, the west coast has a great need for corn and we cannot get it. The only place we can get it is a place that is not cooperating very well with the United Nations, namely, Argentina. Nevertheless, we are in terrific need of corn for poultry feeding and cattle feeding on the west coast. Why is not that on this list?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It has been brought out a couple of times on the floor that there is not any corn available to be shipped in during this 90 days.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the gentleman mean from Argentina?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I did not mention any country. If it were available anywhere in the world to be brought in, I am sure there is not a fair-minded person on this floor who would not be willing to include corn in that list.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, every Member in this House is in sympathy with what this resolution wants to do—namely, bring more feed to the areas where there is a shortage. I want to point out, however, that this cannot be done by the mere passage of a resolution. The passing of a resolution does not produce crops.

It has been pointed out on the floor of the House this afternoon that the Commodity Credit Corporation under Presidential directive is now bringing into this country all the feeds that are available and which can be transported. If this resolution is passed it will simply mean that we are subsidizing other countries and it may well cost the United States Treasury and the people $50,000,000. It will, at the same time, not bring more feed into the country.

I wish to point out that this country produced in excess of 3,000,000,000 bushels of corn last year. This is the second largest crop in the history of this country. There are two difficulties in the present distribution of the feed supplies in this country. The first is transportation, the second is the price. Transportation facilities have been lacking. It has been more profitable to feed corn and wheat to hogs than to send the corn to market.

It seems to me that the whole thing finally boils down to the fact that there has been a bungling by the Federal agencies, namely, the Office of Defense Transportation, the Office of Price Administration, and the War Food Administration in that they have produced a confusion by their many useless and conflicting regulations. It becomes more and more apparent that the difficulties in the production and distribution of food would be solved if there was one Federal agency in entire control over all the phases of production, processing, selling, and transportation of food.

It is impossible for the farmers of this country to proceed with confidence under the present confusing and conflicting regulations.

It has been but a few months ago that the War Food Administration was urging the farmers to produce more hogs and then before these hogs were hardly ready for market the cry went out, you have raised too many, cut down the hogs. The War Food Administration in announcing their new program is asking for a reduction in the number of livestock raised on the farms. Yet we have another segment of the population crying out that there isn't enough food to go around. You hear the charge that the feeders of cattle are getting too much money. I want the RECORD to show at this point something about the price of cattle as it has existed in the past. Today, in Omaha, Nebr., top cattle must sell for $15.60 per hundred. A few months ago they were selling for $17.40, in 1942 the top was $17.20. In 1937 it was $19.20, in 1928, $18 a hundred, and in 1927 it was $17.75. I want to point out that the cost of producing and feeding these cattle has greatly increased. The producer and feeder of livestock today is getting far less than he got in the last several years.

Just last year the farmers were being penalized for raising too much wheat. It was necessary for me to pay a penalty of $178 before I could even sell my wheat or feed it to the livestock on the farm. Just what kind of a policy does this administration have toward the agriculture interests in this country? It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, there are many interests in Washington that ought to have the farmers' interest at heart instead of actually being antagonistic.

It has been said that in the beginning of a war the three following things are paramount and in this order: The military, transportation, and food. After a war has proceeded for several years the order is reversed in importance—namely, food, transportation, and then the military. We have reached the place in this country where food may well be more important than bullets, planes, or battleships. I would suggest to the consuming East which needs food that it pays some attention to the needs of agriculture and sees that the hard-working farmer receives a reasonable profit for his labors and the things he raises. It might go quite a ways toward producing sufficient food for the consuming sections of the country.

It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that this resolution is not necessary. While it only purports to let down the barriers for 90 days it might well be for 90 weeks or for all time to come. The problem is now being adequately handled by the Commodity Credit Corporation without the payment of a huge sum of money as will certainly be required under this bill. Let the various Federal and bureaucratic agencies handling food be united under one head and the grain produced in this country will receive adequate and prompt distribution, then the need for this resolution need not exist.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I believe this emergency measure should be passed. Out in the Middle West, except in one or two States, we are very short of feedstuffs. There was a feed dealers' convention here the other day. At that convention we were informed that only 2,300 tons of protein feed were at present available for the 2,500,000 dairy cows in Wisconsin. That condition exists not only in Wisconsin but in many other States from there to the Atlantic coast.

I do not know how much feed might be brought in under the provisions of this resolution, but if it will help that situation, certainly it would do a lot of good.

The matter of precedent has been mentioned here. It calls to my mind the incident of about a year ago, when a British and American syndicate purchased some 200,000,000 pounds of coconut oil in foreign countries for shipment to this country. There was a 2-cent excise tax on coconut oil coming into this country. The big soap companies had a large lobby which came before Congress and before the Committee on Ways and Means, of which my esteemed friend from Kansas is a member, to recommend a resolution striking off that excise tax of 2 cents a pound, in order that the Government might have the glycerin which could be produced from oil. There were about 13,000,000 pounds of glycerin in that oil which was used for munitions. On the other hand, we presented to the syndicate and soap companies that got the remaining 187,000,000 pounds of the imported oil approximately three and three-quarter millions of dollars by way of lessened taxes. It was a subsidy for the importation of that oil. We did that for the soap makers. Is it not about time to do something to relieve the farmers who have stock they are shipping to market which is not in a proper condition to be sold? For instance, in Milwaukee, the other day, they were selling feeder pigs weighing 100 pounds for only $8 a pig. The St. Paul livestock market has been so crowded with hogs, many not fitted for the market by proper feeding, they finally put an embargo on shipments. That is a part of the situation as to feed in the Northwest. Dairy cattle are in need of more feedstuffs and the same is true of hogs and poultry. I feel that the passage of this resolution might aid that situation somewhat. I am in favor of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All time has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, the following, when imported into the United States from foreign countries, and when entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, during the period of 90 days beginning with the day following the date of enactment of this joint resolution, to be used as, or as a constituent part of, feed for livestock and poultry, shall be exempt from duty: Wheat, oats, barley, rye, flax, or hay, or products in chief value of one or more of the foregoing or derivatives thereof. As used in this joint resolution, the term "United States" means the several States and the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. The exemptions from duties provided for by this joint resolution shall be subject to compliance with regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 1, after "flax", insert "cottonseed."

On page 2, line 5, strike out "and the District of Columbia" and insert "the District of Columbia, the Territories, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALE: On page 2, line 2, after the word "cottonseed", add the word "corn."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, there has already been some discussion about the insertion of the word "corn." Whether any supplies of corn are immediately available or not, it seems to me highly desirable to have corn embodied in this resolution. It is conceivable, at least, it seems to me that Argentine corn might be available within a period of 90 days from the time this resolution becomes effective; and even if not, the resolution might be further extended. It certainly can do no harm to have corn in the resolution. The need for corn for poultry feed all over the country is very great, as has been evidenced by the questions asked on the floor this morning and the interest in the subject evinced by the various Members. I sincerely hope my amendment will be adopted.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman also include clothing, for instance? That is a necessity. Let us make it all-inclusive and take down the bars on potatoes also. Let us do the whole thing up brown here.

Mr. HALE. Answering the gentleman's question, I thought this was a resolution with relation to livestock and poultry feed. In my district the poultry do not eat clothing.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The committee has no objection to the amendment. I do not think it can do any good or do any harm. There is no objection to the amendment so far as the committee is concerned.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I have been told by dairy authorities in my district if this resolution is passed without the corn clause and simply with the wheat for dairy feed, there is not going to be a drop in the bucket in comparison to what we need. I have been trying to get corn for upstate New York for the past several months. I sincerely hope that the House will add corn to this amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Where does the gentleman expect to get this corn during the 90-day period?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I do not know where we are going to get it, but I have been trying for 6 months to get it and there has not been any satisfaction given, either from the Middle West or anywhere else. I think it is high time this House did something to try to get corn, so that the people in New York City and every other metropolitan district will have enough milk and enough dairy products this next year. I will say to the House that the situation at the present time in the Northeast has become so serious that a great deal of the shortage will never be able to be made up. This resolution is not going to solve all our problems we are facing. But I am for it, because at least this is going to cure some of the ills that are prevalent in the Northeast. I hope that the amendment to add corn to the list of products named in the bill will be agreed to and I sincerely hope that the resolution itself will be agreed to.

There has been a lot of discussion about this middle western corn from time to time. The other day we were all glad to hear that the O. P. A. had lifted the ceiling price on corn to $1.16. I do not think it is going to be enough. In fact, I think the next month or two will show that the new ceiling price on corn has not been raised sufficiently to bring enough of it into the Northeast to feed our dairy herds. I, for one, would have advocated a higher ceiling price on corn in order to bring in that corn that we must have in order to salvage what is left of the dairy herds and poultry flocks of the Northeast.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Can you get any corn from Canada?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. We cannot get corn from Canada.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Can you get any corn from Mexico?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. No; but you can get it brought in from some of the other countries.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Can you get any corn from Argentina?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. It is my understanding that you can.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Are you willing to pay a tariff on the corn that comes from Argentina?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. We will not have to if corn is added to this resolution.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. In legislation passed 2 or 3 years ago, we empowered the Government to take over any mine or any mill, or any other industry that was needed in the war effort. Why should we not do the same thing with corn?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is right.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I think the gentleman does not realize that this is a matter of distribution. We have the corn and we are trying to get it to you. I think this amendment will kill the entire resolution. I think it will be defeated because it will damage the objective of those of us who are trying to get you some feed to feed your milk cows.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I want to say that the gentleman's efforts have been very sincere and very helpful, but every effort I have brought to this floor in an attempt to remedy the disastrous situation my farmers face has met with nothing but opposition. I will say to the gentleman that I am for anything that will bring in the corn and other feed for our dairy herds and our poultry flocks in the Northeast. We are facing one of the most serious conditions that the country has ever had to face. I appeal not only in behalf of those farmers who are so bereft of feed, but I appeal also for the consumers of the country. Too much stress is being put on this subsidy question. Too much stress is being put on the proposition of what people will have to pay for their food. It is not a case of being able to pay a low price or a high price, but it is a case of being able to get any dairy products or food at all. I say to this House, Mr. Chairman, that every measure that we bring up here must be given careful consideration and I hope this resolution and the amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I suggest the absence of a quorum and I make a point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Would the gentleman withdraw that until we come to a vote on this matter and then I will make a point of no quorum.

Mr. STEFAN. I withdraw the point of order at the request of my colleague.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I thought the gentleman had withdrawn that. I promised to make a point of no quorum if there was not a quorum present when the bill came up for final vote.

Mr. STEFAN. I reserve the right to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order that a quorum is not present?

Mr. STEFAN. I do, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-three Members are present. A quorum.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time to address some questions of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. In his statement a few moments ago, he suggested one of the chief difficulties was the matter of transportation. I presume from that statement that he had investigated that question more or less thoroughly. I believe the gentleman made this statement, that the Government had the money to buy the feed, that the feed is available, and that transportation is one of the serious difficulties. Will the gentleman elaborate on that to some extent.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. If the gentleman will yield, I made the statement that there is feed available to be bought. The Commodity Credit Corporation is buying it, and they have the funds they need to buy it with.

Mr. DISNEY. Is there sufficient feed available to be bought?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. DISNEY. Where?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. In Canada. We brought in 54,000,000 bushels of wheat. Since the House committee reported this bill the other day, Canada stopped selling all kinds of grain, and we are now bringing in 6,000,000 bushels of wheat under option.

Beginning October 1, 1943, and extending to October 1, 1944, we make the arrangement to bring in 150,000,000 bushels of wheat, and the only reason we do not get it in in greater quantities is lack of transportation.

Mr. DISNEY. Is there anything we can do on the subject of transportation to expedite the delivery of these feed stuffs into this country? What can be done on that line?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I have discussed this with the War Food Administration, with the Commodity Credit Corporation also, and they tell me they are doing everything they can to bring this grain into this country.

Mr. DISNEY. Is there anything the Congress can do to assist?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Personally, I do not think there is. I think they are doing everything they can. Everyone is conscious that this is a serious problem; the departments see it that way and are trying to work it out. The passage of this resolution will be of no assistance; I think rather it may prove to be an embarrassment.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Granting to be true everything the gentleman from Kansas says, that they have done a splendid job in this wheat feed, I am surprised the gentleman from Kansas wants to keep that Government agency, the only one he says that can do it, for if they have done such a good job with wheat, why can they not do it with barley, oats, and other farm crops?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I should like to answer that.

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. The Federal Government has gone into Canada to buy this grain for feed. Thus we have it in the hands of one agency. Why does the gentleman want to send all the feed dealers up into Canada to compete with the United States Government and make the Federal Government pay more for it?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am not going to take anything out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to remind the gentleman from Kansas that wheat is not the only feed that is needed right now. Chickens in my district are dying because of an overdose of wheat. They lack corn, which is the essential feed in the production of poultry and eggs, also dairy products.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make inquiry of one of the gentlemen from the corn-producing States: Just why is it they object to including corn in this resolution? I do not care who answers this question but I want to find the answer, because we need corn on the west coast.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield for the answer to my question.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. We have a record corn crop this year, a 3,000,000,000-bushel corn crop, the second largest crop in the history of the United States. The corn is not available to the entire country because of lack of transportation.

Mr. HINSHAW. I should like to know why we cannot get it, because we need it badly on the west coast.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Another important factor is that of price; they can get a better price from their corn by feeding it to hogs than by shipping it to the west coast.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I think the latter reason is the real one. I am one of the Representatives of one of the largest poultry-producing counties in the United States. I refer to Los Angeles County, Calif. I believe the census statistics will bear out my statement. We are unable to get corn out there. I do not know why you fellows are keeping it, but we cannot get it. We have got to

have it because we need to maintain our production of poultry and eggs, both for the armed forces and for our greatly increased population. Now, let me tell you fellows in the Middle West something. About 2 years ago the price of fryer mash on the coast was $1.70 a hundred. Now it is up to $3.60 a hundred and we can hardly get good mash even at that price. The protein content of that mash has dropped about 20 percent since corn was removed as an ingredient. Now, if you want to keep us from getting that mash by holding your corn to feed to hogs, then you are hurting us and yourselves.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman. I want to know the truth.

Mr. HOPE. As far as I am concerned I have no objection to including corn in the present bill. I do not think it will mean that you will get any corn. I do not believe you are going to get any feed under this bill even if we pass it. You will get just as much corn as you will any other feed. The real reason why you are not getting any corn on the west coast has been the matter of the too low price ceiling on corn. It has kept it on the farm where grown. The price ceiling was raised a little on Monday of this week but I do not think it was raised enough. We will, however, have an opportunity to find out whether it was raised enough.

Mr. HINSHAW. There might be one more way of getting it, and that would be to drop the ceiling on hogs. If they lowered the ceiling on hogs in proportion to the corn-hog ratio there would not be so much hoarding of corn to feed to hogs.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Well, let us lower the ceiling on hogs to $2.50 a hundred. That would release plenty of corn.

Mr. HINSHAW. Do not be absurd; I am not asking anything like that but I think there is an inequality here, either in a too-low price of corn or a too-high price of hogs, that should be equalized to release some of this surplus corn for other areas of the country that need it so badly.

Mr. GILCHRIST. It should be used for something else than feeding hogs.

Mr. HINSHAW. It should indeed. There is plenty of corn that would be sold if it were not for the high price you can get for hogs.

Mr. GILCHRIST. What does the gentleman think they ought to pay? More than $3.60 for mash? About $1.20 per bushel would bring the corn out of Iowa.

Mr. HINSHAW. It seems to me that the sections raising corn are hurting the rest of us who have to buy it, while at the same time they are hurting themselves.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It has been demonstrated that the price of corn is too low to get the corn off the farm. Why does the gentleman want to come in here and put through a bill that will reduce the price of corn when he already knows that is the reason he is not getting the corn?

Mr. HINSHAW. How high is the price of corn now as compared with 2 years ago? Answer me that.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman can answer the question. I did not raise the question.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. I am not going to oppose anything that is put before us in the form of a need for food to win the war and sustain our economic life. I am not going to oppose that, but I may say in reference to corn that we have a ceiling price of $13.75 on hogs. They are talking of lowering that ceiling price, but there are no points on your poultry out there in California or in other sections of the country, although there are high points on our pork. We cannot sell the pork.

Mr. HINSHAW. I appreciate the gentleman's viewpoint and believe that rationing of pork might very well be lifted entirely until the surplus of pork is used, but may I tell him that the poultry production in the United States, and particularly in my county, is falling off very materially. The reason it has dropped is because we cannot get the feed for one thing, and the second reason is that the feed is so high-priced that our producers cannot afford to feed it to poultry and beef cattle and sell under the ceilings.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman has seen the price raised. He is told that if he gets this bill he will not get any more corn. Why does he want to put himself in a worse shape?

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not care so much how we get it, but we do want the corn, and we want it at a fair, reasonable price and not some fancy price that we may have to pay for it in due course.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. But just getting up and saying you want the corn is not going to get you the corn.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I sympathize with the gentleman's position, but, remember, corn is between 25 cents and 30 cents a bushel higher now than it was a year ago and it costs the producer of corn 100 percent more to produce it than it did a year ago.

Mr. HINSHAW. That may be true.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that, in my belief, these corn-hog farmers in the Midwest are cutting their own throats with the help of the O. P. A. In the first place the O. P. A. has given them a ceiling price on hogs that is the equivalent of $1.40 corn. The O. P. A. ceiling on corn is now $1.16 per bushel, so they are holding corn for hog feed in order to get the $1.40 value in the form of pork instead of letting the corn be sold to beef and poultry people at $1.16. The net result is that so much pork is being raised that the corn-hog farmers are now scared to death for fear the very surplus of pork they have so grown will break the price of pork. So you hear demands for a support price for pork. They are beginning to fear that there will be so much pork that the hogs will even eat up the corn they want to save to feed young pigs next year before the present hog crop can be marketed, so they now recommend the removal of point rationing of pork.

That is all right with me, Mr. Chairman. I favor temporarily, at least, removing the rationing of pork products, and beef too because there are more beef cattle on the ranges unfattened than stockmen can take care of. In fact the whole program is "screwy." In both cases we should hold the consumer ceiling prices, but I think that such tremendous surpluses have been built up by O. P. A. and other restrictions that the prices will go down of themselves when these restrictions have been removed. As I said, I would maintain consumer price ceilings while removing rationing and slaughter restrictions on pork and beef. If something like that is not done soon these animals will eat the farmers and stock raisers out of feed and forage.

The corn-hog farmers have a virtual corner on corn. That corner was engineered when the O. P. A. fixed the ceiling price of pork at higher than the corn-hog ratio warrants after fixing the ceiling price of corn. Now they have the corner on corn and a tremendous surplus of pork that they are not allowed to sell—so they are in a real jam.

But that is not the whole story, Mr. Chairman. The military services, the Commodity Credit Corporation, and other agencies, including the O. P. A., have contrived to fill all the storage warehouses in the country to the point that shipments of food to warehouses cannot be unloaded because there is no storage space left, and so there is a tie-up of rail traffic. I submit the following release from the Office of Defense Transportation to prove the point:

RAIL TIE-UP FEARED IN OVERCROWDING OF FOOD STORAGE PLANTS

The Office of Defense Transportation has prepared a report warning that food storage plants are so jammed there is the danger that rail movements will be slowed and that refrigerator cars will remain on sidings unable to unload their cargoes.

Production in food-processing plants already has been slowed as a result of a shortage in storage facilities, admitted by the War Food Administration.

Defense Transportation Director Joseph B. Eastman has called the attention of Food Administrator Marvin Jones and Price Administrator Chester Bowles to the situation and coupled with it a suggestion that some action be taken by the two agencies to relieve the strain on storage facilities.

RATION CUT URGED

O. D. T. storage experts—and presumably Mr. Eastman himself—privately advocate that ration values on certain foods be lowered and that W. F. A. release some of its stored foods as the quickest means to relieve the jam.

A W. F. A. spokesman admitted that both cold and dry storage space was very tight, a condition he attributed to the seasonal

movement of processed foods for winter storage and to increased hog marketings. The Government has large inventories of butter on hand, he said, but this supply now is being reduced as shipments to Russia increase. Butter pledged to that country under lease-lend for the next year is sent during winter months because of Russia's lack of cold storage facilities, he said.

The spokesman insisted there would be no wholesale release of Government-held food stocks, despite recurrent reports from the trade. The Food Distribution Administration is constantly reviewing requirements of various claimants on food stocks, he said, and when an adjustment can be made, supplies are released for civilians.

INSIST ON BACKLOG

Food officials insist on a backlog of supplies, including butter, in order to supply the armed services and lease-lend should their demands suddenly increase, and also to release foods when civilian shortages occur.

Since November 1, the F. D. A. has released from Government stocks the following quantities of foods for civilians:

Peaches, 900,000 cases and more expected; peas, 1,080,000 cases; catsup, 810,000 cases on November 1 and 990,000 cases today; grapefruit juice, 2,400,000 cases; pineapple, 540,000 cases; figs, 77,000 cases; tomatoes, 1,640,000 cases; string beans, 960,000 cases; dried beans, 100,000 bags of 100 pounds each; raisins, approximately 800,000 tons by January 1; dried prunes, about 80,000 tons, and currants, 2,800 tons. F. D. A. also is planning to order a release on canned apples and perhaps canned pork and beans.

Mr. Chairman, in fact this presents a perfectly ridiculous situation. Everyone in California knows that the Government froze and took over the entire fruit pack this year for some reason, and now the Government is releasing hundreds of thousands of cases. It froze butter and other things as well, causing extreme shortages and preventing the action of any part of the law of supply and demand. Hence pressures against ceilings. Hence pressures on unrationed items. Hence reluctance to plant—and withal a general mess of the food situation. It is ridiculous in this land of plenty, even in the midst of war, to so jimmy the machinery of agricultural production and distribution that people go without while farms and warehouses bulge to bursting. The excuse used is that the food must be kept for lend-lease and for the military. The people will do without for both purposes gladly but if the people and the Congress could know the carry-over of surpluses from 1942 crops alone I think they would be amazed. Warehousemen have told me of specific knowledge of conditions in their own warehouses, and there are new large Government warehouses that should be investigated.

Our poultry, dairy, and beef producers in California are in a bad situation, squeezed between rising feed and labor costs on one hand and ceiling prices on the other. They say "What is the use of struggling. We will quit and go into defense work." Thereupon we begin upon a shortage of food. Then the defense workers and all the rest of us stand in line only to be told that there is no more of this or that today. So housewives have to shop far and wide and that takes gas and gas is rationed too. It doesn't make sense, Mr. Chairman. But then—this is a sample of the planned economy and we may as well sample it now so everyone will know whether we want to keep on with it, or not, after the war. I think—not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this resolution, but for different reasons than most Members. Ordinarily I would be opposed to it in normal times; however, I am interested in securing maximum production of all essential foods during the present war emergency. I want to tell you the main reasons for my supporting this resolution and why I think we should attempt to secure additional feed. It is on account of the announced program of the War Food Administration to cut the production of pork, dairy products, beef cattle, and poultry for next year.

In 1943, this year, the farmers, at the request of the Government, produced 127,000,000 pigs. It takes corn and protein feed to take care of those pigs and to bring them up to a weight of 200 pounds or more. But I am sorry to say that the New Deal never thrives under an abundance of production of necessary foods. If we had an abundance of pork, as we have now, there would be no need for rationing, there would be no need for the threat of inflation, and there would be no need for a high price ceiling. All that is necessary would be a good floor or support price. The officials who are shaping this program or who are shaping the domestic policies of the United States have decided that we have too much pork, so we must cut hog production for 1944 from 127,000,000 head to 105,000,000 head. That will result in less pork. The price will go up, and there will be more of an excuse for a threat to inflation and stricter enforcement of price ceilings.

I want to get corn and other feed for these hogs so that we may have an abundance of the poor man's meat, and that is what pork is, for 1944. They are proposing also to cut down milk production, or to hold it the same as it was in 1942 and 1943.

We have a shortage of milk at the present time. I want to increase the production of milk, butter, and other dairy products, therefore I am supporting this resolution with the hope that it will result in additional feed.

The administration is proposing to cut poultry broilers to 80 percent of what it is this year. Poultry is not on the ration list at the present time. Of course, they would like to ration poultry or bring about a situation where poultry must be rationed, and in order to do this they must create a scarcity of poultry. I want to secure additional feed to take care of the large poultry flocks of this country. They also propose with reference to beef, range cattle, and feeder cattle, that this livestock be marketed at 95 percent of the 1942 weight, thereby getting less beef on the market and resulting in additional regimentation and in additional threats to inflation.

Mr. Chairman, I say that the time has come when the people, or the Congress speaking for the people, should assert itself and demand maximum production of all types of feed, grains, livestock, and poultry in this country to take care of our needs and in order to stop this inflationary threat that is constantly appearing in the picture. Furthermore, if we create an abundance there will be no need for consumer subsidies which certain groups are insisting on at the present time.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman suggest a way in which we can get some corn on the Pacific coast with which to feed our flocks?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST] said that if corn were raised to $1.20 it would bring out the corn from Iowa. I do not know whether that is true or not.

Let me continue along the line of corn. Some of our intellectuals are proposing that we feed the corn and proteins directly to the people instead of feeding them through poultry and livestock; in other words, that we perfect a synthetic product made up of protein feeds and corn and sell it to the people as meat or poultry instead of as the red meat itself.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The Gaumitz report states beans and peas as a substitute for milk and dairy products and meat products. That is the intention.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes. We all know they have perfected a synthetic product called oleomargarine. That may be a good nutrition food, but it is not in the class, chemically or otherwise, with butter.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It is the same kind of diet the Japs eat. I do not know why it should be advocated over here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, this debate has taken on what is to me a very interesting turn. I think perhaps we are trying out some of our emotions and trading principles and economic thoughts with respect to the job that lies ahead of us.

Germany moves out of first place in Europe, down to a nonentity. Russia moves into first position. Under the decree, Japan is to cease to function in Asia, and China moves into first position. The British Empire takes third position, and the United States moves into first as far as the world is concerned. So in due course, if that program is to be worked out, we shall have a lot of discussions having to do with tariffs and the removal of protection. World power

position No. 1 carries a lot of international responsibilities.

We have a situation here today where corn is being debated. If we take the duty off corn for 90 days and throw the Argentine market open, I wish somebody would tell me in certain language how much corn would come in from there. We might see 50,000,000, 75,000,000, or 150,000,000 bushels of corn offered. I do not know what is produced in Argentina and I do not know how quickly they would unload in order to prepare their bins for the forthcoming crop. When you start removing tariffs on the American market and throwing this market open to the traders of the world, if boats are available you might see something that would surprise you.

I understand from our corn friends here that there is a lot of corn in this country, but what power is there to make those who own that corn throw it on the market at $1.16 per bushel, or $1.20 per bushel, or $1.50 per bushel, or $3 per bushel, if they prefer to have corn than have credits in the bank or currency in the box? That is what you are really getting at. You give me a reason why a farmer should sell corn today if he wants to feed it or if he thinks the market may advance 50 or 100 percent, or if he thinks the buying power of the dollar he would get for that bushel of corn may decline 25 or 50 percent.

Mr. JENSEN rose.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman from Iowa want to answer that question?

Mr. JENSEN. I want to make the observation that in the State of Iowa we need about 90 percent, and feed about 90 percent of everything we raise. That is one thing a lot of folks do not realize. We are the greatest pork-producing State in the Nation, the greatest poultry-producing State in the Nation, and the greatest finished-beef-producing State in the Nation, and naturally we have to feed a lot of that corn.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understand that. Now, can the gentleman, as an expert on corn and coming from a corn State——

Mr. JENSEN. I do not claim to be an expert.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Can the gentleman tell me where there is any corn for sale of consequence?

Mr. JENSEN. No.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is there anybody that can tell me where there is any corn for sale of consequence? I am not talking about stocks of corn, I am talking about corn for sale—two different things entirely.

Mr. JENSEN. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not know of any corn for sale; I do not know of any cottonseed oil cake or soybean meal or peanut meal, of consequence, for sale. How much there is in the country I do not know. But what power do you have to make our people, who are presently free economic agents, disgorge those inventories they have? We do not have any such power the President dare politically use, and I do not think this Congress is going to pass a law which says to a man that he has to convert corn into currency or into bank balances in the form of deposits to his credit.

So then you come on down to this proposition. Do we want to throw the market open for Argentine corn for 90 days, or say to the world, "Let the trading world figure out its own way of getting the corn here"? That is what is involved in this amendment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. An order is being contemplated down in the War Food Administration under the War Powers Act, which gives the Government virtual power to seize protein feeds. One official told me that he thought under that War Powers Act they also have the authority to go out and seize corn upon the farms.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. In connection with the remark of the gentleman from Iowa, if they cannot let that corn go from the State of Iowa because they want to feed animals there, how are we going to get any corn on the west coast, when we need it as badly as they do?

Mr. CRAWFORD. You will have to go without, because you do not raise corn.

Mr. HINSHAW. We are not going to do without, we are going to get it if we can.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not blame you at all, the least bit. I would do the same thing.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman asked how they would get the power to take the corn. They can take it under the exact same powers under which early this year they took all the corn contained in 16 terminal elevators.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is all right; in other words, under the war powers.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If they have the war power to do these things and the corn is available, why do they not proceed to do it instead of destroying the protective fabric from a tariff standpoint? That brings me right down to this point. We sit around here and play with O. P. A. and apparently from the debate today let O. P. A. distort and practically destroy the economy of this country. Why do we do it? Why do we move into a field of this kind, as illustrated by this resolution, if the thing could be corrected by war powers or by changing the attitude of the O. P. A.? That is the kind of question that is in my mind. If it is impossible for the Office of Defense Transportation or the War Powers Division of the Government or the O. P. A. to do anything about it, that is a different proposition. Perhaps we have to go to some other parts of the world to get some of the excess inventories of foodstuffs for animals and people that they have available for sale at the present time. Apparently we are pursuing that particular course, to go get something and bring it into this country.

Suppose you have an armistice within 90 days, then do you want this statute on the books at that time? I do not think so. But if you have 4 more years of war, you may want to extend this 90-day period to 90 months. God only knows how badly we will want food and foodstuffs if we keep on shipping it out of this country the way we are now.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. At the present time the Government is shipping out of the country protein feeds we need here.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the reason I refer to the 90-month period.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have a mighty high regard for the gentleman's capacity to sift the kernels from the chaff. Now, is the gentleman in favor of this resolution? I have been trying to figure out the gentleman's argument.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have been sitting here trying to figure out in my own mind whether or not I am in favor of it. I have about come to the conclusion, as a result of the debate, that this resolution is not necessary. I wish somebody would get up here and convince me it is necessary. If it is, I will support it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is my opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, this is not the first time that this country has been engaged in a major war. I do not know whether it is necessary, of course, to send the amount of food we are sending to other parts of the world or not. There is no question but what food plays a very psychological part in a war. I remember very well talking with Mr. Clemenceau during the First World War in which he made this statement. It was in the latter part of 1917. He said:

> If the French people knew that we had only 3 days' supply of wheat in the country, the war would cease. The morale of the people would be broken.

That was the day when they were defending, as you know, the city of Verdun. But within 3 days shiploads of wheat came to France. Otherwise it is hard to tell what the history of the world might have been today. Now our men are fighting on at least 50 different fronts. None of us can stand here very well and say that the food that is going out to those fronts should not go there. I suppose that in this war, long before it is over, food will be the greatest factor in the ultimate result, and we are all figuring, of course, on victory. If you read the morning paper you saw there a statement that in order to start this second front in Holland or Belgium or Norway or somewhere over there, it would require 80 divisions, and that of that 80 divisions England could only supply 24 divisions. Just think of the volume of food that must flow 3,000 miles in that direction. Think of the amount of food that must flow in the other direction into Italy, where they are still a long way from Rome. They are not even a third of the way up. They are fighting in the mountains and the snow. Every ounce of food our men are going to have must go some 3,000 miles.

Now the time has come, gentlemen, when there is a question here of how to get food in order to save these great war industries, for the farms are war industries, so that they can supply the basic needs not only of this generation, but of the generations to come. You cannot afford to go out and destroy those plants. What we need in the country today is unity among the farmers. Just because you do not happen to like this resolution a little I do not want to see the farmers of one section line up and vigorously oppose something that will be of benefit to another section. That is not unity. That is not the way to play the game. If we of the East and the Northeast have ever taken the position we are going to cripple you in the West, I do not know when that has been. I have never intended to cast a vote that would do that. I think this bill ought to go through. I do not object, of course, to the corn amendment; in fact, I am for it. There may be other things that ought to go into the bill that may have been overlooked, and we cannot provide for every conceivable situation that may arise. But if we go on trying to supply the world with food and supply enough food for our own people to protect the health of this country, there is no telling but what we may have to draw on many parts of the world, although if the O. P. A. would step to one side, the farmers could and would meet the food problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr WILSON. Mr. Chairman, our farmers do have a nice reserve of corn and that corn reserve is rapidly being depleted because of the bungling of the O. P. A. The O. P. A. as yet require you to submit points when you go to market to buy pork. Many, many suburban residents have been accustomed each year at this time to go to the farmer and buy a butchered hog or one to butcher themselves. But they do not have the points today to do that under the rationing system. The markets are glutted, the packing houses and storehouses are filled with pork and beef and there is no place to market fat hogs. The result is that farmers are holding them for months after they have been ready for market and are feeding them today the corn they had hoped to have left to feed their next spring's crop of pigs to make pork for another year. That is happening all over the country. It is happening in my district and it is happening in your district. I have today introduced a bill putting meat on the free-point list, doing away with the rationing of meat for 60 days, which I am told by members of the Farm Bureau and all the farm organizations, would be the best step we could take, today, to alleviate the situation of glutted markets and help conserve our corn supply for the feeding of pork for next year's meat crop. We all recognize the fact that the most efficient machine in the world for changing corn over to proteins and fats is the hog. We must have a large crop of pigs next spring to ensure an adequate supply of proteins and fats for use another year. The farmers are not going to raise pigs unless they have corn on hand with which to feed them.

They are not going to raise those pigs unless they can get rid of the pork they have on hand today. You people who are interested in getting corn and conserving the corn supply which we have, should get behind me on this bill which I have introduced today to take meat off the ration list for at least 60 days.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman states there is an impending shortage of corn which the farmers can feed the pigs next spring. What does he think will happen in the great Northeast if farmers cannot get corn now and have not been able to get it for months in order to maintain the dairy herds and the poultry flocks, unless a bill of this kind becomes law?

Mr. WILSON. Unless my bill becomes law, this corn that you might have an opportunity to get will be fed to already fattened hogs and will be wasted. The only way you can hope to get corn that we have now is to get rid of the hogs that the farmers are feeding the corn to, and then they might be able to turn a little over to you people.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. They may be; but in the meantime, if we suffer the same conditions we have for the last couple of months, they will wipe out the dairy herds in the entire northeastern section of this country.

Mr. WILSON. I am not speaking against this bill or for it. I am simply offering you one step which you may take toward a solution of your problem. Am I not correct in my observation that this will tend to give you some corn?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If you dispose of the present stocks of meat by putting them free of rations, and then proceed to bring in more hogs through propagation to consume corn, I do not know but what you will reduce your potential stocks of corn. If the program is as announced by the gentleman from Minnesota, to the effect that next year the hog and poultry and beef production is to be decreased, I do not see how it fits into the gentleman's proposal, and I certainly do not see how such a reduction-in-production program can possibly fit in with the observations of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], wherein he points out that we have got to send 15 divisions of men across the channel to fight, with all these other undertakings. So this debate today is quite confusing. Because of that thing, we say that the Government is going to reduce production.

On the other hand, we must conserve the feed to increase production, and so on down the line.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to make a short statement out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the Committee of the House knows that under the program the Speaker was to address the House for 15 minutes this afternoon. On account of other matters on the program and the debate on this bill, I will yield to the Speaker 15 minutes tomorrow when we call up the naval bill, and he will address the Committee at that time for 15 minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the resolution before the House provides for the lifting or waiving of tariff on agricultural commodities including wheat imported from foreign countries. The reason given by the sponsors of the measure is that it may help to take care of an acute feed shortage in this country. If I thought this legislation would increase the supply of feed in this country and thereby provide for more food, I would be glad to support it.

I have made some investigation of this problem. I am informed by officials in the Department of Agriculture dealing with this question that the Commodity Credit Corporation is at the present time buying just as much feed, including wheat, as transportation facilities will permit. It ought to be definitely understood that under our present law the Commodity Credit Corporation has authority to buy wheat and other feeds anywhere in the world and in any amount without tariff restrictions. Not only that, but the Commodity Credit Corporation has been furnished funds by the Federal Government with which to

do it. There can be no reason why we should not receive just as much feed products as foreign countries will let us have with our transportation facilities to bring it into this country. Transportation is the bottleneck in this problem.

Mr. Chairman, under this resolution wheat imported from Canada will cost from 15 cents to 20 cents per bushel more than it does now. The additional cost, known as an equalization fee, will go to the Canadian farmers. They are permitted to charge it on wheat sold to individuals, but not when sold to the American Government. It has been suggested on the floor of the House that this legislation would help increase the production of food. As I have said before, if I thought this were correct, I would certainly support it. We are all agreed that we must have a maximum production of food. No one is opposed to that. We will support legislation that will anywise increase food supplies. Food is necessary for the winning of this war and food will have a lot to do with the winning of the peace. If this administration wants to encourage the increase in the supply of food, it ought to give consideration to two or three fundamental things—first, it ought to assure the farmer a fair price for his products in the market place on the basis of what he has to pay for the things he needs to buy. The farmer and producer must have machinery and equipment so he can carry on his farm operations to a maximum. We must see that he gets his fair share of help as he goes along and give him some assurance that there will not be any roll-backs in the prices for his commodities when they are ready for the market. We must give the farmer to understand that his services are appreciated as a part of this war effort.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about increasing supplies of feed and yet it was only a little more than a year ago we were reducing farm acreage in this country and holding down feed and food production. Farmers were penalized as much as 49 cents per bushel for raising a little more wheat than departmental regulations allowed. These farmers were not only penalized on the extra wheat they raised, and may have fed to their own livestock but they did not get parity checks nor soil-conservation payments. They did not ask for them, but did think they were entitled to sell their wheat without penalty especially when it was so much needed.

Mr. Chairman, this Government collected $17,877,000 in penalties from the farmers of this country who raised about thirty-five or forty million bushels of wheat that was in excess of the amount they were allowed under the Allotment Act. Today we are talking about thirty-five or forty million bushels of wheat that is being brought in from Canada with a 40-cent bushel tariff, but we hesitate to reimburse those farmers for the penalties they have paid just because they saw fit to raise the extra wheat that is so much needed at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, this $14,000,000 is not tax money. It is penalty money that ought to be refunded to the farmers who paid the penalties. They are entitled to it.

Mr. Chairman, several months ago I introduced a bill in this House to reimburse those penalty payments. The committee to which it was referred has taken no action on it. A petition has been placed on the Clerk's desk to discharge the committee and bring the bill to the floor of the House for vote. I trust those of you who believe this measure is at least entitled to be considered by the House, will sign the petition so we can vote on it.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I feel that the gentleman's bill should be reported and passed to relieve these penalties, because we did waive the penalty on those who had not paid it.

I also favor what the gentleman said about increasing farm machinery so we can have an increased production next year, but in the meantime what are we going to feed the cows, especially the milk cows?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from South Dakota. If I thought this legislation would materially increase the supply of needed livestock feeds in this country I would support it during an emergency. I want to relieve the dairyman and the poultrymen of New England and South Dakota, and everywhere else. We already have legislation permitting the importation of wheat and protein products for feeding livestock, and have authorized funds for doing it for emergency purposes.

Mr. CASE. Why not try it?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I certainly would be glad to try it if I thought it would really relieve the feed situation in an emergency. This measure does not, in my judgment, solve either the feed or the food problem. The difficulty on this particular situation is one of transportation and distribution. Our Government is importing all the essential feed transportation facilities will permit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, one thing I have noticed in Congress that causes more trouble in our country than almost anything else is that we are all afraid to vote against a bill that bears a label saying it will remedy something we know is wrong, even though the bill will not remedy it at all. When such a bill is presented to us we stand up and vote against it when we know it will do no good; we stand with shaking knees, afraid to vote against a bad bill with a good label for fear of the effect it will have back home and the fact that our opponents may use it against us.

It seems to me this bill is tinged with a good deal of sectionalism. The people in the Midwest know what it is necessary to do to get more corn. They are going to feel that this is a sectional bill. From their point of view, it is a sectional bill because it will do nothing but appease some section; this Congress, the country having fought one sectional war, ought to be very careful not to vote for legislation that will not do the thing it is supposed to do but will merely stir up sectional feelings.

When you consider this bill, ask yourselves whether you would vote for an amendment to this bill which would make this bill fair to all sections. The following amendment would be consistent with the bill as written: That the provisions of this bill shall apply to all commodities or articles which are rationed or of which there is likely to be a shortage, so that it would apply to clothing and everything else, in New England and everywhere else. That would be perfectly consistent.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. After I have completed my statement I shall be pleased to yield.

O. P. A. is the reason for this bill.

Mr. MASON. That is right.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Just O. P. A. and nobody else. You people who raise corn, you know what is wrong. A lot of farmers do not keep books, particularly the smaller ones. On our farm we keep books. I am telling you we cannot replace the corn in the bins on our farm today at present prices. Why should you bring in a bill that causes dumping at lower prices to reduce the price of corn when it has already been demonstrated to everybody's satisfaction, even O. P. A., that the price of corn has been too low to bring corn to the market? What reason is there? What reason is there for you to hold up the hands of O. P. A. that they can make worse mistakes? This bill repeals the correction of the mistake they had made with respect to corn. It repeals the recent raise of the price of corn.

We need a higher price for corn. One dollar and sixteen cents is not enough. You and all of your constituents are paying $1.40 for corn in the shape of hogs. You are all paying that, as I said, when you buy pork. That is what we want to pay for corn. Why the O. P. A. should say you cannot pay for corn the same as you pay when you buy hogs is not explained. There is no reason for it. Nobody has given you a reason. If the corn price were raised now before we make our program next year, we will give you millions of bushels of additional corn. You know what is going to happen when you get corn in here at a lower price. If the price of corn were higher, all of us on our farms would

find a few more acres to put to corn. With a higher price for corn you southerners would find some acres to put into corn. Those southerners sitting over there are your witnesses.

What is going to happen when you get a lower price? You know what they are doing with their foreign policy, and I refer to you members of the Foreign Affairs Committee. They are having a lot of trouble with Argentina right now. That is the only country they have not been able to reach with a checkbook. Here is a chance to get Argentina and give them our corn market.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Illinois has expired.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER]?

There was no objection.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious question. Do you think this is temporary? Have you stopped to consider that when we emerge from this war we are going to have at least $25,000,000,000 more in factories in this country which want to export, that there is a terrific drive on to export, and concomitant with that is the thought that you cannot export without importing? What do you think they are going to import? You know they are not going to import automobiles, and you know they are not going to import manufactured articles right away. Why do you think they are letting Russia take control of Europe at the expense of Poland, which was our first ally, Latvia, Estonia, and all the rest of those republics over there? Do you know why they are doing that? They want to sell machinery to Russia. What else do they have to do in order to sell to Russia, Europe, and the rest of the world this added machinery they are going to produce? Why, they have to get the farming industry out of America. They have to give the American farm market to China and other countries and they will ship foreign farm products into the South and into the North of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, when a bill like this is brought in, we are just starting to open the door for them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 11 words.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the debate has gone far afield from the resolution that is supposed to be under consideration. Let us get back. I imagine the primary purpose of this resolution is to increase food for the production of poultry, livestock, and so forth. My own State is a heavy producer not only of livestock but of wheat. I do not know why wheat should be included in this resolution. We have a tremendous surplus of wheat in this country today.

Mr. Chairman, I want to read from a letter written by a constituent in a small town in Montana. The following language is included in this letter, and I may say I know the writer personally:

> Nearly every farmer south of Flaxville—

That is a little town down toward the eastern end of the State—

> had a pile of 10,000 bushels of wheat or more out on the ground. The elevators there are plugged with wheat.

The farmers have no place to store their wheat, as they have been unable to build granaries and the result is that this grain is lying out on the ground in many instances.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to my colleague from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I wish the gentleman would tell the difficulty he has had to get sufficient boxcars into eastern Montana in order to take care of the wheat which could not go into the warehouses or elevators, and which was lying on the ground.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman for bringing that out. It is impossible to get sufficient cars to market this wheat. It is referred to in another letter I have from the Farmers Educational Cooperative Union in Roosevelt County, in which the following is stated:

> DEAR SIR: I listened to a commentator from Canada the other evening who was telling that Canada was getting rid of all her surplus wheat, as they have got such a good market for it in the United States.

Yet this bill would take the tariff off of wheat.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. In view of the fact boxcars have been mentioned and the difficulty of securing them, may I say that the Commodity Credit Corporation is doing everything in its power to get all the boxcars available to Canada in order to get the grain out of there before the winter sets in. That is the reason you cannot get rid of your grain.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We have had it up with every department we can think of in Washington trying to get cars and we cannot get them. Our elevators are still plugged with wheat and wheat is still on the ground, yet we are asked to take the tariff off of wheat so the Canadians can ship some more in here.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. In a moment.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Just for a question.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I shall yield later on. Now, get this, and I may say incidentally that this is the commentator speaking over in Canada this man is referring to:

> And the housewife and farmers can buy anything they want made from steel as there is no shortage of steel any more. What is wrong here? We cannot sell a bushel of wheat as the elevators are always plugged. Those close to town get rid of some of their wheat when they could get a car. When they live 30 miles out they could not get any of their wheat into the car because the car would be filled before they got to town; cars were so scarce.

Then this goes on:

> Are we here just to help other nations—

He is one of the farmers of this country. I want to say to you ladies and gentlemen that sooner or later he is one who is going to be called upon to pay this tax bill of over $300,000,000,000. You cannot go to Canada or anywhere else and get this money. You are going to get it out of these farmers and others in this country. How are you going to make the bonds worth anything? The people of the United States are the ones who will have to pay, not the people in foreign nations. You have got to look after your own people to some extent and not run hog wild. You should not bring this wheat in here when you have a surplus of it already. American markets should belong as far as possible to the American farmer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, this letter goes on to say:

> And let our own Nation go to ——?

I do not know what word he wanted to put in there, but I can guess.

> I am doing all I can in helping in all the relief and bond drives that we have. We have a class out here who will not buy a bond or give a nickel to relief. I have three boys in the services fighting for this class of people. What kind of democratic crazy stuff do we call this, to let this stuff in here with a surplus unprecedented in this country on the ground, in the elevators, and in the cars?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. May I say to my distinguished colleague that I cannot see what that has to do with the present resolution.

Mr. O'CONNOR. What are you doing with wheat in this resolution? Why do you want wheat in this resolution if it is not affected?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. There is nothing in this resolution in regard to wheat that has not already been in operation by the present administration ever since the 29th day of last April. This is rather a late day to tell us all the bad things that are happening. We have had ever since the 29th of April to bring out these points. The importation of wheat has been between 35,000,000 and 40,000,000 bushels. We produce some 900,000,000 bushels in this country.

Mr. O'CONNOR. But the gentleman wants to bring more of it in here, duty free, with our wheat rotting on the ground in Montana and in North and South Dakota?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That wheat is used for a different purpose altogether. This is feed wheat.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I know, that is what you say, but this wheat will find its way into the elevators and mills, too, and these people will come over here, just as this man points out in this letter, because they will find such good markets in this country.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In the last few days we have had before our Committee on Insular Affairs testimony that we are using 10,000,000 bushels of grain per month for the production of commercial alcohol, instead of getting the ships into the Caribbean Sea areas to bring blackstrap molasses up here to be converted into commercial alcohol. There is another 120,000,000 bushels of grain we can pick up right there, if we want to cut off this grain conversion.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. As I understand, we are shipping large quantities of flour under lend-lease to Europe. I understand that now we are bringing in large quantities of wheat from a part of that same kingdom and grinding it and giving it to another part. It looks to me as if there is a double expenditure of American funds.

Mr. O'CONNOR. In the first place, we ought to grind our own wheat, we ought to relieve our own people here of the surplus of wheat we have in this country before we let in wheat from other countries, some regard must be had for the American producer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has again expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 13 words.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it is a rather simple proposition with which we are confronted here this afternoon. I can bring you very definitely the word that as far as both the dairy farmers and the poultry farmers in my section of the country are concerned they are in great need of feed of every sort. I can tell you that the development of our farm animals has been markedly retarded, that it takes longer to bring our hens into production than it did before, because of the shortage of feed. This means costs of production are increased and prices which might otherwise be fair and equitable are no longer enough to cover costs.

I think it is important that that feed be gotten to the farmers who need it in the most expeditious manner in which it can be done under present circumstances. As was suggested by the speech of the gentleman from Montana that we just listened to, the problem is largely a problem of transportation. I do not want to go into a lot of detail in a public address about certain things, but it is true that there is such a thing as water transportation, which in some instances is a readier means of getting large bulk quantities of things from one place to another than is land transportation. As far as we in California are concerned, that happens to be an important element.

It seems to me I would be failing in my duty to the farmers I represent if I were not in support of this measure. I feel that the gentleman from Wisconsin has done the right thing in pressing this resolution. Indeed, I am rather encouraged to find that there are so many Members on the Republican side who are advocating this measure. I believe it is indicative of the fact that there come times when we simply have to recognize the fact that there is logic in the contention that reduction of tariff duties may be of benefit to agriculture. It is my personal opinion, in listening to the gentlewoman from Illinois make her speech, that on balance and through the years it is very questionable how much good high tariffs have done to agriculture as a general proposition. I am not one who can say he is a complete free trader. I think protection in some instances is no doubt necessary. But on balance the tariff certainly has benefited industry rather than agriculture in the history of this country.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I know the gentleman is interested in the welfare of agriculture, and we in California have naturally suffered from a lack of opportunity to produce feeds. I wonder if the gentleman knows at this time or if any other Member can tell us what the attitude of the Farm Bureau is on this particular legislative proposal.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am not able to speak for the Farm Bureau, and I hesitate to venture comment on that organization's attitude. I will say that I have been given to understand that they are favorably inclined to this bill. I know they did not appear before the committee against the bill, for I am told that no one did so. I should like some other Member who may have direct word from them to answer that question more factually than I can, because I cannot answer it factually. They have not communicated with me, and I have no right to speak for them.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I wish simply to say that this bill, as I conceive it, is a means of expediting the shipment of grain that we desperately need in certain portions of this country. Our livestock population is tremendously greater than it has ever been before. Relative to that livestock population our feed supplies are short. I have been in receipt of letters only in the last couple of days from poultry associations in my own section and in other sections of my State which present in factual detail the effect of this problem of the feed shortage upon their attempts to carry on their business. Since this measure will help to bring that feed to the farmers who need it and will help to bring it in at a more reasonable cost, it seems to me that with the present overwhelming demand for feed, a demand far greater than the total supply, this is the most reasonable thing for the Congress to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GILCHRIST. The particular amendment just now is the one on corn. It has been several times asked on this floor how we are going to get corn in the country, in California, and in the East, where they need it. They can get corn from Argentina by paying the price. They have gotten a lot of it and are getting it from Argentina and are paying the tariff on it. Argentina is competing with the farmers from Illinois and Iowa and elsewhere who are raising corn. When one says, "We have got to have feed," of course, you have to pay for it. And you will not pay any more than you ought to when you get it from Iowa or Illinois.

Argentina! Argentina! Yes. Do you know of any boys from Argentina that are fighting for your freedom? Do you know what Argentina is doing to you in this World War? Favor Argentina if you want to, and then go out and ask the people of the Middle West to support tariffs again, when you are taking away the very thing that the East has always had. Strike agriculture except when you want its vote.

Now, to speak about corn. Next year in my State the acreage for corn has been increased by 6 percent and there will be corn there. Oats have been decreased somewhat, but the acreage for corn has been increased that much. The acreage for soybeans, which is a great feed for you, has been increased. But you do not want to pay for it. You want to despoil my people and the people from the farms for your feed. That is all there is to this. There is nothing else. You can pay this tariff and then get the feed at reasonable prices. In Iowa at the present time, I have it from a reputable source, there are 75,000,000 bushels of Iowa corn available for movement out of Iowa right now into commercial channels, but they have not moved it because they can make more money by feeding hogs. Oh, we were fools, were we not, to save our corn so we could make more money? Penalize us for that, will you? Then go out and ask us to vote for a tariff again, will you? Penalize us because we want to sell our corn to the best advantage.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to ask the gentleman this question. You are from Iowa. You know farming. I have lived in your district out there, and I know your people. A good Iowa farmer grows corn and converts it into proteins on the

farm through feeding the animals and putting the fertilizer back on the soil and thus maintains the productivity of his soil, does he not?

Mr. GILCHRIST. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is not that the way to grow foodstuffs?

Mr. GILCHRIST. Yes; that is right. I am talking of a way to grow foodstuffs. Take the tariff off every product the farmer has in the Middle West, so that the fellow down East, in Maine, and elsewhere, can get things cheaply. We have been supporting their ideas about tariffs for generations back in Iowa, when we commenced voting for them. This year we had 648,000,000 bushels of corn disappear from Iowa farms and, my friends, that is greater than an all-time record and it is as great as our whole production of corn in that State. Now, that refutes any charge that we are hoarding corn. We are using it. We are doing the best we can with it. All there is to this bill, as I see it, is, that certain people want to get our corn just as cheaply as they can without paying the tariff rates. They import corn from Argentina to the Pacific coast and have been doing it in opposition to our corn and have been laying it down there at a cheaper price than we can.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I will yield for a question.

Mr. O'CONNOR. In the gentleman's opinion how much would corn have to be raised to start it moving to the markets where it is most needed now outside of his own State?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I do not know. I have said I thought the corn would leave the State whenever you make it so it would be more profitable to sell it than to keep it, and you would have to get about $1.20 for corn there to prevent it from being fed to hogs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I ask for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Here is a point that is overlooked on this corn problem. The cost of production of corn, as the cost of production of wheat, has gone up in the last year from 50 percent to 75 percent.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Certainly, that is so.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is one reason why you have to have a greater price for corn in order to cause it to move.

Mr. GILCHRIST. And it has not gone up in Argentina.

Mr. O'CONNOR. No.

Mr. GILCHRIST. If you look at the October "Crops and Markets" you will find today cows have produced more pounds of milk than they have at any other time, notwithstanding the fact that you folks say there is a shortage of feed. You talk about the lend-lease. All right. If Canada is raising this stuff, why not let Canada send it to their compatriots on the battle fronts? Let them take it. Let Great Britain take it from its own Canada instead of taking it from our farmers. If, as is proposed by the lady from Illinois, this is only to get feed, then why do you not import the products from Canada? Why do you not get butter from Canada? Why do you not get milk from Canada? Instead of having this roundabout way of going around the Cape of Good Hope with the corn and feeding it to the cows so that the cows can produce milk or the cows can produce butter? Oh, no, you want to have the benefit of the tariff yourself and not allow the farmers of this country to profit by it except when it is to your own interest. You ask us to support the tariff idea. Now, you can support farm grain. You can pay for corn at reasonable prices and get it from America if you want to. There is no shortage of corn if you pay for it or of feed if you are willing to pay for it. But you have now a chance to despoil the farmers of this country. Well, it is a long lane that has no turn. The American market should belong to the American farmer and not to the peons from the plains and pampas of Patagonia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 14 words.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt there is a serious shortage of stock feed in this Nation. However, it appears to me that this legislation is treating the effect rather than the cause. While we are discussing what brought about the condition which the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] has pointed out so forcefully, we are also trying to do a little face saving for the O. P. A. In my opinion, the reason for this shortage is simple. It is caused by the fact that upon the farms of America today are millions of head of livestock which, through the regular procedure, without Government regulation, would now be processed and stored were it not for the fact that the Army and Lend-Lease, through its overpurchasing, have loaded up every cold-storage warehouse in the Nation to the roof. In an effort to cover up we find them shipping hundreds of cars of frozen foods to the public institutions of the various States, foods which they have overpurchased and are now frantically working to dispose of in an effort to make room in the cold-storage warehouses of this country for incoming products.

Word has gone out from the War Food Administration pleading with the agriculturalists of the country to hold their livestock on the farm and not glut the markets. Why? Because there is not room in the cold-storage warehouses to store it. Each day that livestock remains on the farm it is consuming additional grain, the grain which you so badly need. Do we know what the solution is? At least we think we do.

There must be a relaxing in the point system so that consumers will have an opportunity to purchase meat products, as they have through the years. The longer this livestock is held on the farms, the more feed it will consume. We know that the glut is in the market because of overstocked cold-storage warehouses of the country, and any Member of Congress can check up in his respective district and find these warehouses loaded to the roofs with products overpurchased by the Army, Navy, and other governmental purchasing agencies. Now that these products are purchased, transportation is not available to move them; neither is there a place to consume them other than at the tables of American homes.

Another cause of overstocking is that the same ration points are used in the purchase of butter that are used in the purchase of meat. As the result, a family with three or four small children needing a plentiful supply of butter cannot purchase the proper amount of meat because of the limited number of ration points. Consequently, meat and its products do not move from the warehouse to the consumer. The farmer cannot take his pig to market, because the butcher has no place to put it, as the warehouses are already full. The result is the consumer does without meat, the little pig stays home, and instead of being eaten, he consumes the feed that is so badly needed to meet the shortage that now exists throughout the country.

The O. P. A. has admitted their error in part by relaxing the point system to some extent, but until such time as they liberalize the point system still further and afford the people an opportunity to purchase additional meat products, you will have a continued glutting of the market.

I contend that the Commodity Credit Corporation can bring feed into this Nation, if it so desires, without this legislation. I had an opportunity to look over an agreement entered into by the Department of Agriculture and the Government of Peru, the Commodity Credit Corporation acting as agent, in which this country agrees to purchase 200,000 bales of cotton annually from Peru. This was the estimated production of 135,000 hectares of land. The unusual thing about the agreement was that we agreed to increase the price 1½ percent for each 1 percent of acreage reduced. Reductions in acreage were permitted up to 30 percent. This would mean that for each $1 worth of cotton purchased, we would pay $1.45. I thought we had gotten rid of the system in this country of plowing under every third row. It seems we have merely moved the system to South America. I am wondering if similar contracts are in effect in other parts of the Americas applying to grain, the shortage of which we are now trying to overcome.

We do not have to leave this country to solve this problem. Modify the point system to the extent that it will permit the American public to purchase the meat they need for their families and thus relieve the congestion in our cold storage warehouses. The stock that is now being held by the farmer will move to the market and stop consuming the corn and other feed so badly needed in the East and along the west coast.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. As an incident of the thing of which you speak, last week on our farm, we sent a truckload of hogs to Chicago. They could not receive it. We had to bring it back home and we are still feeding corn to those hogs that were past the feeding stage. If the ration points had been released the people could have purchased that pork. They could have put it into the iceboxes and kept it.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Your case is typical of hundreds of thousands of others throughout the Nation. Such conditions have created the present dilemma in which we find ourselves. Until the present stock of products in cold storage is moved, thus providing space for incoming crops, this condition will continue. Although the Army and Navy and Lend-Lease purchases have created this blockade, only the O. P. A. can correct it. Its solution lies in the easing of the ration point system.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON] has expired.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

I wish to state in the beginning that this is a very important step in the wrong direction. It is a step to sell the American farmer permanently down the river. It is the first step to sell the farmers' domestic markets to foreigners. As usual, you begin by saying you are going to sell his markets for just 90 days. I am not surprised at my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], starting in with 90 days. He knows that the American farmer would not stand for him selling their markets permanently at one time. But at the end of 90 days he will come back with an extension of 90 days, and then with another extension of 90 days. He will continue to ask for extensions until the farmers' domestic markets will be permanently sold to foreign farmers. We are already exporting more tractors per capita to Canada than we are selling to our own people.

Now, let us find out whether it is a case of shortage. My friend from Wisconsin should know, because he used to be one of the wet nurses for triple A. That is where the trouble began. They asked the farmer to reduce his acreage of corn from 104,000,000 to 86,000,000. Then the Lord Almighty interposed and reduced it to 80,000,000 by floods. Then the triple A came along and fined the farmer 49 to 57 cents a bushel for wheat that he planted 8 months before the law was passed. They extorted $15,000,000 from the American farmers—and I say extorted deliberately—in fines and penalties. There is the cause of part of your shortage.

Take the triple A from our necks and abolish the O. P. A. and the American farmer will take care of the American people. That is all you have to do. Now, let us see where we are. First, the triple A reduced corn acreage from 104,000,000 acres to 86,000,000, and the Lord reduced it to 80,000,000. Next the triple A fined the farmer $15,00,000 for producing wheat and compelled him to restrict production of other valuable crops. Then the triple A reversed itself and asked the farmers to increase the hog production 20 percent. The farmers obey. Then they come along and tell him he should sell his corn in place of feeding it to the hogs that they asked the mother pigs to give birth to. They ought to have Mrs. Sanger around. That is exactly the situation.

I am astonished by my Republican friends. They do not see far enough ahead; they have just the tip of their nose to look at. They want to be for protection one day and for free trade the next. My friends, you are not going to go far in the next election, do not mistake me, if you begin now to sell the American farmer's market first and then say you could not help it because somebody faked and told us you needed a little feed. There is plenty of feed in the country. What you need is transportation and less red tape.

Let us see what the situation is. This resolution if passed will not bring in 1 additional bushel of corn or 1 ton of hay. All you are doing is subsidizing the Canadian and Latin-American countries by paying them an addition equal to the tariff. We are already importing all from them that they have to sell and to spare. Why do I say this? Because of this: I called up one of the departments last week. The person talking to me said it was luncheon time, that he was in the office alone and could talk frankly to me. He said:

> Mr. LEMKE, I just recalled before you asked for these protein feeds, the Army called up and wanted 163,000 bushels of oats and 100,000 tons of alfalfa hay for Britain—

Or something like that, I forget the exact quantity.

He said:

> I told the Army officer that we were buying oats and hay from Canada and that the Army could get it at the same price, that the British could get it from the same place, that it was their colony. The Army answered: "But you do not know; they have not any lend-lease in Canada."

In other words, you bring this feed in here and then the Canadians get the advantage of the tariff. Your farmers will not get it. Then we sell feed under lend-lease for little or nothing to foreign countries and you easterners will be as bad off as you ever were before in regard to feed.

I have been reliably informed, even this morning, that lend-lease is selling our gasoline to foreign governments at 2 cents a gallon and that they are selling it back to our Army at 42 cents a gallon. Get the difference in price. And by the way, I am informed that what we need is an investigating committee over there from the Committee on Appropriations to find out what is going on, such a committee would get an eye-opener.

What is the object of all of this? It is a part of this "One-World-Ism." It is democratic discipline, I would say to my friend from Wisconsin; and they are going to discipline you so that you will take the yoke and become a good slave and obey their orders. Then we will have one world and try to bring all the Hottentots up to our level but fail and at the same time bring ourselves down to their level. These are facts I want you to bear in mind. A friend of mine said he was flying over those countries at an elevation of 5,000 feet and even at that height he could still smell the stench of lend-lease.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

By unanimous consent the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Miss SUMNER of Illinois) there were—ayes 97, noes 30.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. RIZLEY: On page 2, line 3, after the word "thereof" strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That this act shall not be construed to authorize the importation of wheat for milling purposes."

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, the committee is willing to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. RIZLEY: On page 2, line 3, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: *"Provided, however,* That such exemptions shall not apply in the case of any article or product, 1, with respect to which the foreign country from which it is exported has imposed an equalization fee or export tax or charge; or, 2, the price of which in the foreign country from which it is exported has been increased subsequent to 30 days prior to the date of the enactment of this joint resolution."

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] that he may proceed for 3 additional minutes in addition to the 5?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe anyone can say I am unsympathetic to the proposition of getting feed to the distressed areas. I do not come from the Corn Belt. As a matter of fact, we have a feed shortage in my territory, and Members of the House will recall that I have at all times supported the proposal for selling feed wheat even when those proposals were opposed by most of the farm organizations and a good many

Members from my own part of the country. I am thoroughly sympathetic with the idea of getting every bushel of feed that we can to the distressed areas. However, I do want to say as strongly as I can that the removal of tariffs on grains as proposed in this bill will not bring a single bushel of feed into this country.

The fact is we have been importing great quantities of feed from Canada and paying the tariff. During this year we have imported more than 100,000,000 bushels of oats and barley from Canada upon which the tariff has been paid, and, in fact, we have imported so much barley that there is now a shortage of barley in Canada, and the Canadian Government has refused to issue any more export permits. We have already taken out of Canada all the barley they have to export and have paid a tariff on it. There is still some oats in Canada, there is still some wheat in Canada, there is still a little hay in Canada which can be imported, but it can be imported just as well, and will be, if we leave the tariff where it is now.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered is directed to this proposition: At the present time there is in effect in Canada on barley and oats what is known there as an equalization fee, which is set up under a regular formula. It is the difference between the selling price in Canada and the price in this country less the tariff. If we take the tariff off it means, of course, that by the automatic operation of the formula they will increase the price that we have to pay by the amount of the tariff, so that instead of American farmers getting any benefit from taking off the tariff the money will go to Canadian farmers. It is not going to go into our customs coffers and it is not going into the Federal Treasury, as is the case at the present time. It will go to the Canadian Government and to the farmers of Canada.

My amendment simply provides that this act shall not be effective as to any commodity upon which any foreign government imposes an export tax or an equalization fee or on which it has increased the price within 30 days subsequent to the enactment of this act. There are other countries, of course, besides, Canada, from which we could import these products. We are at the present time receiving imports of flax from the Argentine. If Argentina follows the same policy that they did when we put the reciprocal trade agreements with that country into effect, as soon as we remove the tariff they will increase the price of flax to the American purchaser. My amendment would prevent that. It will prevent any country in the world from increasing the price to us by either an equalization fee, an export tax, or a simple increase in price. If the act goes into effect and you adopt my amendment, the American farmer will then get the benefit instead of someone in Canada or Argentina or some other country from which we may import.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In view of the fact that Canada is part of the Western Hemisphere and enjoying the benefits of the good-neighbor policy, the gentleman does not feel the Canadian Government would take advantage of this situation and raise the price of wheat to offset the deduction in the tariff, does he?

Mr. HOPE. The Canadian Government has done that. The Canadian Government has consistently kept in effect this policy of applying an equalization fee. Here is what has actually happened since the present bill was reported by the committee: The Canadian Government has stopped the exportation of these commodities, including wheat, until the outcome of this legislation is determined. They are waiting to see if we pass the bill so that they can raise the price.

Mr. LEMKE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. Does the gentleman remember that in 1938 Argentina delivered corn in Chicago for 34½ cents a bushel, paying the tariff, because of the difference in exchange in their favor? That difference is far greater now than it was then. If they had the corn and the transportation, they would ship it to us anyway. Just what the gentleman is saying now is the truth. If you pass this, you simply hand Argentina that much more. We buy it, give it in lend-lease to foreign countries, then they will sell it back to us at 100- or 200-percent profit.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DEWEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DEWEY. I would like to ask about the equalization fee. I understand there is a ceiling on wheat in Canada. What would that be?

Mr. HOPE. I am not sure there is a ceiling on wheat. There is a ceiling on barley and oats.

Mr. DEWEY. Well, on barley.

Mr. HOPE. I have the figures here.

Mr. DEWEY. I do not understand the equalization fee.

Mr. HOPE. I have here a letter from the War Food Administrator in which he states that the Canadian Government has imposed an equalization fee on barley exports to this country which represents the difference between the selling price in Canada and the market price in the United States, less the import duty.

Mr. DEWEY. That answers my question.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman's fear is that the increase between the equalization price and the export price will be picked up by the Canadian Government, is that it?

Mr. HOPE. Yes. Under their formula they may increase the price by the amount of the duty.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. One reason we cannot get corn is because our farmers are not given equipment. Much of that equipment has been sent to Argentina, which is not cooperating to any extent in the war program. Does not the gentleman think it is unfair to encourage the importation into the United States of Argentine grain at this time and that we might as well have it here if our farmers were given what the Argentina farmers have been given?

Mr. HOPE. I agree with the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] thoroughly.

It has been said by other Members, better than I can say it, that if we adopt this resolution today we are simply setting a precedent which is bound to come back and plague us at a later date. It is easy enough to say that we want to get a little feed into the country, therefore we will take the tariff off, and 90 days will be the end of it. But that is not the way those things work out. I do not think we will get any feed under this program, but whether we do or not, we can expect the same arguments to be made for a further extension. Most of the bad legislation which we have on the statute books now was passed to meet some emergency supposed to be temporary in its nature. These emergencies never seem to end, however, and eventually the legislation becomes permanent because vested interests are built up while the temporary legislation is in effect. Let me remind you also, as has been so well stated by the able gentlewoman from Illinois, what logical reason is there for limiting this to feed? Why not open it up and let us take the duty off of everything which is being rationed at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, of course the procedure here is to do anything and everything possible to defeat this resolution. That is exactly what this amendment would do. Under the trade agreement with Canada, if we lower the tariff they cannot raise the price. Let us stop this sniping at the people in the East and fighting them in their desperate attempt to get enough feed to save their herds. Amendments can be offered here, of course, and I do not object to that, and would let this debate run on forever if necessary, but let us vote upon the merits of this resolution, not just try to kill it and make this a sectional fight.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. The purpose of this resolution is to allow badly needed feed to come into this country for livestock and poultry, for a limited period of 90 days.

Mr. REED of New York. That is all.

Mr. COOPER. The adoption of this amendment would defeat the purpose of the resolution.

Mr. REED of New York. No question about it.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. If what the gentleman says is true and if what the gentleman from Tennessee says is true, that there is a provision in the reciprocal trade agreement whereby Canada cannot add to the price the amount we take off in the way of duty, then how is my amendment going to hurt anything so far as Canada is concerned? Is it not a good idea to have it in effect as far as other countries are concerned with which we do not have reciprocal trade agreements?

Mr. REED of New York. If we just want to kill the bill by a series of such amendments we can do it, but I think the thing to do is this. We have adopted amendments here which have had merit. I think the time has come when we had better close debate on this amendment and proceed to vote. If the House is against helping the farmers, that is all right, but I am going to help them as long as I have any opportunity to do so with my vote. Of course, as has just been suggested here, the owners of the herds and the poultry people will furnish some market for the wheat of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOPE), there were—ayes 35, noes 90.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we are about ready to vote on this resolution. I think it has been discussed very thoroughly this afternoon and I am very much pleased that it has been. I do not think we ought to let these resolutions go through without a thorough discussion of them.

As far as I am personally concerned, I expressed my views on this resolution early this afternoon. I am convinced it will not bring in a pound more of grain, that the funds are already available for all we can buy, that the transportation is the difficulty, and that the passage of this resolution will cost the farmers, the livestock feeders, the dairymen, and the poultry producers more money for their grain than they are paying at the present time, the reason being that we are going to remove these tariffs and open up the competition not to the Federal Government alone as the purchaser of feed grains for our people but to anyone who wants to go across the borders or into any country on the face of the earth and buy this grain.

As to this equalization fee, I think we should keep in mind that we have a 42-cents-a-bushel tariff on wheat. If they purchase 150,000,000 bushels of wheat in Canada from October 1, 1943, to October 1, 1944—and that is what they are planning to do—it means $65,000,000 in equalization fees for wheat, which will be taken out of the Treasury of the United States. It will not benefit a single livestock producer or dairyman or poultryman in this Nation. These checks will be mailed to the farmers in Canada after the cost of the administration of this program is deducted, they will be mailed to the farmers who produce this grain, on the basis of the number of bushels sold. It is an equalization fee that works like an allotment payment to farmers in foreign countries.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does not the amount of money to which the gentleman just referred as cost to the Government function in practically the same category as a subsidy?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. It would be a subsidy to the Canadian farmers. That is just what it would be.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It would be a subsidy insofar as it applied to the Treasury of the United States of America.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. It would be a subsidy to the Canadian or any other farmer. It would not help our farmers or our people.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But it would be a subsidy.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. It would be a subsidy to those people in foreign countries. That is the reason I have opposed this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The exemptions from duties provided for by this joint resolution shall be subject to compliance with regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the resolution back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the resolution, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 171) to permit the importation from foreign countries free of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed, had directed him to report the joint resolution back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the joint resolution as amended do pass.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 255, nays 55, not voting 119, as follows:

[Roll No. 166]

YEAS—255

Abernethy	Gregory	Merritt
Allen, La.	Griffiths	Merrow
Anderson, Calif.	Gross	Michener
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gwynne	Miller, Conn.
	Hale	Miller, Mo.
Andresen, August H.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Miller, Pa.
		Monroney
Angell	Halleck	Mott
Auchincloss	Hancock	Mruk
Barden	Hare	Mundt
Bates, Ky.	Harless, Ariz.	Murphy
Bates, Mass.	Harness, Ind.	Murray, Tenn.
Beall	Harris, Ark.	Murray, Wis.
Beckworth	Harris, Va.	Myers
Bender	Hart	Newsome
Bennett, Mo.	Hartley	Norman
Blackney	Hays	Norrell
Bloom	Hébert	Norton
Bolton	Heffernan	O'Brien, Ill.
Bonner	Hendricks	O'Brien, Mich.
Bradley, Pa.	Herter	O'Hara
Brooks	Hess	O'Konski
Brown, Ga.	Hinshaw	Outland
Brumbaugh	Hobbs	Patton
Bryson	Hoch	Peterson, Fla.
Bulwinkle	Hoffman	Peterson, Ga.
Burch, Va.	Holifield	Pfeifer
Burgin	Holmes, Mass.	Philbin
Butler	Holmes, Wash.	Pittenger
Camp	Hull	Ploeser
Capozzoli	Izac	Plumley
Carter	Jeffrey	Poage
Case	Jenkins	Poulson
Chapman	Johnson, Anton J.	Powers
Clark		Price
Cochran	Johnson, Ind.	Priest
Coffee	Johnson, Luther A.	Rabaut
Cole, N. Y.		Ramey
Colmer	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Ramspeck
Cooper		Randolph
Costello	Johnson, Okla.	Rankin
Courtney	Johnson, Ward	Reece, Tenn.
Cox	Jonkman	Reed, N. Y.
Cravens	Kean	Richards
Crosser	Keefe	Rivers
Davis	Kennedy	Robertson
Delaney	Keogh	Rodgers, Pa.
Dilweg	Kerr	Rogers, Mass.
Dingell	Kinzer	Rolph
Disney	Klein	Rowan
Domengeaux	Kunkel	Rowe
Dondero	Landis	Russell
Doughton	Lanham	Sadowski
Drewry	Larcade	Sauthoff
Durham	LeCompte	Scanlon
Elliott	LeFevre	Schuetz
Ellison, Md.	Lesinski	Sheppard
Engle, Calif.	Lewis, Ohio	Sheridan
Fay	Luce	Short
Feighan	Ludlow	Simpson, Pa.
Fellows	Lynch	Smith, Maine
Fenton	McCormack	Smith, Va.
Fernandez	McGehee	Smith, Wis.
Fisher	McGregor	Somers, N. Y.
Forand	McKenzie	Spence
Furlong	McLean	Springer
Gale	McMillan	Stanley
Gamble	McMurray	Starnes, Ala.
Gathings	McWilliams	Stearns, N. H.
Gavagan	Maas	Stewart
Gavin	Madden	Sullivan
Goodwin	Magnuson	Sundstrom
Gordon	Mahon	Talbot
Gorski	Maloney	Talle
Gossett	Manasco	Tarver
Graham	Marcantonio	Thomas, N. J.
Grant, Ala.	Martin, Mass.	Tibbott
Grant, Ind.	May	Tolan

Towe	Weaver	Willey
Treadway	Welchel, Ohio	Wilson
Troutman	Weiss	Winstead
Vinson, Ga.	Welch	Wolfenden, Pa.
Voorhis, Calif.	West	Wolverton, N. J.
Vorys, Ohio	White	Woodruff, Mich.
Walter	Whittington	Worley
Ward	Wickersham	Wright
Wasielewski	Wigglesworth	Zimmerman

NAYS—55

Allen, Ill.	Cunningham	Lemke
Arends	Curtis	Mansfield,
Arnold	Day	Mont.
Barrett	Dewey	Mason
Bishop	Dworshak	Miller, Nebr.
Bradley, Mich.	Ellis	O'Connor
Brehm	Ellsworth	Phillips
Brown, Ohio	Gilchrist	Pracht
Buffett	Granger	Rees, Kans.
Burdick	Hagen	Rizley
Busbey	Heidinger	Rockwell
Carlson, Kans.	Hoeven	Rohrbough
Carson, Ohio	Hope	Schiffler
Chenoweth	Horan	Scrivner
Chiperfield	Howell	Simpson, Ill.
Church	Jensen	Stefan
Clevenger	Johnson,	Sumner, Ill.
Cole, Mo.	Calvin D.	Wheat
Crawford	LaFollette	Winter

NOT VOTING—119

Andersen,	Fuller	Morrison, La.
H. Carl	Fulmer	Morrison, N. C.
Andrews	Gallagher	Murdock
Baldwin, Md.	Gearhart	O'Brien, N. Y.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gerlach	O'Leary
Barry	Gibson	O'Neal
Bell	Gifford	O'Toole
Bennett, Mich.	Gillette	Pace
Bland	Gillie	Patman
Boren	Gore	Reed, Ill.
Boykin	Green	Robinson, Utah
Buckley	Hall,	Robsion, Ky.
Burchill, N. Y.	Leonard W.	Rogers, Calif.
Byrne	Hill	Sabath
Canfield	Jackson	Sasscer
Cannon, Fla.	Jarman	Satterfield
Cannon, Mo.	Jennings	Schwabe
Celler	Johnson,	Scott
Clason	J. Leroy	Shafer
Compton	Jones	Sikes
Cooley	Judd	Slaughter
Cullen	Kearney	Smith, Ohio
Curley	Kee	Smith, W. Va.
D'Alesandro	Kefauver	Snyder
Dawson	Kelley	Sparkman
Dickstein	Kilburn	Stevenson
Dies	Kilday	Stockman
Dirksen	King	Sumners, Tex.
Douglas	Kirwan	Taber
Eaton	Kleberg	Taylor
Eberharter	Knutson	Thomas, Tex.
Elmer	Lambertson	Thomason
Elston, Ohio	Lane	Vincent, Ky.
Engel, Mich.	Lea	Vursell
Fish	Lewis, Colo.	Wadsworth
Fitzpatrick	McCord	Wene
Flannagan	McCowen	Whelchel, Ga
Fogarty	Mansfield, Tex.	Whitten
Folger	Martin, Iowa	Wolcott
Ford	Mills	Woodrum, Va.
Fulbright	Monkiewicz	

So the House joint resolution was passed.

The clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Knutson for, with Mr. Vursell, against.

Until further notice:

General pairs:

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Morrison of Louisiana with Mr. Shafer.
Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. D'Alesandro with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Fulbright with Mr. Compton.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Gillie.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Jones.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Taber.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Clason.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Gillette.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Elmer.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Reed of Illinois.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Schwabe.
Mr. Burchill of New York with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Baldwin of Maryland with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. O'Brien of New York.
Mr. Sasscer with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Fuller.
Mr. Jackson with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Thomason with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Monkiewicz.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Hill.
Mr. Sparkman with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. McCowen.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Morrison of North Carolina with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Whelchel of Georgia with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Thomas of Texas with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. J. LeRoy Johnson.
Mr. King with Mr. Elston of Ohio.
Mr. Slaughter with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
Mr. Cannon of Missouri with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Folger with Mr. Gearhart.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. Gerlach.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Martin of Iowa.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote yea.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman qualify?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I do not, Mr. Speaker.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to print in the Appendix of the RECORD my remarks by including a statement of an opinion rendered by the Attorney General of the United States with reference to the Elk Hills contract, notwithstanding the fact that it is three and four-fifths pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $171.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding that and without objection the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and to include a quotation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] may extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the regular business and all special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by the Honorable Perry Belmont, former Member of this House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement on the F. E. P. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in three instances and to include therein in each instance an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on this resolution today may be given the opportunity of extending their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial by Raymond Clapper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include, in the extension of my remarks made during the debate today, certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a Gallup poll recently taken.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the record and include therein a copy of a letter which has been addressed to members of the School Bus Drivers Association of Louisiana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SHEPPARD and Mr. HAYS were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a poem entitled "A Friend."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE PEOPLE ARE ON TO IT

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, experience is the greatest of all teachers. Lessons learned by experience usually make a deep impression and furnish true guideposts for future conduct. Most intelligent people know enough to learn from experience. It is apparent that many in Government agencies and bureaus, functioning over the past 10 or 12 years, have not manifested enough intelligence to benefit from the experiences had with the American people. I think it can be safely said, without fear of successful contradiction, that independence and freedom form a part of and manifest themselves in American character and that these traits are possessed by every red-blooded American.

The American people are becoming mad—fighting mad, and thoroughly disgusted at the manner in which they have been treated during the past few years by the self-appointed guardians of human liberty and conduct, who are endeavoring to control every thought, word, and action of every American citizen. It might be well, here and now, to serve notice upon the planners and bureaucrats who have designed totalitarian regimentation as the garment to be fitted to every American citizen, that it just will not work. The people of this country do not want it and will not have it.

The efforts to bypass the Constitution of the United States and the laws made in pursuance thereof, as well as the economic system prevailing in this country, is apparent to every intelligent American. They are on to it and are not being fooled. The clever methods used in propaganda and processes of infiltration are also known to the average American citizen. It does not suit them, and they do not propose to have it. The American citizen loves and worships God, has a deep and abiding patriotism, and is devoted to country, Constitution, and flag. For the defense of these he is willing to give all. In return, he expects these things to provide him with what they guarantee him; that is, freedom to worship according to the dictates of conscience; freedom to assemble and discuss problems of mutual interest; freedom of speech, the press, and radio; freedom to work and to progress to a better life; and freedom from want and insecurity. To secure these benefits he is willing, if necessary to pay the supreme sacrifice. This is overwhelmingly demonstrated by the courageous conduct of our beloved ones in the armed forces, whose acts of bravery and sacrifice are unequaled in all history. The efforts of the planners to regiment and strait-jacket him in his life have utterly failed. They may just as well quit. The day of boondoggling and subtle maneuvering is at an end. Men and women in Government places, either high or low, have got to give something back to the American people in the nature of substantial and constructive services, else they are going to be turned out, and mighty soon.

History over the past 10 or 12 years discloses an immense amount of boondoggling, bungling, inefficiency, and waste. This is now apparent to all Americans. First came the N. R. A., with laudable objectives, and which undoubtedly could have accomplished much if the human element had been recognized and cooperative constructive efforts used instead of attempting to coerce and drive Americans. Its purpose was to spread employment and business at a time when such was direly needed in this Nation.

The public-works program in which boondoggling and politics were of paramount importance, rather than honest employment of free American men and women to do a good job with a decent living wage. Also came the farm-control program in which the American farmers were regimented and were compelled to plow under the crops, slaughter their pigs, and engage in like destructive and unnatural practices of so vitally needed food, while the masses in the cities were in dire need of such food. I might also enumerate other agencies of Government under the sponsorship of the New Deal that sought to mix the elimination of misery and want with power and politics, and which, in every instance, miserably failed. All of this forms a part of the history of our Nation over the past dozen years.

Two years ago we became engaged in a gigantic conflict of arms—a global war. This is something in which all of our resources were and are required to produce victory. Did the boondoggling, politics, bungling, inefficiency, and waste stop? Positively no. It seemed only to encourage the planners to take advantage of this catastrophe and to grab control of all the sources of power over the economic structure in our Nation to further prosecute their designs for totalitarian regimentation. I do not mean to say that every person employed by the Government is guilty of these offenses. Many of them are not guilty. Even many of them occupying high places are not guilty, but either due to inadvertence, negligence, or failure to keep their eyes open to their surroundings, they became a part of this movement. It is now time for an awakening by those within the structure of our Government, else they also shall be judged guilty and with promptness turned out of office.

The Office of War Information was set up to give prompt and factual statements to the public of the part that we are performing in this war. They were also permitted to carry on, so far as is consistent with the purposes of this war, propaganda in enemy territory. This was a necessary and proper function. A voluntary censorship was set up with which the American press fully and wholeheartedly cooperated, and which, to the best of my knowledge, has sacredly observed the rules laid down. However, the Office of War Information became infiltrated with many of those unsympathetic to our constitutional form of government and our economic system, and deliberately utilized their high office to assimilate propaganda in pursuance of their individual political philosophies. In fact, it seemed they were more interested in accomplishing this than in giving to the American people full and complete news regarding our progress and action in this war in which every American has a deep and continuing interest. It was a year after Pearl Harbor before we knew the nature of this catastrophe. Time after time important and material information has been withheld from the American people. Are we infants? Are we to be trusted, or are we incapable of self-government? Recently we have had another demonstration of the inaptness of this agency—the General Patton incident. The Cairo and Teheran conferences stories were given to us from outside sources. Much of our daily news comes to us from foreign capitals. The American people can take it whether it is good or bad. They need not be treated as imbeciles or morons.

The Office of Price Administration was created for the express purpose of creating ceiling prices preventing inflation and of providing for the uniform distribution of available food and other commodities for civilian use. Unfortunately for the country, it failed to carry out its original purposes in a careful and efficient manner, and as a result has had heaped upon it much criticism and the severest condemnation. When Mr. Chester Bowles assumed the role of Administrator he publicly proclaimed that from that time forward the Office of Price Administration would be vitally interested in the problem of fair rationing at rigid prices and would abandon its practices in an attempt to control profits of American industry and business. Of course this statement was only in confirmation of factual evidence secured by the select committee of the House of Representatives which had discovered that a design or plan was in operation in the Office of Price Administration whereby the primary purpose of that office was to regulate and control profits rather than to see that ceiling prices were established and rigidly maintained for the protection of the consumer and providing for the uniform distribution of available civilian goods. Now it has come to pass that in this program the Office of Price Administration and the War Food Administration in attempting to apply policies strange in form to our land of pioneers and freemen, the warehouses, freezing plants, and even docks are filled to capacity with foods, and that very shortly they are going to have to disgorge. Just how much they have nobody seems to know. Just what will be done with it they seem to know less about. Millions of pounds of butter, milk, eggs, fruit, vegetables, and other commodities, are threatened with immediate spoilage and will spoil unless immediately released for early use by the American consumer.

The farmer does not know what to do with his livestock today. He can neither feed it nor sell it. He has not been able to buy the feed to keep it and the packing houses have not been in any position to handle it because their refrigerators are filled to capacity. Likewise, the refrigerators of the distributors are filled to capacity and the poor supplicating public does not have the point values to buy this surplus of meat. Much of this is threatened with spoilage unless there is an immediate and drastic readjustment in the policy of the O. P. A. and the immediate reduction or abolition of point values on certain foods, so that the consumer can purchase and use such. The entire food situation is in very bad condition due to improper handling and unless there is an immediate drastic readjustment with the release for consumer purchases of a vast quantity of now stored food, the country is in for a terrific explosion that will rock the very foundation of bureaucracy and certainly will be followed by a sweeping house cleaning of inepts and of inefficients.

I would like to give you some idea of the feeling and temper of the people at this time, and I do not refer to the elections held last month over the country, and last week in the State of Kentucky, which I think very accurately reflect the thoughts of the people. On the contrary, I shall tell you of something that happened only last Saturday in a substantial and thriving Pennsylvania city and which is indicative of the feeling and temper of the American people, and which in itself should be sufficient warning to the policy makers or designers of a new economy, that the American people did not order any such thing, do not want it, and will not have it. Just let me read to you a press dispatch appearing in the Washington Star, Saturday, December 4, 1943:

PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA., December 4.—An attempt of an O. P. A. agent to enforce ceiling prices on farm machinery at an auction sale on a farm near here resulted in 700 irate farmers forcing the agent to leave. Threatening to overturn his car if he did not leave, the farmers escorted the agent to his automobile. Then they returned to the business of buying farm equipment, some of which reportedly was sold at prices which the O. P. A. would brand as exorbitant.

The incident reflects the general feeling running throughout the length and breadth of the land today. It is the same sort of a feeling that ran throughout the length and breadth of the Thirteen Original Colonies immediately preceding the American Revolution and which precipitated the Boston Tea Party. I know the American people are too sensible and substantial to think of a revolution in which blood is shed. They are united such as they have never heretofore been united in support of our Government. The ballot supplies the means for the people to revolt in our country, and it is used intelligently and wisely whenever the people become dissatisfied, and while they are united as never before and intent upon the winning of the war at any cost they are likewise becoming equally as well united in their effort to secure an economical, efficient, and businesslike administration of the affairs of government. Let those who try to reform the American people in their thought and methods take heed. The spirit of independence and the prevailing determination to preserve liberty and constitutional government burns as hot in the breast of the American today as it did in '76. They don't want a managed economy. They don't want totalitarian regimentation, and they are not going to have it. The people are on to what is going on in the Government bureaus and agencies and they are against it. The American is not always fooled. The ballot is the means to a free, prosperous, secure, and progressive America, and the American people are intelligent enough to know how and when to most effectively use it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a communication from the Public Buildings Commission of Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BECKWORTH). Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is now over 5½ months since H. R. 2837, the so-called Fulmer bill, for the appointment of a single food administrator and other purposes, was reported out of the Committee on Agriculture. It has the unanimous support of the committee consisting of 14 Democrats and 12 Republicans. Nevertheless, most of this time the bill has lain dormant in the Rules Committee which, for reasons that are becoming more and more obvious, has refused to grant a rule and let the bill come on for hearings before the House. Time and again without avail Members in the Well of this House have pleaded that this bill, advocated by the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, be heard, while other measures thoroughly unsound but purported to have the same objective, are engaging the attention of the Congress and the public.

One of these measures is consumer subsidies which has been repudiated by this House and is now before another body. It is becoming more and more obvious that this is in reality a fight between two philosophies of economy. The philosophy of a controlled economy, which is exemplified in consumers' subsidies, has barred consideration of the Fulmer bill as an agency of a free economic philosophy.

No sane American will deny that the aim of a successful war economy must be to stimulate and increase production and at the same time discourage and decrease consumption wherever possible. About the time of our entry into the war the President said that his administration would furnish the people with both guns and butter, but it was not long before he was compelled to admit that the American people would have to tighten their belts and accept a lower standard of living during the war. While it may be a question as to which philosophy he is working under at the present time, it is an inescapable fact that in an all-out war such as we are engaged in, we cannot have both guns and butter in full measure; that we must make sacrifices; that we must accept a reduced standard of living, and that we must as a consequence endure inflation in a greater or lesser degree.

The only way to ameliorate this lowered standard of living caused by the demands of production for war and its diversion from normal channels is to increase production in those normal channels. This the Fulmer bill will accomplish, as has been stated time and time again. It is impossible for 10 or more agencies competing with each other for power, with their resultant indecisions, procrastinations, conflict of authorities, clash of personalities, and lack of understanding to bring our production of foodstuffs to its highest capacity.

It is equally impossible for such a conglomeration of agencies to effect economical distribution. We have heard numerous reports of administration hoarding and waste. Some time ago we learned that the War Food Administration was hoarding over 200,000,000 pounds of butter, or enough for a year's supply for our fighting forces. We were told it would stop buying until next April. The public may well wonder how much of this butter has spoiled. About the middle of November last, I was told that for a whole week the Food Distribution Administration was working overtime securing shipping on the Atlantic seaboard and securing labor and ice to pack cars with butter for shipment to Atlantic seaports to get the butter out of the United States. The question may well be asked how much of this butter had spoiled and was that the reason of their hysteria to get it out of the country. It has been stated by reliable sources that millions of eggs in administration warehouses have spoiled in storage, and the same has been reported of canned goods of various kinds. I have been reliably informed that upon inquiry for specific foods in stock piles, it sometimes took several weeks to locate them.

With so many agencies having their fingers in the pie, we cannot readily expect different results. On the other hand, a single food administrator with a competent organization clothed with power coequal to his responsibility would bring order out of this chaos and insure greater production with less waste, thereby ameliorating one of the chief causes of inflation.

However, instead of thus encouraging and cooperating with a free economy for the greatest possible production, the "palace guard" prefers to continue a condition of chaos, thereby not only promoting but insuring a continuation of their doctrine of scarcity, which constitutes a necessary basis for controlled economy. This in the face of the fact that as the United States has been the arsenal of democracy in the war, they propose that we shall also function as the granary of the world, especially in the early post-war period. Such an undertaking, in addition to supplying our own food, greatly emphasizes the fact that measures must be employed which

will insure the greatest possible production and at the same time discourage unnecessary consumption and waste.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. Gladly.

Mr. JENKINS. Is it not a fact that in the gentleman's study, and I know the gentleman has made a very exhaustive study of lease-lend purchases, is it not a fact that as far as the gentleman knows—I will say it is as far as I know—that the New Deal has at no time done anything that has been decisively encouraging of production?

Mr. JONKMAN. They have done absolutely the contrary: discouraged production to create a state of scarcity upon which their doctrine of controlled economy must be based.

Mr. JENKINS. In other words, the old doctrine of kill the little pigs is still prevalent among them.

Mr. JONKMAN. Absolutely.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. Is it not also true that we have had greater production of foodstuffs in the last 2 years than at any other time in the history of the country?

Mr. JONKMAN. Yes; but that was due to the fact that we had two of the finest seasons in succession that were ever known in the history of the country. We cannot bank upon that all the time. The Lord wants us to help ourselves as well.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the Almighty and I am very grateful for His bounty, but is it not true that when the production goes up the administration does not have anything to do about it, but when there is some impairment of production the administration is immediately blamed? I am suggesting that there might be an unfairness in our blaming the administration in the middle of an all-out war. While our economy has not worked perfectly, that it has worked as well as it has I think is a credit to this administration and not a discredit.

Mr. JONKMAN. Let me say to the gentleman that the farmers in the last 2 years have worked longer hours per day than ever before. They have had to work under exceptional hardships during the past two seasons when they were not given the machinery or the manpower they were entitled to. If we had a one-man administrator who would correlate this with the war effort I think we could expect much better results from our efforts.

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not want to take all the gentleman's time, but I think the gentleman's position was not unreasonable and I was inclined to agree with him until a couple of months ago. When I thought a little further about it I felt that perhaps the control of all prices should be in one agency rather than the control of all food in one agency.

Mr. JONKMAN. The gentleman was right up to 2 months ago.

Mr. WRIGHT. It is possible the gentleman was right, but I still think my position is correct.

Mr. JONKMAN. This, as I have said before, will be accomplished by the Fulmer bill, and the Fulmer bill therefore is the answer to inflation, which can be supplemented only by voluntary reduction of consumption and waste by the people themselves. It constitutes as nearly as possible in wartime the function of Government regulation and cooperation with a free economy.

However, the controlled-economy-minded administration will have none of this. Its controlled-economy addicts claim that the only measures adapted to the prevention of inflation are consumers' subsidies. Moreover, they boldly accuse their opponents of inconsistency if the latter have in the past voted for copper and similar producers' subsidies.

To drive home the error of this accusation, it is perhaps appropriate to again advert to the aim of a sound wartime economy, which, as we said before, must be to stimulate and increase production and at the same time discourage and decrease consumption wherever possible. In this connection there has not been sufficient emphasis on the difference between producers' subsidies and consumers' subsidies. Producers' subsidies stimulate and encourage production, while they have but little effect on consumption. Inasmuch as they increase the supply, they are therefore deflationary. On the other hand consumers' subsidies encourage and increase consumption and waste while they have no effect on production. Inasmuch as under them production is stationary and they tend to deplete the supply more rapidly, they are of course inflationary. The very fact that they are based upon the assumption that many people will not buy at existing prices or cannot buy at existing prices as the case may be, but will purchase at the reduced price—made up to the distributors or processors by the subsidy—demonstrates this fact. The resulting greater demand or scramble to consume which is the very basis of consumers' subsidies, in itself offsets any benefit to the consumer by this increased demand and consumption, and thereby the subsidy defeats itself and its purpose.

In other words, as far as inflation is concerned, producers' subsidies and consumers' subsidies are diametrically opposites; the first reducing inflation and the second increasing it under all circumstances. The fallacy of consumers' subsidies is further emphasized by claims such as were made by the majority leader in the debate on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts spent nearly all of his time tracing the increase in recent years of excessive purchasing power. It seems to be his claim that the 35,000,000,000 estimated excess purchasing power in 1943 was the main cause of threatened runaway inflation and the reason for the proposed billion or so of consumers' subsidies. In other words, 35,000,000,000 of excessive purchasing power is inflationary and threatens destructive inflation, but 36,000,000,000 is deflationary and will prevent further inflation. The fallacy of this reasoning is obvious.

Walter Lippmann, in his column last Saturday, admitted sled-length that consumers' subsidies are inflationary. But he seeks to argue that this inflationary force or influence can become anti-inflationary only because we are in the abnormal situation where the Government itself is a principal consumer.

He says:

If we were not in this abnormal situation, then obviously a Government subsidy to hold prices would be inflationary in that it increased the popular purchasing power by the amount of the subsidy.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Did the gentleman happen to see the column of Walter Lippmann which I inserted in the RECORD a few days ago? It was his column for November 30. I have been interested in the gentleman's point of view. In that column Walter Lippmann pointed out what he contended, and I think correctly, was an inconsistency in the action of a majority of the House when it voted to forbid subsidies, on the one hand, on the ground there was plenty of purchasing power in the country, and on the very next day passed a most inadequate tax bill. In other words, his contention was that the House must have been wrong one day or the other. If there was an abundance of purchasing power available, then we should have passed a tax bill commensurate with that fact in order to come closer to paying for the war as we go along. If there were not that purchasing power, we should have been concerned with the fact that if prices rose a good many people would be in trouble.

Mr. JONKMAN. I shall show the errors of his reasoning in a moment.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does the gentleman think Walter Lippmann was wrong in his contention?

Mr. JONKMAN. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman thinks the House was consistent on those 2 days?

Mr. JONKMAN. Absolutely.

He continues:

The critics would then be quite right. But in our present situation the Government itself is not only a great consumer but it has an unlimited supply of purchasing power. Therefore, the more the Government has to pay for what it buys, the more inflationary money it will issue to get what it needs; the less it has to pay, because prices are kept down, the less inflationary money it has to put into circulation. For this special reason and in these special circumstances, subsidies which prevent a general rise of prices are, if correctly administered, contrainflationary. The cost of the subsidies is more than washed out by the much greater saving which comes from the Government's not having to pay higher prices for goods and for labor.

It will immediately be noted that there are a couple of if's and contingencies in the premise from which Mr. Lippmann

draws his conclusion of contrainflation. For he says:

> Subsidies which prevent a general rise of prices—if correctly administered—are contrainflationary.

What kind of subsidies does he mean when he speaks of "subsidies which prevent a general rise in prices?" Certainly not a consumers' subsidy, for he has already said that "it would be inflationary in that it increased the popular purchasing power by the amount of the subsidy." That is therefore not in itself a subsidy which will prevent a general rise in prices. He is begging the whole question. Moreover he states that these unknown, unidentified subsidies must be correctly administered to affect contrainflation. It is inconceivable that an administration addicted to a controlled economy based upon a spend-and-spend program, could even begin to correctly administer such a spree.

It is axiomatic of course that any sound measure—whether subsidy or what have you—which would prevent a further or general rise in prices would be contrainflationary. It is also true that if consumers' subsidies, whether they are sound or unsound, would be accepted as a permanent substitute for wage increases by all of the elements demanding wage increases, they would probably solve that problem. But they will not be so accepted.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gist of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] which very nearly carried the House, tried to tie prices to wages. The amendment would have allowed the use of subsidies only as long as there was not a general increase in wages. Does not the gentleman think that is a sound approach?

Mr. JONKMAN. No; I think it is a snare and a delusion. Either consumer subsidies are sound or they are unsound. You cannot say 10 percent is sound but 100 percent is unsound.

Once it becomes clear by experience that consumers' subsidies are in themselves inflationary; that they do not make food cheaper or more easily obtainable; that they are merely a snare and a delusion thrown out to temporarily avoid demands for increased wages, the increased wage problem will have to be faced anyway. In fact, their use so far has already demonstrated their failure to stop wage increases or reduce the cost of living.

In the meantime we will have saddled on the people a more stupendous bureaucracy and dictatorship than even this bureaucracy-ridden generation ever witnessed. For this bureaucracy will not stop at spending a billion a year. To realize this it is well to look back just a few months in the history of consumers' subsidies.

In the early part of this year the President contemplated and began the use of public funds for consumers' subsidies. It was claimed by many people and Members of Congress that this was a usurpation of powers not vested in him. It will be remembered that in July of this year both Houses of Congress passed a Commodity Credit Corporation bill containing a prohibition against the use of public moneys for such subsidies.

Again it will be recalled that this bill was vetoed by the President which was his constitutional prerogative. This made the use of the taxpayers' money for consumers' subsidies the law of the land under constitutional processes unless and until Congress changed it by overriding the veto. We all know that the House failed to muster the two-thirds vote to override the veto and then passed a bill extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation without the prohibition against consumers' subsidies. Clearly this did not leave the matter of consumers' subsidies hanging in mid-air. While it in all probability was a usurpation of power before the attempted legislation, Congress by its failure to prohibit use of public money for such subsidies by a two-thirds vote, which it could have done, made it the law of the land and gave the President another blank check.

Flushed with this victory and the blank check, were the bureaucrats content to continue their experiments with subsidies of a few cents on butter, beef, and coffee? Indeed not. If I remember correctly this legislation was before the Congress the day before we adjourned for the recess last summer. I had hardly gotten back to my district when I read in the newspapers that under the confirmed powers, the administration was planning machinery to buy up all the basic foodstuffs direct from the producers and distribute them to the consumers either through Government or private distribution centers; that they would be sold at whatever price the administration saw fit, and the loss would be made up by subsidies. It was even stated that Congress would not oppose the scheme.

It is true that since that time there has not been much further public disclosure of this plan or machinery. Forceful public and congressional reaction has probably made the bureaucrats cautious. But that is the result to which consumers' subsidies must inevitably lead. Such a feeding of the entire population as public charges by the administration with printing press money is the objective of the apostles of a controlled economy.

However, it is fortunate that the palace guard disclosed and overplayed its hand. It has served to put the American people on guard. The people know that in Europe wherever it has been tried, beginning with the Roman Empire, there is not a single instance in which subsidies in the long run were used successfully in stemming the tide of inflation. On the contrary, they always caused inflationary chaos and disaster.

It is encouraging to find that the Members of the House are awakening to the danger. In the first vote on June 25 last, the vote was 244 against and 108 for subsidies. The vote to override on July 2 was 228 against and 154 for. In the last vote on November 23, the vote was 278 against and 117 for, or almost two-and-a-half to one against subsidies.

This is encouraging. Congress must not be intimidated by threats of blame for inflation or appeals antagonizing the so-called white collar workers. Most of these know that food subsidies would not as much as get them a mess of pottage, and that it is more dangerous than a mirage, notwithstanding the fact that they have been the greatest sufferers of "palace guard" maladministration.

Consumers subsidies must be defeated and inasmuch as proponents frantically ask what other remedy have you, our answer is sound measures based upon American principles of which H. R. 2837, the Fulmer bill, is one. Again I repeat, this bill should be brought on for hearing before the House. Its immediate passage and application to our economy would largely solve our problem.

THE LATE VINCENT F. HARRINGTON

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House that former Congressman Vincent F. Harrington, of Sioux City, Iowa, who formerly represented the Ninth District of Iowa, died of a heart attack in England. His death has just been confirmed by The Adjutant General of the Army. He was a major of the Army Air Transport in England at the time of his death.

He served in the Seventy-fifth, Seventy-sixth, and Seventy-seventh Congresses and resigned during his last term to enter the Army Air Corps. He served with distinction as a Member of the House of Representatives and will be missed by all who knew him.

I join a host of friends in paying respect to his memory and extend my sincere sympathy to his wife and children and to the other members of his family.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the news that has just been brought to us by our colleague from Iowa strikes very deeply in my own mind and heart. Vincent Harrington was one of my very best friends and he was one of the most conscientious, earnest Members of Congress I ever served with. He was an all-American football star at Notre Dame. He came here from a district in northwestern Iowa where he always had a tough fight to be elected. He was able to be elected in that district largely because of his sterling personal qualities. When the war came along, he offered his services as he had done previously. His loss is going to be felt throughout the length and breadth of

this country by the people of his district, by his colleagues in the House, and by our armed forces in which he served with such distinction.

Mr. Speaker, I requested this time today before I knew that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] was going to follow me with a special order. It so happens I know what the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] is going to speak about and I want to devote a couple of minutes of my time to preface what his remarks are going to be.

We have heard recently, and very properly so—I have made one of them myself—appeals for immediate action to take care of the needs and to meet the contingencies of the men who are now and will in increasing numbers be discharged from the armed forces. Some of the statements that I have heard in the House about this matter have simply been appeals that Congress ought to do something about it. The speech of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], on the contrary, is going to be a specific outline of something we can do about it and he is going to outline for us a bill which he introduced today, I believe, that will meet, in my judgment, the first basic problem.

I confess that I have been working on a bill myself, which would have been a very simply measure, the whole purpose being to require that on the date of discharge every man be given a pamphlet describing to him precisely what his rights, entitlements, and benefits are under the laws regarding veterans. I am not introducing that bill and the reason I am not introducing it is because I am convinced that the gentleman from Louisiana, a member of the Military Affairs Committee, has dealt with that problem more completely in his bill than my own simple proposal would have done. I want to express here and now my appreciation for the fine and earnest work the gentleman from Louisiana has done and will do on this matter.

I still believe that every man should be provided with such printed factual information so that he will know exactly what his entitlements are. I am informed that the gentleman from Louisiana will not only include that in his bill but that it will also include a basic provision for a 3 months' furlough before a man is finally discharged, during which time he will no longer be in active service but will still receive pay and allowances as a member of the armed service. This 3 months' period he may use in any way he sees fit toward making his adjustment back into civilian life. During this 3 months' period he will be entitled to receive full cooperation and benefit from the Veterans' Administration, from the Employment Services, and from every other governmental agency that can minister to his needs and will also have the advantage and assistance of all the veterans' organizations in assisting him in filing any claims that he may legitimately have.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I say to the gentleman that I do not mean to make his speech for him. However, I am deeply interested in this matter. I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROOKS. I am very happy to realize that the gentleman has devoted much time and attention to a subject that is so vital to this Congress at the present time and to the country generally. I think the gentleman's idea is very good. A bulletin containing a statement of the rights and benefits and preferences to which veterans are entitled when they are discharged ought to be in the hands of every man. In one hand he should have the discharge and in the other hand that bulletin.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am much obliged to the gentleman.

I have been concerned about this subject because I have known of a few instances where I believe men have been discharged with medical discharges and where they just have not known what their entitlements were. I think they should have known before they were discharged.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I have been very much concerned lately—and perhaps the gentleman knows something about it—about these veterans who have received some sort of a mental or psychic shock. Quite frequently they were apparently all right before they got into the service, but I have heard of several cases where they had been in the service only a short time, and possibly the doctors were too zealous in trying to prove that their disability was not service-connected. I hesitate to criticize the armed services at any time, because I believe the war is being well handled, and I think our Army and Navy are being well handled, but it strikes me that the doctors should lean over backward to try to find service connection in the case of mental shocks that have arisen in this war. I am told that mental injuries comprise a large portion of the injuries that are received by our soldiers. May I have the gentleman's comment on that?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. My comment is that the record shows that as to the veterans of the First World War the increase of disability is more in the field of nervous and neuropsychiatric difficulties than in any other type of disability, and that as to this war the nervous strain is probably greater than ever before. I would feel that very special attention ought to be given by the best people in the whole world to a program whereby those men can be given an opportunity for real rehabilitation. I think that instead of being too careful to try to prove that this disability is not service-connected the Nation has a fundamental responsibility to those men.

I may say that I have myself introduced a bill to define permanent and total disability in terms of industrial inadaptability, whereby the attempt was made to define industrial inadaptability so that a man might be rated totally and permanently disabled if he did have a difficulty of the sort the gentleman refers to so it prevents him from carrying on a gainful occupation.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am glad the gentleman feels that way. I have known of two or three specific cases of that character. I think it is false economy to fail to do everything we can for a soldier who is trying to adapt himself, when it was the service of his country that at least provided the background and the changed conditions that might have induced him to slip over the line, even though he might have had a predisposition toward such a condition before he got into the service.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time primarily in order to talk about a group of Government officials. I wanted to talk about some people who I suppose may by some stretch of the imagination be called bureaucrats. I wanted to talk about them because I think they have rendered one of the most fundamental and outstanding services to democratic life in the United States that has been rendered by anybody in the last 50 years.

TEN-YEAR HISTORY OF THE ANTITRUST DIVISION

More than half a century ago the people of this country and their Congress recognized the inherent danger of too much concentration of economic power. They saw that the instrument for this power was the creation of industrial monopolies and various types of monopolistic controls. The long congressional debates leading to the passage of the Sherman antitrust laws pictured those evils as they existed 50 years ago. It would be surprisingly appropriate to give those same speeches today with the change of only a few names. The monopoly problem has not been solved.

This failure to deal with and conquer a traditional evil is no fault of the law itself. The act is perfectly clear as to what it intends to prohibit, and the type of free competitive system it means to perpetuate.

The trouble always has been that the law was not enforced.

The monopolistic groups themselves have often been in the forefront giving lip service to the principle of competitive enterprise. And they were perfectly sincere in those pronouncements. They strongly believe in competition—for everybody but themselves. They could well afford to demand that the antitrust laws be enforced when their friends and even their protégés had control of the enforcement machinery. It is only in the last 10 years that they have really felt the bite of the Sherman Antitrust Act. In the last 10 years there has been a serious and sustained effort toward enforcement.

But 10 years is not even a beginning. No appreciable percent of the existing monopolies could be broken up in 10 years—and even if all of them were broken up, and the Government then relaxed its enforcement efforts, they could be re-formed again before the ink was dry on the Court's judgment.

The preservation of a free competitive system is a continuing battle. It is like larceny. We could catch all the burglars today and lock them up securely in jail, but if the vigilance of police authorities were not maintained there would be a new outbreak of robbery tomorrow.

The record of enforcement of antitrust laws during the past 10 years is worthy of note. It is a record in which we might well take pride, but not the sort of pride which involves a relaxation.

Let me review these accomplishments during the past decade.

From 1933 to 1943 the Antitrust Division had four Assistant Attorneys General: Harold Stephens from 1933 to 1935; John Dickinson from 1935 to 1937; Robert H. Jackson from 1937 to 1938; and Thurman Arnold from 1938 to 1943.

During this 10 years the Antitrust Division passed through three distinct stages: First, organization; second, investigation; and third, enforcement. Consider the accomplishment: The Division instituted 342 cases during the 10-year period prior to 1933 and 3,512 during the period after; it collected barely more than $1,000,000 in fines before, and twelve and one-half millions after; it indicted 3,711 new defendants before, and 11,255 after; and it terminated 274 cases prior to 1933 and 3,106 in the decade following.

But these figures are only partially indicative. The effort is also measured in terms of, first increased public support, and second the expansion of the frontiers of antitrust decisions.

In 1933 the Antitrust Division had an appropriation of $125,000; a total personnel of 67 clerks, stenographers, and lawyers; was working on 8 antitrust cases; and was negotiating two consent decrees. With approximately 25 lawyers available for antitrust work, it could not press more than five major cases at one time, and then no staff was available for developing new cases. Violations of the Sherman Act were so much an accepted procedure in American business practice that there was a general assumption to the effect that the antitrust laws were mere symbols of a good but impractical economic theory. This, in spite of the fact the courts had held with uninterrupted consistency that the Sherman Act actually meant "every contract, combination, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade" was illegal.

The sole trouble was lack of enforcement. At any time during the past 20 years 5,000 potential antitrust cases could have been started with the availability of an adequate staff. But when, as in 1933, only 8 cases were brought, it is apparent that a violator of the antitrust laws stood about one chance in 600 of being prosecuted.

Such a gamble would have been tempting even if the rewards had been small. But when it is considered that price fixing and other restraints may well add millions to the coffers of the successful offender, and that he stood a 600-to-1 chance against getting caught, it was a temptation beyond the power of profit-mad business to resist.

In addition to those willful and knowing violators, there were hundreds of honest business folk who violated the Sherman Act through sheer ignorance of its provisions, leaving behind clearly convincing records and documents in their files.

In 1933 the antitrust laws had been on the books for 40 years. Could they be enforced? Would serious enforcement reveal weaknesses sufficient to warrant their repeal? Were they, after all, good or bad laws?

There was only one way to answer those questions—and that was by launching a deadly serious and efficient enforcement program. The acid test of application was the only way.

But an antitrust enforcement program cannot be started over night. It requires anywhere from 6 months to 2 years to investigate and prepare a large antitrust case, and from a month to 8 months to try it. Slow and careful preparations had to be made. A staff must be recruited, trained, or organized for this specialized work. Complaints had to be studied and selections made between them. Investigations had to be made and grand jury proceedings conducted. All of this took time and all of it was necessary before a single case could be brought.

Congress increased the appropriation from $125,000 in 1933 to $314,000 in 1934. The beginning had been made. Never in all its 40 years of history had the appropriation for antitrust enforcement approached that figure. With that start, sponsored by Assistant Attorney General Stephens, the Division began assembling and training a competent staff. Nearly 20 additional lawyers were brought in. From that time forth the professional standard of the Antitrust Division has been outstanding. During the past 10 years 3 members of its staff have graduated into Assistant Attorneys Generalship, more than a dozen into lucrative practices, several into general counselship of big corporations, 3 into Congress, and, but for war which has claimed more than 100, this trend would be even more impressive.

The first year of the vitalized Antitrust Division was devoted to building up and training a staff. The number of cases terminated actually dropped from eight to four. Not a penny was collected in fines. On the surface it looked as if an increase in appropriation was followed by a recession in enforcement activity. But an understanding Appropriations Committee appreciated the time necessary for getting started and, the next year, raised the appropriation by $100,000.

This moderate but constant growth permitted the Division to expand and train for the colossal job ahead. Over the past 10 years the appropriation increased an average of approximately $200,000 each year until it exceeds $2,000,000. Congress has always shown great interest in the enforcement of the antitrust laws and has given the Division all it has asked. The wisdom of that attitude has been proved not only in the enforcement program itself, but in the additional fact that the Division has already turned back to the Treasury in fines considerably more money than it has spent in enforcement. It is conclusive proof that a vitalized antitrust-enforcement program not only pays for itself but constitutes a definite profit to the Government. But of greatest importance is the saving of hundreds of millions of dollars annually to the consuming public by the removal of illegal restraints. It has been estimated that this saving is measured in terms of billions of dollars.

In these first years of the new antitrust program there was a temporary setback during N. R. A. days. After that the development of an antitrust enforcement program went steadily ahead under Assistant Attorneys General Dickinson and Jackson until 1938. During those 3 years the number of Sherman Act cases—distinguished from kindred law cases—instituted each year rose from 4 to 13. The result of having an enlarged staff on investigation and preparation was beginning to make itself felt.

Then, in March of 1938, Thurman Arnold was appointed Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Division. He inherited an able and trained staff built up by his predecessors, but he brought with him something new—a driving zeal for wholesale antitrust enforcement which made him one of the most beloved and at the same time one of the most hated and feared men in public life.

The number of new Sherman Act cases jumped from 13 in 1938 to 92 in 1939. The number of kindred law cases jumped from 206 to 345. The appropriation went from $780,000 to $1,309,000, and the total amount of fines collected went from $85,000 to $2,693,000. And of the 33 cases terminated that year, the Division had the amazing record of winning 31 and losing only 2.

After 5 years of sound and gradual building, the staff and the leader had met for the inauguration of the first serious effort to enforce the antitrust laws in nearly half a century.

During the next 5 years the Division instituted 44 percent of all the antitrust proceedings instituted during its whole existence of 53 years. Arnold stated his point of view during his first year in office—speech, Herald Tribune Forum, New York, October 26, 1938.

Describing government as the art of compromise, he said:

> It consists in reconciling organizations which give people goods and services with the organizations expressing the spiritual values which give them unity and morale. Every organized state must have its established church, or, as I have expressed it elsewhere, its folklore. That church must embody the fundamental truths and principles which give the states its greatness. At the same time that church must not impose ridiculous and unnecessary material sacrifices on the great mass of the people. * * * When the organizations representing the ideals of a culture, whether they be economic, legal, or moral (and the three always merge together), so interfere with the practical distribution of material comforts that it becomes obvious this sacrifice is unnecessary, a spiritual or psychological conflict develops. * * * Practical necessities for the mo-

ment are lost in the paralyzing effect of reiterated phobias. The neurosis continues until practical organizations again distribute the goods which people need. If this end is not achieved, if nobody succeeds in making the practical organizations function, the church itself falls. * * *

Nevertheless, as a practical matter, we cannot escape talking as if nations had morals and group free will. Only in this way are people stirred to action. * * * I would be the last to attack that uniform of principle which gives to simple ordinary persons like myself, and my colleagues at Washington, and to the leaders of business with whom I come into both friendly and unfriendly contact, our prestige and power. * * * We must first make obeisance to the ideals, the mystery, the romance, and magic which give our social organizations the flavor and character which we revere and then emerge from the church to the backyard where wood needs to be sawed.

What is the woodpile that the practical man in Government is facing today? There are many names for it, but I prefer the phrase "unused capacity." * * * How are we going to saw that woodpile? To run our prospective plant at capacity, prices must be adjusted to income. * * * My hope is that the adjustment between prices and income may be made within the limits of our competitive ideal of free and independent producers, buyers, and sellers. Compromises are necessary in cases where modern industrial techniques require such vast organizations that they are in fact small governments within the Government, but no more of such compromises should be made than the hard, cold facts require.

Accompanying this new philosophy of antitrust enforcement went a new technique. For the first time in its history the Division departed from a policy of mere cases and adopted a plan designed to clear at one time an entire industrial segment from restrictive restraints.

The first of these programs was an attack against the use of patents as a means of evading the antitrust laws. Arnold attacked with all weapons at hand. He made speeches, appeared before committees of Congress, sponsored a patent investigation before the Temporary National Economic Committee, and proceeded with antitrust investigations, grand jury indictments, and suits. There was launched a series of prosecutions intended to prevent the pooling of patents for restrictive purposes. These involved such industries as glass bottle manufacturers, makers of spectacles, rock wool, plasterboard, computing gasoline pumps, and numerous others.

They led into another and equally vital field of control by means of private international agreements in which the world was divided into noncompeting territories. Among the articles involved here were military optical instruments, synthetic rubber, magnesium, pharmaceutical products, dyestuffs, lighting equipment, chemicals, petroleum, and nonferrous metals. Thus the new and serious cartel situation was first exposed to the American public.

The second Nation-wide program was a comprehensive investigation of the entire housing and building industry. Evidence had been developed which indicated that nearly 40 percent of the cost of a house went to the payment of various types of levies exacted by restrictive practices. It was recognized that one case involving one restraint might get some good law but not solve the major objective—the reduction of the cost of building a house. Therefore, after due preparation, 11 grand juries were called throughout the country. Approximately 100 lawyers, or half of the entire antitrust staff, were assigned to investigate and present the evidence. Scores of Federal Bureau of Investigation agents were used to search files, locate documents, and interview witnesses. The result was a large-scale country-wide attack aimed at all factors in the industry. The direct effect of the drive could be measured in some specific instances, as in Pittsburgh where the building costs of a housing project were reduced 17 percent. There were many more intangible results which could not be measured in such exact terms. One was the freeing to a large extent of prefabricated housing which, it is hoped, will open a new era of low-cost housing after the war.

The building program was moving with conspicuous success until a Supreme Court decision established the immunity of labor from prosecution under the Sherman Act. Thereafter it was never possible to deal with all the factors which go to make up the high cost of building.

The third broad program dealt with the cost of food distribution. Again the attack was directed against all types of restraint entering the food-distribution picture, from the farmer to the consumer. Indictments were returned against dairy companies, bakers, cheese manufacturers, producers of fruits and vegetables, meat packers, wholesale establishments, and several chain stores. The specific objective was to reduce the spread between the original grower and the ultimate consumer. Much progress could be shown in this endeavor, but the declaration of war and the consequent necessity of price control and rationing brought an inevitable postponement to some of the activity. It is an important fact, however, that the Antitrust Division is prepared to renew its efforts in this direction once the war is over and normal business methods are resumed.

The fourth major program developed was designed to deal with the artificial costs in the transportation field. Here again the specific objective was to eliminate restrictive practices governing the rates for moving the Nation's goods and supplies. That program, the butt of one of the bitterest attacks ever marshaled against the forces of free competition, is still progressing although great pressure is being exerted to have it stopped. As the public understanding increases, the inevitability of its continuance becomes more apparent.

The fifth and last major program dealt with international cartels. This came as an outgrowth of other work such as patents and the investigation of the chemical and the petroleum industries. Some phases of this work were necessarily stopped because of the war, but there is wide agreement in all quarters that investigating efforts should be continued.

In addition to the 5 major programs referred to above, the Antitrust Division carried on a great number of miscellaneous investigations and suits where business complainants appealed to the Government for protection against the aggressive tactics of dominant concerns. Among these were the fire-insurance companies, the loan-shark racket, fertilizer producers, the big oil companies, the Aluminum Co. of America, the American Medical Association, and numerous others. In conformity with a mandate of Congress the continuance of the nonwar work of the Antitrust Division is reflected in the fact that new antitrust cases instituted during the first war year were only 39 less than the peak year just prior to the war.

As an indication of the congressional attitude toward antitrust work the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives incorporated into its report for the first war year the following view: "The committee feels that even though the war and all matters connected with it is our prime objective at the moment the nonwar work of the Antitrust Division should not be relaxed, not only because of its indirect connection with the war effort, but also because of the need for protecting our post-war economy."

During the past 10 years the Division has pioneered on the legal frontiers as well as in enforcement technique. A brief history of this trend in legal doctrine may be helpful.

Two major departures were made during this period in enforcement techniques. One related to approach and the other to the type of case.

Prior to 1938 the few cases brought were concerned largely with developing occasional new points of law. Court tests were made to determine whether a particular practice of a single business concern violated the Sherman Act. Such isolated and fragmentary enforcement made no fundamental change in our economic structure or in methods of doing business. Antitrust cases were of interest largely to lawyers as a legal game. The impact of a decision favorable to the Government was scarcely felt by the public. Even the business of the defendant company was affected but little, since a new device for achieving the same result could be instituted quickly to replace the activity condemned.

Then the Division started using the antitrust laws for a frontal and vertical effort to bring about healthy conditions in an entire industry. Every restraint in an industry from producer through processor, jobber, carrier, and retailer was attacked simultaneously. With all such restraints removed the collective result was of sufficient magnitude to be felt. The two best illustrations of this type of approach were the Nation-wide campaigns in the housing and food industries mentioned earlier. For the first time in 50 years the general public was made aware of the benefits of free competition through enforcement of the antitrust laws. With all restraints removed from

an industry, the home owner or consumer could realize in dollars and cents the effect of competitive forces.

The second departure concerned type of case. Prior to 1938 the general policy was to bring most antitrust cases on the civil side of the docket. As a result few cases were litigated. Consent judgments were entered. Violations of such decrees went largely unpunished. Then came the policy of enforcing the antitrust laws through criminal indictments. The shock of indictment, quite apart from the criminal penalties attached, was a real deterrent to continued violations. As part of this policy it was announced that the Department would dismiss a pending criminal suit if the defendants voluntarily offered, in addition to an agreement to cease the violations charged, "substantial public benefits connected with the policy of maintaining free competition in an orderly market which could not be obtained by the criminal prosecutions." This settlement policy was abandoned in 1940 because of the repeated charge that the Department was using the threat of criminal proceedings to force its economic ideas on industry. Since 1940, criminal cases have been brought in most instances, but can only be settled by nolo contendere pleas and the imposition of fines, even where injunctive relief is sought and secured in addition.

Certain definite lines of advance in judicial thinking on antitrust problems are discernible, in at least four directions, from cases decided in the last 10 years. The frontiers of antitrust enforcement have been extended as to, first, the determination that price fixing is illegal per se; second, the determination that full-line forcing is a business practice in violation of the Sherman Act; third, the determination that an express agreement to fix prices is not necessary to establish illegality under the Sherman Act if the result is the same; and, fourth, a determination that certain professional services were regarded as trade commerce within the meaning of the Sherman Act.

These extensions of the scope of the act came about as follows:

First. Most lawyers believed that the illegality of price-fixing agreements under the Sherman antitrust law had been established in the Trenton Potteries case—*Trenton Potteries* v. *United States* (273 U. S. 392)—in 1927, holding that it was no defense if the prices agreed upon were reasonable. But it was generally considered that a price-fixing agreement, in order to be unlawful, should inflexibly prescribe exact prices.

However, in the Socony Vacuum case—*United States* v. *Socony Vacuum Oil Company* (310 U. S. 150)—it was established that a conspiracy by any means to raise or lower prices, even to the level of the fair-market value and regardless of reasonableness—the same, pages 219–221—is illegal under the Sherman Act, even though the prices were not fixed uniformly and inflexibly—the same, page 222.

Second. "Full line forcing," by which is meant a requirement by a seller that the buyer purchase certain other commodities as a condition of purchasing those he desires, has long been thought to be illegal under the Sherman Act, but the precise question has never been conclusively decided—compare *United States* v. *United Shoe Machinery Co.* (247 U. S. 32) with *United Shoe Machinery Co.* v. *United States* (258 U. S. 451). However, in the General Motors case—*United States* v. *General Motors Corp.* (121 F. (2d) 376, cert. den. 314 U. S. 618)—the result reached is that full line forcing is illegal. There the defendants, manufacturers of automobiles, forced dealers to exclusively use a financing company owned by them, in extending credit to all who purchased automobiles on time. The Court held that the trade-in and financing of automobiles was illegally restrained by this practice, and, as a practical proposition, upheld the division's views regarding full line forcing.

Third. The idea that an express agreement between conspirators is essential to a conspiracy under the Sherman Act has persisted in many quarters from the beginning, but this view was expressly repudiated, and the view that a conspiracy may be implied from the circumstances was reinforced in the Masonite case—*United States* v. *Masonite Corporation* (316 U. S. 265)—where the court reiterated that circumstantial evidence may be relied upon by the Government, in antitrust cases, to establish a conspiracy. There, it was also held that a combination to fix prices results from adherence to prices promulgated by one member of a combination, acting independently, where all members knew of the plan and were bound by separate agreements to adhere thereto.

Fourth. It has never been decided that professional "services" were "trade or commerce," within the Sherman Act, but in the American Medical Association case—*American Medical Association* v. *United States* (317 U. S. 519)—which involved the construction of section 3 of the Sherman Act—prohibiting any person from restraining trade or commerce in the District of Columbia—the court decided that "any person" as used in the act includes all who engage in the prohibited activities, and that it is no excuse that they are engaged in an honorable profession. And, construing the remainder of the section, it held that a conspiracy among physicians to restrain or destroy the competition in and the free availability of medical and hospital services is illegal. Of course, the question whether restraints of competition upon the rendition of "services" is illegal under sections 1 and 2 of the act is still open, but it is probable the court will treat "services" as a part of the "trade and commerce" of the United States.

No history of the Antitrust Division covering the past 10 years can be completed without a review of the Division's effort in behalf of small business. The Sherman Act was primarily designed to preserve competition. Competition is predicated on the principle that there must be competitors.

The urgent necessity of swift war production brought about a situation where the Government began dealing almost exclusively with the big companies. Senator O'MAHONEY, chairman of the Senate Committee on Post-War Planning, recently made the statement that more than 70 percent of all war contracts were centered in 100 large corporations. This condition inevitably threatened the very existence of countless small business establishments throughout the country. Numbers of them appealed to the Antitrust Division as the traditional protector of little competitors. The work of the Division in this respect has been conspicuously successful. Literally hundreds of small manufacturing plants have been kept in operation merely by the fact that the Antitrust Division was able to call their potential capacities to the attention of the contracting officers.

This work was carried on with no headlines. The results are intangible things which cannot be reflected in statistical tabulations, but the numerous letters from businesses which have been saved from ruin bring a sense of satisfaction and accomplishment to all who have participated in this work.

Events may well prove that the accomplishments of the Small Business Section of the Antitrust Division constituted the greatest single factor in the preservation of the competitive system in America.

Mr. Speaker, I am making this speech today not because it deals with a matter which is intimately connected with the war in which our country is now engaged. I want to sound this fundamental warning: The future of freedom, the future of democratic life, for which this war is being fought, depends fundamentally upon the peoples of the nations being stronger than and able to control every international cartel or monopoly which seeks to make itself supreme over the public welfare and even over nations.

After the last World War the German cartelized industry was ready the day the war concluded and the day that Germany acknowledged military defeat, to commence its work of gaining an industrial control through cartelization of many of the industries of the entire world, a control which stood it in good stead when this war came. It is well for us to be forewarned.

The Antitrust Division is an agency of government that, in my judgment, has rendered an outstanding service. I am glad to have my speech concerning that agency a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY AND BENEFITS TO VETERANS

Mr. BROOKS. I have heard the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], who has just preceded me. During the last few days I have conferred with him on sev-

eral occasions about the matter of the handling of discharged servicemen and servicewomen as they go back into civilian life. I am glad at this time to have the opportunity of saying that wherever the interest of the average man or wherever the interest of the underprivileged is at stake, my friend and distinguished colleague from California is always found working and fighting, giving to those groups in society the privileges to which they ought to be, and to which they are, entitled under a real democratic system of government. It has been a real pleasure to work with him.

Mr. Speaker, over the last number of days there has been one speech after another on the floor of the House of Representatives having reference to the discharge of servicemen and servicewomen. There have been various criticisms of what has not been done and various suggestions as to what should be done in those cases. We all realize we are approaching a vastly important problem, a problem that will be with us over the next generation, perhaps as long as you and I live. We want to approach this problem in a different manner to that which the Congress of the United States approached it after the last war. We want to be able to give those men as they come out of the service a definite program of rights, benefits, and assistance to which they as veterans serving in a great war are entitled.

I might say this also—at the present time the Committee on Military Affairs of the House is engaged in hearings covering several bills which have for their purpose the paying of a mustering-out pay to veterans. I have a bill which goes a good deal further in our aid than merely paying mustering-out pay.

Mr. Speaker, on November 9 and 10, in Washington, D. C., the National Council of American Veterans' Organizations, composed of the national representatives of the service organizations of America, met and adopted plans for the post-war period. One of the recommendations of this meeting which I think is entitled to great weight is that a 3-month furlough before discharge be granted to all members of the armed forces of the United States.

Need has now become very apparent for the enactment of this recommendation into law at a very early date. During the course of the present year, almost a million members of the armed forces will be discharged and released back into civilian life. Many of them are men and women who are returned from foreign areas disabled and physically unfit to carry on with the war effort. Many are battle casualties whose cases cry loudly for immediate attention.

Because of these facts, Mr. Speaker, I have prepared with the able assistance of Mr. Millard Rice, of the Disabled American Veterans, and have introduced a joint resolution today which will give these men and women the help which Congress wants them to have at the termination of their armed service.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to my colleague from Louisiana who is a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and who has worked long and diligently on matters of this character.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I want to commend my colleague for presenting this legislation. I think he has rendered to the country a distinct service and I know that his modesty prevents him from admitting that he is peculiarly qualified to speak and act on this question because the gentleman saw service in the First World War and was overseas for a long time and rendered distinguished service in that war. I want to say to my colleague that I am tremendously interested in this subject and I hope the Committee on Military Affairs will bring to the House legislation along this line even before the holidays. We ought to act and act soon.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank my colleague from Louisiana for his very complimentary remarks. I want to assure him that the Committee on Military Affairs met this morning and will meet tomorrow morning on the subject of mustering-out pay; and the committee, I believe, feels the seriousness of urgent action on the matter.

This resolution provides for the granting of a 3-month furlough before discharge to men and women of the armed forces, which includes the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. It will permit members of these services to be released under furlough into civilian life with the knowledge that for 3 months they will receive the pay and allowances which they by law receive as members of the armed forces. During the furlough time, they may readjust themselves, renew their contacts in business life, apply for and receive gainful employment and in general make full arrangements for the return to normal civilian life.

In many cases the families of these men in service have moved away from their homes. In some cases they have consolidated their living quarters with those of near relatives. In other cases they have followed the servicemen from place to place throughout the course of their service as long as they are in the continental United States, and tried to remain with them during their service. As a result of this fact, the man or woman being discharged from the armed services of the Nation finds himself or herself in the position of going back home, and having to make all necessary arrangements for a home, make all arrangements to return to work and renew all of their contacts, literally starting all over again in life.

During the 3-month-furlough period, the obligation is placed upon the Government to assemble their service records, including medical records so that at the time of discharge they may immediately be available for use.

The facts indicate now that the medical records are not available in all cases. When a man comes to the point of being discharged, his medical records may be scattered over several places at distant points and time is required to assemble these records. As a result of that fact, Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for the Veterans' Administration, under the present arrangement in many cases, to make immediate adjudication of a worthy claim for disability benefits.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It seems to me that provision in the gentleman's bill will mean the avoidance of a great many difficulties that have been confronted by veterans of the First World War. Is that not true?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. One of the greatest difficulties they have had in many instances has been the absence of those records. Under the gentleman's bill, before a man left the service he would know where those records were.

Mr. BROOKS. Proceeding to that very point, mentioned by the gentleman from California, Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of this resolution, the War and Navy Departments are authorized to provide throughout the United States demobilization centers to which these men and women about to be discharged are sent. From the center nearest the home he is given 3 months' furlough with a round-trip ticket to his home. At the end of the 3-month period he is brought back for the final pre-discharge examination. At this time he is allowed to file applications and claims which are desirable. He is given clerical and technical assistance from officers of the Veterans' Administration and is permitted to consult with representatives of service organizations available. The Veterans' Administration is encouraged to process immediately claims and to adjudicate them at the very moment of discharge.

And as the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] has just indicated, during that 3-month period the records of that man or woman are assembled at this one point—the demobilization center.

When he returns from his 3-months' furlough his entire record, including all of his medical record is right there before him. At that particular moment when the final physical examination is completed and he knows the result of it, he can refer to his service record and his medical record. That record is available to the Veterans' Administration representatives. It will be available to representatives of those organizations which aid veterans and which are recognized by the Veterans Administration. So that this serviceman, before he receives his discharge, will know as far as anyone can know, just what his physical condition may be; and he will then be advised and counseled as to what action he should take in order that his disabilities may be translated into action by the Veterans' Administration that he may be promptly adjudicated a disabled American veteran.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. I am interested in the fine address the gentleman is making on this very important problem. It is certainly something that this Congress has got to deal with, and of course, the quicker the better. Particularily I was interested in the proposal of the 3-month furlough. Certainly it seems, if practical, that would be very desirable; but I was wondering what the gentleman had in mind with reference to the jurisdiction of that soldier for the 3 months he would be back home. What could he do during that 3-month period? Would he still be a soldier? Would he wear a uniform? Would he be in civilian clothes? Under what jurisdiction, judicially, would he come? There are many problems that would arise.

Mr. BROOKS. Under this bill he would be a furloughed soldier with full authority to pursue all arrangements necessary to reenter civilian life, and to do any kind of work or gainful occupation that he desired during that time, subject only to the obligation at the end of that term to go back and submit to his final physical examination and receive his discharge from the Army or Navy of the United States.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Would he be in uniform?

Mr. BROOKS. He could be in uniform or he may not be in uniform, as he so desires.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. The gentleman would suggest then that under his proposal, a man could be on furlough and in civilian clothes, and then at the proper time go back into the Army with his uniform on, in order to be mustered out, so to speak?

Mr. BROOKS. The purpose of the bill is to not release a veteran and then lose all interest in him. It is to furlough a soldier for 90 days, and during that time give him all of the aid toward being reemployed, and all of the counsel toward asserting any claim that he might have before the Veterans' Bureau, or any preference that he might have in other agencies of Government. When he is discharged he will be placed back into gainful employment or if he is disabled, he will have his claim recognized promptly by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. I am very much in sympathy with the gentleman's proposal. Certainly it seems to me that something along this line is going to be desirable. However, there is one further point. If back home on this 3-month furlough, unfortunately he gets into some trouble of some kind, by action or otherwise, then what would be the jurisdiction?

Mr. BROOKS. This is covered in the provisions in the bill which provide that rules and regulations may be made by the Secretaries of War and Navy covering the situation during the furlough period. It is the intent and purpose of the bill to release that man as far as possible from the Army, subject only to returning at the end of 90 days for examination and discharge. Criminal matters may, if it is found desirable, for such a limited period, be handled by civil courts as prescribed by the Secretaries of War and Navy.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Suppose a man is injured while out on furlough; would he then be subject to all the benefits the same as though he were in the service?

Mr. BROOKS. There would be no difference at all just because he had received a furlough; he would still be in the service. A soldier in South America given a 30- or 60-day furlough and told to go home would be in exactly the same situation as the man who reaches the termination of his service in the Army and who is released for 90 days to go home to make arrangements to reenter civilian life. This is very important. We cannot expect, Mr. Speaker, every man who has been away from the United States for over 3 years, as some of these men have, to come back home and expect to sit around the camps after they reach these shores again day after day and week after week, perhaps running into months, so they may be physically examined, may be sent to the hospital and reexamined time and again. They want to get back to the homes and the loved ones from whom they have been away many months. We offer them this furlough of 3 months that they may go home during this time, see their families, make arrangements to reenter civilian life and then come back, and if they are disabled, receive the rights and benefits they are entitled to from the Veterans' Administration.

If the person about to be discharged does not desire to file a claim for a benefit with the Veterans' Administration, he is encouraged to seek the help of the United States Employment Service or the Reemployment Division of the Selective Service Administration for the purpose of obtaining a job back home. These services are directed to have officers available at this time, and the newly made veteran is aided in filling out and filing his application for work at the very moment of discharge.

Mr. Speaker, in the last war, when we were discharged from the armed forces, we were given $60 and were immediately "placed on our own." The purpose of this bill is to go further than the Nation went with the servicemen in the last war.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to learn of the action of the Veterans' Administration in the establishment of an adjudication unit at Walter Reed Hospital. This, I understand, is to be the beginning of this kind of service, and that if it works all right at Walter Reed Hospital, by agreement with the War Department, the service will be extended to other War Department hospitals throughout the United States. The claims of the disabled men and women may then be studied while they are in the hospital in cases of apparent service-connected disability, and they may begin to receive benefits immediately upon discharge. This action will not, however, advance the claim of the man or woman who is not in a hospital, but the stipulations of this resolution will give him the aid he badly needs.

Speaking further upon the program the Veterans' Administration has just announced, and it follows along with the general purposes of the resolution I have just introduced, this Administration has established at Walter Reed Hospital an adjudication unit. It is very evident that men who are in the hospital for battle wounds, perhaps the loss of an arm or a leg, with or without their service records are entitled to some award and some adjudication. Under the new program of the Administration when men are in that condition, they may immediately file their claims before discharge in the hospital and submit their case for adjudication and an award of the bureau.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

THE SOLDIERS' VOTE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I addressed the House on the justice and necessity of providing a Federal ballot to enable our gallant soldiers to vote in 1944. The argument for a Federal ballot is a simple and obvious one; those who are fit to fight for America are fit to vote in America. Our fighting men are our No. 1 class, triple-A citizens by virtue of their heroic efforts in defense of this Nation. We must assure these fighting citizens of access to the ballot.

Today I want to call the attention of the House to the complete inadequacy of the existing system for polling our vast soldier vote. As the system stands today, there are 48 separate and distinct sets of requirements, set by the 48 separate States. A mass of red tape stands between the absentee soldier and the ballot box. The boys in the slit trenches of Tarawa and Italy obviously do not have the time to fight their way through this red tape. And if they did have the persistence and time it would still, in most cases, be physically impossible for them to comply with the various State requirements.

Allow me to present some facts which demonstrate the burden placed on the soldier vote by the various State registration requirements. There are 39 States which require that soldiers must register to vote. The only exceptions are the States of Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, Minnesota, Nevada, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Texas. And registration is required in certain parts of both Kansas and Minnesota.

There are 34 States where registration is permanent, but men and women in the armed forces who are just reaching 21 will not have registered and have not had an opportunity to register. The

lowest percentage of registered voters in the United States is the 21- to 30-year-old group, showing that a large number of the soldier citizens of these 34 States have not achieved the permanently registered status.

There are nearly as many variations of registration requirements as there are States. In California, Connecticut, and Montana notice of service in the armed forces does not serve to continue registration after failure to vote. I understand that in Louisiana it is necessary to reregister every 4 years unless service in the armed forces is known. Registration is not permanent in certain localities in Missouri and Nebraska and is permanent in others. In New York the execution of a war-voter's oath in signing an absentee ballot constitutes registration.

I have been told that absentee soldiers are not allowed to register in New Hampshire, New Jersey, South Dakota, Utah, Virginia, Wyoming, and sections of Nebraska. New Jersey is the only State mentioned above whose legislature meets in 1944. All other States would have to call special sessions of their legislatures in order to write new laws, or in some cases, institute constitutional amendments to change their absentee-voting machinery for 1944.

These facts show the failure of our existing soldier-voting machinery. I submit that it is obvious that we must correct this failure with an efficient uniform Federal ballot which will allow our fighting men to vote to assure them the triple-A grade of citizenship they are defending.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 by providing insurance benefits in the amount of $5,000 for the parents, regardless of dependency, of those persons in active service who died in line of duty after October 8, 1940, and before April 20, 1942.

Mr. Speaker, on December 20, 1941, we enacted Public Law No. 360 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, first session. Under this act automatic insurance benefits were provided for any person who was killed in line of duty on and after October 8, 1940, and within 120 days after the date of the enactment of said bill, which would be April 20, 1942. These benefits, in the amount of $5,000 are payable to the following beneficiaries and in the order named:

(A) To the widow or widower of the insured, if living and while unremarried.

(B) If no widow or widower entitled thereto, to the child or children of the insured, if living, in equal shares.

(C) If no widow or widower entitled thereto, or child, to the dependent mother or father of the insured, if living, in equal shares.

Under the bill I have introduced I am striking the word "dependent" as it applies to the mother or father of the insured soldier. It is the purpose of my bill to pay to the parents of every boy losing his life during this period the sum of $5,000, irrespective of dependency.

I feel that this is the least that we can do for these parents. Many of these boys were just out of school and had never been in a position to contribute to the support of their parents. It is impossible in most cases for any degree of dependency to be established. I think it is unjust and unfair to ask these parents to make such a showing. It is calling upon them to stultify themselves by taking a mercenary attitude, which they refuse to do.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that this Congress can do that will compensate these parents for the loss of their sons. We have been very liberal in this war in the matter of payments and benefits to our soldiers. I think it is only fair that we should extend this same consideration to these parents. The payment of $5,000 can only be a slight token of our appreciation for the costly sacrifice that they have laid upon the altar of freedom.

I am informed that a large number of these cases have accumulated in the Veterans' Administration. Under the present law no payment of benefits can be made unless dependency can be established. These parents had no thought of any financial gain when their sons entered the service, many by enlistment. No thought was given to insurance, as at that time we were at peace, and war was considered improbable. I think this Congress now has an opportunity to express its gratitude by making these benefits available in all cases where boys have given up their lives in the defense of their country without having in force the insurance provided for under the War Risk Insurance Act.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. O'TOOLE (at the request of Mr. KENNEDY), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. PACE (at the request of Mr. RAMSPECK), for the remainder of this week, on account of illness.

To Mr. THOMASON (at the request of Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON), for rest of this week, on account of important official business with the War Department as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs.

To Mr. SMITH of Ohio (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), for 1 day, on account of attending a funeral.

To Mr. SASSCER (at the request of Mr. WARD), for 1 day, on account of official business.

To Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for 2 days, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 247. An act for the relief of the estate of Richard Dodge Beale, deceased;

H. R. 937. An act for the relief of the estate of Luther Clyde Nanny;

H. R. 1973. An act for the relief of Albert Ferguson and Ozelle Ferguson;

H. R. 2188. An act to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2190. An act for the relief of Marguerite R. McElroy;

H. R. 2299. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of W. M. Hurley and Joe Whitson;

H. R. 3070. An act to repeal the Chinese exclusion acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3309. An act to suspend temporarily the application of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended;

H. R. 3363. An act extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made;

H. J. Res. 175. Joint resolution commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the first airplane flight by Wilbur and Orville Wright; and

H. J. Res. 199. Joint resolution to extend the time limit for immunity.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 648. An act for the relief of Arthur C. Norcutt;

S. 990. An act for the relief of the Washington, Brandywine & Point Lookout Railroad Co.;

S. 1001. An act for the relief of the Meadow Brook Club;

S. 1038. An act for the relief of Verna Mae Rossell and Winifred Rossell Mooney;

S. 1049. An act to authorize the payment of additional compensation to special counsel in the case of United States against Standard Oil Co. of California;

S. 1282. An act for the relief of Eric W. Rodgers;

S. 1290. An act for the relief of William Carroll Knox; and

S. 1315. An act providing for the transfer to the custody and control of the Secretary of the Navy of certain lands comprising a portion of Croatan National Forest in the State of North Carolina.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 9, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 3805. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 by providing insurance benefits, regardless of dependency, for the parents and other relatives

of those persons in active service who died in line of duty after October 8, 1940, and before April 20, 1942, without having in force at the time of such death insurance under the War Risk Insurance Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 3806. A bill authorizing the appointment of morticians as commissioned officers in the Medical Corps of the Army and the Medical Corps of the Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 3807. A bill to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 3808. A bill to increase allowances for clerk hire in post offices of the third class, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 3809. A bill providing for classification of clerks in third-class post offices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WILSON:

H. R. 3810. A bill to provide for the suspension of the point-rationing system with respect to meat for 60 days; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PRACHT:

H.R. 3811. A bill to protect classified civil-service employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3812 (by request). A bill to authorize suits for benefits claimed to be payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. J. Res. 204. A joint resolution to provide an orderly method of demobilization for members of the armed services of the United States; to aid in obtaining suitable employment for such persons; to provide an orderly method for speeding up and handling of claims and applications; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CASE:

H. Res. 375. A resolution requesting certain information from the Attorney General on the authority for transferring to the War Food Administrator certain duties placed by statute upon the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 3813. A bill for the relief of J. Ralph Datesman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 3814. A bill for the relief of M. Senders & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 3815. A bill to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decision of the Court of Claims in a suit instituted by the Mount Vernon, Alexandria & Washington Railway Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

H. R. 3816. A bill for the relief of Walter Acker, Jr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3959. By Mr. ARNOLD: Petition of Anna M. Lakin and 21 other residents of Kahoka, Mo., requesting the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks the enactment of prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3960. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of J. A. Austin and 19 other citizens of Fruita, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3961. Also, petition of Vernon V. Blosser and 25 other citizens of New Lebanon, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3962. Also, petition of Bertha Bovair and 17 other citizens of Glens Falls, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3963. Also, petition of Rev. Alfred Gilberg and 61 other citizens of Ashtabula, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3964. Also, petition of Mrs. Jean E. Moffatt and 40 other citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3965. Also, petition of Leona B. Clarke and 33 other citizens of Merced, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3966. Also, petition of Rev. Charles D. Patterson and 147 other citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3967. Also, petition of Elman C. Ott and 46 other citizens of Fairmount, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3968. Also, petition of Marian Mann and 47 other citizens of Lockport, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3969. Also, petition of David Ginder and 194 other citizens of Middletown, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3970. Also, petition of Bertha P. Finn and 20 other citizens of Hatboro, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3971. Also, petition of Marcum B. May and 68 other citizens of Barker, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3972. Also, petition of Rev. L. G. Armbrust and 86 other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3973. Also, petition of R. F. Mumford and 40 other citizens of Arago, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3974. Also, petition of Delmar D. Yocum and 35 other citizens of Bynumville, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3975. Also, petition of Mrs. C. N. Lorham and 34 other citizens of Culdesac, Idaho, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3976. Also, petition of D. E. Shumaker and 32 other citizens of St. Johns, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3977. Also, petition of Mrs. Malcolm Gustafson and 21 other citizens of Albert

City, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3978. Also, petition of Florence P. Cook and 40 other citizens of West Chester, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3979. Also, petition of Mrs. W. S. Wait and 22 other citizens of Perkins, Okla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3980. By Mr. CASE: Petition of John Adams, secretary of South Dakota Implement Dealers Association, urging promotion and development of a Missouri River project for flood control; to the Committee on Flood Control.

3981. Also, petition of the council on war and post-war problems, of the University of South Dakota, signed by Dean Marshall McKusick, chairman; R. F. Patterson, secretary; and Dr. I. D. Weeks, president of the University of South Dakota, urging promotion and development of a Missouri River project for flood control; to the Committee on Flood Control.

3982. By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: Petition of the railway employees in Quincy, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 3396; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3983. By Mr. HAGEN: Petition of Emelia Erickson, Alma Erickson, and 28 other citizens of Thief River Falls, Minn., advocating the passage of House bill 2082, a bill prohibiting manufacture, sale, and/or transportation of alcoholic liquors for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3984. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition of the members of Lodge No. 444, International Association of Machinists of Sioux City, Iowa, urging support of House Joint Resolution 187; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3985. By Mr. KING: Petition of Thaddeus F. Olk, of Los Angeles, Calif., signed by 235 constituents, stating that food subsidies as outlined by the President are absolutely essential in holding food prices in check and averting inflation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3986. Also, petition of members of the Brethren Church of Hermosa Beach, Calif., of which Rev. Royal D. Glick is pastor, urging passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3987. Also, petition of I. J. Spencer, of Redondo Beach, Calif., and signed by members of the Congregational Church of Redondo Beach, of which Rev. Charles Thomas is pastor, urging passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3988. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Association of Western State Engineers, adopted at Denver, Colo., October 25–26, 1943, relative to maintenance of stream gaging under the adopted policy of equal participation by the States and the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3989. Also, resolution of the Ninety-first Division Association of San Francisco, Calif., requesting that action be taken to remove the restrictions imposed by the Department of Agriculture on the growing of tobacco, and that the Department of Agriculture revise all quotas on the growing of tobacco for the manufacture of cigarettes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3990. Also, resolution of the Philippine Society of California, San Francisco, relative to remitting all charges for transportation and living expenses en route of all American repatriates returning from countries held by the enemy and where their financial resources are frozen, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3991. Also, resolution of the San Francisco Chapter, No. 3, Disabled American Veterans, dated November 4, 1943, requesting that action be taken to remove the restrictions imposed by the Department of Agriculture on manufacturers of tobacco products, including cigarettes, and, further, that the lend-lease program be restricted to a degree where it will have the use only of such surplus tobacco products and cigarettes as may be available after our armed forces have been fully and adequately supplied; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3992. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Jennie E. Hovey and others, of Howell County, Mo., urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3993. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture, relative to subsidies and price-control policies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3994. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of sundry citizens of Washington County, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, December 7, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of the living and of the living dead, Thou bringest forth Thy righteousness as the light and Thy judgment as the noonday. Cause us to hear Thy loving kindness in the morning, for in Thee do we trust.

Upon our spirits as we come today there rests the sadness of farewell at the sudden passing from our side and sight of a loved figure, who for so many years bowed in reverence here at the hour of the morning prayer and in whose thoughts daily was the ministry of the petitions here offered to those whose lives they might touch across this broad land. We thank Thee for the life and service of this servant of Thine and of the Nation, who wore ever the white flower of a blameless life; whose personal bearing stamped him as one of Thy noblemen, whose gentleness made him great, whose rare qualities of heart and mind endeared him to the Members of this body and whose very countenance was as a parchment of peace. In this temple of freedom whose courts he had trod with joyful fidelity for threescore and six years, seeing and recording the moving pageant of the Nation's life, he has lingered until the light of a coming victory over the tyranny which threatened us and all the world reddens the sky. And now, as aged Simeon of old, he has fallen on sleep at his post of service with the parting benediction, "Now lettest Thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen Thy salvation." We pray that Thou wilt pour the benediction of Thy consolation upon his dear ones who sit today in the bowed circle of grief. Bring us all to the homeland of Thine eternal love and to the inheritance of the saints in light. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, December 8, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 171) to permit the importation from foreign countries free of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

A confidential letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to personnel of the land forces on October 31, 1943; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON LICENSURE HEALING ARTS PRACTICE ACT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President of the Commission on Licensure Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission on Licensure Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

LIMITATION ON SEVERAL AGENCIES—EXPENDITURES FOR TRAVEL, PRINTING AND BINDING, AND PURCHASE OF MOTOR-PROPELLED PASSENGER-CARRYING VEHICLES

A letter from the Director of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of letters addressed to the heads of the Division of Central Administrative Services, Foreign Economic Administration, National War Labor

Board, Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, Office of Price Administration, and Office of War Information, establishing limitations on the amounts which may be expended for travel, printing and binding, and the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

LOANS BY THE R. F. C.: AMENDMENT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT—PETITION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached thereto, and appropriately referred a petition I have received from Norton County Kans., which is signed by a large number of farmers and businessmen, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 742, relating to rural electrification, introduced by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached, as follows:

NORTON, KANS., *November 2, 1943.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senior Senator from Kansas,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: The undersigned farmers and businessmen in Norton County urge your support of the pending Russell-Rankin bill (S. 742 and H. R. 878), relating to rural electrification. We feel that the passage of this bill will be of great benefit to rural areas in all parts of the United States and especially in the Middle West. Its passage, we feel, will make possible the benefits of electricity to large areas which cannot now be served.

We sincerely urge your assistance in making possible the enactment of this legislation into law.

GEORGE C. RUMSEY,
RAYMOND WENDEL,
W. S. FIELD
(And sundry other citizens of Norton County, Kans.).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1311. A bill for the relief of Dan Crotts; without amendment (Rept. No. 579);

H. R. 3076. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Arthur J. Martin, Jr., a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 580); and

H. R. 3189. A bill for the relief of Thomas Lewis; without amendment (Rept. No. 581).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1112. A bill for the relief of Taylor W. Tonge; without amendment (Rept. No. 582);

S. 1399. A bill for the relief of Frank Knowles; without amendment (Rept. No. 583);

S. 1433. A bill for the relief of Clarence A. Giddens; with an amendment (Rept. No. 584); and

S. 1484. A bill for the relief of Walter Eugene Hayes; without amendment (Rept. No. 585).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 616. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Vullo; with amendments (Rept. No. 586).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1326. A bill for the relief of Charles A. Straka; with amendments (Rept. No. 587);

H. R. 550. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Renzie Graham; without amendment (Rept. No. 588); and

H. R. 2340. A bill for the relief of the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 589).

By Mr. BURTON, from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 2131. A bill for the relief of Henry Angell; with an amendment (Rept. No. 590).

By Mr. RUSSELL (for Mr. MALONEY), from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 480. A bill for the relief of Francesco P. Mastrilli; with an amendment (Rept. No. 591).

By Mr. ANDREWS, from the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 850. A bill for the relief of George M. Louie; without amendment (Rept. No. 592); and

H. R. 1467. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Rev. Julius Paal; without amendment (Rept. No. 593).

By Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on Immigration:

S. 556. A bill for the relief of Pedro Jose Arrecoechea; without amendment (Rept. No. 594).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH:

S. 1583. A bill to provide that F-1 loans under the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loan program shall be deemed to have been made upon the same terms and conditions as F-2 loans under such program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(Mr. GILLETTE introduced Senate bill 1584, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. AUSTIN) introduced Senate bill 1585, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. 1586. A bill for the relief of Joseph Mrak; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 1587. A bill for the relief of Delbert Henson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'DANIEL:

S. 1588. A bill for the relief of Charlie Holcomb; to the Committee on Claims.

TAX UPON CERTAIN TRANSFERS OF AGRICULTURAL REAL PROPERTY

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, about 2 weeks ago I referred on this floor to the great concern existing throughout the country because of the possibility of an uncontrolled boom in land prices. At that time I introduced a bill designed to deter that trend. I also stated that the Department of Agriculture had under consideration another proposal approaching the subject in a different way. I further called attention to the fact that I was fully aware that under the Constitution revenue bills could not be originated in this body. However, I made the statement for information, with a notice that I expected to present the bill as an amendment to the first revenue bill which should be made available.

I am now sending to the desk a bill which has had the complete study of the Department of Agriculture on the same subject matter. It has been submitted to the Treasury Department, to Mr. Vinson, the Director of Economic Stabilization, and to several governmental agencies. It has at least their approval. I understand it is to be offered in the other House. But because of the time element, which is of paramount importance, I ask unanimous consent to introduce this further bill and have it printed for the information of the Senate. I give notice that it is my intention to offer it as an amendment to the revenue bill which we hope will soon be reported by the Finance Committee.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1584) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GILLETTE, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

MUSTER-OUT PAY TO MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for myself and the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] a bill dealing with mustering-out payments to members of the armed forces, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. The bill I am introducing for the senior Senator from Vermont and myself approaches the problem from a different point of view than the bill sponsored and introduced by the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. Inasmuch as hearings are to be held on this subject I desire to introduce the bill at this time.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1585) to provide mustering-out payment to members of the armed forces, introduced by Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. AUSTIN), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 171) to permit the importation from foreign countries free of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ANNA BELLE LLOYD

Mr. TYDINGS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 218), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Anna Belle Lloyd, widow of Daniel B. Lloyd, late an official reporter of debates of the Senate, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

REHABILITATION OF DEMOBILIZED VETERANS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a form letter which is being sent to Members of Congress, after having first been published by various newspapers. The letter relates to veterans of World War No. 2. I ask that it be

printed at this point in the RECORD, and that there also be printed at this point in the RECORD the reply which I am sending to the letter.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WRITE YOUR CONGRESSMAN

Date: DECEMBER 5, 1943.

Hon. Mr. WILEY,
Member of Congress, Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:

I call on you to support legislation that will provide mustering-out pay, clothing, and hospitalization facilities for discharged servicemen immediately upon their return to civilian life.

Let's not have any bemedaled apple peddlers after this war.

I wish to register my protest against the neglect of wounded, disabled, and mentally sick men of the armed forces who have been discharged without any provision for their care and treatment.

I petition you, as my Representative in Congress, to do all in your power to see that those who fought and bled to preserve the American way of life will be assured the necessities of life upon their discharge from the armed forces.

This is urgent. Please act now.

Sincerely,

Name: Mr. and Mrs. JUNIOR H. PLEUSS,
Address: *Manitowoc, Wis.*

Here is the list of your Wisconsin Senators and Congressmen. Write or wire your protest to both of your Senators and the Representative of your district at Washington at once.

SENATORS

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.
ALEXANDER WILEY.

REPRESENTATIVES

First District: LAWRENCE H. SMITH.
Second District: HARRY SAUTHOFF.
Third District: WILLIAM H. STEVENSON.
Fourth District: THAD F. WASIELEWSKI.
Fifth District: HOWARD J. MCMURRAY.
Sixth District: FRANK B. KEEFE.
Seventh District: REID F. MURRAY.
Eighth District: LA VERN R. DILWEG.
Ninth District: MERLIN HULL.
Tenth District: ALVIN E. O'KONSKI.

DEAR CONSTITUENT: I have your communication regarding relief for veterans of World War No. 2 who are returning every day from the battle fronts of the world and the training camps of the Nation to civilian life, without aid or sustenance except that which might be provided by private means or charity.

I am thoroughly in accord with your suggestion that I "support legislation that would provide mustering-out pay, clothing, and hospitalization facilities for discharged servicemen immediately upon ther return to civilian life."

However, I do not think that goes far enough. Our returning servicemen are returning with a problem far greater than can be solved in terms of dollars and cents. They are coming back, brave men who have given up everything they have lived for in order to fight a grim defense of principles we all hold dear. They have proven beyond doubt their belief in those principles.

Among those principles, certainly, is an important one—self-respect, which cannot be purchased in dollars and cents. It must be purchased by contributing our own honest share to community life. In other words, these returning veterans must have jobs.

Some time previous to receiving your communication, Thursday, December 2 last, to be exact, I presented on the floor of the Senate, bill 1566 which would provide this very service; getting jobs for our returning servicemen. At that time I expressed myself in full accord with legislation already pending for demobilization pay, social security, and insured life insurance. I have already appeared in the Senate a number of times on behalf of veterans' legislation. You may be sure that I shall continue to do so. I believe it is our most important problem. Our $300,000,000,000 debt is of the greatest importance, but greater still are these 10,000,000 returning young men who will be the ones to carry on the traditions of the past. For that matter, and considering the $300,000,000,000 debt, it will be these 10,000,000 young men who will begin the solution of that debt and our other multifarious post-war problems.

With many thanks for your interest.

Yours for victory,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF FEDERAL OLEOMARGARINE TAX—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on the subject of pending legislation to repeal the Federal tax on oleomargarine, which appears in the Appendix.]

MY WORK WITH THE TRUMAN COMMITTEE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR FERGUSON

[Mr. WHITE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "My Work With the Truman Committee," delivered by Senator FERGUSON at Washington, D. C., on December 3, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ROLL-BACK SUBSIDIES—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Holding the Line," published in the New York Times of December 9, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY DR. FRANK W. BALLOU AT TESTIMONIAL DINNER IN HIS HONOR

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Dr. Frank W. Ballou at a testimonial dinner given in his honor by the Washington Board of Trade on December 8, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning at the end of the last call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Calif.
Andrews	Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Colo.
Austin	Danaher	Kilgore
Bailey	Davis	La Follette
Ball	Downey	Langer
Bankhead	Eastland	Lodge
Barkley	Ellender	Lucas
Bridges	Ferguson	McCarran
Brooks	George	McClellan
Buck	Gerry	McFarland
Burton	Gillette	McKellar
Bushfield	Green	Maybank
Butler	Guffey	Mead
Byrd	Gurney	Millikin
Capper	Hawkes	Moore
Caraway	Hayden	Murdock
Chandler	Hill	Murray
Chavez	Holman	O'Daniel
Overton	Taft	Van Nuys
Radcliffe	Thomas, Idaho	Wallgren
Reed	Thomas, Okla.	Walsh, Mass.
Revercomb	Thomas, Utah	Walsh, N. J.
Robertson	Tobey	Wherry
Russell	Truman	White
Scrugham	Tunnell	Wiley
Shipstead	Tydings	Willis
Smith	Vandenberg	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is detained on public business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent on official business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is necessarily absent because of a bad cold.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Under the order entered at the request of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senate will proceed to consider measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 530.

JOSEPH MORET

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1325) for the relief of Joseph Moret, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$17,191.66" and insert "$5,845.16", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Joseph Moret, of Palm City, Calif., the sum of $5,845.16, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation (1) for the death of his wife, Ella Moret, who died as a result of personal injuries sustained by her when a United States Navy airplane crashed into the private residence of the said Joseph Moret in Palm City, Calif., on February 17, 1943; and (2) for damage to his grounds, residence, and personal property as a result of such accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT GRIFFIN

The bill (H. R. 302) for the relief of Robert Griffin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAMUEL J. D. MARSHALL

The bill (H. R. 2545) for the relief of Samuel J. D. Marshall was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VICTOR H. LOFTUS

The bill (H. R. 3299) for the relief of Victor H. Loftus was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

W. R. JORDAN AND MABEL JORDAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1391) for the relief of W. R. Jordan and Mabel Jordan, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$4,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to W. R. Jordan and Mabel Jordan, of Luverne, N. Dak., the sum of $4,000, in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for compensation for the death of their son, John Jordan, who died of injuries sustained by him as the result of an accident which occurred when the automobile in which he was riding was struck by a truck used for and under the control of the Work Projects Administration near Edinburg, N. Dak., on August 14, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. J. D. PRICE

The bill (H. R. 1640) for the relief of Mrs. J. D. Price was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RONALD A. COX

The bill (H. R. 1933) for the relief of Ronald A. Cox was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CARL SWANSON, GERALDINE CECELIA SWANSON, A MINOR, AND ALMER SWANSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1875) for the relief of Carl Swanson, Geraldine Cecelia Swanson, a minor, and Almer Swanson, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 2, line 2, after the words "sum of," to strike out "$2,500" and insert "$1,574.05."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

THE POLL TAX

The bill (H. R. 7) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other elections for national offices, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

TEMPORARY ADDITIONAL PAY FOR EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE OF RURAL CARRIERS

The bill (H. R. 2080) to provide temporary additional pay for equipment maintenance for each carrier in Rural Mail Delivery Service was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COURT REPORTERS IN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 620) to authorize the appointment of court reporters for the district courts of the United States to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments.

The first amendment of the committee was, in section 1, page 2, line 1, after the name "District of Columbia," to insert "and the district courts in the Territories and insular possessions"; in line 4, after the period, to insert "The number of reporters to be so appointed shall be determined by the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges (hereinafter referred to as the judicial conference)"; in line 13, after the period, to strike out "The number of reporters to be so appointed shall be determined by the Judicial Conference of the Senior Circuit Judges (hereinafter referred to as the judicial conference)"; on page 3, line 14, after the word "parties," to insert "with the approval of the sitting judge"; in line 24, after the word "recorded," to insert "and has agreed to pay the fee therefor"; on page 4, line 4, after the word "certify" to insert "all pleas and proceedings in connection with the imposition of sentence in criminal proceedings and"; in line 11, after the word "proceeding," to insert "such transcript shall be prima facie evidence in any court of the proceedings therein reported, and the same shall be forthwith certified by the clerk as having been filed"; in line 14, to strike out "No transcripts" and insert "Transcripts"; in line 14, after the word "of," to insert "evidence taken, argument offered, or oral utterances made in the course of"; in line 17, to strike out "except those" and to insert "when"; in line 18, after the word "appointed," to insert "when approved by the court"; on page 5, line 6, after the words "per annum" to strike out "except that if the amount of time any reporter is required to attend upon the court in the performance of his duties exceeds 30 weeks annually, as determined by the judicial conference, the salary may in the discretion of the judicial conference be fixed in that instance at an amount not exceeding $5,000 per annum"; on page 5, after the word "employment," in line 15, to strike out "Necessary equipment and supplies for recording the proceedings shall be furnished to the reporter by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts"; in line 18, after the word "All" to strike out "other"; in line 19, after the word "expense" and the period, to strike out "in addition, the" and to insert "The"; in line 24, after the word "conference" and the period, to strike out "The fees for transcripts furnished to a judge for his personal use shall be paid by the United States out of money appropriated for that purpose"; on page 6, line 11, after the word "judge" to insert "or a circuit judge," so as to make the section read:

That the Judicial Code (act of March 3, 1911, 36 Stat. 1089, as amended) is hereby amended by inserting after section 5 thereof a new section 5a, entitled "Court Reporters," as follows:

"SEC. 5a. Court reporters.—

"(a) Appointment: Each district court of the United States, including the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia and the district courts in the Territories and insular possessions, shall appoint one or more court reporters for the district court in the manner provided for the appointment of the clerks of said courts. The number of reporters to be so appointed shall be determined by the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges (hereinafter referred to as the judicial conference). The persons to be so appointed shall possess the qualifications necessary for the satisfactory performance of the duties specified in subdivision (b) of this section, to be determined by standards which shall be formulated from time to time by the judicial conference, and shall take an oath to perform faithfully such duties. The court, with the approval of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts (hereinafter referred to as the Director) may appoint additional reporters for temporary service not exceeding 3 months, when there is more reporting work in the district than can be promptly performed by the authorized number of reporters and the urgency is so great as to render it impracticable to obtain the approval of the judicial conference. If the court and the judicial conference are of the opinion that in any district it is in the public interest that the duties of reporter should be combined with those of any other employee of the court, the judicial conference may authorize such a combination of positions and fix the salary therefor, as provided by subsection (c) hereof, any provision of law to the contrary notwithstanding.

"(b) Duties: One of the reporters so appointed for each district court shall attend at each session of the court and at every other proceeding that may be designated by rule of procedure or order of court or by one of the judges of the court, and shall record verbatim by shorthand or by mechanical means (1) all proceedings in criminal cases had in open court, whether in connection

with plea, trial, or sentence; (2) all proceedings in all other cases had in open court unless the parties with the approval of the sitting judge shall specifically agree to the contrary; and (3) such other proceedings as a judge of the court may direct or as may be required by rule of procedure or order of the court or as may be requested by any party to the proceeding. The reporter shall attach his official certificate to the original shorthand notes or other original records so taken and promptly file them with the clerk of the court, who shall preserve them in the public records of the court for not less than 10 years. Upon the request of any party to any proceeding which has been so recorded and has agreed to pay the fee therefor or of a judge of the court, the reporter shall promptly transcribe the original records of the requested parts of the proceedings and attach thereto his official certificate, and shall then deliver the transcript to the party or judge making the request. He shall also transcribe and certify all pleas and proceedings in connection with the imposition of sentence in criminal proceedings and such other parts of the record of proceedings as may be required by rule of procedure or order of court. The reporter shall promptly deliver to the clerk for the records of the court a certified copy of any transcript that he may make of any part of the record of any proceeding, such transcript shall be prima facie evidence in any court of the proceedings therein reported, and the same shall be forthwith certified by the clerk as having been filed. Transcripts of evidence taken, argument offered, or oral utterances made in the course of the proceedings of the court shall be considered as official when made from the records taken by the reporter so appointed when approved by the court. The said original notes or other original records and the said copy of transcript shall be open to inspection in the office of the clerk as provided by law with respect to books containing the docket or minute of judgments, or decrees thereof.

"(c) Compensation: Each reporter so appointed shall receive an annual salary, to be fixed from time to time by the judicial conference and to be paid in the same manner and at the same time that the salary of the clerk of the court is paid. In fixing such salary the judicial conference shall take into account in each instance the amount of time the reporter is required to be in attendance upon the court engaged in the performance of his duties. Such salary shall not exceed $3,000 per annum. The reporter shall also receive his traveling expenses and expenses incurred for subsistence within the limitations prescribed by law for clerks of district courts while necessarily absent on official business from the place of his regular employment. All supplies shall be furnished by the reporter at his own expense. The reporter may charge and collect from parties, including the United States, who request transcripts, such fees therefor and no other, as may be prescribed from time to time by the court subject to the approval of the judicial conference. No fee shall be charged or taxed for any copy of a transcript delivered to the clerk for the records of the court as required by subdivision (b) of this section. Fees for transcripts furnished in criminal or habeas corpus proceedings to persons allowed to sue, defend, or appeal in forma pauperis shall be paid by the United States out of money appropriated for that purpose; and the fees for transcripts furnished in other than criminal or habeas corpus proceedings to persons permitted to appeal in forma pauperis shall also be paid by the United States if the trial judge or a circuit judge shall certify that the appeal is not frivolous but presents a substantial question. Except as to transcripts that are to be paid for by the United States, the reporter may require any party requesting a transcript to prepay the estimated fee therefor in advance of delivery of the transcript.

"(d) Administration: The judicial conference shall supervise and direct the administration of this section. Subject to this section and pertinent laws, it shall be the duty of the court to supervise and direct the reporter in the performance of his duties, including dealings with parties requesting transcript. The Director shall prescribe records which shall be maintained and reports which shall be filed by the reporter. Such records shall be inspected and audited in the same manner as the records and accounts of the clerk and may include records showing (1) the quantity of transcripts prepared, (2) the fees charged and the fees collected for transcripts, (3) any expenses incurred by the reporter in connection with transcripts, (4) the amount of time the reporter is in attendance upon the court for the purpose of recording proceedings, and (5) such other information as the Director may determine.

"(e) Taxation of fees as costs: In the discretion of the court any part or all of the fees for transcripts may be taxed as costs in the case. Fees paid by the United States for transcripts furnished to persons allowed to appeal in civil cases in forma pauperis shall be taxed in favor of the United States as costs in the case."

The amendments were agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 7, after line 13, to strike out section 2, as follows:

SEC. 2. All laws or parts of laws inconsistent or repugnant to the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 7, to change the section number from "3" to "2."

The amendments were agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 7, after line 19, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. (a) Upon request of the appellant, the record on appeal, under rules 75 and 76 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, shall be printed by a printer designated by the appellant.

(b) The Supreme Court shall prescribe uniform rules for the form and printing of briefs and records on appeals from the district courts of the United States, including the district courts of Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Canal Zone, and the Virgin Islands, to the United States Circuit Courts of Appeals and the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. VAN NUYS subsequently said: Mr. President, order of business 541 on the calendar, Senate bill 620, relating to the appointment of reporters for the United States courts, was passed today on the call of the unanimous-consent calendar. House bill 3611, which is a similar bill, is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary. I ask unanimous consent that that committee may be discharged from the further consideration of the House bill; that the House bill may be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the Senate bill as passed today; that as thus amended it be passed; and that the vote on the Senate bill aforementioned be reconsidered and the bill indefinitely postponed. This is for the purpose of correcting the parliamentary status of the bill and making the RECORD correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

USE OF EMBLEM AND NAME OF THE RED CROSS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 469) to implement article 28 of the convention signed at Geneva on July 27, 1929, relating to the use of the emblem and name of the Red Cross, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am informed that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] desires to offer an amendment to that bill, and I ask that it be temporarily passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be temporarily passed over.

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 93) declaring the policy of the Congress with respect to the independence of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc. That is is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the United States shall drive the treacherous, invading Japanese from the Philippine Islands, restore as quickly as possible the orderly and free democratic processes of government to the Filipino people, and thereupon establish the complete independence of the Philippine Islands as a separate and self-governing nation.

SEC. 2. After negotiation with the President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, or the President of the Filipino Republic, the President of the United States is hereby authorized by such means as he finds appropriate to withhold or to acquire and retain such bases, necessary appurtenances to such bases, and the rights incident thereto, in addition to any provided for by the act of March 24, 1934, as he may deem necessary for the full and mutual protection of the Philippine Islands and of the United States.

SEC. 3. In order speedily to effectuate the policy declared in section 1, the President of the United States is hereby authorized, after consultation with the President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, to advance the date of the independence of the Philippine Islands by proclaiming their independence as a separate and self-governing nation prior to July 4, 1946.

SEC. 4. Meanwhile the resources of the United States, both of men and materials, are pledged for continued use to redeem the Philippines from the invader and to speed the day of ultimate and complete independence for the people of the Philippine Islands.

The preamble was agreed to.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 94) establishing the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission, defining its powers and duties, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. I ask that the joint resolution be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

MRS. C. W. SELBY

The bill (H. R. 3039) for the relief of Mrs. C. W. Selby, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WISCONSIN ELECTRIC POWER CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1324) for the relief of the Wisconsin Electric Power Co., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 2, line 1, after the words "intersection of" to strike out "South" and insert "North", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Wisconsin Electric Power Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., the sum of $5,433.75, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for compensation for damage to its property which resulted when an employee of the Works Progress Administration drove an automatic air-driven tool into an underground cable, owned by the said company, near the intersection of North Sixth and West Canal Streets in Milwaukee, Wis., on September 23, 1937: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REGISTRATION FEES OF SECURITIES EXCHANGES

The bill (S. 1146) to amend section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is amended to read as follows:

"REGISTRATION FEES

"SEC. 31. Every national securities exchange shall pay to the Commission on or before March 15 of each calendar year a registration fee for the privilege of doing business as a national securities exchange during the preceding calendar year or any part thereof. Such fee shall be in an amount equal to one five-hundredth of 1 percent of the aggregate dollar amount of the sales of securities (other than securities which are direct obligations of or obligations guaranteed as to principal or interest by the United States or such securities issued or guaranteed by corporations in which the United States has direct or indirect interest as shall be designated for exemption from the provisions of this section by the Secretary of the Treasury) transacted on such national securities exchange during the preceding calendar year and subsequent to its registration as a national securities exchange."

INVESTIGATION CONCERNING MATERIALS NO LONGER NEEDED FOR WAR PURPOSES

The resolution (S. Res. 195) requesting an investigation concerning Government property and materials no longer needed for war purposes was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the President is hereby requested to direct the appropriate executive agency or agencies to make a study and investigation with respect to (1) the types, quantities, cost, location, and custody of those war materials and other tangible property, real and personal, owned or controlled or hereafter acquired or controlled by or in behalf of the Government of the United States, which are or shall become no longer needed for war purposes; (2) the adequacy of current records and inventory controls to keep the Congress and the Executive informed as to the foregoing particulars with respect to such materials and property; and (3) those modifications in the methods of keeping such records and maintaining such controls which may be necessary to make the above information readily available to the appropriate Government authorities. The President is requested to report to the Senate within 3 months after adoption of this resolution and at intervals of not more than 3 months thereafter until such study is completed, concerning the results thereof together with his recommendations.

Mr. MURRAY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which Senate Resolution 195, Calendar No. 550, was agreed to be reconsidered, and that the resolution be restored to the calendar. I do so at the request of the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote by which Senate Resolution 195 was agreed to is reconsidered, and the resolution is restored to the calendar.

HECTOR H. PERRY

The bill (S. 296) for the relief of Hector H. Perry was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers Hector H. Perry, who was a member of the Medical Detachment, Second Regiment United States Engineers, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a member of that organization on the 21st day of September 1928: *Provided*, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

APPOINTMENT OF GREGORY BOYINGTON A FIRST LIEUTENANT IN MARINE CORPS

The bill (S. 1427) to authorize the appointment of Gregory Boyington a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps was considered, order to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint Gregory Boyington, formerly a first lieutenant, United States Marine Corps, a first lieutenant on the active list of the Marine Corps, with the same date of rank and precedence held by him under such former commission: *Provided*, That the said Gregory Boyington shall be an additional number in the grade of first lieutenant, and to any to which he may hereafter be appointed: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to entitle the said Gregory Boyington to any back pay, allowances, or other emoluments by reason of the enactment of this act.

ACQUISITION AND CONVERSION OR CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN VESSELS FOR THE UNITED STATES NAVY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1544) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels, landing craft, and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes, which was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to acquire and convert or to undertake the construction of 2,500,000 tons, or such portion thereof as may be directed by the President of auxiliary vessels and 1,000,000 tons of landing craft and district craft, such auxiliary vessels, landing craft and district craft to be of such size, type, and design as the Secretary may consider best suited for the prosecution of the war, such vessels to be in addition to those heretofore authorized.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That no sums expended by the Maritime Commission from funds appropriated to it for the construction of vessels which are transferred to the Navy shall be reimbursed from naval appropriations, except to the extent of agreements existing on the effective date of this act: *Provided further*, That vessels acquired by the Navy from the Maritime Commission without reimbursement shall not be disposed of except by return to the Maritime Commission.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of that bill?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, this is one of a series of bills designed to authorize the Navy Department to proceed with the construction of certain auxiliary vessels, landing craft, and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes. The legislation is desired in order to increase speedily and quickly the number of landing craft and vessels which will be needed in the event of an invasion in Europe. The report of the committee shows the amount of tonnage of vessels of this character which has been authorized in the past.

The bill seeks to authorize the construction of 2,500,000 tons of auxiliary vessels, and 1,000,000 tons of landing craft and district craft. Such craft are to be additional to all auxiliary vessels or craft heretofore authorized. It is simply a continuation of authorizations already made from time to time in permitting the Navy Department to go forward in increasing the number of its auxiliary vessels and landing craft.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is there any estimate of the expense involved in the construction of these vessels?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Approximately $5,000,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Five billion dollars?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Yes.

In this connection Mr. President, I ask that the report of the committee be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report (No. 547) is as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1544) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels, landing craft, and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire and convert, or to undertake the construction of, 2,500,000 tons of auxiliary vessels and 1,000,000 tons of landing craft and district craft. Such craft are to be additional to all auxiliary vessels or craft heretofore authorized. The bill authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to effectuate its purposes.

Recent similar authorizations, parts of which remain unassigned, are as follows:

	Tons authorized	Tons obligated or tentatively obligated	Tons balance
Act of June 14, 1940	75,000	75,000	None
Act of July 19, 1940	100,000	100,000	None
Act of May 24, 1941	550,000	549,521	479
Act of Dec. 17, 1941, Amending act of May 24, 1941	800,000	799,235	765
Act of July 9, 1942	1,200,000	1,198,746	1,254
Act of June 17, 1943	1,000,000	921,609	78,391
Act of May 26, 1943	1,000,000	996,064	3,936
	4,725,000	4,640,175	84,825

Representatives of the Navy Department appeared before the committee in executive session and stated that the number and types of ships and craft covered by the bill are required in the conduct of the war. The details of some of the requirements were furnished the committee.

The function of auxiliary vessels is primarily to service and maintain the combatant fleet. Most of the additional auxiliary vessels required are for assisting landing craft in amphibious operations. By far the greater portion of the auxiliary tonnage authorized by the bill will be constructed for the Navy by the Maritime Commission. As specified in the act of June 17, 1943, the Navy is required to maintain full control of these ships which are to be manned and operated by the Navy.

The specific plans of operations require that the Navy obligate at once for about 1,800,000 of the 2,500,000 tons of auxiliary vessels authorized by this bill. The Navy estimates that its unforeseen requirements will run about 80,000 tons per month in addition to the foregoing. The bill is designed to give the Navy an operating margin for a reasonable length of time, when they can return to the Naval Affairs Committee to present further developments and requirements.

The act of May 26, 1943 (Public Law 61, 78th Cong.), provided for 1,000,000 tons of landing and district craft. Of this total approximately 996,064 tons have been obligated.

The developments of the war situation indicate that further demands will be made by the operating forces for additional landing and district craft in substantial amounts, and plans have already been laid for increases in the program. These plans must be held in abeyance until further tonnage authorizations are granted. The Navy must obtain authorizations from the Congress to replace losses in landing craft and district craft. It is known that demands will be made for additional landing craft to carry on the war and to replace losses. Authorization for a million tons of landing and district craft is considered necessary to cover these prospective requirements. It may be necessary for the Navy representatives to return to Congress to present additional requirements for landing craft and district craft at a later date. This will necessarily be dictated by the progress of the war.

There are approximately 12 types of landing craft which will require about 800,000 tons of the million included in the bill. Most of those types are familiar to everyone through the press accounts of successful amphibious operations throughout the world. The remaining 200,000 tons will provide small types of vessels such as tugs, oil and gasoline barges, lighters, tenders, and many other different designs to furnish essential services to the operating task forces at advance bases in the various theaters of operations.

Section 2 of the bill authorizes to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of the act. It provides that if money appropriated to the Maritime Commission is used in the construction of these vessels, the Navy shall not reimburse the Commission. This is inserted for the purpose of obviating a double obligation for the same purpose and in no way interferes with the Navy's responsibilities as laid down by the Congress.

A further provision of section 2 of the bill is that vessels acquired by the Navy from the Maritime Commission without reimbursement shall not be disposed of except by return to the Commission. The decision as to when such vessels shall be returned to the Maritime Commission rests solely with the Navy Department.

The bill was introduced at the request of the Navy Department and has been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget. The cost of the additional tonnage authorized by the bill is estimated at $5,300,000,000.

The following letter from the Secretary of the Navy, addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, is hereby made a part of this report:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, November 23, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels, landing craft, and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire and convert or undertake the construction of 2,500,000 tons of auxiliary vessels and 1,000,000 tons of landing craft and district craft additional to those heretofore authorized.

A review of the auxiliary vessel requirements for the Navy which has just been completed indicates that there is urgent need for additional authorization for a total amount of 2,500,000 tons. This amount includes a considerable tonnage of large transports being built by the Maritime Commission that were originally intended to be operated by the War Shipping Administration for the Army. Subsequent to the introduction of the last authorization bill for 1,000,000 tons of auxiliary tonnage (H. R. 1563; Public Law 72, 78th Cong., approved June 17, 1943) it was decided to transfer those ships to the Navy for manning and operation. Revised plans and estimates account for the remainder of the tonnage requested.

The Act of May 26, 1943 (Public Law 61, 78th Cong.), provided for 1,000,000 tons of landing and district craft for the Navy. Of this total approximately 955,000 tons had been obligated as of October 15, 1943. The developments of the war situation indicate that further demands will be made by the operating forces for additional landing and district craft in substantial amounts, and plans have already been laid for increases in the program for which the small balance of approximately 45,000 tons still remaining from the previous authorization will be altogether inadequate. These plans must be held in abeyance until further tonnage authorization becomes available.

Landing craft and district craft are not replaceable when lost, but must be replaced from additional authorized tonnage. It is known that demands will be made for additional landing craft to carry on the war and to replace losses. Authorization for 1,000,000 tons of landing and district craft is considered necessary to cover these prospective requirements.

The cost of the additional tonnage authorized by the proposed legislation is estimated at $5,300,000,000.

The Navy Department recommends that the proposed legislation be enacted into law.

The Navy Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK KNOX.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FORTY-SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT, NATIONAL SOCIETY OF DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The resolution (S. Res. 215) to print the Forty-sixth Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution as a Senate document was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Forty-sixth Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1943, be printed as a Senate document.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1323) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret M. Ross was announced as next in order.

Mrs. CARAWAY. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

RESERVATION OF PUBLIC DOMAIN LANDS IN ARIZONA FOR ADDITION TO HAVASUPAI INDIAN RESERVATION

The bill (S. 1000) to reserve certain public-domain lands in the State of Arizona for addition to the Havasupai Indian Reservation, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask that the bill be passed over.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request so that I may make an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. The passage of this measure is necessary, and I will explain why. The State of Arizona acquired a certain land-grant area, which included the only springs the Havasupai Indians were using to water their stock. Subsequently the land was leased by the State, and the lessee put in a fence, and when the Indians' cattle came up there they

died for lack of water. The only water is at the head of the canyon.

I brought the matter to the attention of the Interior Department, which was agreeable to an exchange whereby it would take other land and let the Indians recover the land in question and add it to the Indian reservation.

Mr. McCARRAN. The measure pertains only to the State of Arizona?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. It pertains to the one case in the State of Arizona?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. The proposal is approved by the State land department.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 5, 8, 17, and 20 of township 30 north, range 2 west, of the Gila and Salt River base and meridian, Arizona, on the public domain, be, and the same are hereby, permanently reserved as an addition to the Havasupai Indian Reservation. This withdrawal is made subject to valid existing rights of any persons thereto initiated prior to August 29, 1940, the date on which these lands were temporarily withdrawn from further disposition by the Secretary of the Interior pending the enactment of legislation adding them to the Havasupai Indian Reservation.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to exchange lands within the area described in section 1 with the State of Arizona for all or a portion of the State-owned lands identified as sections 28 and 29, township 30 north, range 2 west, and the west half section 32, township 31 north, range 2 west, Gila and Salt River base and meridian. The lands received from the State under such exchange shall become a part of the Havasupai Indian Reservation.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to purchase certain improvements on the State-owned lands from the lessee of said lands, at a price to be agreed upon by and between the contracting parties. The sum of $11,100, or as much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to purchase said improvements.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND WITHIN THE CARSON NATIONAL FOREST, N. MEX.

The bill (S. 1488) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to Jose C. Romero all right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain described tract of land within the Carson National Forest, N. Mex., was announced as next in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill? It provides for conveyance of public property.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the bill was introduced at the suggestion of the Department of Agriculture. It appears that for many years Romero has been in possession of the 12 or 13 acres of land which are involved. His family was reared there, but there was some doubt with respect to the title. Both the Department of Agriculture and the Interior Department are satisfied that the land should have a good title. That is all there is to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with an amendment, on page 2, line 15, after the words "land, the" to strike out "Secretary of Agriculture," and insert "Secretary of the Interior," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in recognition of the following facts (1) that Jose C. Romero, of Trampas, N. Mex., had by purchase and possession established a major equitable interest in certain lands comprising a portion of the Las Trampas Grant prior to the acquisition of said grant by the United States through an exchange consummated under the provisions of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 643), whereby said grant become a part of the Carson National Forest, (2) that the said area purchased and possessed by the said Jose C. Romero has been specifically delineated by a survey commenced June 16, 1941, and completed June 18, 1941, by Aaron F. Jones, senior engineering aide, of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, whose field notes of said survey have been accepted and filed by said Department and show the area claimed by said Jose C. Romero to be 12.324 acres, and (3) the said Forest Service has found and stated that the equities of the said Jose C. Romero are such as to warrant conveyance to him of title to the said described 12.324 acres of land, the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed on behalf of the United States to execute a quit-claim deed conveying to the said Jose C. Romero, his heirs, successors, or assigns, all right, title, and interest which the United States now holds in the said described lands.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to Jose C. Romero all right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain described tract of land within the Carson National Forest, N. Mex."

GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1388) to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the construction of a scenic parkway to provide an appropriate view of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question with reference to this type of proposed legislation, and perhaps some member of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys can answer. I should like to know whether or not when donations are accepted of tracts of land which will be contiguous to a highway which the Government is to construct in this park, there will be reserved to the donor such select sites as will give him a monopoly on the use of the property, for example, for hotel purposes, or for similar development to his own personal and peculiar advantage.

I notice that the bill provides that the highway is to be of such width as to comprise an average of 125 acres per mile for its entire length. Obviously, the average might be approximating zero at one point and 300 feet or so at another. I should like to know what the idea is. Perhaps some member of the committee can explain for the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will ask if any member of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys is present.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I should like to have the bill go over, subject to the Senate receiving such explanation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3428) to amend sections 6, 7, and 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska," was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1232) to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill from some member of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys? If no member of the committee is prepared to offer an explanation at this time I ask that the bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

ADDITION OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE SEQUOIA NATIONAL PARK, CALIF.

The bill (H. R. 2641) to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain lands for addition to the Sequoia National Park was announced as next in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] explain this House bill?

Mr. ANDREWS. The purpose of the bill is to permit the Federal Government to acquire for addition to the Sequoia National Park, withcut the outlay of Federal money, certain privately owned land situated near the Ash Mountain entrance to the park. The private property would be acquired in exchange for federally owned land of equal value, and the addition to the park of this land, which adjoins the park entrance, would give proper Federal control and protection to the entrance from undesirable developments.

The same situation exists at Estes Park, Colo., where the committee of which I am a member has for some time been attempting to adjust the situation, in order to preserve the beauty of the park and to prevent encroachments by juke joints and similar establishments. That is the purpose of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2461) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM J. BURNS INTERNATIONAL DETECTIVE AGENCY

The bill (S. 1494) for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency was announced as next in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana explain the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the bill is for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency, for work the agency did in California in protecting certain property of the Government. After the agency had worked for approximately 6 or 8 months, an old statute was found, wherein it was provided that the War Department could not employ a private detective agency in order to protect Government property. Of course, the War Department, when it found that such a law existed, stopped the work of the agency. But for the work the agency had already done, the War Department concluded that since the work had been done by the agency in good faith, it should be compensated.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, that statute is one which should not be overlooked by the executive departments. I shall not object in the present instance, but if any further contracts of this kind are entered into, I desire to serve notice now on both the departments and any detective agency which might be employed by them that if I am here I shall object to bills such as this.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1494), which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the figures "$1,402.50," to strike out "with interest at 6 percent per annum from July 26, 1942, to the date of payment thereof,"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the William J. Burns International Detective Agency, the sum of $1,402.50, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for compensation for services rendered the War Relocation Authority, from June 22 to July 26, 1942, in providing guards for the protection of alien and evacuee property stored in warehouses at various points in the State of California, the payment of such claim being prohibited by the provisions of the act of March 3, 1893 (27 Stat. 591; U. S. C., title 5, sec. 53): *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLARE A. MILLER

The bill (H. R. 977) for the relief of Clare A. Miller was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GERALD ESTELL PROCTOR

The bill (H. R. 1379) for the relief of Gerald Estell Proctor was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

C. J. TOOLE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 636) for the relief of C. J. Toole, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, before the word "in," to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PAUL W. BUSBEY AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1344) for the relief of Paul W. Busbey, Mrs. Paul W. Busbey, Paula Busbey, and Mrs. Louisa Busbey, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$2,298.13", and insert "$1,798.13"; in line 8, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000", and insert "$3,000"; in line 10, after the word "all", to insert "their"; and on page 2, line 1, before the word "against", to insert "including medical and hospital expenses."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be grossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 470) to implement article 28 of the convention signed at Geneva on July 27, 1929, relating to the use of the coat of arms of the Swiss Confederation for commercial or other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Let the bill go over.

Mr. DAVIS. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 866) to fix the compensation of registers of the district land offices in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 91) to aid in effectuating the purposes of the Railway Labor Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the measure is a very important one. I assume that the Senator from Missouri does not desire to have it considered on the call of the Consent Calendar; does he?

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask that the joint resolution be passed over.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I had hoped the joint resolution would be considered during the call of the calendar. I can give an explanation, if one is desired.

Mr. BYRD. The measure certainly represents very important legislation. Obviously it cannot be considered under the 5-minute limitation on debate during the call of the consent calendar.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have asked that the joint resolution be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being heard, the joint resolution will be passed over.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the joint resolution is passed over, may we have an understanding that the Senator from Missouri will move, immediately upon completion of the calendar, that the joint resolution be taken up?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, such an understanding has been had for at least a week.

Mr. REED. I am sorry I did not know that, Mr. President.

LUCILLE SLEET

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1164) for the relief of Lucille Sleet, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 4, after the words "directed to", to strike out "pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lucille Sleet, of Cincinnati, Ohio, the sum of $100, together with interest thereon at 6 percent per annum from January 1, 1923, to the date of payment, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for redemption of certain War Savings stamps, series of 1918, issued to her but later destroyed by fire: *Provided*, That such Lucille Sleet shall first file in the Treasury Department a bond in a penal sum of double the amount of the payment provided for by this act, in such form and with such surety or sureties as may be acceptable to the Secretary of the Treasury, to indemnify and save harmless the United States from any loss on account of such stamps", and insert "redeem in favor of Lucille Sleet, of Cincinnati, Ohio, certain War Savings stamps, series of 1918, issued to her but later destroyed by fire, such redemption to be in the amount of $100."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to redeem in favor of Lucille Sleet, of Cincinnati, Ohio, certain War Savings stamps, series of 1918, issued to her but later destroyed by fire, such redemption to be in the amount of $100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COL. ANDERSON F. PITTS

The bill (S. 1528) for the relief of Col. Anderson F. Pitts was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and

directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Anderson F. Pitts, colonel, Field Artillery, the sum of $2,648, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for a like amount paid by him from personal funds in the settlement of the accounts of the Service Club, One Hundred and Eighty-fourth Field Artillery, Battle Creek., Mich., which was established with the approval and liquidated by direction of his commanding officer.

LEE S. BRADSHAW

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 933) for the relief of Lee S. Bradshaw, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, line 6, after the words "satisfaction of", to strike out "his" and insert "all."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, in line 7, after the word "for", to strike out "compensation for personal injuries and" and insert "loss of earnings."

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, insofar as the amendment in line 8—to insert the words "loss of earnings"—is concerned, I have no objection. I do object to the amendment in line 7, to strike out the words "compensation for personal injuries and." I ask that the Senate not agree to the amendment in line 7.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment beginning in line 7.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 2, line 2, after the figures "1941", to strike out "and for damage to such truck as a result of such accident."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, has the amendment in line 8 been agreed to?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The words in italics in line 8 went out, and the original text in line 7 remained in, on the voice vote which was just taken.

The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, line 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lee S. Bradshaw, of Grovetown, Ga., the sum of $789.60, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and property damage sustained by him, and medical and hospital expenses incurred by him as the result of an accident which occurred when the truck which he was driving was struck by a United States Army truck near Augusta, Ga., on November 14, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

CARL M. FRASURE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1477) for the relief of Carl M. Frasure, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$620" and insert "$506.91."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Carl M. Frasure, formerly an employee of the Office of Price Administration, the sum of $506.91, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for accrued annual leave, the payment of which was prevented by the provisions of the eighth proviso in the paragraph under the caption "Office of Price Administration" contained in the National War Agencies Appropriation Act, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

COL. E. H. TARBUTTON

The bill (H. R. 255) for the relief of Col. E. H. Tarbutton was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RAILROAD BRIDGE AT OR NEAR RANDOLPH, MO.

The bill (S. 1504) to extend the time for completing the construction of a railroad bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for completing the construction of the railroad bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo., authorized to be constructed, maintained, and operated by Frank O. Lowden, James E. Gorman, and Joseph B. Fleming, trustees of the estate of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., their successors and assigns, by an act of Congress approved August 7, 1939, heretofore extended by act of Congress approved June 6, 1940, is hereby further extended 4 years from August 7, 1944.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

WOMEN'S RESERVE OF THE COAST GUARD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1616) to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments, on page 2, to strike out lines 9 to 16 inclusive, as follows:

Strike out section 404 and substitute therefore the following:

SEC. 404. Members of the Women's Reserve shall not be assigned to duty on board vessels of the Navy or Coast Guard, or in combat aircraft at any time. No such member who is qualified to fill an available billet at Coast Guard Headquarters proper at Washington shall be assigned to duty outside the continental United States.

And after line 16, to strike out:

SEC. 2. Each member of the Women's Reserve who was enlisted or commissioned therein on or prior to the date this act is approved shall be restricted to the performance of shore duty within the continental United States, unless and until she shall voluntarily sign a general waiver of said restriction.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MOSS LANDING HARBOR, MONTEREY BAY, CALIF.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1233), to authorize the construction and maintenance of Moss Landing Harbor (Monterey Bay), Calif., which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment on page 1, line 8, after the word "Engineers" to insert: *"Provided, however*, That the construction of such project shall not be commenced until responsible local agencies have given assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of War that they will (a) provide without cost to the United States all necessary rights-of-way, together with suitably bulkheaded disposal areas, for the construction and maintenance of the project, when and as required by the Secretary of War, and (b) hold and save the United States free from damages resulting from construction work", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the improvement of Moss Landing Harbor, Calif., is hereby adopted and authorized in the interest of maintaining and increasing fish production essential for the war program, the project estimated to cost $350,000, to be prosecuted as speedily as possible under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers: *Provided, however*, That the construction of such project shall not be commenced until responsible local agencies have given assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of War that they will (a) provide without cost to the United States all necessary rights-of-way, together with suitably bulkheaded disposal areas, for the construction and maintenance of the project, when and as required by the Secretary of War, and (b) hold and save the United States free from damages resulting from construction work.

SEC. 2. Any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for "Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works" shall be available for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 1 of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 186) to provide for the proper observance of the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of the adoption of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1335) to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain, as

amended," was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN OIL AND GAS LEASES

The bill (S. 1576) to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases was announced as next in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from West Virginia has requested an explanation of Senate bill 1576.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, explanation has been made to me, and I withdraw the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after "December 31", to strike out "1943" and insert "1944", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act of July 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 726), entitled "An act to grant a preference right to certain oil and gas leases," is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The term of any 5-year lease expiring prior to December 31, 1944, maintained in accordance with the applicable statutory requirements and regulations and for which no preference right to a new lease is granted by this section, is hereby extended to December 31, 1944."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF A CERTAIN BUILDING TO AMERICAN LEGION POST, ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

The bill (S. 1417) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to donate and convey on behalf of the United States, to Jack Henry Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, Anchorage, Alaska, the wood-frame building, known as the Telephone and Telegraph Building, located on lots 7 and 8 in block 17, Anchorage townsite, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to donate and convey, on behalf of the United States, to Jack Henry Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, Anchorage, Alaska, that certain wood-frame building, known as the Telephone and Telegraph Building, located on land owned by said Jack Henry Post, No. 1, designated as lots 7 and 8 in block 17, Anchorage townsite, Alaska.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1418) to provide for the adjustment of maximum prices on milk, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. MURRAY and other Senators asked that the bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

That completes the calendar.

PHOENIX-TEMPE STONE CO.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revert to Calendar No. 237, Senate bill 375, for the relief of the Phoenix-Tempe Stone Co. I was not present the other day when the Senator from Connecticut asked that the bill go over. I have since explained the bill to him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 375) for the relief of the Phoenix-Tempe Stone Co.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, at the end of the bill, to add a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Phoenix-Tempe Stone Co., of Phoenix, Ariz., the sum of $1,500, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for damages arising out of the rental by the Civil Works Administration in Arizona of a paving-mixing plant, owned by said company, under a contract No. CWA–234, and dated January 5, 1934: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revert to Calendar No. 349, Senate bill 878. I do not believe any objection will be made to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 878) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended," approved January 24, 1942, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Civil Service with amendments, on page 2, line 6, after the word "ending", to strike out "6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war" and insert "on June 30, 1945, or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may prescribe"; on page 2, line 11, after the word "amended", to insert "and all retirement or pension benefits payable from the policemen and firemen's relief fund of the District of Columbia pursuant to the act of September 1, 1916, as amended", and in line 15, after the word "annuitant", to insert "or recipient of such benefits under such act of September 1, 1916, as amended", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 10 of the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended," approved January 24, 1942 (Public Law No. 411, 77th Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. In the case of those who before the enactment of this act shall have been retired on annuity under the provisions of the act of May 22, 1920, as amended, or the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, the annuity shall be recomputed and paid in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of this act."

SEC. 2. During the period beginning on the date of enactment of this act and ending on June 30, 1945, or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may prescribe, all annuities heretofore or hereafter awarded under the act of May 22, 1920, as amended, or the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and all retirement or pension benefits payable from the policemen and firemen's relief fund of the District of Columbia pursuant to the act of September 1, 1916, as amended, shall be increased by 15 percent. Each such annuitant or recipient of such benefits under such act of September 1, 1916, as amended, shall be paid only such increase as will not cause his aggregate annuity, exclusive of additional annuity purchased by an employee's voluntary contributions under the provisions of section 10 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to exceed a rate of $2,500 per annum.

SEC. 3. Nothing herein contained shall be construed so as to reduce the annuity of any annuitant, nor shall any increase in annuity accrue under this act prior to its enactment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is advised that the amendments have heretofore been agreed to.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PURCHASE OF CERTAIN INTERESTS IN LANDS AND MINERAL DEPOSITS FROM CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW NATIONS OF INDIANS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, on a former occasion Calendar No. 469, Senate bill 1372, was called, and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] objected. I understand that he has now withdrawn his objection.

Mr. LANGER. I withdraw the objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1372) to authorize the purchase of certain interests in lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment, on page 2, line 16, after the words "Secretary of the Interior," to insert *"And provided further,* That before the said rules and regulations are promulgated they must be submitted to and approved by both the principal chief of the Choctaw Nation and the Governor of the Chickasaw Nation"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, pursuant to the provisions of the treaty between the United States and the Choctaw-Chickasaw Nations of Indians, known as the Atoka Agreement, and the supplemental agreements thereafter made and the laws enacted by the Congress, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to enter into a contract on behalf of the United States for the purchase from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians in Oklahoma for all the present right, title, and interest of said Indians in the land and mineral deposits reserved from allotment in accordance with the provisions of section 58 of the act entitled "An act to ratify and confirm an agreement with the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes of Indians, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902. The Secretary shall cause such contract to be executed on behalf of said Indians by the principal chief of the Choctaw Nation and the Governor of the Chickasaw Nation, and shall then submit such contract to said Indians for their approval. If and when such contract has been approved by said Indians, the Secretary shall submit the contract to the Congress for its ratification: *Provided,* That the approval of such contract by the said Indians shall be through a special election called and held pursuant to rules and regulations to be promulgated by the said Secretary of the Interior: *And provided further,* That before the said rules and regulations are promulgated they must be submitted to and approved by both the principal chief of the Choctaw Nation and the Governor of the Chickasaw Nation. Such contract shall not be binding upon any of the parties thereto until it shall have been ratified by the Congress.

SEC. 2. Upon the approval of such contract by the Congress—

(a) The amount of the purchase price fixed in such contract when appropriated shall be placed to the credit of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians on the books of the Treasurer of the United States, and thereafter such proceeds shall be distributed to such Indians in pursuance with the terms and provisions of such contract and shall be exempted from attorney fees and other debt contracted prior to the passage and approval of this act; and

(b) The Secretary shall cause a proper conveyance to be executed by the principal chief of the Choctaw Nation and the governor of the Chickasaw Nation conveying all right, title, and interest of said Indians in such lands and mineral deposits to the United States, and thereupon, all such right, title, and interest shall vest in the United States.

SEC. 3. The appropriation of such sum as may be necessary for making the payments to such Indians pursuant to section 2 (a) of this act is hereby authorized. There is also authorized to be appropriated the sum of $20,000 to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, to defray the expenses of negotiating the contract and holding of the election authorized by section 1 hereof, including the making of such appraisal or appraisals as may be deemed necessary.

SEC. 4. The land and mineral deposits when acquired hereunder shall become part of the public domain subject to the applicable public land mining and mineral leasing laws. The coal deposits acquired hereunder may be leased in accordance with the provisions relating to coal of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), as amended. The asphalt deposits acquired hereunder may be leased by the Secretary of the Interior through advertisement, competitive bidding, or such other methods as he may by general regulations prescribe, and in areas not exceeding 640 acres each. Leases for such asphalt deposits shall be conditioned upon the payment by the lessee of such royalty as may be fixed in the lease, not less than 25 cents per ton of 2,000 pounds of marketable production, and upon payment in advance of a rental of 25 cents per acre for the first calendar year or fraction thereof; 50 cents per acre for the second, third, fourth, and fifth years, respectively; and $1 per acre per annum thereafter during the continuance of the lease, such rental for any lease year to be credited against royalties accruing for that year. Leases for such asphalt deposits shall be for a period of 20 years, with preferential right in the lessee to renew the same for successive periods of 10 years upon such reasonable terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, unless otherwise provided by law at the expiration of such periods. All asphalt leases issued hereunder shall be subject to such further terms and conditions, not inconsistent herewith, as may be incorporated in each lease or prescribed by general regulations adopted by the Secretary of the Interior prior to the issuance of the lease, including covenants relative to mining methods, waste, period of preliminary development, initial investment, and minimum production. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to modify or amend as to area any asphalt lease issued hereunder upon application of the lessee if he finds such modification or amendment to be to the best interests of the United States and of the lessee. The general provisions of sections 1, 27, 29 to 34, inclusive, 37, and 38 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), as amended, shall apply to asphalt leases issued under the provisions of this act, sections 1, 34, and 37 thereof being amended to include deposits of asphalt acquired hereunder, and section 27 thereof being amended to provide that no person, association, or corporation shall take or hold more than 2,560 acres under asphalt lease at any one time. The entire net income from coal and asphalt leases issued under this act shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is advised that the amendment has heretofore been agreed to.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to fulfill a treaty obligation between the United States and the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians by authorizing the purchase of certain interests in lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the said Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians."

WAR SHIPPING FIELD SERVICE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revert to Calendar 470, Senate Joint Resolution 82.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 82) to create the War Shipping Field Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have an explanation of the joint resolution. Am I correct in my understanding that the joint resolution would give unlimited authority to create field officers, and that the salaries to be paid them would also be entirely within the jurisdiction of the departmental head?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is largely true; but there is a limit of $1,500, and yesterday we made provision in an appropriation bill for this purpose.

The joint resolution has been requested by Admiral Land and his Administration, as the report shows, for the purpose of establishing the field inspection group, to be uniformed. They have already been set up by order of the department. The joint resolution would merely put them under statutory recognition and recognize their uniform. The membership of this inspection group would have to be selected from veterans of the war, either from the maritime group or from the naval group, or those who have served in the naval forces of the Government and who for one reason or another have been retired. The report is explanatory.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, personally I have so much confidence in the members of the Commerce Committee that I would not interpose an objection on my own account. However, I have been requested, in behalf of another Senator, to ask that the joint resolution go over, and I feel compelled to do so.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well. It is desired to have the joint resolution passed so that Admiral Land and his group may establish the inspection service in connection with ship construction.

Mr. WHITE. I make the objection on behalf of another Senator, and not on my own account.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

PAY OF NONOPERATING RAILROAD EMPLOYEES

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Senate Joint Resolution 91, Calendar No. 569.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 91) to aid in effectuating the purposes of the Railway Labor Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I had hoped that the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri would postpone action on this joint resolution. I believe the Senate is acting very unwisely——

Mr. TRUMAN. I wonder if the Senator would permit me to explain the situation and then make his objection?

Mr. ELLENDER. I was hopeful that the Senator——

Mr. TRUMAN. For the information of the Senate, this matter has been in abeyance for 3 or 4 weeks.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand; but I had hoped to make a few remarks in order to prevent the motion of the Senator from Missouri from prevailing. I would much prefer that the resolution remain on the calendar until we dispose of the subsidy issue.

Mr. TRUMAN. Very well.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have just indicated, Mr. President, I think we are about to take action on a proposal that may eventually doom our stabilization program. In effect we are being asked to nullify an order that has been established by one in authority. We are being asked to stand in judgment and reverse the findings of constituted authority. If the joint resolution is passed by both Houses of Congress and signed by the President, I for one believe that such an act would be the first serious breach in the President's hold-the-line order. We have established agencies of Government to pass upon the issues involved in Senate Joint Resolution 91 and we, as a legislative body, should not sit in judgment and decide whether or not those agencies have acted wisely or unwisely.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? If the Senator prefers not to be interrupted——

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator has said this would be the first serious step. I desire to ask him if he regarded the settlement of the coal strike which was negotiated by Secretary Ickes as a serious step in the direction of breaking the line.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I will say to the Senator from Missouri that at first I considered that also to be a serious breach, but we have no jurisdiction over it. Whether or not the Little Steel formula was invaded is questionable; it is arguable. If the Board had agreed to give John L. Lewis the $2 a day raise for which he asked in behalf of the miners, for the same number of hours of work, it would have been an encroachment on the Little Steel formula.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. In a moment. Allow me first to answer the question of the senior Senator from Missouri.

In permitting the miners of the Nation an increase from $35 to a maximum of $56 a week they were required to work 48 hours a week or an additional 13 hours.

I have discussed the matter with several persons in whom I have faith, and who are connected with the executive branch of our Government, and I have been advised by them that when the War Labor Board permitted the raise in wages for the miners it was not in violation of the Little Steel formula.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not wish to encroach upon the Senator's time to argue a collateral question, but I do not wish by my silence to give consent to the Senator's argument. I think he is completely mistaken about the matter, but I shall discuss it in my own time.

Mr. ELLENDER. It may be that I have been misinformed, but one thing remains certain and that is, the basic wages of miners have not been increased. This additional pay was allowed by virtue of longer hours of work in each week.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. If the Senator had been willing to allow me to make an explanation of the bill and its implications I think all of his objections would have been answered.

Mr. ELLENDER. I read the report of the committee, and also the report of Judge Vinson. Judge Vinson is the supreme court on the question at issue, and you are attempting to override him by your resolution.

Mr. TRUMAN. Not necessarily, for these people were exempted from Judge Vinson's jurisdiction in the law itself. The raise in the wages paid to coal miners was passed on to the consumer. In the present instance the increased wage would not be passed on to the consumer. There is no comparison between the two situations.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the railroads are called upon to pay from $187,000,000 to probably more than $200,000,000 per year in increased wages, they may petition and demand higher freight rates through proper authority.

Mr. TRUMAN. When the increase was asked for, the railroads, in considering the request, agreed to a raise in pay on the basis on which the Railroad Labor Board settled the matter, and they agreed that there would be no raise in freight rates on that account.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I started to say before I was interrupted, by Executive order the President created a separate board with power to handle the situation involved in the pending joint resolution and——

Mr. TRUMAN. The Board was created by the law enacted by the Congress. The Railway Labor Board settled this dispute, and the settlement was agreed to by both parties. Then Mr. Vinson tried to upset the decision by offering a perfectly absurd settlement which would not be materially different so far as the amount of money involved is concerned.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator knows that under the Executive order creating the separate Board, and also by agreement, the matter had to be passed upon by the Stabilization Director.

Mr. TRUMAN. The separate Board was ex parte, outside of the dispute entirely, and there was no reason for its creation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that, but under sections 3 and 4 of the Executive order creating the separate Board it is stated as follows:

3. If the chairman of the National Railway Labor Panel has reason to believe that the proposed change, in wage rates or salary, may not conform to the standards prescribed in Executive Order No. 9250, or to the general stabilization program made effective thereunder, or to the directives on policy issued by the Economic Stabilization Director thereunder and the proposed change is not modified to conform to such standards, program, and directives, he shall designate three members of the panel as an emergency board to investigate the proposed change and to report to the President. Otherwise, the chairman of the panel may permit the proposed change to become effective.

4. Emergency boards, whether designed pursuant to the Railway Labor Act, Executive Order No. 9172, or section 3 of this order, in reporting to the President shall certify that their recommendations in regard to any proposed change affecting wage and salary payments conform with the standards prescribed in Executive Order No. 9250, the general stabilization program made effective thereunder, and with the directives on policy issued by the Economic Stabilization Director thereunder.

Under the portion of the Executive order which I have just read this whole situation was presented to Mr. Vinson for adjudication.

Mr. TRUMAN. And Mr. Vinson's adjudication was almost exactly in line with the findings of the Railway Labor Board, and so far as the money is concerned there is not 10 percent difference in it.

Mr. Vinson is merely trying to save his face by creating an extra board. The President's Executive order exempted railroad labor from that sort of a settlement.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. Vinson did not create an extra board. The Board created by Executive order whose duty it was to pass upon the wages of the persons involved, had to comply with the directives on policy issued by the Economic Stabilization Director. As I understand, the railroads insisted that all laws be complied with and the matter was by agreement, referred to the Stabilization Director.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to have the Senator from Missouri or the Senator from Louisiana tell us how much money is involved, rather than the percent, in the recommendations of the Board, and under the Executive order.

Mr. TRUMAN. The recommendations of the Labor Board allowed $188,000,000. The recommendations of Mr. Vinson on the 10-percent sliding scale, which upset the old scale, allowed approximately $174,000,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is a difference of approximately $18,000,000 between the recommendations of the board and those under the order of the Stabilization Director, Mr. Vinson.

But, Mr. President, as I have indicated, we have established agencies of Government to pass upon these matters and the Congress has no jurisdiction.

Mr. TRUMAN. This Senate set up an agency to pass on the question, and it passed on it.

Mr. ELLENDER. For the Congress now to take jurisdiction of the matter

would no doubt open the door to other special groups who also desire wage adjustments. Not only would the doors be opened for wage earners, but special agricultural groups, or processor groups, in fact any group whose earning capacity is affected during this emergency. Mr. President, today there are pending before Congress resolutions asking that the price of oil be raised, that the price of coal be hiked, that the price of milk be upped and tomorrow there may be many more asking for price adjustments on many commodities. If the Congress should adopt the joint resolution now being proposed we might as well also decide to pass the other resolutions now pending and others to be introduced, if we are to be consistent.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has said there are proposals pending here to increase the prices of certain commodities. Were any of the recommendations to which the Senator refers made by any board which was set up by the Congress of the United States, or are they extraneous resolutions which have been submitted by Members of Congress without the sanction, request, or approval of boards set up by the Congress of the United States?

Mr. ELLENDER. The milk resolution was reported favorably by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate. The resolution asking for an increased price in oil has the backing of Mr. Ickes, Fuel Administrator, to the extent of 35 cents per barrel, as I recall.

Mr. TRUMAN. The resolution carries out the findings of the Board set up by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. I mean in the other cases.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I indicated before I was interrupted by the Senator from Maryland, my contention is that if we are to interfere with the process established by the Congress and by the President, through Executive order, which now handles those matters, we might as well abolish the office of the Stabilization Director, the War Labor Board, and like boards which are making every effort to stabilize prices and wages and thereby "hold the line."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator's general observation is unanswerable, but I do not think it is in line with my interrogatory. There is certainly a difference between a recommendation which comes from a Board which has been set up by Congress and a recommendation which comes from some board not at all connected with the Federal Government. I think the Senator ought to make a distinction when he says bills are here. They are offered purely at the request of some group, as differentiated, on the other hand, from bills—whether we vote pro or con on the matters is beside the point—which are here and which have the approval of some agencies set up by the Congress.

I have an open mind on this question; I am not committed; but I do not believe that the argument made by the Senator is altogether in line with his general approach to the subject.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have just indicated, the Board that recommended on increase in the rates of payment for the men affected by the joint resolution was created by Executive order, but under article 4 of the Executive order, its findings—the Board's findings—could not become effective until it received the recommendation of the Stabilization Director. In other words, the Senate is proceeding head-on with a recommendation made by the Stabilization Director.

There is certainly a conflict, as I have indicated. Why was the matter ever referred to the Stabilization Director? He must be clothed with authority greater than that vested in the Board, else the Board's recommendations would have become operative. If we should at this moment supersede the Stabilization Director, we might as well abolish that office. I repeat, we are a legislative body and not clothed with judicial functions. My plea with the Senate is based on this proposition: There is now pending before the Banking and Currency Committee a bill which, when considered by the Congress, will decide whether or not we are to provide subsidies for maintaining our stabilization program. Let us postpone action on this measure until the Senate decides whether or not it will try to "hold the line" through the utilization of subsidies. If the Senate decides to ban subsidies and thereby causes the cost of living to rise, then there will be no need for the passage of the pending resolution, because labor in general, and certainly the workmen covered by the resolution under discussion, will have a just cause for an increase, not only for the 8 cents per hour requested but much more. The Congress should under no condition take steps that will open the door to inflation.

Mr. President, by postponing action——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado and Mr. TYDINGS addressed the Chair.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield first to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator is speaking of boards set up to adjudicate this matter. I fear from what he has said that the Senator has two Boards confused. There was one Board set up under the Railroad Labor Act by the President in accordance with the law. After the Mediation Board had been unable to reach an agreement, that Board was set up by the President and was given full power and full authority and full instructions to adjudicate this matter and settle it. The Board did so, and submitted its report and after it submitted the report the Economic Stabilization Director set it aside. Then afterward another Board, a special emergency board, was set up, not according to any law of Congress, but simply set up by the President of the United States. The second Board was told to bring in an agreement in line with what the Director of Economic Stabilization would agree to. Now we have the two Boards.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course. The second Board was created under Executive order and was instructed, as the Senator indicated, to bring in an order in line with what the Director of Economic Stabilization would agree to. I understand that the Board recommended this payment and——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is the 8-cent payment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That was a legal and lawful Board.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was not that the Board that was appointed by the President as the Senator just indicated?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It was appointed by the President.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well. That Board had to act under the Executive order by which it was created.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Oh, no.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I have just read the Executive order under which the Board was created. It states:

> Emergency boards, whether designated pursuant to the Railway Labor Act, Executive Order No. 9172, or section 3 of this order, in reporting to the President shall certify that their recommendations in regard to any proposed change affecting wage and salary payments conform with the standards prescribed in Executive Order No. 9250, the general stabilization program made effective thereunder, and with the directives on policy issued by the Economic Stabilization Director thereunder.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes, that is the second board the Senator is talking about. That is the point I want to make.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the board that recommended the 8-cent increase.

Mr. TRUMAN. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. This is the instruction the first board had under Executive Order No. 9122, of May 22, 1942, signed by the President:

> Subject to the provisions of section 10, such board shall have exclusive and final jurisdiction of the dispute and shall make every reasonable effort to settle such dispute.

That is the instruction that the first board had, the Railway Labor Board.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. I was talking about the board that made the final recommendation, and as I understand, its recommendations had to conform with certain rules and regulations established by the Congress.

Mr. TRUMAN. No; but to rules laid down by the Stabilization Director, and he had a board appointed to carry out what he wanted, not what the Congress wanted.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sorry, I meant through the stabilization program which the Senator from Missouri voted for in October 1942.

Mr. TRUMAN. I claim and can prove that this does not interfere with the Stabilization Director.

Mr. ELLENDER. Just a moment—and which was enacted in order to maintain the level of prices and wages as of September 15, 1942. That, Senators, is what

I believe has been done since the Congress enacted the bill in October 1942, providing for a stabilization program.

I believe that an earnest effort has been made to stabilize and we have come very far in stabilizing prices of commodities as well as wages, and if the Congress today should pass the joint resolution we will be pestered, as it were, by special groups from every walk of life, not only from the ranks of labor, but from agriculture, processors, manufacturers, and others. We will lose our identity as legislators. We will become adjudicators. That is going to happen and that is why I stated a while ago this whole matter will be settled one way or another when we pass upon the bill which is now pending before the Banking and Currency Committee. Surely, if we vote subsidies, it will mean aid for those empowered by us and the President to carry on the fight against inflation. It will be an indication that we should stick to our duties as legislators.

As I have stated on this floor, to my way of thinking there is absolutely no way by which we can prevent inflation except by the utilization of subsidies. If the Banking and Currency Committee should report back to the Senate that subsidies should no longer be paid and the Senate should accede to such recommendation, then, to my way of thinking, that would be the green light to let the bars down and permit commodity prices to climb, which would beget higher wages, and thereby make ineffective the Little Steel formula and our whole stabilization program; in other words, the dam would be broken, and our stabilization program would hit the rocks.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator a question. Is the Little Steel formula involved in the proposed wage increase?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is a pertinent question and——

Mr. CHANDLER. That is a question to which I want to get the Senator's answer.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am relying on the report made by Judge Fred M. Vinson to the committee, in which he said:

> Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, if Senate Joint Resolution No. 91 is passed, Congress will have broken the Little Steel formula.

Not only am I relying on the statement of Judge Vinson, but others in the executive department, in whom I have faith.

Mr. CHANDLER. Let me ask one further question. What does the Senator say to the statement which has been made that the non-operating railroad workers have never had a salary adjustment under that agreement?

Mr. ELLENDER. The record shows they have received an increase in wages.

Mr. TRUMAN. They have not.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is what I want to get clear.

Mr. TRUMAN. They have not.

Mr. ELLENDER. Since January 1, 1941, they have had an increase of over 16 percent. The Senator should know that.

Mr. TRUMAN. Under negotiations which had been pending for 4 years. They had not had a raise since 1938, and that had been under negotiation for 4 years. They finally got a 10-cent raise, which leaves them the lowest paid labor in the whole war set-up.

Mr. ELLENDER. I want to say to the Senator from Missouri that I realize that any Senator who rises on this floor in opposition to what is proposed is sticking his neck out. I know it. I know that many of the men employed by the railroads are underpaid. I am not questioning that at all. To oppose now is not very popular. But I am sure that the Senator will concede that it would be impossible to adjust wages at this time so that they will be fair and just to all classes of labor. We have not been able to do it in peacetime and we cannot do it now. My opposition is based on the proposition that if we accede our whole stabilization program will come to naught, inflation will set in, and the farmers and the laboring men will be among the hardest hit.

Mr. TRUMAN. I think the Senator from Louisiana is setting up a straw man and having the fun of knocking it down. If he would let me explain the joint resolution, he would not have so much fun with it.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will have ample opportunity to explain the bill and I hope he is not serious when he states I am having fun in opposing his motion.

I wish to say this, which might be of interest to Senators who are listening to me, if the recommendations which were made by Judge Vinson are carried out, over 50 percent of those involved under the resolution would get an increase of 8 cents or more per hour. Of the 1,097,180 men involved in this controversy, 121,140 who are now receiving from 40 to 46 cents an hour would get a 10-cent per hour increase instead of an 8-cent per hour increase, if Judge Vinson's formula should be followed.

Mr. TRUMAN. Then the whole railroad labor set-up would have to be renegotiated. I think Vinson's opposition to this is due to a misunderstanding of the facts.

Mr. ELLENDER. Although we are today facing a grave emergency, I think every effort has been made to help poorly paid employees.

Mr. TRUMAN. I disagree with the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is entitled to his opinion and I am certain he will give me credit for being honest in stating my own. The Senator must be confusing the question of comparable wages in one industry with another. Efforts have been made in peacetime to adjust all wages so as to have them all in precise balance, but that has never been possible.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. ELLENDER. In just a moment. Let me proceed further with the question of wage increases for the persons involved under the resolution. As I have just indicated, 121,140 of these employees would receive an increase of 10 cents an hour under Judge Vinson's formula instead of 8 cents provided for under the joint resolution, and 232,500 would receive 9 cents an hour instead of the 8 cents an hour provided for in the resolution. That class is receiving from 47 to 56 cents an hour; in short, 353,640 of them would receive an increase of more than 8 cents per hour under the Vinson formula.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to point out to the Senator that I am unwilling to sit here on the floor of the Senate and have my silence interpreted as an assent that the O. P. A. or any other body has held the line. We passed a very definite law directing them to hold wages, and prices, and what not, all in line. The subsidy program was not originally passed by Congress, but was adopted indirectly because certain things had been allowed to get out of line.

Further than that, other agreements were negotiated between capital and labor, which I shall not mention, because I do not wish to drag in an extraneous issue, after the Government had made a decision giving other persons an increase in wages, and although there was ample law on the statute books, nothing was done about that.

Here is an agency of the Government itself, created by law passed by the Congress, which has made a finding, and that is to be turned down, if the Senator's argument shall be sustained, while millions or hundreds of thousands of workers in another field, where there was no Government approval of the action, get an increase. Certainly there should be some yardstick of substantial justice.

I do not want anyone to accuse the Congress of raising prices. I think if we go to the milk in the coconut we will find that has not been done by Congress, but by other agencies, and I am unwilling to see Congress take the blame for it. The law was very definite. If it had been adhered to, we would not be in this trouble today. The trouble was it was not adhered to, and when a start was made, Pandora's box was opened, and all the evils we now have were the result of the first departure from the original O. P. A. formula.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Maryland well knows that by carrying out the provisions of the Price Control Act, as amended, it was necessary to trample on the rights of farmers and of laboring men. They resented it because we attempted to change overnight their usual and normal way of doing business. We have come a long way in making the people of this country realize that what was done was for the benefit of our economy and for them.

Now that we have reached the crest, and are now going downhill, now that

the war is going on so well, and our stabilization program is proceeding fairly well, notwithstanding all the trouble and all the headaches we have suffered in the past, let us not change our course. I think a good job has been done, and if we are permitted to go along for 8 or 10 more months, I believe some of our enemies will be defeated, and we will not need all the restrictions which are now embodied in our laws in order to stabilize our economy.

Senators, I repeat, we have come a long way. Our cost of living has increased during the war only 25 percent, in contrast with 50 percent during the First World War, when there was no control, when there were no subsidies. My plea is that we postpone action on this measure until Congress shall decide whether or not we shall keep on holding the line by way of subsidies.

I wish to say to my colleagues that if the Congress should decide to take away the chief prop of stabilization—namely, subsidies—the men affected under this joint resolution would not be satisfied with an 8-cent-an-hour raise. They would want a 10- or 15- or probably a 20-cent-an-hour raise, and I would not be surprised that they would be entitled to the maximum increase if inflation sets in.

As I indicated here 2 weeks ago, the cost of living after January 1, if we fail to stand by the recommendations of Mr. Justice Byrnes, Judge Vinson, and others, in charge of our stabilization program, will immediately rise 10 percent, and I do not have to argue to Senators that an increased cost of living begets higher wages, higher wages in turn beget higher consumer goods, and soon our economy would become engulfed in a spiral of inflation which will not only destroy the savings of millions of our people, but would curtail our productivity at a time when we needed it the most.

I again suggest to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], let us postpone consideration of Senate Resolution 91 and await action on the part of Congress in respect to the continuation of subsidy payments now utilized to stabilize the cost of living. If Congress should agree not to make it possible to hold down prices and wages or to stabilize our economy by means of subsidies, then, I repeat, this joint resolution will not be necessary. If the cost of living should rise to the extent that it will be possible if subsidies are prohibited, then a rise of 8 cents per hour for the thousands of workers affected under the resolution will not be sufficient.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. As I understand, the Little Steel formula sought to limit wartime salary increases to 15 percent. The question which disturbs me is, Have these nonoperating railroad workers ever gotten an increase which would bring them up to the level of the Little Steel formula?

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, may I read the finding in the report with respect to that?

Mr. CHANDLER. I want to hold the line. I do not want the increases to get out of line. I do not want inflation. But I want an answer to the question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will yield, I shall be glad to answer.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not care who answers, so long as I obtain an answer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the Senator from Louisiana yield for that purpose?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Colorado for that purpose, with reservation to submit my views.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Four hundred thousand of these employees did not receive an increase which would bring them up to the total limit of the Little Steel formula of 15 percent.

Mr. CHANDLER. Then are they not entitled to it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; not on the basis of the report of the Board set up by the President to adjudicate and to settle this question. The Board ruled out the Little Steel formula. The employees are not claiming any rights under the Little Steel formula of 15 percent. But that is only part of it. Substandard wages is another part. Gross inequities is another part. There are three arms to this thing. It is not simply the 15 percent increase of wages. Wages have not been frozen. There is not a positive ceiling with respect to the 15 percent as permitted under the Little Steel formula. The railway employees are proceeding on the basis of gross inequities. That is the basis on which they are making their plea.

Mr. CHANDLER. They have not had a wage adjustment under the Little Steel formula?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. They do not claim any rights under that. But these 400,000 men have not had their wages raised to the limit allowed in the Little Steel formula.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is the point I wanted answered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Judge Vinson stated before the committee that the persons involved had a 16 percent raise in salaries since January 1, 1941. The Senator knows that if the proposal submitted by Mr. Vinson is put into effect most of the persons he speaks of will obtain this increase.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not know just what that will do, but the proposal made by Mr. Vinson—that whole thing sounds silly to me. We know Mr. Vinson. We have a great admiration for him. We know Mr. James Byrnes. We have a great admiration for him. But they are not railroad men; they are not railroad managers. They do not know how to operate railroads. I do not suppose they know anything more about how to run a railroad than any of the rest of us here in the Senate. The railroads over a long period of time, through negotiations between labor and management, have arrived at these different scales of wages. Now Mr. Byrnes and Mr. Vinson come in and say, "We are going to give this group 10 cents, this other group 4 cents, and some other group 7 cents," and thus throw the whole thing out of line.

Mr. CHANDLER. Is that an arbitrary decision?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is an arbitrary decision.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I pointed out a while ago, we are now in an emergency. I should not have to repeat that we are at war and many regulations now made may be contrary to the normal way of doing things. Mr. Vinson was of the opinion that it was more just to give a 10-cent-per-hour raise to a man receiving from 40 to 46 cents and a 4-cent raise to a man receiving 97 cents to $1.10 per hour, than to allow both classes an all-around 8-cent-an-hour raise. As I have pointed out, I should like to submit the proposition to the 544,106 persons involved in this matter whether or not they would not prefer an increase of 8 to 10 cents per hour, rather than a straight 8-cent-per-hour increase.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It has been submitted to them, I may say to the Senator, and they have given their answer, and their answer is overwhelmingly in favor of the flat 8-cent increase.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, the Senator means to tell us that the 121,144 men who are receiving 40 cents an hour——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. To 46 cents.

Mr. ELLENDER. Forty cents to 46 cents an hour.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Forty cents is the minimum.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator says they prefer to receive 8 cents than 10 cents per hour.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am not talking altogether about them.

Mr. ELLENDER. They are the men I am talking about. Will the Senator tell me——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. They voted overwhelmingly on the question.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator tell me that 232,500 men involved would prefer receiving 8 cents than 9 cents per hour?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I tell the Senator just that, because that is the way they voted.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is exactly the way they voted, I will tell the Senator from Louisiana. The Senator does not know the history of this case.

Mr. ELLENDER. Perhaps I should like to have the mentality of some of those men examined. It seems unreasonable for almost 500,000 to prefer an increase of only 8 cents, when they could obtain from 9 to 10 cents, instead.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator find fault with the small raise which was given to the higher wage group? He does not find fault, but he approves that. He does not want them to get 8 cents; he wants them to get 4 cents. But the Senator has not taken into consideration the fact that these employees are skilled employees, they are shop workers, they are the men who keep

the cars and the engines in shape to run on the tracks. They are technical men. They are technicians.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean those receiving 40 cents an hour?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; those receiving 97 cents.

Mr. ELLENDER. And $1.10?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; not $1.10.

Mr. ELLENDER. There are 81,176 of them receiving from $0.97 to $1.10 per hour.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I wish to ask the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] a question. Was not this matter settled by the proper authorities, and were not the railroads and the employees satisfied? The whole matter could have been settled and put into effect without the question having to come to Congress, had it not been for the interference on the part of certain persons.

Mr. TRUMAN. The Senator from South Carolina is entirely correct with respect to that matter.

Mr. SMITH. It does seem to me that where the employers and employees get together under legal authority and agree, their agreement should be put into effect. But now certain parties who do not know beef from bullfoot come in here and say, "Why, this is all wrong." Perhaps the Senator from Louisiana can justify such procedure.

Mr. President, when two parties to a disagreement get together under the authority appointed for the purpose, and come to the conclusion that a certain formula is right, and agree to put it into effect without coming to Congress at all, I think it is our duty not to interfere with such an agreement. We have nothing to do with such an agreement, as we have had very little to do with a great many things. I have no brief for either the employers or the employees, but it seems to me that what they agreed to is right and is justice. It would not result in increasing freight rates; it would not result in increasing passenger rates. The parties were going to accept the proposal of increase of 8 cents as a settlement of the whole dispute. But now two men come in and say to the parties, "You are all wrong," and, bang! the whole matter comes before us in Congress.

So far as I am concerned I shall vote for the joint resolution in the belief that the dispute has been settled by the parties to it, under proper authority. I do not believe two outside men should come into the matter.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. Do I understand the Senator's position to be that his objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution on its merits, whatever his own views may be, is because he desires to have it postponed so that it can be used as a club in the consideration of the subsidy policy which is coming up for consideration at a subsequent time?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; far be it from being my thought in the matter. That is not in my mind. I am saying that we are going to consider, as the Senator knows, the question of whether we shall continue the payment of subsidies in order to stabilize prices. It is my contention that unless we vote subsidies, prices on commodities will be upped and the cost of living will immediately rise; as I said 2 weeks ago, the cost of living will rise almost 10 percent. With that development, the Little Steel formula will have to be abolished, and there will not be any need for the pending joint resolution.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. Then why cannot the joint resolution be considered on its merits? If the pending matter has merits, let it be considered and passed on its merits. If it has none, the Senate will reach that conclusion, and will reject it.

Mr. ELLENDER. For the simple reason that, as I have further contended in my opening statement, if the joint resolution were passed, it would encroach on the Little Steel formula. On the other hand, the persons affected—those who are more in need of an increase—would benefit greatly by the proposal submitted by Mr. Vinson.

Over half the people who would be affected under the joint resolution, under the Vinson proposal would receive from 8 cents an hour up to 10 cents an hour, more than they would receive under the pending resolution. What Mr. Vinson has tried to do is to reach those who are more in need of the increase.

The distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] said that this method would be an encroachment on the former method employed by the Railway Labor Board and——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No, Mr. President; by the experience of management and labor.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand; but wages are usually fixed by that Board, which was created by law; are they not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well; and the Senator has stated that the Director of Economic Stabilization violated the method by which the wages were adjusted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well. However, in the present instance, as I indicated a while ago, it is not the Labor Board which passed upon the question, but a special board created by Executive order. That board, before it could submit the proposal, had to obtain the approval of the Director of Economic Stabilization.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No, Mr. President; the Senator is mistaken on that point again. He is talking about the second board.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I read the joint resolution, that is what it states.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator is talking about the second board.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, the hold-the-line order was issued on April 8, 1943. It is important that we keep track of dates in connection with this matter, because the whole thing has been progressive and chronological in its development. The hold-the-line order was issued on April 8, 1943. The lawful and legal board, the so-called Emergency Board, was created on February 20, commenced work on March 1, brought in its first report on May 24, and brought in its second or supplemental report on May 29. So it brought in its report after Executive Order 9328 had been issued—the President's so-called hold-the-line order. At the time when the members of the Board were appointed by the President, they were insructed by him to bring in a final settlement of this dispute.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a while ago the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], I think it was, stated there had been no increase in wages since January 1941, the date taken for computation of the Little Steel formula. Is not my statement correct?

Mr. TRUMAN. That is correct; so far as this section of railway labor is concerned, its members have not had a raise since 1938—in 1941 they got a 10-cent raise——

Mr. ELLENDER. According to the statement of Judge Vinson——

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. Vinson does not know anything about the railway business; and if the Senator is going to quote Mr. Vinson. I cannot argue with the Senator because Mr. Vinson did not state the facts.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. His statement is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am sorry to see there is a difference of opinion between the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. The senior Senator from Colorado has stated that the Senator from Missouri is mistaken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No, Mr. President; I did not state that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me inquire what the Senator means, then.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I was saying that the factual data contained in Mr. Vinson's letter to the committee are correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well and I——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not subscribe to his opinions or his judgment in the matter; but I have checked very carefully all the data he furnished, and I find they are substantially correct. I do not think there was any dispute about those facts.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well. Then, Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, and particularly for the information of the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], who asked the question a while ago, as to whether or not there was an increase in salary since

January 1941, let me read from the statement submitted by Judge Vinson:

The nonoperating railway employees have had one general wage increase since January 1941. This was the outgrowth of a claim made in June 1941. Negotiation and mediation proving unsuccessful, an emergency board (known as the Morse Board) was appointed, and made its recommendations on November 5, 1941. The Morse Board recommended a temporary increase for the nonoperating railway employees of 9 cents per hour, an average increase of 13½ percent.

The railway workers protested the fact that the wage increases were to be temporary, and considered the amount of the recommendations inadequate. They threatened a strike, and so the Morse Board was reconvened.

The members of the Board, acting as mediators, secured the Chicago agreement of December 15, 1941. This agreement raised the employees' wage 10 cents per hour, an increase of 15.6 percent, or if consideration is given to the fact that the minimum wage was, in most instances, raised to 46 cents, the percentage increase in straight-time hourly earnings was 16.35 percent.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, let me inquire who made the statement the Senator has read.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is Mr. Vinson's statement, and the Senator from Colorado just said he checked on all of it, and that Mr. Vinson's figures are correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is true, Mr. President, with this exception, which should be noted: There were 400,000 nonoperating employees who did not get this raise.

Mr. CHANDLER. Not even that one?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Four hundred thousand of the nonoperating employees did not get increases in pay up to the limit of the Little Steel formula.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, let me inquire whether under the Vinson proposal those employees will get up to the Little Steel formula limitation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am not prepared to answer that question.

Mr. ELLENDER. My information is that they will.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I presume they will. However, as I have stated before, the 15-percent increase is not at issue here. The emergency board appointed by the President ruled it out. The employees accepted it, management has accepted it, the President has accepted it, and everyone else has accepted it; and they are not attempting to get, and they did not get, the 8-cent-an-hour increase on the basis of the 15 percent. They got it on the basis of gross inequities. There is more to the Little Steel formula than the 15-percent increase.

Mr. CHANDLER. I understand.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Substandard wages and gross inequities enter into the matter; and on the gross inequities angle of it is where they pin all this increase.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not desire to discuss the matter any further than I have already proceeded. I repeat that to my way of thinking the adoption of the resolution would be the opening wedge. Next week we shall be confronted with a bill from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to raise the price of milk from 1 to 2 cents a quart. If that shall go through, no doubt we shall receive proposals from the meat producers, from butter manufacturers, corn growers, wheat growers, sugar growers, and potato growers, who are not satisfied with the present level of prices.

All that I am asking is that the issue involved in this joint resolution be postponed until the Senate decides definitely whether or not it will attempt to hold the line by voting more subsidies. As I have just indicated, if the Senate should vote against subsidies, there is no question in my mind that our stabilization program would go out the window. These workers will not be satisfied with an increase of 8 cents an hour, and a good many others will not be satisfied. When the bars are down, God pity us.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. First of all, let me say that my able colleague, who has been discussing this question, has proved in the past that he is a friend of the workers and the farmers, and the oppressed generally throughout the country. It is my opinion that he is motivated by worthy motives in taking the floor today. However, I believe that the Congress has a legal right as well as a moral right to make a determination as suggested in the joint resolution, in this particular case and for this particular reason. I do not believe that the same legal and moral right applies in many of the instances which the able Senator has brought to our attention.

Some time ago Congress enacted a law known as the Railway Labor Act. In that law certain procedures were established. They include the so-called cooling-off period, and a referendum preceding a strike. There was a recommendation that mediation and arbitration be followed.

Repeatedly on this floor I have heard that law quoted by Members of the Senate in their attempt to have a similar law enacted to govern other industries. Under the operation of this law we have enjoyed a long period of very stable conditions on the railroads of the country. The men operating under this law have respected the law in every degree. It is the only law of its type on the statute books. They have followed its procedures diligently; and in my judgment it is a case of our respecting the integrity of our own law and balancing our judgment by comparing our own act, our own creature, with Executive orders and directives affecting prices and wages in other categories.

In view of the fact that this law has often been referred to as the model labor law of the country, we ought to respect it, because it is our law, and the procedures under that law have been followed and respected by those over whom jurisdiction is exercised.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am in thorough agreement with the distinguished Senator as to the remarkable way in which the Railway Labor Board has adjudicated questions in the past. It is a model. But does the Senator mean to contend that that Board is now clothed with the power of fixing wages in violation of a law which we enacted in October 1942 in our effort to stabilize commodity prices and wages?

Mr. TRUMAN. From which they were specifically exempted.

Mr. ELLENDER. In that law we asked the President to hold the line as of September 15, 1942.

Mr. MEAD. It is my opinion that there is no violation in the decision which has been reached in this instance.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is begging the question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I will give him a direct answer.

Mr. ELLENDER. The reason why both the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from New York state that the board should act in this instance is that they feel that the Little Steel formula has not been violated; but I am asking the Senator this question: Suppose that in the opinion of the Senator from New York it were violated. Does he think that the Railway Labor Board should supersede the War Labor Board or any designated in fixing the wages of the employees?

Mr. MEAD. As I read the RECORD, there has been no violation. Therefore, it is not to be considered——

Mr. ELLENDER. That is not the question I am asking the Senator. I ask the Senator this direct question: Suppose that in his opinion the wages suggested were in violation of the Little Steel formula. Does the Senator contend that the Railway Labor Board should have jurisdiction, rather than the War Labor Board or any special board named by the President?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to give him an answer.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let the Senator from Colorado answer, if the Senator from New York prefers.

Mr. MEAD. I shall be very glad to have the Senator from Colorado answer the question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. On October 2 the so-called stabilization bill was enacted and approved, and went on the statute books. On October 3 the President of the United States issued a directive under that law, and an explanation of it. It is called the President's Executive Order No. 9250, stabilizing wages and prices. It is dated October 3, 1942. In that explanation and directive, under the act of Congress, this is what the President said, under the head of General Provisions, Title VI:

Nothing in this order shall be construed as affecting the present operation of the Fair Labor Standards Act, the National Labor Relations Act, the Walsh-Healey Act, the Davis-Bacon Act, or the adjustment procedure of the Railway Labor Act.

That is the President speaking. He interpreted it himself. He gave the answer to the question of the Senator.

Mr. MEAD. He makes the point that I make, and that is that when the Congress has by law set up a procedure covering a certain condition or activity, that remains the law, and while that law is in effect, it is unnecessary for the President to cover that particular law in the directive which the Senator has just quoted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. On February 20, 1943, the President passed this dispute on to a board set up under the Railway Labor Act, and asked the Board to render a decision. He told the Board that its decision would be final, as the law prescribes.

Mr. MEAD. So the President, whose directive or Executive order created the stabilization agency, created the Board.

The Board rendered a decision. The decision was therefore the work of the Board which the President himself appointed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The railway employees did not like the decision. They asked for 20 cents. They got 8. They asked for a closed shop. They were refused a closed shop. They asked for a minimum of 70 cents. They were refused that. They were given 8 cents, and they did not like it. They protested very vigorously, and the President urged them to accept the final decision to settle the dispute. From patriotic motives, they accepted it, only to have the acceptance thrown out the window by another arm of the executive department.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am not going to argue the point.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is not that other arm responsible to the President? Why did not the President follow through and finish the job?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not know. I cannot answer the question.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I shall not argue that point any longer, but I do not believe the President went so far as the distinguished Senators from Colorado and New York have stated. In the matter of wage increases, there is no question in my mind that the final arbiter was to be the Stabilization Director.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the Executive order issued by the President under date of February 4, 1943, and also a short statement by the Honorable Fred M. Vinson, Economic Stabilization Director, in relation to Senate Joint Resolution 91.

There being no objection, the Executive order and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE ORDER PRESCRIBING REGULATIONS AND PROCEDURE WITH RESPECT TO WAGE AND SALARY ADJUSTMENTS FOR EMPLOYEES SUBJECT TO THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes of the United States, and more particularly by the act of October 2, 1942 (Public Law 729, 77th Cong.), it is hereby ordered:

1. No increases in the wage rates or salary of any employee subject to the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, whether granted as a result of voluntary agreement, collective bargaining, conciliation, arbitration, or otherwise, and no decreases in such wage rates or salary, shall be made except in accordance with the provisions of this order; *Provided, however*, That nothing contained in this order or Executive Order No. 9250 shall be construed as affecting the procedure or limiting the jurisdiction of either the National Mediation Board, as defined in the Railway Labor Act, or the National Railway Labor Panel, as defined in Executive Order No. 9172, except as herein specifically set forth.

2. No carrier shall make any change in wage rates, except such changes as by general order of the National War Labor Board, or by regulations of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, are permitted to be made without the specific approval of the Board or the Commissioner, as the case may be, unless notice of such proposed change shall have been filed with the Chairman of the National Railway Labor Panel, created by Executive Order No. 9172, and shall have been permitted to become effective as hereinafter provided.

Notwithstanding section 4001.2 of the regulations of the Economic Stabilization Director, for the purpose of determining what wage and salary adjustments may be made without any specific approval, the general orders of the National War Labor Board shall be applicable to all employees subject to the Railway Labor Act, except those receiving salaries at the rate of $5,000 or more per annum in regard to whom the regulations of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall apply. But any adjustment of salary under $5,000 heretofore approved by the Commissioner shall not be affected by this order.

3. If the Chairman of the National Railway Labor Panel has reason to believe that the proposed change, in wage rates or salary, may not conform to the standards prescribed in Executive Order No. 9250, or to the general stabilization program made effective thereunder, or to the directives on policy issued by the Economic Stabilization Director thereunder and the proposed change is not modified to conform to such standards, program, and directives, he shall designate three members of the Panel as an emergency board to investigate the proposed change and to report to the President. Otherwise, the Chairman of the Panel may permit the proposed change to become effective.

4. Emergency boards, whether designated pursuant to the Railway Labor Act, Executive Order No. 9172, or section 3 of this order, in reporting to the President shall certify that their recommendations in regard to any proposed change affecting wage and salary payments conform with the standards prescribed in Executive Order No. 9250, the general stabilization program made effective thereunder, and with the directives on policy issued by the Economic Stabilization Director thereunder.

5. Copies of the report with recommendations made to the President by any emergency board under section 4 of this order shall be filed by the board forthwith with the Economic Stabilization Director, the National War Labor Board, and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The Economic Stabilization Director may on behalf of himself or other departments and agencies concerned, report to the President the effect of the recommendations on the general stabilization program. Unless and except to the extent that the Economic Stabilization Director shall otherwise direct, the recommendations of the Emergency Board in regard to proposed changes affecting wages and salary payments shall, upon the expiration of 30 days after the report is filed with the President, become effective.

6. The National War Labor Board and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall either rule on any application for approval of wage and salary adjustments now before the Board and the Commissioner or transfer it to the chairman of the National Railway Labor Panel. The Board and the Commissioner shall not rule on any application hereafter made.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 4, 1943.*

STATEMENT OF FRED M. VINSON, ECONOMIC STABILIZATION DIRECTOR, ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 91

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, if Senate Joint Resolution No. 91 is passed, Congress will have broken the Little Steel formula. By such action, Congress will have told the country that a privileged group is outside the stabilization program and is not to join in the battle againt inflation.

The cornerstone of the wage-stabilization program is the act of October 2, 1942, wherein Congress itself directed that all wages and prices be stabilized as near as practicable at the levels of September 15, 1942. Since the passage of that act the general rule is that there are to be no wage increases. This needs to be stressed, because some appear to believe that wage increases are still a part of the normal course of events. The general policy of no wage increases is subject to no major objections. No one claims that exactly the same wage is paid for the same work in all the plants within an industry, or that wages from industry to industry are absolutely comparable or that all wages and all prices are in precise balance. We have never had such conditions, and probably never will.

The argument as to whose wages are out of line now is a never-ending one. War is no time for each of us to devote his principal energies to improving his lot any more than war is the time for the Government to undertake a program directed toward obtaining a perfect relationship between all wages. Instead, the Government, by a general freeze of wage rates, has assured that the inequalities present while we are engaged in war are to be no greater than those we had in peacetime.

To the general rule that there shall be no wage increases, a few exceptions have been made in the attempt to obtain greater overall fairness. These exceptions have been made under the congressional language that adjustments may be made to the extent the President finds necessary to aid in the effective prosecution of the war or to correct gross inequities.

The President, as directed by the Congress, issued, on October 3, 1942, a general order (Executive Order No. 9250) stabilizing wages at September 15 levels. This order permitted, as exceptions to the general freeze, wage increases to correct maladjustments, gross inequities and inequalities, to eliminate substandards of living, or to aid in the effective prosecution of the war.

In April 1943 there were more than 12,000 applications for increases to correct alleged inequities. The President found the exceptions in the existing order too liberal, and so on April 8, 1943, issued his hold-the-line order (No. 9328). This order directed that there were to be no wage increases except those necessary to correct substandards of living, those within Little Steel, or incentive and merit increases which would not increase production costs or prices. At the same time the President directed the Economic Stabilization Director to carry out the purposes of the act of October 2, 1942.

On May 12, 1943, Justice Byrnes, then Director of Economic Stabilization, promulgated a directive, under the standards of the act, which permits wage adjustments to the minimum sound and tested going rate for

comparable work in similar plants in a particular labor market area. This directive also permits tapered increases for interrelated job classifications when there is a substandard or Little Steel adjustment.

The standards of the hold-the-line order and the May 12 directive are the standards of the present stabilization program, and they are the standards under which the nonoperating railway employees' case has been considered. The only standard which allows a general flat increase over the level of September 15, 1942, is the Little Steel adjustment. This adjustment permits, in appropriate cases, an increase in straight-time hourly earnings to a point 15 percent above the level of January 1, 1941.

The nonoperating railway employees have had one general wage increase since January 1941. This was the outgrowth of a claim made in June 1941. Negotiation and mediation proving unsuccessful, an Emergency Board (known as the Morse Board) was appointed, and made its recommendations on November 5, 1941. The Morse Board recommended a temporary increase for the nonoperating railway employees of 9 cents per hour, an average increase of 13½ percent.

The railway workers protested the fact that the wage increases were to be temporary, and considered the amount of the recommendations inadequate. They threatened a strike, and so the Morse Board was reconvened.

The members of the Board, acting as mediators, secured the Chicago agreement of December 15, 1941. This agreement raised the employees' wage 10 cents per hour, an increase of 15.6 percent, or if consideration is given to the fact that the minimum wage was, in most instances, raised to 46 cents, the percentage increase in straight-time hourly earnings was 16.35 percent.

No further general wage adjustments for railway employees have been made, but on September 25, 1942, the employees served notice of a wage claim for 20 cents per hour, with a minimum rate of pay of 70 cents per hour. A week later the Congress declared, by the act of October 2, that all wages should be stabilized as of September 15. Negotiation and mediation again proving unsuccessful, an Emergency Board was appointed on February 20, 1943. The Board, reporting on May 24, 1943, recommended a general across-the-board increase of 8 cents per hour.

Five days later, the date of the supplemental report, I took over the duties of the Office of Economic Stabilization. During the next 3 weeks I devoted much of my time to the study of the recommendations and of the standards under which wage increases may be made. I determined that a general 8-cent increase was not in conformity with the stabilization program. On June 22 I announced that the recommendation was not to become effective.

At the hearing it was suggested that in determining matters of this character, I do what the President wants me to do. I simply wish to say that in making this determination the President did not directly or indirectly communicate with me.

An opinion dated June 30 explained my action and indicated what might still be done. I stated that I believed the Board had not exhausted the possible applications of the standards of the stabilization program. Knowing that the Morse Board had been reconvened, I wrote my opinion in the form of a letter to the Board and suggested that the Board might reconsider its recommendation and might make a revised recommendation.

This suggestion was not followed because the chairman of the National Railway Labor Panel and the members of the Emergency Board held the view that the Board was dissolved. The chairman of the Panel declined to designate a new Board.

Later the President appointed a Special Emergency Board to reconsider the case. That Board recommended a 10-cent increase for the lowest-paid employees and increases progressively smaller as the rate of pay advanced until the highest-paid employees would receive an increase of 4 cents per hour. I found these recommendations based upon the substandard and interrelated job classification principles, consonant with the stabilization program.

At this point it is well to take note of one or two references in the record to the effect that everyone in the executive department would be glad to see this matter settled. It is settled. The question is whether Congress will unsettle it.

It has been urged by some that when employers and employees agree to a certain wage increase there is little or no reason why the wage increase should not be put into effect. Such a position fails to take into account the fact that a wartime economy is not a peacetime economy. With fewer goods than there is purchasing power, and with shortages of manpower, wages and prices must be controlled. Therefore a wage increase agreed to by employer and employee must still be squared against the standards of the wage stabilization program.

From October 3, 1942, to October 1, 1943, the War Labor Board received 109,003 voluntary applications for wage adjustments. About 25 percent of these are joint employer-union requests. During the same time about 5,100 dispute cases came to the Board. Most, but not all, of these included a wage claim. Hence, during the year the War Labor Board had 5 times as many joint employer-union wage increase applications and 15 times as many employer wage increase applications (where no union was involved) as it had dispute cases. Much more often than not, then, the proposed wage increases which come to the Government for approval present no dispute between the parties.

The critical question is whether for some strange reason the law applicable to others is not applicable to the nonoperating railway employees and their employers. We would be in an indefensible position, indeed, if privileged groups were exempted from the wage controls to which others must adhere. That would be the same as providing that one butcher must sell his limited number of steaks at Office of Price Administration ceiling prices while another butcher is free to charge whatever he can obtain.

It has been stated that if the nonoperating railway employees are subject to the wage stabilization program made effective under the act of October 2, 1942, the Railway Labor Act has been suspended or altered. This is not so. All that has happened is that the wage dispute procedure of the Railway Labor Act has been supplemented with the stabilization standards applicable to all. Congress made no exceptions.

Neither strikes nor wage rates set at what the traffic will bear are conducive to winning the war. Hence, back in May 1942, the President by Executive Order No. 9172 made provision for discouraging strike votes on the railroads by setting up a permanent panel from which emergency boards could be chosen, by delegating his power of selecting such boards to the chairman of the panel, and by providing that it would be unnecessary to take strike votes.

After wages were brought under control by the act of October 2, 1942, the President, carrying out the mandate of Congress to stabilize all wages, issued, on February 4, 1943, Executive Order No. 9299. That order provides, among other things, that a copy of the emergency board's report and recommendations is to be filed with the Director of Economic Stabilization and that the Director may report to the President as to the effect of the recommendations upon the stabilization program. The order provides further that wage and salary recommendations of the board are to become effective at the expiration of 30 days after the report is filed with the President unless and except to the extent that the Director of Economic Stabilization otherwise directs.

Following regularly established procedure the nonoperating railway employees have had their wage claims considered under the wage-stabilization standards applicable to all. It has been possible to approve a substandard adjustment with tapered increases in the interrelated job classifications.

It has been pointed out that these approved wage adjustments result in an additional annual labor pay roll of only $18,000,000, less than a general 8-cent increase. From this it is argued that the stabilization against inflation issue has disappeared from the case. Such a view is, of course, entirely erroneous.

A relatively small consideration is that a general increase of 8 cents for the nonoperating employees would probably necessitate upward revision for all of the operating employees. The all-important consideration is that in view of the December 1941 increase, an across-the-board adjustment in any amount is violative of the Little Steel formula.

The pressure exerted by an organized labor group to break the Litle Steel formula may be a new experience for Congress—but not for those who have been doing battle with inflation. The War Labor Board was asked to abandon the Little Steel formula in the west coast Airframe cases. The Board declined to do so. The War Labor Board was asked to override the Little Steel formula in the packing-house cases. The Board refused. The Board was asked to scuttle this stabilization policy in the shipbuilding cases. But again the Board stood firm. I have merely mentioned three of the largest cases. In a sense every wage request that is denied presents an illustration. The Little Steel formula will be subject to attack in hundreds of future cases.

If the Congress exempts one group from the application of the Little Steel formula, then the executive department would, in all fairness, be compelled to abandon it for other groups. All cases pending before the War Labor Board will be involved and all future cases will be affected. If Congress desires some change in the standards of wage stabilization, it should, in my view, write a formula applicable to all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] that the Senate proceed to consider Senate Joint Resolution 91 to aid in effectuating the purposes of the Railway Labor Act.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, with an amendment to strike out all after the resolving clause and to insert the following:

That the agreement made in Washington, D. C., on August 7, 1943, by and between the carriers and railway labor organization parties thereto, is in accord with the requirements of the Railway Labor Act and all other requirements of law, and shall be held so to be, anything in the law or laws of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. TRUMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Overton
Andrews	Gillette	Radcliffe
Austin	Green	Reed
Bailey	Guffey	Revercomb
Ball	Gurney	Robertson
Bankhead	Hawkes	Russell
Barkley	Hayden	Scrugham
Bridges	Hill	Shipstead
Brooks	Holman	Smith
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Langer	Tobey
Capper	Lodge	Truman
Caraway	Lucas	Tunnell
Chandler	McCarran	Tydings
Chavez	McClellan	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Wallgren
Danaher	Maybank	Walsh, Mass.
Davis	Mead	Walsh, N. J.
Downey	Millikin	Wherry
Eastland	Moore	White
Ellender	Murdock	Wiley
Ferguson	Murray	Willis
George	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I am exceedingly sorry that I have acquired the kind of voice which is prevalent in Washington in the last few days, and I cannot speak as clearly or as long as I should like. Perhaps that is for the benefit of the Senate.

I interested myself in the pending joint resolution and made a thorough and complete study of the procedures which were followed and the reports which were made by the boards set up for the purpose of handling the wage question involved in the resolution. I also made a very careful study of the Stabilization Director' objections and his viewpoint on the subject.

The dispute with the nonoperating railroad labor brotherhoods goes back to 1936, 1937, or 1938, when an effort was made by the nonoperating brotherhoods to obtain an increase in wages. Their demands for an increase were pending for about 4 years, if I remember correctly. Finally in 1941 they were granted an increase of 10 cents an hour. In December 1942 they followed their usual procedure, and asked for a further increase of 20 cents an hour, with the object in view of equalizing the difference in wages between railroad nonoperating labor and labor doing the same sort of work in occupations other than those connected with the railroads. That request, as I have said, followed the usual procedure.

A board was finally appointed to go into the merits of the contention between the railroads and railroad labor, and a report was made to the President by the emergency board appointed by him on February 20, 1943, and pursuant to Executive Orders No. 9172 and No. 9299. The objective to be reached by the report of that board was the equalization of an inequity. It had nothing to do whatever with the Little Steel formula or with any other formula. It was simply an attempt to make an equitable settlement so that the nonoperating railroad labor men would be somewhat on the same basis as laboring men outside the railroad industry.

To show how these inequities grew up and worked against these men, who have been good soldiers and stayed on the job through all the kicking around which they have received, let me say that there are contractors who are paying the men who work for them and who do the same work these railroad employees are supposed to be doing anywhere from 15 to 25 cents an hour more than these railroad workers receive. These are all maintenance men, on the railroads, the express companies, and the refrigerator-car companies, and it is not possible for them to maintain the necessary equipment in shape to operate unless some equitable means can be found to settle this dispute.

These men followed every rule laid down by Congress and every rule laid down by the President through the Executive orders to which I have referred, and all they got for it, as I have said, was a kicking around, and when the settlement was finally agreed to in May of this year, it was overturned by the Stabilization Director. The railroad operating management and the railroad labor representatives were then asked to get together and make a settlement. They got together and made a settlement on August 7, 1942, which was perfectly satisfactory to the railroad management and perfectly satisfactory to railroad labor, but that settlement was also overturned by the Stabilization Director.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Missouri if it was not the understanding of the parties who sat down to try to adjust the controversy that the decision reached would be acceptable and would go into force and effect?

Mr. TRUMAN. It was the understanding in both instances that the settlement of the Railroad Board and the settlement with management and labor in August would be a final settlement and would be agreed to. That was overturned, and the special board referred to by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] was appointed. That board recommended a sliding scale of wages which overturned all the railroad settlements which had been made during the last 10 or 12 years. That settlement was not satisfactory to either management or labor. There is a very small difference between the two settlements in dollars and cents.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator has just referred to a special emergency board. I take it he is referring to that which is described on page 2 of the committee report, some ten or twelve lines from the bottom, as being the board appointed by the President on October 16, 1943.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. The committee says the board is "not of the character or under the circumstances conforming to the requirements of the Railway Labor Act."

Mr. TRUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator tell us if the committee discovered at any time on what authority the special board of October 16, 1943, was created.

Mr. TRUMAN. That board was created for no other purpose than to submit an agreement which would be satisfactory to the Stabilization Director, without regard to the Railway Labor Act.

Mr. DANAHER. Does it depend upon the Railway Labor Act for its existence?

Mr. TRUMAN. No; it depends upon the Executive order to which the Senator has just referred.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TRUMAN. At this point, with the consent of the Senate, I ask to insert in the RECORD a history of the railroad labor wage dispute from a booklet prepared on the subject by railroad laboring men. There are only about four and a half pages, and it explains the history of the act up to this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

I. HISTORY OF THE WAGE DISPUTE

RAILWAY EMPLOYEES OF THE NONOPERATING GROUPS HAVE SOUGHT PATIENTLY, PEACEFULLY, AND LAWFULLY, BUT HAVE FAILED TO GET FAIR AND JUST CONSIDERATION OF THEIR WAGE REQUIREMENTS FROM THE NATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

A. The wage request now under consideration actually originated more than 1 year ago.

On and immediately after September 25, 1942, representatives of the 1,100,000 employees in the maintenance, administrative, signal and telegraph and related railway departments requested of the managements of practically all American railways an increase of 20 cents per hour in their wage rates, and the establishment of a minimum wage of 70 cents per hour.

These requests were made in strict compliance with the existing union agreements, and with the provisions of the Railway Labor Act. That act, passed in 1926 and amended in 1934 and 1936, regulates the handling of all railway labor disputes.

B. Orderly handling of the requests, first made by separate unions upon each of the railway lines, resulted in national negotiations between committees representing virtually all American railway companies, and all of the 1,100,000 nonoperating employees.

These national negotiations began on December 15, 1942, in New York. The railroads' conference committee consisted of three subcommittees representing railroads in the eastern, southeastern and western regions of the United States. The national union committee consisted of the presidents of the 15 cooperating railway labor organizations. Negotiations continued for 3 days, when it became evident that direct agreement at that stage of proceedings was impossible.

The next step provided in the Railway Labor Act for the handling of railway labor disputes is the invoking of the services of the National Mediation Board. That step was taken on December 18, 1942.

C. Mediation began on January 7, 1943, when representatives of the National Mediation Board met with members of the management and the union committees.

The Mediation Board found, on January 15, 1943, that settlement could not be reached in the process of mediation.

In accordance with the Railway Labor Act, the representatives of the Board then proposed that the dispute be arbitrated.

Being unable to get agreement upon arbitration, the National Mediation Board terminated its handling of the dispute on January 16, 1943.

D. Still following strictly the terms of the Railway Labor Act, representatives of the railway employees on January 20, 1943, requested the appointment of an emergency board to investigate, report upon, and make recommendations relative to their wage requests.

The law provides that such an emergency board be set up whenever there is danger of an interruption of railway service. The railway labor organizations had requested the creation of a permanent panel from which emergency boards might be set up during the war, without the necessity of waiting until there was imminent danger of a strike. The President had, on May 21, 1942, acted upon that request. (Executive Order 9172.) The panel appointed by the President was composed of men with great experience and knowledge of railway labor problems, most of them individuals who had frequently served in similar capacities. Nothing in this Executive order, nor in the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, modified nor permitted the modification of the Railway Labor Act.

E. Proceeding under the act and Presidential authority, the chairman of the National Railway Labor Panel on February 20, 1943, appointed an Emergency Board to investigate the wage request of the nonoperating railway employees.

Members of the Board were selected from the Panel previously appointed by the President. Those members were: Dr. I. L. Sharfman, chairman; Dr. John A. Fitch, and Mr. Walter Fisher.

Hearings before the Emergency Board began in Chicago on March 1, 1943, and closed on May 7, 1943. More than 6,000 pages of record were taken, and 234 exhibits bearing on various phases of the dispute were presented by management and employee representatives.

Railway freight and passenger rates were reduced, by the Interstate Commerce Commission, while the wage hearings were in progress—so that the Emergency Board had to consider the wage proposals in the light of rail revenues to be expected under the lowered rates.

The Emergency Board made preliminary report on May 24, 1943, and supplementary report on May 29, 1943. Complete and detailed summaries and analyses of the evidence were made in the 182 pages of the reports.

F. The Emergency Board recommended that, effective February 1, 1943, "all the carriers parties to the dispute * * * increase the basic wage rates of their employees represented by one or more of the 15 cooperating railway labor organizations by 8 cents per hour."

The Board further reported, in accordance with its authority, that these wage increases were "designed to correct gross inequities, and to aid in the effective prosecution of the war."

The Board certified that the increases "conform with the standards prescribed in Executive Order 9250, the general stabilization program made effective thereunder, and with the directives on policy issued by the Economic Stabilization Director thereunder. They are the minimum and noninflationary adjustments necessary for these purposes."

G. Representatives of the nonoperating railway employees felt that the increases recommended by the Emergency Board were inadequate.

However, in conference with the President on May 27, 1943, employee representatives agreed, in view of the national emergency, to accept the recommendations of the Board. Employee representatives, understanding after discussion with the President that unjust overtime compensation bases would be adjusted later, considered the wage question closed.

Arrangements were made for conference on June 24, 1943, with the railway management representatives to embody in an agreement the recommendations of the Emergency Board.

H. Fred M. Vinson, Economic Stabilization Director, on June 22, 1943, issued an order directing that the recommendations of the Emergency Board should not be put into effect. In a subsequent memorandum, issued a week later, the director took issue with the findings of the Board, and with its certification.

Railway labor organizations learned afterward that Director Vinson had taken this "arbitrary and capricious action" after receiving a brief filed by the managements, but without notice to or conference with the representatives of the employees.

I. After further conferences with the President, the Director of War Mobilization and the Director of Economic Stabilization, and at the further solicitation of Hon. James Byrnes and with the concurrence of Economic Stabilization Director Vinson, conferences between railroad management and the unions were held on August 6 and 7. An agreement was reached to increase all wage rates by 8 cents per hour, with a minimum of 54 cents per hour, effective February 1, 1943.

Officials of the administration still withhold approval of this agreement, and the carriers are refusing to put it into effect. Modified proposals from the President were later agreed to by employee representatives, but even these agreements have not been respected by administration officials.

J. On October 16, 1943, an Executive order was issued creating a special emergency board, outside the terms of the Railway Labor Act and the preceding Executive orders, to undertake a new consideration of the wage rates of these employees, subject to the complete veto power of Director Vinson.

Representatives of the employees have advised that Board that they consider the wage agreement of August 7, 1943, reached in accordance with the Railway Labor Act, to be a "valid and binding contract, which is legally enforceable in behalf of the employees regardless of any action or nonaction of approval or disapproval by any governmental authority."

They have further advised the Board that any action by the Director of Economic Stabilization under the new Executive order "would be a nullity, first, because of lack of constitutional authority in the said Director to take such action, and, second, if authority be assumed, because of the unconstitutional manner in which such action was taken and is contemplated."

K. As had been expected, the special Emergency Board brought in a report in accordance with Director Vinson's wishes.

The recommendations of the special Emergency Board were made known on November 4, 1943. The wage changes recommended would not substantially, although they would slightly, reduce the total cost of the increase; they would not substantially reduce the total increase in labor purchasing power; they would not modify the relationship of the nonoperating wages as a whole to the Little Steel formula.

The only effect of the special Board's recommendation—and a serious effect—would be a drastic redistribution of the increase according to a wholly impractical theory.

Stabilization Director Vinson and his special emergency board are thus not affecting inflation, or wage stabilization, or labor costs. They are instead substituting their own ideas for those of the managements and the employees, as well as for those of the Emergency Board set up under the Railway Labor Act, as to just how much each particular railway worker is to receive.

It would have been a wholly different matter, if Director Vinson, or his spcial Emergency Board, had corrected substandard wages in the industry by establishing an equitable minimum, without taking money away from other classes.

The objections of the railway labor organizations to the constitution, and the program, of the special emergency board were fully sustained by its report.

L. After having proceeded thus in accordance with the law and in strict regard for the national emergency for more than 1 year; after seeing the report and recommendations of an emergency board of railway experts arbitrarily set aside; after experiencing repeated repudiations of definite understandings with administration officials; after reaching a definite agreement with railway managements, and being refused approval—after all these peaceful, orderly, and lawful processes had failed to secure the settlement necessary "for the effective prosecution of the war," the 15 railway labor organizations on October 25, 1943, reported in detail to their membership, and issued a strike ballot returnable not later than November 25.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, reference has been made on the floor to Little Steel and the Little Steel formula, and the difference between the wages paid to men working under the Little Steel formula and the wages paid railroad laboring men. According to the New York Times of December 6:

On January 1, 1941, Mr. Fairless added, the corporation's basic common labor rate in the Pittsburgh district was 62½ cents an hour; it was increased to 72½ cents on April 1, 1941, and to 78 cents on February 16, 1942, being now nearly 25 percent above the level of January 1, 1941, with the cost-of-living index advancing about 25 percent in the same period.

He said that the average hourly earnings of all the corporation's steel-producing and fabricating wage earners rose from $0.853 on January 1, 1941, to $1.159 last October, an increase of 35.9 percent, and during October the average weekly earnings of all such wage earners was $50.42, as compared with $33.01 in January 1941.

With the increase, the wages of the railroad workers will still be far below those paid to the steel workers, who are subject to the Little Steel formula. I think that situation represents a gross inequity. These railroad men have followed the law specifically; they have been patient; they are patriots; they do not want to hold a club at the head of the Government, as was done in the coal strike. They are not that sort. The coal strike was settled, and it was settled on a basis that passed the cost of the increase on to the consumers of coal. We have been informed by the railroad operating management and by railroad labor that this 8-cent increase to the nonoperating railroad brotherhoods will not be passed on to the consuming public, and therefore will not be inflationary, and will be adjusted to the Little Steel formula.

Mr. President, I wish to apologize to the Senate for my inability to explain this matter in any better form, but the distinguished junior Senator from Kan-

sas [Mr. REED] will follow me and he will go into more detail than I have.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, we are about to act on a question which should not be before us to be dealt with, yet I am in favor of our dealing with it. Clearly we have legislative power to deal with the question.

First, I wish to clear away one or two points. The question of inflation is not involved. The difference between the amount of money involved under the contract signed by the railroads and by the brotherhoods, and that which would be allowed under the Vinson formula, is the difference between $185,000,000, in round numbers, and $167,000,000. That is all the money that is involved.

Mr. McKELLAR. Only $18,000,000?

Mr. REED. That is all that is involved, whether we passed the joint resolution, or the Vinson formula should be accepted.

Mr. President, I wish to make my position clear. I do not regard the Senate as a wage board. I do not want to see the Senate, while I am a Member of it, undertake to review wage decisions of wage boards. I think if we ever start on that line we will not have time to do anything else. Yet here is a situation upon which hinges so much that is of importance that I think we are justified, not only justified, but impelled, almost compelled, to take action today. Unless we do take action, unless the joint resolution shall be passed, unless the Congress shall exercise its power to break this impasse between the parties, the President of the United States will be taking over the railroads for operating purposes within the next 3 or 4 or possibly 5 weeks. There will be no other course left open to him.

Lest there be some feeling or lest I may have left an impression that we are under compulsion here, I wish to deny that, not only on behalf of myself, but also on behalf of the railroad brotherhoods.

I desire now to state a little more in detail than has been done how and why this question comes to us. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] referred to the fact that this wage question came up on an application from the brotherhoods for an increase I think in August or September of last year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. September 25.

Mr. REED. September 25, 1942?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. REED. Let me say parenthetically, before I proceed further, that this question is before the Senate today as the natural result of the absence of a labor policy on the part of the Government of the United States, or because of the determination of labor questions for personal or other reasons. This is the fruit of the kind of policy that has been followed.

The men involved asked for an increase in wages. The request took the usual course under the War Labor Act. The first step under that act is for the railroad employees of a single railroad to make a request for any raise desired. That was done; but that is only a matter of form. Then, when the single railroad fails to reach an agreement, all the railroads act together, and all the employees act together in two groups. This is that kind of a case.

If they cannot reach an agreement—and usually they cannot—the mediation board steps in next, and that generally does not get anywhere. Then there is provision for arbitration. In this case the brotherhoods refused to arbitrate. The railroads are divided between the eastern, the southeastern, and the western railroads. The southeastern and the western railroads were willing to arbitrate; the eastern railroads were not, and refused. So that method failed.

When a case reaches that point, a so-called strike vote is taken by the employees, and pending any action of that kind, when all efforts have failed, the President appoints a so-called emergency board. In February of this year he appointed an emergency board. That was all in accordance with the provisions of the Railway Labor Act.

The board reported on May 24, this year. It recommended an increase of 8 cents an hour to all employees of all classes. At the White House the President of the United States asked the spokesman for the brotherhoods to accept that award, and the brotherhoods agreed to accept it.

For the information of the Senate, if it is interested in how this case has been kicked around—and I shall go into more detail later—let me read from pages 107 and 108 of the hearings. I happened to be a member of the subcommittee and also of the full committee which dealt with this matter, and I think I am the only Senator who heard every word of the testimony.

I read from page 107. Mr. Harrison, speaking for the brotherhoods, said:

> On the 27th day of May, as is customary under these circumstances, I called on the President as the spokesman of these organizations and indicated to the President that we had read the report of the Sharfman board, and while we were disappointed that our original demands—

Of 20 cents an hour, I think the figure was—

> were not in their entirety granted, under all the circumstances, in view of the national situation, we would—

At his request—

> urge our members to accept.

At the request of the President, the railroads and the brotherhoods, the employers and the employees, were preparing to get together and write into a contract the terms which the Board had laid down and which the men had accepted. Mr. Vinson had just taken office. In June he issued a memorandum disapproving the agreement and saying that an opinion would be rendered later, and it was.

Mr. President, in nothing that I say along this line is there any criticism of Mr. Vinson. He had just come into office. He was overwhelmed with work. He took temporary steps to stop the matter. He stopped it; and on the 30th day of June he gave his reasons in full for what he did.

Mr. President, in the bandying around back and forth of this case let me again quote Mr. Harrison. He said on page 108 of the hearings:

> I suppose I have seen the President 8 or 9 times; I have talked with the Honorable Mr. Byrnes some 8 or 9 or 10 times, and I have talked with Mr. Vinson 5 or 6 times, I guess, and we were unable to compose our difficulties.

On the 29th of July, Mr. President, representatives of the railroads and the brotherhoods were asked to the White House for a conference. Great events were impending, and it was desired not to have any disturbances at home. The two parties to this controversy were asked to get together and see if they could not settle it. The parties said, so we were informed, "Yes; we are willing to settle it. We have been able to do so all the time." Believing that they were doing what the President and Mr. Byrnes and Mr. Vinson desired them to do, the representatives of the men met with the carriers in Washington, and on the 7th of August both parties signed a contract, and both parties have stood ready to put that contract into effect right up to and including this day.

In addition to this record, along with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], I have listened to the story "off the record" of these men telling us of the weird, almost unbelievable and incredible circumstances surrounding these negotiations; how they went back and forth, how at three different times they were given to understand that this adjustment would be accepted, and they accepted it and entered into a contract.

Mr. President, there is a reason why they are here before Congress. I hope my distinguished lawyer friends will remember that I am simply a layman. The contract of August 7 between the railroads and the employees contains this clause, and this is why the question comes up in the Senate today:

> This agreement is subject to any existing requirements of law.

So far as the Railroad Labor Act is concerned, this agreement conforms to every requirement of law. There is a question in the mind of the railroad counsel, which they frankly expressed to us, as to how much legal authority there is in the disapproval by Judge Vinson of this contract, and the railroads very naturally refuse to go ahead and pay out millions of dollars without that question being settled.

The men, through their representatives, have definitely and consistently and all the time refused to accept the Vinson version, which represents a difference of only $18,000,000. That is the only amount of money involved.

The men do not want the kind of contract proposed by Mr. Vinson. I do not undertake to say that it is good or bad; I am not trying to say whether Mr. Vinson is right or wrong. I do not undertake

to say whether the attitude of the brotherhoods is entirely equitable in all respects and to all classes of men. That is not my business in the Senate. What we have before us is a question, I think, more important than any single question that has come before the Senate in months. As I have said, it ought not to be here. I am sorry it is here. We do have the power to act. What we are being asked to do is to pass a declaratory statute. In other words, the railroads refuse to proceed so long as the shadow or cloud of the Vinson opinion, with whatever power he may or may not have, remains.

Mr. President, I wish to say before I develop the next point that I have never dealt with a more patient or reasonable body of men than those representing the 15 nonoperating brotherhoods in this case. They have been kicked around, passed back and forth, and have had three promises from the White House that they would receive the 8 cents. They are told one thing at the White House, and Mr. Byrnes tells them something else. The next day Mr. Vinson shows up and he objects to the whole thing. So finally, the settlement suggested by Mr. Vinson being unsatisfactory, the men came to Congress. I think they had a right to do that. I think we have a right to consider the question. Of course, we have a right to consider it, but I think we should consider all the facts and all the circumstances connected with the controversy.

Mr. President, the President of the United States has had power ever since the First World War to take over the transportation system of the country in an emergency. That has been emphasized in the present war. When we passed the Connally measure, and passed it again over the President's veto, we went beyond the question of an actual strike, because in that measure we said that the President could and should take over "facilities" in the case of a threatened strike.

Here is the actual situation: In accordance with their own laws and customs, which are not forbidden by any statute of the United States, after having earnestly striven for 12 months to obtain a satisfactory adjustment, after having been given probably the worst "runaround" that any body of men could possibly have received in the matter of a wage adjustment, and after reaching the end of their patience, they did what they were entitled to do. They took a strike vote. The returns are in. I do not know what the vote was, but I have no doubt that it was overwhelmingly in favor of a strike.

Mr. President, that does not mean that we are going to have a strike. The so-called strike vote merely authorizes the leaders and the executives of the brotherhoods to fix a strike date. They do not call a strike immediately. They fix a strike date. But when they fix a strike date, under the Connally Act that is a threatened strike, and the President of the United States does not have much option. I have been reasonably free in criticizing the President of the United States when I do not agree with him, which is a considerable part of the time; yet I desire to say that I think that whenever the brotherhood executives ever fix a strike date, the President will have to take over the railroads at once; and God forbid that we should ever have Government operation of railroads again.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Amen.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I went through that in the First World War. The indescribable confusion which existed, the delays, the embargoes, the losses of every kind which occurred under Government operation are in such great contrast to the magnificent way the railroads of the country are operated today that I simply do not want to take a chance on having that happen again.

So, Mr. President, in summing up the situation, I find that the negotiations were instituted and conducted in accordance with the law. Finally, the brotherhoods were given to understand by the highest authority in the land that such a contract would be approved. The brotherhoods were rather frank in telling about the number of times they were given such assurance. Three times they understood they had a definite promise from the White House that the 8-cents-an-hour increase would be allowed. Every time, including the last time, Mr. Vinson came along and upset that understanding.

At any rate, a contract was entered into, and both parties want to carry out the contract. When those terms were agreed to, Mr. Jacob Aronson, legal vice president for the New York Central Railroad, appeared before our committee. He represented the carriers. He has represented the railroads all through these negotiations. The Senator from Colorado and I questioned him. Inasmuch as I am a more patient man than the Senator from Colorado, I finally obtained the following answers from Mr. Aronson. We were talking about the pending joint resolution, and I asked the following questions, which appear on page 134 of the record:

> Do you think this is a solution?
>
> Mr. ARONSON. Yes; I do think it is a solution, for this reason. If this were enacted and became law, as I see it now there would be no remaining impediment to the going into effect of the agreement.

I said, "That satisfies me."

The Senator from Colorado said, "That is a very fine answer."

Mr. Aronson then said:

> You will understand that I am not here either authorized or with the disposition to take sides as between respective branches of the Federal Government. I do not like to be put in a position where we should take sides as between different conflicting departments of the Government.

Mr. Aronson had consistenly taken the position that this quarrel was not one between the railroads and their employees, but that the trouble lay between the brotherhoods and the administrative agencies in Washington. So, Mr. President, having regard for all the circumstances, taking into consideration the whole picture, starting with it as an ordinary but important wage negotiation, following through the tortuous and tedious and circuitous paths it traveled, we come to a place where, right or wrong—I am not passing judgment upon that—this country faces such a situation that, unless the Congress breaks this impassé, the President of the United States will seize the railroads, probably within the next 4 to 6 weeks, for Government operation. That would be a disaster.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, could not the President break the impassé if he desired to do so?

Mr. REED. The President could have prevented the impasse from arising, if he had wished to do so.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Could not the President break it now?

Mr. REED. He could, certainly.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. In the report, I notice a statement by Mr. Vinson, appearing on page 6, near the bottom:

> At this point it is well to take note of one or two references in the record to the effect that everyone in the executive department would be glad to see this matter settled.

Then he made the definite statement:

> It is settled. The question is whether Congress will unsettle it.

Mr. President, I feel that the Senator from Kansas has stated his position, which directly answers that statement; but possibly in plainer words he could say it is necessary that Congress take this action.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I think it is necessary, if we are to avoid an impending disaster, unless we may assume that our failure to take action would cause the President to change his policy or would cause Judge Byrnes to change his policy or would cause Judge Vinson to change his policy. I do not want to make such a violent assumption.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Vinson's statement leads me to think that the nonoperating brotherhoods would accept the 10-cent increase formula if we did not interfere. That is the point I wish to make.

Mr. REED. They have told us over and over again, both in the hearings and personally, that they will do nothing of the kind, and I do not think there is any chance that they will.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield, certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. In practically every case which has been decided by Mr. Vinson and in practically every case in which there has been an increase in wages, the result has been an increased cost of the product to the consuming public.

As I understand the question now before the Senate, the increase, if granted either under the Vinson formula or the Senate formula, would not result in any increase in the cost of the product, which of course is operating the railroads and selling railroad service. Is that correct?

Mr. REED. I do not think the Senator from Maryland stated the matter exactly as he wanted to state it. Of course, it

will result in an increase in the cost of operating the railroads.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. REED. But that increase in the cost——

Mr. TYDINGS. I mean the cost to the public.

Mr. REED. That increase in cost will not affect either the price or the cost of the service to the public. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then the answer is, of course, that if the increase is granted under one or the other of the two means at hand, the public will pay no more for either freight transportation or passenger travel.

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. So that the inflationary side of the matter, as differentiated from other wage increases, is not present in this conflict.

Mr. REED. That is correct; and I think we can emphasize that point, Mr. President. In the first place, there is entirely too much exaggeration and distortion of the inflationary specter in this country. As a matter of fact, the people of the United States daily are being led to believe that if we forbid subsidies, we in effect would either be removing the price ceilings or letting prices go wherever they might, without control. My mail is loaded with letters from persons who have such an understanding. It is not correct.

A moment ago the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] was in the Chamber; I wish he were here now. Let me say that there is nothing inflationary in the joint resolution, for the reason the Senator from Maryland has mentioned. If there were some increase in cost to the public, it would be negligible.

Mr. Vinson's insistence on his proposal is being carried to a point where we are threatened with a disaster to the whole country. The difference between his formula and the formula embodied in the contract between the railroads and their employees is only the difference between $167,000,000 and $182,000,000.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. One question occurs to me, and I ask the Senator's opinion because I know he is qualified to answer. If we should assume a less serious result of failure to pass the joint resolution, namely, that there would not be a seizure of the railways as the result of a threat, but there would be a strike, would the loss to the country and to the public because of the strike be financially greater than the difference of $18,000,000?

Mr. REED. Infinitely so. The answer is obvious. The difference between the two formulas is negligible.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. One day's loss would equal the difference.

Mr. REED. That is true. I can think of no greater disaster to the country than the threat of Government operation of the railroads. Bear in mind that if the Government should take over the railroads, it would still have the wage dispute on its hands, just as it had in the case of the coal mines. Is there any reason to believe that the administration would handle this dispute any more happily or successfully than it has handled the wage dispute in the case of the coal mines?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I should like to ask the Senator a further question. In Mr. Vinson's report, the date of which I do not now recall, but which is printed in the committee report, he makes the direct charge that if this increase is granted to the nonoperating brotherhoods, it will be a sufficiently large increase so that there will be an injustice as between the wages of the operating brotherhoods and what will be the wages of the nonoperating brotherhoods. Reading that charge, I am wondering if the Senator feels that we shall be compelled to raise the wages of the operating brotherhoods. Then, of course, we might confront a demand for increases in freight and passenger rates. Can the Senator answer that question?

Mr. REED. I can only state my opinion. In the first place this wage controversy falls into a class by itself. It went to an emergency board. The emergency board made a finding, after long consideration, or at least ample consideration, and that finding was written into a contract between the employees and the employers. Both sides are ready to accept it. This is not a Little Steel case at all. It is very true that most of the nonoperating brotherhoods had had a wage increase. As the Senator from Missouri very correctly pointed out, there was a long-pending wage adjustment which became effective after January 1, 1941, and the increase in wages exceeded, on the average, 15 percent. So this case falls entirely outside the Little Steel formula.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In comparing the operating employees with the nonoperating employees, there is this distinction: The nonoperating employees obtained an award of 8 cents from the emergency board. The operating employees were awarded 4 cents, which they rejected. So we could very well uphold the two emergency boards without any great increase such as the Senator from South Dakota has indicated might occur.

Mr. REED. That is very true. I am very glad to have the Senator from Colorado help out at this point.

There was a finding by an emergency board, finally embodied in a contract which is acceptable to both sides. That finding was based upon the "gross inequities" provision.

I am not a member of a wage board. While I am a Member of the Senate I do not want this body ever to get into such a position that it must undertake to pass judgment upon the merits or demerits, or equity or lack of equity, of wage contracts.

At any rate, this emergency board, in making the 8-cent award, hung it upon the "gross inequity" phase of the Stabilization Act.

The operating brotherhoods, that is to say, the trainmen, enginemen, and yardmen, wanted an increase in wages. They have an award of 4 cents from an emergency board. They come clearly under the Little Steel formula. They have had some increase in wages. The 4 cents an hour brings them up to 15 percent.

The operating employees could not make a "gross inequity" case. I think it was shown that the minimum wage—I am now speaking from memory—of the operating employees is about 70 or 80 cents an hour. It may be higher than that. On the other hand, the wages of nonoperating employees, which include section men, are as low as 46 cents an hour.

I am not wholly out of sympathy with Mr. Vinson's ideas on this subject. I think there is some merit in his contention; but there is not sufficient merit in it for me to refuse to act in my capacity as Senator in a case such as this. While I wish this case were not here, and while I do not think it ought ever to have been allowed to come here, yet it is here, and I think fairly so. It being here, we must do something about it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. On the question just discussed by the able Senator from Kansas, what attitude has been taken by the operating employees toward the contract between the carriers and the nonoperating employees? Have they expressed any view upon it?

Mr. REED. There are 2 groups of railroad brotherhoods. There are 21 so-called standard railway labor unions. Fifteen of them got together in what they call cooperating labor organizations.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Which group is affected by this particular measure?

Mr. REED. The nonoperating employees.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I understand that; but are they included among the 15 unions to which the Senator has referred?

Mr. REED. They are the shop men, clerks, section hands, and so forth.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What I am driving at is this: If the proposed increase were given to the nonoperating employees, if the joint resolution were to be passed by the Congress and approved by the President, what would be the attitude of the operating employees? Has there been any indication of the attitude of the operating groups with respect to their wages? Have they indicated their attitude?

Mr. REED. There has been nothing brought before the committee of which I am a member.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Have they expressed any view on the subject?

Mr. REED. Not so far as I know.

Mr. REVERCOMB. They have not indicated any position on it?

Mr. REED. No so far as I know. So far as I am concerned—and I speak only for myself—if and when we pass this joint resolution we are not establishing

a precedent for anyone, anywhere, at any time, on the merits of a wage controversy in and of itself.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is the point I am trying to have made plain. If we should pass the joint resolution, would the operating groups say, first to the carrier, and then perhaps in a demand for legislation, "We want more money"? Is there any indication that that might happen?

Mr. REED. It rather reinforces my judgment and leaves me with a somewhat more comfortable feeling to consider that the joint resolution only enforces the judgment of the duly constituted board which passed judgment on this question.

Mr. WHERRY, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. ELLENDER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. REED. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Following up the question asked by the junior Senator from West Virginia as to wages, what does the Senator have to say as to whether or not we would be establishing a precedent for increased prices? The Senator well knows that in our section of the country, where cattle are produced, we are very much interested in seeing the price of cattle brought back to the highest price established between January 1 and September 15, 1942, which was $17.80 a hundred at Chicago, and which was arbitrarily reduced by the Price Stabilizer to $16 a hundred. The Senator says that the passage of the joint resolution would afford no precedent as to wages. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] pointed out with much force awhile ago in his remarks that the passage of the joint resolution would afford a precedent for price increases. He pointed out that pressure groups might seek to establish higher prices, when the Price Stabilizer seeks to keep such prices down.

Mr. REED. When the Senator from Louisiana points anything out he always points it out with force. I think the answer to the Senator from Nebraska is "No." I arrived at the decision, which I have discussed here this afternoon, as a member of the subcommittee and of the full committee, after as careful consideration as I have ever given to any question which has come up in the Senate since I have been a member of it. I do not think we are shocking anybody's conscience. I do not think we are establishing any precedent which would be dangerous. The Congress has passed declaratory statutes before. Doubtless it will do so again whenever there arises a combination of circumstances which call for such action. What we are asked to do here is to pass a declaratory statute.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I hope the Senator will pardon me for being rather insistent, but I am not satisfied with the answer to the question which I propounded, or perhaps I did not catch the answer. Again I wish to ask, what effect would the passage of this joint resolution have, regardless of the very true fact that it sustains a ruling of the administrative board? Would it be an incentive or excuse for the operating brotherhoods to go to that board with requests for higher pay?

Mr. REED. Oh, no.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Has that question been considered?

Mr. REED. The operating brotherhoods have had their case before a duly selected emergency board, such as the one which made the 8-cent award. That board made an award to the operating brotherhoods of 4 cents an hour. What we are trying to do here today is to pass a declaratory statute, which would make effective the findings of the board. The other board found that 4 cents was all the men could have.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I gather from the Senator's answer that there is no danger of our setting a precedent for the operating organizations of the railroads to ask for more money upon the passage of the pending joint resolution.

Mr. REED. I should not want to say to the Senator from West Virginia that any group of men might not take something we had done as an excuse for asking us to do something else. So far as I am concerned individually, or as a member of the Interstate Commerce Committee, it would be perfectly useless for the operating brotherhoods to come here and ask for any action comparable to what we are asked to do now, because they could not make out a case like the one now before us.

Mr. AUSTIN rose.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. REED. Let me first yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. I defer to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have but one more question, which is rather a repetition. Has there been any indication that the brotherhoods would use the granting of this last increase as an excuse for a request for a further increase?

Mr. REED. Not so far as I know. I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. My question is to elicit the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Kansas upon this particular point: Is it not true that the pending joint resolution deals with only one agreement, which is specified by date, so there can be no doubt that we are dealing with one specific agreement, and that when we talk about a resolution declaring that that agreement is in conformity with our policy, declared by law, we are not deciding another case based on another and different agreement?

Mr. REED. Or set of circumstances.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Vermont is certainly correct. I thank him very much for his contribution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I shall yield in a moment. The main part of the resolution is as follows:

> That the agreement made in Washington, D. C., August 7, 1943, by and between the carriers and railway labor organization parties thereto, is in accord with the requirements of the Railway Labor Act and all other requirements of law, and shall be held so to be—

And so forth. The language was changed since the time the joint resolution was first introduced. I was not satisfied with the phraseology which originally appeared in Senate Joint Resolution 91. No one had any particular pride of authorship in the language. Frankly, I talked this matter over with Donald Richberg, who is counsel for the brotherhoods, and one of the very ablest lawyers about whom I know anything. Other members of the committee also discussed the matter with him. We were trying to make the language as definite, concise, and as limited to the immediate circumstances as it was possible to make it. I did not select this language myself, but it had Mr. Richberg's approval.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Since a legally constituted board, according to the Senator, has passed on this issue why is it necessary for Congress to take action?

Mr. REED. Because the opinion, order, or directive—the New Deal term with which the Senator from Louisiana is quite familiar—the directive of Judge Vinson cast a cloud upon the agreement.

Mr. ELLENDER. Well, can the Senator show us anything in the Executive order creating this Board which holds that this matter must not be submitted to the Stabilization Director for adjudication?

Mr. REED. There was no Stabilization Director when this matter started in the beginning.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand, but does the Senator take the position that the orders of this special Board were not to be passed upon by the Stabilization Director?

Mr. REED. If the Senator will remember, before the adoption of the act of October 2 of last year the President of the United States was just about to declare a dictatorship, but postponed it for 30 days in order to give us a chance to act. And we acted. I remember very well that the distinguished Senator from Ohio wanted to be very careful that we did not vest by indirection or loose language any more authority in the President, or allow him to take any more authority than we actually gave him. So the following language was adopted—reading from the end of section 2 of the act of October 2, 1942:

> He—
>
> The President—
>
> may not under the authority of this act suspend any other law or part thereof.

Whether the President has come into collision with that language in the directives through which he has established these various agencies and reestablished them, and shifted their power, transferred authority, and increased confusion—whether or not he

has come into conflict with that limitation in the act of October 2, 1942, I do not undertake to say. The Senator from Louisiana is a distinguished lawyer. I always depend upon my good friends the Senator from Vermont, the Senator from Connecticut, the Senator from Colorado—and I am coming to depend on the Senator from West Virginia—for my law. I am a layman. I have much difficulty in handling these items. I do my poor best.

I think the President of the United States violates more law and exceeds the authority Congress has given him more frequently than any officer of the Federal Government I have had experience with in my whole lifetime. Whether he has done it in this case or not, I do not undertake to say. Anyway, if he has, we can cure it, so far as we are concerned, here today, and I am willing to do it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator that even among the lawyers of the Senate it is rather confusing to hear distinguished Members take the position that this Board was legally constituted and had the right to do specific things, and then, on the other hand, take the position that we in Congress must pass on the same issue. Either Mr. Vinson does not have jurisdiction or he does. My contention is that he has, and, if that be so, then he is the final arbiter, and the moment Congress makes any attempt to override him, it strikes me that we should abolish the office of Stabilization Director, and simply let nature take its course, as I suggested earlier in the afternoon. We cease to be a legislative body and assume judicial functions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield to me?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to reply to the point raised by the Senator from Louisiana. The Board was a lawful board; there can be no dispute as to that. It brought in its verdict as the Senator from Kansas has stated on May 24. Then in pursuance of its report, which was submitted to the President, railroad management and labor met and worked out an agreement on August 7, but in that agreement there was added a line or two to the effect that that agreement must be subject to the laws of the country. My understanding is that, because of the inclusion of the line, that the agreement had to be in accordance with the laws of the United States, it is made necessary for Congress to state what the law is. That is my explanation of the situation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, did not that clause refer to the fact that there could be no increase in wages or any increase in the price of commodities unless it was submitted to the Stabilization Director in order that he might determine whether or not such a change would cause a break in the line?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No. That language went into the agreement of August 7 because the Director of Economic Stabilization had issued his proclamation and his directive, and management did not want to pay out money for wages when there was a cloud on the procedure. Director Vinson placed a cloud upon the whole process of determining the issue by his directive of June 22, followed by his opinion of June 30, and, because of his action when management and their employees met, they wanted to safeguard themselves and say that the agreement had to be in accordance with law.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, in conclusion I wish to say I have no criticism of Judge Vinson beyond the fair criticism that I think he is alarming the country unnecessarily by his wholly unjustified emphasis upon what he calls the inflationary factor involved in this matter. There is no inflationary factor involved in this case.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President——

Mr. REED. I shall yield to the Senator from Delaware in a moment if he will be so good as to allow me to proceed. There is no inflationary factor. The difference between what he proposes and what the contract contains is only $18,000,000. The whole amount involved, at a time when we are talking only in billions, is $187,000,000; so, I think Mr. Vinson is fairly entitled to criticism for unnecessarily alarming the country over a danger that does not exist. I now yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BUCK. Can the Senator tell me how much money is involved if this increase in wages is granted?

Mr. REED. When the matter was first up, when the award was made by the emergency board, it was agreed that the maximum should be $204,000,000.

Mr. BUCK. Has that been increased or decreased?

Mr. REED. I have just read the figures. There was put into the RECORD a statement by the brotherhoods showing the number of people employed or involved in this contract. It is a part of the record of the Senate. The difference, as I stated earlier, is that the emergency board award, according to the interpretation placed upon it, involved $185,000,000, and the same authority or source says that the Vinson award or formula involves $167,000,000.

Mr. BUCK. The outside figure would be $200,000,000; would it?

Mr. REED. The outside figure originally accepted was to be $204,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It should be pointed out that the amounts are not static; they are somewhat changeable according to the number of employees, the number of hours they work, and matters of that kind. So it is pretty difficult to say that it is exactly $204,000,000 or $187,000,000. But the railway employees by another calculation have made a new estimate that there is only $10,000,000 difference. The real difference is some point between $10,000,000 and $18,000,000.

Mr. REED. I think of another criticism, which might lie to some extent upon the Senator from Louisiana. I think that this administration and its friends are unreasonably, unnecessarily, and unduly alarming the country, and the people of the country as to the effect if certain things are done or not done, including this proposed legislation.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President——

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. I notice that Judge Vinson in his statement which is in the record concludes as follows:

> The all-important consideration is that in view of the December 1941 increase, an across-the-board adjustment in any amount is violative of the Little Steel formula.

I assume he means by that that 8 cents an hour increase is violative of the Little Steel formula, in view of the increase made in December 1941. I should like to hear the Senator from Kansas make a statement concerning that phase of the matter.

Mr. REED. I think it has been pointed out quite clearly by the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Colorado that if these workers should get an increase, if 8 cents an hour were added to what they now get, it would violate the Little Steel formula; but the Little Steel formula is not involved in this matter at all. As a matter of fact, this award was made and was clearly stated by the emergency board to correct inequities that the law directed be corrected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In addition to that argument, which is sound, the award made by Judge Vinson of $187,000,000 violates the Little Steel formula also.

Mr. OVERTON. That was the next question I was going to ask the Senator from Kansas. If that be true, then why is it that the order of Judge Vinson does not violate the Little Steel formula?

Mr. REED. The order of Judge Vinson would violate the Little Steel formula just as much as the other would violate it, except for a slight difference in the amount of money involved. In principle, if the award of the Emergency Board is violative of the Little Steel formula, then the formula of Judge Vinson is violative of it and inflationary.

Mr. OVERTON. And the question would be whether to accept Judge Vinson's formula or the formula of the Emergency Board created by the railroad operators and by the nonoperating railway employees.

Mr. REED. The question is whether we are going to take a legal determination, which was reached after the machinery Congress had created had been put into motion and used, and a decision obtained. The President three times asked the brotherhoods to take the decision, and they said, while it was not enough, they would take it. Finally the railroads and the brotherhoods were sent for, and on the 29th of July they appeared and were told to settle their dispute. They did settle it, and signed a contract on the 7th of August. Then that was overturned. If that is good faith, if that is good sense, if that is good judgment, then I do not know what good

faith, good sense, and good judgment are.

Mr. OVERTON. Let me ask one more question. The only other argument in favor of Judge Vinson's formula is that his would not be inflationary, whereas the 8-cent across-the-board increase would be inflationary. The only difference is $18,000,000. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Missouri that that difference would not create any inflation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator yield to me at that point?

Mr. REED. In a moment. I do not want to do anyone an injustice. I do not know that Judge Vinson would rest his case wholly on the assumption of the statement of the senior Senator from Louisiana. I think Judge Vinson thinks it is a more equitable way to use the money. I shall not quarrel with him about that.

Mr. OVERTON. It is not a question of inflation.

Mr. REED. It is not a question of inflation.

Mr. OVERTON. There are only two questions involved, first, whether it violates the Little Steel formula, as Judge Vinson thinks it does, and second, is either of the plans inflationary, or are both?

Mr. REED. If either violates the Little Steel formula, both do, and neither is inflationary.

Mr. OVERTON. If one is inflationary, the other is.

Mr. REED. Yes; if one is inflationary, the other is.

Mr. MEAD. Will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. I wish to commend the Senator from Kansas for the scholarly way in which he has presented the argument, and I wish to make only one observation, and then I shall be through. Oftentimes we hear about the employees receiving a wage adjustment since 1941. In reality that was granted upon an application made by them in 1938 based upon conditions which were found to exist at that particular time. So in reality, while the decision in the case was delayed over a period of years, in reality they have not received a wage adjustment since 1938.

Mr. REED. As the Senator from New York and I both know so well—we have come up the hard way, both of us, and have a familiarity with conditions from mingling with all sides of railroads, from section man up; I myself have been a section man——

Mr. MEAD. So have I.

Mr. REED. In the present case the largest single classification was the lowest-paid section men, who are getting 46 cents an hour. If someone wants to talk about a depressed wage in this day of war prices and war wages, there is the section man's wage of 46 cents an hour, which obtains on the railroads today.

Mr. MEAD. I wish to verify what the Senator says. I believe a good many of the employees have been neglected altogether too long, and not only does the wage raise recommend itself but there have been gross inequalities in the pay of these railroad workers, as the Senator has pointed out.

Mr. REED. And the main principle involved in this adjustment authorized by the emergency board, which was appointed in February and reported in May, is the correction of these gross inequities.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I was about to yield the floor, but I yield to the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. On the question of inflation, the Senator has taken the position that since the difference between the formula as written out by Judge Vinson and that by the Board is only $18,000,000, it will not bring about inflation. The question I wish to pose to the Senator is this: Since under the Vinson formula over half the employees involved will get from 8 to 10 cents an hour increase because of their low wages, and lower rates will be paid to those now receiving higher rates per hour, will not that decrease the chances of inflation? In other words, the greater part of the increase will be paid to those receiving very low wages, wage earners who really need the increases so as to make both ends meet. I can well understand that if high rates were paid to those already receiving high wages, inflation may be involved in some degree.

Mr. MEAD. I do not think there is enough to be inflationary.

Mr. ELLENDER. A little bit added here and a little bit added there makes a big bit after awhile.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay a vote on the joint resolution, but in view of the vote I expect to cast, I wish to make a brief statement with reference to it.

The joint resolution has troubled me no little, not because I had any lack of sympathy for and with the employees of the railroads involved, but because I regretted the fact that it became necessary, apparently, for the Congress of the United States to deal by legislation with the question of an increased wage involving any group of our citizens.

It is unfortunate, in my judgment extremely so, that this controversy has not been adjusted and settled long ago. I think it is unfortunate that any wage dispute is permitted to drag on until it becomes chronic to such a point that when it is finally settled practically neither side is satisfied with the settlement. But the joint resolution is before us, and we must deal with it on its merits, regardless of any wish we may have had that the question could have been adjusted without its being brought here for consideration.

I think I may say that the men involved in this railroad wage dispute, whether employees or employers, themselves regret that the matter has been found to be of such a character as to make it necessary to bring it to the Congress of the United States under the joint resolution now before the Senate.

I am sure I speak for both sides of the controversy, with whom I have held numerous conferences, when I say that it would have been better and more satisfactory all around if the matter could have been adjusted under the ordinary processes of adjustment, without the Congress being called upon to take any action with respect to this particular difficulty.

I have in a modest way sought, without undertaking to inject myself into the controversy, or to grab the ball and run off with it, or to direct its course, to see if the matter could not be adjusted without congressional action. There probably was a time when that could have been done, but that is neither here nor there now; it was not done, and no efforts I myself found it possible to make were successful.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. REED. I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky whether he does not recall that during the time he was making this effort I expressed to him my hope that he would be successful, that I stated I should very much prefer to see it settled by some sort of negotiation than to settle it here, and that I hoped the distinguished majority leader would be successful in his efforts.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator did approach me and make that statement, and I am sure he was sincere about it. I am satisfied all of us would have been much happier if it could have been adjusted without action on the part of Congress. But we now have the matter here and we must deal with it, and in my judgment we must deal with it in a fair way, without prejudice against anyone or for anyone, without impugning anyone's motives, or integrity, or good faith.

I have been particularly troubled by reason of this matter because of my warm friendship for Judge Vinson, with whom I have been associated in legislative life for a period of 2 decades. Judge Vinson comes from my State. He has been an outstanding public servant, and is now an outstanding public servant. However much any man may disagree with any of his conclusions, in my judgment no man can question his good faith, or his sincerity, or his honesty. Of course, the same statement applies to Justice Byrnes, with whom we have all served here in the Senate and elsewhere.

Questions such as this, however, can not be adjusted or settled on any man's personal admiration or affection for some public officer. We have our own responsibility, and I think we will be remiss in the performance of our duty if we do not accept and discharge that responsibility as we see our duty to be.

Mr. President, I have been long rather intimately connected with railroad labor legislation. Back in 1916 I was a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives at a time when the 8-hour day on the railroads of the United States was a burning question between the employees and the employers. A strike had been called. A date had been fixed. President Wilson came before Congress

and requested that we pass an act acknowledging the 8-hour day as the legal workday of railroads, and as a member of that committee I helped to write the Adamson law passed in 1916, as I recall, which is still on the statute books.

I introduced in the House of Representatives the original bill which became known as the Howell-Barkley bill, which set up the Board of Railway Mediation, to supersede the old Railroad Labor Board created by the Transportation Act in 1920. We did not secure the enactment of that measure in the first session in which it was introduced, but I think the fight which was made for it in that session was responsible for the fact that in the next session it was enacted practically without opposition and has been the law ever since. That was in 1926. That law has been on the statute books since then, with slight modifications, and it has worked more successfully than any labor legislation which has ever been enacted in the history of this country, and I doubt whether in any country legislation enacted to adjust railroad labor disputes or other disputes has worked as successfully as that law has worked.

There has not been a major strike on the railroads of the United States nor a serious threat of a major strike since the enactment of that statute. It has been accepted by both the railroad management and the railroad employees, and it has been observed and carried out in good faith.

That is why it is, Mr. President, that in the Price Stabilization Act as first passed, and in the amendment to it which was adopted later, and in practically all the orders of the President until the order he issued on the 4th of February this year, the Railway Labor Act was exempted from the operation of either the Price Stabilization Act or the orders of the President issued under it.

There is some doubt in my mind, I am frank to say, whether the order of February 4, 1943, completely nullifies either the enactment of Congress in two instances exempting the Railway Labor Act from the operation of the Price Stabilization Act, or the previous Presidential orders which also specifically exempted the Railway Labor Act from the operation of the orders.

Whether the Adamson law passed in 1916, fixing the 8-hour day, because there was what appeared to be an insolvable dispute as to hours—not wages, but hours—constitutes a precedent for this measure, it is not necessary to argue. It might be said that Congress has heretofore taken action designed to settle a controversy between the railroads and their employees, and in justification of that action and in justification of the proposed action it might be said that Congress has regarded our transportation system as constituting a separate field for legislation, both in regard to the fixing of rates and practices by establishing the Interstate Commerce Commission, because it recognized that it could not by legislation fix rates, and in regard to setting up the special Board of Mediation and Conciliation for the settlement of railroad disputes affecting labor.

Congress has for many years, beginning back in 1887, and coming on down in 1926, and more recently, regarded transportation as a separate field for legislation by Congress in undertaking to facilitate the adjustment of disputes, because an interruption in our transportation system that might be Nation-wide would be more important and more disastrous than interruption in any single factory or any combination of factories in the United States.

So when the present dispute arose between the railroads and their employees they began negotiations to adjust the controversy, as I recall, in September 1942. Those negotiations continued until December 1942 and January 1943. Finally it was determined that the wage question could not be adjusted by mutual negotiation between the roads and the employees, and it was, of course, then that they resorted to the Railway Mediation Act under which the Mediation Board, and the panel set up by the law itself, were made use of. Coming on down step by step, under the Railway Labor Act, the final Emergency Board of 3 provided for in the act, out of the 10 or 12 members provided for by the act, was designated as a Special Emergency Board to deal with the question of wages involved in this dispute.

That Board deliberated upon the matter. The railway employees had asked for 20 cents an hour increase. After hearing both sides, and after deliberation and consideration of the elements involved, the Board recommended an increase of 8 cents an hour. The Board certified that that increase would be in accordance with the law, and would not be in violation of the wage stabilization policy under the law of Congress and the executive order issued by the President. The Board was required to do that, as I recall. If I am mistaken about that I should like to be corrected. The Board was required so to certify and did so certify.

As I understand, following that certification, or that award by the Emergency Board, the next step was for the railway employers and the employees to get together and write a contract, provided they were willing to agree to the award made by the Emergency Board. It is my recollection that before that meeting took place between the railroads and the employees, Judge Vinson issued his order nullifying the 8-cent award which had been recommended by the Emergency Board. After that, the conference took place between the railroads and the employees. I imagine it is largely on account of the fact that the nullification order had been issued before that meeting that in their agreement accepting the 8 cents an hour increase they inserted a clause that it was not in violation of the law, or was in accordance with the law. There had been some doubt or question about it, because of the order of Judge Vinson.

So there seems to have been an impasse between the Director of Economic Stabilization, the railroads, and the employees. Neither side was willing, apparently, to make any concessions, although at one time Judge Vinson suggested a graduated rate of from 4 cents to 10 cents an hour, and at another time a suggestion of a graduated rate of from 7 cents to 10 cents an hour was made, but was not accepted. I understand that it would have been agreeable to the employees, on one day when the matter was in process of negotiation; but the suggestion was not accepted on the part of the Government or the railroads, and therefore it did not become effective.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. By what authority of law did Judge Vinson nullify the ruling of the Board?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a matter in dispute. The authority under which he issued the order was the order of the President, as I understand, of February 4, 1943. Am I correct about that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No. Mr. President; the hold-the-line Executive order was Executive Order No. 9328, of April 8, 1943.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. And on the basis of that order——

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought he also claimed some authority under the order of February 4, which was issued by the President.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not think so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Perhaps not. At any rate, he claimed authority under either one or both. Probably the Executive order of April 18 is the one upon which he relies for his authority. In the meantime, of course, these negotiations had been in progress since the preceding September.

Therefore, by the joint resolution, we are called upon to decide by our votes whether in our judgment the action taken by the Emergency Board appointed by the President under the Railway Labor Act was in accordance with the law at the time when it was taken. I shall not enter into a discussion of the legal aspects of that matter. I am going to vote for the joint resolution, and my vote of course will indicate that I think the action taken by the Board was according to law.

After the order of nullification, the railways and the employees met, and agreed on the 8-cents-an-hour increase. The railroads hesitate to embark upon the enterprise of paying it unless Congress itself declares by this proposed legislation that it is legal. That is really the only question here involved.

Mr. President, I desire to say also that, in my judgment—I think there is no dispute about this—the railway employees never asked for this increase on the theory that they were entitled to it under the Little Steel formula. They never set up a Little Steel formula as justification for it. We provided in the law, and the President provided in his orders, that gross inequities and substandard wages might be taken into consideration, in addition to any formula, as I understand, adopted by the War Labor Board. The War Labor Board set up the 15-percent Little Steel formula; it was not set up by Congress. I do not indicate that

it was an improper thing to do, but it was a formula set up by the War Labor Board. When, however, the Congress passed the Stabilization Act, and when the President issued his orders, all of them, both separately and in combination, provided for the adjustment of gross inequalities and inequities and substandard rates of wages, which, of course, would have to be done independently of the Little Steel formula which the War Labor Board itself established.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In the report of the Emergency Board, submitted to the President on May 24, that point was touched upon. The Board said:

> The Little Steel formula constitutes an integral part of the stabilization program as it now prevails, and the Board is recommending no departure from it.

In other words, the Board was saying that the 8-cents-an-hour award it was making was not a departure from the Little Steel formula. That statement is found on page 10, paragraph 41, of the report of the Emergency Board to the President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I understand. I thank the Senator for the contribution.

Mr. President, the point arises, Can the increase be justified on the ground of gross inequities or gross inequalities? It might be well for us to recall that from 1936 to January 1941, while the rates of pay of nonoperating railway employees rose 8.6 percent, the rates of wages paid in all manufacturing industries rose 22.2 percent; in durable goods, 27 percent; nondurable goods, 15 percent; nonferrous metals and their products, 29 percent; iron and steel and their products, 26 percent; machinery, 25 peruent; metal mining, 23 percent; lumber and allied products, 23 percent; stone, clay, and glass products, 22 percent; food and kindred products, 22 percent; petroleum and coal products, 22 percent; tobacco manufactures, 21 percent; quarrying and nonmetallic mining, 21 percent; and transportation equipment, 20 percent. In stating the foreging figures, I have omitted the fractions of percentage.

Mr President, since January 1941, the end of the period to which the foregoing figures apply, the nonoperating railway employees have had one increase—an increase of 10 cents an hour, or 16 percent. The average hourly earnings of employees of other industries have increased as follows: All manufacturing, 41 percent; durable goods, 41 percent; nondurable goods, 33 percent; transportation equipment, except automobiles, 44 percent; lumber and timber basic products, 42 percent; quarrying and nonmetallic mining, 38 percent; nonferrous metals, 38 percent; machinery, except electrical machinery, 36 percent; iron and steel and their products, 34 percent; chemicals and allied products, 34 percent; tobacco manufactures, 31 percent; metal mining, 31 percent; stone, clay, and glass products, 27 percent; and food, 27 percent.

The increase in hourly wages of railway employees during the 7-year period from 1936 to 1943 has been 30 percent, as compared to an increase of 71 percent in the case of all manufacturing employees, 77 percent in the case of durable goods employees, and 51 percent in the case of nondurable goods employees.

So, Mr. President, from the standpoint of gross inequities, and as the wages of these employees are compared to the wages paid other comparable employees in the United States, I am convinced that the Emergency Board was well within the facts, within its jurisdiction, and within its rights and the law in undertaking to adjust this gross inequity by the increase of 8 cents an hour in the wages of nonoperating railway employees. I might make further comparison.

The only way I have been able to convince myself that I can get away from the propriety of this increase on the ground of gross inequities is to say that when Congress passed the law it only meant the provision as to gross inequities to apply as between individuals, not as between groups of employees. I did not then and I do not now place such an interpretation upon the law which we passed, or upon the Executive orders issued by the President.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE rose.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, does not the Senator from Kentucky agree that not only is this action justified in order to carry out the act of Congress and the Executive orders with regard to gross inequities, but that, insofar as the practical aspects of the situation are concerned, if the railroads are to operate and if they are to retain sufficient trained personnel to carry on their activities—when I say "operate," I refer to the functions performed by the nonoperating employees—it is necessary to correct these gross inequities? It is true that these men and women have been patriotic and have stayed on the job, but I have been informed that the pressure is great for them to leave and go into other industries where they would receive higher wages for a similar type of work.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree to that statement.

We all remember what happened in the last war with regard to the railroads. The Government had to take them over and operate them. I have heard of no one in this war who wants the Government to be required to take over the railroads. The Government has enough to attend to in the management of business without undertaking to manage and operate the railroads.

The railroads of this country have done a magnificant job in this war, and they have done it with equipment which was inadequate when they began. When I say "the railroads," I include all the employees of the railroads. They have done a magnificent piece of work. The pressure for them to leave railroad employment and join their fellow citizens in going into war plants where higher wages are easy to obtain is great. There has been a considerable turn-over among railroad employees, because some of them receive a wage so small that there is an inducement for them to engage in other employment, even for the temporary period of the war. I dare say that the reason many others have not done so is that they fear that by doing so they would lose their seniority rights as employees on the railroads, even if, when the war is over, and the temporary flush of employment has terminated, they were able to return to the railroads with which they were associated and find employment.

It is my understanding that it is agreed by all parties—the railroads as well as the employees—that this increase of 8 cents an hour will not be reflected in increased rates. That means that it will not be passed on to the consumer. There will be no additional expense involved in transporting goods from one part of the country to the other. Therefore, in the sense of increasing the cost of living, it would not be inflationary, because it would not increase the cost of living.

It may be argued that because some of the men are to receive a little more pay and will have a little more money to spend, that, in itself, would automatically create an inflationary situation. I am not persuaded by that argument. If they are entitled to the increase, if they are entitled to this adjustment in order to put them on an equal basis with other employees in comparable employment, the fact that they may have a little more money to spend, and may be able to buy a few more goods, does not seem to me to detract from the justice of the increase itself. Of course, that would be an argument against any other increases among other groups of employees, because by reason of an increase they would have more money to spend, and in the case of almost all other groups the increases would be automatically passed on to the consumer. This one would not be.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. Let me remind the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that the increase will not nearly equal the increase in the cost of living. Any increase in wages which they receive will go for something to eat.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is undoubtedly true. One hundred and eighty million dollars divided among 1,100,000 employees will not enable them to go on any long, riotous splurge of spending and purchasing things which are unnecessary, or even things which are necessary. So far as the inflationary effect is concerned, if there would be any such effect at all, $180,000,000 would not be very different from $154,000,000, $160,000,000, or $165,000,000. If $180,000,000 would be inflationary, $165,000,000 would be only slightly less inflationary. If $180,000,000 is a violation of the Little Steel formula—which it is not, in my judgment—$165,000,000 would be equally in violation of the Little Steel formula. I do not think either amount would be inflationary.

Because I entertain the views which I have expressed, I shall vote for the joint resolution.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I think we all have a feeling of regret that a question of this kind must be determined by the Congress. However, the very purpose of the establishment of the Constitution seems to include just this sort of thing—to establish justice, to promote the general welfare, and insure domestic tranquillity. All those are objects of the Government itself.

It is particularly unfortunate at this time, since the parties most interested have practically agreed as to what should be done. As I understand, the railroads themselves have agreed to the amount that should be paid, and do not object to the increase. The railroad employees of this particular class do not object to the amount which has been agreed upon, although it is nowhere near what they had asked. The Government agency agreed on this amount. So there is so nearly an agreement that it seems to me it would be very unfortunate if Congress should not do something to cause a settlement of the disturbance which is really serious, or might become so.

The workers of this class are not the ones who attract attention. They work quietly. The nonoperating employees are working daily, and working in a way that does not attract attention.

The railroads are filling a tremendously important place in our present war effort, and railroad workers are doing a magnificent job. While busses, trucks, air lines, and waterways are all doing their part, the fact remains that the railroads are still the backbone of our Nation's transportation system and they are handling by far the majority of the tonnage and travel required in today's war effort so far as our land operations in America are concerned.

From every corner of our vast country raw materials are hauled by the railroads to our busy war plants, and from these plants finished products are hauled by rail to assembly plants, training centers, or ports of embarkation. At the same time raw recruits are gathered from every village and crossroads and taken by rail to their points of training. From there, they are again moved several times in the process of training until at last they are delivered by the railroads to the ships waiting at ports along our Atlantic and Pacific shores.

Along with all this war business, the gas and rubber shortages, the activities of the enemy submarines, which were so serious along our Atlantic coast, the eagerness of families to visit their sons in training camps, and other war conditions, have all combined to produce a staggering demand from civilian transportation right at the time when the railroad industry is being called upon to perform a Herculean war job.

Last year the railroads handled about one-third more freight business than the previous all-time high record set in 1941. This year the business being handled by the railroads is greatly exceeding the high records of 1942. As a result of material shortages and war restrictions, the railroads have not been able to purchase the new and additional equipment which their excessive business and enormous profits would have led them to buy in more normal times, or if the war shortages and restrictions did not prevail. Consequently, this tremendous and magnificent job of railroad transportation is being accomplished by management and men, and not by additional equipment or machines.

The present staggering peak of railroad transportation is being handled with about 7,000 fewer locomotives than the railroads had in 1929, and with about 500,000 fewer cars. Last year the railroads handled about 54,000,000,000 passenger-miles with about one-third fewer cars than they had for this use several years ago, and this year passenger business is still higher. All this is being done with a labor force several hundred thousand below that of their previous peacetime business peak of 1929.

The railroads and their employees are truly in this present war. They haul raw materials to the war plants, and bring away the world's greatest fighting planes, trucks, guns, and machines. They haul raw recruits to the training centers and bring away the world's greatest fighting soldiers, sailors, pilots, and marines.

In view of the importance of this indispensable war activity, and of the magnificent efficiency of railway workers in performing this war work, it would seem only natural, only logical, and only fair that their wages should be on a level with those of other war workers.

Actually, however, the average wage of the 1,100,000 nonoperating railroad workers, including highly skilled, semiskilled and unskilled employees, was reported by the President's Emergency Board to be 73.8 cents an hour, which is less than common, unskilled labor is being paid in many of our other big war plants.

While the Little Steel wage award issued by the War Labor Board more than a year ago fixed 78 cents an hour as the minimum to be paid common, unskilled labor in the steel industry, we still have more than 120,000 railroad workers being paid 46 cents an hour or less.

Untrained girls and women are being taken into other war jobs and paid for the most ordinary type of labor wages which are far in excess of the wage rates received by skilled office workers filling responsible and highly technical positions in the railroad industry.

While war plants all the way from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf, are begging and advertising for machinists, boilermakers, electrical workers, signalmen, and other skilled craftsmen at rates ranging from $1.25 per hour up to as high as $2 an hour, there are more than a quarter of a million of these same highly skilled mechanics working in the railroad industry for 95 and 96 cents an hour.

While workers in other industries and in other war plants are paid time and one-half for work in excess of 40 hours a week, the 1,100,000 railroad workers involved in this present wage dispute must work 48 hours before being paid overtime, and some of them are still working 10 hours a day and 60 hours a week at straight-time rates. Under section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act as enacted by Congress back in 1938, it is compulsory to pay time and one-half after 40 hours a week to the overwhelming portion of the Nation's workers, but railroad workers are not covered by the fair labor standards made compulsory by Congress and consequently do not come under them.

In the face of these facts, is it any wonder that we have a railroad labor crisis? In the face of these facts, is it any wonder that railroad efficiency is now being dangerously threatened at a time when the Director of the O. D. T., is calling for even greater efficiency? Members of the Senate will readily see that we are now faced with a serious and practical problem which cannot easily be solved, and must not be evaded through any smoke screen of statistical formulas. The Senate subcommittee reports that the Little Steel formula is not involved in the pending joint resolution, but I am convinced that if railroad workers were given the 78-cent minimum granted by the War Labor Board award which established the Little Steel formula, and the 1,100,000 railroad workers were paid wages commensurate with the average of $1.07 paid in the steel industry, there would be confronting us no such problem as the one now under consideration.

When the full record shows that the railroad workers are at or near the top of the list in war importance and in war efficiency, but at or near the bottom of the list in war wages, I think the duty of the Senate becomes very plain. In fairness to railroad workers, in compliance with the patriotic plea of railroad labor leaders in an effort to restore railroad labor morale, and as an important contribution to our continued successful prosecution of the war, every effort should be made to correct the unfortunate conditions which have arisen through some misunderstanding, in which a comparatively small difference is involved. We hear estimates of the difference being as low as $12,000,000. Such a sum would certainly represent no danger of inflation. If the amount recommended by the governmental authorities would not be inflationary, then the amount recommended by the pending joint resolution would not be inflationary.

The leaders of railroad labor have given America no cause for concern during the war, and they are well known to the Members of the Senate. They are able and experienced in their work. They have long been known as the most conservative group of labor leaders in America. Their patriotism is certainly beyond question and was again demonstrated when they came to Congress with the request that assistance be given them in their continued efforts to avoid any serious difficulties. They are now seeking the assistance of Congress in their efforts to avoid any such catastrophe.

In giving this assistance we will not be doing violence to the Little Steel formula, but we will be making an important contribution to the successful prosecution of the war. For these reasons I shall vote for Senate Joint Resolution 91, and in my opinion to do otherwise would

be to penalize the Nation's most admirable and conservative group of organized workers for the patience they have shown, for the efficiency they have maintained, and for the good conduct they have displayed during the 14 months which have passed since in September 1942 they first filed their request for a moderate wage increase.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that from the standpoint of the railroad interests themselves, from the standpoint of railroad labor, from the standpoint of the people of the United States, and from the standpoint of our Government in time of war, the pending joint resolution should be passed.

Mr. BRIDGES. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Overton
Andrews	Gillette	Radcliffe
Austin	Green	Reed
Bailey	Guffey	Revercomb
Ball	Gurney	Robertson
Bankhead	Hatch	Russell
Barkley	Hawkes	Scrugham
Bone	Hayden	Shipstead
Bridges	Hill	Smith
Brooks	Holman	Taft
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Butler	La Follette	Tobey
Byrd	Langer	Truman
Capper	Lodge	Tunnell
Caraway	Lucas	Tydings
Chandler	McCarran	Vandenberg
Chavez	McClellan	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Walsh, Mass.
Danaher	Maybank	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Mead	Wherry
Downey	Millikin	White
Eastland	Moore	Wiley
Ellender	Murdock	Willis
Ferguson	Murray	
George	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

ATTACKS ON SOUTHERN DEMOCRATS

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I had intended to speak today on the splendid question of southern Senators, the black sheep of this body, the men who have come here by virtue of the votes of their constituents but have no business here, who are utterly despised by those whom they have been instrumental in putting in office. There is an editorial in the Evening Star of today which I shall read, whether it has been put into the RECORD or not. The sentiments expressed in it suit me exactly.

Mr. President, the comments we are hearing are not very pleasant for those of us who for seventy-odd years have kept the real Democratic fires burning and made possible the election of the gang that is now disgracing it. The idea that those of us of the South, who through thick and thin have stood for the principles of the Democratic Party, should be denounced here as "southern Democrats" by those whom we would not recognize in the party in the South.

Thank God, I am one who comes under that appellation. I wish to endorse the speech made by my colleague the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], in which he said the time had come when the South should organize its own party. If we approve a measure that is introduced, we are all right. But take a measure such as the antilynching bill. How many Senators who have lived in the midst of an ungovernable, lustful crowd, and had their womenfolk outraged, would sit down and say, "Let the law take its course"? Let the law take its course? No. We have dealt with these things until we have trained those guilty of these actions so that their crime has almost passed out. There is no lynching in my section of the country. We would lynch some white people if they would go down there [laughter]—and I think I would join in the lynching—but so far as the Negro is concerned, there are no lynchings.

There was the antilynching bill. Oh, the righteous men, whom we were instrumental in putting in office, who organized to do what? To discredit the grandest people God's sun ever shone on.

Sometimes I think that all this harping at the South is because of envy of the real character of southern men and women. The idea of saying that HARRY BYRD led a conspiracy. Conspiracy against what? It was a conspiracy on behalf of the Constitution of the United States, if it was a conspiracy at all. If he led a conspiracy, I was one of the conspirators. Of course they would say, " 'Cotton ED' SMITH, that dirty dog, yes." But I am here to say today, Senators, denunciation of southern Senators is a poor reward for the faithful service of our section of the country, which through all these years has stood by the principles of a great party, and made it possible for certain men to be here. If the people of the South organize and stand by their self-respect, if they organize and say, "We are going to vote for the man of our choice," there will never be another Democratic President—I mean of a certain variety. Of course, some call themselves Democrats, but by God, if they are Democrats I never was one, and I want that definitely understood. [Laughter.] Men come here and parade around and say, "We are Democrats." Mr. President, I do not feel in the humor to discuss those who have denounced southern Democrats, but I say now that when the spirit moves me, I wish to say some very "kind" things about those who have done so.

Let me read a word or two from the editorial in this newspaper. The editorial sounds pretty good to me. I want Senators to listen to it. As an old lady in my State says, it is very "appropus."

Mr. McKELLAR. What is the newspaper?

Mr. SMITH. The Washington Evening Star. It is a good newspaper. It does not shine so brightly sometimes, but on an average it does pretty well. Listen to this:

> How does it happen that the terms "southern Senator" or "southern Democrat" have acquired a certain opprobrious connotation? If a Democrat from Illinois—

God save the mark—a Democrat from Illinois!

> If a Democrat from Illinois—

Senators heard the Senator from Illinois fighting in the Senate for that bill which stirred up so much hell. For nearly 3 weeks he pleaded in the Senate for the bill; he spoke of how glorious it was, but not constitutional; that the bill rose above the Constitution. I believe it was Claude Swanson who said:

> There comes a time when a man has to rise above principle.

[Laughter.]

This was one of the times.

I continue to read from the editorial:

> If a Democrat from Illinois votes against a "liberal" measure it is counted as just another adverse vote. But let a Democrat from Virginia or Mississippi vote against the same measure and it becomes a sinister frustration of the democratic processes by a reactionary southern Democrat who owes his seat in Congress to the poll tax.

There we have another illustration. It is proposed to do away with the poll tax by Federal law—in direct contravention of the Constitution. A measure is brought to the Senate and its sponsors say, "Oh, it is constitutional to do this, so let us take the poll tax away from the Southern States."

I said to a reporter that to me it was a strange thing how certain words seemed to bring on a sort of alliteration; the polecats trying to defeat the poll tax. Now Senators observe that it is so, too.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred in the Washington Evening Star be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTHERN SENATORS

Because he seldom deals in personalities, the language employed by Senator BYRD, of Virginia, in his reply to the attack made on him by Senator GUFFEY, of Pennsylvania, has attracted wide attention. On the surface of this is a case of pent-up indignation bursting through the restraints imposed by a normally equable temperament. But it is also symptomatic of an irritating malady which has taken hold of our political system, and which is capable of causing a great deal of trouble.

Angered by the Senate's action on the soldier vote bill, which left the handling of this matter to the States, Senator GUFFEY told newspapermen that northern Republicans under Joe Pew (a Pennsylvania political figure) and southern Democrats under the leadership of HARRY BYRD had conspired to deprive the armed services of the right to vote. This, Senator GUFFEY continued, was "an unpatriotic and unholy alliance."

Senator BYRD replied that this was a "deliberate" misstatement and a "gratuitous insult" to the Democratic and Republican Senators who voted for the plan which Senator GUFFEY opposed. He went on to denounce Senator GUFFEY in scornful terms, and he was joined in his repudiation of the charge by other Senators from the South.

The record shows that Senator BYRD was right. Actually, less than one-third of the Senators voting on the issue were "southern Democrats and northern Republicans." Therefore, it was highly misleading, to say the least, to charge that this "unholy alliance" decided the result. But the aspect of this flare-up which is the real cause for concern has nothing to do with the question of who was right and who was wrong in this particular dispute. The thing that should give all of us pause is that fact—as demonstrated by this incident—that mature thought on vital public issues has been so largely displaced by such shoddy substitutes as name calling and "sloganeering."

How does it happen that the terms "southern Senator" or "southern Democrat" have acquired a certain opprobrious connotation? If a Democrat from Illinois votes against a "liberal" measure it is counted as just another adverse vote. But let a Democrat from Virginia or Mississippi vote against the same measure and it becomes a sinister frustration of the democratic processes by a reactionary southern Democrat who owes his seat in Congress to the poll tax.

This is arrant nonsense, of course. A little reflection would explode the fiction that a Member of Congress is good or bad, depending upon whether he comes from the South or some other section of the country. But reflection calls for thought, and there are some people who shrink from thinking for themselves. They would rather be guided by the labels which propaganda pins on men and issues, and in too many instances these propaganda labels are coined by individuals whose real interest does not rise above narrowly personal or factional levels.

To a very large extent the "southern Democrat" is the creation of the "liberals" in the Democratic Party and the political extremists who have gathered around them. It is they—not the Republicans—who have given the term its currency and its popular significance. They hoped by this technique to compel support for their programs or to discredit those who opposed them. Their real accomplishment, however, has been to split the Democratic Party by alienating some of its ablest and most distinguished members, and to shake the confidence of a good many thoughtless people in the integrity of what is, after all, the democratic system. It is high time that they turned their energies into more constructive channels.

Mr. SMITH. The writer of the editorial writes along my line of thinking.

Mr. President, I want to nominate HARRY BYRD for President right now, and call on the Southern States to organize a Democratic Party, and let us try to get one decent President. I have been here with five Presidents and a piece—and a sixth; five Presidents and the thing we have got. Yes; I have. I have been here with six Presidents, and I enjoyed being a Senator until this miserable thing came along—I mean this miserable party. I want it definitely and distinctly understood—I am afraid Senators will infer it—that I am not a New Dealer. [Laughter.] I rather believe that Senators can infer that I am not. And that is not so because of any personal feeling. God knows I love the Constitution and I love States' rights. I love to have the vote get as near to the people as possible, and not to have a gang here in Washington sit down and dictate to my State what shall be the qualification of voters, and dictate how much I shall eat. We have had bureaucrats here who will not even let us get shoes to wear. No. They regulate our food. I do not know what in the name of common sense has become of the spirit of America which on a thousand battlefields won for us the glorious country in which we live, under the inspiration of a million years of suffering. The Constitution was not written as an ebullition of politics. It was the result of the bitter experience of a million years of suffering. It was inspired by the spirit of people who believe that we are the captains of our own souls and the arbiters of our own fate. In the year 1943 no one can cow that American spirit which culminated in the Constitution of the United States. No one can drive that spirit from the American people.

Here in the House of our friends—not of our friends, but in the House we built under the auspices of that immortal document—one of the best men that graces this body is termed a conspirator, a southern conspirator conspiring to uphold the Constitution.

Mr. President, no one knows how much I, a Member of the Senate from the deep South, and thank God I am, resent the miserable falsehoods hurled at Members of the Senate from the South such as HARRY BYRD. I am glad the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] took the floor. When I read his speech I felt very much like the man who became too lazy to pray. He wrote a prayer and placed it over the mantelpiece and at night he said, "Lord, them's my sentiments." When I read the Senator's speech I said, "Them's my sentiments."

Mr. President, I want the South to unite and say to those who condemn us, "All right, if you are going to aim every law against us, and denounce us, we will just go to ourselves and vote our own convictions." We can do it, and please God we will do it.

Mr. President, at some future time I hope to be able to express myself more fully.

You know, all these speeches which were made against the interview given out by the great statesman from Pennsylvania remind me of what the Negroes used to sing in the cotton patches at home. The song runs like this:

I hardly needs to tell you how you often comes across
A fifty-dollar saddle on a five-dollar hoss.

[Laughter.]

We have made fifty or a hundred dollars' worth of speeches on a miserable ebullition which ought not to mean a thing.

Mr. President, I have one platform on which I shall live and die—my loyalty to the Constitution, my loyalty to States' rights, and my loyalty to white supremacy. Senators who do not like it need not take it. Here under the driving force of all the power that can be brought to bear on us, attempt is made to compel us to take the Negro on an equality, to eat with him, to sleep with him. I am not going to do it. That reminds me of a colloquy between two men. One man said to another: "My God, man, has not the Negro been improving?" The other one said: "Imitatively, yes." The first man said: "I do not mean imitatively. How about his instincts?" The other man said: "I don't know about his instincts, but he outstinks hell."

There is not a human being on the earth that I love more than I do the old Negroes at home. Old Uncle Bill carried me in his arms. I loved him almost more than I did my mother and my father, but I did not want him to eat at my table or sleep in my bed, and he did not presume to want to do it.

I simply throw out this remark about the Negro for fear Senators may think that perhaps I might be going along.

Mr. President, I want to apologize to this body for these few random remarks. I know that it hurts the feelings of some devotees of the splendid form of our administration. I simply wanted to throw out a suspicion, or a suggestion, that it did not suit me, and I am not going to bite my tongue about it either. Men say I am in the "dog house," and, by God, they cannot keep me from barking [laughter], and if they get close enough to me I will bite them, too.

Senators, I simply wish to enter this word of protest against the great statesman from Pennsylvania. I like him personally, somehow or other, but I do not like his politics.

Mr. President, I want to state here and now that from now on, HARRY BYRD is my candidate for the Presidency.

I wish to tell the Senate something which happened long ago. My brother Coke was talking to Sam Jones, a great Georgia evangelist, who was sitting in his study. I was a poor boy, and I happened to drop in there. My brother said to Sam Jones, "Sam, did you hear anything about my being made bishop at the next general conference?"

Sam looked at him, and said, "No. Where did you ever hear of a Smith being made a bishop?" He looked in the fire for a while, and then said, "I do not know, Coke; you might have a chance. That office has got powerful low." [Laughter.]

So, Mr. President, I say that my friend HARRY BYRD has a chance, for that office has got powerful low. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, if there are two Members of this body of whom I am personally proud, they are JOSIAH W. BAILEY, of North Carolina, and HARRY BYRD, of Virginia; and I thank God that no aspersions cast by the great, lurid lights of Pennsylvania can dim their manhood or can in any way abate their service to their country.

At some future time, Mr. President, I shall make some extended remarks. [Laughter.]

PAY OF NONOPERATING RAILWAY EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 91) to aid in effectuating the purposes of the Railway Labor Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BARKLEY. Not on the committee amendment, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I had intended to speak on the pending measure, but in view of the lateness of the hour, I shall not do so. I request unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my

remarks an article I wrote on the subject of the pending measure.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROZEN FORMULAS IMPAIR THE WAR EFFORT

(By Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.)

Economic stabilization has become a fetish with the powers that be in our national administration. They have become so obsessed with the idea of freezing the economic status quo and holding the line against inflation, that they have completely lost sight of the old-fashioned but still important considerations of simple justice and American fair play.

No one denies the dangers of inflation. No one disputes the need for a stabilization program to avert serious inflation. But there are many who question the feasibility as well as the justice of a rigid freeze program to accomplish this end.

It has always been good American doctrine that when an individual, or a group of individuals, has a fair and legitimate claim or complaint, he is entitled to a fair hearing and appropriate redress. Yet the current administration of the economic stabilization program, by its rigid insistence upon the sanctity of the Little Steel formula and the other technical concepts of the various Executive orders on the subject, discards completely any such consideration.

EXHIBIT NO. 1

This tendency has been apparent in the treatment accorded the great mass of farmers on the subject of farm commodity prices, the treatment of small business caught in the jaws of Federal bureaucracy, and more recently in the treatment of labor in the consideration of legitimate complaints over wage inequalities.

There is no excuse for the way in which the railway wage question has been kicked around in the last 6 months. It is the exhibit No. 1 of the basic unfairness of the way in which the stabilization program has been administered up to the present time.

Over a million railroad employees represented by the 15 nonoperating railway labor organizations, the clerks, the telegraphers, the shop mechanics, the maintenance-of-way men, and the others, have been waiting for more than a year for action on their wage demands. The operating employees have been waiting since last January.

They have been patient. They have been reasonable. They have stayed on the job. They have observed all the rules that the most punctilious critic of labor dares prescribe. They have calmly and laboriously assembled and presented a great mass of expert, technical data to support the justness of their claims.

They have done all this because they have faith in the ultimate justice of the processes of the Railway Labor Act which has covered collective bargaining between management and labor on the railroads since 1926. They negotiated with the management, they secured the mediation of the National Mediation Board, they considered arbitration, and finally, in accordance with the requirements of the act, they submitted their cases to impartial emergency boards appointed by the President.

A STRONG CASE

In the case of the nonoperating employees, the Emergency Board recommended an increase of 8 cents an hour all along the line to every employee affected. But the Director of Economic Stabilization stepped in and vetoed it on the grounds that it violated the letter of the various requirements of the hold-the-line policy, and the Little Steel formula in particular.

In the case of the operating employees the Emergency Board made its recommendation after the Director of Economic Stabilization had torpedoed the 8-cent increase recommended for the nonoperating employees. Under these circumstances the Board admitted it could not do justice to these railroad employees on the merits of their case in view of the terms laid down by the Director of Economic Stabilization.

Read the conclusion of the Emergency Board in this second case. It stated, "On the basis of the entire record * * * it is the opinion of the Emergency Board that the employees involved in this dispute have made out a strong case for a wage increase to correct gross inequities and to aid in the effective prosecution of the war.

"In view, however, of the order of the Economic Stabilization Director of June 22, 1943, and his memorandum opinion of June 30, 1943, in the nonoperating cases, this Board is compelled to conclude that * * * the operating employees may be granted such increase only as may be justified under the Little Steel formula."

INCREASES WARRANTED

An analysis of the statistical data presented to the Emergency Board in the voluminous record taken of the hearings shows why the Board came to the conclusion that wage increases were warranted, both to correct "gross inequities" and to "aid in the effective prosecution of the war."

The average wage of the nonoperating railroad employees is 73.8 cents an hour, including skilled, semiskilled, and unskilled classifications. Compare this with a minimum wage of 78 cents an hour in the steel industry for unskilled common labor. The prevailing minimum wage on the railroads is 46 cents an hour.

Railway employees are working on a 48-hour week at straight time rates as compared with a 40-hour week in other industries.

Considering only the basic hourly wage rate, the increase for all manufacturing industries from December 1940 to December 1942 was practically double the 10-cent increase granted the nonoperating railroad employees during that period. In some manufacturing industries the wage rates increased over three times as much as on the railroads.

The story on the operating employees is much the same. From January 1941 to October 1942 the monthly earnings of train and engine and yard service workers increased 22.7 percent. Some of this increase was due to a wage increase in December 1941, and part was due to longer hours of work. But the increase in weekly earnings of factory workers over the same period averaged over 40 percent.

A GREAT RECORD

These facts have a significance beyond the question of justice for the railroad worker. They also have an important bearing upon the ability of the railroads to keep their employees from going into more remunerative industries.

The prosecution of the war depends to a great extent upon maintaining the peak efficiency of our transportation system. The railroads are being called upon to do almost superhuman feats in getting the men and supplies of victory across the country. Coastal transportation by water has been seriously curtailed, and the railroads have had to take on the added burden diverted from that and other normally competing forms of transportation.

Everyone familiar with the transportation problem concedes that they have done the job and done it well. The credit goes to both management and labor, but in the last analysis it is the competence, the loyalty, and the patriotic willingness to give that extra full measure of performance on the part of the men in overalls that have made these achievements possible.

This great record of achievement gives those men a right to demand that they be dealt with fairly in return. To sidestep their legitimate requests and plead the technicalities of iron-clad formulas and hold-the-line orders, threatens to demoralize one of the most vital industries this country has in an hour of extreme need.

The railway brotherhoods represent the finest type of organized labor. For 20 years they have kept the railroads operating without any significant work stoppage. As the Emergency Board reported to the President, "The profound significance of this record can best be appreciated when it is contrasted with the work stoppages in the nonrailroad field that have marred the defense and war effort of the past 3 years."

The men and women, who have thus proved themselves patient, fair, and reasonable even through the desperately trying times of the early 1930's, are entitled to sympathetic understanding at the hands of the public in this current controversy.

It is to be hoped that through them the public can be brought to see the need for readjusting the stabilization technique employed at Washington. Instead of trying to freeze the economic status quo for the duration of the war, the Federal Government ought to use the controls it has over wages and prices to achieve a fairer balance between them and correct such gross injustices when they arise. Any other course will result in major strikes and a serious interruption of essential war and civilian production.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for the yeas and nays on the final passage of the joint resolution.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I had intended to speak on the pending measure, also; but, like the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], I shall be kind to the Senate at this time, and shall forbear making the speech I had intended to make.

However, I request unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement made by Joseph B. Eastman to the special board appointed by the President to consider this whole matter. The statement is the most eloquent one I have read with respect to the entire problem.

I also request unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD several paragraphs from the statement made by Mr. Aronson before the committee, and two paragraphs from the report of the Emergency Board, submitted to the President on May 24.

There being no objection, the address and excerpts from the statement and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Board, I appear here in response to your request and without consultation with any other agency of the Government. I cannot discuss the merits of the wage controversy which you have under consideration, because that is outside the scope of my responsibilities as Director of the Office of Defense Transportation and it has been and is the responsibility of others in the Government. It may be, however, that I can give you some information as to present and prospective railroad operating conditions and their relation to the war effort which will be of some value

to you in your deliberations, and that I am very willing to undertake to do.

Our country, as you know, is now engaged in production on a scale which goes far beyond anything hitherto thought possible, and upon that production depends the successful prosecution of the first global war in history, a war in which our destinies and those of all the world are at stake. Transportation facilities, adequate and continuously available, are absolutely essential at every step and stage of this crucial productive effort, and the railroads are much the greatest factor in that transportation. Their services are also indispensable to the assembly, training, equipment, and supply of our huge military forces.

So far the performance by the railroads of their tremendous wartime duties has, as everybody agrees, been deserving of the highest praise. Those duties, however, are far from over. It may, and probably will be, a long time before the final day of victory comes, and even when it does come there will be heavy work for the railroads to perform in the post-war period of demobilization and world readjustment. Not long ago I predicted that the next 6 months at least would be a most critical period for the railroads. The reasons for this prediction are not presently important, although I can give them to you if you wish. Because of the difficulties which are anticipated in the immediate future, however, the railroads and the shippers are undertaking, at my instigation, to carry on an intensive campaign to raise operating efficiency, if at all possible, by as much as 10 percent. This campaign has been undertaken notwithstanding the fact, which we all realize, that efforts to achieve maximum efficiency in operation have already been brought to a high pitch of intensity. It is a situation where those who have already given what might be thought to be their utmost must for the future give even more.

Of course, the remarkable performance of the railroads so far would have been impossible without the loyal and hearty cooperation of the employees, for after all they do the work. I have had my differences of opinion in the past with the employees, or rather with their duly selected representatives, and I expect to have such differences of opinion in the future. Nevertheless, the railroad employees are as fine a body of workers as our country possesses, and in general they are deeply patriotic. The railroad executives will testify with one accord, and the statistics will attest the fact, that the employees have been working faithfully and effectively and on the average for long hours ever since the emergency began.

Any stoppage of railroad service, for even a short period of time, because of the refusal of employees to work, would damage our war effort to a degree which I believe to be beyond the present power of any of our enemies. It is unthinkable that this should happen, and personally I do not believe that it ever will happen. To a lesser degree, but still to a very serious degree, any lowering of the morale of the railroad employees impairs our war effort. The campaign to increase railroad operating efficiency 10 percent, of which I have spoken and which necessities of wartime conditions demand, cannot possibly succeed without the earnest and wholehearted cooperation of the employees.

One of the most serious difficulties which is confronting the railroads, and which will continue to confront them with increasing force and effect, is the manpower problem. It is impossible to produce on the present colossal scale and at the same time withdraw millions of our best manhood from production into the fighting forces without a general manpower problem requiring resort to every conceivable expedient by way of relief. The railroads are suffering severely from this general condition. A very large number of their men have gone into the military services, but a much greater drain on railroad manpower resources has come from the constant drift of employees, particularly in the nonoperating groups, to better-paid work in the war-production plants. The wage question is, therefore, definitely a most important factor in the situation.

This manpower problem is by no means confined to the train-service employees. There are more than three times as many employees in the so-called nonoperating groups, and the railroads cannot function without them. As an illustration, let me tell you what happened in Pacific coast territory. The railroads serving that territory have been particularly hard pressed by the great tide of traffic which the war with Japan, the creation of immense new war-production plants on the coast, and the discontinuance of intercoastal water service through the Panama Canal has brought to their lines. The same conditions have, of course, tremendously increased the demand for labor in that territory. Last year these railroad lines, notably the Southern Pacific and the Santa Fe, suffered great losses of track labor, which stands near the bottom of the scale in the level of railroad wages, and they were unable to recoup these losses by recruiting new forces from the labor supply available to them in this country. The threat to the physical condition of their roadbed and track caused by this situation became so acutely dangerous that drastic measures of relief were necessary.

At length, and in part through the efforts of my own Office, relief was obtained by the importation of native Mexican labor. It was made a condition of this importation that these Mexicans should receive the same wages as paid by the railroads for the same work to citizens of the United States, and enjoy as favorable working conditions, and that they should be returned to Mexico at the end of a definite period of time, which was made 6 months, subject to possible further extension. Several thousand Mexicans were thus imported, and track conditions were relieved. There is now an existing need for many more, but this need is not being supplied, because the Mexican Government has for the time being refused its consent. The danger to the physical condition of roadbed and track has again become acute.

At the time when this importation of Mexican nationals first came under formal consideration, the controversy with respect to the wages of railroad-track labor had already been initiated. It was urged by the War Manpower Commission and by me, and the railroads agreed, that everything possible should be done to expedite the progress of that controversy and bring it to a speedy conclusion. It was recognized by all that this wage question was a matter of urgent importance. Because of circumstances which I have no doubt were unavoidable, the issue is still undetermined. That fact may well have had an effect not only on the supply of available labor in this country but also on the attitude of the Mexican Government with respect to the importation of more of its nationals.

Let me give you a further illustration of the importance of the nonoperating groups. Railroad traffic, both freight and passenger, has risen to peaks which tower above all prior records. The railroads have had to handle this traffic with considerably less cars and locomotives than they had in 1929 or even at the time of the last World War. To do this successfully, they have had to make the maximum possible use of the equipment that they had. One of the important means to this end was to keep their cars and locomotives in repair. They have, in fact, reduced the percentages of bad-order cars and locomotives to all-time low records. If these percentages increase materially, the supply of equipment available for service will be reduced materially. In the critical period which lies ahead, it is of supreme importance that this should not happen.

The railroad employees who have kept these cars and locomotives in repair are the maintenance-of-equipment employees, the so-called shopmen, and they are in the nonoperating groups. They are, for the most part, mechanics of large experience and skill. It is vital that they be retained in railroad employ. They are men, however, who can readily find employment at higher wages in the war production plants of the country. There are advantages to them, in the way of seniority and pension rights, if they remain in railroad service, but these advantages are limited. They are not controlling.

This brings me to the wage controversy which you have under consideration. It is an unusual controversy. In the ordinary sense, no controversy actually exists. A fact-finding board, appointed by the President under the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, has investigated the controversy which did exist between the labor organizations and the managements, and has recommended a uniform increase of 8 cents per hour. Such an increase the railroads are now willing to pay. Settlement of the controversy on this basis was prevented, however, by the action of the Economic Stabilization Director, who reached the conclusion that he was impelled, by the statute and Executive orders which govern his action, to withhold approval.

The purpose of that statute and those orders was to hold the line against inflation. There could be no more worthy purpose, because inflation, if it comes, will wreak havoc upon our country and all of us, including the workers of every description.

I would not, and could not if I would, criticize the action of the Economic Stabilization Director. I am sure that he has done his duty as he sees it, and I assume, for I have made no study of the matter, that he has interpreted his duty correctly. I do not understand, however, that his action precludes increases of some extent and character in the wages of the employees concerned, or that it was based in any way upon the thought that the increases recommended would now cause, in the aggregate, too heavy a drain on railroad financial resources.

I can express no opinion on the merits of the case before you. The most that I can do is to express my conviction that the failure to decide this matter definitely is now causing disturbance of the morale of the railroad employees and that there is decided danger that the performance by the railroads of their immensely important part in the war effort will be seriously impaired unless this condition is soon corrected. My hope is, therefore, that you will reach your conclusions as speedily as possible, and that, in reaching them, you will give such consideration to the conditions which I have described as you find to be possible. I believe that the railroad employees realize that the part which they play in the war effort is, while less dangerous, quite as necessary and important as the work which the men in our fighting forces are called upon to do, and that they want to continue to play that part faithfully. They have been disturbed and perturbed by the long delay in this matter and by a consequent feeling of injustice. Nevertheless, my confidence in their character and patriotism is such that I believe they will accept such decision as the President may make on the basis of your recommendations, provided the necessity for that decision is made clear in the light of the governing law and the good of our country under the wartime conditions in which we are now living and the perils which lie ahead.

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT OF JACOB ARONSON, VICE PRESIDENT, NEW YORK CENTRAL SYSTEM AND CHIEF COUNSEL, CARRIERS CONFERENCE COMMITTEES, BEFORE SPECIAL EMERGENCY BOARD, DESIGNATED BY THE PRESIDENT TO REPORT ON THE CLAIM FOR WAGE ADJUSTMENTS OF NONOPERATING RAILWAY EMPLOYEES, WASHINGTON, D. C., OCTOBER 28, 1943

We recognize the almost universal desire on the part of the several organizations for a uniform wage increase, and we recognize also the impracticability in time of war of making a detailed appraisal of the wage rates of 73 different classes of railroad employees for the purpose of determining varying adjustments that might be applicable to each.

For all of these reasons, it seems to us that the agreement of August 7 providing for unform wage increase of 8 cents per hour in the case of the 73 classes of nonoperating railroad employees may properly be approved within the limitations of Judge Vinson's memorandum. Accordingly, we ask you as executive advisers of the President of the United States to recommend that the agreement of August 7 for a uniform increase of 8 cents per hour be approved.

It thus appears, that although not in accord as to the reasons why the agreement of August 7 should be approved, the fact is that there is no pending dispute between the carriers and these employees with respect to wage rates. We have reached an agreement and it awaits only governmental approval for its consummation.

EXCERPTS FROM MAY 24, 1943, REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT BY THE EMERGENCY BOARD, APPOINTED FEBRUARY 20, 1943, PURSUANT TO THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT AND EXECUTIVE ORDERS 9172 AND 9299

6. As a result of the influence of this legislation as applied to the rail carriers, railroad wages have maintained a degree of stability, entirely apart from the anti-inflation measures of the war emergency, that has been equaled or surpassed by few industries. Wages on the railroads have moved more slowly, both up and down, than in industry as a whole, and the level of railroad wages, both up and down, has changed more moderately than in other industrial spheres.

7. While there have been numerous labor controversies on the rail lines, continuity of railroad operation has likewise been maintained in outstanding measure. For a period of two decades there has been an almost complete absence of strikes or other interruptions of railroad service. The profound significance of this record can best be appreciated when it is contrasted with the work stoppages in the nonrailroad field that have marred the defense and war effort of the past 3 years.

8. It is a matter of great public concern that the integrity of these orderly processes, with their fruitful results, be safeguarded in every way possible. If railroad employees were to find themselves unjustly penalized because of their reliance upon these orderly processes or the considerable lapse of time necessarily incident thereto, strong impetus would be given to the disruptive practices which frequently flow from the exertion of economic power or the performance of work in justifiable discontent. The pressures in these directions, springing from the impairment of morale, would be difficult to allay, and the effective prosecution of the war might be seriously obstructed.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I do not intend to delay the Senate in voting on the joint resolution. However, I feel that I should explain what my vote will be, because I know that, against the position of the great majority of the Members of the Senate, I shall vote "nay," and I suspect I shall be one of a small minority. I would not do that, I would not undertake to match my judgment against that of so many of my colleagues if I were not actuated by profound considerations. I cannot elaborate upon the reasons for my position, because I have promised to be brief.

But as I see the matter, Mr. President, we are in a very grave crisis on the home front. All we have planned and all we have legislated in the name and for the sake of stabilization is involved. Every barrier we have undertaken to erect against the ultimate destruction which is described by the very vague word "inflation"—meaning undoubtedly, in my mind, unspeakable consequences — all that is involved.

We are called upon to override our own law, the Stabilization Act. We are called upon to take back to ourselves powers which we delegated and which have been exercised in good faith. We are proposing to open the door to the deliberate act of the Congress, and to invite all discontented workers in America to abandon the procedure which we provided for stabilization and to prevent inflation, and to appeal, one after another, to Congress to pass this bill or that bill; and tomorrow other workers will come—the steel workers, the coal workers, the textile workers, and all other workers who are regulated, and the farmers, with respect to the prices they receive for their products. We will reverse the order we have established and which has operated with more success than I thought possible, and we shall have taken upon ourselves the whole burden, and with that burden will take the whole responsibility.

Whatever may be the merits of any man's claim for better wages—and I sympathize with all men who wish to improve their lot—the proposition now before the Senate would open the door to no end of demands, would set up a principle in contravention to the principle we established, would invite and would welcome the workers and the producers of raw materials and of farm products to abandon the institutions which were created by our acts, would repudiate our delegation of powers, and would return them to us. Our last state would be incomparably worse than our first. If by the passage of such legislation as that now pending, however meritorious it may seem to be, we open the doors to demands of that kind—and I am sure we shall be doing so by passing the pending measure—if inflation comes, we shall not be able to escape responsibility; we shall not be able to exonerate ourselves.

I realize that my attitude at the moment is very unpopular. I anticipate that within less than 18 months after the responsibility for inflation and all its ruin has been imposed upon the Senate and the House of Representatives, the American people, whom we seem to be pleasing at this hour, will be fulminous in condemning us later.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I must have the wrong slant on this matter. The Senator from North Carolina seems to think this step has been initiated by Congress. As I understand the matter, the forces that were legal had agreed to the increase in pay, and it would have been put into effect except for the fact that another, subsequent appointee upset the whole business, and consequently the only officers who could be called upon were the Members of Congress.

We are simply attempting to ratify what had been agreed upon by the forces which had already been appointed; and the whole thing would have been worked out without ever coming here. Now we are simply called upon to ratify what has been done before the matter ever came here.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, let me respond to my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from South Carolina. The stabilization of wages is founded on the Stabilization Act passed by the Congress. My distinguished friend, the senior Senator from South Carolina, thinks that act does not control, supersede, override, and absolutely dominate the Railway Labor Act. This afternoon I took pains to obtain a copy of the act, and also to obtain copies of the executive orders. The act and the executive orders establish the over-all power of the men appointed to serve, and of the Stabilization Act to control. That was not questioned until very recently, and it cannot be questioned by anyone who will read the law.

We are asked to repudiate that act. We are asked to permit persons who are disappointed because of a ruling under that act—disappointed because of the ruling made by Mr. Vinson, the Administrator—to appeal to us. If the Senate allows this appeal, I do not think the Senate will be able to disallow any other appeal. All of them can be made to appear meritorious.

That is in response to my distinguished friend. I shall conclude with a little development of what I was saying when I was interrupted.

Apparently it is popular now, but I am not, of course, suggesting that any Senator will vote for this measure because it is popular. I do not do such things. I realize that there will be some condemnation visited upon me for taking the position I am taking. When I was in Raleigh a week or two ago a prominent politician told me that if I should vote for subsidies I would receive the condemnation of 98 percent of the people of North Carolina. I answered him very simply. I said, "Yes; and if I should cast a vote either for or against subsidies—my mind is not yet settled on that question—if I should cast any vote that would bring inflation upon the people of North Carolina, I would not only be condemned by 98 percent of the people, I would be condemned by 100 percent, including myself." In the general judgment of that collapse those who are responsible if it shall come—and I greatly fear it will—will fall upon the rocks, and the mountains will fall down upon them. That is my judgment, so I shall vote "nay."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, in view of the remarks of the Senator from North Carolina as to the responsibility for this particular measure, I wish to ask my colleague [Mr. TRUMAN], the author of the joint resolution, whether it is true, as has been repeatedly represented to Members of the Senate—I know it has been so represented to me, and I assume it has been so represented to many other Senators—that the President of the United States, himself, twice agreed, and twice promised the particular formula contained in the joint resolution.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is true.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, it seems to me that that settles the question of responsibility. I may say in all fairness that my colleague's answer would have been determinative of my vote on the joint resolution. I have great respect for Judge Vinson; but after all Judge Vinson is the agent of the President. If it be true, as has been asserted and not denied, that the President of the United States, himself, in his own responsible capacity, has twice agreed to this particular formula, and twice promised to put it into effect, it seems to me that the least the Congress can do is to carry out that promise. Therefore I shall vote for the joint resolution.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the able Senator from North Carolina has stated, in epitome, the reasons why I shall vote against the joint resolution. In view of the lateness of the hour, I ask that a memorandum which I have prepared regarding my position be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, in all my 15 years of Senate experience I have never faced a more difficult decision than in the pending circumstance. But, come what may, I take my position today, and for the duration, against casting any vote which may be charged with any responsibility for precipitating the forces of fatal inflation upon 130,000,000 American consumers. Inflation can do to America at home what Hitler can never do to America abroad. Inflation can turn any victory-at-arms into a shambles in which the apparent beneficiaries of some temporary and expedient advantage will become full partners and full victims in the ultimate debacle. Therefore, whatever the price, there must be no debacle.

Mr. President, these railroad brotherhoods, representing the finest type of organized labor and deserving of maximum consideration at the hands of government, can abstractly justify every word in the pending resolution which would put Congress on record as approving the 8-cent hourly wage increase awarded to them by due process of law. The award is agreeable to their employers. It is not inherently inflationary because it will not itself be passed on into an inflationary increased cost of living. It had been determined by the orderly, patient procedure of the Railway Labor Act which is our one, great statutory monument to the peaceful settlement of labor disputes. I regret more than I can say that the administration's stabilization authorities have seen fit to challenge it. That, however, is their responsibility—unless I relieve them of it by my collateral, congressional action.

Unfortunately the administration's stabilization authorities take a different view. They assert that the granting of this wage increase will break the line which we all are tenuously holding against the inflationary spark which can set off a conflagration. They assert they cannot hold the line if this sort of thing occurs. On the merits of the argument I think they are wrong—particularly since they themselves approve an alternative, sliding scale of wage increases for these railway classifications which in aggregate would cost but little less. But, unfortunately—and it is a tragic misfortune—these administration authorities, thanks to inept legislation, are responsible in their discretion for the overall inflationary situation. What they think and what they do—in subsequent reaction to what we do—will largely determine our inflationary fate. If they do not hold the line, because they say we have made it impossible, there will be small consolation for the country or for anybody in it if the aftermath proves to be just a noisy inquest to decide who is to blame.

Mr. President, I do not believe that anybody can hold the line much longer against inflation if 531 Members of Congress embark upon the business of attempting to fix wages in specific cases or upon the equally dubious business of attempting to fix prices for specific commodities, no matter how persuasive the reasons may be in each individual instance. Neither do I believe that anybody can hold the line if executive stabilizers foul their own nest with another John L. Lewis case, or with an indefinite expansion of O. P. A. mistakes. Nor do I believe that anybody can hold the line much longer unless we rewrite the fundamental law and gear wages and prices together and then keep them geared. There must be a new assessment of realities. We confront a condition, not a theory. It seems to me that in all these contemporary crises, respecting both prices and wages, we are treating symptoms and ignoring the disease. Congress and the President cannot stand in everlasting impasse in this anti-inflationary war without losing it. It is past time for sensible men to get together.

Now I come back to the pending case. I submit that the issue is not worth forcing by any of the parties to this controversy. They—and we—all have more to lose than to gain thereby. Everybody agrees that these railroad workers are entitled to some sort of a wage readjustment. The only difference is largely one of distribution—with the aggregate amount approximately the same. On the one hand, is this worth a strike to railway labor—a strike which would paralyze America's war effort—a strike which would speedily cost labor itself infinitely more than it could recoup through ultimate victory? On the other hand, is it worth a strike to Government when so much of equity is on labor's side? Meanwhile, and of more imminent concern, is it worth the precedent which Congress is here asked to set—the precedent of attempting to control specific wage decisions by congressional fiat—the precedent which administration stabilizers, no matter how wrong we may think them, assert will make it impossible for them to longer stem the inflationary tides?

That is where we come in. And if we pass this resolution we are all the way "in." We have taken over for better or for worse, without possessing the machinery to "follow through." That machinery, never forget, will still remain in the hands of the Executive.

Mr. President, these questions answer themselves so far as I am concerned.

Congress can—Congress should—write a new formula for gearing prices and wages in a common, practical, and effective formula. From my viewpoint, every effort to this net result should be made at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue, before it is too late. I have no quarrel with any of my colleagues who disagree with my personal opinion. I never knew so much right to be on the side of those with whom I am forced reluctantly to disagree upon this critical occasion. But, feeling as I do about the paramount importance of protecting the American people against inflation, I am forced, under existing circumstances, to leave this war problem to the President of the United States where it has been placed by law.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, in view of the statement of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the statement of Mr. Donald R. Richberg, who appeared at the hearing on behalf of the employees. The statement begins on page 117 of the hearings.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator JOHNSON of Colorado (chairman of the subcommittee). Give your name and affiliations and then proceed in your own way, Mr. Richberg.

Mr. RICHBERG. My name is Donald R. Richberg. I am a lawyer, practicing in Washington, D. C., and Chicago, Ill. I have been engaged in this matter in behalf of the 15 cooperating organizations for the purpose of aiding, so far as I could, in the maintenance and enforcement of their agreement of August 7, 1943, with the railroads.

What I have to say is not intended as a dry legal argument addressed to a court. I want to review the legal situation leading up to this resolution to show why, in our judgment, it is a logical and a proper solution for this situation.

Senator REED. I hope you are going to make your explanation in words of one syllable, because you are addressing two nonlawyers.

Mr. RICHBERG. I intend to speak in a manner that can be understood by anyone, regardless of his legal experience—although I regard practically all Senators as lay lawyers.

I want to first take up the factual situation at the time of the passage of the Stabilization Act. It was at that time that wages paid to railroad employees had been stabilized for a long period of time under an act of Congress. I think the recital yesterday of the history of the wage negotiations and wage adjustments under the Railway Labor Act will bear me out in that statement.

As I understand the amendment to the Emergency Control Act, it was for the purpose of stabilizing wages and prices, and it was very definitely stated at the time, and has been repeated over and over again by those concerned with the passage of the act and with the administration of it, that it was not an act to freeze wages, but was an act to stabilize them. The two are quite different.

Stabilization, as I understand it, is maintaining in a stable form to avoid sudden changes; to maintain a certain equilibrium. Very clearly I think the intention of the Stabilization Act was to endeavor to arrive at a certain equilibrium of prices and wages so that we would not have sudden changes and inflationary effects.

When the act was passed and all during this period of wage control by the Government there has been a continual exemption of the processes of the Railway Labor Act. I am just going to sum these up, because I think they are very important as showing the intent of the Congress and the concern of Congress and the administration.

Senator REED. If you will sum it up completely you will save me a lot of words; otherwise I will have to do it myself.

Mr. RICHBERG. Here is the situation, Senator. When the War Labor Board was authorized to exercise its present powers in Executive Order 9017, January 12, 1942, there was an express exemption of the railway wage issues.

Then, on May 22, 1942, in issuing Executive Order 9172, the President set up a Railway Labor Panel and provided that the Chairman of that panel could act to select a board of three whenever the situation warranted; and in that order it was stated that the Emergency Board so set up should have final and exclusive judrisdiction of railroad wage disputes.

Whatever that meant, it certainly did not mean that at that time there was in contemplation that anyone else should have a superior and an appellate jurisdiction, because words were used which were not in the Railway Labor Act itself. The words used in the Executive order were that this Emergency Board should have final and exclusive jurisdiction.

Then the Stabilization Act was passed October 2, 1942, and it was specifically provided in that act—and I quote just this one sentence—that the President may suspend certain provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act.

And then the sentence concluded "but he may not, under the authority of this act, suspend any other law or part thereof."

That very clearly left the Railway Labor Act processes in full force and left the Railway Labor Act as the way of settling railroad wage controversies.

Senator REED. You are probably aware of the fact that the admonition has been honored in the breach by the executive authorities very much more than in any other way.

Mr. RICHBERG. I will accept the Senator's statement without making it my own; but I will accept it as to its accuracy.

I think that is very important, because in this situation eventually we come down to the question as to whether, by the actions taken in this case and in other matters, there is a practical suspension of the Railway Labor Act. If so, the fact that it is done by indirection does not make it any less a suspension.

Senator REED. Or any less objectionable?

Mr. RICHBERG. Or less objectionable, because if you superimpose upon a body that is supposed to have authority a superior authority and give final authority to that superior authority, then you practically have wiped out the powers of the previous authority.

When the President issued his Executive Order 9250 on October 3, 1942, which was to implement the Stabilization Act, and which was issued, as you know, immediately after that, there was provision made for the determination of various wage matters by the National War Labor Board. But also in that Executive order was this provision [reading]:

"Nothing in this order shall be construed as affecting the present operation of the Fair Labor Standards Act, the National Labor Relations Act, the Walsh-Healey Act, the Davis-Bacon Act, or the adjustment procedure of the Railway Labor Act."

In other words, the President again carried out what seemed to be the intent of the Congress, accepted by the President, of maintaining in full force and effect the adjustment procedure of the Railway Labor Act.

We had quite a little discussion over what that meant. There were disagreements between various persons, and various lawyers disagreed as to whether that meant merely the adjustment procedure, referring to the adjustment boards under the Railway Labor Act, or what it did mean; and as a result of that extensive discussion the President issued his Executive Order 9299 on February 4, 1943; and in the issuance of that order he made it very clear again that the processes of the Railway Labor Act were to be maintained.

I want to quote from that order briefly, because that has brought us down to the present processes for acting on railway wage disputes.

In this order there was provision made that if the carriers and employees entered into agreements for changes of wage rates, that could be submitted to the chairman of the National Railway Labor Panel, which was an outgrowth, as I have said, of the Railway Labor Act, under an Executive order of the President, establishing a panel, and that if he had reason to believe that the change did not conform to the standards of Executive Order 9250 or the general stabilization program or directives and policies, then he should designate three members of the panel as an Emergency Board to investigate the change and to report to the President. Otherwise the chairman of the panel could permit the proposed change to become effective.

Very clearly there the processes of the Railway Labor Act were kept entirely separate from the operations of the National War Labor Board and even from the operations of the Economic Stabilization Director, except so far as he issued directives.

In other words, the President gave no power to the Economic Stabilization Director to review such agreements; it was left entirely with the chairman of the Railway Labor Panel.

Senator REED. Subject only to final action by the President?

Mr. RICHBERG. Subject to the fact that, if he was not in doubt he could approve them, but if he was in doubt, then he could appoint an Emergency Board to investigate that change. Then the Emergency Board, under those circumstances, or an Emergency Board appointed to pass on a case where there had been no agreement, either type of Emergency Board would report to the President. That is correct, Senator. As to the report of the President, here for the first time comes in any suggestion of an over-all control. Copies of such report of such an Emergency Board were to be filed with the Economic Stabilization Director, the National War Labor Board, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and then provision was made that the Economic Stabilization Director "may on behalf of himself or other departments and agencies concerned, report to the President the effect of the recommendations on the general stabilization program."

It did not say that he should review it or set it aside, but that he should report to the President—

"Unless and except to the extent that the Economic Stabilization Director shall thereupon direct, all recommendations of the Emergency Board in regard to proposed changes affecting wages and salary payments shall, upon the expiration of 30 days after the report is filed with the President, become effective."

I pause there, because that word "effective" has been used in various ways, and I want to point out that the only effect of an Emergency Board report is to establish the recommendations made by the Government body. The Emergency Board is not a compulsory arbitration tribunal, and the Railway Labor Act specifically provides that it shall not be a violation of a legal obligation to refuse to arbitrate.

So long as we are maintaining the processes of the Railway Labor Act we have a situation where the final action is in the form of a recommendation by a Presidential board. If the Economic Stabilization Director is going to make any suggestion, obviously he can do nothing more than to change the recommendations or suggest a different form of recommendation. But we still have the final processes of the Railway Labor Act, one of which is that parties must agree on the settlement of their controversy. And this is very important, because the effectiveness of the Railway Labor Act over all these years has been in the very fact that it did not provide for compulsory arbitration and the fact that it provided for a conference, for Government mediation, and, if the parties did not agree voluntarily to arbitrate, then it provided for a fact-finding board which would review the entire controversy and make impartial recommendations as to how the parties should settle it.

I remember when that matter was debated in the Senate in 1926, when the Railway Labor Act was passed, one or two Senators were inclined to scoff at it and speak of it as rose water. It did not exercise any compulsion on anybody. But the compulsion of the pressure of the facts and of public opinion has been so effective all through the years that the recommendations of this Emergency Board have operated to settle these controversies, and we have not had any strikes of any size on railroads during the entire period of the Railway Labor Act.

So we have the policy of Congress which was adopted in 1926 and written into law as to the means by which wage disputes and other disputes between management and employees should be settled on American railroads, and it has worked. It has worked effectively not only to settle these controversies, but to do exactly what we are talking about now, and that is to stabilize conditions, because with these processes it is perfectly clear you cannot have any sudden upset of conditions in the railway industry. You have to go through this long process of conference, mediation, and arbitration on any question of importance before any result can come out of it in the sense of resolving a bitter controversy, and the effect of that has been, as we have pointed out, the stabilization of wages during that period.

It has also had this effect, which the Congress could have very properly had in mind in eliminating the Railway Labor Act from the operations that were set up under the stabilization program. The wages of railroad labor have as a whole lagged behind any adjustments by a certain definite time in other industries where there was no such control mechanism and where there have been fairly rapid wage changes. That is peculiarly true from the period from 1939 on, when, as a matter of fact, because of the tremendous development of business and the increased employment and the rising cost of living, wage adjustments were being made constantly in large, well-organized industries, and had considerable effect, whereas the railway employees, moving along this comparatively slow process, were lagging behind. So, when we start with a program that says we will try to stabilize wages as of a certain date on the assumption, which has been referred to over and over again by the National War Labor Board, that a certain uniformity between the cost of living and wages that had been reached at the time when the program began to be effective, you do not find that true with regard to railroad wages. They were still running somewhat behind. I am only using this illustration to point out that it was not intended by the Congress—and so interpreted by the Executive in the early orders which were issued—to subject the processes of orderly adjustment under the Railway Labor Act to any of these new procedures.

I think it is pertinent right there, as Mr. Harrison has pointed out, to call your attention to the fact that we have also this situation in the railway industry, and that is that prices are determined by another Federal body—by the Interstate Commerce Commission; and there is no question of a disorderly price rise or anything of that sort,

because railroad rates have got to be fixed by the Commission. You cannot change them without the authority of the Commission. And we have had the Railway Labor Act acting as a stabilizing force on wages, and on the other side you have had the Interstate Commerce Commission acting as a stabilizing force on prices; and the very Stabilization Act itself exempted from its operations, as far as control was concerned, these public regulatory bodies, with the provision that the President could intervene through his various agencies. And I will refer to the fact that in the Stabilization Act it was provided that no common carrier or public utility shall make any general increase in its rates or charges unless it first give 30 days' notice to the President, and such agency as he may designate may make timely intervention before a Federal or State authority may have jurisdiction to consider such increase.

So there we have a situation where this industry particularly was stabilized under an entirely different set-up, a different formula, and a different method from those which were found necessary in the case of industries generally.

If you have now by indirection the idea that the Economic Stabilization Director has been given final authority over wages, to decide what they should be, or to prevent settlements, the simple, plain effect of that would be to suspend the Railway Labor Act.

Senator REED. Right on that point, Mr. Richberg: In section 2 of the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, the President is given power to suspend certain provisions of the first Emergency Price Control Act?

Mr. RICHBERG. Yes; definitely.

Senator REED. And section 2 concludes [reading]:

"But he may not, under the authority of this act, suspend any other law or part thereof."

What I want to say is that I had a little something to do with the framing and the passage of this, and that language is put in there specifically and definitely to prevent this blithe or carefree way by which the Executive authority had been disregarding acts of Congress, so that nothing in this act could permit the suspension of any other part of this act or any other law or part thereof.

Mr. RICHBERG. I am glad the Senator makes that construction.

Senator REED. We put that language in there for a purpose.

Mr. RICHBERG. I assume you did.

Senator REED. Not the Railway Act alone, but many acts.

Mr. RICHBERG. That is one of the reasons why, when we now suggest that Congress pass this joint resolution clarifying and affirming the purposes of the Stabilization Act, we are not so much arguing that Congress should override the Executive in the exercise of any Executive authority, but to place the limits that the Congress intended to place upon such Executive authority.

Senator REED. And, putting Senator JOHNSON'S statement in another way, to reassert the authority of Congress?

Mr. RICHBERG. Precisely.

Senator JOHNSON of Colorado. Then, Mr. Richberg, it is your contention that Senate Joint Resolution 91 does not do violence to the Stabilization Act, or the War Powers Act, or any other act of Congress but, rather, that it is consistent with the former acts of Congress?

Mr. RICHBERG. I think it is not only entirely consistent but, as the situation has developed, it is an action of the Congress which would help very much to clarify and to enforce the original intention of the Congress.

Senator JOHNSON of Colorado. I am especially glad to have you clear that point up. Mr. Harrison's remark a moment ago bothered me considerably when he said that he did not think there would be very much objection, meaning on the part of the administration, if Congress did take hold of this matter.

Mr. RICHBERG. Perhaps I might interpret Mr. Harrison's remark a little bit by saying that it did seem to us that if the Congress made it quite certain that the processes of the Railway Labor Act should be permitted to work it would, as a matter of fact, relieve the administration of a burden that otherwise the administration might think it ought to carry in connection with railroads, which it is carrying in connection with other industries.

Senator JOHNSON of Colorado. That is not the kind of interpretation I place on it.

Senator REED. Would you say that the poker got hot and they might find this way of dropping it?

Mr. HARRISON. What I meant, Senator, was that administrators have certain views of their powers to handle a problem of this kind, and we are asking Congress to say that they have proceeded in a way that was not intended by the law, and that is the purpose of the resolution. You can call that overriding or whatever you want to call it.

Senator JOHNSON of Colorado. We know that there is a great deal of pressure down at the White House right now from a great many labor groups on the question of an increase in wages, and we know that the pressure is becoming terrific. It has even become so terrific that Mrs. Roosevelt commented on it before her press audience the other day. When she does that, that means that the shoe is beginning to pinch a little. I thought perhaps when you said that you did not think there would be very much objection at the White House if Congress took hold of this matter you meant that if Congress would bail the situation out now that the pressure was hot, it would be a fine thing for everybody down at the White House.

Mr. HARRISON. You can make that deduction from it, but I still stick to what I said.

Senator JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not want to make any false deductions, because it is an important point.

Senator REED. Without disagreeing with my good friend the chairman, my concern is to bail the country out from the effect of a series of mistaken policies.

Mr. RICHBERG. Referring to what you said a moment ago about the expansion of authority here, there is this to be said—and I have been under pressure in my time as an administrative officer. Sometimes the authority is extended not because the administrative officer wants to grab more power—though sometimes they do—but because the pressures are so great to get something done that the administrative officer moves on into another field.

I wanted to call your attention to the Stabilization Act because that is the source of the President's authority; and I think the authority cannot rise above that source. The Stabilization Act was not an unlimited grant of power.

Senator REED. It was undertaken to be rather a severely limited grant of power.

Mr. RICHBERG. I would have judged so from the express language used in the act.

Senator REED. Which, as I said, was intentional and not accidental.

Mr. RICHBERG. In that act the President was authorized to issue a general order stabilizing prices, wages, and salaries affecting the costs of living. There was a grant of power to issue interpretative orders and regulations, and so forth, but essentially a general order; in other words, there should be a general policy, and then it should be implemented.

In addition to that general order, there is a provision to which I want to call your attention because, on account of its language, it has been very frequently misinterpreted.

Let me say that I am going to take now a professional attitude. It has been frequently misinterpreted by laymen because of the use of the word "may." It reads [reading]:

"The President may, except as otherwise provided in this act, thereafter provide for making adjustments with respect to prices, wages, and salaries, to the extent that he finds necessary to aid in the effective prosecution of the war or to correct gross inequities."

As I say, many persons reading that language think that the President may do it or not, as he sees fit. As a matter of fact, it has been settled so long that it is not a doubtful question of law any more that "may" means "shall" where the rights of the public and third persons are involved.

Senator REED. That is a very correct statement of the law.

Mr. RICHBERG. There is no question about that. I need not cite cases. There is a long line of cases in the Supreme Court in which it has been held over and over again, and it has never been questioned.

Here you have a situation where it would be a manifest absurdity to interpret it otherwise. It means that that is a mandate, that as a part of the stabilization power he shall make the adjustments necessary; that is, he shall provide for making adjustments to aid in the effective prosecution of the war or correct gross inequities.

Coming right down to this very situation here, we have a Presidential board which passes on all the questions presented under the stabilization program, and it passed on the merits of this case. The original Sharfman Board said that it could not grant increases under the Little Steel formula. So they passed that out. They discussed various situations. What was provided here was that the President should provide for corrections of gross inequities. The Sharfman Board very definitely, and on evidence that cannot be impeached, found there were gross inequities in this situation.

We are not asking a retrial of this; I am simply pointing out that a Presidential board did find the existence of gross inequities which required correction.

Under that law it was the President's duty to provide for such adjustments; and that is our first reason for saying that there was no authority granted under this act to the President or to Director Vinson or to anyone else to prevent making adjustments which were required to correct gross inequities. As a matter of fact, it was a mandatory duty of theirs under the law to provide for that.

Senator REED. May I call attention to a clause that you read and to which I attach some significance: "Except as otherwise provided in this act."

And this act provided that they were not to disturb any other act; and we did not grant the President power to suspend any other act or any law or part thereof, and the Railway Labor Board was specifically exempt.

Mr. RICHBERG. Exactly. Now, Senator, let me bring out one other point.

Senator REED. I have had some very long but inconclusive discussions with various Government agencies about this act.

Mr. RICHBERG. I will just read, if I may, from the report of the Sharfman board. [Reading:]

"The wage increases recommended below for the 73 classes of nonoperating railroad employees, on the basis of a careful study and analysis of the entire record, are designed to correct gross inequities and to aid in the effective prosecution of the war."

That is from the Sharfman board's report, paragraph 20.

Senator JOHNSON of Colorado. It is not your contention that the Sharfman board was acting without the law; is it?

Mr. RICHBERG. They were acting entirely within the law. They were created under the Railway Labor Act.

Referring again to the Stabilization Act, What were the limits on its power of stabilizing wages, prices, and salaries? It was in order to aid in the effective prosecution of the war that a general order could be issued stabilizing wages and salaries affecting the cost of living.

You have this extraordinary situation as to the amount of money involved in these wages. It is for all practical effects the same amount of money that can be distributed in accordance with the Director's order. The difference in this last recommendation of a few million dollars is not important, because the order is not placed on the basis that it is saving money; the order is placed on the basis that they are redistributing wage increases. This wage increase is redistributed. Why? To satisfy an idea as to how this amount of money should be spent, how the wages should be increased, not to in any way affect the cost of living, because the changes made here have no effect on the cost of living. The Sharfman board reported that the wage increase which they recommended would not affect the cost of living. It is stated by the Director in his order that this does not affect the cost of living. Certainly the difference between the two does not affect the cost of living.

So we have a situation where the fundamentals of the Economic Stabilization Act do not apply at all.

Senator JOHNSON of Colorado. Has Judge Vinson contended that there was a principle involved?

Mr. RICHBERG. I have read everything that has been set forth, and I am still utterly unable to determine on what basis Judge Vinson is interfering with the execution of this agreement. I cannot tell. I cannot make out why it is necessary to redistribute these wages except on the basis of his judgment that the lower-paid men ought to have a little more and the higher-paid men ought not to have so much.

Senator JOHNSON of Colorado. Have the legal aspects been presented to him at any time?

Mr. RICHBERG. When we had this Special Emergency Board, which was appointed to advise Judge Vinson as to how Judge Vinson was to carry out Judge Vinson's opinion, I pointed out to the Board the legal situation in the statement which has been presented and which I think was filed here yesterday, and I questioned the legality of the authority that Mr. Vinson was seeking to exercise, and the answer to that in the report of the Special Emergency Board was this. They stated our contentions as to legal questions, and said [reading]:

"It was contended also that the President has no power to nullify the agreement of August 7, 1943, and that said agreement is now a valid and binding contract and legally enforceable, regardless of any action or nonaction of approval or disapproval by any governmental authority, and that if any Government official has been invested with the power of disapproving such a contract, that official can take no such action without giving notice to the parties to the contract and opportunity to be heard * * *."

And so forth. Then they say [reading further]:

"This Board was requested to advise the President of its judgment about the points of law thus raised by the brotherhoods."

That is an interesting statement. [Reading further:]

"We have deemed it proper to state the contentions thus made before this Board, but we are convinced that it does not lie within our province to attempt to pass upon them and we do not do so."

I suggested that they ought to advise the President regarding it.

Senator REED. The effect of Judge Vinson's latest action in implementing his opinion is to substitute their judgment as to how these increases should be distributed for the judgment of the parties who directly negotiated this contract, namely, the railroads and the organizations?

Mr. RICHBERG. Precisely.

I come back to the question of the suspension of the Railway Labor Act. That act provides that it is a duty imposed upon the carriers and employees to make and maintain agreements. That is the first duty. The whole act is directed toward the purpose of maintaining agreements and maintaining tranquillity of labor relations.

Now, Senator, we have this situation, that the parties agreed. The Board sat for 44 days and heard an enormous amount of testimony and passed on all the issues. The parties agreed on the increase, which in total is not disapproved by the Director with whatever authority he might have, but he undertakes, without ever having considered the record, without ever having reviewed the record, without ever having given any hearing to the parties—as a matter of fact, he undertakes to substitute personal judgment for that of the parties most concerned who have made an agreement as to the distribution of wages.

We go right back to the Stabilization Act, and I ask where in this act or anywhere else has there been given such power by the Congress. We think it should be made plain to the administration that no such power was intended by Congress and no such power has been given by Congress. The only basis on which the President's authority is granted is to aid in the effective prosecution of the war, to have some control over prices and wages and to stabilize them, and to correct gross inequities. Our proposition at the outset is that we are not asking the Congress to write a new law or to substitute a legislative action for an executive action. We are asking the Congress to make it clear what the intent of the Congress was. This is a very good instance where you can make perfectly clear the exact intent of the Congress.

Senator REED. And your position is that this is a part of the responsibility of Congress and you are not expecting us to assume any extra or unreasonable responsibilities?

Mr. RICHBERG. Not only that, but I call your attention to this, and I think it is sufficiently important to see if it meets with your approval. I would like to read a memorandum as to the legal authority involved here. I think you would like to hear it, because it is not an unusual action of Congress. This is the type of action which Congress has taken repeatedly in the past, and it is entirely within the authority of Congress and not in any way an invasion of the authority of any other department. The memorandum that I want to read is as follows [reading]:

"The various acts of Congress, such as the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, and the amendment of October 2, 1942, commonly referred to as the Stabilization Act, are exercises of the legislative power and, although administrative authority is granted to carry out the will of the Congress, the power of the Congress to act directly upon the subject matter remains unimpaired. Indeed, a great number of questions have arisen as to whether, in such acts, Congress has delegated legislative power unconstitutionally or whether the Congress has constitutionally made a law and merely authorized executive officials to administer the law in accordance with standards laid down by the Congress. If the Congress desires to make the law more definite in its application in specific situations, the Congress may act either by amending the law or by legislating as to a specific case.

"'* * * The legislature may pass a declaratory act, which, though inoperative on the past, may act in future. This law expresses the sense of the legislature on the existing law, as plainly as a declaratory act, and expresses it in terms capable of conferring the jurisdiction. * * * (*Postmaster General of the United States* v. *Early*, 12 Wheat. 136, 148–149; opinion by Chief Justice Marshall.)'

"In *Bailey* v. *Clerk* (21 Wall. 284) Congress had passed an act defining the meaning of the words 'capital employed' in a previous act. The Court held:

"'* * * This enactment was evidently intended to remove any doubt previously existing as to the meaning of the statute and declare its true construction and meaning. Had it been intended to apply only to cases subsequently arising, it would have so provided in terms.'

"There is a famous case, which is directly in point on this situation, regarding obstructions to interstate commerce in which the Congress exercised its declaratory power to override a judicial interpretation of a previous act of Congress. The decision and opinion of the Supreme Court in this case, *Pennsylvania* v. *The Wheeling and Belmont Bridge Co.* (18 How. 421), apply closely to the present problem.

"The Supreme Court of the United States had held that a bridge erected across the Ohio River was an obstruction to the free navigation of said river, and directed that the obstruction be removed as being in violation of the acts of Congress regulating navigation of the Ohio River. (See 15 How. 518.) After the rendition of this decree, the Congress passed an act which provided, in part, as follows:

"'That the bridges across the Ohio River at Wheeling, in the State of Virginia, and at Bridgeport, in the State of Ohio, abutting on Zane's Island, in said river, are hereby declared to be lawful structures in their present positions and elevations, and shall be so held and taken to be, anything in the law or laws of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.'

"The act further provided that the bridges should be declared to be post roads and that the pipes of chimneys of all vessels and boats navigating the river should be regulated 'so as not to interfere with the elevation and construction of said bridges.' The Supreme Court sustained the authority of the Congress to determine what should constitute an obstruction to navigation."

You will note in this case that the Supreme Court itself held that these bridges were an obstruction to navigation [continuing reading]:

"It will be noted that under more recent legislative practice the Secretary of War has been given authority to pass upon questions as to obstruction to navigation through the building of bridges. For example, in *Miller* v. *Mayor, etc., of New York* (109 U. S. 385), an effort was made to restrain the construction of the Brooklyn Bridge, which construction had been authorized by the Secretary of War in accordance with the act of Congress of March 3, 1869. It was contended that the approval of the Secretary of War was not conclusive, but that the courts could pass upon a complaint that the bridge as projected would obstruct, impair, and injuriously modify the navigation of the river. The Court held, in part, as follows:

"'* * * By submitting the matter to the Secretary Congress did not abdicate any of its authority to determine what should or should not be deemed an obstruction to the navigation of the river. It simply declared that, upon a certain fact being established, the bridge should be deemed a lawful structure, and employed the Secretary of War as an agent to ascertain that fact. * * * Its power, therefore, to determine what shall not be deemed, so far as that commerce is concerned, an obstruction, is necessarily para-

mount and conclusive. It may, in direct terms declare absolutely, or on conditions, that a bridge of a particular height shall not be deemed such an obstruction; and in the latter case make its declaration to take effect when those conditions are complied with. * * *

"It should be evident from the above cases and from a mass of cases discussing the delegation of legislative power and the creation of administrative authority, that when the Congress enacts a law and commits its administration to executive officials, the Congress does not abdicate its authority to pass declaratory acts which may either interpret the law or make specific application of the law either preserving all the original standards or modifying them according to the will of Congress."

Right there I am going to insert a fairly recent case, the case of *McNair* v. *Knott* (302 U. S. 369, decided in 1937), in which the opinion was written by Mr. Justice Black. In that case the question arose as to the effect of an act of Congress; and there is one paragraph that I would like to read from Justice Black's opinion [reading]:

"There is nothing novel or extraordinary in the passage of laws by the Federal Government and the States ratifying, confirming, validating, or curing defective contracts. Such statutes, usually designated as 'remedial,' 'curative' or 'enabling,' merely remove legal obstacles, and permit parties to carry out their contracts according to their own desires and intentions. Such statutes have validated transactions that were previously illegal relating to mortgages, deeds, bonds, and other contracts. * * * In this case, we hold that the security agreement—originally ultra vires—became enforceable from the date the amendment became effective."

I will read further from the memorandum to which I have referred [reading]:

"The cases involving the retroactive or the future effect of a declaratory statute have usually turned upon the issue as to whether or not the legislature had interfered with the exercise of the judicial function in determining the meaning of a statute or whether or not the legislature had simply declared what the law should be in the future, which is clearly the legislative function. The law is well summed up in Cooley's authoritative work on Constitutional Limitations (8th ed. 1927), from which the following quotation (p. 188) is taken:

"'It is always competent to change an existing law by a declaratory statute; and where the statute is only to operate upon future cases, it is no objection to its validity that it assumes the law to have been in the past what it is now declared that it shall be in the future. * * *. To declare what the law is, or has been, is a judicial power; to declare what the law shall be is legislative. * * * And if it appears to be the intention to establish by declaratory statute a rule of conduct for the future, the court should accept and act upon it, without too nicely inquiring whether the mode by which the new rule is established is or is not the best, most decorous, and suitable that could have been adopted.'"

Senator JOHNSON of Colorado. Going back to that decision in which it says that to declare what the law is or has been is a judicial power; to declare what the law shall be is legislative, as I understand this resolution, it is a judicial document; it is not declaring what the law shall be, because we are not changing any law.

Mr. RICHBERG. Let me explain the difference, Senator. The interpretation of the law and the determination of the law may vary in the past or in the future with only this difference, and that is that after there has been a judicial determination of private rights of the parties the legislature will not set that aside. But here we have not got that situation at all; and that is what I am going to point out right now [continuing reading]:

"It is important, however, to observe that in the present instance there is involved no possible conflict between legislative and judicial powers. The Stabilization Act, the Executive orders, and the general stabilization program have received no judicial construction. The contract of August 7, 1943, has not been construed by any court. Indeed, it has not yet been carried into effect. A question might be raised as to whether the executive authority granted by the Congress has been correctly interpreted and exercised. But this question need not be raised. If the Congress passes a declaratory act through which the validity of the agreement of August 7, 1943, and its conformity with the wage-control legislation of the Congress is determined by an act of Congress, that legislative action would be final and decisive. The Congress has laid down the standards and procedure of wage control. In order to relieve the Congress of an impossible burden of detailed regulation, the Congress has granted administrative authority to apply the law to specific cases. But there is nothing in this grant to deprive the Congress of its fundamental authority to act directly in a specific case. Such an action will, in fact, aid generally to clarify the standards and the procedure of wage control which will normally be administered by the executive officers, to whom such authority has been delegated."

Mr. Chairman, there is not any question as to the authority of the Congress. There is no interference here with any judicial authority. The action which is sought here is essentially legislative action. The action which has been taken here has been administrative action under assumed authority from the legislature. It is entirely within the control of the legislature to either approve or disapprove or lay down rules for the future.

I have very little more to add to what I have said. I think I should say that there has been some reference here, and there is reference in one of the President's Executive orders to the First War Powers Act, and that is a matter that is quite commonly misunderstood.

The First War Powers Act, as a matter of fact, provided for a redistribution of Executive powers and functions, and it provided for reorganization of boards and the transfer of functions from one board to another. But it did not change any substantive law. It did not repeal any laws as far as the substantive law was concerned. It simply provided that the President could say that this body shall enforce this right or this function, but it left all the law that had been written by the Congress in full force and effect. So that the President can transfer powers to this body or that bureau; he can transfer powers to the Secretary of the Interior. But there is nothing in the First War Powers Act that either creates a new body of substantive law or that suspends or sets aside any body of substantive law so that the Railway Labor Act is entirely effective.

Senator REED. The First War Powers Act did not add to or subtract anything from substantive law?

Mr. RICHBERG. No, sir. It simply provided for a redistribution of powers under the executive agencies of the Government.

The Second War Powers Act of course has a great many provisions of one sort or another, but I am not going into those. We have copies of the two acts here. I do not think it is necessary to put them into the record.

Senator REED. There are two War Powers Acts that antedated the Emergency Price Control Act.

Mr. RICHBERG. May I give you one further point that was brought out before the Special Emergency Board? I think possibly one reason they did not wish to comment on that was because there was really no answer to be given to it. But I think it is very important, when we are submitting this matter to Congress, to show the ways in which laws passed by Congress have been administered.

Under the price-control provisions for the operation of the Office of Price Administration there are specific provisions laid down by which it is absolutely essential to have hearings and notice, and an opportunity to be heard. Although the Administrator himself may issue certain orders after consultation with various persons, those affected have a right to come in immediately and make a protest and to be heard on their protest, and if the protest is overruled they have the right to appeal to the Emergency Court of Appeals.

So that there has been laid down by the Congress itself a very elaborate and careful machinery for protecting the procedures that are known as due process of law.

Yet, on the question of wages under the Railway Labor Act, there is a procedure which bears no relationship whatsoever to anything known as due process of law.

The action taken by the Economic Stabilization Director in June was taken without notice, without opportunity of hearing; it was taken despite the fact that an extensive hearing had been had before the Emergency Board on a vast record which had not been even read or reviewed by the Economic Stabilization Director, and which cannot be. Issuing a fiat from the sanctity of chambers is not due process of law as we know it.

If the Congress had intended the grant of any such power over wages, it would certainly have at least put the safeguards around wages that it put around prices. Certainly the safeguards of wages are as important to men in this country as the safeguards of prices. Prices may be important to a man who is seeking to sell something, but certainly the wages which a man is receiving for his labor is equally important.

Under this procedure it is supposed that a contract which has been made for wages can be impaired without any hearing, without any opportunity to be heard, without any record upon which any appeal can be had, and with no opportunity for an appeal to a court to set aside an order which might be entered entirely without authority or in violation of law.

I simply point out to this committee that certainly Congress never had the intention, after the careful protection that it put around price regulation, that wages should be subject to any such disorderly and arbitrary consideration and review.

The Labor Board, for example, has to hold hearings when it passes upon these matters. The Labor Board is required, under the Smith-Connally Act, to give notice of hearings and an opportunity to be heard, and, of course, if the Board proceeded outside its authority, it would be obvious that there would be an opportunity for judicial review.

So, we have a situation in which the very question of judicial review is surrounded with a vacuum, you might say. The director has gone off somewhere where we cannot touch him. He has acted on something that we know nothing about. We have no record. All we can do in the way of directly attacking the director's action would be by some action to restrain him from the illegal exercise of authority.

But what is the effect of that authority here? No one has ever claimed there is any right to fix the wages of these men. It is simply to destroy an existing contract and then say, "You can have another kind of a contract that I, in the quiet of my cloistered room, have decided is better for you."

In that situation it is certainly high time that the Congress should take some action either to indicate that it has conferred no such power, or that if any power is going to

be conferred of that nature it should be conferred by an act of Congress with specific protections.

Senator REED. Do you still entertain the quaint notion that this is a government of laws and not of men?

Mr. RICHBERG. I still entertain the notion that that is what we are fighting to maintain.

Senator JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Richberg, your testimony has been very interesting to me. I happen to be one of the Americans who are very much afraid of inflation, an American who believes that inflation is perhaps only second to Hitler in its dangers to this country and one who believes that no one would suffer so much by inflation as would labor. So I want to do everything in my power to uphold the hands of the President in his fight against inflation. I would not want to open the doors for a general stampede for wage increases. I would not want to have any part in that sort of a proceeding, regardless of the merit of any special case. I think in this particular instance there is a strong case. I believe that you have made a strong case; that there is no doubt about the need in this particular case for an increase. It is very comforting to me, therefore, to have you point out that this is a special situation; that even if we enact Senate Joint Resolution 91 Congress will not be opening the doors wide for wage increases, and that we will simply be calling the attention of the administration to what the laws already on the books amount to, and calling attention to the fact that they are not being executed in accordance with the laws. So your testimony is very comforting to me.

Senator REED. There is another situation in this matter that I see. I do not know how important it is; but I am also very much opposed to having the Government take over the railroads and operate them. I do not think there is very much idea of a strike. I think whenever it comes to that fatal hour the railroads will be taken over by the Government; and I do not want to see that. Wages are important, but the most important thing, to me, is the preservation of constitutional processes. That comes first. It comes ahead of you gentlemen and your wages; it comes ahead of prices and inflation; and that is definitely threatened in the procedure which has been followed in this case and in numerous other instances with which I have had experience. That is my concern.

Senator JOHNSON of Colorado. Does that complete your testimony, and your presentation of the case?

Mr. RICHBERG. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement.

The emergency board based its award primarily on the existence of gross inequity, allegedly demonstrated by comparison of the wage rates now paid to employees here involved with the rates paid to other workers deemed generally comparable. In its comparison the board took account both of specific rates paid at a particular time, and of wage rate trends.

I tried to find out today whether this would be in the nature of a breaking of the Little Steel formula. I was told by the proponents of the joint resolution that the Little Steel formula did not apply; that this was a separate arrangement by railroad employers and employees, and that on the basis of gross inequity, a vote for the joint resolution is justified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the joint resolution pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] who is unavoidably absent from the chamber. If the Senator from New Jersey were present he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. HOLMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. I am advised that if he were present he would vote as I am about to vote. I am, therefore, free to vote, and vote "yea."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I am advised that if he were present he would vote as I am about to vote. I am therefore at liberty to vote, and vote "yea."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE (when Mr. WHEELER's name was called). I have been requested to announce that the senior Senator from Montana is absent because of illness. If he were present he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] and will vote. I vote "yea." I am not advised how the Senator from Oregon would vote.

Mr. MEAD. My colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is unavoidably detained. If present he would vote "yea."

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I desire to read a telegram from the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS]:

WEST PALM BEACH, FLA.,
December 6, 1943.

HON. HARRY TRUMAN:

Please see that I am paired in favor of 8-cent raise per hour for railway workers as provided by your resolution. Thanks and regards.

ROBERT R. REYNOLDS.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] transferred his pair to the Senator from North Carolina and voted.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Florida would vote "yea."

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi, the Senator from Wyoming, and the Senator from Tennessee, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is detained on public business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to the State of Georgia.

Mr. WHITE. My colleague, the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], is absent on official business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is absent because of a bad cold.

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 4, as follows:

YEAS—74

Aiken	Gillette	Overton
Andrews	Green	Radcliffe
Austin	Guffey	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Robertson
Barkley	Hayden	Scrugham
Bone	Hill	Shipstead
Bridges	Holman	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Langer	Tobey
Capper	Lodge	Truman
Caraway	Lucas	Tunnell
Chandler	McCarran	Tydings
Chavez	McClellan	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Walsh, Mass.
Danaher	Maybank	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Mead	Wherry
Downey	Millikin	White
Eastland	Murdock	Wiley
George	Murray	Willis
Gerry	O'Daniel	

NAYS—4

Bailey	Ferguson	Vandenberg
Ellender		

NOT VOTING—18

Bilbo	McNary	Reynolds
Brewster	Maloney	Russell
Byrd	Moore	Stewart
Connally	Nye	Wagner
Glass	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Hawkes	Pepper	Wilson

So the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 91) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments to the preamble are agreed to; and, without objection, the preamble, as amended, is agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. LAWRENCE LEWIS, late a Representative from the State of Colorado, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

FILIPINO REHABILITATION COMMISSION

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 546, Senate Joint Resolution 94, a joint resolution establishing the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission, defining its powers and duties, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 94) establishing the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission, de-

fining its powers and duties, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I objected to the joint resolution when the calendar was called. I do not intend to object to the consideration of the joint resolution now or at any other time; but I think that it is a measure which merits more consideration than we can give it at 10 minutes to 5, when the Senate is ready to go into executive session.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have no disposition, of course, to force a discussion of the joint resolution at this late hour. I wish to call to the attention of the Senator from Ohio and other Senators interested in the joint resolution the following situation:

In 1941 Congress enacted a law amending in part the Filipino Independence Act. In that act we provided for the same commission which is proposed in the joint resolution. It is my opinion that perhaps that fact was not known to the Senator from Ohio when he objected a while ago. There is nothing new in the joint resolution with regard to the commission. The commission is already provided for by existing law.

Let me state the reason for the importance of this measure.

I have been advised that the damage done to Filipino property in the Philippine Islands will be between $300,000,000 and $500,000,000. In my humble opinion the Congress should take jurisdiction of this matter rather than have one of the executive departments do it, insofar as the formulation of policy is concerned.

Therefore, as the Commission has already been set up, about the only new thing of any consequence in this measure is to give the Commission the authority to hear and determine the facts in reference to rehabilitation. I believe that the policy should be formulated by the Congress and, in my judgment, it is most opportune that the proposed legislation be enacted as speedily as possible.

Possibly the Senator from Ohio did not recall that we had already set up the Commission in the 1941 act.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Are there nine Filipinos receiving $10,000 a year from the Philippine Government today as members of the Commission? Is not that an entirely new provision?

Mr. TYDINGS. The nine members appointed under the 1941 act were all appointed by the Philippine Government. Three of the nine members appointed to represent the United States were appointed by the President of the Senate, three by the Speaker of the House, and the remaining three were appointed by the President. No one who holds an office under the government is paid any salary. That would apply to the Filipinos as well as to the Americans on the commission, who would be three Senators, three Members of the House, and presumably a member from each of the State, War, and Navy Departments. So no salary is involved in this measure, unless the President should appoint a civilian who would not be a member of the Government, to be one of the three whom he has a right to appoint.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the joint resolution provides for setting up a large American-Filipino commission consisting of nine Americans and nine Filipinos. Nine Filipinos are to be appointed by the President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, and each is to receive $10,000 a year unless he is already an officer of the Philippine Government. The Philippine funds are here. To a certain extent we are trustees for them. I do not think we can pass the matter off lightly by saying that we are not concerned with what the Philippine Government pays. In appointing the members of the commission the President has to choose nine exiled Filipinos, so the group from which he can choose is very limited.

So far as rehabilitation is concerned, I do not agree that any commission of the kind proposed is necessary. We created the War Damage Insurance Corporation. At that time we discussed with Mr. Jones the question of the extent to which war damage in the Philippines should be compensated for. It is a question for us, not for the Filipinos, to decide. Whatever compensation is to be allowed will come out of the Treasury of the United States, or out of the war-damage insurance fund which has been paid by American taxpayers. It seems obvious to me that we ought to reserve that power. We ought to have the recommendation of an executive department of this Government as to whether or not we are to pay damages incurred in the Philippines. It is very difficult to determine what damage has been caused or will be caused as a result of the war. It is difficult to determine what has taken place when we have not been in occupation of the Philippine Islands.

At any rate, the question cannot be determined now, and we may not be back in the Philippines for a year or two. This Commission cannot pass on those questions until after the Philippines are recovered. It seems to me that we are being asked to set up a vast international, so to speak, governmental machine of no possible value except for the planning of future American-Filipino relations. That is something which ought to be done, but I believe it can be done a great deal more simply by the proper departments of this Government negotiating with the Filipinos whom they can reach, than by an imposing commission composed of members who will be paid $10,000 a year.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I think that the Senator from Ohio has inadvertently given the impression that the commission can settle war damages and pay out money. There is nothing in the world which the commission can do except to make recommendations. It has no more power to pay a penny than I have to conduct the affairs of Russia. All it does is to determine the facts and make whatever recommendations it wishes to the Congress. It has no power to settle anything. It is authorized only to recommend policies. Therefore when the Senator says that the commission will pay war damages, or will have some authority to pay war damages, that is not in keeping with the language of the joint resolution. All that the commission can do is to recommend a policy to Congress which Congress can cast aside, adopt, or amend.

Mr. President, the commission is already in existence so far as the law is concerned. In the 1941 act it was provided that the commission be appointed. In the Philippine Independence Act it was provided that this commission be appointed. So there is nothing new about it. The only thing we are attempting to do here, in addition to the power already granted, taking into consideration the war which has since intervened, is to have the commission make recommendations concerning the whole picture. The Congress would not be bound to accept the recommendations.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. If the commission is already in existence, what is the use of enacting any more legislation?

Mr. TYDINGS. The authority for the commission is already in existence, and we can have it appointed tomorrow morning. But, in my opinion, to have the commission set up without authority to deal with the things which have taken place since Pearl Harbor would leave a very great void. The commission should have all the facts and the entire picture, and make its recommendations accordingly. There is nothing in the joint resolution which would allow the commission to determine a policy. The commission could only hear facts and recommend a policy. What would be the harm in that?

Mr. TAFT. The harm lies in the fact that, in my opinion, it is of no concern to the Philippine Government to what extent America compensates for property destroyed in the Philippine Islands. I think that is a question of American policy.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thoroughly agree with the Senator; but the commission cannot say how much anyone is to be compensated. It has no more authority to pay or give a cent than I have, or the Senator from Ohio has. The only purpose of having Filipinos on the commission is to hear what they have to say so that a policy may be formulated in the light of all the facts.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me the only effect of enacting the legislation would be to put 12 persons on the pay roll, 3 Americans and 9 Filipinos, at $10,000 a year for a period of 2 years, when they may have nothing to do, when it is wholly unnecessary to have such a commission.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Filipinos themselves are to pay absolutely all the salaries of all Filipinos, under the resolution. That would not cost the Treasury of the United States a penny, not one cent. The Filipinos asked for this. The President of the Philippines and the Vice President came to my office and asked for this provision. All they want is to sit down with

us and mutually formulate a policy for the future of the Philippines.

Nothing is binding. The Commission has no more authority to bind this Government and the Filipino Government than the Prime Minister of Great Britain has. All they can do is hear facts and recommend to Congress, in a report, a proper policy dealing with the Philippines from now on. That is all there is to it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Philippine Legislature had the say, I do not believe for one moment they would create nine $10,000-a-year jobs for any commission of this kind. In effect, we are the trustees of the people of the Philippine Islands when they are under Japanese occupation. Their funds are here. I cannot see that we have any more right to vote their money away than to vote our own money away for the American members of the commission. There are to be three United States Senators and three Representatives on the commission, who will not receive any pay in addition to their regular salaries. Three can be appointed by the President from any group, nine $10,000 Filipinos and three Americans, passing on questions which the Senator says will not determine anything, who will merely make a recommendation. We can get a recommendation without cost from the War Damage Insurance Corporation on the policy involved and as to what we should pay or not pay for damages in the Philippines.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me tell the Senator that there is more involved in this matter than merely a consideration of war damages. The Army and the Navy want to have the future of our national defense in the Philippines determined. We have already been in consultation with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy about the matter. The whole question of bases has to be settled. The Army and Navy, theoretically, and the President of the United States, might take these bases, but the Filipinos have been willing, so far as I know, to give us, within reason, any bases we want them to give us.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator will yield, is not the question of bases covered in the joint resolution we have already passed this afternoon? Is that involved in any way in the pending measure? We passed a measure providing for bases and for immediate independence. That does not have anything to do with this measure.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is correct. I am merely telling the Senator that there is the question of American rights in the Philippines; the question of the investments in property which has never been liquidated, which will pass under Filipino law; there is the question of land; there is the question of future trade. All those matters were provided for in the original independence bill. In the measure passed in 1934 it was provided that this commission should be set up 2 years before independence to consider the overlooked problems which would result from independence. If the commission could in any way legislate, if it could bind this Government, the objections of the Senator from Ohio would be well taken, but all it can do is to recommend policy. If anyone thinks that a policy is going to be recommended without any action being taken to set up a proper commission to determine and deliberate on it, in my judgment he is making a very serious mistake.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator that consideration of the joint resolution might well be postponed until the next session of the Senate. It would not make a tremendous difference. If the commission were a simpler setup, if there were to be a few members on each side, or if it were to be postponed for another 6 months or a year, until we were somewhere near the time when these questions will have to be considered, I do not know that I would have any objection. Perhaps some amendment could be worked out. If the Senator would let the measure go over until the next session of the Senate, and have it made the pending order of business, I should think that would be the best course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall be very glad to have it made the unfinished business, but in view of the fact that I am forced to leave to go to western Maryland tomorrow night to keep an engagement of long standing, I should like to have unanimous consent that at 4 o'clock Monday afternoon the Senate shall proceed to vote on the joint resolution and all amendments thereto. That will allow 4 hours of debate, and I think we can decide all questions long before that time.

Mr. TAFT. Did the Senator say 4 o'clock?

Mr. TYDINGS. Four o'clock Monday afternoon.

Mr. TAFT. I hope the Senate may not be in session on Monday for so long.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will make it at not later than 4 o'clock, and I am willing to move the hour up to any time suggested, just so the Senate itself may understand what is involved when the vote is taken.

Mr. TAFT. Why can it not remain the pending order of business, and not be called up until the Senator is present?

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall be here Monday.

Mr. TAFT. Let us bring it up, then, the first thing Monday.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask unanimous consent that at not later than 4 o'clock on Monday the Senate proceed to vote on the joint resolution and all amendments thereto.

Mr. TAFT. That would be entirely satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests that before entering into an agreement of that kind it would be necessary to have a quorum called.

Mr. BARKLEY. Has the motion been agreed to to make the joint resolution the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest we act on that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 94), establishing the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission, defining its powers and duties, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs with an amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in connection with the request of the Senator from Maryland that at not later than 4 o'clock Monday there be a vote on the joint resolution and all amendments, I ask unanimous consent that the requirement for a roll call before such an agreement is made be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is granted.

INVESTIGATION OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk Senate Resolution 197, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. The purpose of the resolution is to provide authority for an investigation of the R. E. A. I report the resolution favorably, with an additional amendment. I ask for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Illinois whether before the Committee to Audit and Control any basis was set out for an investigation of the R. E. A. What is it that is to be investigated?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator may recall that some time ago the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] raised a question on the floor of the Senate about the investigation. At that time the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry sought $15,000 to make the investigation, and a subcommitte of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported the resolution directly to the Committee to Audit and Control, and I refused to consider it. The Senator may recall that the Chair ruled with the Senator from Illinois on the point raised.

Later the resolution went back to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but there was no testimony before that committee with respect to the investigation. As I recall, the original $15,000 was sought for the purpose of employing a lawyer to go through certain books and records. I do not know what those books

and records are. It was disclosed that someone had a trunk load of information which it would take a lawyer 3 or 4 months to go through. After discussion of the entire question the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry cut the appropriation from $15,000 to $2,500.

I report the resolution at this time with that kind of an understanding. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is present. He is responsible for the resolution. He probably can enlighten the majority leader with respect to what the investigation is all about.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to inquire of the Senator whether it involves a matter which has in a sense been floating around Washington regarding the proposal that the Rural Electrification Administration use funds appropriated for it by Congress to set up some sort of a cooperative insurance company, and whether it involves a legal opinion on the part of the legal counsel of the R. E. A. that such funds could not be used for that purpose under the appropriation of Congress. Does it involve that question?

Mr. LUCAS. In reply to the inquiry, I may say to the Senator that that question was discussed. Candidly, I do not yet know why the $2,500 is wanted. All I know is that originally the subcommittee said it wanted $15,000 to employ a lawyer to go into all the books and records for the purpose of ascertaining what was in the record and then make some kind of report. The Senator from Minnesota has been instrumental in pushing this investigation, and he knows more about the subject matter than does any other Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I simply wish to make an observation. It has become habitual in the Senate for one Senator or another to submit a resolution to investigate something. Sometimes he may have a grievance against an institution which he wishes to investigate, and he submits a resolution, has it referred to the committee of which he is a member, and gets the committee to report it favorably. Then it goes before the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and pressure is brought on that committee. I make no such statement with respect to the pending resolution. But it seems to me the practice has become habitual to present loosely drawn resolutions for the purpose of investigating something against which a Senator has a grievance or cannot understand. It seems to me we should look a little more carefully than we have been doing into resolutions which provide for investigations.

I shall not object to consideration of the resolution, but I wish to utter a word of warning—and this does not apply simply to the pending resolution but to all similar resolutions—that we should be careful with respect to making expenditure of money from the contingent fund of the Senate simply for the purpose of indulging in the pleasure of investigating something. We should not make the expenditure unless there is a real basis for the investigation.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I wish to assure the Senator that I have no personal interest in this matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. No, I am not intimating that the Senator has. I did not even know that the Senator was the author of the resolution.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has unanimously recommended that the proposed investigation be made. I can assure the Senator that it is not my intention to ask for any investigation for the purpose of reflecting on any one for any personal reason of my own at all. I have the deepest and the most profound interest in the R. E. A., and I am sure that so far as I am concerned, and so far as the other members of the committee are concerned, there is no other motive.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the investigation involve the question of the legality of an expenditure of funds appropriated by the Congress to the R. E. A., for the creation of a cooperative insurance company?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That also has been mentioned. That is to be determined only on the evidence.

Mr. BARKLEY. It has been mentioned that that subject is involved in the investigation.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. It is involved in the investigation in some way; yes. I cannot say how it is involved.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, as I understand, an effort has been made to induce the R. E. A. to use funds appropriated for the development of rural electrification to create an insurance company, and the Solicitor of the R. E. A. held, and I think rightly, that they had no authority to use the funds appropriated for the R. E. A. for that purpose.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is what I have heard, but I have not seen the opinion.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall not object to the consideration of the resolution, but I think the time has come when we must look into these routine, formal resolutions which are brought to the Senate for the purpose of spending money to investigate something simply because someone whips himself up a little grievance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 197) authorizing the employment of assistants and the expenditure of funds in a proposed investigation of the administration of the Rural Electrification Act, submitted by Mr. SMITH on October 25, 1943, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments, and from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, with an additional amendment.

The amendments of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry were, in line 1, after the word "That", to strike out "the subcommittee of"; in line 2, after the word "Forestry", to strike out "appointed by the chairman of such committee" and insert "or any duly appointed subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized"; in line 5, after the word "act", to strike out "is authorized" and insert "and"; and in line 8, after the word "of", where it occurs the first time, to strike out "$15,000" and insert "$2,500"; and the further amendment of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was, in line 6, after the word "inquiry", to insert "to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words to report such hearings as may be had; and."

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or any duly appointed subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to inquire into the administration of the Rural Electrification Act and, for the purposes of such inquiry, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words to report such hearings as may be had; and to employ clerical and other assistants and to expend during the Seventy-eighth Congress not in excess of $2,500, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, which shall be in addition to any other funds available for expenditure by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or any subcommittee thereof.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I simply wish to reiterate what the Senator from Kentucky has said with respect to the question of investigations. As chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I am as much interested as is any other Senator in investigating anything in connection with the executive branch of the Government or the war effort where there is an honest-to-God case based upon factual data. But as the Senator from Kentucky well says, resolutions are constantly being submitted, the purpose of which is to investigate something, and before very long someone is likely to submit a resolution to investigate the investigating committees, because there are so many of them.

I think Senators should seriously consider the question of investigations before resolutions are submitted. If a committee considers a resolution it should take some testimony, and bring it before the Senate in the way of a report, the same as is done with respect to a bill. I have not, however, succeeded in inducing any committee to do so. I have not succeeded in inducing a committee to submit a report to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, advising that committee in certain language what the investigation is about, and what the evidence taken in connection with the resolution shows.

We should have some knowledge concerning the resolution in order to form an intelligent opinion as to how much money should be spent. I have talked until I am blue in the face about this matter. Although I have talked and talked on the subject, whenever a resolution goes to a committee, it comes out without testimony having been taken on it. It comes out as did the resolution

just passed, and as practically every other resolution comes out, without a single line of evidence, without a report as to why the committee wants the money. That, I contend, is unfair to the Committee to Audit and Control. I am the one who has to take it on the chin. I am the one who has to assume the responsibility, as chairman of the committee, for spending the taxpayers' money on the investigations.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, in view of the statement of the Senator from Illinois, I feel compelled to remind the Senator that standing committees have charge of certain problems and charge of certain bills dealing with activities of the Government. It is a long standing rule of the Senate that a standing committee determines whether or not legislation shall be recommended to the Senate. The committee holds hearings. It may make investigations. The rule of the Senate is that a standing committee has complete charge with respect to the merits of an investigation to determine whether or not an investigation should be made.

I shall not take up the time of the Senate to show the proceedings in that connection. But a standing committee has full charge of the matter referred to it by the Senate. The question of whether there should be an investigation must be determined by the standing committee. The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate may determine the question of the money which may be expended. I think the Senator from Illinois is in error when he says that he thinks his committee has any jurisdiction over the merits of the subject matter, or over anything except the matter of finding the funds with which to make the investigation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, assuming that what the able Senator from Minnesota says is correct, how does the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate determine the amount of money that is necessary if all it gets from any standing committee is a resolution which says "We want $25,000 to investigate"? How are we going to determine whether the committee should have $25,000, or $15,000, or $10,000 on that sort of blanket request?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, let me tell the Senator how we acted in this connection. When an investigation is begun, it is difficult to determine how much money is needed. The subcommittee was appointed in this case to take charge of this resolution, and it labored for about 2 months to determine first of all whether or not an investigation should be undertaken. The subcommittee worked assiduously. A great deal of work was done to determine whether or not it was necessary to have an investigation, and then the report was made to the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. The only thing I know is what was reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The original resolution reported by the subcommittee provided for $15,000 for the single purpose of employing a lawyer.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I think the Senator misunderstood the Senator who made the report. I do not wish to continue the discussion, however.

Mr. BARKLEY. Some time back the Senate amended its rules regarding these matters in order to avoid the unnecessary expenditure of money for investigations. It provided that when a resolution is submitted it must go to the standing committee to which it ought to go. That committee is responsible. It has placed upon it the burden of making a showing.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Absolutely.

Mr. BARKLEY. If necessary it should call witnesses. It should not simply report a resolution as a matter of courtesy and good will merely because some Senator happens to be a member of the committee. Such action is not fair to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. If that committee has the power to determine how much money should be appropriated it has the power to determine whether any money should be appropriated. I make these remarks in order that standing committees may accept the responsibility of going into these questions and determining on its merits whether any situation justifies an investigation.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I agree with the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I venture to suggest that in 9 cases out of 10 standing committees have not in recent years or months held any hearings on whether there ought to be any investigation at all. They report a resolution and then camp on the doorstep of the Senator from Illinois, as chairman of the committee, to get the money, and frequently they have the lawyer already named and have him in mind before the appropriation of the money is ever made for his employment.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I wish to say to the Senator from Kentucky that the subcommittee of which I was a member had charge of this resolution for nearly 3 months before it decided to ask for power to make an investigation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand the resolution has been agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to make a further statement in connection with the matter. I find it more and more annoying as I am required to consider the resolutions which are constantly being presented. I am not saying this because the able senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] submitted the resolution just now agreed to.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I understand.

Mr. LUCAS. That resolution is merely another one on top of another one. I do not propose to continue to assume the responsibility for the spending of money for investigations, especially when a resolution touching a new subject matter is submitted.

The Truman committee is a different proposition. We know exactly what that committee is constantly doing, and its activities are matters of public knowledge and are in the public interest.

But when a Senator submits a resolution dealing with a new subject matter, such as the one which is the subject of the resolution just agreed to, I think some kind of a showing should be made. I am becoming tired of being constantly hounded, as the majority leader suggested awhile ago, by those who are responsible for such resolutions. The job is not worth it.

As chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I am attempting to do a conscientious piece of work, and so long as I am chairman of the committee, I shall continue to do so. But I do not propose to continue to take it on the chin with respect to the type of resolutions which are constantly being reported by committees. A Member of the Senate submits a resolution to a committee, and says, "I want it agreed to." The committee says, "That is fine. We will report it to the Senate, and it will be passed on to the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. He will have to make the decision about giving you the money." That is the situation.

There are resolutions now pending which I do not propose to pass upon until a showing is made. If Senators do not want to have that done, they can have me discharged as chairman of the committee, and that will be perfectly all right so far as I am concerned.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS OF COLORADO

Mr. BARKLEY. If there be no further nominations on the Executive Calendar, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair) laid before the Senate resolutions of the House of Representatives (H. Res. 377), which were read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
December 9, 1943.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. LAWRENCE LEWIS, a Representative from the State of Colorado.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have read, and for which I ask immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 219) was read, and was considered by unanimous consent, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. LAWRENCE LEWIS, late a Representative from the State of Colorado.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the Members of the Senate are truly saddened today to learn of the death of Representative LEWIS. Like many Members of the House of Representatives and many Members of the Senate, the late Representative never spared himself when there was public work to be done. Long hours and year after year of hard work without a vacation took their toll, and our late friend is now only a memory. LAWRENCE LEWIS made the supreme sacrifice, another victim of overwork.

Personally, I have lost a dear friend and coworker, whom I shall grievously miss, in the Halls of Congress and elsewhere.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, LAWRENCE LEWIS was the Representative in Congress from my home district, at Denver, Colo. He was first elected to the House of Representatives in 1932, and thereafter served continuously until his death. He was retained in office by a grateful and appreciative constituency. To every task, small or large, he brought to bear the force of a fine intellect enriched by wide education and culture. He was indefatigable. He worked every day, all day, into the late hours of the night. Sundays and holidays found him at his desk.

The pressures, the endless burdens of his office, so gladly assumed, eventually broke his health. He went away to rest. But a driving, unrelenting sense of duty would not let him rest.

He returned to Washington, and here he died, as I believe he wanted to die—at the scene of his labors and his great accomplishments.

I like to think that God is smiling on that noble man.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the second resolving clause of the resolution just agreed to, the Chair appoints the two Senators from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON and Mr. MILLIKIN] the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate do now take a recess.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until Monday, December 13, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 9 (legislative day of December 7), 1943:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS

Kenneth A. Haines
Vernon J. Forney

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

CHIEF, BUREAU OF ORDNANCE

George F. Hussey, Jr., to be Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years, from December 1, 1943.

TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be commodore

Humbert W. Ziroli, to be a commodore, for temporary service, while serving as United States naval member with the Allied Control Commission, to rank from November 1, 1943.

To be rear admiral

William H. P. Blandy

REGULAR SERVICE

To be lieutenants, junior grade

Eden T. Preston
Curtis L. Tetley

To be ensigns

Walter C. Dillard	Raymond M. Reynolds
Francis J. Grisko	James F. Trawick
Roy M. Isaman	Dan Dopuch
Robert M. Elder	Warner Clark, Jr.
Charles S. Lane	

To be assistant surgeons

Elbert M. Cyrus, Jr.	Frederick G. Grant
Edgar P. Berry	Robert H. Bradshaw
James T. Smith	William M. Morris
Robert J. McManus	Kenneth C. Ling

To be assistant paymaster

Ralph L. Hashagen.

To be assistant civil engineer

Thomas W. Anderson

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious and all-wise Father, through Thy mercy every morning is made new and every day is a new beginning; there was never a night without a day and never an evening without a morning. Looking over this wonder-teeming world, there is nothing higher than the soul is high and nothing wider than the heart is wide. Oh, take from us any ignoble spirit, and at any sacrifice hold us to the line of the Golden Rule.

In the wonders of our purest love we discern Thee; in the glory of Thy abounding goodness, Thou art there; over against every yearning and temptation is the amazing gift of Thy beloved Son; Thine are the treasures and the will of earth and heaven. Let us not forget our estate and thus dim the outlines of our daily conduct. Along the highway of life help us to appreciate the common man with his qualities of manhood; the many common things which lend glory to the earth—the sky, the landscape, and the pathways decked with nature's hand. In the hour of crisis, in the stern discharge of duty, the uncalendared ones do not fail. O Thou who knowest the unexpressed desires of our hearts, grant us the things which are good and pure; be with us all the way as we labor to deal justly, to conquer wrong, and guard our country's honor. In the name of Him who lifts His pierced hands in holy benediction for the peace of the world. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced

that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3598. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs be permitted to sit during the general debate that may take place today or tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

FEED SHORTAGE IN OKLAHOMA

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein three telegrams relative to the feed shortage in Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEWART addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LaFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in opposition to the bill H. R. 3270.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

THE INSURANCE BILL

Mr. LaFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LaFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the insurance bill known as H. R. 3270. This morning I have extended my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD stating my position. The extension of remarks contains more than I can give in any time under special order and at the same time answer questions. For that reason, I have taken a special order for Monday, December 13, at which time I shall speak again on these bills, and am willing to be interrogated on the statements I have made in my extension of remarks. I do not make this last statement in a spirit of braggadocio, but rather because I feel that this is a proper way to apprise the members of the Committee on the Judiciary of my position, so that they will not feel that they have been taken advantage of by my extension of remarks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by my colleague the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

LAW BY PRESS RELEASE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain letters and a press release.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HINSHAW addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech made by the Honorable Thomas J. Curran, in reply to a speech made by Mayor LaGuardia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a copy of Tennessee's absentee voting law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

THE LATE VINCENT F. HARRINGTON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, just before the House adjourned on yesterday it became my sad duty to announce the death of former Congressman Vincent F. Harrington, of Sioux City, Iowa, and my remarks appear in the RECORD this morning. He formerly represented the old Ninth Congressional District of Iowa. However, after the recent reapportionment it became the Eighth District of Iowa, which I now have the honor to represent.

Congressman Harrington was born in Sioux City, Iowa, on May 16, 1903, and was educated in the Sioux City schools and Trinity College of that city. He was graduated from Notre Dame University in June 1925 with a B. A. degree. Thereafter he was instructor in history and economics and athletic director at the University of Portland, Oreg., from 1926 to 1927. He served in three sessions of the Iowa State Senate from 1932 to 1936, and was nominated for Lieutenant Governor of Iowa on the Democratic ticket in June 1936 but withdrew to accept convention nomination for the Seventy-fifth Congress from the Ninth District of Iowa to fill a vacancy caused by the resignation of Representative GUY M. GILLETTE. He was elected to the Seventy-fifth Congress in 1936, reelected to the Seventy-sixth Congress in 1938, and reelected to the Seventy-seventh Congress in 1940. However, he resigned his seat in the House of Representatives on September 5, 1942, to enter the Army Air Corps. He was commissioned a captain and was assigned to Stout Field, Ind., and later was advanced to the rank of major. Only a few weeks ago he went to England with the Army Air Transport. Yesterday we learned that he had died a few days ago from a heart attack, this news being confirmed by the office of The Adjutant General of the Army.

I knew Vincent F. Harrington well. Although we belonged to opposite political parties he was always most kind and considerate, and I shall always remember him as a true friend. He represented his district well, and I know made a host of friends during his service in this House. His work has been cut short in the fullness of his usefulness, and we whom he has left behind feel a sense of deepest sorrow and loss. He died in the service of his country, and that is an honor for any man.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I was terribly shocked yesterday when I heard of the death of that wonderful and good friend of mine, Vince Harrington. Vince was a friend of all who wanted his friendship. Vince died in the service of his country. No higher tribute can be paid to any man than to say he served his country; he was a great, patriotic American, a statesman, a devoted father and husband. My heart goes out to that wonderful wife of his and his two fine children. I do not have the words

to sufficiently express my feeling of sorrow because of the loss of this fine and good man. We shall all miss him. America will miss him. The armed forces will miss him. We can ill afford to lose such a man during these troublesome times. Good-bye, Vince, may God bless your soul.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, if I were to appraise the character of Vince Harrington, I would name first his integrity, his honor, and his unswerving devotion to duty and country. He always looked out for the best interests of his district. He was not a party man in a strict and literal sense. He oftentimes would talk to the folks on the other side of the aisle, and he sometimes agreed with them on policies, although this may not have coincided with a majority on his own side. He represented his district regardless of party, but he was nevertheless a party man in fundamentals and essentials. His political integrity will ever be honored. I understand that his father died about a month ago. I am told that his body will not be brought back here for interment, at least until after the war, but his soul and spirit are here already.

I enjoyed his friendship. I honor him for the manner in which he conducted himself toward his friends, for his courtesy, his bearing with folks, for the way he got along with people. He was popular in the extreme. Honest men esteem and value nothing so much in this world as a real friend. Such a one is, as it were, another self to whom we impart our thoughts; who partakes of our joys and who comforts us in affliction. And the company and fellowship of such a man is an everlasting pleasure to us. Such a man was Vince Harrington. We will all sadly miss him. My great State of Iowa has lost a great man, an outstanding statesman, and a loyal, self-sacrificing soldier. He was a graduate of Notre Dame. For 3 years he played on the line with that famous champion football team which produced the "four horsemen." We can say nothing here today that will add to his fame. We are sad; we feel the loss of a true friend, because he was loved and honored by all of us. And to his lovable wife, Katherine, and his children, we extend our sympathy and condolence. I know the House does, and I know Iowa does. He always kept his word. When he was last elected he told his people that if a war should ensue he would resign and lend his services to his country in the war effort. That is exactly what he did do. He resigned from this Hall, went to the war, died in England a couple of weeks ago. We all honor his memory and will enshrine it in our hearts.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, the Grim Reaper is no respecter of persons. In this instance he has cut down a statesman and soldier who was in full vigor and in the prime of his life. I knew Congressman Harrington, Major Harrington, as a genial gentleman, as an able legislator, and as a loyal friend. He was devoted to his wife and children, who have our sincere sympathy. They will, I know, carry on in this ordeal like good soldiers as he would have them do.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in the fall of 1942, just a few days after Vince Harrington resigned from Congress and donned the uniform of a major in the United States Army Air Corps, I met him just outside the House wing, the last time I ever saw him. When I congratulated him on the step that he had taken his reply was, "Well, that is just the way I feel about it." That was typical of Vince Harrington. Whenever he decided what he believed was the right thing to do, he did it without hesitation and when he decided his experience as an aviator was necessary to the welfare of the United States, he did not hesitate to resign from Congress and don the uniform of his country. His passing is a tremendous loss to his family and my heart bleeds for them. Also his passing is a loss to the State and to the Nation to an extent that can never be fully measured.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, at this moment my heart is so full that I can scarcely speak. Vince Harrington and I were very intimate friends before either of us came to Congress. I scarcely recall in my lifetime an event that has affected me any more than his tragic and heroic death in England, announced yesterday afternoon.

Vince Harrington was one of the young men of Iowa in whom the State had a great deal of confidence, and who undoubtedly had a very great future before him. In Congress he was always courageous; always voted for the welfare of his country, regardless of what effect it might have on his own fortunes. That kind of a man will inevitably go up in the world, I think. Had he been spared, Vince Harrington would have enjoyed a superb career.

He was an excellent and gallant soldier, an able and courageous legislator, a kind and affectionate father, a very warm and loyal friend. The State of Iowa this morning mourns the death of one of her distinguished citizens. My heart goes out to his beautiful wife and children, mourning in Sioux City at this time.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, the report of the death of our former colleague, Vincent Harrington, comes as a blow to all of us. It was my privilege to serve in the House with Vince, and he was one of my best friends. Previous to his election to Congress he had been a member of the Iowa State Legislature. It was a well known fact that during his political career he had the support of the voters of his district regardless of party affiliation. Although he again won the Democratic nomination to Congress in 1942, he thereafter resigned to enter the air force.

It is unnecessary to call to the attention of this body the good qualities of our friend. He was devoted to his country and always made his decisions in accordance with his own conscience, regardless of personal consequences. He was a thoroughly competent legislator and was at the time of his resignation a member of the important Appropriations Committee. To his widow and children we extend our most sincere sympathy.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, it was a distinct shock to me to learn last evening of the death of a former Member of the House, Maj. Vincent F. Harrington, who served in the Seventy-fifth, Seventy-sixth, and Seventy-seventh Congresses up to the time of his resignation to enter the air service on September 5, 1942.

It is my recollection that Major Harrington was the first Member of Congress to resign to enter the armed services in the present war. He did it quietly and without any fanfare or publicity.

Vince, as he was affectionately known by his colleagues, was well liked and respected by the Members of this House, always courteous, always a gentleman, and he was absolutely fearless in the performance of his duties as a Member of Congress.

I am sure that the membership of the House joins with me in conveying to his wife and two little children our most sincere sympathy in their loss.

May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this Chamber is filled with the memories of Members who have come with and gone from this body, of the services they have rendered to our country as Members of this body, as well as their contributions.

We, who serve with Members who receive the call of the Maker, having been directly associated with them in lifetime, immediately feel their passing on. When that happens it brings back memories of a personal nature to each and every one of us, as well as a keen feeling of personal regret and our profound feelings of sympathy for the near and dear ones that every former Member or late Member leaves behind him.

Everyone who served with Vince Harrington has a personal feeling of regret in his passing on. We sympathize with his widow and children. We extend our feelings of regret to the Iowa delegation. The fine expressions from the Iowa delegation are not only fitting but thoroughly appreciated by all Members. We feel keenly the loss of the services of this great man, not only during the war in his capacity as an active participant but also in the contributions he would make in the future as a citizen of Iowa and a citizen of the United States.

We who served with Vince Harrington will always remember him as a fine, sincere, lovable gentleman. During the years I have been associated with him, I have never heard him say an unkind word about any man, any person, even in private conversation. A man of substance, a man of capacity, but a man who did his work steadily; a man who may not have shone in a sensational manner, but a man who was appreciated by those who served with him. As one of his distinguished colleagues well said, a man who, while a party man, voted his conscience. When a question was presented to the House on which his party took one position, and his conscience took another, he did as a man should do under such circumstances. He voted his conscience.

I shall always remember Vince Harrington, as will those who served with

him—sweet, lovable, sincere, fundamentally sound in every respect; a man who performed his duties nobly as a Member of this body. Then, when our country was engaged in war, following the dictates of his conscience, he resigned from this body in order to serve our country in the actual conduct of the war in which we are now engaged.

To his widow and children we extend our profound sympathy in their bereavement. To the people of his district and to the State of Iowa, we also express our feelings of regret in their loss of a great citizen. For those of us who served with Vince Harrington in this body, I know I speak their thoughts and their sentiments when I state that each and every one of us in his passing or has sustained a personal loss. When the Maker called Vince Harrington into the Great Beyond, He took unto Himself one of the sweetest and most lovable men that any one of us has ever met or will meet in our journey through life.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, it grieves me greatly to learn of the death of Vince Harrington. He and I were personal friends, both prior to the time he went into the service and afterward.

He has been to my office many times; in fact I now occupy the office he occupied. He was capable, he was honest, he was courteous, he was efficient, he was very cooperative, and he had a million-dollar smile. We shall miss him.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, until this morning I had not learned of the passing of our former colleague, Vince Harrington, of Iowa, one of the finest men with whom I have ever served.

Thomas Jefferson, whom I regard as the greatest political philosopher of all time, said there were three questions to be asked of any applicant for public office: Is he honest? Is he qualified? Is he faithful? Vince Harrington met that superb test.

Not only that but he gave his life in defense of his country. I do not know the particulars of his death, but I do know he will go down as one of the heroes of this war.

Someone has said:

There is something of pride in the perilous hour,
Whatever be the form in which death may lower,
For fame is there to tell who bleeds,
And honor's eye on daring deeds.

No matter what the particular circumstances were surrounding his untimely death Vince Harrington, as I said, will always be regarded not only as one of the heroes of this war but as one of the heroic Members of the American Congress. I have never known a man who was more conscientious in the discharge of his duties as a Representative in this body.

Shakespeare said:

What stronger breastplate than a heart untainted!
Thrice is he armed that hath his quarrel just,
And he but naked, though locked up in steel,
Whose conscience with injustice is corrupted.

You could always go to Vince Harrington and realize that he was talking from a conscience unsullied. He was a Christian gentleman in every sense of the word.

Our hearts go out to his bereaved loved ones. We only regret that there is nothing we can say or do that will tend to lessen the great burden of sorrow they are now carrying. I think I can say in all sincerity however and with the approval of every Member of the House that we all share that sorrow with them.

He was a patriot, a statesman, and a worthy representative of the people of the great State of Iowa.

His life was gentle; and the elements
So mix'd in him, that Nature might stand up,
And say to all the world, "This was a man!"

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, our hearts are saddened today by the news that comes to us of the untimely passing of our former colleague the gentleman and soldier, Maj. Vincent F. Harrington, of Iowa.

It was my pleasure to have known Vince closely and well since I first entered Congress at the beginning of 1939. Even prior to that year, I had known about Vince through the record that he left behind him at our mutual alma mater, the University of Notre Dame.

Vince was a man whom a fellow was proud to call his friend. He was an outstanding Member of this body and served with distinction here for many years. He voluntarily left Congress to accept an assignment with the Air Transport Command and was stationed at Stout Field near Indianapolis, Ind., before his duty took him to England, where his untimely passing occurred a few days ago. In the Army, as in Congress, he fulfilled his duty with credit to his alma mater, to his home State of Iowa, to the Nation, and to himself. Certainly no more can be said of any man than that he laid down his life for his country. May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, "Take me not away in the midst of my days, O my God, Thy years are throughout all generations." This must have been the sentiment of our distinguished friend, Vince Harrington, at this time, the day of vigor of his manhood. But God designed otherwise and he has been called to his eternal reward.

The news of his death in England brought back vividly to me a scene at the Union Station in Washington 2 years ago when Vince, as a fellow member of a subcommittee on appropriations, bade farewell to his beautiful young wife. We then departed on the first lap of a trip of inspection of our diplomatic posts in 17 countries and the Island of Trinidad, all south of the Rio Grande. On a 60-day journey, with 52 airplane flights, one begins to appreciate the character and personality of a companion. And on that trip Vince Harrington endeared himself to all his associates.

True is the statement of the majority leader, "He was never heard to say a word against another."

His promise to his people that he would enter the service of his Nation should war be declared, found him after Pearl Harbor in his country's cloth.

That he was a man of conscience was demonstrated many times in this body. Members from his own State praised him today in glowing terms, waxing strong in compliment to his sterling qualities. For me it suffices to say that I knew him well and called him friend. May God rest his soul.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their own remarks in the RECORD with regard to our former colleague the late Vincent F. Harrington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I secured permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to insert an address on rural electrification delivered by our former colleague the Honorable Clyde Ellis, of Arkansas. I am advised that the cost of printing this speech will be $157.50. This, of course, does not mean it will add that much cost, because we already have the machinery and the force to do the printing, so the additional cost really will be very small.

Having received this estimate of cost I renew my request that it be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an excerpt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a recent resolution adopted by the Los Angeles County Council of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask that on Tuesday next after the legislative business of the day and

other special orders I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that until the unanimous consent requests have been granted?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think I ought to make it now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-nine Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 167]

Allen, Ill.	Gale	Morrison, La.
Andersen, H. Carl	Gallagher	Morrison, N. C.
Andrews	Gavagan	Murray, Tenn.
Baldwin, Md.	Gearhart	O'Brien, N. Y.
Barden	Gerlach	O'Leary
Barry	Gibson	O'Neal
Bates, Ky.	Gifford	O'Toole
Bell	Gore	Outland
Bennett, Mich.	Gorski	Pace
Bland	Grant, Ala.	Patman
Boren	Green	Pracht
Boykin	Hall, Leonard W.	Ramey
Burchill, N. Y.	Hartley	Reed, Ill.
Byrne	Hébert	Robinson, Utah
Canfield	Heffernan	Sabath
Cannon, Fla.	Hill	Sasscer
Cannon, Mo.	Horan	Satterfield
Carson, Ohio	Jackson	Schwabe
Celler	Jones	Shafer
Clason	Kearney	Slaughter
Compton	Kefauver	Smith, Ohio
Cullen	Kilburn	Smith, W. Va.
Curley	Kilday	Snyder
D'Alesandro	King	Somers, N. Y.
Davis	Klein	Sparkman
Dawson	Knutson	Stevenson
Dickstein	Kunkel	Stockman
Dies	Lambertson	Sumners, Tex.
Douglas	Lane	Taber
Elmer	Lea	Taylor
Elston, Ohio	Lewis, Colo.	Thomason
Engel, Mich.	Luce	Treadway
Fay	Ludlow	Vursell
Fernandez	McCord	Wadsworth
Fish	Mansfield, Tex.	Walter
Fitzpatrick	Martin, Iowa	Wasielewski
Folger	Miller, Mo.	Whelchel, Ga.
Fulbright	Mills	Wolcott
Fulmer	Monkiewicz	Woodrum, Va.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three hundred and twelve Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. BYRNE, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ACQUISITION AND CONVERSION OR CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN AUXILIARY VESSELS, LANDING CRAFT, AND DISTRICT CRAFT FOR THE UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement previously given to the Committee on Naval Affairs, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3715) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels, landing craft, and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3715, with Mr. MONRONEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], Speaker of the House, and I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether it is possible for me by saying what I have in my heart today to say to be helpful to all of us or not. I read a great deal, I hear a lot of conversation, I hear things and I see things on the printed page that I feel are very hurtful to the unity of your country and mine and if I were going to say what would be the subject of my remarks today I would say that I desire to speak on some dangerous trends.

I know that every man and woman in this House loves this country. I do not doubt the patriotism of a single one of you, I do not doubt the patriotism of those numberless millions of men and women out there. I do know that there are complaints about supposed sacrifices. I think I know, however, that the people in this country who are making the greatest sacrifices are complaining the least. I think of the mother of six sons, a widow, in the district I represent. Every one of her sons is in the Army or in the Navy. She is not complaining, but is meeting her sacrifice as a great American and has gone out to get herself a war job.

Every day or every week somebody, somewhere asks: "What are we going to do with England after the war is over?" "Is England in diplomacy going to outdo us after the war is over?" "What is going to be done with this little island or that little island or the other little island in some sea after this war is over?" "Is England going to stride the world like a colossus?"

That is dangerous talk. Anything calculated to bring about disunity and wrong thinking in our own country or disunity among us and those allied with us is dangerous talk; it is dangerous propaganda; it is a reflection upon the intelligence of American manhood and womanhood that we do not have patriotism enough and brains enough to sit around a peace table with anybody upon the face of the earth.

I brand expressions like that as canards, not only upon the patriotism, but the intelligence of those who will represent us when this terrible war is over.

Then somebody says to me: "What are we going to do with Russia after the war is over?" "What is Russia going to do after the war is over?" What I am interested in in 1943 and 1944 is what Russia is doing now. We will settle those things after this war is over.

They ask, "Is Russia going to communize the world? Will that strange doctrine find root in American soil?" It will only when the people of the United States are willing to accept communism, and not until then.

"Is somebody trying to change our form of government?" they ask. "An insidious group somewhere?" Now, listen: Under our form of government and the way we have of doing, the election of Members of the House of Representatives each 2 years, the election of a President every 4 years, and the election of all the Senate each 6 years; this form of government of yours and mine is not going to be changed until the people, exercising their intelligence and an unpurchasable ballot, vote to change this form of government.

Another thing, especially since the Patton affair, which was tragically unfortunate, the Army has not escaped whisperings. Of course, everybody knows that mistakes have been made, that judgments have gone wrong. If in the Army they had had months to consider whether or not they would do a certain thing, some of the seeming mistakes might not have been made. We were attacked and we were unprepared to defend ourselves. Things had to be done in a hurry. Decisions had to be made, when you could not even wait overnight. I do fear that these men in the Army and in the Navy, if criticism goes on, and if they are called into the open to answer questions that many times should be asked in executive session, may themselves come to fear to make decisions upon which the fate of the Nation or a hemisphere may depend.

I call your attention to that because I know that these earnest men are using all of their training, all of their brains, and all of their patriotism to do this job well, and to do it as quickly as it is possible. If the Army and the Navy cannot run this war better than any civilian, then we should have done away with West Point and Annapolis a long time ago.

So when these strange things are talked and printed and blared over the radio, I hope that we, if we are fortunate enough to have a few days among our own people during the Christmas season, which at its best cannot be a very happy Christmas, will go back and try to stamp out some of these things among our own people.

Another thing, ceilings for the other fellow but not for me; price fixation for the other fellow but not for me; uncontrolled inflation on what I have to sell but controlled prices on what I am called upon to buy—that just will not work.

We can tell the people of America a story of production unequaled by anything in the annals of time. Two things stand out in 1942, and will for half a century, in my opinion. One was the swift conversion of American industry from what it was doing to the manufacture of the instruments of war, and the mass production that they brought about. The other was the unexpected and successful resistance of Russia.

Some people say, "Why send so many things across the ocean to other people?" I would rather send bullets and bread to the armies of the Allies to fight on their front than to have to send more of our boys to fight on all fronts.

Let me repeat that the people, in my opinion, who are complaining the most are the ones least justified in complaining. I am an average American citizen, no better, I know, no worse, I hope, than the average. I have no son to give to this war or to the reconstruction of a sad and stricken world after it is over, and I am in the same position as at least 50 percent of the men and women. I am wondering what sacrifice I have made, and I cannot think of a single one. Maybe I have been slightly inconvenienced. Like the average American, I have had all the coffee I needed to drink and plenty of sugar to go into it. I have had enough gasoline to transact my essential business. I have eaten well and plenty, as has every other American citizen, and many of them are eating better today than they have ever eaten before. Of course, I have bought some bonds, all I can afford to buy. That is no sacrifice. I will get my money back with interest, if these boys who are fighting and dying over there win this war for you and for me.

We in this country would not know that a war was on if we did not read the newspapers, hear the radio, and see the vacant chairs in the homes of the country. In all probability, a hostile gun will never be heard fired inside of this hemisphere, a bomb in all probability will never fall. But when I think of this widow that is giving six sons, she is making a sacrifice. When I think of her son who has been in command of a submarine in the Pacific Ocean ever since Pearl Harbor; when I think of millions of other mothers' sons who are in the Southwest Pacific, wading in the mud and murk of vermin-infested islands, where if disease does not attack them the murderous Jap is behind every stone, every stump, and every tree; when I think of the sacrifice of these people, I would despise myself if I complained about my little inconveniences, and that is the best or the worst or the greatest sacrifice I have made.

Some people are complaining who have improved their position during this war. I hate to think it, but as I do think it, I must say it, I think some groups in this country, at the expense of our unity in the war effort, are thinking more of their position after the war than they are of winning the war now. It is a sad commentary upon some human beings.

Some people just love to be unhappy. They just love to be scared. "What is Russia going to do to us?" "What is England going to do to us?" "What are they going to take from us?" "What have they got to give us after this thing is over?" "Are we going to be able to feed the world after this thing is over?" "Are they going to demand the bread and the meat that should go into the mouths of our people and the milk that should go into the stomachs of our children, to the deprivation of our people here?" Of course, that is not going to happen. Ah, my friends, this war is not over by a great deal. The people of the United States are so geared that if we win a little island somewhere they think the war is almost over. I think anyone who predicts the length of a war is dealing in superhazards. And I do not predict the length of the war in Europe or in Asia. But I cannot see anything in this situation, either in Europe or in Asia, that would cause me to believe it is going to be a short war. It is going to take the might and brain of every patriot under the flag to do this job. Our hands are to the plow. We cannot look back. The very fate of civilization depends not only on how our Army and our Navy act, but how you and I act and how you and I respond to the necessity of this hour.

Unity in this war effort we must have. And I trust the brains and the patriotism of Americans after it is all over to look after our interests. It is going to take the work, the loyalty, and the love of every citizen throughout the length and breadth of the earth who loves liberty and who is willing to sacrifice to preserve liberty in this world and make it again a decent place in which to live. I am saying this not for you so much as hoping that it might get out somewhere and might help somebody and might stop some complaints which are wholly unjustified. When I think of the millions of men and women who are making the supreme sacrifice in sons in this war, when I think of the bravery of the best equipped soldiers that ever went to battle in the history of mankind, how our production has put into their hands the greatest instruments of defense and for attack of any soldiers ever called to battle in all the history of mankind, if we do our job on this front in unity, not only here but with those who fight with us, God knows, and you know, that the boys who wear the uniform will do their part.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], and ask unanimous consent that he may speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in rising at this time is to merely make a brief statement for the information of the membership of the House with reference to the status and the progress of the hearings on pending legislation relating to discharge or muster-out pay of the armed personnel of this country.

We started hearings on this legislation with the hope that we would be able to bring the legislation to the House by tomorrow. Unfortunately, we have found ourselves in some difficulty in connection with the problems that naturally arise when one department comes before a committee taking one position, another department another position, and still another department a different position. We have reached the stage where we expect to close hearings tomorrow. Our hearings begin at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning for the last session, we hope. After that we will refer the matter to a small group of the Committee on Military Affairs which, with the aid of counsel, both our legislative counsel and from the various departments, we will undertake to whip into form as soon as we can a piece of legislation that will do justice to all of our armed forces. We hope to be able to bring it here, at least, not later than next Tuesday. I simply wanted the House to know that we were not delaying it; that we were trying to keep our feet on the ground, because we find in the hearings there have been more than 600,000 men discharged from the service who now have good jobs, and the question will naturally arise whether a man who has been in the Army 15 days and discharged for some trivial cause, and now in a good job, should have as much money allowed to him as discharge pay as a man who has fought 2 years in north Africa or in Italy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 minutes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire and convert to naval purposes or to undertake the construction of 2,500,000 tons of auxiliary vessels and 1,000,000 tons of landing craft and district craft of such size, type, and design as the Secretary of the Navy may consider most suited for the prosecution of the war.

Since the beginning of the emergency shipbuilding program in June 1940, Congress has authorized approximately 3,700,000 tons of auxiliaries, representing approximately 1,125 vessels of various types. The additional authorization of 2,500,000 tons provided for in this bill will bring the total authorized tonnage to approximately 6,200,000 tons.

It is expected that the vessels to be secured under the 2,500,000 tons of authorization provided for in the bill will be divided into three principal groups, as follows:

(A) Vessels now being built by the Maritime Commission for the Navy's account are of three principal types, namely:

First. Troop transports, "AP," involving a total of approximately 223,000 tons. These vessels, bearing the naval

designation "AP," are troop transports of the large convoy-loaded type; that is, their military function is to carry troops from a port of embarkation to a port of debarkation, utilizing piers and other port facilities for the loading and unloading operations. Landing boats for amphibious operations are not carried on this type of vessel. These vessels are now being built by the Maritime Commission.

Second. Small assault transports—APA—involving a total of approximately 53,400 tons. These vessels are distinguished from the so-called AP vessels in two principal respects—namely, they are small in size, having a length of approximately 400 feet, and being assault transports, as distinguished from convoy-loaded transports, they will carry landing boats which will permit the troops transported to be landed on a beach for the initial assault on enemy shores. The vessels are to be built by the Maritime Commission to a special design worked out jointly by the Maritime Commission with the Navy.

Third. Escort aircraft carriers—CVE—involving approximately 121,150 tons. These are vessels which are being constructed to a special Maritime Commission design, and are provided with a flight deck permitting planes to take off and make return landings. The primary purpose of these ships is to act as a part of convoys of merchant vessels, supplying the air escort for the convoy. They have also played an important part in furnishing air support for the landing operations at north Africa, Sicily, the Aleutians, and the Gilberts.

(B) Vessels to be built by the Maritime Commission for the Navy's account are of five principal types, namely:

First. Convoy-loaded transports and cargo vessels—AP-AK—involving approximately 340,000 tons. As convoy-loaded vessels, these ships are intended to transport troops and cargo from one port to another. The troop transports will be somewhat smaller in size than those heretofore described.

Second. Assault transports—APA—involving a total of approximately 759,200 tons. These will be vessels similar in purpose to those described above. These ships will be converted from Maritime Commission C-3 hulls and from Maritime Commission Victory-type hulls. Each of these ships will carry a complete combat team of troops. In addition to carrying the landing boats for landing these troops on enemy shores, they will also carry two or three tank lighters for landing tanks with the troops.

Third. Assault cargo ships—AKA—involving a total of approximately 135,000 tons. These ships are cargo vessels designed to accompany the assault transports which carry the troops to the point of actual combat. The assault cargo ships carry vehicles, gasoline, tank lighters, and other equipment for the troops landed from the assault transports. A certain ratio of these cargo vessels must accompany every movement in which assault transports are used.

Fourth. General communication ships—AGC—involving a total of approximately 40,500 tons. These vessels are equipped to serve as headquarters and communication information centers—flag ships—for the commands or portions of commands of amphibious movements.

Fifth. Tenders—bearing various naval designations—involving a total of approximately 100,000 tons. This group will embrace a fairly wide range of vessels, such as tenders or repair ships for various classes of operating vessels, including diesel-engine-driven smaller craft, airplane engine overhaul ships, antisubmarine and antitorpedo net-carrying vessels, barracks ships for the men who will operate the tenders, stores issue ships, and so forth. It is expected that the majority of these vessels will be converted from Maritime Commission Liberty-type hulls. These conversions are relatively simple in their scope and can be accomplished in quite a short time.

(C) Vessels to be acquired by transfer from the Army: This category involves approximately 250,000 tons of vessels to be secured by transfer from the Army. It is expected that the vessels will be of two principal types, namely, small cargo vessels and combination troop transport and cargo ships. They are existing ships now in service in the Southwest Pacific. Details as to the characteristics of these vessels are not now available.

The total tonnage represented by the several types enumerated above is 2,022,250 tons. This leaves a working balance of 477,750 tons which may be utilized by the Navy in several ways. With this working balance, as the war progresses, it may be necessary to construct new types not heretofore built to meet war emergencies. The committee feels that this working balance of 477,750 tons is a fair and equitable leeway. It may be taken up in destroyer tenders, submarine tenders, seaplane tenders, ammunition ships, fleet oil tankers, repair ships, salvage vessels, and any and all types of auxiliaries necessary to support the fleet and aid in the amphibious warfare.

The fiscal arrangements by which the Navy will acquire the 2,500,000 tons authorized by the bill will be as follows:

Of the total tonnage—approximately 1,772,250 tons—now building or to be built by the Maritime Commission for the Navy's account, the Navy will reimburse the Commission in full for the cost of construction involved in the building of the small assault transports—APA—and the escort aircraft carriers—CVE—in accordance with the terms of agreements which have already been effected between the two agencies. The cost to the Maritime Commission of building the balance of the tonnage is not to be reimbursed by the Navy, but, as is provided by section 2 of the bill, this cost will be borne by the Commission out of its own appropriations. It is understood that provision for such expenditures has been made in the Budget which the Commission is currently presenting to Congress and that the amount involved is approximately $900,000,000.

The 250,000 tons of vessels to be acquired by the Navy through transfers from the Army will be acquired without any exchange of funds between the two agencies in accordance with the provisions of the act of July 11, 1919 (41 Stat. 132; 10 U. S. C., sec. 1274), which provides as follows:

> The interchange without compensation therefor, of military stores, supplies, and equipment of every character, including real estate owned by the Government, is hereby authorized between the Army and the Navy upon the request of the head of one service and with the approval of the head of the other service.

So much of the approximate balance of 500,000 tons as may be acquired by the Navy through the medium of new construction undertaken by the Maritime Commission for the Navy's account, or through the medium of additional transfers of vessels from the Army, will involve no reimbursement by the Navy of expenditures incurred by either the Maritime Commission or the Army. The cost of so much of the balance as may be acquired through the medium of new construction undertaken by the Navy directly with its own contractors or through acquisitions from sources other than the Maritime Commission or the Army, will, of course, have to be borne out of Navy appropriations.

As previously stated, the Navy is committed to reimburse the Maritime Commission in full for the cost of the construction of the escort aircraft carriers and the small assault transports which are now being built. With respect to the balance of the 1,772,250 tons which the Commission is building or will build for the Navy's account, a large number of items of machinery and special equipment are to be furnished by the Navy, and the cost of these items must be borne by Navy appropriation. In addition, the total cost of ordnance for all these vessels must be borne by the Navy. Similarly, in the case of the 250,000 tons of vessels to be transferred to the Navy from the Army, the cost of ordnance and certain items of conversion must be borne by Navy appropriations. The total cost to the Navy of these items, plus such portion of the cost of the balance of approximately 500,000 tons as the Navy may ultimately bear, is estimated at $2,750,000,000, inclusive of ordnance.

Over 300 auxiliary vessels are to be acquired or constructed with the auxiliary tonnage authorized in this bill. The total cost to the Government is estimated to be $3,750,000,000, of which $2,750,000,000 is the estimated amount that will come out of naval funds.

Of the tonnage authorized for landing craft, over 330 such craft will be constructed at an estimated cost of $1,820,000,000 which will all come from naval appropriations.

The estimated cost of the ordnance for the vessels and landing craft to be acquired by the Navy is included in the sums I have just mentioned.

This program will, therefore, cost the Government, according to present estimates, $5,570,000,000.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Does the bill make any provision for tankers to supply the Navy with fuel?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; they are taken care of.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. I think the chairman should advise the committee that while this type of landing craft is new, yet they have been tested out in actual warfare conditions and their value absolutely proven.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is correct. Many of them have already been built. I would not have made this statement unless there had appeared in the paper this morning an article stating that some 25,000 ships of this character have already been completed and they have been used successfully in our landing operations under battle conditions.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in making this very clear statement the gentleman from Georgia has stated that this bill represented an expenditure of $5,700,000,000. Can the gentleman tell me approximately how much money the Navy still has as an unexpended balance from appropriations heretofore made?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. From the total appropriations?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am sorry, I cannot; but I may say that the gentleman may rest assured the Navy is getting value received for every dollar spent.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I did not mean that. The only point I am trying to make is that we may be appropriating money faster than they can make contracts satisfactorily.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We may be appropriating money to meet future conditions, but the Navy anticipates certain things will arise and therefore they must have the money to meet those conditions.

The deficiency bill which will soon come back to us from the Senate carries the contract authorization to carry out this program, though Congress has not yet authorized it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Under what type of contract will this equipment be constructed, cost plus or what?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Some of it might be on a cost-plus basis and some by competitive bid.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Has the gentleman or his committee had occasion to check the activities of the Maritime Commission in connection with the barge-building program in which 160 were built but not used?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I can only say that we contract with the Maritime Commission like we contract with any one else. We have not gone into the question to see whether the Maritime Commission is a good agency for the Navy to contract with or not.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. May I mention to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs that there have been some 120 barges built for the carrying of oil and liquids designed by an individual who never had any experience in that line. They are all docked at the present time because they have humped in the middle and are no good.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That may be true. Many mistakes have been made, but that is one of the unfortunate things about war.

Mr. Chairman, if there are no questions members of the Committee desire to ask with reference to particular details, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Do I understand that all of these craft that are now being built and covered by this appropriation are being built under present designs? They are not being redesigned except to correct minor mistakes that have occurred?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The Navy has complete control over what the Maritime Commission builds for the Navy and they are built according to Navy design, not according to Maritime Commission design.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I might point out an interesting fact that we discovered out on the west coast. The Navy in taking over ships from the Maritime Commission spent a great deal of money in remodeling and redesigning ships that were ready to go into service for the Maritime Commission.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I inserted, by direction of the Committee on Naval Affairs, a provision in an appropriation bill which gave the Navy Department complete control as to the design and type of ship that the Maritime Commission builds from that date on down to the present time. Prior to that time the Navy was taking ships from the Maritime Commission that were built not for the Navy and not of a Navy design, but of general shipbuilding design, and they had to be converted.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. They converted an ordinary ship from a cargo ship to a refrigerator ship and when they had that work 90 percent completed, they reconverted the ship back the other way.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I understand when this bill was referred to the committee it had in it some $200,000,000.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No. The gentleman has the wrong bill in mind. This bill is reported unanimously by the Committee on Naval Affairs, it is in accordance with the financial program of the President and has been approved by the Budget.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It has been approved by the Budget for the entire amount recommended in the bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. In this bill, yes.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. May I say that I approve, and I think the American people not only approve but are very much pleased with, the splendid record that the Navy of the United States has made in this war, especially of late weeks in connection with the great activity in the Pacific area. May I say also that the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs who is handling this bill, and his committee, has the complete confidence of the House because the members of that committee and the chairman have always demonstrated their knowledge of the subject and I feel whatever that committee brings to the House the House can fully follow with assurance.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Naval Affairs at a most careful executive hearing on this bill, heard Admiral Horne, Chief of Naval Operations and the ranking military men in the Navy under Admiral King, who is not in the city. Those gentlemen appeared before the committee and urged immediate enactment of this authorization. It is so urgent that the Senate Appropriations Committee in the deficiency bill has authorized contracts to be made.

The committee feels that while this is a large expenditure they are clearly justified in asking approval of this bill.

With reference to the district craft, it is not the intention of the Navy Department to build any district craft out of the tonnage provided for that purpose without coming back to the committee and justifying the need for such craft. So you may rest assured that this tonnage will be used up in auxiliary ships of the type and kind that I have pointed out and in landing craft that are so essential and necessary to carry on effectively and vigorously the warfare against the enemy.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The distinguished gentleman has indicated with some gratification, as I take it, that a survey of the gentleman's committee indicated

that under renegotiation of the contracts let in this ship-building program they show a profit not in excess of 4 percent. Did I understand the gentleman correctly? That is after taxes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. In order that that statement may be understood, do I correctly understand the gentleman's statement to mean that in the renegotiation procedure that 4-percent figure the gentleman used represents a profit of 4 percent based upon gross volume of business transacted, or 4 percent based upon invested capital?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It represents 4 percent of the contract for the particular ship. For instance, if the battleship *South Dakota* costs $80,000,000 after renegotiation and after taxes, the disclosure is to the effect that the shipbuilder would have a net profit of 4 percent. Before renegotiation it was running about 11 percent.

Mr. KEEFE. The point I want to get from the gentleman is this. I have in mind a company with an invested capital of $100,000, that did a business of $1,000,000 gross building boats. Now they are allowed after taxes 4 percent profit?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. On what?

Mr. KEEFE. On the $1,000,000.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. On the contract for that particular ship.

Mr. KEEFE. Which in gross means 4 percent on the million dollars, if their contract amounted to $1,000,000.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. They would make $40,000.

Mr. KEEFE. That is 40 percent upon their invested capital of $100,000.

Mr VINSON of Georgia. The reason I was making that statement is to justify a strong renegotiation statute. In the case of one submarine company that was not subject to renegotiation because their submarines were delivered before the renegotiation law went into effect, their profit was 27 percent after taxes.

Mr. KEEFE. The point I want to make is that I do not believe it should be given out that these concerns that are engaged in the shipbuilding business are making only 4 percent. The average person understands that to be 4 percent upon their invested capital, but as a matter of fact they are making about 40 or 50 percent on their capital. Is not that true?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; the gentleman is in error. Let the gentleman read the document I will send him.

Mr KEEFE. The gentleman admitted that my statement of facts was correct, that the man would make $40,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I had two or three requests for time to discuss this measure, but in view of the developments those requests have been withdrawn. I therefore yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as read and be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to acquire and convert or to undertake the construction of 2,500,000 tons, or such portion thereof as may be directed by the President, of auxiliary vessels and 1,000,000 tons of landing craft and district craft, such auxiliary vessels, landing craft, and district craft to be of such size, type, and design as the Secretary may consider best suited for the prosecution of the war, such vessels to be in addition to those heretofore authorized.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That no sums expended by the Maritime Commission from funds appropriated to it for the construction of vessels which are transferred to the Navy shall be reimbursed from naval appropriations, except to the extent of agreements existing on the effective date of this act: *Provided further*, That vessels acquired by the Navy from the Maritime Commission without reimbursement shall not be disposed of except by return to the Maritime Commission.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MONRONEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3715) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels, landing craft, and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day deliver to the White House, for forwarding to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2188. An act to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3070. An act to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3363. An act extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made;

H. R. 247. An act for the relief of the estate of Richard Dodge Beale, deceased;

H. R. 937. An act for the relief of the estate of Luther Clyde Nanny;

H. R. 1973. An act for the relief of Albert Ferguson and Ozelle Ferguson;

H. R. 2190. An act for the relief of Marguerite R. McElroy;

H. R. 2299. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of W. M. Hurley and Joe Whitson;

H. R. 3309. An act to suspend temporarily the application of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

H. J. Res. 175. Joint resolution commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the first airplane flight by Wilbur and Orville Wright; and

H. J. Res. 199. Joint resolution to extend the time limit for immunity.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. OUTLAND (at the request of Mr. MAGNUSON), for 1 day on account of illness.

THE LATE LAWRENCE LEWIS

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I have a very sad mission to perform this afternoon. It is with deep sorrow that I inform the House of the passing of our beloved colleague the Honorable LAWRENCE LEWIS, who represented the First District of Denver, Colo., in this body for the past 11 years.

The passing of our colleague does not come as a surprise because we know he has been critically ill for a number of days. However, we are never ready for news of this kind. It leaves us, who knew our colleague so well, with very heavy hearts indeed.

Mr. LEWIS was dean of the Colorado delegation, having come to this body in the year 1933. He served for a time on the Committee on the Judiciary, and for the past few years on the Committee on Rules. He has been one of the prominent and influential Members of this House.

LAWRENCE LEWIS was beloved by all who knew him. I cannot recall hearing anyone say anything against him. So far as I know, he had no enemies.

When I was first elected to this body in the fall of 1940 I received a rather long letter from LAWRENCE LEWIS congratulating me on my election and offering to do anything he could to help me as a new Member of Congress.

I remember on the day I arrived in Washington LAWRENCE LEWIS came to my office to greet me and made me feel at home. LAWRENCE LEWIS was of that disposition. He told me that politics were largely forgotten after men were elected to Congress and it then became our duty and privilege to work together side by side, regardless of our party affiliations. I found that true with LAWRENCE LEWIS and with my other colleagues here. Colorado has lost one of her leading citizens and most distinguished public servants. LAWRENCE LEWIS served his State and people well. He worked unceasingly for their interests. He put in long hours every day representing not only the First District of Colorado, but the entire State, and the West, and this Nation. We read, Mr. Speaker, every day of the casualties in this war and of the brave boys who are

dying on the battle fronts the world over. I say that LAWRENCE LEWIS is a casualty just as truly as if he had lost his life in actual conflict. LAWRENCE LEWIS gave up his life here in Washington fighting and working for those things which he held so dear, and striving to the utmost of his ability to serve his constituency and his country. LAWRENCE LEWIS had not been well for the past year. He went to the hospital last fall immediately after his election and had just returned to his seat here in September, eager to assume his full responsibilities and take up his work again. The spirit indeed was willing but the flesh was weak, and after a few weeks he was compelled to quit. So today we mourn the passing of LAWRENCE LEWIS. He took great pride in the fact that for several years he never missed a roll call of this House. Today he answered the roll call in a higher body.

I cannot say, and I will not say
He is dead—he is just away.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed a great shock to me, as I know it was to each of you, to learn this afternoon of the passing of the Congressman from the First District of Colorado, Hon. LAWRENCE LEWIS. It was just 2 years ago today that I was elected to serve in this body, and a few weeks later Mr. LEWIS came down and stood here with me in the Well of the House when I took the oath of office. I shall always think of him as sitting down there in the front row, listening and watching, as we from Colorado used to think, the watchdog for his and our Colorado.

We knew that Mr. LEWIS had been in failing health for the past 2 years, and during the past year he had been able to serve only occasionally. However, I was not prepared for the news of his death a few minutes ago. Colorado, may I call to your attention, is a small State in population. We have four Representatives in the House and two in the Senate. If I am not mistaken, we have lost three of these men, Members of this House, within the last 4 years, and one Senator. That is rather a costly casualty list since the beginning of these war problems. LAWRENCE LEWIS was indeed a war casualty. He watched, he studied, and he worried over the things that were and are happening. He was a man of great culture. I do not believe that he had an enemy in the world. He was a man of courtesy. He was a man who had great affection for those who knew him and who loved him. He was recognized in Colorado as one of the leaders of our State and a man of unusual ability and of unquestioned character and integrity. We in Colorado, and especially our congressional delegation, can ill afford to lose the leadership of LAWRENCE LEWIS.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the House has been doubly saddened today. We had a double saddening not so long ago on the occasion of the loss of two of our distinguished Members. Today comes the announcement that the House of Representatives has lost a distinguished former Member and our late distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. LEWIS]. It is difficult on an occasion of this kind to express one's thoughts. One gropes for adequate words to express the deep feeling that he is possessed of in the knowledge that a dear friend and colleague has been called into the Great Beyond by the Maker. To me, the outstanding traits of our late colleague were his seriousness, his profound devotion to duty, and the fact that he exemplified to the greatest extent humanly possible to all of his colleagues and his fellow men the important message that power, whether obtained through political preferment or the possession of wealth or the occupying of position of any kind, is a trust. He always exercised his powers as a Member of this body and the responsibilities that were imposed upon him as a great trust. That, in my opinion, is the very essence of the success of a democracy, that those charged with responsibility of position, no matter what that position may be, but particularly in public life, have imposed upon them a great trust; that the power they have is not a personal power, but one to be exercised for the good of the Nation and for the good of the people in the effort to attain these common objectives that our great Government stands for and that sooner or later we are going to be judged by some one who is not of this world and to Him—God Himself—we must make an accountability for the manner in which we exercise the power that is temporarily ours and which we possess and exercise doing our lifetime. We must account for the fact that we exercised it not arbitrarily but as a trust. That follows the other great premise upon which our Government is based, that this is "a Government of laws and not of men," and in order for it to be "a Government of laws and not of men" power, wherever it is vested, temporarily as it is, in the case of all of us in public life, must be exercised not as a personal possession, but as something temporarily entrusted to us by the people distinctly as a great and grave trust. Of course, we are all human and we make human mistakes. That is to be expected. But in the overall picture of the life of all of us, and I except no man, that I have ever served with, in these times, recognizing our own human weaknesses and our frailties, I say that it is our strength that every man that I have served with, in the over-all picture, has always, in my opinion, had in mind that the power, whatever it might be, to the extent we possessed it, is a trust and not something that is a personal possession. It is a power that we are not to use in an arbitrary manner.

My late colleague exemplifies that in his seriousness, his depth, his personality, the manner in which he approached the consideration of all legislation. It was refreshing to all of us to be together in his presence. I always left LAWRENCE LEWIS with a feeling that I was inspired by having been in his presence.

LAWRENCE LEWIS died in the line of duty. For months, as we all know, he has been seriously ill. He had been in the hospital. He had been convalescing. Yet, when he should not have done so, he came back to the floor of the House. I can remember on several occasions saying to him, "Lawrence, do not stay on the floor too much." The strain of a controversial debate on the floor is intense upon us. Those of us who enjoy normal health feel its strain. There are times when emotions are such that it arouses in us human feelings of excitement, and we all feel the effects of it. That is particularly so in the case of any Member who is not feeling well. On several occasions when controversy was running rampant throughout the Chamber—and that is to be expected at times—I have suggested that he remove himself from the atmosphere, because we were all feeling the effects of intense debate. But he stuck to his duty. He was on this floor when his health was such that he should not have been here. That is another example he leaves with us, the example of devotion to duty.

We all have our weaknesses, yet our strengths are such that we all have something that is an inspiration and an example to those we serve with.

I am at a loss to adequately express my thoughts, but in the over-all picture of what the life of this fine gentleman meant, fitting into the life and traditions of our country, he was an outstanding exemplar of everything that is high and noble. During his lifetime he has nobly lived up to the great traditions that we inherit from past generations of Americans, and which we of today possess—the institutions of government that we enjoy.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, we are again reminded of the uncertainly of life. A few minutes ago the flag on the staff of the Capitol descended to half mast, a silent reminder that the Grim Reaper has again invaded our ranks. When the Death Angel beckoned this time it was to summon the distinguished Representative, LAWRENCE LEWIS, from Colorado.

We all knew him, and to know him was to love him. Gentle, kind, patient, able, honest, and reliable. No man ever questioned the courage or integrity of LAWRENCE LEWIS.

After he had been in Congress for a short time, he told me that he was convinced that the first requisite in a successful career in Congress was to gain and retain the respect and confidence of his colleagues. His 10-year service here is conclusive proof that he followed the formula which he had suggested for himself. He was not spectacular. He was real and genuine and, in the language so well understood in his western country, he was all wool and a yard wide. LARRY LEWIS thought always of accomplishment rather than publicity. A fervent believer in Jeffersonian democracy, he often expressed distress at some modern tendencies. To him, his country commanded greater allegiance than any group, bloc, or party. As we think in retrospect, we are all agreed that he lived the good life and made the good fight. It is with sad hearts that we pause in the midst of a busy legislative day to pay our tribute to the life, character, and mem-

ory of this splendid man. We sympathize with his friends and his family.

Mr. Speaker, when LARRY LEWIS left us, the city of Denver, the State of Colorado, and the Nation lost a real asset. The world is better because he lived in it. We shall miss him much.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of LAWRENCE LEWIS, not only the First District of Colorado, but also the Central West and the Nation have lost a very able, conscientious legislator. He was kind, genial, easy to work with, a true gentleman at all times. It so happens that my congressional district and the district Mr. LEWIS represented had problems dealing with flood control and irrigation and problems dealing with air routes and transportation that were comparable and closely related. We worked together on these problems. I never knew a finer man to work with than LAWRENCE LEWIS. It seemed as though he had but one motto, the motto of service, a motto that ran along the line that we were going through this life but once and must take advantage of every opportunity given us to render service.

He was not well during the last few years; he had a cross to bear; but regardless of that he was the same noble character. I am going to miss him very much. God bless his memory.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we are all deeply shocked to learn of the sudden death of our good friend LAWRENCE LEWIS a few hours ago. It was my privilege to serve on the important Committee on Rules with this distinguished son of Colorado. In fact, I sat next to him on the committee and learned to know him well. I feel that my own life has been enriched by this intimate association with our late friend and colleague.

LAWRENCE LEWIS was possessed of many splendid virtues. He was a man of kindly disposition, of abiding faith in his fellow man, and of a most inquisitive mind. But I think that those of us who knew him best can all agree upon one spendid asset possessed by this man of sterling character—and that was his consistent devotion to his duties. I doubt if there is a Member of this House who worked harder on the legislation considered by this body than did LAWRENCE LEWIS during his tenure of office. I dare say that there were few bills that were considered upon the floor of this House that did not receive the closest scrutiny and study from this son of legislative toil. He regarded his duties here as a representative of his people in this great legislative body as a high sense of trust. No legislation was treated lightly by him.

LAWRENCE LEWIS was an able representative of his people. He was an asset to this House. His kindly and solicitous interest in its membership endeared him to his colleagues generally. His district, his State, and the country will miss him greatly. He was a splendid type of American citizenship.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, in the earlier years of my service in Congress my office was located on the same corridor with that of LAWRENCE LEWIS and we came to be great friends. I came to an understanding of the gentle nature the man had, of his devotion to his duty here, of the careful way in which he studied each legislative act that came before the House; and then I observed the daily attendance of LAWRENCE LEWIS upon this floor.

Since his illness I have missed his presence in the first seat to the right of the center aisle where he nearly always sat. I know of no man with whom I have served here whose nature was more gentle, whose attention to duty was more conscientious, and who was freer from criticism of his fellow man that LAWRENCE LEWIS. He was a great servant of the people, a fine friend, a true American, and we all will miss him greatly.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the passing of our late colleague the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. Harrington, and further that my remarks may appear in the RECORD for the earlier part of the day following the eulogies to Mr. Harrington.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, in the death of LAWRENCE LEWIS a man has passed from the service of this House who commended himself to me because of the gentle characteristics of his personality and because of his devotion to duty in the congressional seat which he held.

There are certain individuals in this body on both sides of the aisle that we come to know and associate with more closely than others. It was my pleasure, and I shall ever remember it as such, to hear him talk on many occasions not so much about pending legislation but on the worth-whileness of life and its responsibility; and it is in that manner that I today recall LAWRENCE LEWIS.

During the middle of August I was in Denver, Colo., for a brief time. Because of Mr. LEWIS's illness I was unable to call upon him personally, but among the fine citizens of that community to whom I mentioned the name LAWRENCE LEWIS the unanimous response was that he was a good man and an excellent representative. Then only a few days ago, talking with LAWRENCE LEWIS here at the Capitol itself I impressed upon him what an earlier speaker today said, that we felt perhaps he should lessen his labors in this body. I recall the essence of his response. It was: "I have a duty to my people and I worry about my country." I hope and trust all of us in a certain measure can also remember that we as individuals have a duty here in the Congress and that we too have a very deep concern for our Republic.

Such men as LAWRENCE LEWIS are worthy of the highest commendation and the most reverent memory.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, word of the death of LAWRENCE LEWIS came to me as a distinct shock and as a deep personal loss. I first became acquainted with Mr. LEWIS upon my arrival here in Congress 5 years ago. He represented the First Congressional District of Colorado which included the city of Denver, a city which was named after a most distinguished son of my own community, Gen. James W. Denver.

Mr. LEWIS and I had a number of most enjoyable talks about Denver, the history of Colorado and the services of General Denver to that great State. The fact that the founder of his city came from my home community created a tie between us that soon blossomed into friendship. I learned his character, and to appreciate the quiet manliness that was his, and to respect the soundness of judgment which he displayed on all occasions. Later it was my pleasure to serve with him on the Rules Committee in the House. He was not able to take his place on that great committee the first part of his year, but came back to us this autumn time, weakened from his illness. I said to him then that I hoped he would take things slowly and not overdo. He replied to me, in about the same words that he spoke to my colleague from West Virginia, that he was anxious to get back in the harness and to again take up his work in the Congress of the United States; that he was more happy here performing his duties for his people than anywhere else in the world.

LAWRENCE LEWIS served his State and his Nation well. He gave his life in the service of his country as a Member of this House in wartime. He is a fallen soldier on the home front. His name will be written high on the Nation's roll of honor. He will continue to live in the hearts and memories of those of us with whom he served in these historic Halls.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I cannot add to the memorable and beautiful tributes that have been paid the distinguished gentleman from Colorado, [Mr. LEWIS]. He represented a neighboring State of mine, Colorado. I knew LAWRENCE LEWIS as a friend. Indeed, it seems that was only yesterday when I first became a Member of this House. Naturally, we fellows who come here from

the western country where the population is sparse, where our number in this House is small, and our problems are great and our responsibilities heavy, we sort of cling together, so to speak. He was one of the first gentlemen with whom I became acquainted. He helped me a lot.

He was not only a statesman but he was a great lawyer. I knew of his work in the courts not only of Colorado but also in the courts of adjacent States to that great State. He would have graced with dignity any position that required great legal attainment. In fact, as a lawyer I always thought he would be sort of lonesome with the average assembly of lawyers.

In addition to that, I have served on unofficial committees of the House with Mr. LEWIS, where we were trying to get what we thought was our due and what was coming to us in the western country. Our problems were alike. We sympathized with each other. I learned to know him intimately and to love and admire him. In addition to that we happened to live in the same hotel in Washington here for some time. I spent many evenings with him.

Mr. Speaker, knowing him as I did, I do not think a finer soul ever embarked out on that echoless sea.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of these beautiful tributes to our late colleague, Mr. LEWIS of Colorado, I cannot help but call attention to the fact that when he returned from his serious illness this last autumn to the beautiful demonstration of the affection in which he was held when Members of this House stood and applauded and cheered him upon his return to the seat which he customarily occupied in the front row. That was perhaps more appreciated by him than any other thing we could say today.

When I first came to Congress my office was near the office of Mr. LEWIS, and we often walked to and from the House together. In that way I became acquainted with that shy, most kindly, and human individual. I always felt that Mr. LEWIS was a true representative of his district. I do not know of anyone who was more concerned about the problems of the people in his district than was Mr. LEWIS.

In his failing health and under war conditions, with the additional problems he had, it must have been a tertrific strain upon him to carry on as nobly as he did. Everyone in this House is hard working and conscientious, but I do not know anyone who was more hard working or more concerned about his duties than was Mr. LEWIS. Each of us who had the slightest acquaintance with him deeply regrets his passing and in his passing we will miss him in the days to come.

His district, State, and Nation have lost a loyal, efficient, conscientious, and patriotic Representative.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DREWRY].

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Speaker, the passing of LAWRENCE LEWIS comes as a shock to me. Of course, I knew of his serious illness. Only recently I had spoken to him and inquired about his health. He said he thought he was recovering. In this room are memories of men like LAWRENCE LEWIS, men who served their country faithfully and conscientiously and perhaps paid the penalty for their assiduous attention to their duty as Representative. LAWRENCE LEWIS was a member of the Democratic national congressional committee representing the State of Colorado, and always brought to the work of that committee the same attention, thought, and faithfulness that he showed in other endeavors of life. He was one of the most faithful Members of the House. He attended regularly the sessions, and, as has been mentioned by others, I recall his sitting here in his usual seat giving close attention and serious thought to every Member who spoke. He had a pleasant, agreeable manner and a sweet temper to his fellow men. Such qualities of mind and heart gave him a high place in the esteem of his colleagues. I know he will be missed not only by his colleagues but by his State and his Nation.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness I learned a few minutes ago of the death of our beloved colleague. For many months he has been ill. It was with much rejoicing we saw him return to his duties here several short weeks ago. At that time it appeared as if he had recovered his health, and we were all happy over his convalescence. His death today therefore comes as a shock.

It was my privilege to know LAWRENCE LEWIS intimately for a good many years. We were members of the Committee on Rules for a number of years. I know from that association what a fine, patriotic, conscientious public servant he was. He was a Democrat, yet always above his party he placed the welfare of his country. He was a hard worker and devoted to the service of his State and his country. Men like LAWRENCE LEWIS are greatly missed, and they remain with us in fond memories. We do well to mourn his loss.

A fine public servant, an inspiring statesman, and a splendid American citizen has left this world for the rich reward which will be his in the Kingdom of Heaven.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, if LAWRENCE LEWIS had been here today and listened to the Speaker, as we had the pleasure of listening to him, he would have stood in his place and applauded, because he was so thoroughly American he was opposed to anything that even bordered on the demagogic. He loved this country and he was concerned about these "isms" and doctrines and movements that apparently seem determined to destroy our form of government.

I knew Mr. LEWIS for a great many years, not only through serving with him here but through some mutual friends. We had a common interest. He graduated from Harvard in 1901. He went back to the law school and was graduated from it in 1909. He maintained an interest in the eastern seaboard. He knew a lot about New York and things that were happening there. From time to time he discussed little matters of business interest he had.

He occupied the front seat, it is true. Many Members have referred to that. But he was a very modest and humble man. He did not take the first seat as a matter of choice but because he was slightly hard of hearing and wanted to catch every word that was being said.

He brought to his work that enthusiasm that we find typical of men of his kind. After 25 years of public service he had a deep appreciation of the problems of the country. In the last war he was very active. He was counsel to the adjutant general of his State, and for a while he was a private and attended officers' training school, although he was a mature man. He never lost interest in the Army or in the soldiers.

With all the legislation we had here, he kept apace of it. He wanted to play a very active part. The contribution he made to this House will long be remembered because he worked not only hard but intelligently. He deplored the speeches that were made for the RECORD or for the folks back home, because he was concerned about the effect upon the minds of the untrained and those that are easily led. He had such a basic love for his Government that those things worried him. He personally took them to heart.

We will miss him, and I am sure the country will miss him, because it has lost a faithful son.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, the first day I came to the House I ran into a young gentleman from the State of Iowa. After we had looked around the House a little bit, being new and green, we decided we would go down and get something to eat. The restaurant was crowded, as usual, but there was a kindly gentleman sitting at one table. He asked us if we would like to sit down with him. We did not know who he was but he asked us who we were. We said very proudly, and maybe a little chestily, that we were Members of Congress. You are that way your first day here. I recall he very humbly said that he was a Member of Congress, and that he was glad to see young folks coming in.

He talked to us that day. I guess the best way to describe LAWRENCE LEWIS is to say that he talked as he looked, kindly and gentle. I shall never forget that. Of course, we have talked to him many times since.

That young gentleman from Iowa died day before yesterday in England in uniform, and LAWRENCE LEWIS died today

The only tribute that I can pay to both my friends, Mr. Speaker, my older friend and my young friend, is that they both died in the service of their country.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, time marches on. As has been indicated by the gentleman from Colorado, we rightly, I think, in this body feel that it takes from our number rather a deadly and heavy toll. Returning from Alabama this morning, from a visit in my district which followed my journey to the funeral of the able, distinguished, and beloved dean of the Alabama delegation, Marse Henry Steagall, I entered the Chamber as the tributes to that fine and distinguished former Member, Vince Harrington, concluded. Hardly had that occurred when we were shocked and grieved by the news that the also able, distinguished, and universally beloved dean of the Colorado delegation has answered the last roll call and gone to his reward.

There is nothing I can add to the highly merited tributes that have been paid him by his other colleagues, who loved him as I did. We have missed him in that front seat while he was ill during the past year. We shall very greatly miss him now that he will never occupy it again. In his departure this House, his congressional district, the State of Colorado, and the Nation lose one of the ablest, the most industrious, and the most patriotic statesmen who has ever served a constituency.

His passing is a great personal bereavement and loss to me, which I feel deeply. I extend my deep, heartfelt sympathy to his loved ones, friends, and constituents in their great bereavement and loss. Though gone, he is not forgotten, nor will he be. On the other hand, the influence of his charming, modest, though forceful, sweet spirit will linger with those of us who remain through the years.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the news of the death of our colleague, LAWRENCE LEWIS, strikes me, as it does all of you, with deep sadness. I knew, of course, of his long illness. I knew years ago that he had been overworking. I have told him so and have remonstrated with him at times, but not with much effect, for like many men who preferred to wear out rather than rust out, he kept on the job many more hours per day than most of us spend at our legislative tasks. He was one of the hardest working Members of this body.

It has appealed to me that so many of my colleagues today in these brief tributes have mentioned this favored chair, on the front row next to the central aisle in which the distinguished gentleman from Colorado was often found during sessions of the House. As I have brought my friends from across the continent into this Chamber to show them around, I have usually said to them, "Seats for individual Members are not designated in this Chamber as in the Senate Chamber. In fact, there are only two chairs in this House that may be designated as belonging to officials," pointing out the two for our floor leaders. "But this chair is usually occupied by one Member, Congressman LEWIS of Colorado, although it is not officially assigned him." So accustomed was our friend from Colorado to occupying this particular seat of vantage in the Chamber that I never felt right in taking it myself when vacated, if he could be seen approaching.

But his occupying that seat was but one symbol of the time, the thought, and conscientious purpose which he gave to his legislative tasks. There are a good many, no doubt, who feel that a Congressman's presence in this Chamber, his answering roll calls and careful studying of bills, is the main part of a lawmaker's job. We know it is one of the main parts. LAWRENCE LEWIS certainly filled his part well in respect to attendance and careful study of the legislative program, as has been pointed out.

But I, too, know, as so many others have mentioned, of the long hours he spent and the midnight oil he burned, studying, planning, and thinking for the background of that official service which he gave as a Member while present in this Chamber. Many nights for several years I saw a light in his office when I left mine. Coming, as I do, from the Rocky Mountain area, I want to say, as my friend from Montana and others have said, we often, being so few in number in the House, get together for consultation. We found that the voice of LAWRENCE LEWIS, like that of Ed Taylor and other splendid men from the roof garden of America, had aided us greatly in our councils for the betterment of our distinctive part of the country as a part of the betterment of our entire country. I think it has been truly said, like of the man in uniform, LAWRENCE LEWIS is a casualty of this war. Not only has Colorado lost a distinguished son, but America has lost a good soldier in our fight for a better country.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, they tell me LAWRENCE LEWIS is dead. I do not know what they mean.

For 10 years our offices have adjoined. For 10 years he, as deputy Democratic whip and I in a similar capacity on this side of the aisle, have enjoyed that intimacy and mutual confidence which so long as I live I shall never forget.

Colorado did itself proud to send to the Congress of the United States so able a representative of its people. Quiet, unostentatious, but one of the ablest men who sat in the Halls of Congress through the period which has tried men's souls, he did his duty as he saw it and voted his convictions fearlessly. We disagreed as partisans but we agreed as Americans.

God rest his soul. A strong man has fallen to pay the price of overwork for those he sought to serve so faithfully and well. His State, the country, and all of us have lost a friend at a time when our need is so great as to be immeasurable, as is our loss.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 377), as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. LAWRENCE LEWIS, a Representative from the State of Colorado.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The Speaker will announce the committee tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the further resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, December 10, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands at 10:30 a. m., Friday, December 10, 1943, to consider H. R. 3807, a bill to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases, after which time the committee will go into executive session to consider various matters.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MURPHY: Committee on Claims. S. 653. An act for the relief of Johnny Newton Strickland; without amendment (Rept. No. 939). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MURPHY: Committee on Claims. S. 1090. An act for the relief of John Henry Miller, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 940). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 297. A bill for the relief of August Michela, infant; with amendment (Rept. No. 941). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1469. A bill for the relief of Robert Beckwith, Julius Buettner and Emma M. Buettner; with amendment (Rept. No. 942).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2455. A bill for the relief of Hassler-Ponder Toy Manufacturing Co., Inc., with amendment (Rept. No. 943). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3195. A bill for the relief of Willard Kerr, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 944). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3504. A bill for the relief of Wade Bros., a partnership composed of M. J., G. W., and Ovid Wade; without amendment (Rept. No. 945). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MRUK:

H. R. 3817. A bill relating to the current payment of the individual income tax not withheld at the source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 3818 (by request). A bill to further perfect the consolidation of the Lighthouse Service with the Coast Guard; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 3819. A bill to rescind Petroleum Administrative Order No. 5 and Petroleum Directive No. 59 of the Petroleum Administrator for War relating to the transportation of petroleum products to the east coast; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 3820. A bill for the relief of certain widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 3821. A bill to authorize the construction of the Pine Flat-Kings River project in California; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 3822. A bill to provide for payment of mustering-out pay to members of the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERIDAN:

H. R. 3823. A bill to interpret and define the term "National Guard" and to determine the Federal recognition of service therein; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON:

H. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the point-rationing system with respect to pork be suspended for 60 days; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. Res. 376. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 2350, a bill to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 3824. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mamie Selby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3825. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mamie Selby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3995. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of the American Legion Post, No. 229, and signed by 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3996. Also, petition of Mrs. W. Heede, Jr., and 37 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3997. Also, petition of the American Legion Post, No. 299, and signed by 30 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3998. Also, petition of the Barry Wehmiller Machinery Co. and signed by 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3999. Also, petition of the Barry Wehmiller Machinery Co. and signed by 10 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4000. By Mr. NORMAN: Petition of William V. Appel, of Aberdeen, Wash., and nine other citizens of Aberdeen and vicinity, protesting passage of any legislation having as its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4001. By Mr. PLOESER: Petition of Arthur W. Bolte and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4002. Also, petition of John W. Golobic and 18 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4003. Also, petition of L. Nalibarsh and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4004. Also, petition of J. R. Johnson and 80 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4005. Also, petition of Albert Dauster and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4006. Also, petition of David S. Phelan and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4007. Also, petition of Charles A. Haase and 23 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4008. Also, petition of Besse Conrad and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4009. Also, petition of Mrs. M. Sauerwien and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4010. Also, petition of Elizabeth M. Boyle and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4011. Also, petition of Arthur Pellman and 18 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4012. Also, petition of Charles Kratz, Jr., and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed be Thou, O Lord of Hosts, who art beyond our prayers and beyond all that we ask. We have asked for a cupfull and the ocean remains, for a sunbeam and the sun abides; we rejoice that Thou givest above all that we can think. O let us clothe ourselves with spiritual strength and power that we may lift our eyes unto the hills from whence cometh our help.

Almighty God, the problems that we are to work out require the use of all our powers; O turn our way unto the Lord—the way of a pure purpose and worthy ambition. Enable us to walk in the paths of helpful service, guarding our lips, lest they speak the inadvertent word, idly spoken. "The tongue of the wise useth knowledge; death and life are in the power of the tongue." Continue to revive within us the sympathy that feels another's grief, the charity that weaves another's hope, and the love that shares another's burden and under no circumstances may we bear malice.

For another most honorable Member, faithful, honest, and true, his sun has set at the approach of eventide. Immortality—O blessed undying truth which bridges the gulf and makes the continuity of life a glorious reality. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 255. An act for the relief of Col. E. H. Tarbutton;

H. R. 302. An act for the relief of Robert Griffin;

H. R. 977. An act for the relief of Clare A. Miller;

H. R. 1379. An act for the relief of Gerald Estell Proctor;

H. R. 1640. An act for the relief of Mrs. J. D. Price;

H. R. 1933. An act for the relief of Ronald A. Cox;

H. R. 2080. An act to provide temporary additional pay for equipment maintenance for each carrier in Rural Mail Delivery Service;

H. R. 2545. An act for the relief of Samuel J. D. Marshall;

H. R. 2641. An act to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain lands for addition to the Sequoia National Park;

H. R. 3039. An act for the relief of Mrs. C. W. Selby;

H. R. 3299. An act for the relief of Victor H. Loftus, disbursing clerk, American Embassy, Mexico, D. F., Mexico; and

H. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution to provide for the proper observance of the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of the adoption of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 636. An act for the relief of C. J. Toole;

H. R. 1344. An act for the relief of Paul W. Busbey, Mrs. Paul W. Busbey, Paula Busbey, and Mrs. Louisa Busbey;

H. R. 1616. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended;

H. R. 1875. An act for the relief of Carl Swanson, Geraldine Cecelia Swanson, a minor, and Almer Swanson; and

H. R. 3611. An act to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States, to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 296. An act for the relief of Hector H. Perry;

S. 375. An act for the relief of the Phoenix-Tempe Stone Co.;

S. 878. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended," approved January 24, 1942, and for other purposes;

S. 933. An act for the relief of Lee S. Dradshaw;

S. 1000. An act to reserve certain public-domain lands in the State of Arizona for addition to the Havasupai Indian Reservation, and for other purposes;

S. 1146. An act to amend section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934;

S. 1164. An act for the relief of Lucille Sleet;

S. 1233. An act to authorize the construction and maintenance of Moss Landing Harbor (Monterey Bay), Calif.;

S. 1324. An act for the relief of the Wisconsin Electric Power Co.;

S. 1325. An act for the relief of Joseph Moret;

S. 1372. An act to fulfill a treaty obligation between the United States and the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians by authorizing the purchase of certain interests in lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the said Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians;

S. 1391. An act for the relief of W. R. Jordan and Mabel Jordan;

S. 1417. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to donate and convey on behalf of the United States to Jack Henry Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, Anchorage, Alaska, the wood-frame building, known as the Telephone and Telegraph Building, located on lots 7 and 8 in block 17, Anchorage townsite;

S. 1427. An act to authorize the appointment of Gregory Boyington a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps;

S. 1477. An act for the relief of Carl M. Frasure;

S. 1488. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to Jose C. Romero all right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain described tract of land within the Carson National Forest, N. Mex.;

S. 1494. An act for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency;

S. 1504. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a railroad bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.;

S. 1528. An act for the relief of Col. Anderson F. Pitts;

S. 1544. An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels, landing craft, and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

S. 1576. An act to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases;

S. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution to aid in effectuating the purposes of the Railway Labor Act; and

S. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution declaring the policy of the Congress with respect to the independence of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 219):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. LAWRENCE LEWIS, late a Representative from the State of Colorado.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of the above resolution the Presiding Officer had appointed Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado and Mr. MILLIKIN members of said committee on the part of the Senate.

REAR ADMIRAL GEORGE F. HUSSEY, JR.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SHEPPARD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a short item which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, and also an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INTERNED JAPANESE

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, as the Members probably know, a subcommittee of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities has been holding hearings on the very complicated and sometimes delicate questions of the handling of Japanese in this country.

Yesterday the Attorney General of the United States, Hon. Francis Biddle, appeared before our committee. There is pending before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, a bill which would take away the citizenship rights of any American-born citizen who declared his loyalty to any other country. This bill, perhaps with some modification, under the views expressed by the Attorney General, would be constitutional, and I believe it would help very much in solving some of the problems with which the country is faced, and particularly our Committee on Un-American Activities.

So I commend to the Members of the House to take an interest in this bill, which is H. R. 2701. I hope the Immigration and Naturalization Committee will meet and commence hearings and bring the bill to the floor as soon as possible, because it would be helpful to have it enacted into law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. REED of New York was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

CARE OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR NO. 2

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein the order of the Chief of Staff, regarding the care of veterans of World War No. 2.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order for 30 minutes which was granted me for yesterday be reestablished today in whatever order it may come on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a statement by a former Member of the House, Hon. Maury Maverick, in connection with the proceedings of the American Prison Association. This exceeds the quota allowed and I have a statement from the printer that it will cost $112.58. I renew my request notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CARE OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR NO. 2

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I am glad my colleague from California [Mr.

J. LEROY JOHNSON] brought up the matter of veterans' discharge. I had occasion on yesterday to confer with General Hines of the Veterans' Bureau, regarding this matter. He tells me there has been delay in some cases, but that he is attempting to send to the various discharge centers men from the Veterans' Bureau who are veterans themselves, to inform the discharged veteran of his rights and of the papers he should fill out and so forth. As a matter of fact, General Hines offered this suggestion, to which I am sure the Members of the House will agree. He suggested he be allowed to employ some of these discharged veterans themselves to aid. He can use four or five thousand men in the various discharge centers who would in turn take care of the returning discharged veterans.

I think it is a splendid idea and I think General Hines should be applauded by Congress for making that suggestion.

However, the quicker we pass the mustering-out bill the better this whole situation will become. This should be done immediately.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including an editorial written by Dr. L. L. Gwaltney, editor of the Alabama Baptist, appearing in the issue of that paper of December 9, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

OUR HEROIC NURSES

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, 5 of the large hospitals of the city of Chicago are in my district together with the activities of a very well-known nursing organization known as the Visiting Nurses. The nurses from these organizations have received splendid training and many of them are serving in the forces of the Army and Navy of the United States and are piling up an enviable record in medals and citations won since the United States entered the war 2 years ago. Service nurses are recruited by the Red Cross. Two Army nurses were the first women to have received the coveted Soldier's Medal; 2 air-evacuation nurses have earned air medals; 1 Army nurse wears the Purple Heart; 5 have been awarded the Legion of Merit; and 18 Army nurses who served on Bataan are entitled to wear the special citation bar given defenders of the Philippines.

I should like at this time, as a Member of this body, to express my high admiration for the nurses serving with our armed forces.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

DISABLED VETERANS OF WORLD WAR NO. 2

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] said that General Hines was asking for more personnel. I have been urging General Hines to ask for more personnel for weeks, yes, for months. I also asked that veterans might be given their rehabilitation in the Veterans' Administration. I also asked that contact men from the Veterans' Administration be placed in hospitals to help service men and women with their claims. As of October this year approximately 635,000 men have been given honorable discharges. Out of 158,837 claims filed for disability there were allowed only 27,825, disallowed 60,000. The cases have been rated very slowly, many have not been touched. It has worked a great hardship; it has been a very cruel thing that our disabled veterans have not at least been given a rating and an attempt made to give them their just disability dues.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I wonder whether it is not feasible to keep these disabled veterans in the Army until their disability records are straightened out and their care arranged for.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have introduced a bill to accomplish that very purpose and I earnestly hope it will pass. They should be allowed to stay in the Army until their cases are adjusted, or be given a furlough if they are able to be out of the hospitals. I am glad to have the gentleman's support in the passage of the bill. He is always interested in the veterans.

The need for doctors and nurses is increasing rapidly. The shortage in the insurance offices and in other offices of the Bureau is acute also. It may not be General Hines' fault that he has not the necessary personnel to carry out the provisions of the laws passed by the Congress for the veterans, but it is the unescapable fault of the administration.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article by Walter Lippmann which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech I delivered last night at Philadelphia.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, including a speech recently made by the Governor of Kansas.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein a report on veterans' discharges.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NOTIFICATION OF ELECTION OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

The Clerk read as follows:

DECEMBER 9, 1943.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The certificate of election in due form of law of Hon. CHESTER O. CARRIER as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-eighth Congress from the Fourth Congressional District of Kentucky, to fill a vacancy in that district, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SWEARING-IN OF MEMBER

The Honorable CHESTER O. CARRIER, Representative-elect to the Seventy-eighth Congress from the Fourth Congressional District of Kentucky, presented himself before the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein a speech by W. D. McAfee, Chief, Construction Materials and Tools Division, War Food Administration.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. GILLIE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, yesterday our distinguished Speaker made a speech on the floor of the House and among other things, pleaded for unity between the United States and her allies until complete victory is ours, when we could then sit down at the peace table and attempt to work out an amiable agreement for our future course.

I feel certain that every American worthy of the name agrees with that statement. However, in yesterday's press I find these statements:

Stimson warns Nation worst is yet to come.

WILSON SEES LONG WAR

Charles E. Wilson, executive vice chairman of the War Production Board, yesterday predicted a long hard struggle lay ahead.

LORD KEYES SAYS END OF WAR IS NEAR, CALLS FOR SPLITTING OF REICH

LONDON, December 9.—Lord Keyes, admiral of the fleet, said last night the end of the war was near, without a shadow of doubt.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, cannot you see how contradictory statements made by responsible people in these two Governments will do much to create the very situation which our distinguished Speaker deplored? They cannot both be true.

These statements on the very face of them attempt to create confusion and disunity and can be used as excellent propaganda by our enemies to create disunity. They can argue that America has a long hard war because we have yet to defeat the Japs, while Great Britain's war is practically over and that she will quit once Germany is defeated and leave us to fight the Japs alone.

How will the British people respond when told by the admiral of the fleet that the end of the war is near without the shadow of a doubt and then after the collapse of Germany in 1944, as Prime Minister Churchill has indicated, those same Britishers are told they have yet to fight on against our most potent enemy.

It seems to me that if those in high places are confused and cannot agree, it is asking a little too much not to expect some confusion in the ranks.

O. W. I. has the proper letters of the alphabet but has been improperly named. It should be "Oh what inconsistency or incompetency."

DAKAN'S DREAM

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I want to read to the House a jingle I received from a lady who recites that she has two sons serving in the south Pacific, where they have seen plenty of Americans bathed in blood, which makes her deeply resent the puny Mr. Dakan's attitude:

DAKAN'S DREAM

It makes the statesmen cogitate
When they observe how Nippons rate.
Why, they've been asked to relocate,
To purify Ohio State.

We've always thought that State was clean.
Fine Presidents, from there, we've seen.
We just supposed they bathed—I mean
We never peeked behind the screen.

Ohio schools have won renown,
Too bad the bathtub gets them down!
But, when the Japs have moved to town,
They'll bathe the folks, from toe to crown.

And Michigan is dirty, too:
At least that is the Dakan view;
But, tell us, just what can they do
When buying bathtubs is taboo?

The lakes are cold this time of year;
But Japs "can take it" so we hear.
If Dakan's right, the time is near
When State-wide bathing will appear.

Too bad, we have to go so far
To learn how negligent we are!
The Rising Sun shall be the star
To bring our bathing up to par.

Why not put old Dakan right?
A bath, in tar, with feathers bright,
Might make one planner see the light;
And let's not wait 'til bathing night!

—*Ruth Coffee Hillis.*

WAITSBURG, WASH.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article by Robert Vanderpool, on renegotiation of excessive profits on war contracts, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a brief letter from one of the departments on Federal employees in South Dakota.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday and Thursday of next week after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on each occasion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain newspaper articles and telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I asked and received permission to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by Father John A. O'Brien of the University of Notre Dame. I am advised by the Public Printer that this will cost $105. I ask unanimous consent that this may be included as a part of my remarks notwithstanding the estimate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT].

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include letters from various State unemployment-compensation commissions on the subject of bridging the gap pay for veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]?

There was no objection.

ACQUISITION, CONVERSION OR CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN AUXILIARY VESSELS, LANDING CRAFT, AND DISTRICT CRAFT FOR THE UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1544) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels, landing craft, and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is merely to ascertain for information if this is not the same bill we passed on yesterday?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the House passed H. R. 3715. The Senate passed S. 1544, a bill identical with the House bill; therefore I am asking that the Senate bill be now passed. Then both Houses will have passed the same bill (S. 1544).

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs if the Senate bill provides for any part of the construction by the Maritime Commission with appropriations to be charged to the Maritime Commission rather than to the Navy Department?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The Senate bill provides exactly the same provisions as the House bill. The House bill permits the Navy to engage in contracts with the Maritime Commission.

Mr. CASE. With full reimbursement to the Maritime Commission?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of the total tonnage (approximately 1,772,250 tons) now building or to be built by the Maritime Commission for the Navy's account, the Navy will reimburse the Commission in full for the cost of construction involved in the building of the small assault transports and the escort aircraft carriers in accordance with the terms of agreements which have already been effected between the two agencies. The cost to the Maritime Commission of building the balance of the tonnage is not to be reimbursed by the Navy, but, as is provided by section 2 of the bill, this cost will be borne by the Commission out of its own appropriations. It is understood that provision for such expenditures has been made in the budget which the Commission is currently presenting to Congress, and that the amount involved is approximately $900,000,000.

Mr. CASE. That is a complete statement of the matter so far as the Maritime Commission is involved?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. CASE. I may say to the gentleman that the Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee having to do with the Independent Offices appropriation bill had the Maritime Commission before it yesterday. Most of the members of that committee were in hearing and among other questions this was one that was discussed. I appreciate the

gentleman's reference to the statement that was made yesterday, but the members of that subcommittee did not get it because they were working with the Maritime Commission on this question.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The principal sources from which the Navy expects to obtain the 2,500,000 tons of auxiliary vessels called for in the bill are as follows:

First. Two hundred and fifty thousand tons, already in existence, from the Army.

Second. Five hundred thousand tons, now being built by the Maritime Commission for the Navy's account;

Third. One million, two hundred and fifty thousand tons to be built by the Maritime Commission for the Navy's account; and

Fourth. Five hundred thousand tons, which the Navy will acquire by purchase or construction for its own account.

Mr. CASE. There will be complete reimbursement for this portion which the gentleman has described and the balance will come out of the Maritime Commission's appropriation. Now, what is the status of the ships that are paid for by the Maritime Commission?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. They belong to the Maritime Commission, as they are being paid for by that agency, but will be under the control of the Navy. They do not become Navy ships, they are Maritime Commission ships, but they will be used by the Navy so long as they are needed but the ships that the Navy pays for which are built by the Maritime Commission are Navy ships.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate having that statement as a part of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to acquire and convert or to undertake the construction of 2,500,000 tons, or such portion thereof as may be directed by the President of auxiliary vessels and 1,000,000 tons of landing craft and district craft, such auxiliary vessels, landing craft and district craft to be of such size, type, and design as the Secretary may consider best suited for the prosecution of the war, such vessels to be in addition to those heretofore authorized.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That no sums expended by the Maritime Commission from funds appropriated to it for the construction of vessels which are transferred to the Navy shall be reimbursed from naval appropriations, except to the extent of agreements existing on the effective date of this act: *Provided further*, That vessels acquired by the Navy from the Maritime Commission without reimbursement shall not be disposed of except by return to the Maritime Commission.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which the House passed the bill H. R. 3715 yesterday be vacated and the bill laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE NAVY TO PROCEED WITH THE CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with a previous unanimous-consent agreement, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3741) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 3741, with Mr. GOSSETT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to establish or develop the following naval shore activities by the construction of such temporary or permanent public works as he may consider necessary, including buildings, facilities, accessories, and services, with which shall be included the authority to acquire the necessary land, and to continue or complete the construction of any project heretofore authorized or undertaken, which projects have been specifically approved by the Secretary of the Navy, with approximate costs as indicated: Fleet facilities, $4,000,000; aviation facilities, $25,000,000; storage facilities, $20,000,000; ordnance facilities, $60,000,000; personnel training and housing facilities, $81,200,000; shore radio facilities, $5,000,000; Naval Research Laboratory, $800,000: miscellaneous structures, $4,000,000: *Provided*, That the approximate cost indicated for each of the classes of projects enumerated above may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be varied upward or downward, but the total cost shall not exceed $200,000,000: *Provided further*, That prior to the acquisition, by lease or otherwise, of any land under authority of this act, the Secretary of the Navy shall report to the Senate and House Naval Affairs Committees all such prospective acquisitions.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purpose of this act.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the object and purpose of this bill is to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish or develop naval shore activities within the continental United States by the construction of such public works as he may deem necessary.

The projects to be undertaken under the authority of this bill are fleet facilities, aviation facilities, storage facilities, ordnance facilities, personnel training and housing facilities, shore radio facilities, Naval Research Laboratory, and miscellaneous structures. This program is intended to carry forward the needs of the Navy Department for continental public-works construction until the end of the current fiscal year. As the war progresses and the Navy expands, additional shore facilities are necessary to properly care for the Navy's needs, and this bill is designed to provide for these additional facilities.

The bill as introduced in the House limited the total cost of the projects to be undertaken to $200,000,000. However, as the projects were investigated in detail by the committee it developed that certain additions should be made in order to properly take care of the Navy's current needs. Accordingly, the committee is recommending that the total cost be raised to a limit of $235,060,000. This increase in cost provided for additional items as follows: $2,000,000 for aviation facilities, $12,000,000 for ordnance facilities, $11,060,000 for personnel training and housing facilities, and $10,000,000 for miscellaneous structures.

The $2,000,000 item added to the bill by the committee under the heading of aviation facilities is to provide additional facilities in the Naval Air Transport Service, and is considered absolutely necessary in view of the continued expansion of that service in the Navy and the valuable work it is doing.

The $12,000,000 item added to ordnance facilities provides for transportation facilities in the Puget Sound area and for storage facilities in the San Diego-San Pedro area. With the increase of naval activities in the Pacific it is considered that the increase recommended is of the utmost necessity for the storage and expeditious handling of ammunition for our ships in that area.

During the course of the hearing it developed that additional facilities were necessary in the personnel distribution centers in both the Eleventh and Twelfth Naval Districts to care for men who are held in that area awaiting transfer, or men who have been on ships lost in action and have been sent there to await further assignment or detail. The increase of $11,060,000 in personnel training and housing facilities is for the purpose of providing proper and appropriate housing facilities for such men. Without this increase there will be housing facilities at these centers for only about 65 or 70 percent of the men whom it will be necessary to care for. The committee believes that adequate provision should be made for the personnel that have to be kept in these localities.

The $10,000,000 increase in miscellaneous structures is to provide access facilities to Terminal Island, San Pedro, Calif., to the greatly expanded naval activities on the island and for access to the shipbuilding plants in the immediate vicinity of the naval activities. The present facilities are extremely inadequate and congestion is such that movement of traffic is very slow, requir-

ing an unreasonable time for the passage of traffic to and from the island.

The Navy Department fully justified to the committee the needs for all of these increases in the bill. Therefore, I ask that the Committee of the Whole House accept the amendments recommended by the Committee on Naval Affairs and give approval to this public works bill.

Let me call your attention to the amendments.

The first committee amendment increases the sum authorized to be appropriated for aviation facilities by $2,000,000 from $25,000,000 to $27,000,000. This increase was determined upon since the need for the additional money involved is required to construct additional facilities for the Naval Air Transport Service at or near Alameda to meet the rapidly increasing demand for facilities to handle the large increase in naval air transport operations. The money requested should be made available at this time so that the augmented facilities can be proceeded with at an early date.

The second amendment increases the funds sought by the Navy Department for ordnance facilities from $60,000,000 to $72,000,000 or $12,000,000. These additional funds are required for the establishment of shipping facilities in the Puget Sound area to relieve the extremely hazardous condition now existing in the heart of the city of Seattle where high explosives to a large degree are being handled through the congested water front of the city of Seattle. The funds will be employed in the construction of an extension of the railroad from Shelton, Wash., to the vicinity of the Bremerton Navy Yard, a distance of approximately 32 miles, and the development of shipping facilities in the near vicinity to relieve the hazardous condition now existing.

The third amendment increases the funds sought by the Navy Department for housing and training facilities from $81,200,000 to $92,262,000 or $11,060,000. This sum was requested in order to provide additional housing facilities in the Eleventh, Twelfth, and Thirteenth Naval Districts to meet the requirements imposed by the increased personnel being dispatched to the west coast for replacement crews of ships and to provide for the personnel being returned from the combat areas.

The fourth amendment increases by $10,000,000 the sum requested by the Navy Department for miscellaneous structures, increasing the total amount requested from $4,000,000 to $14,000,000. This increase is to provide access facilities to Terminal Island, San Pedro, Calif., to the greatly expanded naval activities on the island and for access to the shipbuilding plants in the immediate vicinity of the naval activities. The present facilities are extremely inadequate and congestion is such that movement of traffic is very slow, requiring an unreasonable time for the passage of traffic to and from the island. The construction of the access facilities requested herein will materially relieve the situation and greatly add to the efficiency both of the naval and private activities on this island.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. CASE. In connection with the railroad trackage facilities referred to in the report——

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is Puget Sound.

Mr. CASE. I notice a provision for building a railroad 32 miles long. Will that railroad be owned by the Navy Department or is that to be loaned or given or otherwise transferred to some private railroad for operation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I might say to the gentleman from South Dakota, it will be owned and operated by the Navy. The real purpose of the spur is that there will be quartered in Seattle, I suspect, hundreds of thousands of tons of ammunition on the water front, which is not only hazardous, it is dangerous. That ammunition will have to be rehandled into the yard on barges. That is dangerous. Also all the freight that goes into the Bremerton Navy Yard. The gentleman appreciates and will realize, that the Bremerton Navy Yard, although being one of the largest in the world, has no rail connection. The rehandling costs of freight have amounted in the last 6 years to the cost of this spur and I suppose will amount to more in the future. It is something that should have been done a long time ago. All the Navy heads of yards and docks have recommended it. The Navy officials at Bremerton Navy Yard have recommended it. It will be operated by the Navy. I suspect that the use by the Navy of the spur line—it is really a spur—will continue for many, many years to come, because truly the operation at the Bremerton Navy Yard will be just as great, if not greater, in the years to come.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say to the gentleman from South Dakota and to the Committee, the policy of the Naval Affairs Committee is not to make an expenditure of this kind under any condition unless it is Government-owned and Government-operated. Now the policy goes further. Instead of going out and building on somebody else's ground and investing money, we build it on our own ground. We do not go out and take Government money and build up facilities on somebody else's property and then the Government, later on, have to turn it back to the original owner.

Mr. CASE. Then I assume the $12,000,000 amendment proposes the acquisition of the land?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Absolutely, the right-of-way in fee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I say to the gentleman from South Dakota that the land in between is all stumpage land? Most of it has very little relative value and there is nothing in between to build up. There is no expensive land. I do not know. My colleague from Washington can probably tell me, I suppose, that the land might be worth $5 an acre.

Mr. CASE. Further, does the $12,000,000 amendment propose the cost of land and the building of the track alone, or does it also include the authorization for the rolling stock which will be required to operate the railroad?

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I say to the gentleman, in the navy yard itself we have sufficient rolling stock to take care of this spur.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It is the construction of the track and the building of the track, as stated by the gentleman from Washington, and the rolling stock is already sufficient in that navy yard.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate the answer that the two gentlemen have given and also appreciate the statement which the Chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee has made with respect to the policy in the acquisition of land, and I am only sorry that the Naval Affairs Committee was not able to follow out that policy in the acquisition of land where we had to build island bases around the world.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We have a committee on that.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Let me say this. I introduced an amendment in the House at the direction of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the House agreed to it, that not a single lease anywhere in the United States and not a single purchase of realty by the Navy is made until it is submitted to the Committee on Naval Affairs and approved by that committee. The Committee on Naval Affairs has appointed a subcommittee consisting of Mr. MAAS, Mr. DREWRY, and Mr. COLE, when Mr. MAAS cannot serve; and myself to investigate thoroughly each and every one of such items.

Today I introduced a bill giving the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate and the Naval Affairs Committee of the House the right to veto any sale or the cancelation of a lease on any of the property that the Navy has acquired which, as the war develops, it may be necessary for the Navy to cease using, because when they go to sell this property that they have taken possession of either by condemnation or by purchase, or when they go to liquidate these plants that we have poured millions of dollars into I want the Congress to have a voice in how it is going to be disposed of.

Mr. CASE. Again I want to commend the diligence of the committee in inquiring into these properties within the United States, and to express the hope that it might be possible for the Congress in some way to assert a similar diligence with respect to the permanent interest that we may obtain in the bases we have built around the world.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am thoroughly in accord with the gentleman, but let us win the war before we get into a discussion of that matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. With pleasure.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If I understood the gentleman correctly, he said that the

Navy intended to operate these facilities. Is that correct?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. What facilities?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The one you are going to acquire under this bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We were discussing a railroad from the water front on Puget Sound to the Bremerton Navy Yard. Of course, the Navy will operate that just like it operates any naval plant.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not have any doubt at all about what you think you are going to, but what I am getting at is, What are you going to do if Tom DeLorenzo comes along and keeps the power of hiring and firing your employees?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know you are.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I have just finished reading the report of the special committee on the Brewster plant. It is the most fascinating and most enlightening document that will be submitted to this Congress. It is a story almost as fascinating as you will find in the novel of the Count of Monte Cristo. I invite every Member of the House to read that account of Brewster. Then you can form your own opinion of what will happen if Thomas DeLorenzo has anything to do with the building of these projects.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Can you rewrite that story so as to have a more pleasant ending?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Well, I could.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know you could, but do you think you will have a chance?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Now, Mr. Chairman, if there are no further questions from any members of the Committee with reference to any phase of this bill, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Is there anything in here about continuing pilot training in the Navy?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, yes. All of this is under the heading of "Aviation facilities." It is for the establishment of naval air-station facilities; the primary training; the intermediate training; the operations training.

Mr. STEFAN. That is what I am particularly interested in. I was wondering if the gentleman could enlighten us on what the Navy is planning to do. Do you plan to expand some of these naval training stations?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is just exactly what the $25,000,000 is for.

Mr. STEFAN. We have some in the Middle West. They are very, very successful. Is there any of that for the stations in the Middle West?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I will tell you where they are.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am interested in the question asked by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] for this reason: We do not have a single naval training establishment in the State of Missouri. Some of our local people down there near the city of Cape Girardeau built with private money, a fine establishment, and they are ready to train those boys. They tell us that the program is being curtailed and they cannot furnish trainees for this institution which has been built by private capital. Here it is. "Come and get it Uncle Sam," and they say "We cannot take it."

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I can only say that I hope they utilize all of these without going to the Treasury and getting more money to expand some that are already in existence.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I would like to know if this takes care of these stations.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I do not know that particular case the gentleman has referred to. I will read it to the Committee in a minute.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Several Members have asked me since the discussion on this bill began whether or not there is a break-down of the items. I understand the gentleman is placing that in the RECORD.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No. The reason we do not place it in the RECORD is this, and the reason why we do not give it out is due to this fact: the war conditions may change tomorrow and some of these places will not be built. We do not do it because the Member would have sent word out to his district that there was going to be a naval expansion costing so many hundreds of thousands of dollars, yet after a resurvey with the war situation shifting backward and forward they might conclude not to built it, in which case the Member of Congress would be in a right delicate situation. So it was decided for that reason only not to give the information. I have no hesitancy however in giving it and will be glad to give it to the Committee now.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In other words, if a Member of Congress would like to look at the break-down he can go to the Committee on Naval Affairs and they would be glad to give it to him.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The distinguished chairman is really an expert on these various programs. Does he think it is wise economy on the part of our Government to go out and solicit private capital to build and expand facilities for the training of these men and then for the Government to come along and say they are reducing the program and cannot avail themselves of the facilities?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from Missouri that it is not in the interest of economy and that it should not be done. If the particular place to which the gentleman has reference can be utilized it should be utilized and some of the others not expanded.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. In just a moment. I want to finish with this matter first.

In the expenditure of the $4,000,000 it is going to be necessary to locate for fleet facilities some bases either on the west coast, the Gulf coast, or the east coast. They have not been determined. If anyone wants to take that up I suggest that they do so with the Office of Naval Operations in the Navy Department.

Mr. STEFAN. Now, how about the places in the Middle West?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. $27,000,000 is planned to be expended for aviation facilities broken down in this way: In the North Atlantic area in Brunswick, Me., Squantum, Mass., Quonset Point, Charlestown, R. I., Martha's Vineyard; in the Middle Atlantic area at Lakehurst, Norfolk, and Cherry Point. In the South Atlantic area at Key West, Fla. On the West Coast at San Diego, Alameda, Santa Barbara, Seattle, Mojave, and Astoria. In the naval air primary training, facilities will be established at New Orleans, Dallas, Norman, Memphis, St. Louis, Hutchinson, Bunker Hill, Chicago, and Minneapolis.

Mr. STEFAN. Is that all of them?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, no; there is no use putting all of these in the RECORD.

Mr. STEFAN. Are there any in there for Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma—the Middle West?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I will turn this document over to the gentleman to let him look at it for himself.

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman will yield further, what I am interested in and what I know the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] is interested in is whether or not aid will be extended to these institutions that have expended so much money in creating facilities and in adjusting their courses to meet this training program.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. These should be utilized; we all agree with that; but it may not be possible to use all of them and they may not be able to utilize right now, all the airfields established under the civil aeronautics program, with the community furnishing the ground and the Government appropriating the money to build the airfields. The Navy gives careful consideration to each and every site available as to whether it is suitable for naval use.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, many communities built the buildings and furnished everything.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Some of them. We are taking them over day after day whenever the military needs justify it. Unless, however, there is some military need to justify it we should not establish in your district, my district, or anybody else's district any activity just because there are certain facilities there which were built by another agency when the overhead cost of operating it is way out of proportion.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am as much interested in economy and efficiency as is the gentleman from Georgia; but here are facilities available, and for the sake

of economy, if facilities are available why expand others that are not now adequate?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. For the simple reason that they are already in existence. As I said, not a single new field is being established. The authorities are trying to utilize those fields that Civil Aeronautics has built wherever they can be utilized.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman will certainly agree that if an existing facility is 90 percent completed it would be good economy to utilize it rather than to build another one to take its place.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We are not building any new ones; we are merely expanding those already in existence.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another observation?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. My information is that they are building some large plants; in other words going out and building a large plant to take care of a great number of these boys, and for that reason they are taking them out of these local establishments and centralizing them in these large plants which they are expanding and building.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That may happen in certain places on account of the overhead cost. You could see it would be in the interest of economy to concentrate instead of having a half dozen different small establishments, each with an overhead attached to it.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. For example, this plant I am talking about is located under the dome of one of the finest colleges in our State where they can be given every facility.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I do not think the gentleman need worry about that. They are not cutting down the college program.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Yet they are denying these people the necessary trainees to carry on.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I notice in the gentleman's bill certain facilities are to be expanded on a permanent basis. That evidently contemplates a post-war operation of such bases?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No. There is nothing in here that deals with the post-war Navy requirements. After the war it might be that a great many of these bases can be used and a great many of them will not be used; but the bill is not predicated upon post-war operations at all. It is predicated upon the needs and the necessities now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, no one seems to be opposed to this bill. Some of us might feel better satisfied if the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs and the members of that committee had charge of the carrying out of the program, and I refer not to what should be acquired or constructed or used but to the way in which the money might be spent. If the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] was Secretary of the Navy and his committee had control of the expenditures for the Navy not a Member of the House would worry.

This bill will call for $235,000,000, with an additional $60,000, which is a comparatively small sum. However, that amount would buy perhaps one-third, maybe one-half, more if the money were judiciously spent.

I have read some of the testimony taken before the subcommittee of the Committee on Naval Affairs which investigated this Brewster contract. I heard the head of the union which has the power to prevent the discharge of any man or woman testify. I heard him testify that unless the planes that were being built in that factory, and the Government has some sixty-odd million dollars invested over there with orders for $139,000,000, I heard him testify, I repeat, that unless those planes could be built under the union's interpretation of the contract with the company they would not be built at all. That is just one incident in a long series which establishes the fact that unless some of these union politicians and racketeers can have their way with the expenditure of Government money they will not support the effort of the fighting men by first creating and then taking over to them in the front lines the things which those fighting men must have if they are to survive.

Do you get the import of that? There is a man over on the fighting front. He needs a gun, or a barge is needed to land reinforcements, but as a union man I say, "You will not get it unless the employer complies with our demands as to the manner in which, the time when it shall be made, and the amount we demand be paid for it." Do you get that? That is what is being done all over this country.

Yesterday our Speaker, and we all respect him, made a wonderful talk here; called attention to dangerous trends. It was a wonderful plea for unity. Whether it was directed to the public and to the Members of the House as a whole or more especially to the members of his own party who are in revolt against the New Deal I do not know. All may well give it thoughtful consideration. Let me say now that there is no more dangerous trend in this country, there is no more dangerous situation in this country than that which exists today where men on the production and supply lines say, as they have said, as they are saying day after day, "You will not get this gun, you will not get this shell, unless you agree to our demands."

IS THIS COOPERATION WITH THE MEN ON THE BATTLE FRONTS?

It is long past time when the administration, having failed, Congress should assume the burden of seeing that the taxpayer's dollar is economically and efficiently spent. It is time that Congress set the War Labor Board on the right track, put an end to its and the administration's coddling of certain union labor politicians; to the policy of extending to them special favors in return for political support.

Recent hearings before the Smith committee have disclosed a situation, the effect of which is a destruction of property rights, of personal rights, in utter disregard of constitutional safeguards. That, at least, is my opinion.

Because the hearings are still continuing no reference will be made to the facts disclosed, but the conclusions given above are substantiated by the reports in the daily newspapers.

Yesterday from the city of Holland, Mich., came the following telegram:

HOLLAND, MICH., *December 7, 1943.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The men of the Holland Motor Express Co. and the Rooks Transfer Lines, Inc., of this city, went on strike Monday, December 6. This will tie up all of our war industries and many of them will have to shut down unless they can get immediate relief.

The issue is mileage between Muskegon and Chicago. AAA says the companies are right in their contention. Feinsinger, of the War Labor Board 1 trucking panel, concedes this fact. But on account of the companies making a temporary concession some time ago, due to the demands of the union Feinsinger decided that the companies must make this temporary concession permanent, because the companies had not consulted the War Labor Board in the matter at the time they made this temporary concession. In view of the fact that the AAA has at two different times checked up on the distance between Muskegon and Chicago, and both times their figures agree with the mileage that the companies are paying now, and that this man Feinsinger concedes the correctness of the findings of the AAA, both these companies are determined not to deviate from the original agreement made with the union, and are ready to close up shop and go out of business. Can you be of any assistance?

Respectfully yours,

HOLLAND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
E. P. STEPHEN, *Secretary-Manager.*

In reply to my inquiry, this morning I received a telegram which states that the American Automobile Association, after two check-ups, gives the mileage between Muskegon, Mich., and Chicago, Ill., as 178 9/10 miles.

The union which went on strike in Holland, Mich., on Monday, December 6, and which will close plants engaged in war production, unless material flows freely, states that the distance is 183 miles.

Sometime ago the companies involved made a temporary concession and paid union men on the basis of 183 miles. Now a Mr. Feinsinger, the War Labor Board representative, holds that because of this temporary agreement between the companies and the union, which was made without the knowledge or consent of the War Labor Board, the companies must now pay the union on the basis of 183 miles, although the actual distance is no more than 179.

The purpose of the union is to have the mileage fixed at a figure over 180 miles for then the companies would have to pay on an 8-hour basis instead of a 6-hour basis. That makes a difference

of $1.11 per trip each way and means something like $15,000 or $20,000 per year additional wage cost for the companies, which inevitably will be passed on to the Government and added to the cost of munitions program.

What shall be said of the men who at home live in a peaceful community, presumably sleeping in comfortable beds, and enjoying three meals per day, refuse to aid in producing materials of war needed by the men who are on the fighting front, because they are not paid $1.11 per day—$1.11 which they do not earn, for which they do not render any service and which in part must be paid by the returning soldiers.

The War Labor Board takes the position that inasmuch as Congress authorized it to settle labor disputes involving war production, that even though Congress requires that those disputes be settled without disregarding the provisions of the N. L. R. A., it still has absolute authority to make any order which it thinks necessary in order to settle a dispute. To illustrate, if these men on strike demanded that they be paid $5 or $10 additional per day as a condition precedent to working in a munitions factory, the Board or the Regional Director, Mr. Feinsinger, might order the company to make payment. That the A. F. of L. intends to have its way is shown by a telegram just received, which reads as follows:

HOLLAND, MICH.,
December 9, 1943.

Employees of the striking companies have been ordered by the A. F. of L. to keep away from the property of the companies and if anyone of them are found talking to the managers of the companies they will be fined $100.

E. P. STEPHAN,
Secretary, Chamber of Commerce.

It is time that Congress passed a bill, similar to the one I introduced sometime ago, providing that when men engaged in war production refuse to work in war production, they automatically, regardless of age or physical condition, be inducted into the Army, at Army pay and by the commanding officer of the district in which they live, be assigned to a job deemed by the commanding officer as essential to the war production at soldier's pay.

The policy of appeasement, of extending special privileges in return for political support should be ended.

When men on the supply line, because they do not receive $1.11 for work which they did not perform, refuse to keep flowing the shells, the fighting tools needed by the men on the fighting line, it is time for all Americans to stop, think, and then act.

Mr. Chairman, if that was the only instance we might pass it by, but that is typical of the whole set-up. When you go to spending $235,000,000 you are not going to get $235,000,000 worth of results if that procedure continues.

Here is a clipping taken from either last night's paper or this morning's paper in connection with a hearing before the Committee on Military Affairs. A Burlington, N. C., firm had $63,000,000 of United States contracts and they spent $30,000,000 to get one plane. That is the report of the investigator of that committee. The report states they borrowed 50 skilled workers from an East St. Louis firm to which they paid $48 a man per day for their services.

Here is another letter from a paper company up in my district. I have had this up before. They are engaged in making paper cartons for ration boxes, for shell containers, and similar articles. They are compelled to slow down and on some days to close down. Why? Because they cannot get waste paper. Why can they not get waste paper? Because of the black-market operators in Chicago. How do I know that? The O. P. A. writes me a letter and they tell me over the phone, the O. P. A. tells me that the black-market operators are doing business, that the O. P. A. is after them. This came up first way back last April, and this is December.

This company, as just stated, wanted this waste paper to make cartons for shells and ration boxes for the boys in the service. They cannot get it because a bunch of crooks in Chicago are operating a black market on waste paper. When I got the O. P. A. run into its hole, it said, "We have had it up before the grand jury in Chicago," and they did. Our company furnished them with evidence, and the O. P. A. said, "Well, these men have been indicted, but the indictment is being held up by the United States attorney in Chicago." Their phrase was, "He is sitting on it." The United States district attorney is charged by the O. P. A. with sitting on an indictment which would end the practices of black-market operatives on the waste-paper market which prevent the manufacture of boxes that the boys need to carry their food in. Can you conceive of any worse situation? Yet there it is.

The Speaker of the House can talk about dangerous trends. I am telling you there are many of them, many of them. The administration's habit of coddling Lewis and labor politicians is one of the most dangerous trends. The new Member who came in this morning from a Kentucky district normally Democratic does not happen to be a dangerous trend. It happens to be one which points the way toward—what do you call it?—a revival of American spirit and American principles. I hope the apparent trend toward repentance is real, lasting, and sincere.

I will talk about other dangerous trends in a few days. There are many of them. But most of them will, if the change shown in recent elections continues, be nipped in the bud.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to establish or develop the following naval shore activities by the construction of such temporary or permanent public works as he may consider necessary, including buildings, facilities, accessories, and services, with which shall be included the authority to acquire the necessary land, and to continue or complete the construction of any project heretofore authorized or undertaken, which projects have been specifically approved by the Secretary of the Navy, with approximate costs as indicated: Fleet facilities, $4,000,000; aviation facilities, $25,000,000; storage facilities, $20,000,000; ordnance facilities, $60,000,000; personnel training and housing facilities, $81,200,000; shore radio facilities, $5,000,000; Naval Research Laboratory, $800,000; miscellaneous structures $4,000,000: *Provided*, That the approximate cost indicated for each of the classes of projects enumerated above may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be varied upward or downward, but the total cost shall not exceed $200,000,000: *Provided further*, That prior to the acquisition, by lease or otherwise, of any land under authority of this act, the Secretary of the Navy shall report to the Senate and House Naval Affairs Committees all such prospective acquisitions.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "$25,000,000" and insert "$27,000,000."

Line 4, strike out "$60,000,000" and insert "$72,000,000."

Line 5, strike out "$81,200,000" and insert "$92,260,000."

Line 8, strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$14,000,000."

Line 12, strike out "$200,000,000" and insert "$235,060,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purpose of this act.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GOSSETT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3741) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, and with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. MAGNUSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

SOLDIERS' ABSENTEE VOTING BILL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, there is so much misleading criticism and misleading propaganda being spread concerning the soldiers' absentee voting bill, which I am supporting, and which passed the Senate last week, that I am going to urge every Member of the House to get a copy of it and read it carefully between now and Monday. You will see that it provides a constitutional way for the men in our armed forces to vote, and leaves the election machinery in the hands of the States, where it belongs.

Of course, it is opposed by PM, the uptown edition of the Communist Daily Worker, which is often referred to as the worst enemy the Jewish people of this country ever had. You often hear it said that PM and Walter Winchell are doing more to stir up anti-Semitism in this country than any other paper or broadcaster ever known. They continue to malign Members of Congress, both House and Senate, and to misrepresent them about this measure.

As a result, I am getting a flood of correspondence from New York about this measure. Some of it is most offensive, and even filthy; and all of it shows gross ignorance of, or disregard for, the facts. Most of it seems to be the result of advertisements which PM has been running, calling on its readers to write members of this committee against this bill.

This measure provides the only way for the soldiers and sailors and members of the Marine Corps to vote legally by absentee ballots. Every State in the Union is now ready to cooperate to the fullest extent. This bill provides for aid of the War and Navy Departments in getting these ballots to the men in the service and getting them back, and giving them free air-mail services going and coming. Anyone who opposes the passage of this measure is simply opposing the only method for enabling these men in our armed forces to vote at all.

A few days ago I inserted a list of the names of people who had written me opposing this bill the day before. Because of their names, the Communist paper, PM, which, as I said, is doing the Jewish people more harm than any other publication in America, came out and accused me of anti-Semitism.

For that reason I am inserting the names and addresses of the ones who wrote me the next day. Many of their letters are duplicates. These people have simply been misled, or else they have no regard for our American form of constitutional government.

Here are the names and addresses of the ones who wrote me on December 8 in opposition to this bill:

B. Marcein, Bronx; E. S. Blamc, H. M. Reuben, Aaron L. Rochman, J. M. Grohol, New York City; Florence Freidman, Newark, N. J.; Mrs. Ray Grodon, A. S. Rothschild, N. R. Scheutz, Ruth Scheutz, New York City; Jeanette Weiser, Bronx; A. Gottsman, Army; Helen Smenka, Brooklyn; Fannie W. Halpern, Forest Hills; Harold Weiss and family, Bernard Lerner, Brooklyn; Mark K. Daniel, Anna Harkavey, New York City; Miriam Groden, Washington, D. C.; Florence Mansowitz, Mrs. L. Flatow, Mr. Heran, Brooklyn; Ruth Nash, New York City; Max L. Diamond, Long Island City; Mr. and Mrs. B. Sedan, Jacqueline Warshauer, New York City; Mary Tiner, Brooklyn; Don Luger, Coast Guard; Sophie M. Blinken, John T. Hamer, Doris J. Dirnfield, M. L. White, New York City; Dorothy K. Funn, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. I. D. Kapnik, Brooklyn; Harry Davis, Bristol, Pa.; Hilda P. Sharin, Forest Hills, N. Y.; Harry Schenkman, Charles Kondla, Brooklyn; Florence Wishlow, Far Rockaway, N. Y.; Anita Hoecker, Jersey City, N. J.; Charity Melcher, Chambersburg, Pa.; Mrs. Mortimer Salinger, New York City; Georgiana Sheldon, Brooklyn; Mr. and Mrs. E. S. Munger, Saugatuck, Conn.; Harry Menkin, Brooklyn; Harold Marley, Lawrence, Mass.; Gertrude I. Weintraub, Brooklyn; Sgt. L. Roemer, Washington, D. C.; Otto R. Dempewolf, Brooklyn; Alice Belkin, New Haven; Maude Brenner, Washington, D. C.; Elias Kogan, Florence Maier, Brooklyn; Stanley Gole, Yonkers; Oliver C. Drake, Ramsey, N. J.; R. B. Lange, Philadelphia, Pa.; R. E. Schneider, New York City; M. Cogan and family, Sam Beckman, Beatrice Golub, Brooklyn; Alex Smith, Gertrude Rosenthal, Mr. and Mrs. Harold Stern, New York City; Mrs. Rebecca Crouch, Mrs. Schneider, Brooklyn; Rose L. Durst, New York City; E. Snyder, Brooklyn; Frank Scharnberger, St. Louis; Miss E. Weinstock, Brooklyn; Rita J. Kane, unknown; Evely- R. Mehlman, New York City; Laura Wog, Brooklyn; Lillian Valinsky, Bronx; Isabelle Stone, Seton Eversley, New York City; Mr. and Mrs. Sanchez, Bronx; Abraham Neustadter, Army; Minna C. Gabriel, Albert Sharbart, A. Ramirez, Helen Lishner, Brooklyn; G. D. Yeager, Pittsburgh; Marguerite Wiznia, Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by the Polish Premier on the Teheran Agreement, that was released through the Polish telegraph agency of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a report on the Year of Victory by Admiral William F. Halsey, distributed by the Associated Press.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MEMBERS TO ATTEND FUNERAL OF THE LATE LAWRENCE LEWIS

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as Members to attend the funeral of Mr. Lawrence Lewis, the following Members of the House: Messrs. CHENOWETH, ROCKWELL, DELANEY, and BROWN of Ohio.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 378) which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That ROBERT F. ROCKWELL, of the State of Colorado be, and he is hereby, elected to the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on the Public Lands.

The resolution was agreed to.

WILLIAM A. PIXLEY

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I ask unanimous consent that House Resolution 194, a private claim, be rereferred from the Committee on Accounts to the Committee on Claims.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARLESS of Arizona). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request for the time being.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to take a back seat for anyone in my anxiety, and in my daily prayers for a united effort, that the war might be successfully concluded at the earliest possible date, and that the men and women in the armed services whose lives are spared may return to their loved ones and this wonderful country of ours. But I also pray that we may have unity of purpose in our faith in our Constitution and our representative form of government.

The dictionary defines "unity" as follows: "State of being one; harmony; accord; continuity without deviation or change, as in purpose or action."

Unity, to me, does not mean making myself subservient to, or standing idly by and letting any individual or group undermine our Government, for which so many brave men have sacrificed their lives.

Yes, Mr. Speaker; I have always stood, I stand now, and I will always stand for a unity built upon the principles set forth in the Constitution of the United States.

I do not believe in a false unity as professed by the Nazis, Fascists, Communists, and their fellow travelers in this country. Let us not forget it was the Communists who did everything they

could think of to hinder the strengthening of the national defense of our Army and Navy, by sabotaging the defense industries in the United States until June 21, 1941. This may be only a temporary unity.

These Communists and fellow travelers, who are employed in many agencies of our Government, and whose every purpose and ideas are inimical to our form of government, should be removed from the Federal pay rolls and removed at once. However, the root of this evil lies in the department or agency of the Government that approves the appointment of these crackpots.

No greater warning could be given the American people today than that given by Jesus Christ in the closing sentences of His Sermon on the Mount, when He admonished the people, as reported by Matthew, chapter 7, verse 15. I quote:

> Beware of false prophets which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves.

America is at the cross roads. Warning signals are out. We may shortly find ourselves in the midst of the wreckage of what was once the world's greatest republic. We may find in its place, a Marxist, totalitarian dictatorship. Liberty, freedom, and justice will have perished. The world's greatest bloodless revolution will have taken place, because the people either did not care, or they were so mentally lazy they had no desire to find out, or so blindly followed one man for political reasons, as the people of their country are being led step by step to the ruination of our republican form of government.

Mr. Speaker, there is a giant conspiracy going on in this country, spearheaded by the Communist Party of America, to overthrow our Government by infiltrating their members and fellow-travelers into the various departments and agencies of our Government. The technique is: After one of the followers of Karl Marx obtains a position in a key department, they do everything possible to establish a working nucleus by getting not only additional party members within that agency, but others who show signs of being gullible to their influences and machinations.

One of their most frequently used methods is to frame a fellow employee who is a nonbeliever in their theories, whereby he loses his job, thus creating a vacancy into which one of their believers can be placed.

While it is highly desirable to eliminate every single subversive from the Federal pay roll, this does not cure the situation, because in most cases this individual is only one of a group. In addition, this individual is more than likely to turn up in some other department of the Government.

What is so pitiful is, there seems to be no concern among those in high places in the administrative branch of our Government, to as much as raise a finger to bring about a remedy of this alarming situation, but on the contrary these elements are defended and protected.

Today I am talking about this situation as it relates to the Office of War Information. This is the propaganda agency of our Government, which officially presents our views to the world, and was set up under Executive order by our President. I fully appreciate and understand the value of propaganda, as one of the most potent factors in psychological warfare. But I believe it should be administered strictly from an American point of view, and not to promote an ideology foreign to our Constitution and our American way of life.

Mr. Speaker, on November 4, 1943, when the House had under consideration the request for a deficiency appropriation of $5,000,000 for the Office of War Information, I introduced House Resolution 344, which authorizes the creation of a special committee, designed to carry through a thorough investigation of the Office of War Information, for the purpose of eliminating these dangerous elements in the personnel of that agency.

It is my sincere belief, from information which I have, that a thorough investigation of the Office of War Information will, among other things, disclose the following facts:

First. The Office of War Information maintains in New York, their Foreign Languages Division, from which short-wave overseas broadcasts by radio are made to foreign countries. An investigation will verify the fact that the personnel in these offices is overloaded and topheavy with aliens, Communists, and fellow-travelers who subscribe to an ideology that is inimical to our form of Government, and the avowed purpose of which is to destroy it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Along the line that the gentleman has been suggesting as to the technique which they have employed to entrench themselves in the Government, you might go further and say they have also attempted to smear individual Members of Congress and the Congress itself as a body and to destroy the faith of the American people in their form of government.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman from Michigan is absolutely correct.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman from Illinois is making a real contribution to Americanism in exposing subversive influences within our Government.

Mr. BUSBEY. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his complimentary remarks.

Second. The men in charge of obtaining the personnel for the Foreign Languages Division of O. W. I., have utterly disregarded the possibility of employing people of foreign extraction who have lived in this country for many years, are capable and well qualified for this work, and whose patriotism is beyond reproach.

Third. Aliens have been employed, notwithstanding the fact that it is absolutely impossible to check and investigate their background.

Fourth. Application forms prepared by the Civil Service Commission are not of a nature that require aliens to disclose sufficient information regarding their past history.

Fifth. The morale of patriotic employees is extremely low, due to the policy pursued by certain individuals who are charged with the responsibilty of carrying out the policy of the O. W. I. This policy has caused certain employees to resign and seek employment elsewhere. With this thought in mind, I could not help but wonder what prompted four key men to resign from the London office of O. W. I., as reported in last night's edition of the Washington News.

Sixth. The salaries paid many employees are far above what the majority of these employees ever made before in their lives, and probably more than they will ever make again.

Seventh. Even after various subversives have been removed from the pay roll of O. W. I., these subversives are allowed to return and visit with their friends in the offices of O. W. I. This practice should be stopped.

Eighth. Attempts on the part of officials in O. W. I. have been made to retain employees on the pay roll, even after their subversive activities were known.

Ninth. There are many people holding jobs in the Office of War Information with civil-service ratings, when they could not possibly pass the civil-service examinations for which they are graded.

Tenth. Undesirable employees are retained on the pay roll and cannot be discharged, because a final investigation report and findings are not made by the Civil Service Commission within 1 year.

Eleventh. The recorded salaries of employees, as listed in the hearings of the Appropriations Committee of the House, does not reflect the true situation. This only indicates the annual salaries at which the employees are carried on the roll, and does not account for overtime pay, which in many cases amounts to a considerable sum. I therefore suggest that the Appropriations Committee call for a list of salaries actually paid, rather than salaries at which these employees are carried on the books.

Twelfth. The offices of O. W. I. have not only been used to propagandize the public in behalf of the policies of the New Deal, but their broadcasts to foreign countries do not reflect the true sentiments and philosophies of the overwhelming majority of the American people, and I doubt the Department of State.

Thirteenth. Propaganda favorable to the cause of communism has been injected into foreign broadcasts.

Fourteenth. The O. W. I. broadcasts have emphasized on certain occasions, the second front, which does not coincide with the strategy and policy up until now of those charged with the responsibility of carrying on the war.

Fifteenth. The Appropriations Committee is not in a position to accurately advise the Congress on the activities of O. W. I., due to the lack of an investigating staff for this work. As a consequence, many activities of O. W. I. which

should be made known to Congress are not, because the officials of O. W. I. are more concerned with keeping information from Congress rather than exposing their skeletons in the closet. Therefore I say in all seriousness, the only way Congress will ever know the true facts is to authorize the creation of a special committee to investigate the whole situation.

Several more items should be added to this list, all of which should be thoroughly aired and investigated. While I question seriously whether the establishment of the Office of War Information was wise, nevertheless at this stage of the war it should probably not be abolished. I do believe, however, that the Congress of the United States should make a determined attempt to clean house in this agency, and without delay get rid of all the undesirable subversives on the pay rolls.

It is agreed that propaganda has its place in our present-day warfare. But if the officials of the O. W. I., our propaganda agency, will not heed the advice of the Congress regarding this housecleaning job, it would be far better if the agency be completely eliminated, and the State, War, and Navy Departments take over the propaganda job, rather than have it continue along the line it is operating at present.

This situation should not be considered as a party proposition in the least, for we are all equally concerned. I am sure the Members on both sides of the aisle who put country above party, are anxious to know the full, true facts regarding this agency, in order to determine what should be done in the best interests of our country. There is absolutely no other way to ascertain these facts than by a thorough, complete investigation of the entire agency.

Judging from the hundreds of letters coming to my office, evidently I do not stand alone in my ideas regarding this subject matter; but it would not make a particle of difference. My convictions in this matter are firm and resolute.

I refuse to waver in this fight that I believe to be patriotic and righteous, and I ask all patriotic lovers of freedom and liberty to join with me in this fight for God and country.

I trust the Rules Committee will report favorably at an early date my resolution authorizing a special committee to make this investigation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include an editorial from the Chicago Daily News.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Tuesday, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk, and special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 35 minutes on the subject of military highways.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE SMELL OF OIL

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, when, on the floor of this House in April of 1942, I declared "oil is going to play a very prominent part in this war," I did not go far enough.

I should have said "oil is going to decide this war."

Had I known then what I know now, I could have added that the production of this vital oil was going to be so manipulated that the big producers would drive every independent in the oil industry out of business.

That is absolutely the tragic situation we are approaching.

THE DILEMMA OF THE INDEPENDENT IN THE OIL INDUSTRY

Unless the present trend, the present manipulations, are halted the independent is going to be the forgotten man. Forgotten, that is, unless some historian reminds the coming generations that this same man was responsible for the discovery of more than 75 percent of our Nation's known oil fields—that this same daring enterpriser, the person who risked his own capital to give us a petroleum-propelled economy for half a century, was finally ground out of existence by the greed and avariciousness of the major oil companies.

ELKINS ACT CASES

I was first aroused over this oil matter after I made a thorough study of the suits known in the Department of Justice as the Elkins Act cases.

To go back for a moment:

On April 8, 1938, there was filed with the Attorney General of the United States a complaint alleging violation of the rebate sections of the Elkins Act by the common carrier pipe lines.

The act, as you well know, is most stringent in its provisions forbidding the giving, granting, accepting, or receiving rebates by any means or device whatsoever in connection with the shipment of oil via pipe lines.

It will be recalled that the immense growth of the Standard Oil Trust was due almost entirely to rebate manipulation. In those days it was a rebate from the railroads. The suits I speak of had to do with pipe lines, but the same principles—or should I say lack of principles?—are involved.

Preparation of the suits began.

REBATES ON SHIPMENT OF OIL VIA PIPE LINES

They were against three great companies—namely, the Standard Oil of Indiana, Phillips Pipe Line Co., and Great Lakes Pipe Line Co.

Almost immediately there were disturbing rumors heard. Knowing sources predicted that the cases would never go to trial but would be settled by consent decree.

When advised of this, Attorney General Biddle wrote in a letter:

> It is the intention of Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold to submit any plan which may be suggested for the settlement of this litigation to the proper congressional committee for its consideration before the Department officially accepts the plan.

That was the promise of the Department of Justice.

Knowing of the promise, I felt better about the entire matter.

It appeared that these great concerns, despite their millions upon millions of dollars, were to be treated like any other person or corporation; that there was not one law for them, another for you and me.

But what happened?

You know the history as well as I do.

No proposed settlement was ever submitted to a committee of Congress.

CASES MYSTERIOUSLY SETTLED WITHOUT TRIAL

Cases which, had they gone to trial, might very well have resulted in penalties aggregating $3,000,000,000 were settled overnight.

And I mean overnight—settled in 24 hours.

Overnight not only 3 companies arranged settlements, but 18 others jumped aboard the benevolent bank wagon—engineered by whom? The major oil companies? The Department of Justice?

The answer remains as much a mystery today as it did then.

Judge Pine, the Federal district judge before whom the consent decree was taken, upon grasping the import of the documents, was heard to remark: "Ah, the Christmas spirit I perceive." That was December 1941.

PARTIALITY TO THE OIL MONOPOLY

As we near another Christmas 2 years later the same spirit of favoritism for the major oil companies continues.

Big red apples in the form of special treatment go to the majors; to the independents, ashes.

How long are we in Congress going to allow this Santa Claus spirit to continue? How much longer are our people going to remain complacent?

We have all—every one of us—witnessed this special treatment for the major oil companies.

Our constituents have complained about it.

Some of our more courageous Federal officers have called it to our attention.

And our own congressional committees have reported to us on it.

Still nothing happens.

WHEN WILL CONGRESS ROUSE ITSELF

Still, it appears, the major oil companies remain greater than the people—more powerful than our own Federal officers—and, they practically sneer at a congressional committee's report.

Two years ago Members of Congress were circularized with a then almost unbelievable document entitled "Basic Objectives."

Under the cloak of war the capture of the oil industry was being planned.

Look it up in your files. I have my copy here before me. Let me read the way and means which were planned to attain the major oil company Basic Objectives."

BASIC OBJECTIVES

Even if no legislation be passed specifically aimed to bring about the necessary national adjustment and coordination of the oil industry—

Let me call your attention to their clever choice of words. I continue—

there are at hand ways and means whereby the Federal Government could bring about most, if not all of such coordination. Were the President to create and appoint a national defense coordinator for oil and a joint Government-industry board to assist and advise—

Get that "assist and advise"—

the coordinator, the vast majority of the individual units in the oil industry—

That vast majority of individual units they speak about is just another way of saying the independents—

would find themselves in no position to decline to comply voluntarily with the requests of the coordinator—

The coordinator who is to get his assistance and advice from the board. I continue—

and the board.

The board, of course being the joint Government-industry committee—

The natural disinclination—

I am again reading from the Basic Objectives—

to oppose in any way the national defense program—

Here the package is wrapped in the folds of the flag—

coupled with fear of drastic Federal legislation, would be quite sufficient to cause compliance in almost all cases.

Should these pressures be not quite enough, Basic Objectives cleverly suggested the use of priority control of needed materials, the commandeering of transportation facilities and blacklisting of any alleged offenders of the proposal to coordinate.

INDEPENDENTS FACING EXTINCTION

Since the advent of this plan we have seen many of the independents coordinated right out of business.

Under our respective noses we have had our powers, the powers of Congress, coordinated to and by the Petroleum Administrator for War.

And, the Coordinator, or Petroleum Administrator for War, is being advised.

The Board, let me assure you, has taken on a very warlike—a very patriotic sounding name.

The Board—is no simple sounding committee—the Board, the advisers, call themselves the Petroleum Industry War Council.

Now, this Petroleum Industry War Council, by the fine sound of its name, you would think, was engaged primarily in warring on Hitler and Hirohito. You would think that.

It is my belief it would be more aptly named if it were called the Petroleum Industry Council of Major Oil Co. Executives Concerned With Making War on the Independents.

Why do I suggest that name?

PETROLEUM INDUSTRY WAR COUNCIL A CREATURE OF THE MAJORS

Well, get a copy of the roster of its officials. It is a blue book of major oil company executives.

And, let me remind you, this Board advises, if you please, with one Ralph K. Davies, who is still drawing his magnificent salary as vice president and director of the Standard Oil Co. of California. Mr. Davies is the Assistant Petroleum Administrator for War. However, he is more often the Acting Director, Mr. Ickes' multiple duties being what they are.

Can you imagine this Board, composed largely of major oil-company officials, doing anything, advising anything, against the best interests of the major oil companies?

Can you imagine the acting Coordinator-Administrator, vice president of the California Standard Oil Co., agreeing to any suggestions or advice against the best interests of his powerful company?

It is but trying your patience when I make such a query, yet these are the conditions we face today in the oil industry.

None of us can plead ignorance.

As recently as October 5, of this very year, one of our most capable interim committees of the House Committee on Naval Affairs reported its findings.

WHAT COORDINATION MEANS

This report on the petroleum situation, written by the honorable chairman, L. MENDEL RIVERS; F. EDWARD HÉBERT; GEORGE J. BATES; and WILLIAM H. WHEAT, shows what all this coordination between the Board and the Coordinator is about.

It appears, from this able report, there is entirely too much coordination going on.

HOUSE COMMITTEE IS CRITICAL

The report states, and I read from it:

The Petroleum Administration for War was criticized by nearly every witness who appeared before the subcommittee for its bungling, its inexcusable delay in acting on applications for rights granted by regulations, its lack of a broad Nation-wide knowledge of the oil industry, and its favoritism to the large oil companies, whose employees predominantly man the Petroleum Administration for War—

The committee, searching honestly, diligently, for the facts, could hardly have come up with any other conclusion.

The report continues:

to assist him in regulating the petroleum industry, the Administrator has set up an innumerable number of committees in each of the five districts into which the country has been divided. Such committees are composed of industry members, most of whom are connected with major oil companies. These committees are entirely too numerous and much delay and confusion have been caused by their overlapping authority. Furthermore, it is the opinion of the subcommittee that these committees have been entrusted with too much power—

Power, I might interject, which Congress never intended they should have—

and they have been biased in their exercise of this power in favor of the major oil companies.

Thus—

The report continues—

there has been a discrimination against the weaker independent members of the industry.

And how did this discrimination come about?

The report gives the answer in plain, understandable English.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE INDEPENDENTS

The majors have been able to discriminate against the independents and favor the majors under the guise of furthering the war effort.

There you have it.

Basic objectives are no longer objectives—they are realities. The plan is in operation now.

The fine coordination of basic objectives has brought it into being.

And how?

Well, because of the war.

While you and I may be primarily concerned in winning the war it seems that a great segment of our oil tycoons want first to kill off the independents—Hitler and Hirohito can wait—even though it may cost the lives of a few hundred thousand young men, more or less, why get excited. Let us get rid of the independents—we can do it now—under the guise of furthering the war effort—tomorrow may be too late. "Tomorrow may be too late if the war ends too soon," is what they are really saying.

And—they are throwing it into the very teeth of every Member of Congress.

MAJORS ARE MAKING HAY

And we are taking it.

Taking it while the majors—under the guise of furthering the war program—make war on the independents and increase their hold on the oil empire of America.

The Standard Oil Co. of California, and its United States Navy deal for the exploitation of the Navy's great oil reserve out at Elk Hills in California, is another example—if another be needed.

THE LATEST ELK HILLS DEVELOPMENTS

Briefly, 1 year ago the United States Navy, which owns two-thirds of this great oil field, and the Standard Oil Co. of California, its neighbor, owning one-third of the field, agreed to go into business together.

But Navy, owning two-thirds or more of the field and with untouched oil reserves, gave to Standard, the one-third owner, complete control of the field.

When some of us, even though we hazarded the chance of being branded with deterring the war effort, questioned the merits of the arrangement, the Department of Justice again appeared in the oil picture.

This time, however, I am happy to report with results unlike the Elkins Act episode.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL LITTELL ENTERS THE SCENE

Norman M. Littell, Assistant Attorney General, and one of the most courageous men in Government service I have ever known, was, because of his position, called upon to give his opinion of the deal. This he did—honestly and fearlessly and without the coordination or suggestions or advice from any petroleum industry war council or board.

Mr. Littell did not even check with the Acting Petroleum Administrator for War, Ralph K. Davies, of the Standard Oil Co. of California, a party to the contract.

Handicapped though he may have been, his memorandum—which I am certain all Members of Congress have seen by this time—declared, simply: "The contract is illegal and void."

Handicapped, perhaps, because he was not controlled by the coordinative spirit, lacking perhaps, a Santa Claus perspective, Mr. Littell gave only his clear, concise legal opinion.

That was that the arrangement was "illegal and void."

The ink was hardly dry on his memorandum when the Standard Oil Co. officials bestirred themselves from their financial fox holes and the Navy trained their best legal brains and blasted salvos at the Assistant Attorney General.

Under the guise of furthering the war effort—here appeared easy prey—a pot shot—a sitter.

The Standard officials prated patriotism, while the Navy issued a 50-page tome of praise for the contract.

In response to my request for the names of the authors of the Navy's 50-page document of praise of their deal with the Standard Oil Co. of California, which was unsigned, Adlai E. Stevenson, special assistant to the Secretary of the Navy, has given me that information.

THE NAVY LAWYERS UPHOLD ELK HILLS CONTRACT

In his letter to me, in which he states the document was hurriedly prepared, he lists the names of nine individuals who assisted in its preparation.

Nine attorneys on the one side—only Mr. Littell defending the people's side.

From the past associations of these gentlemen — understand, I make no charge against their honesty, their sincerity or their ability—but from the record of their past experiences, as given me by the assistant to the Secretary of the Navy—it appears they all are of the "board member" type.

I give you their names:

Mr. Keith R. Kane, special assistant to the Secretary of the Navy and former member of the New York City law firm of Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft.

Mr. Warren J. Dale and Mr. David T. Searls, members of the Houston, Tex., law firm of Vinson, Elkins, Weems & Francis.

Lt. Carl McGowan, who in civilan life has been connected with the legal firms of Debevoise, Stevenson, Plimpton & Page, New York City, and Gardner, Carton & Douglas in Chicago.

Rear Admiral H. A. Stuart, director of the Navy's office of Naval Petroleum Reserves.

Commander Victor Wilhelm, in civilian life the chief petroleum engineer of the Texas Co. in California.

Commander Harry Stolz, member of the Los Angeles engineering firm of Stanley & Stolz. Both commanders are on Admiral Stuart's staff.

Research assistance, according to the Navy's letter to me, was given by Lt. Richard G. McClung, formerly associated with the New York City law firm of Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Gardiner & Reed, and John E. Shatford, president of the Shatford Trade & Transport Co. of El Dorado, Ark. Mr. Shatford, the letter states, is "a practical oil man of long experience" and he assisted them on the economic aspects of the oil industry.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Do I understand the gentleman is giving the names of the attorneys who drew up the first contract between Standard Oil and the Navy in regard to Elk Hills?

Mr. COFFEE. I am giving the names of the 9 distinguished lawyers who composed the 50-page tome in which they took issue with Mr. Norman Littell, Assistant Attorney General, who declared that the contract was illegal and void. The Navy came back with a 50-page brief in which it insisted the contract was valid and binding and was justifiable and meritorious.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to congratulate the gentleman on getting that information. I asked who drafted the Elk Hills contract with the Navy in a hearing before the Committee on Public Lands and I could not find out who had drafted that contract.

Mr. COFFEE. I thank the gentleman very much. I think the Committee on Public Lands has done a signal service in pointing the torchlight of publicity at this deal. We hope that an improvement will eventuate as a result of these investigations and that a new arrangement will be entered into whereby the Government will either own the entire field or operate it for itself and have complete control of the operation.

Note well that when the Navy wanted information on the economic aspects of the oil industry about a case in California they took the advice of a man from Arkansas—all, I suppose, in order to further the war effort.

NO INDEPENDENTS CONSULTED

Note well, according to the Navy's own record of these men, not a single person was a California independent oil operator.

What was the reason for this?

I will not presume to answer for the Navy.

However, I would like to know why when it came time—although they say they were rushed in the preparation of the memorandum—to delve into the economic aspects they went to Arkansas instead of California. Elk Hills after all is in California—not Arkansas.

Commander Victor Wilhelm, one of the consultants, is a Californian, a major oil company executive, a man who was the chief petroleum engineer of the Texas Co. in California.

The Texas Co. in California, I am told, works in complete harmony with the Standard Oil Co. of California. Furthermore they are partners in the development of certain oil fields in the Far East.

I can only venture the mildest form of a guess as to the reasons for the exclusion of a California independent oil operator in these hurried consultations and that is—they did not want any independent advice.

But, regardless of all the experts, the Littell opinion stands to this day.

NEW CONTRACT BEING ARRANGED

But, a new arrangement has been made.

A temporary agreement was entered into on September 8. It provides that a new, shall I say "contract," must be written within 90 days.

By the way, that agreement has just been temporarily renewed for another brief period until the committees of Congress can act on the whole proposition which has been thrown into our laps by the recent joint act of the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Navy, about which you may have read in the newspapers yesterday.

So, sometime along about the jolly, festive yuletide season, when our hearts are filled with love and charity for our fellow man, I imagine a new contract will be proclaimed, and with as little fanfare as possible.

I predict it will be a legal contract—a contract neither Mr. Littell nor any other attorney of equal ability may attack upon its legality or validity technically, no matter how much such attorneys may disapprove of the same as an expression of public policy.

I may even say it will be a coordinated contract, since all concerned will have been given ample opportunity to make it so.

However, I further predict that, though covered with legal verbiage, the gracious, generous sentiments of the Christmas spirit will be contained therein, and legally.

Standard Oil of California, I am certain, showing the usual disdain for Congress, will end up with the control of this vast oil reserve which belongs to all the people of the United States.

This, they will throw in our teeth.

Or perhaps the coordinators may, too, take unto themselves some of the spirit of Christmas and withhold the announcement of the new proposition until we are recessed; at home before our own yule log where the whole affair may be overlooked.

I wrote this speech before the latest development occurred a few days ago, in which the Secretary of the Navy brought up his proposition before the respective committees of Congress, Naval Affairs, and Naval Appropriations. I am hopeful and much more optimistic than at the time this speech was composed, that

Congress may have something to say, now, which will correct the sad situation yet obtaining with respect to Elk Hills.

Gentlemen, these are but a few of the fundamental facts which revolve about the entire oil picture.

The war is first to make war on the independents.

That is the reason we are in the serious position today.

STRANGLING THE OIL INDEPENDENTS

The independents are being strangled.

They have not had the opportunity to throw their full force into the oil battle—the battle to supply the vital petroleum products so necessary to defeat Hitler and Hirohito.

The enemy immediately in front of them is the major oil companies.

They cannot get at our military opponents until they can climb over the bodies of their opponents in their own industry—the major oil companies.

And, gentlemen, they are losing their battle with the majors. Under the guise of furthering the war effort—they cannot win.

In ordinary times they have been able to hold their heads above water.

The present battle is too great for them, just as it would be too great for any other group of American businessmen.

You gentlemen from the oil States know the details of the pattern better than I do. You can supply all the figures—the facts with which to paint the very, very dreary picture which confronts us.

The basic objectives of the major oil companies are here—they have been accomplished.

IN CALIFORNIA HEAVY PETROLEUM REQUIREMENTS ARE NOT BEING MET

In California, where I am somewhat familiar with conditions, since my State depends upon the oil fields of California for her petroleum products, conditions are growing continually worse.

There, in August, the demand for petroleum products reached 982,516 barrels daily.

Production was 138,226 barrels daily short of meeting requirements.

This demanded a withdrawal from storage supplies of 4,611,000 barrels.

The debit figures are mounting.

They are mounting because the independents have been prevented from going out and drilling wells in areas where they believe they are most certain to find additional sources of petroleum.

They have had to set aside their plans for drilling properties which are most probably producing areas.

They have been discouraged from bringing in new wells from these areas—new wells which would bring in new supplies of oil and add to the credit side of the ledger.

OIL PROSPECTING DISCOURAGED

Rather, they have been forced by the coordinators to go out on the wildest of wildcat ventures in their search for new supplies.

And since they sincerely want to further the war effort, they have done this.

In the first 9 months of 1943 the California operators, most of them independents, have completed 1,048 wells.

This figure is 115.6 percent above the figure for 1942.

But still production is too low.

And it will get lower.

The independents cannot be expected to invest their capital in losing ventures forever.

When they are coordinated into bankruptcy, that is the end; that is when the majors take over.

With our dwindling supplies, it may be the time for Hitler and Hirohito to take over.

THE EFFECT OF OIL ON THE WAR

Oil is going to decide this war.

To win that decision, we need every bit of oil we can draw from the ground. That means we need the all-out assistance of both the majors and the independents.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I believe the gentleman is making a very excellent statement. I know that the gentleman is very much concerned not only about the present war which we must win very largely with supplies of oil from the west coast, but also that there be available in storage underground, that can be withdrawn at some future time, sufficient oil for any further conflict that may occur in the Pacific some 25 or 50 years after this war.

Mr. COFFEE. Unquestionably. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. HINSHAW. Therefore, by withdrawing it at the present rate we are jeopardizing the future, not only of the west coast, but of the country. Nevertheless we do not protest the present withdrawals, even though they are exceedingly heavy considering the amount of oil in the ground.

Mr. COFFEE. We have full realization of the dangers in the future because of excessive withdrawals at the present time.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I shall be happy to yield to the able gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from Washington upon his presentation of the subject matter, which he is so thoroughly discussing. He has been in the fight for a long time, on behalf of the consumer and the independent against the monopolies in the oil industry. He has been giving the House today information of tremendous value, of which I hope my colleagues will take full heed.

Mr. COFFEE. I thank the gentleman for his gracious statement. He has, himself, been in the forefront of this crusade and has helped me tremendously on many occasions in bringing out the true facts and in revealing the machinations of the oil monopoly.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield.

Mr. OUTLAND. The gentleman from Washington is doing a good job. For years he has been performing admirably in the fight against monopoly, especially in the field of oil. I hope he will continue, undeterred and unafraid, regardless of pressures. There is no more important undertaking for all of us members of Congress than to array ourselves against the encroachments of monopolies in all of their various manifestations, particularly the most gigantic of all, the oil monopoly.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the helpful comments of the learned gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND]. During the time he has served in Congress, he has distinguished himself as a fearless champion of independent business, of the consumer, and of the plain citizen. He has everlastingly been on the side of the independent in the oil industry and has placed the welfare of his country always above the thought of profit for any select group.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I am pleased to yield to the able gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I have been listening to the enlightening speech you have been delivering and I compliment you upon the tone and content of your remarks. The information you have been presenting will arouse the country to the imperative need for prompt action by the Congress to end the control by monopoly of the oil industry. "It is time that Congress woke up to the dire prospect of world cartels controlling the business of the globe" and to the grim danger of all independents being snuffed out by the strangle hold of the oil monopoly and of similar monopolies in other fields. The gentleman from Washington has rendered a signal service to the Congress and to the country today, and on many previous occasions in his crusades to direct the salubrious light of publicity upon the maneuverings and machinations of the oil and other equally reprehensible monopolies.

Mr. COFFEE. It is inspiring to hear such encouraging words from a man of the high caliber of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], whose record in Congress has demonstrated his fearlessness and his forthright character in fighting always on the side of the independent businessman against monopoly and for fair play. The gentleman from California is a successful businessman in his own right, yet, understands the problem of the plain citizen and the humble of our land and believes in befriending the consumer and in resisting gigantic combines of every nature. I am pleased and proud to have this expression of support from the courageous statesman who has just taken his seat.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman has spoken very ably about the plight of the oil industry with particular reference to independents. First of all I want to congratulate the gentleman on his fine speech and his thorough knowledge of

the subject. I doubt that anyone in the House knows more about the oil business than the gentleman now speaking. I heard the gentleman, and I was very much interested in his statement, speak about the enemies of the independent oil industry. Would the gentleman venture an opinion in which governmental agencies those enemies are now working to destroy this independent industry?

Mr. COFFEE. First of all I want to thank the gentleman for his generous and gracious compliment and reciprocate by saying the gentleman from South Carolina has distinguished himself through the years by his knowledge of the problems, particularly with reference to the legal aspects, of the oil industry. I want to congratulate him for the great fight he has made for truth in the oil industry. In further reference to the query of the gentleman I would say that the major oil companies are thoroughly entrenched in bureaucratic agencies of Government. In the War Production Board there are dozens of dollar-a-year men, former executives, still drawing pay from the major oil companies who are in possession of power. They are in the office of the Petroleum Administrator for War, which is headed by Ralph K. Davies, who draws a salary of $47,500 from the Standard Oil Co. of California, while at the same time getting a salary from the taxpayers of $10,000.

This makes a total of $57,500. That man is in charge of the Petroleum Administration for War, in which position he is empowered to make decisions vitally affecting the welfare and continued solvency of the competitors of the Standard Oil Co. of California and associated major oil companies. So I think that major oil company influence penetrates the various agencies of government, but particularly the Petroleum Administration for War and the War Production Board. The major integrated oil companies are also well represented by former or present executives of various segments of the oil monopoly in the War, Navy, State, and Commerce Departments.

Mr. RIVERS. I think the gentleman has hit the nail squarely on the head.

Mr. COFFEE. If I may be permitted to continue—I welcome these interruptions, because they bring out points I may have overlooked——

To get the help of the independents we must step in now and put an end to the very unfair, very one-sided civil war which rages within the industry.

It is nothing short of our immediate duty to put an end to the committees whose only usefulness, under the guise of furthering the war effort, is to kill off the independent producer and with him kill off his vital share of oil production to win the war.

It is our duty as Members of Congress, representatives of the people, lawmakers of the Nation.

However, I have every fear that it is too late—that the major oil companies have finally completed the one big objective that is basic indeed.

THE FOLLY OF SUSPENDING THE ANTITRUST LAWS

That is the setting aside of the Sherman antitrust laws. They are now in the enviable position of making most any type of manipulation without running afoul of the rules and regulations which for years have given some medium of protection for the independent, the small businessman.

I speak of Petroleum Directive No. 70, issued by the Petroleum Administrator for War, the coordinator, on September 24, 1943.

You lawmakers of Congress should be interested in this new law for the Nation. As Members of Congress, who daily assemble in these legislative halls, I think it is only right that we be kept abreast of what new laws have been promulgated by the board members—if only for our own personal protection.

PETROLEUM DIRECTIVE NO. 70

I read of this latest law, passed not by Congress, but decided upon by the board members, and, I suppose, no doubt, under the guise of furthering the war effort, in a dispatch from the Office of War Information—a useful institution to keep this lawmaking body informed on recent, new legislation, among its other worth-while functions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARLESS of Arizona). The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is making a very interesting and informative address, and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to continue for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. I am quoting from Petroleum Directive No. 70, issued by Harold Ickes, as Petroleum Administrator for War, through the person of Ralph K. Davies, who is the acting, and for all practical purposes, the real Petroleum Administrator for War:

It is short, let me read it to you:

> Foreign operations of American oil companies during the war emergency will be more completely coordinated—

Following again along the coordination line as expressed in Basic Objectives—

> under the terms of Petroleum Directive No. 70 issued today by Petroleum Administrator for War Ickes.

Upon a study of the document, this new law passed by the Board, I am convinced that even "coordinated" now becomes an outmoded word.

Though the Standard Oil Co. officials call it "a horrid word," "cartelized" would be the more fitting term because that is what Directive 70 does.

The cartel is complete.

UNCLE SAM SANCTIFIES OIL INDUSTRY CARTELIZATION

The oil industry can now be more completely cartelized, production can be controlled, markets may be doled out to favorites and consumer prices can be manipulated to the complete satisfaction of the Board.

As I see it, the steps are simple.

First. You have a war, the efforts of which are to be furthered.

Second. You arrange to coordinate all efforts under the guise of furthering that war effort, and then thirdly, when the initial coordination is complete, you cartelize the industry. Presto, the war effort has been a success.

A CUTE ARRANGEMENT BENEFICIAL TO OIL MAJORS

Here is how it works:

A foreign operations committee is empowered to determine the oil needs of the foreign country or area to be supplied and report to the Director, the Petroleum Administrator for War. In other words, they are going to find out about the market, the number of customers, and so forth. Then the Director, presumably acting upon the advice of the major oil company board and his major oil company assistant, who as I have said, is more often than not the acting director, with his order list already in hand, prepares to make the sales.

In simpler language, the major oil companies, after talking it over among themselves, decide which company will get this and that market.

It works the other way around, too, because the same committee has control over imports of foreign oil into the United States. The Board has not overlooked a thing.

And, to make certain it works, transportation is to be arranged with the War Shipping Administration.

They did that in 1941, when two companies in the United States agreed with the Japanese Government that they would increase the sale of petroleum to Japan commencing May 15, 1941, by 450 percent. Those two agreements were entered into by two major American oil companies, 7 months before Pearl Harbor.

Mr. RIVERS. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. Was one of those major companies the Standard Oil Co. of California?

Mr. COFFEE. No. It was the Standard Vacuum Oil Co. of New York and the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey who, together with their English affiliates divided the entire export products of the Dutch East Indies and agreed with the Japanese Government to sell them 450 percent more oil. In other words, they increased the quota which Japan had theretofore been receiving from 400,000 tons of petroleum products per year, exported from the Dutch East Indies to Japan. They agreed on May 15, 1941, to increase that amount from 400,000 tons to 1,800,000 tons during the year then next ensuing. That was less than 7 months before Pearl Harbor. The cute part of it was that the Japanese Government, in consideration of the generous willingness of these companies to deal with them, agreed with them that they would import the oil in British bottoms rather than in Japanese bottoms. In others words, part of the consideration

was the profit to be received by the English companies on their tanker ships sailing under the English flag.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do you know whether our Government has knowledge of that?

Mr. COFFEE. Yes, it did. And the British Government had knowledge of it. The State Department insisted that it had followed the urgings of the British Foreign Office in okaying that arrangement. That was brought out before the Rules Committee in June 1941, at the time my House Joint Resolution No. 30 to investigate the facts anent the sale of war material to the Axis Powers and their affiliates had hearings on 3 successive days. Mr. Dean Acheson, who was then Assistant Secretary of State and still is, told that to the committee.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. About that time the gentleman will recall a number of Members of the House made some protests.

Mr. COFFEE. Oh, unquestionably.

Mr. STEFAN. Regarding critical materials going to Japan. Some of it was raw material—chrome from the Philippine Islands. It was stated at that time that the Philippine Legislature was willing to stop the exportation of this critical material to the Japanese, but they were prevented from doing so because of some interference here in the United States.

Mr. COFFEE. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. That matter was discussed and brought to the attention of the committee by several Members of the House of Representatives at the time the gentleman mentions?

Mr. COFFEE. It was.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Washington has again expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think the gentleman knows how deeply I appreciate his valiant work in trying to protect America against this monopoly. It is my judgment that it is at least one of two or three of our greatest problems as to our future democracy in this country. Does the gentleman believe there is any solution of the Elk Hills reserve petroleum which will really protect the public interest and the future defense of our country, except the acquisition of the Standard Oil Co. holdings by the Navy Department, so that it can be in truth a reserve?

Mr. COFFEE. I agree absolutely with the gentleman's conclusion. I was happy to note that the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] made that statement in the press yesterday. In my judgment you cannot deal with that outfit unless you absolutely own the land. Whenever you deal with them it is like trying to deal with somebody who has the plague. You are bound to catch some kind of infection which they exude or give out.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think if the gentleman will consult the new volume published by the State Department entitled: "Peace and War" he will find that the program of supplying petroleum products to Japan was a part of the policy of the United States at that time, and as I read it the policy was for the purpose of preventing Japan from committing an overt act in order to obtain oil at a time when the world was not ready to have them do it.

Mr. COFFEE. I agree with the gentleman as to the State Department attitude, though I have always vigorously opposed appeasement of Japan in any form. I might say I am rather familiar with that whole policy because, as some of you may recall, I was one of the most active Members in the fight to interdict the sale of war materials to Japan, with particular reference to oil, along with a great many Members on the Republican and Democratic sides. I introduced the first bill in Congress to prohibit shipments of war materials specifically to Japan.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished and erudite gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman presented all those facts to the Rules Committee at that time when he appeared in support of his resolution asking that the House investigate and determine the amount and the quantity and financial value of material being sent to Japan. Hearings were held by the Rules Committee and the State Department opposed consideration of the resolution at that time largely on the ground just suggested by the gentleman from California.

Mr. COFFEE. I appreciate the distinguished gentleman from Michigan interjecting his recollections in my speech at this point because I well recall how ably the gentleman from Michigan at that time brought out what he regarded as the signal danger that then existed. The State Department did take the attitude, I might say, from the very beginning that we were not in position to go to war with Japan and contended that were we to stop the sale of these supplies to Japan, principally oil, it would precipitate war immediately.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman knows that oil was stopped by State Department order on the 1st day of August in 1941 and that we were attacked 4 months and 7 days later.

Mr. COFFEE. I know that the Executive order was finally signed by the President late in July and that in August, 1941, was put into effect following the occupation of Thailand by the Japanese forces, although I might recall to the gentleman's mind that 1 year previously the President had signed an Executive order that provided that there should be no more shipment of high octane gasoline to Japan after July 30, 1940; but that order was freely violated, as I brought out before the Rules Committee and high-octane gasoline was shipped to Japan by special consent.

Mr. HINSHAW. By special permit of the State Department, was it not?

Mr. COFFEE. That is right, by special permit of the State Department.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Would not the gentleman agree that it was done on the long-range policy of the major oil companies in the United States to build export trade in order to make certain that there would be no "oversupply" of oil in the United States?

Mr. COFFEE. Unquestionably that is the case. Because I think it would be interesting to you, I point out that Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, had been a private attorney until January 31, 1941. His law firm, which is still in operation in the city of Washington, D. C., had been general counsel for the Ethyl Corporation. The Ethyl Corporation manufactures high-octane gasoline. As you know, it sells first structure at about 1½ or 2 cents more than second structure, commonly denominated the "regular" gasoline.

Mr. Acheson in his capacity as a private lawyer had handled the case against the Government of the United States when Thurman Arnold, acting for the Department of Justice, sued the Ethyl Corporation on the ground that it was violating the Sherman antitrust law, and unlawfully conspiring to hold up the price of this ethyl gasoline. We find that thereafter the gentleman was—we will not say was rewarded—but just purely by coincidence we find this distinguished counsel for one of the major oil outfits in the United States being made Assistant Secretary of State. We also find another distinguished former official of the major oil companies, Gen. Pat Hurley—General Hurley bobs up in every administration, whether it is Republican or Democratic just as the oil industry bobs up in every political party whether it is Tea Pot Dome in Republican administrations, or dubious happenings in the Democratic administration. The barons of the major oil empire seem to be more powerful than political parties. Are they the invisible government? Now General Hurley has suddenly become so important that he is too good to be a brigadier general longer but is to become a major general—though General Hurley had been general counsel, and for all I know still is, of the Sinclair Oil Co. You will recall the Sinclair Oil Co. made the first settlement with the Government of Mexico and it came out ahead of all the other major oil companies in that deal.

I am sure all of you noticed the front page pictures of General Hurley chumming with the Arabian princes who recently visited our shores. General Hurley owns the Hurley-Wright building now rented by the United States Government on terms highly lucrative to the owner, for one of its agencies, so I am informed. General Hurley, we are advised, handled preliminary arrangements for the Teheran Conference. Persia, or Iran, embraces some of the richest oil fields in the world.

In this connection it would be pertinent to quote from the Wall Street Journal of October 21, 1943. It will be significantly noted that the author says that Federal officials are reluctant to discuss negotiations involving development of petroleum properties in the Middle East. Gentlemen, I wonder why? Is this more coordination? But let me read you this cryptic article. You form your own opinion:

OIL DIPLOMACY—UNITED STATES PLANS TO FINANCE PETROLEUM DEVELOPMENT IN ARABIA AND IRAN—GOVERNMENT TO PUT UP $125,000,000 TO HELP EXPLOIT TEXAS-STANDARD PROPERTIES—WOULD AID THE BRITISH, TOO

(By George B. Bryant, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—The United States Government is considering financing a large-scale development of petroleum properties in the Middle East.

Current negotiations are said to be running in two directions, one contemplating development of concessions held by American interests in Arabia and the other centering on expansion of British operations in Iraq and Iran.

The American interest involved is the Arabian concession of approximately a quarter million square miles owned jointly by Standard Oil of California and the Texas Co. through the California Arabian Standard Oil Co. The British properties are held by the Anglo-Iranian interests.

Officials are reluctant to discuss the current negotiations, other than to acknowledge that they are in progress. There have been indications, however, that a decision on the development plans is not very far in the future.

GOVERNMENT'S PART NOT REVEALED

Just what part the Government will play in exploitation of the Middle East fields has not been revealed. The negotiations have been handled through the State Department insofar as Britain interests are concerned and by the Petroleum Reserve Corporation, an R. F. C. subsidiary created for development of foreign oil fields, on the American side.

The discussions with representatives of California Arabian are said to have involved two different financial arrangements. One of these called for a Government ownership in the company, to be acquired by the purchase of common stock. Under the other plan, the Government would provide the necessary facilities and take oil in repayment. The latter arrangement is said to have preference at this time.

The Arabian development, as it has been discussed here, would involve an outlay which might total about $125,000,000. Facilities would include drilling, refining, housing, and transportation. Nothing has been disclosed on the reported discussions with the British interests.

The War Department makes a deal called the Canol project, whereby we are committed to go forward and spend about $130,000,000 plus, in Canada in connection with the Imperial Oil Co. of Canada, Ltd., which is affiliated with American oil majors, as a result of which we invest a colossal quantity of the taxpayers' money. After the transaction has been completed, Canada gets the works and we get another kind of works.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I assume the gentleman was here yesterday and heard the Speaker of the House deliver a very instructive appeal to the people for unity, and calling attention to a dangerous trend if we questioned the British or the English?

Mr. COFFEE. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman has no idea that the mention of this Canadian oil exploration or this reference to post-war control of oil by the Standard Oil Co. and some of its English friends would run counter to that thought?

Mr. COFFEE. No, sir; I do not believe it will run counter to it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not either, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. COFFEE. As a matter of fact, some members of the Canadian Parliament have deplored the Canol project as a secret build-up for a monopoly. The same arguments were advanced at Ottawa as by our distinguished Republican Member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN], and by certain other Members of this House in both parties. I commend them for their fearlessness in exposing the situation. There is nothing of a disunity nature about that. Both sides do not want the taxpayers' money turned over to private interests for these various projects.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield to the talented gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. May I ask the gentleman if he is aware of the fact that there is a definite movement on foot in this country today to depress our local oil industry and to import oil after the war?

Mr. COFFEE. I am convinced such developments are in the offing and unless we intervene soon and courageously stop it, that is what will eventually happen.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield to the genial gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman permit me to make an observation in reply to the question just propounded?

Mr. COFFEE. I would be happy to have the attentive gentleman do so.

Mr. STEFAN. I think the gentleman from Washington is making a very splendid contribution. He is giving a warning to America. May I say in elaboration of your reply to the question, that Thurman Arnold was succeeded by Wendell Berge, who happens to be from my State, in the Antitrust Division. I would also like to sound a warning along the line suggested by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] that, in my opinion, there is a very definite movement on foot in America to carry on American participation in the international cartels, as has been indicated in some of the philosophies propounded by certain American people that perhaps after the war we should surrender not only oil but many of our other things, such as our synthetic rubber plants in which we have $750,000,000 invested. Synthetic rubber is made successfully from the by-products of petroleum, alcohol from molasses, and alcohol from grain, and timber and pulp mill wastes. We can produce synthetic rubber for 7 cents a pound in the post-war period. We will be making, at the end of 1944, 850,000 tons of synthetic rubber, which is more than we normally use in our country; yet I fear that American participation in international cartels will surrender and give to this Dutch-British monopoly the rubber market not only of the United States but of the world. The gentleman from Washington is giving the American people a warning which all of us should heed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that it is extremely important that we see that under the provisions of the U. N. R. A. appropriations our natural resources are not sent to other countries?

Mr. COFFEE. I am convinced our exhaustible natural resources should be husbanded and protected to the *n*th degree for the benefit of our own country and for the welfare and prosperity of the United States.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is one of the things that we must guard against very carefully?

Mr. COFFEE. Absolutely, and I compliment the gentlewoman for her convictions on that subject.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I take it the gentleman would not subscribe to the philosophy that the best way to conserve our exhaustible natural resources would be to permit their control by a monopoly?

Mr. COFFEE. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I comment on the statement made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]?

Mr. COFFEE. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I call attention to the fact that 3 or 4 days ago I introduced a bill in the House

identical with one introduced by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] in the Senate, which would require the registration of every agreement of any American corporation with a foreign corporation which is of a cartel nature, and the making of that information available to the Department of Justice and the public of the United States.

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman will yield, my feeling is that Mr. Wendell Berge, of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice will cooperate with the gentleman.

Mr. COFFEE. I, too, have absolute confidence in the integrity and ability of Wendell Berge.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I wish to compliment the gentleman, especially for his fight to keep oil from being sold to Japan. I recall when I came here in the early part of 1939 I entertained that same opinion and worked with the gentleman to some extent with reference to the matter. I well remember how hard the gentleman worked and how much even I tried to do as a new Member of Congress with reference to that. Of course, we can all see now that our failure to prohibit oil exports to Japan was a mistake, and that the gentleman who now has the floor was eminently correct.

Mr. COFFEE. I appreciate what the eloquent gentleman from Arkansas has said. I recall very distinctly that not only he but a great many Republican and Democratic Members of Congress did everything within their power to secure the passage by the Congress of legislation and also action by the executive departments which would have resulted in stopping the sale of oil and war materials to Japan.

With further reference to what the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska said about cartels, in my judgment, that is the greatest menace facing America today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. I believe the menace of cartels is the greatest cloud which hangs on the horizon of the United Nations today. In that connection I cite the statements made by Mr. Eric Johnston from my home State, the distinguished Republican president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, in which he in speeches in England pointed out to them that free enterprise could not work hand in hand with the world cartel system. Therefore, he stated, if the English were going to foster world cartels he would have to differ with the English. To that statement I heartily subscribe.

The Bank for International Settlements, which was set up about 12 years ago, the home office of which is at Basel in Switzerland, which is on the German border, is operating actively today. The principal depositor of the Bank for International Settlements is the German Nazi Government, which has 85,000,000 Swiss gold francs on deposit; yet that same bank right now is the financial clearinghouse for the International Red Cross and the American Red Cross.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman forgets that yesterday we were admonished that we were not to worry about what the English or the British Empire might do after the war was over.

Mr. COFFEE. I am talking about the cartels right now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I know, but that is fostered by the British Government. I am worried about it, and I was just wondering if the gentleman is worried about it.

Mr. COFFEE. I certainly believe in looking after our own interests to the best of our power.

Mr. HOFFMAN. So do I.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. There is a danger that has nothing to do with the British involved in what the gentleman just mentioned, which is the danger of another attempt on the part of the German cartelized industry once again to develop and to dominate by means of cartelization the industries of the world after this war just as they did to some extent after the First World War.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. In the American participation in international cartels there is much to worry about right here at home, as to who participates in them in America, with connections overseas.

Mr. COFFEE. That is right. There is no one who knows more about those developments and their dangers than KARL STEFAN, the very eminent and scholarly gentleman from Nebraska, who is so widely traveled and who is such a profound student of world history and such an accomplished linguist.

Further adverting to the Bank for International Settlements, I might point out that the head of that outfit is a man named Tom McKittrick, a partner of J. P. Morgan & Co., of New York City, who is right now the president of the Bank for International Settlements.

Interestingly enough, the majority of the board of directors of the Bank for International Settlements are German Nazi officials, yet that bank is functioning right along and American money is being deposited in the bank. These cartels get along regardless of whether wars are being fought between their respective countries. These fellows seem to be bigger than their countries. They ignore their countries. They do not care who is fighting whom. They sit around the table together—Dr. Schacht, the great German financial expert; Montagu Norman, the great British financial expert; and Tom McKittrick, the great American financial expert. And that is just one of many which I hope to cite in a subsequent speech on the subject of cartels, the greatest menace facing the United Nations today.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman has just mentioned the subject of disconnecting certain people from the Federal pay rolls. Does the gentleman know that Dean Acheson, whom you have just mentioned, is a member of the law firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb, which is today representing the three gentlemen Watson, Dodd, and Lovett, whom this Congress has tried, by its control of the pursestrings, to disconnect from the Government pay rolls?

Mr. COFFEE. So I have been advised from what I have read and what the gentleman has stated.

Mr. CHURCH. And Dean Acheson's law firm today is representing them in the Court of Claims?

Mr. COFFEE. That is the same law firm which has represented certain major oil companies.

COORDINATION TO THE NTH DEGREE

That there may be no slip up on the international side of the picture, the Foreign Operations Committee is directed to coordinate or cartelize its activities with the British Overseas Supply Committee.

Now we know that with the exception perhaps of the I. G. Farben and other German cartelizers, the British are the best at that particular game. So, complete cooperation can be expected.

The board will select the companies to import; they will select the companies to export.

And, they will select the companies—on both ends—which are to be the suppliers.

GOVERNMENT FOSTERED WORLD OIL MONOPOLY DEPLORED

This arrangement, I think you will all agree, even out-Farbens the great I. G. Farben—a monopoly complete in every detail.

Again they have thrown it in our teeth.

Though they operate under the cloak, under the protection, of the American flag, and are, I am sure, fully determined to further the war effort, Members of Congress have absolutely no control over them.

As a last resort, Congress has often had to abolish needless committees, unnecessary bureaucrats, by cutting them off at the pockets—that is refusing to make appropriations for salaries and other expense.

But not these lads under the wing of Directive 70.

BYPASSING CONGRESS

They have taken care to see that they will be perpetuated.

The order reads:

Operation expenses of all such committees shall be made from a fund to which voluntary contributions may be made by persons engaged in the petroleum industry and such funds may be solicited by the Foreign Operations Committee.

In other words, the Rockefellers will pass the hat among the other Rockefeller companies and their associated affiliates and enough dimes will be collected, you may rest assured, to keep the cartel rolling.

The perfect monopoly—the perfect cartel, every single phase opposed to our ideas of fair business practices as expressed in the Sherman antitrust laws—yet it is the law.

How will it affect the independent oilman?

How would it affect any other industry in which the large and powerful interests have complete control of exports and imports and domestic markets?

With the exception of perhaps some small favorable, temporary condition—it will kill the independent.

It will kill off the independent competition just the same as it would kill off the small manufacturer, the small mining enterprise or the small farm cooperative if faced with similar conditions.

How will it affect the consumers of the Nation?

I need not tell you that prices can and will be regulated once we see this new cartel in full bloom—once, under the guise of furthering the war effort, the monopolists have time fully to explore their opportunities.

DANGERS OF OIL CARTEL ARE ITS INVITATION TO INSTITUTE SIMILAR PRACTICES IN OTHER FIELDS

It is now the time for this Congress to decide upon not only the immediate oil problem as it concerns the war, but as it concerns the basic concepts of business economics.

Shall we shelve the Sherman antitrust laws and allow this new monopoly, this new cartel to stand?

Let me shout the warning:

If we do—if we do not now raise our hands and our voices and our votes—while we still have them, against this giant octopus which is crawling over our land in the guise of furthering the war effort, it will spread its tentacles out and overwhelm other great industries. When it does, small business will go the way the independent oil man is about now to go.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. May I ask the majority leader to give us an idea of next week's program?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be glad to.

On Monday the discharge petition will come up on the oil bill. Then we have the matter coming out of the Appropriations Committee relating to farm labor. There will be other legislation, but there is nothing definite that I can advise the gentleman from Michigan about now or advise the House. There is a supplemental appropriation bill which will go to conference. If they agree, of course that will come up. If the mustering out bill comes out we will bring that up just as quickly as possible after it is reported by the committee which is proceeding in consideration of that bill.

I understand that legislation is before the Committee on Foreign Affairs in connection with relief and rehabilitation and that the committee meets on Wednesday next. If that is reported out, which is doubtful, next week we may be able to bring it up, but the chances are, and this is my own personal opinion, that the bill probably will not be in order for next week.

Mr. MICHENER. The farm-security item to which the gentleman referred is included in an appropriation bill that is over in the Senate and coming back on a conference report?

Mr. McCORMACK. No, no; the bill is coming out of our committee.

Mr. MICHENER. Coming directly from our own committee? Is there not an appropriation bill to come from the Senate?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, there is a deficiency bill. There is a bill over there. I do not know if it is the farm-security deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. MICHENER. My understanding is that the bill in the Senate has been materially changed since it has left the House and many of the items included in the Senate bill will be most controversial in the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Some of them will, I understand.

Mr. MICHENER. The possibilties are that the bill will take some little time and probably cause some roll calls in the House next week. I speak of this because if it is true the Members ought to know it.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no question but that if that bill comes up next week in the House, and it will, assuming it goes to conference and the conferees make a report, there are a number of controversial features and there will undoubtedly be roll calls.

Mr. MICHENER. Could the distinguished majority leader give us any information with reference to the completion of work before Christmas? A great many Members are asking the question. I know how difficult it is to answer. I do not expect an absolute answer, but is there a goal to be aimed at?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a very difficult question to answer. At the present time, unless something develops, I think we will be in session after Christmas. I am sorry to say it; but, unless something unexpected develops, I cannot see but what we will have to be in session after Christmas.

Mr. MICHENER. You mean for the rest of this session?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. Just how long after Christmas I cannot say. The Commodity Credit Corporation bill has to be disposed of. There is no question about that. It is not out of committee yet. It has to be debated in the Senate and then it has to go through the final processes. If there are any amendments over there, they will have to be presented and the bill sent to the President. I cannot say what action will be taken there; but, assuming the bill is vetoed, it then has to come back; and if the veto is sustained, then we have certainly got to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, because, no matter how Members may feel on the question of the use of subsidies, I think we are practically unanimously in favor of the extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I know I am.

Mr. MICHENER. The debate in the House on the subsidy bill made it clear that there was unanimity of opinion, so far as the Members of the House were concerned, on that item.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. MICHENER. If a resolution were brought in here just continuing the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation temporarily, there should be no question about it being passed at once, unanimously.

Mr. McCORMACK. There should be no question about it. I was hopeful, though those hopes have more or less disappeared, that the Commodity Credit Corporation might be extended for a limited period beyond the first of the year, and then let the pending legislation go through the regular legislative processes. But apparently that developed into a disappointing hope.

Mr. MICHENER. Which we regret.

Mr. McCORMACK. I join with the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman take some more time? I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have 5 additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I ask for 1 additional minute, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Can the gentleman tell us anything about when the vote permitting the soldiers to vote will come?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. I wish I could, because I am absolutely in favor of a bill that will enable the soldiers and sailors to vote.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I guess we all are, but it is a matter of detail how to do it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Are you?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Sure, but I do not want any administration or bureaucrat to vote them. I want them to vote. That is all. I do not want to make a speech about that. I want to ask another question. As I get it, we are going to have a very, very busy week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I expect to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is that following along the general plan of the commandos of the drive for action committee?

Mr. McCORMACK. Is the gentleman an advocate of the so-called commandos?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not a member in good standing. I have not paid any dues or special assessments or signed on the dotted line, but I am in favor of action ordinarily. The gentleman ought to know that.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am always interested in listening to the observations of my friend from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank you.

Mr. McCORMACK. Even on occasions——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Even when there is nothing to it?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a statement by a representative of the National Educational Association to a group of Congressmen yesterday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unaimous consent that my colleague from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] may extend his own remarks and include an editorial from a Mobile paper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein a speech by the distinguished Catholic bishop, Bernard J. Sheil, of Chicago. I find on examination of the manuscript that it exceeds the quota. I have received a statement from the Government Printing Office that it would cost $120. Notwithstanding that I renew my request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address recently delivered by the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therewith a poem in memory of our late colleague, Lawrence Lewis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the legislative program for the day and other special orders, that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be granted leave of absence for Monday and Tuesday, December 13 and 14 next, on account of official business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DILWEG, for 5 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. HARNESS of Indiana, for 3 days, on account of illness.

To Mr. OUTLAND (at the request of Mr. MAGNUSON), indefinitely, on account of illness.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 296. An act for the relief of Hector H. Perry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 375. An act for the relief of the Phoenix-Tempe Stone Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 878. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended," approved January 24, 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 933. An act for the relief of Lee S. Dradshaw; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1000. An act to reserve certain public-domain lands in the State of Arizona for addition to the Havasupai Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1146. An act to amend section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1164. An act for the relief of Lucille Sleet; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1233. An act to authorize the construction and maintenance of Moss Landing Harbor (Monterey Bay), Calif.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

S. 1324. An act for the relief of the Wisconsin Electric Power Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1325. An act for the relief of Joseph Moret; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1372. An act to fulfill a treaty obligation between the United States and the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians by authorizing the purchase of certain interests in lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the said Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1391. An act for the relief of W. R. Jordan and Mabel Jordan; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1417. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to donate and convey on behalf of the United States to Jack Henry Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, Anchorage, Alaska, the wood-frame building known as the Telephone and Telegraph Building located on lots 7 and 8 in block 17, Anchorage townsite; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 1427. An act to authorize the appointment of Gregory Boyington, a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1477. An act for the relief of Carl M. Frasure; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1488. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to Jose C. Romero all right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain described tract of land within the Carson National Forest, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1494. An act for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1504. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a railroad bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1528. An act for the relief of Col. Anderson F. Pitts; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1576. An act to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution to aid in effectuating the purposes of the Railway Labor Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution declaring the policy of the Congress with respect to the independence of the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, December 13, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE

APRIL 7, 1943.

TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

Pursuant to clause 4 of rule XXVII, I, JOHN E. RANKIN, move to discharge the Committee on Rules from the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 29) entitled "A resolution to amend clause 40, rule XI, of the Rules of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-seventh Congress," which was referred to said committee January 6, 1943, in support of which motion the undersigned Members of the House of Representatives affix their signatures, to wit:

1. J. E. Rankin.
2. Marion T. Bennett.
3. Bernard W. Kearney.
4. Fred E. Busbey.
5. Paul Cunningham.
6. James Domengeaux.
7. J. Hardin Peterson.
8. Thomas G. Abernethy.
9. A. Leonard Allen.
10. Earle D. Willey.
11. Edith Nourse Rogers.
12. Grant Furlong.
13. Homer D. Angell.
14. James H. Fay.
15. Norris Poulson.
16. Robert B. Chiperfield.
17. Jay LeFevre.
18. Michael J. Bradley.
19. Compton I. White.
20. Charles M. LaFollette.

21. Thomas J. Lane.
22. Charles B. Hoeven.
23. James C. Auchincloss.
24. Emory H. Price.
25. Carl Hinshaw.
26. C. W. Bishop.
27. John Edward Sheridan.
28. Albert J. Engel.
29. Henry P. Jeffrey.
30. Ranulf Compton.
31. Harold C. Hagen.
32. Angier L. Goodwin.
33. William J. Miller.
34. Merlin Hull.
35. Ivor D. Fenton.
36. Chet Holifield.
37. Maurice J. Sullivan.
38. A. M. Fernandez.
39. Charles A. Wolverton.
40. Leo E. Allen.
41. Evan Howell.
42. Joseph R. Bryson.
43. Harry L. Towe.
44. Joseph P. O'Hara.
45. Paul H. Maloney.
46. Wm. H. Wheat.
47. Paul W. Shafer.
48. Ben F. Jensen.
49. Ralph E. Church.
50. Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr.
51. Victor Wickersham.
52. John M. Robsion.
53. William A. Rowan.
54. William I. Troutman.
55. John Phillips.
56. Charles R. Clason.
57. Walter E. Brehm.
58. L. C. Arends.
59. Chauncey W. Reed.
60. Anton J. Johnson.
61. Stephen A. Day.
62. Wm. W. Blackney.
63. Richard M. Simpson.
64. Martin Gorski.
65. Thomas S. Gordon.
66. Robert F. Rockwell.
67. Thomas J. O'Brien.
68. Reid F. Murray.
69. Henry C. Dworshak.
70. Tom Murray.
71. John P. Newsome.
72. Jim McCord.
73. James V. Heidinger.
74. Fred Norman.
75. Harris Ellsworth.
76. Daniel Ellison.
77. Sid Simpson.
78. Henry O. Talle.
79. Paul Stewart.
80. Ross Rizley.
81. Fred C. Gilchrist.
82. D. Lane Powers.
83. Mike Mansfield.
84. Walt Horan.
85. B. Carroll Reece.
86. Harry Sauthoff.
87. Bob Sikes.
88. James A. Wright.
89. Harve Tibbott.
90. Richard J. Welch.
91. A. C. Schiffler.
92. Pat Cannon.
93. Joe Hendricks.
94. Edw. J. Hart.
95. Foster Stearns.
96. James W. Mott.
97. Fadjo Cravens.
98. Karl E. Mundt.
99. W. F. Norrell.
100. John Jennings, Jr.
101. Aime J. Forand.
102. E. C. Gathings.
103. John L. McMillan.
104. Howard Buffett.
105. Ray J. Madden.
106. John W. Murphy.
107. John M. Coffee.
108. Everett M. Dirksen.
109. J. Glenn Beall.
110. Joe B. Bates.
111. Richard F. Harless.
112. B. W. Gearhart.
113. Alvin E. O'Konski.
114. Edwin A. Hall.
115. Henry D. Larcade, Jr.
116. Lyle H. Boren.
117. Usher L. Burdick.
118. John E. Fogarty.
119. Wm. Lemke.
120. Joseph Mruk.
121. Karl Stefan.
122. Jed Johnson.
123. William S. Hill.
124. Philip J. Philbin.
125. Louis E. Miller.
126. W. P. Elmer.
127. J. Leroy Johnson.
128. Wesley E. Disney.
129. Joseph E. Talbot.
130. Noble J. Johnson.
131. Frank B. Keefe.
132. Oren Harris.
133. F. Edw. Hébert.
134. C. E. McKenzie.
135. Arthur Winstead.
136. John S. Gibson.
137. William C. Cole.
138. Brooks Hays.
139. Max Schwabe.
140. John D. McWilliams.
141. Wirt Courtney.
142. Edward O. McCowen.
143. Gerald W. Landis.
144. Estes Kefauver.
145. Frank Fellows.
146. John B. Bennett.
147. John R. Murdock.
148. James H. Morrison.
149. Edward H. Rees.
150. Thomas A. Jenkins.
151. James F. O'Connor.
152. Dewey Short.
153. Frank Carlson.
154. Clarence Cannon.
155. John M. Vorys.
156. W. P. Lambertson.
157. Alvin F. Weichel.
158. Mike Monroney.
159. Earl R. Lewis.
160. Henderson H. Carson.
161. Ed Rowe.
162. Homer A. Ramey.
163. Joseph J. O'Brien.
164. William T. Byrne.
165. Fred Bradley.
166. Carl T. Curtis.
167. Lawrence H. Smith.
168. Orville Zimmerman.
169. Overton Brooks.
170. Matthew J. Merritt.
171. Errett P. Scrivner.
172. Francis E. Walter.
173. Clair Engel.
174. Jennings Randolph.
175. Martin J. Kennedy.
176. Melvin J. Maas.
177. James M. Curley.
178. Louis Ludlow.
179. L. Mendel Rivers.
180. Cecil R. King.
181. John H. Tolan.
182. L. H. Gavin.
183. George E. Outland.
184. D. K. Hoch.
185. Dan R. McGehee.
186. Robert L. Rodgers.
187. Francis J. Myers.
188. Pehr G. Holmes.
189. George J. Bates.
190. R. B. Wigglesworth.
191. Christian A. Herter.
192. A. Sidney Camp.
193. Thomas Byron Miller.
194. Charles A. Plumley.
195. J. W. Fulbright.
196. N. M. Mason.
197. Chester H. Gross.
198. Cliff Clevenger.
199. Winifred Stanley.
200. Aug H. Andresen.
201. E. G. Rohrbough.
202. Hubert S. Ellis.
203. Chester E. Merrow.
204. H. C. Fuller.
205. George H. Bender.
206. D. Emmert Brumbaugh.
207. Walter C. Ploeser.
208. Warren G. Magnuson.
209. Roy O. Woodruff.
210. Harry R. Sheppard.
211. Frank A. Barrett.
212. Lindley Beckworth.
213. George G. Sadowski.
214. Earl Wilson.
215. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
216. W. Sterling Cole.
217. Francis Case.
218. Ward Johnson.

This motion was entered upon the Journal, entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with signatures thereto, and referred to the Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees, December 10, 1943.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Public Lands Committee on Monday, December 13, 1943, at 10 a. m., to consider H. R. 2241, a bill to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument, Wyo.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. S. 45. An act to amend section 3 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653; 16 U. S. C. 566); with amendment (Rept. No. 947). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 3405. A bill making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers, feeds, nursery stock, or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 948). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 3760. A bill authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Lt. Gen. Thomas Holcomb, United States Marine Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 946). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3826. A bill to require the approval of the Naval Affairs Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives of all disposals and acquisitions of real property or interests therein by the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 3827. A bill to authorize the acceptance of certain land as a gift to the United States from Walter N. Campbell and Zenobia Campbell; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 3828. A bill to aid the program for the conservation of food; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 3829. A bill for the relief of Herman Gelb; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POWERS:

H. R. 3830. A bill for the relief of Robert Zane Collings; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3831. A bill for the relief of the Citizens State Bank; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 3832. A bill for the relief of E. D. Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 3833. A bill for the relief of Domenico Bucci; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WILSON:

H. R. 3834. A bill for the relief of Anthony Galbreath; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4013. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Ray H. Fleming and 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4014. Also, petition of Laurence Gottschamer and 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4015. Also, petition of the American Legion Post, No. 299, and signed by 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4016. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 293 residents of the county of Butler, State of Pennsylvania, protesting against the passage of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, which advocates socialized medicine; also objecting to the control of the Office of Price Administration over the sale of the farmers' products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4017. By Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania: Petition of Myrtle Van Horn and 26 other residents of Luzerne County, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by enacting prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4018. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of the Baker Confectionery Store, of Auburn, Maine, protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress and requesting their Senators and Representative to vote against any and all such proposed legislation to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4019. Also, petition of the Slovak Catholic Association, of Lisbon Falls, Maine, protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress and requesting their Senators and Representative to vote against any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4020. Also, petition of Laurier-Pooler Restaurant, of Fairfield, Maine, protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress and requesting their Senators and Representative to vote against any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4021. Also, petition of the Lemelin Market, of Fairfield, Maine, protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress and requesting their Senators and Representative to vote against any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4022. Also, petition of the Blair Restaurant, Waterville, Maine, protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress and requesting their Senators and Representative to vote against any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4023. Also, petition of the Elks Club, of Lewiston, Maine, protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress and requesting their Senators and Representative to vote against any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4024. Also, petition of sundry citizens of the town of Lisbon, of Lisbon Falls, Maine, protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress and requesting their Senators and Representative to vote against any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4025. Also, petition of the Greek Catholic Association, of Lisbon Falls, Maine, protesting against the consideration of any and all prohibition measures by Congress and requesting their Senators and Representative to vote against any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4026. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mary W. F. Speers, petitioning Congress to impeach the Honorable Arthur J. Tuttle, United States district judge, for the eastern district of Michigan, southern division; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, December 7, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer.

Eternal God, spirit of light and truth, of beauty and freedom and of joy, behold us a company of seekers for the highest, for we, too, in exalted hours have seen Thy Star. Although earthborn clouds sometimes obscure its guiding beacon, yet our eager eyes are fixed on the lighted heavens even as we travel over desert sands. Lift our duty above drudgery. Let not our strength fail or the vision splendid fade in the heat and burden of the day. O God, who as an understanding Father pitieth Thy children, make us patient and thoughtful one with another in the fret and jar of these difficult days, remembering that each comrade by our side fights a hard fight and walks a lonely way.

Forgive us, O Lord, if we hurt our fellow souls. Teach us a gentler tone, a sweeter charity of words, and a more healing touch for all the smart of this wounded world. Give us courage for the day and hope for the morrow. Day unto day may we lay hold of Thy hand and look up into Thy face, whatever befall, until our work is finished and we hear far voices out of darkness calling through an open door to another room in the Father's many-mansioned house. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, December 9, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS FOR JUDGESHIPS IN TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and also at the request of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], who is chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, who will hold the hearings I am about to announce, I give notice that on Tuesday, the 21st day of December 1943, at the hour of 10:30 a. m., in the Judiciary Committee room in the United States Capitol, a public hearing will be held on the nomination of Albert M. Cristy, of Honolulu, to be second judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii; on the nomination of Emil C. Peters, of Honolulu, to be associate justice of the Supreme Court, Territory of Hawaii; on the nomination of Cable A. Wirtz, of Hawaii, to be judge of the second circuit, circuit courts, Terri-

tory of Hawaii, and on the nomination of Willson C. Moore, of Hawaii, to be fourth judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii.

I ask unanimous consent that the formal notices of the hearings be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the notices were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ALBERT M. CRISTY TO BE SECOND JUDGE, FIRST CIRCUIT, CIRCUIT COURTS, HAWAII

Mr. MURDOCK (for Mr. MCCARRAN). The Committee on the Judiciary has received the nomination of Albert M. Cristy, of Honolulu, to be second judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii.

As chairman of the subcommittee appointed to consider this nomination, I announce that a hearing has been set on this nomination in the Senate Judiciary Committee room on Tuesday, the 21st day of December 1943, at 10:30 a. m. At that time and place all interested parties may make representations to the committee.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF EMIL C. PETERS TO BE ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT, HAWAII

Mr. MURDOCK (for Mr. MCCARRAN). The Committee on the Judiciary has received the nomination of Emil C. Peters, of Honolulu, to be associate justice of the Supreme Court, Territory of Hawaii.

As chairman of the subcommittee appointed to consider this nomination, I announce that a hearing has been set on this nomination in the Senate Judiciary Committee room on Tuesday, the 21st day of December 1943, at 10:30 a. m. At that time and place all interested parties may make representations to the committee.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF CABLE A. WIRTZ TO BE JUDGE, SECOND CIRCUIT, CIRCUIT COURTS, HAWAII

Mr. MURDOCK (for Mr. MCCARRAN). The Committee on the Judiciary has received the nomination of Cable A. Wirtz, of Hawaii, to be judge of the second circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii.

As chairman of the subcommittee appointed to consider this nomination, I announce that a hearing has been set on this nomination in the Senate Judiciary Committee room on Tuesday, the 21st day of December 1943, at 10:30 a. m. At that time and place all interested parties may make representations to the committee.

NOTICE OF HEARING OF WILLSON C. MOORE TO BE FOURTH JUDGE, FIRST CIRCUIT, CIRCUIT COURTS, HAWAII

Mr. MURDOCK (for Mr. MCCARRAN). The Committee on the Judiciary has received the nomination of Willson C. Moore, of Hawaii, to be fourth judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii.

As chairman of the subcommittee appointed to consider this nomination, I announce that a hearing has been set on this nomination in the Senate Judiciary Committee room on Tuesday, the 21st day of December 1943, at 10:30 a. m. At that time and place all interested parties may make representations to the committee.

LETTER FROM SECRETARY OF WAR ON INCIDENT INVOLVING GENERAL PATTON

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk read the second letter from the War Department concerning the Patton case. I make the request on behalf of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs so that the Senate may be informed of the words that have come from the Secretary of War.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 3, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: In reply to the request in your letter of November 26, which was relayed intact to General Eisenhower's headquarters, I have received a reply, and the information is transmitted as follows:

On the third of August General Patton visited the Fifteenth Evacuation Hospital in Sicily. While there in the receiving tent the incident already reported in the press with respect to Pvt. Charles L. Kuhl took place. This is the only incident similar to the one already reported in another hospital as of August 10th. General Eisenhower was, however, informed by reliable newspaper correspondents of a case wherein General Patton spoke threateningly and with undue harshness to a soldier for failing to wear his leggings because his ankles were swollen but who, nevertheless, was doing full combat duty. These incidents are the only ones disclosed by a thorough investigation by the theater inspector on the general subject of General Patton's treatment of enlisted men. These two incidents and those already reported to you were taken in consideration and covered by General Eisenhower in his corrective action.

With respect to the misleading announcement issued by General Eisenhower's headquarters on November 22, I am informed that the reason for the nature of this reply was a military one, a reason based on operations then, and since, in progress. It was considered necessary to immediately and categorically deny the false implications that a change had or would take place in the command of the Seventh Army, or that its morale was impaired. This may have been an error in judgment from a public-relations viewpoint, but it was eminently sound from a military standpoint.

There could be no intention to deny the incident itself since it was obvious that the incident, together with the corrective action, was well known to most of the correspondents in Algiers. The intention was simply to correct, for important military reasons, the untrue and damaging inferences from that incident which Drew Pearson had made in his original broadcast.

As soon as practicable, a ranking staff officer called all members of the press and radio together and officially reviewed the details of the Sicilian hospital incident.

The military reasons referred to above are still important to Allied operations in the Mediterranean theater and consequently must remain secret for the present, but I assure you that they will eventually be disclosed. At that time it will be made evident why a general discussion of the details of this affair at any time prior to the completion of certain strategic plans was directly contrary to the military interests of the United States and of our allies. General Eisenhower was obliged to consider this matter from a military viewpoint rather than that of what is termed "public relations."

General Eisenhower in this last report has again reported that these instances have not affected General Patton's standing as a tactical leader, one who successfully concluded, in record time, a complicated and important military campaign, and one whom his officers and men would again be willing to follow into battle. He reports that the serious aspect of this case is the danger that the Army will lose the services of a battle-tested Army commander, and also afford aid and comfort to the enemy.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an exchange of letters between myself and the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], with respect to his position on the legislation affecting the right of members of the armed forces to vote in the forthcoming election. The letter from the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia came to me absolutely unsolicited.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
December 8, 1943.

Hon. SCOTT LUCAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR LUCAS: I have been and still am in favor of giving our armed forces, away from home in the Federal service, the right to vote in Federal elections for Federal officers, under Federal authority and responsibility; and I was in favor of the bill reported after due hearings and consideration by the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, and I was also in favor of it without any emasculating amendment. I am writing this brief note to you, both to keep the record straight and to inform my constituency.

I wrote with my own hand the suffrage clauses of the Virginia Constitution, but inasmuch as the Congress, more than a year ago, in what is now known as Public Law No. 712, specifically provided that no member of the armed forces was to be compelled either to register or pay a poll tax in order to vote in a Federal election, I can not see that the rights of the States are either jeopardized or in any way involved in the present controversy.

Should this matter arise again in the Senate, I hope that you will see that I am properly paired in favor of the soldier vote.

Sincerely yours,

CARTER GLASS.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., December 11, 1943.

Hon. CARTER GLASS,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GLASS: I am happy to receive your interesting and timely letter of recent date wherein you make clear and unequivocal your position with respect to giving members of the armed forces in time of war the right to vote in Federal elections. No letter I have received in my 9 years as a Member of the Congress has pleased me more.

Long before I came to Washington you were one of my national idols. Every American interested in good government is familiar with, and reveres, your long and distinguished career as a public servant.

Your courageous advocacy of the passage of this legislation strengthens my conviction of the righteousness of this cause. Your belief that those who offer their lives in defense of their country should have the opportunity

to exercise the right of franchise is consistent with the lifelong record you have made in behalf of popular government.

Permit me to say to you, sir, in the utmost candor, that my only purpose from the beginning of this important legislation was to grant the opportunity of voting to the men and women who are defending their country. My thought from the very first has been that we should have honest and efficient elections for Federal officers upon every island, every ship, in every camp, yea, wherever our forces are located. We must take the ballots to the soldiers and sailors wherever they may be. Their responsibilities are such that they cannot assume the initiative in obtaining absentee ballots under State laws.

No doubt you are familiar with the case of *Burroughs and Cannon* v. *United States* (290 U. S. 534, 545) wherein the Court emphasized the importance of the Presidential election and "the vital character of its relationship to and effect upon the welfare and safety of the whole people," in justifying the exercise of Federal power to preserve the purity of elections for Presidential and Vice Presidential electors.

I am sure you agree with me that the unfortunate result of depriving millions of members of the armed forces of a right to vote in such election is to deny to the Nation representative self-expression on a matter vital to its very existence.

While I am certain the Senate and the country understands that your recent illness made necessary your absence on the day this legislation was voted upon, we are all happy to know that you are well enough to carry on your correspondence and direct the work of your office from your home. Your many friends join me in the hope that your recovery will soon be complete.

With every good wish, I remain,

Yours most sincerely,

SCOTT W. LUCAS.

DRAFTING OF OFFICERS IN MILITARY SERVICE FOR NATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN THE 1944 CAMPAIGN

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, earlier today I made a press statement presenting certain correspondence with the War Department and the Navy Department regarding the 1944 campaign. I ask that the statement be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There has been much divergent speculation over the question whether Army or Navy officers may be drafted by political parties for national leadership in the 1944 campaign. The question has been raised in both major parties. In order to settle the matter authentically, I recently addressed the following hypothetical questions to the Secretaries of War and Navy:

"1. Can an officer, without any direct or indirect participation in the movement himself, accept a draft nomination for high public office from a major political party?

"2. Can an officer, thus drafted, accept such a nomination and remain in the armed services during an election campaign in which he does not participate and in which he takes no part?

"3. If elected under such circumstances, can an officer resign to accept such an election from the people?"

The reply of Secretary Knox is as follows:

"The answers to all three questions, assuming the facts to be precisely as set forth by you, is in the affirmative, subject to the limitation that it is discretionary with the President whether or not he will at any time accept the resignation of an officer of the Navy."

The reply of Secretary Stimson is as follows:

"In the circumstances set forth in your letter, no War Department policy or regulation will be so construed as to prevent an Army officer from accepting a nomination for the Presidency or Vice Presidency of the United States and remaining on active duty in the armed services during the election campaign. At the pleasure of the President, he may, if elected, resign to accept the office or, if eligible therefor and desirous of so doing, retire."

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

OFFICERS APPOINTED IN THE ARMY FROM CIVIL LIFE

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of service, with special qualification therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service, for the period October 1, 1943, through November 30, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

EIGHTH MONTHLY REPORT OF NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD

A letter from the Vice Chairman of the National War Labor Board, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 130, Seventy-eighth Congress, the eighth monthly report of the Board, covering the month of October 1943 (with accompanying papers); ordered to lie on the table.

SEPTEMBER 1943 REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Board, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the Corporation for the month of September 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REGISTRANTS DEFERRED BECAUSE OF EMPLOYMENT UNDER FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director of the Selective Service System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of 18- to 38-year-old registrants deferred because of their employment in or under the Federal Government on October 15, 1943, in continental United States and the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, containing the names of 121,838 registrants of whom 115,513 were registered with local boards in continental United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF SEVERAL AGENCIES

Letters from the Administrator of the National Housing Agency and the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1943, for their respective agencies, and also a letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, submitting, pursuant to law, a revised estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

RESOLUTION OF KANSAS-OKLAHOMA DIVISION, MID-CONTINENT OIL & GAS ASSOCIATION—CRUDE OIL PRICE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted November 30, 1943, at the twenty-fifth annual membership meeting of the Kansas-Oklahoma Division, Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, at Tulsa, Okla.

This resolution again calls attention to the fact that the Office of Economic Stabilization, for the third time I believe, has rejected the recommendation of Harold L. Ickes, Petroleum Administrator for War, that the price ceiling on crude oil be increased 35 cents a barrel.

Mr. President, there is a serious shortage of petroleum and petroleum products for carrying on the war effort. The need is for greater production. One of the incentives for increased production is price. Those engaged in the oil business, and Secretary Ickes, who has made a thorough investigation of the entire matter, are all convinced that the best way to get new wells into production is to grant the increase in the price of crude oil.

It certainly cannot be argued that an increase of 35 cents a barrel would be out of line with the prices of other materials and services, or that it would be out of line with increases in production costs. It is also only fair to state that if the governmental agencies given power over the economy of the Nation abuse the powers given them, Congress in time will intervene and take away some of those powers. That, I believe, is what will happen unless some of these agencies mend their ways and take more realistic views on the relation between prices and production costs.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas on the 29th of October 1943, the Office of Economic Stabilization disapproved the recommendation of the Petroleum Administrator for War for an increase of 35 cents per barrel in the price of crude oil; and

Whereas with this outstanding exception, it is the considered opinion of all official agencies and industrial groups concerned with the petroleum industry that there is no way in which this Nation's oil productivity can be increased without greater overall oil field activity and that this only can be achieved effectively and efficiently through greater over-all price incentives; and

Whereas, it is the universal opinion of those engaged in the petroleum industry that the price of crude oil must be raised if the industry is to fulfill its obligation to the Nation to produce sufficient petroleum and products to meet the need of the war program and essential civilian demand: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the Kansas-Oklahoma Division, Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, in annual meeting assembled, hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to amend the existing price control statutes so as to insure a proper and adequate price for crude oil and its products; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary is directed to record this resolution in the permanent minutes of the Kansas-Oklahoma Division, Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, and to transmit an attested copy of this resolution to each Member of the Congress of the United States, to the Petroleum Administrator for War, and to the chairman of the Petroleum Industry War Council.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on behalf of the Military Affairs Committee I report back favorably without amendment Senate bill 429, authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously in the name of Congress a Medal of Honor to Billy Mitchell.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

By Mr. OVERTON, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1340. A bill to establish a sanitary code governing the operation of restaurants in the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 595).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

H. R. 2697. A bill to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior; with amendments (Rept. No. 596).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

H. R. 324. A bill to place postmasters at fourth-class post offices on an annual-salary basis, and fix their rate of pay; and provide allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment, and fix the rates thereof; with amendments (Rept. No. 597).

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

H. R. 2836. A bill to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 598).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to whom was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on December 9, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 648. An act for the relief of Arthur C. Norcutt;

S. 990. An act for the relief of the Washington, Brandywine & Point Lookout Railroad Co.;

S. 1001. An act for the relief of the Meadow Brook Club;

S. 1038. An act for the relief of Verna Mae Rossell and Winifred Rossell Mooney;

S. 1049. An act to authorize the payment of additional compensation to special counsel in the case of United States against Standard Oil Co. of California;

S. 1282. An act for the relief of Eric W. Rodgers;

S. 1290. An act for the relief of William Carroll Knox; and

S. 1315. An act providing for the transfer to the custody and control of the Secretary of the Navy of certain lands comprising a portion of Croatan National Forest in the State of North Carolina.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

S. 1589. A bill for the relief of C. Guy Evans, Garland Mineral Springs, Index, Wash.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 1590. A bill for the relief of the State of Tennessee (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1591. A bill to provide additional compensation for county extension agents and home demonstration agents engaged in cooperative agricultural extension work; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1592. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Ann Knight Gregory; to the Committee on Pensions.

(Mr. ELLENDER introduced S. J. Res. 99 and 100, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appear under a separate heading.)

(Mr. ELLENDER also introduced S. J. Res. 101, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. PEPPER introduced S. J. Res. 102, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—DATE OF MEETING OF SECOND SESSION OF SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a Senate joint resolution to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation, as an agency of the United States from December 31, 1943, to February 5, 1944, and also fixing the date of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress at noon on Wednesday, January 12, 1944, which I ask to have appropriately referred.

I also ask unanimous consent to introduce two separate joint resolutions the purpose of which is to accomplish the same objective.

Mr. President, I am certain that the Congress cannot give adequate consideration to the all important subject of subsidies before the Christmas holidays. I am reliably informed that it will be very difficult to maintain a quorum in the House of Representatives after this week and my guess is that the same condition will prevail in this body. Aside from the holiday spirit the prevailing epidemic of influenza now in Washington is accounting for quite a number of absentees from both bodies.

The resolutions that I am asking consent to introduce simply provide for an extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation to February 5, 1944, and also that when we commence next session we assemble at noon on January 12, 1944. Should the resolutions be adopted Congress will have over 3 weeks in which to consider subsidies, and no doubt all Members of the Congress will be in a better condition both mentally and physically to legislate on the subject.

There being no objection, the joint resolutions, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER, were received, read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

S. J. Res. 99. Joint resolution continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, and fixing the date of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress; and

S. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. J. Res. 101. Joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PLANES AND BATTLESHIPS IN WARFARE

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, since the early part of the war now raging many air-power enthusiasts have proclaimed the obsolescence and uselessness of the battleship as a weapon of war. While it is true that air power has proved itself an indispensable factor in modern warfare, it has not succeeded in driving the battleship from the high seas of the world.

The battleship, when used in proper conjunction with other units of warfare, yet remains a most potent and lethal weapon both offensively and defensively. This fact was admirably demonstrated by the U. S. S. *South Dakota* in the epic struggle which it waged against Japanese naval and air forces in the South Pacific area not so many months ago.

Mr. President, as a Senator and as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, I have always maintained that the United States should build and maintain the most effective and most powerful Navy in the world. That fleet must be comprised of every type of vessel and plane which is necessary to give it maximum striking power. I am by no means convinced that the battleship does not constitute a vital and necessary component of the modern navy and I am fully persuaded, Mr. President, that the United States must maintain its Navy at full strength after the war's end.

In connection with this matter, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Planes or Battleships? Both," which appeared in this morning's issue—Monday, December 13, 1943—of the Washington Times-Herald.

PLANES OR BATTLESHIPS? BOTH

Last week, on the second anniversary of Pearl Harbor, the United States launched the third in a series of the biggest battleships yet floated by any nation.

The ship was the U. S. S. *Wisconsin*, the other two in this class being the *New Jersey* and the *Iowa*. Her tonnage is about 52,000, her big guns and antiaircraft when installed will be an enormous aggregation of fire power; she has some new and supposedly effective antisubmarine devices, and she cost an estimated $90,000,000.

The ship's launching, like all other battleship launchings for the last 8 or 10 years, set the air-power enthusiasts arguing afresh that it is all so useless. The airplane, say these people, has made the battleship obsolete, a sitting duck for bombers, and to tie up $90,000,000 of the taxpayers' money in one of

these sea-going steel monsters is little short of criminal.

There have been episodes in this war which strengthened the air power people's case. Most dramatic of these was the Japs' sinking by air power of the British warships *Repulse* and *Prince of Wales* in the wild week following Pearl Harbor. Hitler's beloved S. S. *Bismarck* was supposed to be unsinkable, yet she was sunk after sinking H. M. S. *Hood*—though by combined air and sea power. And certainly Pearl Harbor demonstrated that a docked battleship, with its crew off guard, is duck soup for the bombers.

And yet, the case for the airplane over the battleship is not yet fully made up.

Battleship backers insist that the new battleships are so heavily antiaircraft gunned that it is almost impossible for planes to get close enough to hit them. This contention has been borne out up to now, at least in part, by the excellent showings against air attack of the U. S. S. *South Dakota* in the southwest Pacific—long known to the public only as the battleship X.

It looks to us as if we'd better go on building battleships and planes for a while yet. We've got the money to blow $90,000,000 now and then on a battleship, and as long as other nations have these weapons, we'd better play safe and have them, too. Indeed, what we shall need after this war will be the world's most powerful surface and submarine Navy, plus the world's best air force, plus a highly trained skeleton Army expandable almost overnight to war strength from reserves who have had 6 months' to a year's compulsory military training.

VITALITY FOR ALL—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Vitality for All," delivered by the Vice President before a meeting sponsored by the Carolina Political Union at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C., December 11, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

TWENTY-FOURTH BROADCAST TO JAPAN BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD his twenty-fourth message to the people of Japan, broadcast on the 7th of December, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXCERPT FROM POEM BY CAPT. CLAUDE B. MORRIS

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from a poem written by Capt. Claude B. Morris, attached to the Second Corps Headquarters, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY H. S. ROBERTS AT MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE U. S. GUYER

[Mr. REED asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by H. S. Roberts, of Kansas City, Kans., at the memorial service for the late Representative U. S. Guyer, of Kansas, on December 1, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR OIL NEEDS—ARTICLE BY HON. HAROLD L. ICKES

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an article on post-war oil needs, by Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, published in the Washington Post of December 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CARNEGIE INSTITUTE FOUNDER'S DAY ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR CARLOS MARTINS

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Carnegie Institute Founder's Day address by Hon. Carlos Martins, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the United States from Brazil, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROBLEMS OF THE WEST—LETTER FROM ROY A. KISTLER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Roy A. Kistler, of Colby, Kans., with respect to the farm problems of the West, which appears in the Appendix.]

FILIPINO REHABILITATION COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question before the Senate is on Senate Joint Resolution 94 establishing the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission, defining its powers and duties, and for other purposes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, when Senate Joint Resolution 94 was under consideration last Thursday, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] pointed out that in his opinion it would be ill-advised for us, by United States law, to define the compensation of the Filipino members of the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission. On thinking the matter over I believe the position of the Senator from Ohio to be sound, and therefore I am offering an amendment which is short, which will correct the measure in that regard, and leave the matter of compensation for the Filipino members of the Commission in the control of the Philippine Government.

The amendment I offer is, in section 13, paragraph (f), on page 3, line 22, before the word "members" to insert "United States"; in line 23, after the word "under", to strike out the word "each" and insert "the United States"; in line 24, after the word "annum" and the period, to insert "The compensation of the Philippine members of the Commission shall be determined by the Government of the Philippine Commonwealth." The language of paragraph (f), when perfected, will read as follows:

> The annual compensation of the United States members of this Commission, other than those holding official positions under the United States Government, shall be $10,000 per annum. The compensation of the Philippine members of the Commission shall be determined by the Government of the Philippine Commonwealth.

As the members of the United States part of the Commission will largely be persons who are already drawing Federal salaries, it is doubtful if any member of the Commission coming from our own Government will receive any compensation at all for such services. The question of Filipino compensation will be determined by the Philippine Government.

I offer the amendment and ask that it be pending at the time the measure is considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be in order after the committee amendment is disposed of.

The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 10, after the word "appropriated", it is proposed to strike out "the sum of $ ", and insert "such sums as may be necessary."

REPLY TO REPORT BY SENATOR BUTLER ON HIS TRIP TO CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICA

Mr. McKELLAR obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	George	Murray
Bailey	Gerry	Nye
Ball	Gillette	O'Daniel
Bankhead	Green	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Guffey	Overton
Bone	Gurney	Pepper
Brewster	Hatch	Radcliffe
Bridges	Hayden	Reed
Brooks	Hill	Revercomb
Buck	Holman	Robertson
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Butler	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	Lodge	Truman
Chandler	Lucas	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Vandenberg
Connally	McFarland	Van Nuys
Danaher	McKellar	Wallgren
Davis	Maybank	Walsh, Mass.
Downey	Mead	Walsh, N. J.
Eastland	Millikin	Wherry
Ellender	Moore	White
Ferguson	Murdock	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is detained on public business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of public matters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, at the beginning of my remarks I may say that I desire to yield later on to any Senator who wishes me to yield to him, but until I shall have completed my state-

ment with respect to the over-all picture of the so-called Butler report I should like not to be interrupted. After that time I will be glad to yield to any Member of the Senate who desires me to yield.

Mr. President, at the outset let me say that it is not my intention to reflect in any way upon the character or integrity of my distinguished friend and colleague the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]. He has been in the Senate only a short time and I had formed a very high and favorable opinion of him. I have no doubt he is a worthy and honorable man. It is true I have been deeply disappointed in his judgment in making the so-called report of his trip to South and to Central America. I think he has been grossly and grievously misled. I think he has been, so to speak, "taken in" and grievously imposed upon. As to his report, I shall criticize it very freely, but as to his honesty and character I shall make no aspersions.

Mr. President, I shall discuss today the so-called Butler report.

In doing so I shall start by taking my text from the eleventh chapter of the Book of Matthew.

Christ had given His instruction to His disciples and then proceeded to preach to the multitudes in the city. John the Baptist was in prison. He also had disciples, and he sent two of them out to find out about Jesus. Evidently the two disciples were doubtful whether He was the Messiah. As they departed, Jesus said to the multitude, concerning John:

> What went ye out for to see? A reed shaken with the wind? But what went ye out for to see? A man clothed in soft raiment? A prophet?

Now, Mr. President, I ask the question of the three self-styled disciples of good government who went to South America last summer—Joseph W. Seacrest, the newspaperman; Maurice Mumford, the magazine writer; and my esteemed friend, the Senator from Nebraska, "What went ye out for to see?" Did they go out to aid the good-neighbor policy in which we all believe? Or did they go out to aid in cementing the ties and bonds which now hold together the various nations of the American hemisphere? Did they go out for the purpose of helping to win this war? Or what did they go out for to see? Did they go out hoping to find what they called boondoggling, or did they go out hoping to find waste and extravagance in our dealings with our Latin-American neighbors? Or did they go on a fishing expedition throwing out nets with the hope of dragging in mud? Or did they hope by wide publicity to foment misunderstandings between us and our Latin-American neighbors or between neighbors having a common friendship and fighting a common enemy? Again I repeat the words of my text: What did this newspaperman and this magazine writer and this good Rotarian, the Senator from Nebraska, go out for to see? Did they go out on a political mission? Were they seeking material for next year's election? Ah, Mr. President, when we read what is in the first draft of the report as printed, we find that this mission, this remarkable visit, evidently did not intend to help the war effort. The travelers did not intend to help cement the kindly relationship that existed between us and Latin America, but, as it seems to me, they were bent upon stirring up trouble and strife between the independent states of America, and I shall now undertake to show that to be the fact.

Mr. President, on November 26, last, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] put into the RECORD what he called an over-all account of our dealings in Latin America for the last 3 years. Previous to that speech he had had an article printed in the Reader's Digest under his name and under the title of "Our Deep, Dark Secrets in Latin America." This article seems to be an epitome of his so-called report to the Senate filed on November 26.

In the Reader's Digest and in the so-called report it is seen in the very nature of things that it was impossible for the Senator from Nebraska or any other man to have gotten all this information on an airplane trip of 55 days, traveling many thousands of miles in the air, and dropping down on capitals of Latin-American countries for a few hours and occasionally a couple of days. Judging from the so-called report, it looks as if the report must have been arranged before the trip was started; and the trip seems to have been merely an attempt to cloak the report with some semblance of personal information. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] calls it a report to the Senate. I wonder how much the newspaperman and the magazine writer had to do with the preparation of this report. I wonder how much this marvelous airplane trip over the highest mountains in America cost, and who paid for it. I wonder how much this magazine writer had to do with "our deep, dark secrets in Latin America." Such a title sounds very much more like the work of an experienced magazine writer than it does like the work of a Senator, and the articles also are stamped with newspaper and magazine insignia.

Mr. President, I went to the Senator from Nebraska on November 26, when I heard that he was going to put some kind of a report in the RECORD, and told him our appropriations affecting Central and South America had all come through the Appropriations Committee, of which I was a member, and that from what I had heard of his so-called report I was confident that we had made no such expenditures in Latin America, and I urged him to quit before putting what I believed to be incorrect figures in the RECORD, but he would not listen to me, and said the report had to go in the RECORD immediately, that very day. Thereupon, I told him that inasmuch as it was an attack on the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses, I would investigate the actual facts and would present them to the Senate later.

Now, Mr. President, I am here with the actual facts. I present first an over-all picture of all our expenditures and operations for the last 3 years in Latin America. I hope Senators will listen carefully as I read these figures:

Federal expenditures and cash-loan transactions in and related to the 20 other American republics for fiscal years 1941–43

Purchase of strategic materials and ships, consumed, sold, or stock piled (including capital outlays to facilitate procurement)	$1,102,637,000
Valuation of lend-lease materials and services transferred	93,646,000
Army and Navy except troop and fleet expenses (other than lend-lease transfers and purchase of ships)	158,960,000
Other expenditures:	
Department of State	1,724,000
Foreign Economic Administration	3,522,000
Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs	29,169,000
All other agencies	37,164,000
Total expenditures	1,426,822,000
Cash loans:	
By Export-Import Bank	120,028,000
By other agencies	536,000
Total expenditures and cash loans	1,547,386,000
Minus:	
Cash-loan repayments to Export-Import Bank (excluding interest)	57,820,000
Cash received on account of lend-lease	6,193,000
Net total	1,483,373,000

NOTE.—All figures for Defense Supplies Corporation, Defense Plant Corporation, Metals Reserve Company, Rubber Development Corporation, Rubber Reserve Company, and United States Commercial Company are actual expenditures through Oct. 31, 1943. It is estimated that the total expenditures and cash loans in fiscal year 1944 will approximate $1,000,000,000, primarily for strategic materials, and subsequent expenditures under existing and possible future agreements are dependent upon the progress and duration of the war.

Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska stated in his "Our Deep, Dark Secrets in Latin America" and also his so-called "report" to the Senate of his Andes Mountain air trip that our expenditures in Latin America at the lowest estimate were $6,000,000,000, and he believed they would run as high as $8,000,000,000. He referred to our expenditures as "boondoggling" and "fish-doggling" by "do-gooders" and "help-outers," and denounced the whole program as wasteful extravagance.

Now, Mr. President, let us examine the above over-all statement of expenditures for these 3 fiscal years, namely, 1941, 1942, and 1943. Of the $1,426,822,000, which represents the limit of expenditures, it is seen that $1,102,637,000 was for the purchase of strategic materials and ships, and for this money the United States received definite values. We bought these strategic materials in our prosecution of the war. We had to have them. Latin America was the best place in the then situation of the world—and still is—from which to get them; and in regard to some of the materials it was the only place where we could get them.

When we take the cost of our strategic materials and ships, namely, $1,102,637,000, from the total over-all expenditures of $1,426,822,000, it leaves our total actual expenditures in Latin America at the relatively modest war figure of $324,185,000.

So, Mr. President, instead of the $6,000,000,000 or the $8,000,000,000, as reported by the Senator from Nebraska and his newspaper and magazine friends as a result of their flying trip to various capitals of Central and South America, we find that those expenditures aggregated only $324,185,000. Mr. President, there is quite a difference between $324,185,000 and $6,000,000,000 or $8,000,000,000. Does anyone wish to know what that difference is? Let us state what it is. These facts show that the Senator from Nebraska on what he called his conservative estimate of $6,000,000,000, was just $5,675,815,000 wrong. Think of it Mr. President. Just $5,675,815,000 wrong. Just a trifling little mistake of 95 percent on the whole matter; that is all. He was 5 percent right, and 95 percent wrong—merely a little error of more than 95 percent out of the total.

So, Mr. President, we find this monumental "report" from Latin America, after a flying trip of 55 days and of 20,000 miles—I say 20,000 miles; that is Mr. BUTLER'S figure, and we know what a good figurer he is—5 percent right and 95 percent wrong.

He made a trifling mistake of $5,675,815,000. Mr. President, it is even worse than that, because other deductions must be made. The figure of $324,185,000 for Federal expenditures in 1941, 1942, and 1943, is really too high, but I wanted to be generous with my friend from Nebraska. The figure $324,185,000 includes many items which are just as important to winning the war as is the purchase of strategic materials.

First, it includes an item of $93,000,000 of lend-lease transfer, on which repayments of $30,000,000 are expected.

Secondly, it includes military and naval expenditures of $158,000,000 of which $108,000,000 was spent on airports and other military facilities, absolutely vital to our antisubmarine activities, the ferrying of our planes to Africa, and the protection of the Panama Canal.

Thirdly, it includes an item of $7,000,000 for sanitation around the airports and bases, and in connection with the procurement of strategic materials. Deducting the $30,000,000 to be repaid on lend-lease transfers, the capital investment in airports and military facilities, and the expenditures on sanitation, the $324,185,000 is reduced to $178,000,000. I think the Senator from Nebraska, his newspaper friend, Mr. Joseph W. Seacrest, and his magazine friend, Mr. Maurice Mumford, will go down in history as a triumvirate of the most monumental and erroneous guessers that the world has ever known. I doubt if Ananias, Baron Munchausen, or Jules Verne, singly or combined, every conceived or ever uttered such monumental and inaccurate guesses in all their lives as have been included in this marvelous so-called report.

What was the purpose of it? I again refer to my text. "What went ye out for to see?" They themselves admitted that their report was erroneous. Evidently they had no confidence in their own figures as submitted in the so-called report. The Senator from Nebraska made the report on November 26, and his letter asking for the real facts from the various departments was dated November 24. It is perfectly evident also that they obtained no ratification of those figures in Latin America, because as soon as they returned to the United States, the Senator from Nebraska wrote a letter to each and every agency doing business with South America, to get the real facts as to expenditures. Those facts have been obtained, and they will be placed in the RECORD.

If they had been searching for facts, it is obvious that the expenditure of time, energy, and money by these three ambassadors might have been saved. They could have requested the facts in Washington before they left.

Again, Mr. President, I refer to my text, "What went ye out for to see?" Think of it! Their 200-page printed report shows expenditures of $6,000,000,000, and when the facts are presented, it is found that only $324,185,000 has been expended in Latin America, except for the purchase of strategic materials and ships. They went out to make a mountain, and they came back with what I think is a molehill.

I now wish to take up the constituent figures and transactions on which this over-all picture is based. The first picture I wish to present is a report furnished me by Hon. Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, and the moving power in so many of these defense corporations.

Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD following my remarks the reports and documents which I shall discuss during my presentation.

First, I ask that the entire report of Mr. Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, be inserted in the RECORD. I shall read and comment on certain facts and figures given by Mr. Jones.

Second, I wish to insert in the RECORD and comment on certain items in the report of Mr. Warren L. Pierson, President of the Import-Export Bank.

Third, I insert the report of Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State.

Fourth, I insert in the RECORD the reports of Hon. Leo. T. Crowley, Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration.

Fifth, I submit the report of Hon. Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy.

Sixth, I present the report of Hon. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War.

Seventh, I ask to insert the report of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, Mr. Nelson Rockefeller.

Eighth, I submit the report of Hon. J. B. Hutson, President of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(The reports referred to appear at the conclusion of Mr. MCKELLAR'S speech.)

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall not read all of Mr. Jones' statement, but I shall read certain excerpts from it and comment on them.

Mr. Jones says:

Senator BUTLER says:

"The $20,000,000 credit was advanced for the construction of the Nicaro nickel plant in Cuba, and no final determination of its ultimate ownership has been made as far as I have been able to learn."

And elsewhere he says:

"As far as it is known, the enormous air bases, the huge military bases built at United States expense in Cuba, for which we paid dearly indeed, go to the Cubans after the war; and the $30,000,000 nickel plant in Cuba built by the Defense Plant Corporation, a Reconstruction Finance Corporation subsidiary, apparently is intended to be theirs, also."

Mr. Jones continues:

The situation at Nicaro is that the Nicaro Nickel Co., a subsidiary of Freeport Sulfur Co., owns nickel-bearing mining property near Preston, Cuba. Defense Plant Corporation has committed itself to the expenditure of $32,800,000 for the construction of production facilities for the mining, milling, and treatment of ore from these properties. Legal title to the facilities is held by the Cuban Nickel Co., a Cuban subsidiary of Nicaro Nickel Co., for the benefit of and subject to the direction and control of Defense Plant Corporation.

Defense Plant Corporation has leased the plant facilities to the Nicaro Nickel Co. for a 10-year period. They will be operated for the account of the Metals Reserve Company. At the expiration of the lease agreement or in the event of its earlier termination, Nicaro must either cause title to be transferred to Defense Plant Corporation or it must exercise within 6 months its option to buy the property at cost less depreciation of 7½ percent per annum but in no case for less than 36⅔ percent of original cost.

It is quite clear from the contractual relationships that ultimate ownership of the property rests with Defense Plant Corporation, unless Defense Plant Corporation sells the property at some later date.

Senator BUTLER'S statement that the ownship of this property is apparently intended to go to the Cubans after the war is therefore entirely without foundation.

Mr. President, I come now to one of the most interesting mistakes made in this record. It is found under the title "Rubber." Mr. Jones quotes the Senator from Nebraska as saying that that is a very important subject at this time. Mr. Jones' statement continues:

Senator BUTLER says:

"The daily press carried an announcement in October 1943 that 30,000,000 tires are to be produced within the next year for civilians.

"If this be true, it seems incongruous to permit rubber costs to continue at the rate of $200 to $500 per pound in Guatemala, Brazil, and other Latin-American countries. The former cost of raw rubber was 6 cents a pound."

Keep those figures in mind.

"Either the United States does not need rubber badly enough to spend $500 a pound in Latin America to get it, or the 30,000,000 tires of civilians must be awfully urgently needed.

"The rubber program, the quartz program, the fiber program—all three in Latin America—are sordid pictures of waste and disappointing results.

"Five hundred thousand pounds of rubber was desired from the big Brazil projects. Less than 30,000 pounds have been delivered to the United States this year."

Listen to these figures—

"The cost — overhead — investment and everything included, runs close to $15,000,000. This is about $500 a pound for rubber. We used to pay 6 cents a pound for raw rubber."

The statement of the Senator from Nebraska is a frightful one; is it not? Listen to the answer. I am still quoting from Mr. Jones.

The main trouble with the above statement is that it distributes the cost over 30,000 pounds of rubber instead of 30,000 tons of rubber.

And long tons, too. It is a trifling mistake. In percentage it is a little larger than the original, but not so costly. Think of it. The Senator estimates the cost of rubber in Brazil and other countries to be $500 a pound, and he gives a figure of 30,000 pounds of rubber as representing all that we have received, when, as a matter of fact, we have received 30,000 long tons of 2,240 pounds each. That is some mistake; is it not? Is it possible that we will pay much attention to a report which makes such a mistake as that? There is not only a mistake in the number of pounds, but truth compels me to say that the Senator made a mistake in the $15,000,000. The mistake is not on his side of the equation but on mine.

I continue reading from Mr. Jones' statement.

Total expenditures by Rubber Reserve Company and Rubber Development Corporation to acquire and increase the supply of natural rubber in Latin America up to January 1, 1944, will approximate $78,000,000.

So instead of my friend being correct in saying that $15,000,000 has been expended for rubber in Latin America, $78,000,000 has been spent.

Mr. President, what is the situation as it relates to rubber? As everyone knows we had been obtaining our rubber from the Far East, and the supply was cut off. We have undertaken to manufacture synthetic rubber, but, as every informed person knows, about 25 percent of natural rubber is required to be mixed with synthetic rubber in order to make a product equal to that which we demand. I do not know what synthetic rubber costs, but I wish to say in all fairness that the rubber which we are buying from Brazil costs 82 cents a pound—not $500, but 82 cents. That represents some little difference; does it not? I have before me the figures from Mr. Jones as to what is being spent. Of course, we have to have rubber. Our rubber supply had been exhausted. Our airplanes, jeeps, and big guns must roll on rubber. We must have a good quality of rubber. We must have natural rubber mixed with synthetic rubber in order to get along. No man ever did his duty better than Jesse Jones did his when he undertook to obtain natural rubber from South America. I believe that almost everyone will agree with that statement.

I turn now to the Bolivian air lines. Mr. Jones is again quoting Senator BUTLER:

Among the queer deals made is the Bolivian blunder. The United States, through the Defense Supplies Corporation, an R. F. C. subsidiary, loaned Bolivia $660,000 with which to buy new planes. This was to get Bolivia to promise a $200,000 subsidy annually to Panagra (Pan American-Grace Airways)—an American air line.

So here we have come-on from our purse of $660,000 to get a foreign government to subsidize an American air line. Well.

That is a terrible charge.

The facts are—

Says Mr. Jones—

In April 1941 Defense Supplies Corporation started a program designed to replace Axis personnel and equipment in Latin-American air lines with United States personnel and equipment.

In furtherance of this program, Defense Supplies made a loan to Lloyd Aereo Boliviano of $300,000 for working capital and for construction, improvements, and replacements. In addition, aircraft and spare parts to the value of $360,000 were sold to Lloyd Aereo Boliviano on credit.

A subsidy equal to $16,000, United States currency, per month ($192,000 per year) had for some time been paid to Lloyd Aereo Boliviano by the Bolivian Government, and in the Defense Supplies contract covering these loans to the Lloyd Aereo Boliviano it was stipulated that the Bolivian Government should continue this subsidy. Obviously, the reason for making this one of the conditions of the contract was to make sure that the Lloyd Aereo Boliviano would continue to receive this assistance from the Bolivian Government so that it could operate in the black, thus providing additional security for the ultimate payment of the loan.

Of course, he refers to the loan which the American Government had made.

I continue to read from the statement of Mr. Jesse Jones:

When Lloyd Aereo Boliviano divested itself of its German management, Lloyd Aereo Boliviano and the Pan American-Grace Airways entered into a contract for the operation of Lloyd Aereo Boliviano by Pan American-Grace Airways.

Defense Supplies Corporation was not a party to this contract. The contract provided for the payment of compensation by Lloyd Aereo Boliviano by Pan American-Grace Airways of $1,500 monthly, one-half of which Pan American-Grace Airways obligated itself to invest in the capital stock of Lloyd Aereo Boliviano.

Instead of that being a bad transaction, it was a perfectly straight transaction.

The Mexican over-all agreement is the next one which Mr. Jones takes up. He states:

Senator BUTLER, in referring to the over-all agreement with the Mexican Government for the purchase of strategic and critical materials makes the following statement:

"The sections marked seem to indicate that, largely as a good-will measure, the United States is committed to the purchase of surplus commodities or materials of Mexican origin, whether we need them or not. And that, as a matter of policy, we are further committed to buy them at the highest prevailing prices—whether justified or not. The only limitation seems to be that when we have purchased up to 25 percent of such exportable surpluses, we may not be called upon to buy more."

Mr. Jones states the facts to be, as follows:

The facts in connection with this agreement are that it was originally negotiated at the request of the United States at a time when Mexico was a large exporter of strategic materials to Japan. We asked Mexico to stop such exports and offered to provide an alternative market for them.

What better sense could be exercised than to take a position such as that. We not only offered a market for them, not only backed Mexico, but we kept Japan from getting the essential materials. Mr. Jones goes on to state what the materials are:

(a) Henequen; ixtle of lechugilla, of maguey, of mezcal and of palm; pita; similar fibers; binder twine and cables and cords manufactured with the above-mentioned fibers.

(b) Antimony—

Listen to this, and remember that all these materials were needed in our factories—

Antimony, arsenic, bismuth, cadmium, zinc, cobalt, copper, fluorspar, tin, graphite, manganese, mercury, mica, molybdenum, lead, tungsten, and vanadium, whether in mineral, concentrated or metallic form.

Those materials are absolutely necessary. We got the strategic materials which were necessary, and Japan by the agreement was kept from getting them. Not only that, but, Senators, let me tell you that Jesse Jones has a long head and when he trades he knows what he is doing, and the American Government does not lose by his action.

Senator BUTLER'S statement referred to a project for the construction of a vanadium plant in Peru, and $5,000,000 credit extension therefore.

The facts are these:

As trustee for Defense Plant Corporation, Vanadium Corporation of America holds title to new facilities constructed with funds provided by Defense Plant Corporation up to a maximum of $4,000,000 for increasing the production of vanadium in Peru. Title is held in trust for and subject to the control of Defense Plant Corporation.

Under an agreement for use, Vanadium Corporation has the right to use these facilities for a period of 10 years. At the end of that period or in the event of earlier termination of the agreement, if Vanadium Corporation does not purchase the properties, it must transfer title to Defense Plant Corporation. The option to purchase is good for 90 days after termination of the agreement.

Vanadium Corporation may buy the plant either at cost, plus interest, less annual fees paid for use of the facilities, or the cost less depreciation—whichever is the higher.

So it seems, Mr. President, that Mr. Jones in connection with his transactions gives a full, free, ample, and complete report, denying in toto every charge made in the so-called report of the Senator from Nebraska.

I next come to the charge made against the Export-Import Bank. I shall be brief, because all these papers will go into the RECORD. I shall merely refer to them. I read from the report of

Mr. Pierson, President of the Export-Import Bank:

The Butler report states:

Other expenditures of the United States in Cuba, to which a military significance seems to have been imputed, are:

Loan of $25,000,000 to Cuba for widening the central highway from Habana to the other end of the isle. The contention was made that this highway, though already of normal width and well surfaced, was strategically valuable as a means of more quickly transporting troops across the island, should necessity arise at some future time. However, it was freely admitted among military staff men that such a necessity was far from imminent. In addition, here again the argument was advanced that it was a part of the good-will program to improve this boulevard for the Cubans.

Listen to the facts:

In 1941 Export-Import Bank approved a line of credit of $25,000,000 in favor of Republic of Cuba to assist in financing the cost of materials, equipment, and services from the United States and Cuba required in connection with such United States projects as might be requested from time to time by Cuba and approved by the bank as eligible for financing under the credit. Prior thereto—

Listen to this, Senators:

Prior thereto Cuba had borrowed from Export-Import Bank in excess of $38,000,000, all of which had been properly repaid, together with interest. At the time the $25,000,000 line of credit was established the Cuban Congress levied taxes to provide for the repayment of any sums borrowed under this credit.

Mr. Pierson goes on to explain them. The money was paid back in the first instance, and the assertion is made that there is not a dime due the United States. There is some debt still outstanding, but there is no debt past due. Cuba is paying the debt right along. I shall refer further to that matter.

The next facts alleged by the Senator from Nebraska seem to have been taken at random, but the report of Mr. Pierson discloses the true state of affairs. By the way, I want to say that while I know Mr. Pierson only very slightly, he is very much like Jesse Jones in his trading operations. One can take his report and see that the loans he has made have been made on ample security, and that there have been no losses; indeed, in making these and other loans, loans to Americans as well as loans to foreign countries, he is in the black at this good hour to the extent of $30,000,000. Yet the report of the Senator from Nebraska would have us believe that for ulterior purposes Mr. Pierson is making loans to countries to the south without value and without proper security.

When the report of Mr. Pierson is read the conclusion cannot be escaped, whether one may want to escape it or not, that he has made good loans every time; all those which are due have been paid, and those which are not yet due will be paid.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator know where the Senator from Nebraska got the information that Mr. Pierson was a boondoggler?

Mr. McKELLAR. No, sir; I do not know where he got that information.

Mr. President, Senator from Nebraska made a number of charges. One had to do with $10,000,000 for an oil refinery project, another with railroad equipment, another with Mexican handicraft aid, and other projects. There is not a word of truth in the charges; they are wholly without foundation. The transactions made were based on the best of business judgment and the best business management. I shall not read any more from this report, but I want to ask Senators to be good enough to read the two reports of Jesse Jones, representing the Defense Plant Corporation and many other corporations and representing also the Department of Commerce, and read the report of Mr. Pierson. If they will do that they will find in those reports an absolute refutation of every charge in the so-called report of the Senator from Nebraska.

I now wish to refer to a very brief report by Leo T. Crowley. I do not know how many Senators know him, but he is one of the grandest men we have in the public service.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he proceeds to another point?

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will permit me to conclude, but I yield to him.

Mr. LUCAS. I was wondering whether there was anything in the report of the Senator from Nebraska which showed that he ever checked with Jesse Jones or Pierson before he wrote his article.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; both the report and the article were actually published 2 days after he wrote to Mr. Jones and to Mr. Pierson, and to the other gentlemen, for the facts.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Was that Drew Pearson?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; not Drew Pearson. It is Mr. Warren Lee Pierson, head of the Export-Import Bank, and one of the finest men in this country.

Mr. Crowley says:

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: You have requested me to give you the relevant data about lend-lease aid supplied to the other American republics during the fiscal years 1941, 1942, and 1943. It is as follows:

1. Substantially all lend-lease aid to Latin America consists of military items such as guns, aircraft, military vehicles, small naval craft, and materials used in ordnance plants and other installations for producing articles with a military or naval end use.

2. The original arrangements to supply military and naval equipment to Latin America were approved by General Marshall, Chief of Staff; Admiral Stark, Chief of Naval Operations; the Acting Secretary of State; and the President.

3. All assignments of military and naval equipment have been approved by military and naval authorities, acting under the direction of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

4. The valuation of lend-lease materials and services, made available to Latin-American countries during the fiscal years 1941, 1942, and 1943 amounts to approximately $93,646,000 (comprising Navy Department $14,185,000; War Department $77,029,000; Treasury Department $1,315,000; and War Shipping Administration $1,117,000). Of this total, a substantial part has gone to Brazil.

5. During the same period the United States has been reimbursed to the extent of $6,193,000 for lend-lease aid furnished the countries of Latin America. The payments for lend-lease aid supplied to these countries will probably eventually amount to approximately one-third of the value of materials and services supplied.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In connection with the last letter read by the Senator, I call his attention to the fact that the newspapers today announce the fact that Brazilian contingents are to be sent into the Allied front lines.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have noted that, and I am delighted to know it. I shall refer to that later.

Mr. President, I next come to the Foreign Economic Administration. Our distinguished Vice President at one time was at the head of that agency. I wish to read from a report:

Many other essential war materials have been obtained from the Latin-American republics, including fibers, fats, and oils, and lumber products. These countries are now the only source of abaca (manila hemp), henequen, certain grades of sisal, fibers used extensively in naval operations, and the chief source of flax. They are now the only source of castor seed, castor and rapeseed oil, furnish us all our imported supply and 20 percent of our requirements of tung and oiticica oil, 10 percent of our requpirement of certain oils used for soaps, glycerines, and plasticizers, and large quantitities of balsa wood and mahogany required in our naval and aviation programs. Many other illustrations could readily be added.

The report says further:

Senator BUTLER makes two general criticisms of the procurement program in Latin America. The Senator asserts (1) that the Government procurement agencies have paid "premium" prices for supplies and (2) that they have entered into agreements to purchase exportable surpluses of certain commodities which are in excess of our own requirements. These criticisms, in my opinion, are not well founded.

Prices paid by the Government have been no higher than the minimum necessary to obtain the supplies required. Wartime prices for commodities imported from the Latin American republics, like those imported from other sources or produced domestically, have, of course, risen sharply as a result of extreme shortage of supply and abnormal wartime demands. It can be safely said, however, that the prices paid under Government procurement programs have been substantially less than the prices which would have been paid by private dealers in a free market without price controls. By acting as the sole buyer in many cases and eliminating private competitive buying, the Government has saved the public many millions of dollars.

One more quotation, and I shall be through. The Senator from Nebraska is quoted as saying:

The indications are that some graft may attend the quartz production and distribution handling, since the price seems unreasonably high in the United States compared to the price at the mines and since someone has been paid a lot of money for quartz that has no value. Either that, or the inspection of the quartz before purchase has been faulty or insufficient.

The report then proceeds:

Answer. The charge is baseless. The assumptions on which it is made are unfounded, as shown previously. Since last March the Purchasing Commission has had in ef-

fect a system of double-checking of inspections which minimizes the possibility of error on the part of the inspectors. The financial calculations are likewise double-checked in Rio and again in Washington.

Mr. President, there are two more matters to which I wish to refer. In the report of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs it is stated:

The Aviation Subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives reporting on its special mission to inspect air bases, November 3–20, 1943, made the following comment upon the work of the health and sanitation program:

"Especial mention is due to the health and sanitary work which has transformed deadly tropic areas into healthful bases. Too much credit cannot be given for this achievement, for it has probably resulted in saving the lives of many thousands of American boys. In addition these missions will have their good effect upon the people and the officials of the areas in question in the years to come."

This further statement appears in this report:

If the Japanese had struck at this hemisphere after Pearl Harbor, it is a fair guess that Ecuador would have been one place where our troops would have been fighting.

The Senator from Nebraska very severely criticized the expenditures for an air base in the Galapagos Islands, which lie near the Pacific entrance of the Panama Canal. This report states:

If the Japanese had struck at this hemisphere after Pearl Harbor, it is a fair guess that Ecuador would have been one place where our troops would have been fighting. Today the hospitals and clinics to which Senator BUTLER refers, through preventive and curative measures, are taking important steps to safeguard the lives and health of our troops and sailors stationed at bases in Ecuador and of those who are working so hard to obtain the maximum amount of Ecuador's balsa wood and other essential raw materials.

The total amount spent in Ecuador on our troops, and our air base on the islands nearby belonging to Ecuador, was $1,400,000; and it was spent to save the lives of our soldiers. Do such conditions exist there as existed in Guadalcanal and near Manila? We all remember how many men we lost there. Could we have afforded to do anything else than see that the health of our troops was protected?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, would the Senator object to being interrupted for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to have the Senator wait for a little while. It will not take me long to conclude, and I shall then be glad to answer any question.

I have reports not only from those to whom I have referred, but from Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, from the Secretary of the Navy, from the Secretary of War, and from the Commodity Credit Corporation, all of which uphold the figures I have given, the over-all picture I have given. Instead of $6,000,000,000, exclusive of the strategic materials and the ships we bought, we have spent $324,185,000 in all of Latin America. There is quite a difference between those figures.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the event the report submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is finally printed as a Senate document—and I hope it will not be—the documents which I have now submitted, showing what the true facts are, may be printed as a part of that Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I feel I must object to that request.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will take that matter up later. I do not think the Senate can afford to let such an inaccurate, such an untrue report go out as a Senate document, when we have reports from the departments which show what the actual facts are, and when we show that the report of the Senator from Nebraska is 95 percent untrue and only 5 percent true. But I will take that matter up later.

Mr. President, it is thus seen that our financial operations in Latin America thus far have amounted to about 5 percent of what the Senator from Nebraska "conservatively" estimated them to be. It will also be seen that each and every department of the Government dealing with South America during this war has conducted itself in a fair, open, and honest way, and in a perfectly friendly way.

We have bought an enormous amount of strategic materials in Latin America, more than $1,102,000,000 worth.

We have obligated ourselves to buy what Mr. Jones estimates will be seven hundred and fifty million or eight hundred million dollars more of strategic materials if the war continues for some time. He says the ultimate amount will not be more than $1,000,000,000 more.

We have by our purchases down there and by reason of the good will shown to us by our Latin-American neighbors prevented these strategic war materials from getting into the hands of the Japanese or the Germans.

Mr. President, to my mind one of the greatest accomplishments by the associated American republics as a whole during this war was to prevent these strategic materials from getting to Germany and to Japan.

We have sought in every way to bring about, maintain, and keep good relations with our Latin-American neighbors.

This good-will policy toward our Latin-American neighbors in the South has been many times attempted by American statesmen, but none have succeeded as fully and so completely as has our present able and distinguished Secretary of State, Cordell Hull.

At the very begining of this administration in 1933 Mr. Hull made a good-will trip to Montevideo in attendance upon the Inter-American Conference that was held there that year.

In like manner in 1936 he attended another special inter-American meeting at Buenos Aires.

In 1938 he attended for the third time an Inter-American Conference at Lima, Peru.

In 1940 he attended a similar conference at Havana, Cuba.

At all these meetings Mr. Hull by his kindness, his consideration, his deference, and his fairness incurred the good will not only of the countries which he visited but all Latin America, and I think I can say that no American statesman has ever made the impression, has ever had the whole-hearted cooperation of the Latin-American republics like Secretary Hull has received. It seems from the results that Mr. Hull has been as successful in Latin-American conferences as he was recently in the Moscow Conference.

It must be remembered that soon after this war broke out it was expected that Germany would soon over-run French North Africa, and it was boldly stated that she was going to take Dakar and use it as a base to invade this hemisphere from that point. We all know the Atlantic Ocean is very narrow there, narrower than it is anywhere else. Natal in Brazil is an important port and it was believed it would be first attacked by Germany. Naturally, therefore, it was necessary that we make every effort to cooperate with our South American and Central American friends, and no group of nations—and I say this with pride in Latin America—ever rose to the occasion in a finer, better, or a more self-sacrificing way than did our South and Central American friends in this war.

I visited South America some 5 or 6 years ago, and I know of my own knowledge that in all their large cities—and three of them, Buenos Aires, Rio de Janeiro, and São Paulo, are among the largest cities in the world—there were great groups of German traders, Japanese traders, Italian traders, English traders, and lastly American traders, seeking to sell their wares in South America and seeking to buy the products of South America. They had close business relations with Germany and with Japan and with Italy, all of whom are all our enemies, though Italy has now capitulated.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that when we remember all these conditions we must see how fortunate we are that the nations of this hemisphere are together and united. In this connection I want to mention Mr. Nelson A. Rockefeller who has contributed so effectively to this result.

Japan expected to land on the west coast, the Germans and the Italians expected to land on the east coast of South America, but they have not done it, and they are not going to do it. Why, Mr. President? My answer is that it is because of the good will and the friendship, cooperation, strong community of interest that have been built up in the last few years by the people of this country and the people of South and Central America. Not only have they not aided the other side, but 13 have declared war against the Axis, notwithstanding their business relations heretofore existing, and 6 more have broken off relations with the Axis Powers, leaving only 1 that is neutral.

In 1941 every man in this country was alarmed for fear that the Axis might make some break along the inter-American line, but there has been no break. No enemy powers have landed their troops on any part of this hemisphere, and that reassuring fact is due to the good-neighbor policy established, as I have outlined heretofore, between the United States and our Latin-American neighbors to the south of us.

We have dealt with them on terms of perfect equality, of perfect friendship and of great consideration, and they have likewise dealt with us. In my judgment no great group of nations has ever acted any more fairly or any more justly to their neighbors than the Central and South American nations have acted toward us in this war. I take off my hat to them. I am proud of the fact that we are doing business with them and I want to make our relations a thousandfold stronger and better than they have been heretofore.

Any amounts which we have spent down there or lent down there have been relatively exceedingly small. We have expended these amounts to win the war and the South and Central American states have cooperated in breaking off their relations with the Axis Powers and in standing by the people of this hemisphere. All honor to them and all respect to them. I admire them very greatly and I hope that the good-neighbor policy which Americans have so long desired and sought will be continued and upheld and I believe it will be. They are our neighbors and they are our friends.

The Senator from Nebraska, in his report, charges that the United States is attempting to purchase the good will of the Latin-American countries. The Senator should have known that the good will of the Latin-American countries is not for sale. They guard jealously their good name and their reputation. They would no more think of selling themselves and their countries' interests than we would.

The Senator apparently was ignorant of the fact that, as a result of the good-neighbor policy, the United States already enjoys the good will of the Latin-American countries. This was obtained, not by attempted purchase, but by developing the community of Latin-American interests through the good-neighbor policy. This policy rests on observance of the principles of sovereignty, equality, respect, justice, nonintervention, friendliness, and cooperation. It was because this Government conducted itself in conformity with these principles that it gained the good will of the Latin-American countries.

The Senator from Nebraska recommended in his report "a long-term program of attacking fundamental evils, ignorance, malnutrition, disease, and so on," a program he estimated as costing up to $50,000,000 a year, in Latin America. This would be a continuing peacetime program. Our contribution would take various forms—provision of technical assistance, advice, demonstration of improved methods, loan of technicians and experts in all fields. The Senator from Nebraska says that our contribution can be made "at a nominal cost to ourselves"—only $50,000,000.

I am interested in the Senator's program; $50,000,000 is a lot of money. Provision if made by us for all the technical advice he recommends would cost money. It would certainly cost far more money than was being spent in developing the good-neighbor policy before the war. Our peacetime expenditures along that line before the war were only a few thousand dollars annually. Now the Senator from Nebraska is urging us to send experts in all fields, to participate in a $50,000,000 annual program.

SUGAR PRICES

The article and the report attack sugar prices. Both the supply and the price of sugar have been maintained at present levels, largely as the result of the close and amicable cooperation on the part of the Governments of the independent republics of the Caribbean—Cuba, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic.

Negotiations with these friendly Governments resulted in sugar contracts with the Commodity Credit Corporation at fair prices for both the Caribbean producers and the American consumers. These agreements provided for production and price conditions which have made it possible for the American housewife to buy this daily essential at the corner grocery, after 4 years of war conditions, at a price which last fall, on a national average, amounted to 6.8 cents a pound. This average price of 6.8 cents a pound compares with prices during the era of World War No. 1, which ranged from 9.3 cents in 1917 to 19.4 cents in 1920, thus showing the remarkable skill and ability with which these problems have been attacked.

The present price of sugar has been maintained despite the tremendous wartime demand for this vital food. The sugar production of the Philippines and of large areas of Russia and Asia has been lost to the United Nations, which consequently have had to depend more than ever before on Caribbean sugar. But the efforts of our friends in the Caribbean have been placed at the service of the United Nations, and will undoubtedly carry us through, at fair and reasonable consumption and price levels.

GOOD-NEIGHBOR POLICY

The Senator from Nebraska states that the good-neighbor policy of our Government has widely become a hemispheric hand-out that is neither good nor neighborly. That statement appears in the Reader's Digest article. He charges that the activities of this Government in regard to the other American republics during recent years have promoted jealousy among those countries, and distrust of the United States. "The pattern of good neighborliness is being ripped to pieces," the Senator states. He concludes by asking whether the expenditure of large sums of money by the United States in the other American republics was worth while, saying that we have received little in return from those countries, other than the prevention from them of Axis propaganda and espionage against us. "After all," the Senator concludes, "they could do no less."

The Senator is absolutely incorrect when he says that this Government has promoted jealousies between other countries, and distrust of the United States. The United States has helped in every way in the world to still such jealousies.

The following extracts relating to Latin-American cooperation in the war are taken from the biennial report of the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, July 1, 1941, to June 30, 1943, to the Secretary of War:

Footnote, page 6:

Vitally important in the strategic defense of the United States is Brazil which offers the nearest point of approach to this continent from the east. It is also vital to the security of the Panama Canal that the various avenues of approach through Brazilian territory be in friendly hands and adequately guarded. The traditional friendship between Brazil and the United States and complete agreement between the two peoples on matters of interest to the Western Hemisphere have had an important bearing on our defense preparations. Close cooperation between the United States and Brazil was crystallized through the formation of a joint Brazil-United States Defense Commission in May 1942. This Commission has since been working on mutual defense plans and matters related to our common war effort.

On page 7, speaking of the international situation in 1941, General Marshall states:

Then as well as much later our military developments in the Caribbean had to be measured by the constant threat of a German occupation of Morocco and Dakar and fifth-column activities throughout Latin America.

Footnote, page 7:

In March 1942 the Inter-American Defense Board was created composed of military and naval technicians appointed by the governments concerned to consider measures necessary for the defense of the continent. Lt. Gen. Stanley D. Embick is presently chairman of the Board and is senior United States member. All of the Latin-American countries are represented. The charter of this Board is contained in the resolutions of the third conference of Foreign Ministers held at Rio de Janeiro in January 1932.

Page 39, paragraph 7:

Close cooperation by Brazil: Oral permission was obtained from Brazil in March 1942 for the establishment of air facilities in Belem, Natal, and Recife, permitting the unlimited transit of military aircraft and the stationing of United States Air Forces technicians in Brazil. The agreement was later formalized with permission to construct additional facilities and station United States personnel in northeast Brazil. This close cooperation of Brazil in this matter has been of inestimable value in building up our air forces in Europe and north Africa.

The activities of the United States in regard to other American republics have been used vigorously to draw all the American republics together. The expanded activities of the United States in regard to these republics since 1941 have been primarily undertaken for military, naval, and economic purposes directly related to our war effort, although

they also represent in part the increasing and continuing interest of the United States in promoting the common welfare and the economic advancement of all the republics of this hemisphere, through cooperative developments in economic, social, and cultural fields. I desire vigorously to emphasize that it is important that these programs and the advantages to the war effort derived therefrom were made possible by the fact that the American republics as a whole during the years from 1933 until 1939 developed and consolidated a relationship based on mutual understanding and the recognition of common interest.

It is at this mutual understanding and agreement of the American republics that apparently the purpose of the Senator from Nebraska and his associates in the Reader's Digest article and in the so-called report is aimed.

I desire to digress here long enough to say that I have heard that the editor from Nebraska who went on the trip is not in sympathy with the report or with the article in the Reader's Digest. I hope that is true. If it is true, I wish to say that I shall take pleasure in exonerating him entirely.

The only conceivable reason for publishing these vastly erroneous reports at this time is to bring about distrust and division among the American republics. Otherwise what could be the purpose of these gentlemen in taking this enormously expensive airplane trip and publishing these remarkable distortions of facts and these remarkable documents?

The only other possible reason for the trip and these publications is a political one. If it is political, then these gentlemen are putting politics before the successful prosecution of this war and before the best interests of their country. I hope it is not politics; but if it is politics, we will meet them on that issue. If it is politics, I give it as my best judgment that no party will ever make our present friendly attitude toward the Latin-American republics and their present friendly attitude toward us an issue in its platform.

I digress here long enough to say that this morning I read a newspaper dispatch from which I shall now quote. The dispatch states that—

Seven of the leading Republicans in the United States today—

Which I suppose was yesterday—

joined in strong endorsement and praise of the good-neighbor policy.

The first of these was Mr. Herbert Hoover, a former President of the United States, and a man who, when he was connected with the Government, undertook to foster the good-neighbor policy.

The next is Wendell Willkie, who was the nominee of the Republican Party in the last election. He does not believe that an issue should be made of the good-neighbor policy in the platform.

Alfred M. Landon, another former nominee of the Republican Party, does not believe in putting that issue in the platform.

Thomas E. Dewey is unwilling to let such an issue go into the platform, even though he is not a candidate for the Republican nomination for President.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], whom we all know, has published an admirable statement to the effect that he is not in favor of putting the good-neighbor policy in issue in the platform. The same thing is true of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], as well as Hon. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, who has served in three Cabinets.

None of these distinguished Republicans is willing to make an issue of the good-neighbor policy as it is being enforced. After reading the reports of all these officials of the Government stating the facts, it goes without saying that the Republican Party in its convention will never touch the question of interfering with the good-neighbor policy in South America.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the newspaper dispatch to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICAN LEADERS REAFFIRM GOOD-NEIGHBOR POLICY

Seven of the leading Republicans in the United States today joined in strong endorsement and praise of the good-neighbor policy.

In a symposium distributed by the United Press, the Republican leaders—who included the only living ex-President of the United States and two former Republican Presidential candidates—all declared that the good-neighbor policy is above partisan politics and will continue no matter what party is in power in Washington.

The Republicans who reaffirmed their faith in inter-American cooperation are former President Herbert Hoover, Wendell Willkie, and Alfred M. Landon, Republican candidates for President in 1940 and 1936; Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, and one of the Republican Party's leading Presidential nomination possibilities in 1944; Senator Warren R. Austin, of Vermont; Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio, and Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson, Republican member of the Cabinet.

In addition, Senator Hugh Butler, Republican from Nebraska, who recently criticized the operations of the good-neighbor policy, declared that the Republican Party is just as committed to the pan-American policy as the Democrats and will support it.

The Republican statements were in reply to questions asked by the United Press. All of the leading Democrats already have reaffirmed their intention of continuing the good-neighbor policy.

Former President Hoover declared, "I am absolutely confident that if the Republican administration should come into power in Washington that the good-neighbor policies will be carried on as established from 1928 to 1932. During those years Mr. Hoover was President. He added that during a visit to South America in 1928, he used the phrase "good-neighbor policy" in a series of addresses in the other American republics.

"The whole Republican attitude is one of equality among the Western Hemisphere states," Mr. Hoover said, "and cooperation in Western Hemisphere progress and ideals." He stated that he emphasized this attitude throughout his administration.

Mr. Willkie, who was defeated by President Roosevelt at the last election, stated that "it would, of course, be considered nonsense by Americans of all party affiliations—Democrats and Republicans—to suggest that the pleasant and cordial relationship between the United States and Latin-American countries be lessened or abridged in any respect." None but a foolish person would suggest such a thing, Mr. Willkie declared.

Mr. Willkie, who again is one of the leading candidates for the Republican nomination as Presidential candidate, said that "in view of the fact that the Republican Party is not now in charge of our National Government no one has the right to speak for it although I reflect the judgment of not only its leaders but of its rank and file when I say that when the Republicans come to power, instead of friendship with Central and South American countries being lessened, it will be steadily increased."

Another one of the outstanding Republican Presidential possibilities, Governor Dewey, of New York, said bluntly that "there is no partisanship in the United States regarding the good-neighbor policy."

Governor Dewey said that "continuance of our warm relationships with our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere will, I am sure, always be supported by both parties." Mr. Dewey pointed out that he believed the good-neighbor policy was first given its name by a Republican statesman, Elihu Root, during a speech in 1926.

Both Secretary of War Stimson and Mr. Landon, former Governor of the State of Kansas, expressed similar sentiments.

Mr. Stimson, who served as Secretary of State under President Hoover, said "the policy is one of mutual good-will assistance looking toward a common welfare of all the 21 republics in this hemisphere. I've personally witnessed and participated in operations directed toward these results in at least three administrations prior to the present one," he pointed out. And he said: "I believe the policy will be permanent and will steadily grow even more useful."

Mr. Landon added that "if there is one policy the people agree on in the United States it is continuation of the good-neighbor policy toward our neighbors to the south. We have our family differences," he continued, "but we always settle them within ourselves and present a uniform front to everyone else in the world."

In his statement, Senator BUTLER declared he favored the good-neighbor policy but was uninterested in what he called "buying friendship of the Latin-Americans." Mr. BUTLER predicted that the Republicans would adopt a foreign-policy plank at their next convention which would support the good-neighbor policy. "I am ready to support such a plan," he added.

Another prominent Presidential possibility in the Republican Party—Senator TAFT—declared there is no reason for anyone in Latin America to worry about the Republican policy in regard to the western hemisphere.

"The good relations will continue regardless of the party," Senator TAFT said. And he added that the Republican Party believed in the policies of nonintervention and mutual respect of sovereignty as outlined by Dwight Morrow when he was United States Ambassador to Mexico.

The Ohio Senator also said he approved of the policy of granting loans and credits to the other American republics, "as in the case of a steel mill in Brazil."

Senator AUSTIN called the good-neighbor policy "the outstanding development in foreign policy our Government has made in the last half century."

The good-neighbor policy, according to Mr. AUSTIN, "is so well established among all people in the United States, that there is no danger of its being changed. There's practically unanimous interest on the part of the

Republicans," he said, "to make the policy even more effective."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I deeply regret that my good friend from Nebraska saw fit to take the course that he has taken and publish the articles which have been published in both the Reader's Digest and in the RECORD. I hope, now that he has the facts, he will frankly state that he has been misled in the matter, for he has certainly been misled.

I have heretofore shown that all the money we have expended in any way in Latin America has been $324,185,000, except for purchases of strategic materials and ships; that what we have invested in loans has been invested in good loans; that what we have expended in the way of air bases or submarine bases or military projects of any kind has been invested not alone for the protection of those countries but for the protection of the entire hemisphere of America of which we are a part. When I went to my friend and urged him not to make in the Senate of the United States such a statement as I had already read in the Reader's Digest, and he refused to grant my request, I then told him that as a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate I knew he was wrong in his figures, and that we had not spent any such sum as he set forth. I say to him now that when I recall the days—the likelihood of the invasion of South America at one time; when I recall the sinking of our ships by German submarines in the waters and seas and gulfs of Central and South America; when I recall especially the sinking of our oil tankers, which deprived the eastern part of the United States of oil for so long; when I remember that by reason of these friendly agreements with Latin America and our good-neighbor policy toward South and Central America 19 out of 20 of those countries have broken off relations with all the Axis Powers and the other is neutral; when I remember that this hemisphere is intact from invasions, even if we had spent $6,000,000,000, as my distinguished friend says, or twice $6,000,000,000, it would have been well spent in accomplishing the great results we have accomplished in keeping our enemies away from American shores. But it cost only $324,185,000.

God ordained that the peoples of America should be neighbors, but it remains for men living and dealing with one another to develop friendship. That friendship is something which is now real in this hemisphere and cannot be broken up by so-called reports 95 percent wrong, the purpose of which is still shrouded in mystery.

Mr. President, I come to another—and I believe the final—argument in this case. I think I started my remarks by saying that the so-called report was an indictment of the Congress itself. I find that it is an indictment of several others. I wish to mention some of those who are indicted for "boondoggling" or "fishdoggling," and who are referred to as "do-gooders," and other such terms.

I wish to call attention to some of the men whom the Senator from Nebraska has indicted. The first is Mr. John B. Hutson. Mr. Hutson is from the State of Connecticut. He is highly educated. He has been with the Government for a long time, in various bureaus of the Department of Agriculture. He is President of the Commodity Credit Corporation. His life has been an open book, and has been devoted to the public interest. His honesty and integrity has never been questioned until this remarkable report.

The next man indicted is Edward R. Stettinius, Jr. The lend-lease work in Latin America has been done largely by Mr. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., the Administrator of the lend-lease program until he was recently appointed Under Secretary of State. Mr. Stettinius is only 43 years old. He is highly educated, a fine businessman, and he has been a splendid administrator of lend-lease work. He is as honest as the day is long, and as straight as a string. They do not make any better men than Ed Stettinius. I knew his father in the First World War. He served his country faithfully and well in Washington. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., is a chip off the old block, and yet he is indicted in this report.

Ah, Mr. President, but that is not all. The next man indicted is Mr. Warren Lee Pierson, a Minnesota banker. He was educated at the University of California as a lawyer and was for years counsel for the R. F. C., and then became President of the Export-Import Bank in 1935. Everyone who knows Mr. Pierson knows that he is not only an honest man but he has been remarkably successful, and the Export-Import Bank has earned $30,000,000 since he has been at the head of it, and yet this report indicts Mr. Pierson.

I come now to Mr. Leo T. Crowley. Mr. Crowley was born in Wisconsin. He is a banker and businessman, and has had a marvelous success. He is one of the kindliest and most courteous men I have ever known. His word is his bond. He came here first in 1934 as the head of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and he made that Corporation a wonderful success. More recently he has been made Foreign Economic Administrator and Alien Property Custodian, and in that work he is accomplishing great results. I think Mr. Crowley is one of the most energetic and correct men whom I have ever known in my life, and yet this report indicts him.

The next man indicted in the report is Nelson A. Rockefeller. Mr. Rockefeller is a young man of unimpeachable integrity, honesty, and excellent ability. He is the grandson on his mother's side of a distinguished former United States Senator from Rhode Island, Senator Nelson Aldrich. He was named for this grandfather, and, like the grandfather, he seems to have a flair for public life.

He has indomitable energy, is a fine personality, and is one of the best witnesses of those who appear from time to time before the Senate Appropriations Committee. The President could not have found a better man for the particular and highly desirable work which Mr. Rockefeller has been doing in Latin America. Mr. Rockefeller has made a splendid success as Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, and much of the success of carrying out our good-neighbor policy and good-will policy in Latin America is due to him and his excellent work.

I now come to five other gentlemen whom I will consider together. They are Messrs. Knox, Stimson, Jones, Hull, and Wallace. They are all under indictment for alleged extravagance, boondoggling, fishdoggling, and other things to which such terms have been applied in implying wrongdoing.

Secretary Knox is the owner of one of the largest newspapers in the United States. He is a good Republican. He is a member of a Democratic Cabinet and the head of the great Navy Department which is fighting to win this war. He is doing a fine job. Instead of being indicted he ought to be praised. I add my meed of praise of him.

As to Secretary Stimson, he is one of the best known and one of the ablest men in the country. He has been a member of the Cabinet under three Presidents—Taft, Hoover, and Roosevelt. He was Secretary of War under Taft. I was in Washington when he was appointed. He was on the Atlantic Ocean, by the way, when he was appointed. He was Secretary of State under Hoover, and is now Secretary of War under President Roosevelt. He has charge of all the American Army forces. His endorsement is upon the facts which have been reported by me. His endorsement is unqualified. He likewise, instead of being indicted, ought to be praised in the highest degree for the marvelous work which is being done by our Army all over the world, including Latin America.

Jesse Jones. I do not suppose there has ever been a better or a more successful businessman in the whole country than Jesse Jones. In private life he was personally successful, and as an administrator of the Government he has been just as successful, or even more so. Talk about Jesse Jones making a bad investment. Think of it for a moment. Think of anyone suggesting that Jesse Jones makes bad investments for himself or for anyone else, or for the Government. Jesse Jones does not make bad investments. The charge that he does is the most errant poppycock. Jesse Jones does not make bad investments. He does not do impractical things. He conducts every department of which he is the head with the highest degree of credit, ability, honesty, and integrity. It is a pity that we do not have in the Government more men like Jesse Jones. Yet Jesse Jones is indicted by this report.

Last but not least among the Cabinet members, the report of the Senator from Nebraska actually indicts my good friend Cordell Hull, of Tennessee. Mr. Hull has an answer to the indictment which anyone can see and understand. I hope everyone will read it. The administration of his Department has been patriotic, intelligent, honest, and careful, and has resulted in the greatest possible success. I cannot believe that my distinguished friend from Nebraska ever dreamed that he had undertaken to reflect upon the character, ability, and

honesty of Cordell Hull, and, yet, that is what he has done.

Again, Mr. President, the so-called report of the Senator from Nebraska actually indicts our Vice President, the Presiding Officer of this body. We all know that for quite a while he was at the head of the Board of Economic Warfare, which has now been consolidated and made a part of the Foreign Economic Administration. Yet the Senator indicts Vice President WALLACE for his operations in Latin America. Of course, we all know that the indictment is not true. We know that whatever the Vice President did was done honestly, fairly, and with an eye single to the best interests of his country's welfare.

So, Mr. President, we find 10 of the leading officers of our Government—10 of the leading citizens of our country, some of whom are leading citizens of the world—indicted for alleged dishonest and corrupt practices in dealing with Central and South America. I hope that since the departments have all presented the facts and shown how very erroneous the Senator's statements have been in both the so-called report and in the Reader's Digest article, he will withdraw the report and not publish it to the people of the United States.

I am speaking as a friend of the Senator from Nebraska. The other day when I asked him not to publish his report until he had ascertained the facts I thought I was doing him a service. He did not seem to think so. After examining the facts which have been given here, and which are a part of the RECORD—I do not want him to act hastily—I hope that he will see fit not to publish the report, but instead will withdraw it from the Senate and from the country.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator from Tennessee, who is the acting chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, tell the Senate the status of the resolution which has been pending before the committee, calling for an investigation of lend-lease?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very happy to do so.

It will be remembered that some time ago the Committee on Appropriations recommended to the Senate that four men be added to the staff of the Appropriations Committee. This was done on the recommendation of the members of the committee, both Democrats and Republicans. The proposal was reported to the Senate, and the Senate ordered that the action be taken. We have three of the very best experts, at least two of whom have been working almost continuously on lend-lease matters. There is also a clerk. I am quite sure that a report will soon be forthcoming, for they assure me to that effect, and say that it will be a complete report on every lend-lease proposal. I am very happy that is so. I wish to say of the gentlemen who have been employed that they have exceeded my best expectations.

What I want to do is to cut down appropriations to the lowest amount possible. I think we ourselves sometimes do make extravagant appropriations. I want to cut them in every way, and I believe that the four splendid gentlemen whom we have employed, or rather borrowed, two from the General Accounting Office and one from the F. B. I., will aid us greatly in accomplishing just what the Senator from New Hampshire wants to accomplish and what I seek to accomplish.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator permit me a further inquiry?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I understand the Senator's reply to me, but still it is in such form that it does not answer my question. What is the status of the resolution proposing an investigation of lend-lease? The Senator referred to the additional men who have been hired, and I know about that.

Mr. McKELLAR. The subject is being very actively investigated now, and I hope to have a report ready very shortly.

Mr. BRIDGES. The speech the Senator is making today is not that report, is it?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no. What I have said applies only to lend-lease expenditures in South and Central America, which are a comparatively small part, only $178,000,000, as I recall the ultimate figure, of the total lend-lease expenditures. My statement applies only to that, and I have made it so that the Senator may have the facts as to lend-lease in South and Central America.

Mr. BRIDGES. The report will include all lend-lease expenditures in South America and elsewhere?

Mr. McKELLAR. It will include all of them.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then, of course, it will include lend-lease in South America?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. BRIDGES. And the information which has been covered by the Senator today?

Mr. McKELLAR. Lend-lease in Latin America is covered by my statement submitted today, but none of the other of the lend-lease operations are.

Mr. BRIDGES. But is what the Senator reported on lend-lease today in answer to the Butler charges, so-called, the report of the committee or is it the Senator's own statement of the figures?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I have referred to reports given to me by various agencies dealing with South America and made remarks in connection with them. That is all.

Mr. BRIDGES. And the Senator's statement has nothing to do with committee investigation?

Mr. McKELLAR. It has nothing to do with it, except that part which applies to lend-lease in South and Central America; that is all.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; but did the information come from the group of experts who are investigating lend-lease?

Mr. McKELLAR. Some of it did; yes. I think a few weeks ago they considered the figures which were given by the Lend-Lease Administration.

Mr. BRIDGES. What I am trying to do, if the Senator will permit me, is to ascertain whether when the lend-lease investigation is completed the report will be made first to the Appropriations Committee and then to the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. It will be made first to the Appropriations Committee, and then to the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Therefore, I understand that what the Senator says today is not the final report of that investigation?

Mr. McKELLAR. No, sir.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, December 8, 1943.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I enclose copy of my letter to Senator BUTLER in reply to his request for information regarding loans, expenditures, etc., in Latin American countries, of agencies financed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Senator sent practically identical inquiries to the R. F. C., Defense Plant Corporation, U. S. Commercial Company, Rubber Reserve Company, Rubber Development Corporation, Defense Supplies Corporation, Metals Reserve Company, and the Export-Import Bank.

I explained to Senator BUTLER over the telephone that it would be difficult and take considerable time to give any accurate figures on commitments, projects, etc., but that in addition to money actually expended as included in my letter, commitments, projects, etc., would probably run another billion.

In a hurried check it appears that specific commitments of the various purchasing and contracting agencies financed by the R. F. C. aggregate between $650,000,000 and $700,000,000. In this connection, we have over-all agreements with Mexico, Peru, and Chile to take virtually their entire production of certain critical and strategic materials and minerals. These agreements do not include refined copper from Chile and Peru which, however, we secure through American companies operating in those countries.

In addition to these overall agreements with Mexico, Peru, and Chile, we have special over-all agreements for virtually the entire production of tungsten, in Argentina, tin, and tungsten in Bolivia, platinum in Colombia, and copper, lead, and zinc in Mexico.

Practically all of our purchase contracts and commitments cover critical and strategic materials which we require in prosecuting the war. Some have been bought to prevent their going to the enemy. We buy as cheaply as we can, and get value for the money we spend.

The commitments growing out of our over-all agreements are necessarily open-end in their nature, and it is impossible to make an accurate estimate of what they will aggregate, but the figure of $1,000,000,000 that I gave Senator BUTLER will, I am sure, be sufficient to cover it.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce.

NOVEMBER 24, 1943.

Hon. HUGH A. BUTLER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: In reply to your inquiry, the R. F. C. and its subsidiaries have expended $1,001,361,060.05 through October 31, 1943, for purchases in Latin America. Following is a break-down by corporations:

Defense Supplies Corporation	$250,336,491.66
Defense Plant Corporation	35,786,364.95
Metals Reserve Company	635,296,300.92
Rubber Development Corporation	63,509,570.91
Rubber Reserve Company	15,962,232.35
U. S. Commercial Co	470,099.26

In addition to this, the Export-Import Bank has authorized loans in Latin America of $778,982,997.42, but only $211,520,909.12 of these authorizations has been disbursed. Repayments have been $107,176,250.38.

We have made loans in and purchases from the following countries: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, British Guiana, British Honduras, British West Indies, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Netherlands (Aruba), Netherlands (Guiana), Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce.

DECEMBER 7, 1943.

NICARO NICKEL PROJECT

Senator BUTLER says:

"The $20,000,000 credit was advanced for the construction of the Nicaro Nickel Plant in Cuba, and no final determination of its ultimate ownership has been made as far as I have been able to learn."

And elsewhere he says:

"As far as it is known, the enormous air bases, the huge military bases built at United States' expense in Cuba, for which we paid dearly, indeed, go to the Cubans after the war; and the $30,000,000 Nickel Plant in Cuba built by the Defense Plant Corporation, a Reconstruction Finance Corporation subsidiary, apparently is intended to be theirs also."

The situation at Nicaro is that the Nicaro Nickel Co., a subsidiary of Freeport Sulphur Co., owns nickel-bearing mining property near Preston, Cuba. Defense Plant Corporation has committed itself to the expenditure of $32,800,000 for the construction of production facilities for the mining, milling, and treatment of ore from these properties. Legal title to the facilities is held by the Cuban Nickel Co., a Cuban subsidiary of Nicaro Nickel Co., for the benefit of and subject to the direction and control of Defense Plant Corporation.

Defense Plant Corporation has leased the plant facilities to the Nicaro Nickel Co. for a 10-year period. They will be operated for the account of the Metals Reserve Company. At the expiration of the lease agreement or in the event of its earlier termination, Nicaro must either cause title to be transferred to Defense Plant Corporation or it must exercise within 6 months its option to buy the property at cost less depreciation of 7½ percent per annum but in no case for less than 36⅔ percent of original cost.

It is quite clear from the contractual relationships that ultimate ownership of the property rests with Defense Plant Corporation, unless Defense Plant Corporation sells the property at some later date.

Senator BUTLER's statement that the ownership of this property is apparently intended to go to the Cubans after the war is therefore entirely without foundation.

RUBBER

Senator BUTLER says:

"The daily press carried an announcement in October 1943 that 30,000,000 tires are to be produced within the next year for civilians.

"If this be true, it seems incongruous to permit rubber costs to continue at the rate of $200 to $500 per pound in Guatemala, Brazil, and other Latin-American countries. The former cost of raw rubber was 6 cents a pound.

"Either the United States does not need rubber badly enough to spend $500 a pound in Latin America to get it or the 30,000,000 tires for civilians must be awfully urgently needed.

"The rubber program, the quartz program, the fiber program—all three in Latin America—are sordid pictures of waste and disappointing results.

"Five hundred thousand pounds of rubber was desired from the big Brazil projects. Less than 30,000 pounds have been delivered to the United States this year. The cost—overhead, investment, and everything included—runs close to $15,000,000. This is about $500 a pound for rubber. We used to pay 6 cents a pound for raw rubber."

The main trouble with the above statement is that it distributes the cost over 30,000 pounds of rubber instead of 30,000 tons of rubber.

Total expenditures by Rubber Reserve Company and Rubber Development Corporation to acquire and increase the supply of natural rubber in Latin America up to January 1, 1944, will approximate $78,000,000. This includes all development expenses, all capital investments and loans, all operating transportation and administrative expenses, the purchase and operation of boats and airplanes, the building of camps, houses, and airports, transporting some 25,000 additional people into the Amazon Valley, and all salaries and travel expenses of the entire organization. It also includes the purchase price of 100,000,000 pounds of rubber received from 16 Latin-American countries since the program started in 1941. Assuming that all capital investments, loans, facilities, equipment, organization expenses, and so forth, were charged off now, the over-all cost of this rubber would be 82 cents a pound—99 percent plus wrong.

The equipment and facilities acquired will be usable to the end of the purchase contracts, December 31, 1946. Consequently, the rubber to be received in 1944, 1945, and 1946 should cost substantially less.

Few people perhaps realize that the Amazon Valley is approximately the size of the continental United States, with a population of less than 2,000,000 people and very meager transportation facilities. The principal rubber-bearing trees are some 2,000 miles from the mouth of the Amazon.

While our main dependence for wartime requirements of rubber must of necessity be on synthetic, some natural rubber is required in the full utilization of synthetic rubber for certain purposes, including heavy duty tires. According to the Rubber Director, these require as high as 30 percent natural crude rubber mixed with the synthetic.

Hence, every effort must be made to increase the production of wild rubber in this hemisphere. For the first 10 months of 1943 imports from Latin America aggregated 56,000,000 pounds, as against 26,000,000 pounds for the same period in 1942.

We could have continued to get a much smaller amount of rubber at a substantially lower price, but increasing the production in this circumstance increased the cost.

In addition to the foregoing, $4,800,000 has been spent planting cryptostegia, a rubber-bearing vine in Haiti.

BOLIVIAN AIRLINES

Senator BUTLER says:

"Among the queer deals made is the Bolivian blunder. The United States, through the Defense Supplies Corporation—an R. F. C. subsidiary—loaned Bolivia $660,000 with which to buy new planes. This was to get Bolivia to promise a $200,000 subsidy annually to Panagra (Pan American-Grace Airways)—an American air line.

"So here we have come-on from our purse of $660,000 to get a foreign government to subsidize an American air line. Well!"

The facts are:

In April 1941 Defense Supplies Corporation started a program designed to replace Axis personnel and equipment in Latin-American air lines with United States personnel and equipment.

In furtherance of this program, Defense Supplies made a loan to Lloyd Aereo Boliviano of $300,000 for working capital, and for construction, improvements, and replacements. In addition, aircraft and spare parts to the value of $360,000 were sold to Lloyd Aereo Boliviano on credit.

A subsidy equal to $16,000 United States currency per month ($192,000 per year) had for some time been paid to Lloyd Aereo Boliviano by the Bolivian Government and in the Defense Supplies contract covering these loans to the Lloyd Aereo Boliviano it was stipulated that the Bolivian Government should continue this subsidy. Obviously, the reason for making this one of the conditions of the contract was to make sure that the Lloyd Aereo Boliviano would continue to receive this assistance from the Bolivian Government so that it could operate in the black, thus providing additional security for the ultimate payment of the loan.

When Lloyd Aereo Boliviano divested itself of its German management, Lloyd Aereo Boliviano and Pan American-Grace Airways entered into a contract for the operation of Lloyd Aereo Boliviano by Pan American-Grace Airways.

Defense Supplies Corporation was not a party to this contract. The contract provided for the payment of compensation by Lloyd Aereo Boliviano to Pan American-Grace Airways of $1,500 monthly, one-half of which Pan American-Grace Airways obligated itself to invest in the capital stock of Lloyd Aereo Boliviano.

MEXICAN OVER-ALL AGREEMENT

Senator BUTLER in referring to the over-all agreement with the Mexican Government for the purchase of strategic and critical materials makes the following statement:

"The sections marked seem to indicate that, largely as a goodwill measure, the United States is committed to the purchase of surplus commodities or materials of Mexican origin, whether we need them or not. And that, as a matter of policy, we are further committed to buy them at the highest prevailing prices—whether justified or not. The only limitation seems to be that when we have purchased up to 25 percent of such exportable surpluses, we may not be called upon to buy more."

The facts in connection with this agreement are that it was originally negotiated at the request of the United States at a time when Mexico was a large exporter of strategic materials to Japan. We asked Mexico to stop such exports and offered to provide an alternative market for them.

The materials covered by this agreement were all items of direct war use, which had been of material assistance to the Japanese in their armament program, as is indicated by the schedule attached to the agreement, which Senator BUTLER failed to quote. These materials are:

(a) Henequen; ixtle of lechugilla, of maguey, of mezcal and of palm; pita, similar fibers; binder twine and cables and cords manufactured with the above-mentioned fibers.

(b) Antimony, arsenic, bismuth, cadmium, zinc, cobalt, copper, fluorspar, tin, graphite, manganese, mercury, mica, molybdenum, lead, tungsten, and vanadium, whether in mineral, concentrated or metallic form.

All of these materials have proved extremely useful in the United States Government's war effort. Many of the purchases have been made by private consumers in the United States and not by the Government agencies. The prices paid to Mexico have been, as the agreement states, in line with the prices prevailing in this country. We have therefore received full value for our expenditures; in addition, we put a highly useful embargo on shipments to Japan from Mexico 5 months before Pearl Harbor.

We consider this agreement a very useful one because it not only served to deprive the Axis of much needed materials for the war but secured for the United States virtually the full production of such materials at fair prices.

VANADIUM CORPORATION PROJECT IN PERU

Senator BUTLER's statement refers to the project for the construction of a vanadium plant in Peru as covering $5,000,000 in "credit extended."

The facts are these:

As trustee for Defense Plant Corporation, Vanadium Corporation of America holds title to new facilities constructed with funds provided by Defense Plant Corporation up to a maximum of $4,000,000 for increasing the production of vanadium in Peru. Title is held in trust for and subject to the control of Defense Plant Corporation.

Under an agreement for use, Vanadium Corporation has the right to use these facilities for a period of 10 years. At the end of that period or in the event of earlier termination of the agreement, if Vanadium Corporation does not purchase the properties, it must transfer title to Defense Plant Corporation. The option to purchase is good for 90 days after termination of the agreement.

Vanadium Corporation may buy the plant either at cost, plus interest, less annual fees paid for use of the facilities, or the cost less depreciation—whichever is the higher.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON,
Washington, December 9, 1943.

The Honorable KENNETH MCKELLAR,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: At the suggestion of the Department of State, I am pleased to transmit herewith for your information some brief observations concerning the references to the Export-Import Bank in the report by Senator BUTLER and a statement of loans disbursed and repayments made during the fiscal years 1941, 1942, and 1943.

Sincerely yours,

WARREN LEE PIERSON,
President.

(Enclosure)

NOTES CONCERNING SENATOR BUTLER'S REPORT AND EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Because of apparent misunderstanding as to the purposes and operations of Export-Import Bank, a brief factual statement is presented:

The bank was created in 1934 for the purpose of aiding in the financing and facilitating of exports and imports and the exchange of commodities between the United States and other countries. It is authorized to have $700,000,000 of loans outstanding at any one time. The Congress increased the limit from $200,000,000 to the present $700,000,000 in September of 1940 to enable the bank to make loans to assist in the development of the resources, the stabilization of the economies, and the orderly marketing of the products of the countries of the Western Hemisphere.

Although its operations in behalf of our foreign trade have been world-wide, circumstances have restricted them since the war almost entirely to the Western Hemisphere and particularly to the making of such loans as will develop resources vital to the war effort.

Net earnings of the bank from the date of its establishment to November 15, 1943, total $30,104,755.08.

In connection with its Latin-American operations, the bank has since 1934 authorized lines of credit totaling $778,987,767.40. Of this amount, however, an aggregate of $201,567,308.58 was canceled or has expired. Actual loans effected total $212,182,962.52, of which amount $107,284,391.37 has been repaid. There are no loans to any Latin-American country or political subdivision or agency thereof which are in default. As of November 30, 1943, outstanding loans relative to Latin America, including loans to governments and loans to United States exporters and suppliers, totaled $104,898,571.15. Undisbursed authorizations or commitments amounted in the aggregate to $372,009,346.20.

Attention is called to the substantial amount still undisbursed. These are the result either of (1) the inability because of the war to buy equipment, commodities, and services from the United States, (2) the lack of shipping facilities, or (3) the failure of the prospective borrower to comply with the conditions of the commitment. Experience has shown that for one reason or another approximately 25 percent of all commitments are not utilized and result in cancelations or expirations as shown above. The reason is generally one of the following: (1) Expected orders for United States goods were not placed or were placed in countries other than the United States; (2) lines of credit established in favor of foreign central banks to furnish dollar exchange to enable American exporters to be paid promptly are, in many instances, not required to be used because the existence of the line creates confidence and thus releases available dollar exchange.

Loans have been made to Latin-American countries to assist those countries on a basis mutually beneficial to the United States and the borrower to develop the countries' resources and to stimulate an economically sound industrial growth. From the standpoint of the United States, the development of raw materials required by our industry is indispensable to a sound and profitable trade between the two countries. With respect to industrialization, two facts should be called to mind: (1) That, the great industrial nations of the world have been our best customers and that our over-all trade with such countries has increased as their industrialization and purchasing power has increased; and (2) that assistance from the United States insures that such industrialization—which will take place in any event—will be carried out with the machines and products of our factories instead of with the materials and equipment of our competitors in foreign trade.

In his report on Expenditures by the United States in Central and South American Countries, Senator BUTLER, of Nebraska, has failed to represent accurately the operations of Export-Import Bank as follows:

1. Although the report allegedly covers an 8-year period ending with the calendar year 1944, figures presented with respect to the bank cover operations since its creation on February 12, 1934, to the date of the report. The fact is that during the period from July 1, 1940, through the close of business December 1, 1943, the bank made loans totaling $139,612,000. Repayments during the same period totaled $71,615,000 with the result that the net increase in loans outstanding was $67,997,000.

2. Although the bank is engaged solely in the making of loans, the manner of presentation implies no distinction between a loan from the bank and moneys expended by the United States for purchases abroad, military bases, and other purposes.

3. He represents the total of authorizations without mentioning that of that amount $201,567,308 was never utilized and has been canceled or expired.

4. He does not mention repayments of $107,284,391.37 nor show that presently outstanding loans total only $104,898,571.

5. He does not refer to the fact that the bank has realized net earnings of $30,000,000 on its operations.

6. He fails to state that more than half of the loans authorized by the bank have been extended to manufacturers and exporters in the United States to assist them in the sale of their products abroad against strong foreign competition.

7. He fails to state that the major portion of funds loaned to foreign governments and their agencies are for the purchase of materials and equipment in the United States and that many of the loans are limited solely to that purpose.

8. He considers all loans, including those to United States exporters and importers as having been made for the purpose of industrializing Latin America—an end which he concludes to be clearly against the best interests of the United States.

In addition to the fallacies inherent in the general approach to the subject, the report is replete with inaccuracies in its references to the operations of the bank on a country-by-country basis as follows:

Cuba

The Butler report states:

"Other expenditures of the United States in Cuba, to which a military significance seems to have been imputed, are:

"Loan of $25,000,000 for widening the Central Highway from Habana to the other end of the isle. The contention was made that this highway, though already of normal width and well surfaced, was strategically valuable as a means of more swiftly transporting troops across the island, should necessity arise at some future time. However, it was freely admitted among military staff men that such a necessity was far from imminent. In addition, here again the argument was advanced that it was a part of the good-will program to improve this boulevard for the Cubans."

The facts are:

In 1941 Export-Import Bank approved a line of credit of $25,000,000 in favor of Republic of Cuba to assist in financing the cost of materials, equipment, and services from the United States and Cuba required in connection with such United States projects as might be requested from time to time by Cuba and approved by the bank as eligible for financing under the credit. Prior thereto, Cuba had borrowed from Export-Import Bank in excess of $38,000,000 all of which had been promptly repaid together with interest, At the time the $25,000,000 line of credit was established the Cuban Congress levied taxes to provide for the repayment of any sums borrowed under this credit.

Out of the $25,000,000 credit the bank has agreed to the utilization of $7,438,144.73 for the repair, resurfacing, and partial reconstruction of the Central Highway. It is not to be widened or decorated. The highway is 660 miles long and is a main artery of transportation throughout the island. Because stretches of the pavement were laid originally on unsettled ground and because the highway has not received necessary maintenance over a period of years, extensive sections of the road have settled so that in a number of places there are cracks in the highway up to 4 inches wide and 200 feet long. Cuba's request to borrow such amount for the repair and reconstruction of this important Cuban highway was not predicated upon any argument of military necessity nor was the request considered by the bank upon such a basis.

The Butler report states:

"The Export-Import Bank authorizations to Cuba total over $40,000,000 (the population of Cuba is about 4,000,000)."

The facts are:

In addition to the $25,000,000 line of credit referred to above, the Export-Import Bank has authorized a credit of $15,000,000 in favor of the city of Habana to finance the rehabilitation and extension of the Habana water supply system. It is doubtful that this $15,000,000 credit will be utilized, however, in view of the fact that private financial interests are now negotiating such a credit.

As stated above, Cuba has previously borrowed and repaid to the bank a total of $38,000,000 plus interest.

The Butler report states:

"Nevertheless, considerable nondefense spending to give further aid to the Cubans, along Work Projects Administration or National Youth Administration lines has been undertaken at United States expense.

"Such spending includes United States funds for: * * * loans for peso coinage; sugar stabilization loans; hat manufacturing project credit."

The facts are:

1. Peso coinage: The Export-Import Bank financed the purchase of silver by the Cuban Government to be minted into pesos by the United States Mint at Philadelphia. In addition to the repayment of the principal amount loaned for the purchase of the silver, the Cuban Government paid interest on that amount plus a commission to the bank for the handling of the transaction and paid to the mint at Philadelphia the fee established by law.

2. Loan to Cuban Sugar Stabilization Institute: To enable Cuba to produce an additional 400,000 tons of sugar in 1941, the bank made a loan to the Cuban Sugar Stabilization Institute repayment of which was secured by 400,000 tons of sugar represented by warehouse receipts. The loan plus interest was paid in full within 6 months. It is significant to note that the sugar shortage in the United States in January and February of 1942 would have been far more critical if this loan had not been made to enable the production of additional sugar.

3. The so-called hat manufacturing project credits to which the Senator refers was in fact one loan extended by the bank to Charles H. Williams and associates, a United States exporter, to assist in financing the sale and exportation to Cuba of Stetson hats. The loan was made and promptly repaid in 1938.

The Butler report summarizes loans to Cuba as follows:

"The total estimated United States military expenditures in Cuba is reported in the neighborhood of	$15,000,000
"Our Federal loan-and-credit program approaches	60,000,000
"Our strategic and sugar purchases approximately	175,000,000
"Other loans, grants, credits, or investments for those activities listed above total about	40,000,000
"Total	290,000,000"

The facts are:

Existing lines of credit from Export-Import Bank to Cuba total $40,000,000. All other loans from Export-Import Bank to Cuba have been repaid. It is impossible to determine whether or not there has been a duplication of Export-Import Bank credits in arriving at the $60,000,000 item shown above.

The Senator makes further references to Cuba on page 35 of his report in that section entitled "Personal Observations" as follows:

The Butler report states:

"And actually on March 31, 1943, active Export-Import Bank authorizations to Cuba totaled $40,000,000, of which nothing had been repaid."

The facts are:

Although total authorizations as of March 31, 1943, amounted to $40,000,000 only $300,000 had been disbursed, no part of which had as yet become due. Previously, as hereinbefore pointed out, Cuba had borrowed in excess of $38,000,000 from Export-Import Bank, which amount had been fully and promptly repaid together with interest.

The Butler report states:

"Still fearing that we were short of doing our duty by the Cubans, the Export-Import Bank granted credits for pesos coinage that totaled nearly $28,000,000. Then to assure their good will, the United States Government set up an $11,000,000 fund for Cuban sugar stabilization and as a means of credit subsidy through the Cuban Sugar Institute."

The facts are:

The peso coinage loan is explained above. Also stated above is the fact that the sugar loan was a loan secured by the actual sugar represented by warehouse receipts. Both loans were promptly and fully repaid together with interest.

Mexico

Under the heading "Industrialization aid to Mexico":

The Butler report states:

"Mexican steel mill (Export-Import Bank credit), $6,000,000."

The facts are:

This credit may be utilized solely for the purchase of materials and equipment in the United States.

The Butler report states:

"Mexican railway development (Export-Import Bank credit), $30,000,000. (This is a total $100,000,000 project.)"

The facts are:

The statement is incorrect. Export-Import Bank has not authorized any credit for such purpose.

The Butler report states:

"Oil refinery project, Petroleos Mexicanos, $10,000,000."

The facts are:

The statement is incorrect. Although there have been discussions with reference to the possibility of the bank's participation in financing a high-octane refinery, no credit has as yet been authorized.

The Butler report states:

"Railway equipment aid project (Export-Import Bank credit), $30,000,000."

The facts are:

The statement is incorrect. This appears to be a duplication of the second item above. Export-Import Bank has not authorized any credit for such purpose.

The Butler report states:

"Highway—United States aid to Pan American Highway section to Mexico (Export-Import Bank credit) $100,000."

The facts are:

In 1941 the bank authorized a credit of $30,000,000 to Nacional Financiera upon the guaranty of the Mexican Government, the notes to be secured by the pledge of Government road bonds which in turn were secured by the proceeds of the gasoline sales tax. Ten million dollars of the credit has been used. One million seven hundred and forty-seven thousand two hundred and ninety-four dollars and sixty-seven cents has been repaid; the balance outstanding is not due.

The Butler report states:

"Mexican handicraft aid—credits, $100,000."

The facts are:

This is a line of credit in favor of a New York importer to assist in financing the importation to the United States of Mexican handicraft and art objects for commercial sale.

The Butler report states:

"Water-pipe meters supply credits (Armco International Corporation), $84,998."

The facts are:

This credit was extended to a United States firm, Armco International Corporation, to assist that firm in financing the sale and exportation to Mexico of pipe and water meters. The loan was made in 1936 and has been repaid.

The Butler report states:

"Pumps and motors supply credits, $42,000."

The facts are:

This credit was extended to a United States firm, Fairbanks Morse & Co., to assist that firm in financing the sale and exportation to Mexico of pumps and motors. The loan was made in 1937 and has been repaid.

The Butler report states:

"Locomotive supply credits (American Locomotives Sales Corporation), $602,649."

The facts are:

This credit was extended to a United States firm, American Locomotive Sales Corporation, in 1937 to assist in financing the sale and exportation of locomotives to Mexico. The loan has been repaid.

The Butler report lists under the heading "Still other United States expenditures for welfare or economic aid to Mexico" an item designated as "Water purifying projects."

The facts are:

Although the item "water purifying projects" is not identified, it is assumed that the Senator has referred to a credit extended by Export-Import Bank in 1937 in favor of a United States firm, the Permutit Co., to assist in financing the sale and exportation to Mexico of water purifying equipment. The loan has been repaid.

The table lists a number of loans and credits by Export-Import Bank which had already been listed by the Senator on the preceding page of his report and have been discussed above.

The Butler report states:

"28. Railway equipment aid project—Export-Import Bank, $500,000."

The facts are:

This credit in the amount of $500,000 was authorized in favor of a United States firm, American Car and Foundry Co., in 1937 to assist that firm in financing the sale and exportation of railway equipment to Mexico. Only $225,961.05 of the credit was used, which amount has been repaid.

Peru

Instead of $30,000,000 the bank has made a commitment of $25,000,000 which is available only for projects approved, and upon conditions stipulated, by the bank. No part of this credit has yet been utilized.

Brazil

Of the credits listed by Senator BUTLER on page 13, items 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 25, 26, 29, 31, 32, and 33, were in favor of United States manufacturers and exporters to finance the sale and exportation of United States products to Brazil.

Items 6 and 13 constitute a duplication in part. Export-Import Bank has extended a credit of $45,000,000 to be utilized only for the purchase in the United States of materials and equipment required for the construction of the steel mill in Brazil. The loan is guaranteed by Banco do Brazil. Between 5,000 and 6,000 orders have been placed in the United States for the supplying of this equipment.

Items 10, 27, and 28 were extended in favor of United States firms to finance the importation of Brazilian products for commercial use in the United States.

All other items listed, i. e., numbers 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 30 were credits extended to Banco do Brazil or to Brazilian firms to be utilized solely for the purchase of materials and equipment in the United States.

The credits listed by the Senator were made between 1934 and the date of his report. With respect to such credits, Export-Import Bank has disbursed a total of $65,094,883.11. Of this amount $36,146,445.70 has already been repaid.

Haiti

In the section on Haiti (p. 14) there are listed under the heading "Credit extended" the following:

Butler report:

"8 Standard Fruit & Steamship Co., construction material and equipment—$500,000."

"11. Haitian Agricultural Corporation, material, equipment, and services—$1,000,000."

The facts are:

The credit to Standard Fruit & Steamship Co., a United States firm, was extended to assist it in the purchase and exportation of United States materials and equipment to Haiti. Of the total credit, only $100,000 has been utilized of which amount $90,000 has already been repaid.

The Haitian Agricultural Corporation referred to above is a United States firm owned by citizens of the United States which for many years has been engaged in the production of sisal in Haiti on a commercial scale. The credit was extended to assist the firm in the purchase and exportation of United States machinery and equipment. Only $80,000 of the credit was utilized, of which amount $63,700.05 has already been repaid. The unused portion of the credit was canceled because it was not required by the borrower.

Butler report:

"10. Barque Nacional de la Rep di Haiti (sic), United States agricultural and industrial products, $500,000."

The facts are:

The credit referred to was a dollar exchange credit authorized in favor of Banque Nationale de la Republique d'Haiti. No part of the credit was utilized and its availability allowed to expire September 1943.

Export-Import Bank of Washington—Statement of transactions affecting the other American republics for fiscal years 1941–43

[In thousands of dollars]

	1941	1942	1943
Loans disbursed	35,123	45,973	38,932
Repayment of loans (principal only)	26,188	21,344	10,288

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 10, 1943.

The Honorable KENNETH MCKELLAR,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: I am glad to transmit to you herewith at your request information concerning the expenditures of the Department of State in and with reference to the other American republics since July 1, 1941, together with some comments regarding statements made by Senator HUGH A. BUTLER concerning activities of this Government in those countries.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

Enclosures:

1. Memorandum and table concerning financial expenditures.

2. Memorandum concerning the report of Senator BUTLER.

Statement of Department of State financial transactions affecting the other American republics for fiscal years 1941–43

[In thousands of dollars]

Description	1941	1942	1943	Total 1941–43
Cultural relations program				1,392.649
Regular State Department appropriation	34	140	260	
Interdepartmental committee appropriation	149.02	207.833	601.796	
Special emergency activities				331.211
The Inter-American Advisory Committee for Political Defense		15	94	
The Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee			22.810	
Miscellaneous projects	3.171	69.306	126.924	
Total	186.191	432.139	1,105.530	1,723.860

NOTE.—It is estimated that expenditures for the fiscal year 1944 will amount to $2,562,000.

TYPES OF PROJECTS COVERED IN EXPENDITURES REPORTED

The expenditures reported as current expenses of the United States Government agencies in the other American republics include all expenditures by the Department of State under the appropriation "Cooperation with the American republics," which includes projects such as (1) convention for the promotion of inter-American cultural relations; (2) selection, translation, and printing in Spanish, Portuguese, and French of certain publications of this Government for distribution in the other American republics; (3) travel of advisory committees concerned with cultural relations; (4) travel grants to leaders; (5) grants to students; (6) cultural institutes and services; (7) grants to American schools; and (8) other miscellaneous projects for the promotion of cultural relations. The expenditures reported also include special projects which are being carried on in cooperation with the American republics in connection with the war effort, such as (1) the Inter-American Advisory Committee for Political Defense; (2) the Inter-American Financial and Economic Committee; and (3) miscellaneous and minor projects of various types.

TYPES OF PROJECTS NOT COVERED IN THE EXPENDITURES REPORTED

There have been excluded from the expenditures reported such items as those listed hereafter for the reasons stated:

1. Contributions to inter-American organizations dealing with technical and scientific problems and rendering joint services to member governments, of which the United States is a member, and to the maintenance and operation of which it contributes its proportionate share as fixed by treaty or other agreement. Most of these organizations have been operating for many years. Some of them are located in the American republics and others in the United States.

2. Expenses of participation in inter-American conferences of a character which are required in the normal conduct of foreign relations, such as those carried on in peacetimes.

3. Expenditures for the acquisition of Government-owned offices and residences for the use of the Foreign Service.

4. Expenses in connection with the conduct of our regular Foreign Service activities which are carried on in all countries of the world and not only in the American republics.

5. Annual payments to Panama under convention of 1903 for 99-year lease of the Canal Zone.

COMMENTS ON THE REPORT OF THE HONORABLE HUGH A. BUTLER RELATIVE TO EXPENDITURES BY THE UNITED STATES IN CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICAN COUNTRIES

UNITED STATES POLICY IN CENTRAL AMERICA

The Senator charges that the United States in 1941 contributed to the failure of the "long-sought dream of Central American patriots for a federal union" by recognizing insurgents who had overturned the "union government." This is cited as an example of the "atmosphere of misunderstanding" created by President Roosevelt's good neighbor policy.

The Senator evidently refers to an incident that took place in 1921, the last time when a Central American union was attempted. In that year a Central American union consisting of Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala was formed and recognition was sought from the United States. Two months after establishment of the union a revolution of antiunion forces in Guatemala overthrew the existing government in that country. When the union government objected to this act, Guatemala withdrew from the federation. The union government proposed to attempt to put down the revolutionary movement in Guatemala but when the United States expressed its concern over "any attempt by one Central American country to interfere with the internal affairs of another," the union was dissolved. In April 1922 the United States recognized the new government in Guatemala.

The policy of this Government toward a possible Central American union has officially been stated in the Department's instructions to its representatives as follows: "The creation of a Central American union is a matter for the exclusive consideration and decision of the countries concerned."

COMMITTEE FOR POLITICAL DEFENSE

Referring to the activities of the Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense which discusses problems of control of subversive activities with the appropriate officials of the governments of the American republics, the Senator reports "State Department officials feel that this is an intrusion in their field."

The Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense was established in accordance with a resolution adopted at the meeting of Foreign Ministers in Rio de Janeiro to which the American representative, of course, agreed. The Department has been fully satisfied concerning the functions of this committee and has cooperated with it in every respect.

TRADE AGREEMENTS

Senator BUTLER argues that the reciprocal trade agreements with the other American republics have been largely nullified by our activities under the war programs which he implies have destroyed the credit standing of Latin America and consequently the ability of the other republics to do business with the United States.

There is no inconsistency between the reciprocal trade agreement policy and the activities of this Government in arranging for the purchase of strategic materials under agreements between the governments concerned. The trade agreements are intended to encourage expansion of private commerce along sound lines, and they may be expected to have this effect again after the war when normal trade is resumed. Importers in the other American republics do not lack credit to buy United States goods; the goods are not available in sufficient quantity because of wartime needs.

The Senator also charges that the trade agreements have encouraged the production of agricultural export commodities in countries where agricultural workers do not produce enough food for an adequate diet and are therefore impoverished and in bad health.

This Government's policy has been to encourage production of noncompeting agricultural commodities in the other American republics. The United States imports such commodities as sugar and coffee from other American republics and exports to them

agricultural commodities produced here such as wheat, flour, and lard.

AIRPORT CONTROLS IN RIO DE JANEIRO AND SAN SALVADOR

The Senator states that Brazil forced the United State to relinquish the control towers at the airport in Rio de Janeiro to the Brazilian Army despite our strenuous objections, and that because the Brazilian officials were incompetent an airplane of the V. A. S. P. line crashed, killing 18 persons.

The changes in the operation of control towers at the Rio de Janeiro airport were made by the Brazilian authorities at the urgent insistence of American air line officials in order to improve a situation which had previously been unsatisfactory. These changes greatly increased the safety factor in landing and taking off. The crash of the Brazilian plane to which the Senator refers was not due in any way to the operation of control towers as the Senator suggests.

The Senator also cites as an example of ingratitude on the part of El Salvador the report that that country recently "booted out" the competent radio and control tower men of the United States air line and replaced them with Salvadorans whose incompetence endangered the lives of passengers coming in and out of the airport at San Salvador.

There are no control towers on the airport at San Salvador.

CULTURAL AIDES STUDYING RUINS

The Senator reports that "several cultural aides of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs and the State Department are spending time to uncover more ruins and reconstruct others in both Mexico and Peru."

No employees of the State Department have been or are now engaged in any such activities.

INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

The Senator has criticized the project for construction of the Inter-American Highway and the pioneer road which was undertaken for military purposes. The following information is given on that subject:

United States cooperation in the construction of the Inter-American Highway from the Mexican-Guatemalan border to Panama City was approved by Congress, upon the President's recommendation, in 1941 (Public, No. 375, of December 26, 1941). The President pointed out that the completion of the highway would improve transportation within and between the several countries it traversed and the United States, develop new lands and new natural resources, increase consumption of American imports, notably American automobiles, parts, garage equipment, etc., help maintain the economic structure of the Central American republics, which had been adversely affected by war conditions, increase the tourist traffic between the United States and this area, and have a direct bearing on the defense of the Canal Zone area.

While the latter point was not the primary consideration in the decision to cooperate in the construction of the highway by May 25, 1942, the need for an adequate overland line of communications to the Canal Zone had become so acute that the General Staff decided that "An all-weather pioneer road from the United States to Panama City is needed to serve military purposes for supply and communication, particularly in view of restricted water transportation. Such a road can be completed within 1 year." The linking together by a pioneer road of the segments of the Inter-American Highway which had already been completed was consequently undertaken. Fifteen months later, on August 27, 1943 (approximately the time that Senator BUTLER was speaking to the military leaders of the Caribbean defense command), the General Staff, in pursuance of a general plan for the reduction of defense installations of the Western Hemisphere, approved a recommendation that "Participation by the Army in the Pan-American Highway will be terminated when presently allocated War Department funds are exhausted and the project turned over to civil agencies of the Government for completion." Allocations for the construction of the pioneer highway amounted on that date to $40,000,000. Final accounts of the cost of the pioneer highway will not be completed for some months, but it is believed that costs will approximately equal those allocations.

An appropriation of $7,000,000 was approved on February 21, 1942, under the $20,000,000 authorization provided by Public, 375. A further appropriation of $5,000,000 under this authorization was approved on June 26, 1943. On July 12, 1943, a separate appropriation of $12,000,000 was approved in order that a particularly difficult section of the highway in Costa Rica might be completed on an emergency basis as a part common to the pioneer and inter-American highways. Costa Rica was financially unable to provide cooperative funds to match this appropriation, but in all other cases the respective governments have provided one-third of the total expenditures for the construction of the inter-American highway. All United States appropriations were made to the Public Roads Administration rather than the Department of State.

Total United States expenditures on the inter-American highway in the fiscal years 1941–42–43 equaled $3,541,000 including $670,000 in Army funds spent by the Public Roads Administration on access roads. Total credits of the Export-Import Bank to the respective governments for the construction of the inter-American highway (including a general credit of $30,000,000 to Mexico for highways, only $10,000,000 of which has been withdrawn and $1,686,797 of which has been repaid, and a loan of $1,815,000 made to Nicaragua in 1939, $199,000 of which has already been repaid) have amounted to $38,215,000 of which but $14,324,202 is actually outstanding. Thus total United States commitments made since 1939 in connection with the inter-American highway, including gross authorizations, appropriations, or credits of the Export-Import Bank but excluding Army expenditures amount to $70,215,000 as against Senator BUTLER's allegation of $438,800,000. Latest figures show expenditures of over $70,000,000[1] by the respective local governments on the highway. Although it appears, on the basis of revised estimates, that considerable additional money beyond that authorized will be needed to complete the highway, requests for whatever appropriations may be necessary for this purpose will of course be submitted to the Congress for its approval in due course.

HONDURAN RELIEF PROJECT

Senator BUTLER charges that the United States unnecessarily undertook road projects in Honduras to alleviate unemployment which, according to the Senator's report, the American Ambassador described as not sufficiently bad to warrant such an undertaking. The Senator charges that such difficulties as Honduras did experience were created by the United States because gold and antimony mines were shut down and bananas were left to rot in the fields.

There are no gold mines of importance in Honduras. Antimony mines, which provide only insignificant amount of employment, have not been shut down. The unemployment in that country, which developed in 1942, was due to the decrease in banana exports which in turn arose from the diversion of shipping by the United States to more urgent wartime uses. The situation was described by Ambassador John D. Erwin (then American Minister to Honduras) in a report to the Department dated August 15, 1942, in which he said that a few more weeks of hardship may produce serious trouble in north coast area and urged that the United States speedily initiate work relief projects in that region. The report stated that hundreds of families were close to starvation despite efforts to obtain locally produced food, the situation being most hard on women and children. The greatest unemployment was found amongst dock workers who under normal times loaded and unloaded ships which because of war demands no longer could be spared for the banana trade. The United States Government cooperated with the Honduran Government in the construction of a badly needed road which gave work to the unemployed until improvements in the economic situation, including the expanded production of strategic materials such as mahogany and abacá, provided other sources of employment.

[1] Including amounts spent prior to 1941.

LOAN TO ARGENTINA FOR OIL EXPLORATION

Senator BUTLER states that the United States loaned Argentina $50,000,000 for the development of oil resources. The source for this information was given by the Senator as being a Mr. Cook of the Standard Oil Co.

No Government agency has advanced a loan to Argentina for such purposes.

PUERTO RICAN AID

The Senator includes in his computation of United States expenditures in Latin America $57,000,000 in aid to Puerto Rico from the United States Government.

Puerto Rico is a Territory of the United States, not a foreign country.

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: This is to supplement the information previously submitted to you in my letter of November 30, 1943.

The expenditures of the predecessor agencies of the Foreign Economic Administration for all activities relating to the Latin-American countries, other than those of the corporate agencies, totaled $3,672,000 through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943. The expenditures of the Corporations have been reported to you independently.

I should like at this time also to comment on the nature and scope of our foreign procurement program in the other American republics and on some of the statements made with regard thereto by Senator BUTLER.

1. The foreign procurement operations have been handled by the Foreign Economic Administration, its predecessor agencies, Commodity Credit Corporation, and the several corporate agencies of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. With few exceptions, discussed below, all purchases have been made for supply reasons and in accordance with the requirements determinations of the Army-Navy Munitions Board, the War Food Administration, and the War Production Board and its predecessor agencies.

2. The Latin-American republics have always been an important source of many strategic war materials, quartz and the better grades of mica, for example. The Japanese invasion of the Philippines, the East Indies, and China, from which we had normally obtained all of our rubber, 95 percent of our quinine, 60 percent of our hard fibers, and two-thirds of our fats and oils, forced us to rely more than ever on the Latin-American countries to fulfill our essential needs.

The contribution of the other American republics in supplying our requirements has been of the greatest value to the war effort. The importance of the minerals obtained

from these countries, for example, is shown by the following table:

Commodity	Percent of total United States supply that must be imported	Percent of total United States imports coming from Latin America	Percent of total United States new supply coming from Latin America
Quartz crystals	99.9	100	99.9
Tantalum	99	[1]66.5	66
Tin	99.9	67.5	67.5
Mica (good, stained, or better)	95	24	23
Beryllium	83	84.3	70
Manganese (Metallurgical and Battery)	85	35.5	30
Tungsten	62	54.5	34
Zinc	40.5	57	23
Copper	26	93	24
Fluorspar	9.4	65	6

[1] Including almost all of the vital high-grade material.

Many other essential war materials have been obtained from the Latin-American republics, including fibers, fats and oils, and lumber products. These countries are now the only source of abaca (manila hemp), henequen, certain grades of sisal, fibers used extensively in naval operations, and the chief source of flax. They are now the only source of castor seed, castor and rapeseed oil, furnish us all our imported supply and 20 percent of our total requirements of tung and oiticica oil, 10 percent of our requirements of certain oils used for soaps, glycerins and plasticizers, and large quantities of balsa wood and mahogany required in our naval and aviation programs. Many other illustrations could readily be added.

3. Senator BUTLER makes two general criticisms of the procurement program in Latin America. The Senator asserts (1) that the Government procurement agencies have paid "premium" prices for supplies, and (2) that they have entered into agreements to purchase exportable surpluses of certain commodities which are in excess of our own requirements. These criticisms, in my opinion, are not well founded.

Prices paid by the Government have been no higher than the minimum necessary to obtain the supplies required. Wartime prices for commodities imported from the Latin-American republics, like those imported from other sources or produced domestically, have, of course, risen sharply as a result of extreme shortage of supply and abnormal wartime demands. It can be safely said, however, that the prices paid under Government procurement programs have been substantially less than the prices which would have been paid by private dealers in a free market without price controls. By acting as the sole buyer in many cases and eliminating private competitive buying, the Government has saved the public many millions of dollars.

The agreements under which this Government obligated itself to purchase the exportable surpluses of certain commodities have been of the greatest value to the war effort. These obligations were assumed in exchange for the undertaking of the producing countries to prohibit exports to the Axis Powers, thus insuring to this country and those friendly to it a monopoly of the critical war materials in question. With a few exceptions discussed below, the commodities purchased were all needed and would have been purchased regardless of the agreements to fulfill war requirements. Under the agreement with Mexico of July 15, 1941, the only one discussed at length by Senator Butler, not one dollar has been spent which we wouldn't have had to spend in any event to get essential minerals and fibers.

4. Some purchases have been made partly or entirely because of political considerations and not for reasons of supply alone. The cost to this Government, however, has proved to be surprisingly small. The following is believed to be a complete list of purchases of this character executed as of the end of the fiscal year 1943.

(A) BRAZILIAN COFFEE

Pursuant to a commitment made on behalf of this Government by the Department of State to purchase or underwrite Brazilian coffee up to the quota established for that country by the Inter-American Coffee Agreement, Commodity Credit Corporation agreed (a) to purchase or underwrite the unshipped balance of the Brazilian 1941–42 import quota, amounting to 2,659,279 bags; and (b) to guarantee the purchase of the 1942–43 quota. The unshipped balance for 1942–43 has now been determined to be 1,458,718 bags.

The purchase contract was formalized in an exchange of diplomatic notes dated October 3, 1942. These notes set forth that the agreement was entered into "in keeping with the policy of close collaboration between the Governments of the United States of America and Brazil, and in order to minimize the adverse effects on the economy and the people of Brazil from the war."

The price paid and to be paid for the coffee is the United States ex dock green coffee ceiling price, less current importation costs and normal marketing and administrative expenses. The value of all of the coffee delivered and to be delivered to Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to the foregoing commitment is approximately $75,000,000, assuming the Corporation were required to fulfill its maximum commitment.

Due to a marked improvement in shipping conditions, however, resulting in a termination of coffee rationing, deliveries to the Corporation have been far below the contract maximum. Most of the coffee purchased by the Corporation has already been shipped to the United States and some of it has been disposed of.

The ultimate cost of this program will depend, of course, on how long the coffee purchased must be held in storage before sale. In view of the improvement in shipping conditions, however, there is good reason to believe that the corporation will suffer little or no loss at all.

Mention might also be made in this connection of a contemporaneous undertaking to purchase the unshipped balance of Haitian coffee, under which, however, it proved unnecessary to make any purchases.

(B) BRAZILIAN COCOA BEANS

Pursuant to an exchange of diplomatic notes dated July 11, 1942, Commodity Credit Corporation agreed to purchase 1,300,000 bags of Bahia cocoa beans of the 1942–43 Brazil crop, less the amount sold to other purchasers in the United States. The price was $6.30 per 100 pounds, f. o. b. Brazilian ports, or a total commitment of some $10,800,000. Thereafter, however, a marked betterment of the shipping situation resulted in the importation through private channels of the entire amount of cocoa beans which Commodity Credit Corporation was committed to buy in the event of failure of such private importation. The guarantee is therefore no longer operative, and no actual purchase by this Government resulted.

(C) CUBAN, DOMINICAN, AND HAITIAN SUGAR

On January 28, 1942, a contract was entered into by Defense Supplies Corporation with the Cuban Sugar Stabilization Institute for acquisition of the 1942 crop of Cuban sugar and molasses. The price paid for the sugar was $2.65 per hundred pounds f. o. b. customary coastal point of delivery for each mill.

Commodity Credit Corporation has also agreed to purchase 3,000,000 short tons of sugar from the 1943 crop. At the time this purchase was made, it was doubtful whether the 1943 sugar could be shipped and the agreement was made in part to maintain the Cuban economy. The sugar was needed, however, and the shipping picture has, of course, greatly improved since the date of the agreement.

The price was the same as that paid for the 1942 sugar although costs of production had materially increased. The total price amounted to approximately $159,000,000. The net cost of this sugar to Commodity Credit Corporation was approximately $4.41 per 100 pounds, determined as follows:

Purchase price	$2.65
Ocean freight	.56
Internal freight (Cuba and United States)	.45
Duty	.75
Total	4.41

The sugar is being sold at the O. P. A. domestic ceiling price of $3.74, and an apparent loss to this Government of approximately 67 cents per hundred pounds is involved in the transaction. It will be noted, however, that one of the items taken into consideration in determining this cost is the duty, which is larger than the apparent loss, and therefore no actual loss is being sustained by the Government.

At about the same time that the 1943 agreement was entered into with Cuba, contracts were also executed with the Dominican Republic and Haiti. As a result of these latter two agreements, approximately 440,000 tons of Dominican sugar and 40,000 tons of Haitian sugar have been purchased by Commodity Credit Corporation. Practically all of the sugar from the Dominican Republic and Haiti has been sold to the United Kingdom by Commodity Credit Corporation at its cost price.

(D) URUGUAYAN WOOL

In the summer of 1942, Uruguayan wool growers and dealers had on hand a large quantity of wool from the 1941–42 clip which they were unable to sell. Request was made of the United States Government, through the Department of State, to purchase this wool and thereafter the Uruguayan Government sent a mission to the United States to consult with representatives of this Government.

After prolonged negotiations, the Board of Economic Warfare directed Defense Supplies Corporation to agree to purchase up to 30,000 bales (approximately 30,000,000 pounds) of Uruguayan wool of the 1941–42 clip at an over-all average price of 37 cents per pound in the grease for Super Style wool, and 35 cents per pound for Bonne Belle Style wool. Defense Supplies Corporation was further directed to underwrite up to 37,500 bales (approximately 37,500,000 pounds) of the 1942–43 clip at an over-all average price of 35 cents per pound in the grease for Super Style wool, and 33 cents per pound for Bonne Belle Style wool.

The agreement with the Uruguayan Government was effected by an exchange of diplomatic notes between the Secretary of State and the Ambassador of Uruguay. These notes set forth the hope that the agreement would aid in the stabilization of the economy of Uruguay, and would decrease the dislocations to its economy caused by the war demand.

The Department of State advised the Uruguayan Ambassador, on July 13, 1943, that pursuant to the provisions of the agreement,

we elected to terminate our underwriting obligation. The termination became effective on October 13, 1943.

The present market value of the wool acquired under this agreement is equal to or exceeds the cost. The wool, which has arrived in the United States, is included in the stock pile of foreign wools maintained in this country pursuant to directive of the War Production Board.

(E) PERUVIAN, NICARAGUAN, AND HAITIAN COTTON

Early in 1942, the Commodity Credit Corporation agreed for the period of the war emergency to purchase the exportable surplus of Peruvian cotton, but not to exceed 200,000 bales a year. The prices were fixed in accordance with existing world prices and it was provided that they would be increased or decreased 1½ percent with each percent of decrease or increase in cotton acreage. Under this agreement, less than 10 percent of Peru's exportable cotton surplus has been purchased. While no definite statement can be made as to the ultimate cost of the program, it seems reasonable to say that all of the cotton will be sold without loss and possibly at a profit.

Similar arrangements were made with Nicaragua and Haiti. No cotton was purchased under the agreement with the latter and the Nicaraguan cotton purchased has all been sold at a profit.

5. In a very few instances, commodities were purchased not because they were needed but because the purchase enabled us to buy or facilitate the procurement of other strategic materials essential to the war. We have agreed, for example, to purchase subspecification mahogany in order to obtain the desired grades of this commodity; during 1943, we have had to buy only about $20,000 of the subspecification lumber. In another instance, as Senator BUTLER notes, we agreed to purchase a quantity of Brazil nuts in order to enable the owners to divert the capital invested in the nuts to rubber production in the Amazon region. The cost of the nuts was about $1,000,000, 75 percent of which represents a loss.

6. I am attaching memoranda on two subjects discussed by Senator BUTLER, one on the quartz operations in Brazil, and the other on four abaca projects in Latin America.

I hope the information furnished herewith will prove helpful.

Sincerely yours,

LEO T. CROWLEY,
Administrator.

QUARTZ SITUATION IN BRAZIL

1. Senator BUTLER states that "quartz has been increased in price substantially, although the supply has increased."

Answer. The demand for quartz crystal oscillators for use in military radio communications increased many thousand percent from 1941 to the present time. The prices paid for quartz in Brazil have been the minimum necessary to meet the requirements for raw material. The supply has increased and production of needed quartz oscillators has not been limited by shortage of raw material.

2. Senator BUTLER states that "the price of certain grades of quartz at certain Brazilian production centers ranges from 70 cents a pound up, but the price to processors in the United States ranges from $3 or $4 up to $7 per pound. This disparity seems unjustified."

Answer. The vast majority of quartz crystals contain flaws, not visible to the naked eye, which can only be discovered by scientific examination, first by inspection in an oil bath in the concentrated beam of a carbon arc lamp and then by further inspection with a polariscope. Such facilities are not used in the producing centers in the interior of Brazil and quartz purchased there by Brazilian dealers is bought on visual inspection with full knowledge that a large percentage of this quartz contains flaws which will be revealed when inspected under scientific instruments. It is quite obvious, therefore, that quartz sold in producing centers is not comparable to quartz sold after inspection at the National Bureau of Standards. Any comparison of prices which does not take this into account is meaningless.

3. Senator BUTLER states that "the type of quartz mined, transported to the United States and stored here in Washington by the Defense Supplies Corporation or Metals Reserve Company is about 50 percent or more of no value at all. It is useless and manufacturers cannot make radio quartz parts from it."

Answer. The initial Government purchases were made during 1941 without the services of an inspection station. At that time the custom of the trade was to inspect by visual methods only. Moreover, prior to June 1941, great quantities of quartz had been purchased by Germany, Japan, and Italy without any special effort to obtain the better grades and, in order to gain the full cooperation of Brazil in preventing diversion of supplies to the Axis, it was necessary to acquire some low quality material which under ordinary conditions would not have been accepted. Some of the material purchased in this period was at one time considered below minimum standards. As a result of technological developments, however, much of the material rejected has been reclassified into cuttable grades and about 70 percent of the total purchases will be used or held as a low-grade stock pile.

An inspection station was placed in operation in Brazil in November 1942 with specifications for purchase based upon the recommendations of the National Bureau of Standards. During the early months of 1943, when quartz for consumption was in urgent demand, all material known to contain a high proportion of better qualities was shipped by air after inspection in Brazil. In view of the urgency at that time, however, the Government also shipped by water any quartz which could not be thoroughly inspected in Brazil without undue delay, and in which there was reason to believe a significant portion, at least, of cuttable material was present. This was done as a matter of deliberate policy. Naturally, some of the material was rejected upon inspection in the United States, but this was anticipated and precious time was saved.

4. Senator BUTLER states that "private manufacturers of quartz parts for military radio equipment are forced to buy the majority of their supply through a private agent."

Answer. Private manufacturers may obtain quartz from (a) private sources, either importers or exporters, or (b) Metals Reserve Company. If they purchase material from the latter they must deal through a sales agent appointed by Metals Reserve, but this agent acts not in a private capacity but for the account of Metals Reserve.

5. Senator BUTLER states that "the United States Purchasing Commission in charge of quartz buying have paid unjustifiably high premium prices and this has increased the cost of the finished products to the United States for military purposes unnecessarily."

Answer. The Government's prices for quartz in Brazil, as previously stated, are the minimum necessary to obtain the requisite supplies. Prices paid by private importers for quartz in Brazil are slightly in excess of prices being paid by the Government. The Government deliberately offers to purchase only those supplies which the private dealers decline to handle.

6. Senator BUTLER states that "great waste from purchase of useless quartz has resulted from the policy of indiscriminate buying and huge stores of this useless quartz is now on hand."

Answer. Prior to the establishment of the inspection service station in Rio, substantial quantities of quartz had accumulated in Rio which the Government would not buy except on an inspection basis. After the inspection service station was established this material was purchased, payment being made on the basis of the usable quartz found on inspection. In order to prevent any future demand for purchase of the worthless quartz at a later date, the Purchasing Commission insisted that the rejected quartz also be included in the transaction without any increase in the price offered for the usable material alone. Thus the Government suffered no loss and avoided the possibility of being subjected to pressure to buy worthless material in the future.

7. Senator BUTLER states that "the indications are that some graft may attend the quartz production and distribution handling, since the price seems unreasonably high in the United States compared to the price at the mines and since someone has been paid a lot of money for quartz that has no value. Either that, or the inspection of the quartz before purchase has been faulty or inefficient."

Answer. The charge is baseless. The assumptions on which it is made are unfounded, as shown previously. Since last March the Purchasing Commission has had in effect a system of double-checking of inspections which minimizes the possibility of error on the part of the inspectors. The financial calculations are likewise double-checked in Rio and again in Washington.

ABACA

Senator BUTLER includes under the heading of "W. P. A., N. Y. A., and F. S. A. Reconstituted in Latin America" certain abaca plantations in four Latin American countries. The plantations thus described are operated by United Fruit Co. under Government contracts in Panama, Costa Rica, Guatemala, and Honduras. It is expected that by 1945 the abaca (manila hemp) production from these plantations, practically the sole present source of this essential fiber, will equal 15 to 20 percent of the amount formerly imported from the Philippine Islands.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, December 9, 1943.

The Honorable KENNETH MCKELLAR,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: I have your letter of December 6, 1943, in which you state that the Senate Appropriations Committee desires to obtain at the earliest possible moment certain information from the affected agencies in connection with the personal report recently submitted by Senator BUTLER on expenditures in Latin America. You also state that you are particularly desirous that before information is submitted consultations be arranged with representatives of other affected departments and agencies with a view to avoiding repetition and duplication of material, and presenting correlated statements.

* * * * *

I shall appreciate hearing from you in case further information or other break-downs are needed. * * *

Very truly yours,

FRANK KNOX.

NAVAL AID TO THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS
CURRENT EXPENSES

Current expenses of the United States Navy in other American republics during the fiscal years 1941–43 amounted to $24,021,000. This figure includes expenditures as reported by disbursing officers located ashore throughout the American republics, including Guantanamo, approximately $13,000,000; Rio de Janeiro, approximately $4,000,000; Recife, ap-

proximately $1,500,000. The figure does not include maintenance and operating expenses of fleet units operating in and around the other American republics.

LEND-LEASE

General comment

1. Furnishing lend-lease material to the American republics has been developed as follows:

(a) Staff agreements with all the American republics initiated in June 1940, for the purpose of determining the scope of military cooperation within the capacity of each of the American republics.

(b) An estimate of the type and quantity of material necessary to make our staff agreements effective.

(c) The necessary training program to instruct the personnel how to operate material received.

2. It should be noted that when staff conversations were in progress during 1940 and 1941, this period corresponded with the darkest moments of the war—the entrance of Italy into the war, Dunkerque, the fall of France, and later, Pearl Harbor. It was necessary to make plans for the possibility of having to wage war without the help of allies. It was vital to our interests not only to secure the friendship of the American republics, but also to obtain necessary bases and whatever local assistance that could be rendered.

3. In general, our naval agreements provided for our use of their bases, installations, airdromes, and other facilities. The agreements also provided for furnishing material to repair and maintain local naval equipment and to provide small patrol boats for those maritime powers which had the naval personnel capable of manning them. One of the principal provisions was to build up certain naval bases in Brazil, Peru, and Chile for the use of our naval vessels and merchant marine, as well as that of the country concerned. These bases have been a great factor in the success of our naval operations in the south Atlantic and the southeast Pacific.

4. Acting in close cooperation with the War Department, naval aviation has also been provided for joint cooperative work, particularly in Brazil, Peru, Chile, Cuba, and Mexico.

5. It is desired to emphasize that all naval lend-lease material has been provided in accordance with definite policies and agreements entered into with the other American republics. Furthermore, all requisitions for naval material have been carefully screened by the appropriate agencies of the Navy Department. As the strategic situation has improved, the Navy Department has also revised the estimates for lend-lease material required by the other American republics for military cooperation. For example, as a result of the African campaign, when it became evident that the danger of invasion from the European Axis Powers had ceased to be a factor, naval lend-lease material has been provided only for antisubmarine warfare or to prepare for other joint military operations.

Status of naval lend-lease to the other American republics

1. Official requests for armaments have been submitted by all American republics and lend-lease agreements have been signed with all except Argentina and Panama.

2. The valuation of the lend-lease materials and services transferred to other American republics, including naval vessels which by act of Congress are required to be leased instead of sold during the fiscal years 1941 to 1943, has been estimated as $14,185,000.

Lend-lease material and naval cooperation

1. Brazil

(a) Mobility of defense has been created through a chain of air bases along the coast of Brazil to meet the mobility of attack. German submarine warfare has traveled in cycles of both time and geography. The success of the United States Fourth Fleet in waging successful warfare against German submarines off the coast of Brazil is well known. In weighing the cost of our expenditures we should take into account the great value of being able to ferry the thousands of fighters, bombers, and air transports through Fortaleza and Natal to Africa and what that meant to the success of the north African, Sicilian, and Italian campaigns. The security of these bases has been insured by close cooperation between United States naval forces and the Brazilian armed forces. All the combined armed forces operating in Brazilian waters are under the supreme strategic direction of the commander of the United States Fourth Fleet. This close cooperation, never before achieved in our inter-American relations, is due largely to lend-lease material sent to the Brazilian Navy and the Brazilian air forces.

(b) We have loaned to the Brazilian Government a number of patrol boats. The crews to operate these vessels were trained in the United States. Furthermore, the personnel required to maintain and repair these vessels in Brazil have received instruction from United States naval representatives. To operate and keep in repair these vessels require a great number of officers and men. The operating Brazilian crews are men with long service in the Brazilian Navy and are thoroughly accustomed to the sea. They lack only specialized training to be efficient. In many respects the Brazilian crews are superior to the United States reserve personnel available to man these boats. At any rate, the saving in manpower to the United States Navy is considerable. The Brazilian patrol boats escort convoys of American ships as well as Brazilian. They have also participated in submarine attacks.

The Brazilian Air Force operating combat planes are also under the strategic direction of the commander of the United States Fourth Fleet and operate under the principle of unity of command. The Brazilian Air Force claims to have sunk several enemy submarines.

2. Cuba

(a) As a result of special agreements with the Cuban Government, twelve 83-foot Coast Guard vessels have been loaned to the Cuban Navy for operation under the strategic direction of the United naval commander of the Gulf Sea Frontier. These vessels were sent as a loan, not a gift. The crews were trained at Miami and on board Coast Guard Reserve vessels operating in Cuban waters prior to delivery of the 12 patrol boats in question. These vessels have been actively engaged in patrolling and escorting convoys under the general direction of United States naval officers. The following figures furnished by the Cuban Navy are taken from operation reports of April, May, and June 1943:

Miles covered by the 12 vessels	40,278
Under way (hours)	3,673
Moored at Havana (hours)	14,806
Moored or anchored, other ports (hours)	7,727
	26,206
Average speed (knots)	11.2
Number of ships convoyed	216
Tonnage of ships convoyed (tons)	473,351

The Cuban Navy claims that the flotilla of submarine chasers, during this period had a total loss of only 0.027 percent of the tonnage convoyed during enemy attacks, achieved contacts with enemy submarines and successfully attacked one of these.

(b) Operating these vessels by the Cuban Navy has saved considerable manpower for the United States Navy. The vessels are too small for high seas operations. They would be of no value off the coast of Brazil for antisubmarine operations.

(c) Of course it is impossible to predict when German submarine operations will be resumed within the limit of striking distance of the patrol boats loaned to Cuba.

(d) Surface vessel patrols are required in addition to the aircraft patrol maintained.

3. Mexico

The Government of Mexico is patrolling their coast with their own ships and airplanes. There are no United States naval vessels or airplanes assigned to this patrol. The patrol vessels were repaired in United States yards.

4. Ecuador

The Government of Ecuador has received three vessels which are loaned to them in accordance with the Lend-Lease Act. They are not a gift but a loan. They are used for patrolling the coast of Ecuador, transporting military supplies to the Galapagos Islands, and for training Ecuadoran midshipmen and enlisted personnel. Two of them are of the converted yacht type, which have a limited military use but are considered suitable for training the midshipmen and crews of the Ecuadoran Navy. Most of the converted yacht type of patrol vessels are being decommissioned by the United States Navy and being replaced by modern craft. The other vessel is a small cargo patrol vessel for general service.

5. Other American Republics

Naval lend-lease material has been furnished to repair and maintain floating equipment of the other American republics. Chile and Peru are maintaining an antisubmarine patrol in cooperation with the commander of the Southeast Pacific Force. Colombia and Venezuela are patrolling their territorial waters with vessels repaired in the United States. The patrols maintained by these countries are of great assistance to the United States, as it permits us to reduce the number of our own patrol vessels for this duty.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., December 10, 1943.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: I refer to your letter of December 6 in which you ask for certain information from the War Department in connection with the personal report recently submitted by Senator BUTLER on expenditures in Latin America. It is further understood that you desire this information at the earliest possible date.

Attached hereto are fiscal reports with explanatory notes showing certain figures supplied to Senator BUTLER and those supplied to the Bureau of the Budget at the request of the Department of State. For the reasons stated in these reports, time has not permitted a detailed break-down of the figures presented.

In order to answer the questions asked in paragraphs C, D and E of your letter, it is necessary to review briefly the major factors in the present war which necessitated the expenditures made by the War Department.

The general strategic situation in the world in 1940 and 1941 from the fall of France to Pearl Harbor, corresponding to one of the darkest moments of the war, necessitated the implementation of war plans by the United States not only for the defense of the continental United States, but also for the vitally important Panama Canal and all avenues of approach to the Western Hemisphere. In these plans, it was necessary to consider the possibility of having to defend the Western Hemisphere without the help of allies.

Plans called for the establishment of a network of air and naval bases with complementary military establishments extending from the southern borders of the United

States south to include the northeast and northwestern coasts of South America. The actual execution of the plan required the obtaining of agreements from various Latin-American republics for the use of their territories and the organization of technical engineering forces for the actual construction of bases adapted to military and naval uses. The time factor involved in negotiations and construction and the urgent military necessity for initiating action on this plan did not permit bargaining for commercial post-war rights in contemplated air bases. In fact, under the climate of opinion in the Latin-American republics during the period of negotiations, it would have been impossible to include agreements for post-war commercial rights in the permissions which were obtained for the construction of air bases for military use.

Staff conversations were held with many of the Latin-American republics and various agreements were reached to permit the construction and operation of air bases. In many of the more important bases, the United States obtained and still maintains full military operational control and rights. It is impossible to estimate the importance of the bases provided for both the eastern and western approaches to the Panama Canal; some of these are necessarily hundreds of miles from the zone itself and linked to the continental United States by other bases to permit rapid air reinforcement. Likewise, bases constructed in the Antilles and along the northern coast of Brazil, permitting the flow of large quantities of personnel, munitions, and aircraft to active theaters of war, have played and continue to play a vital part in military operations overseas. The strategic value of these bases cannot be measured in terms of dollars.

In all the Latin-American countries where the United States has established air bases, full cooperation has been extended by local authorities not only to facilitate our military operations, but also to provide protection by the suppression of potential sabotage activities and, in many cases, actual defense of our installations, both at the airfields and at the ports nearby. An outstanding example of this exists at the air bases in northeast Brazil, where the Brazilian Army, using lend-lease equipment supplied by the United States, has organized and maintained efficient 24-hour-a-day airfield and beach defenses. At all air bases operated under United States military control, no expenditures have been made by the United States for purchase or leasing of the land, nor have duties been charged on the importation of equipment or supplies shipped for the use of the United States. In no case have landing fees been charged for any military or naval aircraft.

Under basic lend-lease agreements, all Latin-American countries with the exception of Argentina and Panama submitted requests for lend-lease material. Assignments of equipment from War Department procurement were made through the Munitions Assignments Board after careful screening of requests by the War Department as to military necessity therefor in relation to our own plans for defense. Assignments of matériel were necessarily limited by availability due to pressing demands of our own forces and those of our allies in combat.

Every effort was made to provide types and quantities of equipment best suited to enable the various countries to organize antisabotage measures internally and to protect vital installations and ports supplying strategic materials for the war effort. The delivery of this equipment not only contributed materially to the defenses of the Western Hemisphere, but also aided in increasing the degree of cooperation accorded our military operations. In many cases, the necessity of stationing additional United States troops to protect important areas was obviated by the assignment of equipment to the local armed forces.

As the strategic situation improved, the War Department revised its estimates for lend-lease for purely defensive purposes. Assignments were continued where necessary for active military collaboration in operations in the Western Hemisphere, such as antisubmarine warfare, and for the training and preparation of such forces as may be used overseas in offensive operations with our own forces.

In the majority of American republics, the United States maintains air- and ground-training missions, whose duty it is to instruct the armed forces of those countries in the operation and use of United States equipment. The air missions have been particularly successful in training Latin-American pilots with United States aircraft and records show that the proportion of accidents is not excessive for normal training and operations.

During the period when the submarine menace along the east coast of the United States and in the Caribbean was at its height, sea communications with bases in Central America and Panama were definitely threatened. The completion of a pioneer road through portions of Central American republics was undertaken by the War Department against the contingency that overland communication might be necessary to supply the Canal Zone. When that contingency no longer existed, the War Department withdrew from participation in its construction.

In connection with all I have briefly outlined above concerning War Department activities in Latin America, I am inclosing a copy of a letter which I recently sent to the Secretary of State which summarizes the value of the cooperation afforded us by the other American republics.

In view of the urgency of your request, the information herein contained is necessarily limited to that now available. Should you desire further information, I shall be pleased to have it prepared upon your request.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

(Enclosure)

Fiscal Report, War Department Expenditures, Latin America

1. BASIS FOR DATA SUBMITTED

	To Senator BUTLER	To Senator MCKELLAR
Period covered	Fiscal years 1942, 1943, and 1944, except for lend-lease transfer of military material, which see below.	Fiscal years 1941, 1942, and 1943, except for current expenses, which see below.
Area covered	Everything south of the Rio Grande.	20 Latin-American republics.
Inter-American Highway.	Not included	Included.
Lend-lease transfers of military material.	May 11, 1941, through Nov. 30, 1943.	Fiscal years 1941, 1942, and 1943.
Current expenses[1].	Fiscal years 1942, 1943, and 1944.	Fiscal years 1942 and 1943.

2. Submission to Senator BUTLER

Construction of airfields (materials, labor, and supervision)	$346,123,000
Personal services (other than construction)	5,857,000
Military matériel	125,000,000
Total	476,980,000

The following note was appended: "In your consideration of these items it should be understood that, because the Army is operating in many widely scattered parts of the world and of necessity authority to construct essential military facilities had to be decentralized to theater commanders, these figures may not include some costs which to date have not been reported to the War Department."

3. Submission to Senator MCKELLAR

	Fiscal years (000 omitted)			
	1941	1942	1943	Total
(*a*) In the other American republics:				
Current expenses[1]	(2)	700	2,100	2,800
Capital outlays:				
Military installations[3]	(4)	(4)	(4)	108,095
Other[5]	0	0	21,874	21,874
(*b*) In the United States for the other American republics[6] lend-lease transfers of military material	0	10,518	66,511	77,029
Total				209,798

[1] These figures include only the cost of administration of military intelligence in other American republics. No data is included for pay of other military or civilian personnel of the War Department, cost of local procurement, travel and communication or other administrative expenses, as the record of expenditures overseas is not maintained on a geographical basis and the data are not available.

[2] Not available.

[3] This includes the value of air fields and air bases only. No adequate record is available for other types of military installations.

[4] No fiscal year break-down available.

[5] This represents construction by the U. S. Army Engineers on the Inter-American Highway.

[6] No records are available regarding expenditures in the United States which affect the other American republics. Certain activities have been carried on, such as training of pilots and technicians, travel and entertainment of visiting Army officers and the like, but these activities have been very small and are not included.

Approximately one-third, or $27,000,000, of the amount of lend-lease transfers are reimbursable.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
December 10, 1943.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Assistant Secretary of State, in a letter dated December 4, requested a brief statement from the War Department setting forth the strategic advantages which have resulted from the willingness of the American republics to permit us to construct and operate military establishments within their territories.

The construction of airfields and other facilities in Mexico, Central America, the West Indies, and the northern coast of South America enabled our armed forces to organize and complete all necessary defenses of the vitally important Panama Canal and insured our ability to reinforce the zone quickly with aircraft of all types. These same installations together with similar ones in certain other South American republics made possible the air patrols that were so great a factor in the elimination of the submarine menace from extensive areas.

Vast quantities of urgently needed personnel, supplies, equipment, and aircraft have been moved to active theaters over the air routes which depend upon the fields constructed by us through the Antilles and the northeast coast of South America. At certain times of the year these have been our only completely effective airways across the Atlantic and at all times they have been a vital pipe line to many strategic areas.

It is thus difficult to measure in words and impossible to appraise in dollars the military and strategic value of the bases accorded us by the other American republics, both before and after Pearl Harbor. Without the initial and continued cooperation of the other American republics the greater part of the foregoing would have been impossible. There is no question that without that cooperation, the war effort of the United Nations would have been seriously impaired.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

COORDINATOR OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C., December 13, 1943.

Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: In response to your request for information in connection with the report of Senator HUGH BUTLER entitled "Expenditures by the United States in Central and South American Countries," Senate Document 132, I am transmitting two reports: (1) Statement of the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs and (2) Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, summary statement of expenditures.

Please let me know if there is anything further you wish.

Sincerely,

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,
Coordinator.

(Enclosures)

Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs—Summary statement of expenditures, fiscal years 1941, 1942, 1943

Total expenditures	[1] $29,168,997
Health and sanitation	7,497,066

This program is designed (1) to safeguard the health of the armed forces of the United States and of the other American republics against the dangers of tropical disease made so apparent in the fighting with the Japanese in the Far East; (2) to protect the health of and make more efficient workers throughout the American republics engaged in producing critical and strategic materials and so to make possible maximum production.

It is carried out by the best obtainable medical and engineering personnel in cooperation with the local governments which contribute substantial amounts in cash, personnel, and services. It is under the direction of Brig. Gen. George C. Dunham, U. S. Army Medical Corps.

The effectiveness of this program has recently been testified to by the Aviation Subcommittee of the House Committee on Military Affairs whose report following their visit to Latin American air bases stated:

"Especial mention is due to the health and sanitary work which has transformed deadly tropic areas into healthful bases. Too much credit cannot be given for this achievement, for it has probably resulted in saving the lives of many thousands of American boys. In addition these measures will have their good effect upon the people and the officials of the areas in question in the years to come."

Food supply	1,673,641

This program was inaugurated at the beginning of the submarine menace when shortage of shipping raised serious problems of food supply in certain vitally strategic areas, notably in northeastern Brazil and in the vicinity of the Panama Canal. It has concentrated on the production of food in northeastern Brazil where are located many important air and naval bases and where have been concentrated large numbers of troops and naval vessels. The program is conducted in cooperation with the Brazilian Government which contributes an amount to the program in money, personnel, and services approximately equal to that contributed by the United States.

It has also undertaken production for and has delivered food to the Panama Canal Zone, thus insuring to it sources of supply free of or comparatively free of submarine dangers.

It has also assisted areas in Central America accustomed to importing food and which have faced serious shortages due to loss or withdrawal of shipping.

Emergency rehabilitation	1,015,546

This program was inaugurated to assist local governments in meeting serious emergency situations caused by the war. Economic and social dislocations can supply fertile ground for Axis subversive activities dangerous to the United States. There have been only two such programs.

[1] Excludes $977,000 for loans and expenditures to facilitate procurement not included in total figure of $29,168,997 shown above.

Information	[2] $11,693,592

The major objective of the information program of the Office is to encourage the fullest interchange of all forms of information which will further the unity of the American republics.

It seeks to meet and counteract by a positive and factual presentation of the truth the propaganda activities of the Axis affecting hemisphere solidarity.

Through an active program in the fields of press, radio, and motion pictures, the fullest participation of the people of the American republics in the war program is encouraged.

Trade and commercial	[3] 1,635,736

This program has been devoted to various war activities, such as the elimination of Axis commercial interests in Latin America, and to measures designed to improve the transportation of strategic materials over heavily burdened transportation systems, particularly railroads.

In addition, based upon the premise that trade relations between nations are of vital importance to their friendship and cooperation, this department is designed to promote better trade relations and better understanding between the businessmen of the United States and of the American republics.

General projects	572,927
Administrative expenses	5,080,489
Total funds available	79,543,270

[2] Excluding loans of $205,941, which are repayable in full.

[3] Excluding expenditures of $770,846 to facilitate procurement of strategic and critical materials.

In addition to the $29,168,997 of expenditures, more than 80 percent of the above-stated available funds were committed for the carrying forward of the above programs as of June 30, 1943.

STATEMENT OF OFFICE OF THE COORDINATOR OF INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS IN CONNECTION WITH REPORT OF UNITED STATES SENATOR HUGH A. BUTLER

This statement is made with reference to a printer's proof of Senate Document No. 132, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, entitled "Expenditures by the United States in Central and South American Countries, Report by Hon. HUGH A. BUTLER," presented by Mr. BUTLER November 26 (legislative day of November 18), 1943.

This report contains a large amount of material apparently taken from publicly available sources intertwined with a running commentary which reflects the conclusions and opinions of the author resulting from his trip to South and Central America. These conclusions and opinions indicate many misunderstandings both of facts and of the objects of programs.

The purpose of the report appears to be to give the impression that vast sums are being given away by the United States Government to buy Latin-American friendship.

Since this is the purpose of the report the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs believes that its comment can most clearly meet the issue presented by an affirmative, historical, and functional account of its program setting forth the amounts of money spent and the purposes for which they have been spent. This account is set forth below:

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

On August 16, 1940, the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (then called the Office of the Coordinator of Commercial and Cultural Relations Between the American Republics) was established by Executive order of the President. The world situation, and particularly conditions prevailing throughout the American Hemisphere at that time were the occasion of the creation of the office and dictated the tasks which it undertook. The nature and extent of the objectives facing the Office throughout the 3½ years of its existence have varied and shifted in emphasis, being determined in accordance with the current necessities of world and hemisphere developments.

In August 1940 Germany had already overrun most of Europe, destroying nations and subjugating millions of people by a new method of attack combining armed might with propaganda and fifth-column activities. Germany was ready and poised to attack again; the direction of her attack was not clear. It might be at England; it might be south through Spain to Africa and Dakar and so to Brazil and the American Hemisphere. Fortunately for us, Germany turned east and attacked Russia.

In August 1940, the large German populations of Latin America were triumphant—der tag was at hand. Germany was about to conquer the world. Those who were aware of the situation knew that the German and other Axis elements in Latin America constituted an obvious potential fifth column. German commercial houses were to be found in even the smallest towns. Axis propaganda was being circulated on a wide scale in every one of the other American republics and German controlled air lines constituted a vast network from Argentina to Ecuador.

At that time, fortunately for us and thanks to the good-neighbor policy, our relations with the Latin-American nations were better than they had ever been before and successive inter-American conferences at Montevideo, Lima, Panama, and Habana had demonstrated a solidarity which was not only encouraging but which, in the light of the world situation, was clearly a necessity. The office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs was organized, therefore, to assist and implement the good-neighbor policy in the face of the threat of German conquest in order to (1) combat the important and powerful Axis propaganda and its commercial influences in all of Latin America and (2) to affirmatively make better known to the peoples of the hemisphere the ideals, aims, and way of life of the American people and their growing power of military defense.

Executive Order No. 8840 defining the duties and responsibilities of the Office, charged it with responsibility of formulating and executing "programs in the commercial and economic fields which, by the effective use of governmental and private facilities, will further the commercial well-being of the Western Hemisphere."

Further, the aforesaid Executive order also charged the Office with the responsibility of formulating programs "which, by effective use of governmental and private facilities in such fields as the arts and sciences, education and travel, the radio, the press, and the cinema, will further the national defense and strengthen the bonds between the nations of the Western Hemisphere."

From August 1940, until June 1941, the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs conducted its operations with $3,425,000, which was made available to it by the original Executive grant. On June 17, 1941, Mr. Rockefeller appeared before the Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations and explained fully the use made of the emergency funds so granted to it and requested additional funds. (Hearings, second deficiency bill, 1941, pp. 683–727.)

From that day forward the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs has received its funds from the Congress (with certain exceptions hereafter to be noted) and has in successive appearances before members of the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives fully explained its program. In each case the explanation has been reported and can be found in the printed record of the respective hearings. Even where, by reason of the need for speed, programs of this Office have been launched with funds from the emergency fund of the President, those programs have later and at the first available opportunity been fully described to the Appropriations

Committee and generally additional funds have been requested and appropriated, for the continuance of these programs.

In his appearance before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on June 17, 1941, Mr. Rockefeller, in explaining the purpose and program of the Office, stated:

"In the other American republics there now is a condition which is just ripening for the type of action which the Axis Powers have used in Europe, where they have taken advantage of a weakening morale with their propaganda, with which they are flooding the other American republics today, whether it is through the radio, through news columns, through a subsidized press, or by word of mouth, through well-organized units, constantly hitting at hemisphere solidarity, constantly putting forward what is going on in Europe, constantly trying to undermine the actions and the intentions of the United States, to confuse the peoples and set one group against another.

"So we will not be able to do the job of hemisphere defense, which we have got to do as a vital part of our own national defense, unless we can keep these countries from economic collapse, unless we can maintain their unity of purpose with us, and unless we can maintain their political independence from Axis domination." (Hearings, second deficiency appropriation bill, 1941, p. 691.)

Within the framework of the Office's responsibilities and program as so described, it proceeded, in cooperation with other departments and agencies, to examine and arrange for the elimination of the Axis air lines in Latin America, to study the network of Axis business and commercial firms in Latin-America, to stimulate trade between the Americas and to promote a better understanding by all the Americas of their defense problems and of their community of interest.

On December 7, 1941, war came and the threat to the hemisphere which heretofore primarily had been on the east in Europe suddenly appeared on the west as well. We knew, and our neighbors knew, what a blow was struck us at Pearl Harbor. It became necessary to greatly expand the information program of the Office so that all of the Americas might know of our will to fight, our growing strength and of the absolute necessity that all the nations of the Western Hemisphere band together for common defense.

In December 10, 1941, Mr. Rockefeller appeared before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate in connection with the third supplemental national defense appropriation bill for 1942 and again explained the program of this Office.

With the reports of the fighting in the Philippines and in other areas in the Far East, it became apparent to those closely following the hemisphere situation that steps to control tropical disease must be taken immediately against the danger that we might have to fight on this side of the Pacific. These reports with their news of steady Japanese victories also forecast the danger that we might speedily lose the vital source of raw material which had been available to us in the Far East. This area had served as our principal source of supply of rubber, tin, quinine, etc. If the United States lost this source of supply, the only remaining one accessible to us would be in Latin America. If Latin-American sources of supply had to be developed to full productivity or if we should possibly have to fight in Latin America either in the east or in the west, the hazards of tropical disease would become a major factor in our plans. Already American soldiers were being moved to bases throughout the Americas which the Latin American republics in fullest solidarity and cooperation had granted to us. Brazil was already an integral part in our lifeline by air to the East.

Accordingly, experts in the field of tropical medicine were assembled by this Office to map out the areas in the hemisphere of greatest risk from disease. Similarly, on the basis of expert advice, the areas of strategic importance were mapped out, as were the areas where the sources of supply of critical and strategic materials were located. These three areas were then compared and the public health program of the Coordinator's Office was thereupon planned in relation to the health menace existing in these strategic areas.

Fortunately, the American republics were as aware as we of the vital necessity of such a program. At the conference of foreign ministers at Rio de Janeiro in January 1942 the other American republics manifested their solidarity with us after the Pearl Harbor attack by taking joint action which resulted in 19 of these republics breaking off all relations with the Axis and taking concrete steps to combat Axis activities in this hemisphere and to assist us in the prosecution of the war. Resolution XXX of that conference recommended the undertaking of appropriate action in the health and sanitation field.

The necessity for this health program throughout the hemisphere being clear and daily being made clearer by reports from the Far East, the President on February 15, 1942, allocated $25,000,000 from his emergency fund for the purpose of initiating and carrying out such a program in cooperation with the other American republics. The United States Army assigned to this Office Dr. George C. Dunham, of the United States Army Medical Corps, to assume the responsibility for the execution of the program. General Dunham has ever since been and is now in charge of the administration of this program.

On June 13, 1942, Mr. Rockefeller appeared before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations in connection with a request for additional funds. At that time he defined the problems facing this Office and described its program. In his preliminary statement. Mr. Rockefeller said:

"The significance of the objective and the problems can be interpreted in military and economic terms. The other American republics are a vital flank of the United States, the strongest and most powerful member of the hemisphere. This country must have confirmed allies defending that flank. Should the Axis establish an effective bridgehead for operations in any one of the other republics, the vulnerability of that flank and of such vital points as the Panama Canal is all too clear. The other American republics are also a vital source of the materials of war. We must have confirmed allies who will produce those materials and who will help us make the weapons of modern warfare. It is not only the leaders who must be our confirmed friends. War today is a total war, and unless the people themselves will fight, there will be no real protection against Axis infiltration or invasion. There must be full cooperation between all of the people of the 21 republics of this hemisphere." (House hearings, first supplemental national defense appropriation bill, 1943, p. 560.)

At that time Mr. Rockefeller also advised the committee of the health and sanitation program of the Office in the following terms:

"To improve health and sanitation conditions which would otherwise adversely affect military operations and the production of strategic materials needed in the war effort, a large-scale program of health and sanitation has already been begun. This program seeks to alleviate bad conditions of health and sanitation, thereby improving living conditions and the efficiency and morale of the people." (House hearings, first supplemental national defense appropriation bill, 1943, p. 589.)

"Essential health and sanitation work has already been started in Brazil, Haiti, Ecuador, Paraguay, Guatemala, Honduras, Salvador, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Panama. Plans are being made for this work in other countries, most immediately in Peru, Bolivia, and southern Mexico, where the collection of wild rubber depends largely upon the solution of health, food, and related problems." (House hearings, first supplemental national defense appropriation bill, 1943, p. 590.)

During the summer of 1942 the Office continued its program along the lines outlined to the Appropriations Committee. The north African campaign had not yet started and it was necessary to emphasize to the American republics through every available medium of information the progress this country was making in the production of munitions and implements of war and in the training and development of its Army and Navy.

On November 9, 1942, our Army landed in north Africa. This was a matter of enormous significance to the nations of the American Hemisphere. With the landing of American troops, the South American continent which might have been the highway by which Hitler came to us was transformed into the vital artery by which we attacked Hitler. It may be fairly stated that without the full and complete cooperation of our American neighbors and especially Brazil, this attack would have been practically impossible.

This attack had another aspect of great importance. With it our military position in the whole European war was transformed from one of defense to one of offense. The need for handling this and subsequent developments in our campaign of attack upon Europe with the utmost efficiency in the information program of this office became of foremost importance. A letter from General Marshall to Mr. Rockefeller expressed the opinion of the Chief of Staff with regard to the operations of this Office in the information field at this time. This letter reads as follows:

NOVEMBER 23, 1942.

DEAR MR. ROCKEFELLER: I wish to express to you and to your organization my appreciation of the efficient and intelligent manner in which you cooperated with the War Department in executing the propaganda effort in Latin America in the sphere assigned to you in connection with the north African operation, our first Allied effort on a large scale.

I feel that the efficient performance of duties by the personnel of your organization has constituted a material contribution to our military effort, and has been of outstanding value to the Government.

Faithfully yours,

G. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

At the same time, with United States civilian and military personnel moving through Brazil, with ships touching at Latin-American ports, and with ever-increasing requirements for Latin America's strategic and critical materials, the need for and importance of the Office's program in health and sanitation increased proportionately.

Another effect which must not be lost sight of was the impact of all of this upon the economic life of all of the Latin-American republics. Every available ship was removed from Latin-American trade with the result that, first, the Latin-American countries were not able to obtain in exchange for the raw materials they furnished us the manufactured articles which they needed; and, second, only those materials were being shipped which were vital to the war so that the countries deficient in critical and strategic materials lost a large measure of their export trade with resulting unemployment and economic distress. To meet these emergency situations arising from war conditions

which were imposing severe hardships on certain countries, this Office undertook and carried out in a limited number of cases certain emergency programs designed to alleviate acute economic dislocation, particularly in Central America where bananas were the primary crop.

On April 21, 1943, Mr. Rockefeller again appeared before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations in connection with the National War Agencies Appropriation bill for 1944. At that time, Mr. Rockefeller again reviewed in detail the program and operations of this Office and practically all of its chief executives appeared and testified in detail with regard to the work of their respective departments. The testimony so given covers 220 pages in the printed record of these hearings.

FINANCIAL

The program of this Office as described in the successive hearings before the Appropriations Committees of the Congress is in full operation today.

On the program as so described this Office, including its corporations had disbursed a total of $29,168,997[1] (exclusive of $1,875,000 appropriation transfers and working fund advances to other Government agencies) at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943. For the period beginning with the commencement of the Office and ending June 30, 1943, the Congress had appropriated for the use of the Office $44,457,820. In addition, during this period there had been made available to this Office from the emergency fund for the President $35,158,950, and $20,000 had been advanced to this Office as a working fund from the United States Public Health Service, making total funds available $79,636,770. During the same period this Office transferred to other Government agencies, by appropriation warrant, $93,500 leaving net funds available for this Office of $79,543,270 to June 30, 1943.

In addition to the $29,169,000 of funds expended by this Office over 80 percent of the available funds were committed, the greater part for health and sanitation work which had to be undertaken upon a basis which would permit completion of programs once commenced.

The funds so made available to this Office have been and are being spent in the United States and in Latin America through the staff of this Office. All programs and projects before being undertaken are considered by and receive approval as to basic policy from the Department of State. The Department of State does not, in expressing such approval, assume responsibility for the financial aspects of such programs or projects. All appropriation requests of this Office presented to the Congress have before their presentation been reviewed by the Bureau of the Budget and by the Department of State. The position of the Department of State has been expressed in letters printed in the official record of the appropriation hearings. (Hearings, second deficiency appropriation bill for 1941, p. 718; hearings, first supplemental national defense appropriation bill for 1943, p. 564; hearings, second supplemental national defense appropriation bill for 1943, pp. 358–359; hearings, national war agencies appropriation bill for 1944, pp. 161–162.)

The funds so expended and committed are divided between the various activities of this Office as follows:

FUNCTIONAL

1. Basic Economy Department

The Basic Economy Department is divided into three divisions: (a) Health and Sanitation; (b) Food Supply; and (c) Emergency Rehabilitation. To June 30, 1943, this Department had expended $10,332,635.

(a) Health and sanitation

The health and sanitation program of this Office was inaugurated as above set forth under the direction of Brig. Gen. George C. Dunham, United States Army Medical Corps. Its purposes have at all times been first, to safeguard the lives and health of the armed forces of the United States and of the other American republics around the many bases, airports, and other strategic areas established for defense against attack either from the east or west; second, to protect the health of workers engaged in the production of strategic and critical materials. For this program the Health and Sanitation Division expended $7,497,066 as of June 30, 1943.

Contributions by the governments in the countries affected within their ability to furnish funds, personnel, and material have been very considerable. The planning and administration of these programs have in every case been cooperative. The undertaking has been a joint undertaking of the local ministry of health with the field party sent by this Office. The nature of the work to be done, its location and its engineering and execution have at all times been the product of the best technical personnel available to this Government and to the host government.

Although primarily directed to military and procurement objectives, this Office has always recognized that the various health and sanitation programs were being carried out within the boundaries of a foreign sovereign nation in cooperation with its ministry of health. Hence health and health-training projects looking to the improvement of general health conditions in the country in question are often included within the over-all program.

It would be impossible in this statement to answer and to refute in detail all of the various suggestions and criticisms concerning the health and sanitation program contained in Senator BUTLER's report. All of these programs were entered into for military and economic purposes in connection with the war and all have been planned and are being executed by the best experts available.

The Aviation Subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives reporting on its special mission to inspect air bases, November 3–20, 1943, made the following comment upon the work of the health and sanitation program:

"Especial mention is due to the health and sanitary work which has transformed deadly tropic areas into healthful bases. Too much credit cannot be given for this achievement, for it has probably resulted in saving the lives of many thousands of American boys. In addition these missions will have their good effect upon the people and the officials of the areas in question in the years to come."

We would like, however, by reference to two examples to indicate the nature of Senator BUTLER's criticisms and present some of the considerations in the light of which these criticisms should be weighed.

(1) Belem, Brazil

On page 24 of his report Senator BUTLER refers to the malaria-control work being done at Belem and refers to the men engaged on this project as "United States mosquito abatement boondogglers."

The city of Belem is one of the most vital strategic cities in the whole of South America at this time. It contains one of the most essential of all the airports on the United States-South America-Africa-Asia route. Before the outbreak of the war military and commercial planes were stopping at Belem on their way from the United States to Africa and Asia. With the outbreak of the war this base became one of the most important links in the thin line of communications between the United States and the Near and Far East. Without the Belem, Fortaleza, Natal link it is hard to imagine how the campaign in North Africa and the present Italian campaign could be possible.

In addition Belem lies at the mouth of the Amazon River and all transportation along that great river valley passes through Belem on its way to the Atlantic. Headquarters of the United States procurement agencies for the Amazon valley are located there. Commercial air traffic between the United States and the east coast of South America stops overnight at Belem.

Malaria was known to exist in and about Belem. So were other insect-borne diseases. It was therefore early recognized that steps must be taken to reduce the malaria danger not only to those living and working there but to those passing through who might carry the disease with them to their points of destination in the United States and elsewhere.

To the health program in Brazil, the Brazilian Government is controlling $950,000 and, in addition, almost the entire staff of the Brazilian Yellow Fever Service together with large amounts of equipment and supplies. The work in and about Belem is, as in other countries, a cooperative venture undertaken by two allies to save lives.

(2) Ecuador

Senator BUTLER objects to this Government undertaking a program in health and sanitation on a cooperative basis with Ecuador. He also criticizes money spent to help rehabilitate Ecuador's Province of El Oro which was laid waste in the war with Peru in 1940.

Ecuador is one of the most strategically important countries on the west coast of Latin America. Today, we have important bases in Salinas, a short rail journey from Guayaquil, and in the vital Galapagos Islands which lie 600 miles off the Panama Canal and from the key to our defense of that vital point. These bases have been made available to us by the Republic of Ecuador free of cost although she is not a belligerent in the war.

Most of the balsa wood used by the United States and England comes from the coastal provinces of Ecuador. It is from this balsa wood that Great Britain's famous mosquito bombers are made.

The health problems in Ecuador have long been widely known to the medical profession. Not many years ago the first railroad was built from the coastal port of Guayaquil to the capital city of Quito. By the time the railroad was finished, it is said that a man's life had been lost with each tie that was laid for the entire length of the railroad due to yellow fever, malaria, and typhus. The history of the achievements of the medical profession in recent years in and about the port of Guayaquil is a great record of accomplishment.

If the Japanese had struck at this hemisphere after Pearl Harbor, it is a fair guess that Ecuador would have been one place where our troops would have been fighting. Today the hospitals and clinics to which Senator BUTLER refers, through preventive and curative measures, are taking important steps to safeguard the lives and health of our troops and sailors stationed at bases in Ecuador and of those who are working so hard to obtain the maximum amount of Ecuador's balsa wood and other essential raw materials.

In Ecuador, $1,401,000 total expenditure by coordinator to June 30, 1943.

(3) Questions of technical competence

Senator BUTLER, in a number of instances, criticizes operations of the Health and Sanitation Division upon medical and other technical grounds. For example, Senator BUTLER charges on page 22 of his report that various

[1] In addition, loans had been made and funds expended in connection with the acquisition of strategic materials in the aggregate amount of $977,000.

drainage ditches constructed by our sanitary engineers were unnecessary and a boondoggle and that many have been abandoned.

It is well recognized that drainage is one of the most essential items in malaria control. None of the drainage ditches constructed in this program for such purpose has been abandoned. The location of drainage ditches has been determined in each case by sanitary engineers according to the best professional standards and in their construction the best of technical engineering experience has been available and utilized.

The same thing applies to Senator BUTLER'S criticism of the construction of a sanitary market in the strategic port of Port-au-Prince, Haiti, and of the building of hospitals and health centers.

(b) Food supply

The food supply program of the Office was inaugurated in September 1942, and as of June 30, 1943, had been initiated chronologically in the following countries: Brazil, Costa Rica, Paraguay, Nicaragua, Honduras, Panama, and El Salvador.

The most important and largest of these programs was inaugurated in Brazil and was designed to aid in the food-supply problems in the northeastern portion of Brazil and in the Amazon Valley. These problems were created by the following conditions: (1) large concentrations of troops and war vessels in the northeastern portion of Brazil; (2) the greatly increased personnel in the Amazon Valley engaged in the procurement of wild rubber; and (3) the absence of sufficient shipping to transport food supplies from South Brazil to the north in the face of enemy submarines. South Brazil has always been an important source of food for these areas.

To this program undertaken for the joint benefit of the United States and Brazil, this Office has undertaken to contribute $2,000,000 over a 2-year period and the Brazilian Government has undertaken to contribute $250,000 in funds and approximately $1,750,000 in services and equipment. The program has increased materially the local production of food and so reduced the need for ships to import food into the areas in question.

The programs in Central America were designed for the purpose of producing fruits and vegetables for shipment to the United States armed forces in the Canal Zone thus reducing the necessity for shipping such foods through submarine-infested sea lanes. The programs were instituted in accordance with an agreement with the Canal Zone authorities. Large quantities of foodstuffs have already been produced and shipped to the Canal Zone. This has resulted in saving shipping for other uses. The program has also been designed to assist these countries in meeting problems created by their inability, due to lack of shipping, to import foods for their own local consumption.

As of June 30, 1943, this Office has expended $1,673,641 upon its total food supply program.

On page 30 of his report, Senator BUTLER, speaking of Honduras, states that it has no need for a food program, that the Government has a favorable trade balance and can afford to meet its own problems and the Senator criticizes the wastage of Honduras' banana crop, its principal export.

First. With regard to adequacy of food supply. On the basis of total area there is room for all to grow food, but the bulk of Hondurans live in the mountains where there is little fertile land. Consequently, productive acreage is small in relation to the number of people and agricultural resources in the areas where the greater population lives are less than adequate.

Second. In normal times the Honduran Government does have a favorable trade balance on the basis of which it has imported the necessary foods as well as manufactured products. But Honduran trade was practically destroyed by action of the United States Government taken because of the necessities of war. This action consisted of curtailing exports of machinery and withdrawing almost all shipping from Honduran service.

Third. Wastage of the banana crop was a direct result of the withdrawal of shipping and occasioned by United States action. The shipping was regarded as more necessary elsewhere.

(c) Emergency rehabilitation

The emergency rehabilitation program has been executed primarily in two countries—Ecuador and Honduras. In Ecuador, at the request of the Department of State, a project was established for rehabilitation in the Province of El Oro which was devastated during the Peruvian-Ecuadoran boundary dispute. This has been referred to above under "Health and Sanitation."

In Honduras the sudden curtailment of banana exports due to lack of shipping during the latter part of 1942 created unemployment of 17,000 men on the north coast. Of these, 50 percent were able to leave the area or make adjustments by going on the land, leaving a total of 8,500 unemployed in the area. There was danger of political unrest dangerous to United States and Honduran interests in an area where Axis propaganda was already actively at work. The Department of State and this Office, in cooperation with the Honduran Government, and upon the urgent request of the United States Embassy in Honduras, planned a program which was instituted by this Office for the construction of a road between the railhead at Potrerillos and Lake Yojoa. This road is essential to communication between the Caribbean and Pacific coasts of Honduras. The Honduran road project will improve highway transportation through the central part of the country connecting the Atlantic with the Pacific and acting as a feeder road to the Pan American Highway.

As of June 30, 1943, $1,015,546 had been expended on emergency rehabilitation.

(d) General

The balance of funds expended by the Basic Economy Department were expended for projects of general interest to the various divisions of the Basic Economy Department and for administrative expenses. These funds amounted to an aggregate of $146,382.

(e) Wage scales

In Senator BUTLER'S report it is stated that Federal agencies are paying wages which are very much higher than prevailing wages in the American republics.

It has been the practice of this Office at all times to pay prevailing wages. This practice is evidenced by personnel procedure memorandum No. 1 directed to all chiefs of party in every country and giving explicit instructions to pay laborers solely in accordance with the local "going" or "prevailing" wage rates.

2. Information department

As of June 30, 1943, this department had expended $11,693,592.[2]

The major objective of the information program of the Office is to encourage the fullest interchange of all forms of information which will further the unity of the American republics.

It seeks to meet and counteract by a positive and factual presentation of the truth the propaganda actvities of the Axis affecting hemisphere solidarity.

Through an active program in the fields of press, radio, and motion pictures, the fullest participation of the people of the American republics in the war program is encouraged.

[2] Excludes loans of $205,941, which are repayable in full.

This program is carried out by the personnel of this Office in Washington, New York, and San Francisco. In the American republics it is carried out by committees of leading American citizens of long residence in 59 cities. These committees work in close relationship with the United States embassies or consulates and have the assistance of technical personnel made available by this Office.

This is an affirmative program of this Office undertaken on behalf of this Government. It is difficult to see how it can properly be classified, as it is by Senator BUTLER in various places in his report, under the heading of "gifts" to the various American republics.

On page 25 Senator BUTLER describes as wasteful and unnecessary the journeys to this country of newspapermen who have visited our cities and war plants and returned to their countries to write in their papers of their experiences. We have regarded this as one of the most successful and valuable of our programs. It has been conducted in cooperation with the National Press Club.

As in the case of the Basic Economy Department, the activities of the Information Department are carried out through various divisions as follows:

(a) Press

The Office has since its inception sought to increase by every possible means the fullest interchange of news significant to the inter-American program.

The Office publishes an illustrated magazine En Guardia in Spanish and Portuguese for distribution to a selected list in the other republics. In response to requests, window display placards, photographs, cartoons, handbills, and special material for local newspapers are widely distributed in the other republics.

In furtherance of the growing mutual understanding among the peoples of the hemisphere, a group of 85 leading newspaper publishers, writers, and editors from the other American republics have been invited to the United States to inspect our war activities.

(b) Radio

In the field of radio, the Office seeks to develop to the fullest extent radio broadcasting as a means of exchanging information and promoting unity among the American republics. The policy of the Office has been to utilize fully all existing mechanical and programing facilities.

The following methods of transmitting programs are used: (1) Short-wave broadcasts from the United States; (2) rebroadcast over local stations of programs sent by radio telephone; (3) rebroadcast over local stations of programs from United States short-wave stations; (4) domestic long-wave broadcasts of local productions in the various countries; (5) transcribed programs shipped to local stations for domestic broadcast; (6) cooperation with the United States advertisers who sponsor radio broadcasts.

The Office has cooperated with the National Broadcasting Co. and the Columbia Broadcasting System in developing and programing two international networks with outlets in the various American republics.

(c) Motion pictures

A program of production and distribution of 16 mm. nontheatrical films is in operation. Content of the films for distribution in the American republics centers around the United States war program and subjects dealing with hemisphere cooperation.

Through the cooperation of the five newsreel companies, an extensive program of distribution of newsreels of inter-American significance has been undertaken.

Members of the motion-picture industry are cooperating wholeheartedly with the Office in connection with commercial feature pic-

tures both individually and through the Motion Picture Society for the Americas, Inc.

(d) Science and education

The program of education in the field of inter-American affairs has been an integral part of the work of the Office since its inception. Both an immediate and a long-term purpose are being served through such a program, which is designed to help forge bonds of mutual understanding and appreciation which form the basis of a close cooperative approach to joint problems.

3. Trade and commercial

This department has been devoted to various war activities, such as the elimination of Axis commercial interests in Latin America, and to measures designed to improve the transportation of strategic materials over heavily burdened transportation systems, particularly railroads. It has not engaged in the procurement of strategic materials. Senator BUTLER has erroneously attributed to this Office the program for the growing of cryptostegia and sisal in Haiti.

In addition, based upon the premise that trade relations between nations are of vital importance to their friendship and cooperation, this department is working to promote better trade relations and better understanding between the businessmen of the United States and of the other American republics.

As of June 30, 1943, this department had expended an aggregate of $1,635,736.[3]

At the present time the activities of the Office are primarily concentrated in the following fields:

(a) Inter-American economic development

The American republics have a great interest in their future economic relationships with the United States. Believing that, both for the present and for future trade development, it is of great importance that the private businessmen of the hemisphere shall have relationships of friendship and cooperation, the Office maintains a close working relationship with the Inter-American Development Commission of which Mr. Rockefeller is chairman. This commission, which is an international body, is affiliated with local national commissions composed of leading businessmen in the United States and in each of the American republics.

Looking toward the same objective is the Mexican-American Commission for Economic Cooperation created as a result of the meeting of President Roosevelt and President Avila Camacho in April 1943. Mr. Rockefeller is Vice Chairman of this Commission.

(b) Transportation

In the field of transportation problems both of an immediate and long-term character are dealt with in close collaboration with other Government agencies concerned. One of the principal objectives of this department is the correlation of the movement of goods by water, highway, rail, and air. Railroad maintenance and technical advancement in areas which supply the United States with critical materials are other important objectives.

For example, a program was undertaken to assist the Mexican Government in raising the technical efficiency of its national railway system in order to meet the increasing tonnage demands resulting from the war activities of Mexico and the United States. A technical mission, including mechanical, track, and transportation technicians was sent to Mexico to aid the Mexican railroads in carrying the increased load of strategic and critical materials necessary to the United Nations' war effort. The program is intensifying the use of existing railroad facilities thereby reducing the amount of material supplied from the United States.

Senator BUTLER in his report has referred to this project as a $100,000,000 program. To June 30 it had cost $771,000. The total funds available for this project (but not all committed) are $7,500,000.

Similar technical missions are advising the Governments of Bolivia and Ecuador in connection with their similar transportation problems arising out of the increased loads of vital materials which they must carry and the inability of the United States to export to them new equipment and repair parts.

(c) Industrial training administration

Another activity in this area of great importance has been the administration of trade scholarships. This program gives practical experience and training to outstanding young men of the other American republics in industries in the United States. Expenses for a year's training are paid by United States firms which are cooperating in the program. Several hundred firms in such fields as construction and road building, transportation, mining, communications, commerce, finance, and agriculture are cooperating.

General expenditures

General expenditures made by this Office as of June 30, 1943, for projects and administration are as follows:

General projects, $572,927.
Administration, $5,080,489.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION,
Washington, D. C., December 11, 1943.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: This is with respect to the report of the Honorable HUGH A. BUTLER to the Senate relative to expenditures by the United States in Central and South American countries.

A table of Commodity Credit Corporation expenditures affecting other American republics during the fiscal years 1942–44 is enclosed. The table sets forth by fiscal years and types of transactions (including administrative expenditures) the expenditures made through October 31, 1943, and those which, prior to the issuance of Executive Order 9385 transferring certain functions from the War Food Administration to the Foreign Economic Administration, it was contemplated would be made through June 30, 1944.

The statement is made in Senator BUTLER'S report with reference to benefits derived by Mexico from United States expenditures, that Mexico's share of cotton subsidies is estimated at $3,600,000, of wheat subsidies at $4,800,000, and of flour subsidies at $5,300,000. The report indicates that these subsidies are paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Senator apparently refers here to the so-called export subsidy programs carried out in accordance with congressional direction pursuant to section 32 of Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress (7 U. S. C. 612c). These programs are not carried out with funds of Commodity Credit Corporation but with funds appropriated by or for the purposes of section 32. Under such programs, subsidies are paid only to United States exporters of the commodity concerned upon proof of exportation. Although the amounts shown in the report are attributed to Mexico, actually the figures used by the Senator represent estimates of total obligations affecting all South and Latin-American republics for the fiscal years 1941, 1942, and 1943. These estimates were furnished to the Senator by the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations of the Department of Agriculture by letter of June 12, 1943. The Senator was informed at that time that total export subsidies on cotton products, wheat and wheat flour exported to all South and Latin-American republics were estimated at $3,598,665 for the fiscal year 1941, $4,820,070 for the fiscal year 1942 and $5,300,000 for the fiscal year 1943.

Under his recapitulation of total Latin-American expenditures, commitments, and purchases by the United States, which appears at the end of the report, the Senator shows the following as item number (11):

Administration of Sugar Act of 1937—United States subsidy and expense of administration of Sugar Act of 1937 for benefit of Cuban, Puerto Rican, and other Latin-American countries' sugar-production aid and quota maintenance

1942	$35,000,000
1943	47,462,910
1944	63,883,060

Source: Tabulation of items in the Budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, p. 303.

This item, in virtually identical form, is repeated later in the same recapitulation as item (62). The Senator states that the sums shown are expended for the benefit of "Cuban, Puerto Rican, and other Latin-American countries." Actually no payments are made under the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1131 ff.), in foreign countries, the application of the act being expressly confined to the continental United States and the Territories of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. See section 307 of the Sugar Act (7 U. S. C. 1137). The justification for including in a recapitulation of "Latin-American" expenditures payments made only in the United States and its Territories is not apparent. Moreover, aside from the fact that the inclusion of these expenditures in the recapitulation would not appear to be warranted, the same sums shown in item (11) are repeated by the Senator in item (62) in arriving at his grand total of $9,064,066,470.40. The deduction of items (11) and (62) from the recapitulation would reduce the grand total by some $292,690,000.

With respect to the purchase of the 1942, 1943, and 1944 Cuban sugar crops, which is mentioned at several points in the report, it should be stated that the conclusion of these purchases was a matter of urgent war necessity, both in order to obtain necessary sugar supplies and necessary supplies of industrial alcohol. The price paid not only has been a reasonable one, but has remained the same, 2.65 cents per pound, under each of the three purchase contracts entered into with the Cubans. This price is practically the same as that paid in the open market for such sugar prior to the war. As a result, sugar is one of the few commodities in which there has been no appreciable rise in price under the pressure of wartime demands.

As is indicated in the report, total purchases of the 1942, 1943, and 1944 Cuban sugar crops will approximate $592,000,000. This figure represents the total amount obligated under the Cuban sugar purchase contracts. However, based on Commodity Credit Corporation's experience in the handling of previous crops, it is contemplated that only about one-half of this amount will have been paid out when the entire 1944 Cuban sugar crop has been shipped, and the amount so paid out will be fully recovered upon the sale of such sugar to domestic refiners. The remainder of the $592,000,000 will have been expended by private business which purchases the sugar from Commodity Credit Corporation, but makes payment therefor directly to the Cubans in satisfaction of Commodity Credit Corporation's obligation under the Cuban sugar purchase contracts.

While the entire amount paid by Commodity Credit Corporation to Cuban growers for the purchase of sugar will be recovered the Corporation will sustain losses due to the absorption of a portion of the increase in transportation costs above those prevailing in the pre-war period. Through October 31,

[3] Excludes expenditures of $770,846 which have been classified as made to facilitate procurement of strategic and critical materials by other agencies.

1943, such losses have amounted to $22,201,096.04, and additional losses on the 1943 and 1944 crops of sugar are estimated at $15,000,000.

It may be noted that the figure $289,755,711 appearing in item 1 of the recapitulation at the end of the report apparently includes the amount paid to date under the Cuban purchase contracts. This amount is also included in the $592,000,000 total of item 77. This inclusion constitutes an apparently unjustifiable duplication.

The purchase prices of commodities imported from the Latin-American republics by Commodity Credit Corporation, plus normal cost of importation to the United States, have, without material exception, not exceeded the market or ceiling prices for such commodities in the United States. Wartime prices for commodities imported from the Latin-American republics, like those of commodities produced domestically or imported from other parts of the world, have, of course, risen sharply due to extreme shortage of supply and almost unlimited wartime demand. It can be safely said, however, that the prices paid under Commodity Credit Corporation procurement programs have been substantially less than those which would have been paid under competitive buying conditions and without price ceilings. By substituting, in many cases, the Government as the sole buyer and by the imposition of domestic ceiling prices, the Government has saved the public many millions of dollars.

Sincerely yours,

J. B. HUTSON,
President.

Commodity Credit Corporation—Expenditures affecting other American republics during fiscal years 1942–44

[In thousands of dollars]

Type of transaction	Fiscal year 1942	Fiscal year 1943	Fiscal year 1944		
			Actual through Oct. 31, 1943	Estimated Nov. 1, 1943, through June 30, 1944	Total, fiscal year 1944
Purchase of commodities:					
Direct purchases by Commodity Credit Corporation	None	85,000	96,229	153,771	250,000
Transferred from Defense Supplies Corporation	None	101,200	0	0	0
Total purchases of commodities represents purchases made for the purpose of resale or for stock piling	None	186,200	96,229	153,771	250,000
Loans: Represents loans made in connection with programs affecting other American republics	0	180	81	119	200
Capital investments: The Commodity Credit Corporation has not made any capital investments in or for other American republics	0	0	0	0	0
Cost of equipment sent to other American republics: Represents equipment which was sold at cost to other American republics to assist in development of agricultural commodities for sale to and importation by the United States	0	45	0	0	0
Administrative expenses in other American republics: Represents expenditures made in other American republics for salaries, travel, rent, communication services, equipment, supplies, and other expenses	2	44	22	[1] 73	95
Administrative expenses in the United States: Represents expenditures made in the United States for salaries, travel, rent, communication services, equipment, supplies, and other expenses in carrying out programs affecting other American republics	0	295	188	[1] 470	658
Memorandum items:					
Sale of commodities	0	81,299	98,000	127,000	225,000
Inventory, Oct. 31, 1943			133,756		

[1] Represents amount budgeted for expenditures for period Nov. 1 through June 30, 1944. This amount will be reduced depending upon date of transfer of foreign purchase activities to the Foreign Economic Administration pursuant to Executive Order 9385 dated Oct. 6, 1943.
(Prepared Dec. 7, 1943).

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me for a moment or two?

Mr. McKELLAR. Indeed, I will.

Mr. BUTLER. I intend to maintain my reputation for brevity, but I feel that it is perfectly proper for me to say a few words at this time so that in the RECORD my remarks will be printed in connection with what the Senator from Tennessee has had to say today.

In the first place, I want to explain to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee the reason for my absence from the session during a part of the time when he was speaking. It was necessitated because of my having made an appointment that could not be broken. I explained to the acting minority leader my absence from the floor. So I want the Senator to know that it was not due to the fact that I was not interested in his report. I shall read it with a great deal of interest and care.

I desire to stress the fact, at least, that my report in no respect or detail anywhere was intended to be a reflection either upon the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations or any representative of the departments of government that have had anything to do with expenditures of money, be they war expenditures or nonwar expenditures, in South America or elsewhere. The Senator from Tennessee mentioned men whom I consider to be on my list of friends, I hope to the same extent they are on the list of friends of the distinguished Senator; and his opinion of those men can be no higher than the opinion of them held by me.

I want to commend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for the wonderful work he has done in guarding governmental expenditures along certain lines in our own country. The Senator from Tennessee has stressed the point that I referred to $6,000,000,000 of boondoggling expenditures. I think in my remarks the other day I made it very plain that I was in hearty agreement with the bulk of the expenditures which have been made, and I took exception in my report to only a portion of the expenditures, so that the Senator from Tennessee and others interested might see the entire picture.

If we undertake a tremendous expenditure for war-program projects of that kind in Latin-American countries, then may I ask is it necessary that we continue expenditures on other projects in Latin America which we consider nonessential here at home? I believe the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has taken the leadership in this body to do away with several programs which were initiated and followed during the last 8 or 10 years, such as C. C. C., N. Y. A., and W. P. A. I believe all those activities have been discontinued here at home. In my report I listed projects in South and Central America which are exactly comparable to those projects which we, ourselves, thought we could not afford in the United States. May I ask, Can the American taxpayer afford to pay for such projects in other lands any more than he can afford to pay for them here at home?

I appreciate the charitable treatment the distinguished Senator has given me today, and I am sure that he would be perfectly willing to permit me an opportunity to study the figures he has put in the RECORD and to make a more detailed statement at some future time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be delighted to have the Senator do so.

I omitted something that I should have stated a while ago in connection with what I think the Senator has asked me. The Senator will recall that in his report and in his magazine article, too, he said something about our having given several ships to Cuba. I neglected to say that the Senator is entirely mistaken about that. We have not given any ships to Cuba. The Senator will recall, as the Senate will recall, that not long after the war started Germany, with her submarines, was sinking our ships in the Caribbean Sea. Under an arrangement with Cuba we loaned her 12 ships, as I recall——

Mr. BUTLER. Submarine chasers.

Mr. McKELLAR. Submarine chasers, which have done splendid work. They were manned by Cubans. Of course, they do not have that many now because the submarine warfare has been reduced by, I think, 80 percent, but it is true that when the war ends each and every one of those ships will be returned to the United States.

Mr. BUTLER. I may say in connection with that particular item that I talked with members of the United States forces, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, when I was in Habana, and it was their opinion that we would have gained much more had we retained those ships, manned them by our officers and sailors, and kept them under our own control, and that it was more or less an item of wastefulness that we turned them over to others to handle.

Mr. McKELLAR. The answer to that is that they have successfully managed

them and that our oil tankers are not now being submarined.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I shall not extend my remarks longer, but I do not believe I should take my seat without paying my respects to several gentlemen whom the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has named, and whom he says I have indicted. I do not think I have done so, because I respect them as highly as he does. Secretary Hull is one. Jesse Jones is another, and I think he is just as good a banker as the distinguished Senator from Tennessee considers him. If my memory serves me correctly, the Senator from Tennessee had objections, more violent, perhaps, than mine, to much of the program that has been under way in some of our neighbor countries to the south.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. BUTLER. Just a moment. It was when I was in Mexico City that I first heard that the B. E. W. had been closed up, due to strenuous objection, I am told, Jesse Jones had to much of the program that was under way. I heard that another reorganization was made whereby certain parties in control were turned out, and control was given to another gentleman, who I think will perhaps do a much better job of administering the program than would those who previously had it in hand.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will read Mr. Jones' report, which will be in the RECORD tomorrow, he will find an answer to what he says.

Mr. BUTLER. I shall not only read the report, but I shall also take into consideration what Mr. Jones has told me.

Mr. GILLETTE obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Earlier in the day the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] asked unanimous consent that his statement today in regard to the so-called Butler report be made a part of the Senate document heretofore ordered to be printed, embodying the remarks, or report, or whatever it may be called, of the Senator from Nebraska. It seems to me that, in ordinary fairness, that should be done. Those who read one should be able to read the other, and make up their own minds about which is correct, or whether either of them is correct. The report that was ordered printed as a Senate document will go to one set of people, and the other may go to an entirely different set, and each group, reading the version it receives, will have only one side of the question.

Of course, a motion would be in order to rescind the order by which the original Butler report was made a Senate document. I do not want to make a motion of that kind, nor does the Senator from Tennessee, but it seems to me that in common, ordinary fairness to the American people the two statements, one by the Senator from Nebraska and one by the Senator from Tennessee, should be printed together as a Senate document. The document has not as yet been printed; it is still in the form of galley proof, which the Senator from Nebraska has, and what I am suggesting could readily be done. I hope the Senator from Maine—who, I suppose, was acting for the Senator from Nebraska; I do not know whether he has any particular interest in the matter—I hope, indeed, that the Senator from Nebraska himself will recognize the fairness of printing both these statements together.

Mr. BUTLER. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. It seems to me the distinguished Senator from Tennessee would hardly want his figures to go out in conjunction with a report which he claims is so erroneous as the report I submitted. I should think he would wish to dignify his report by making it a separate document.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am afraid the Senator is now being facetious or specious; there is not much difference.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from Tennessee has had 2 weeks in which to study the figures I submitted. I have not had the opportunity even of hearing all the report the Senator from Tennessee has made, and I think that in all fairness the leader should wait for a few days to give me opportunity at least to look over the report. I may be perfectly willing to accede to his request.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am perfectly willing to wait, but I will say——

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I yielded to the Senator from Kentucky for a specific purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator will let us finish this discussion.

Mr. GILLETTE. I did not yield for a long colloquy and controversy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wanted merely to state, if the Senator will yield to me another moment or two, that the whole report of the Senator from Nebraska was ordered printed as a Senate document without anyone in the Senate reading it.

Mr. BUTLER. I did not ask to attach it to some other document.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is true the Senator did not. If this matter is not to be printed at once, if it can remain in its present status of being in galley proof, as it now is, for a few days, until the Senator looks into the matter——

Mr. BUTLER. If the Senator will let it abide that way, we will talk it over.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1544) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels, landing craft, and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3741) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3741) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE TREATY-MAKING PROVISIONS OF THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, early in February of this year I introduced in the Senate three joint resolutions, each of which presented a proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States in the provision relating to the treaty-making power and the ratification of treaties. In May last I introduced an additional joint resolution proposing an amendment on the same subject matter. These four proposals each dealt with the subject in a way different from the others, and my thought in offering the four alternative proposals was that the whole matter could be in the hands of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary for study and consideration. Each of the four proposals embodied suggestions that had been made from time to time by students of our treaty-making history. At the time of the introduction of the fourth proposal, I took the time of the Senate to discuss at some length the reasons which animated me in taking this introductory action, and, at the same time, I reviewed in some detail the events leading up to the adoption of this provision of our Constitution. The able Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary very promptly referred these four resolutions to a subcommittee of very able constitutional lawyers, Members of this body, under the chairmanship of the eminent senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

More than 10 months have elapsed since the introduction of the first resolutions, and I believe that no action has as yet been taken with reference to them. I say this not by way of criticism of the members of the subcommittee, because I am fully aware that each and every one of them has been deeply engrossed in the legislative work incident to a host of other pressing problems. But, Mr. President, within a comparatively few weeks many of the State legislatures of the Nation will have assembled in their various legislative halls. Many of them will be meeting in biennial sessions. If an amendment to the treaty-making provisions of the Constitution is to be ratified by the requisite number of State legislatures in time to be of real benefit in the making of treaty agreements following the termination of the present war, it is extremely important that amendatory resolutions initiated by the Congress be acted on in time for presentation to these several State assemblies.

It is because of my deep conviction that action of this amendatory kind is important, if not imperative, that I again rise to urge the consideration of the matter and prompt action by the Senate.

Once more I wish to make some general observations on the subject matter. In so doing, I shall repeat many of the things I have said on this floor, but I feel justified in so doing because some months have elapsed since I spoke on the subject. Furthermore, I wish to supplement some of the things which I said then, and this supplementary matter would lose something of its force if I did not closely connect it with the historical field of study. Before entering into the discussion, however, I wish to make my apology to the eminent constitutional lawyers who are Members of this body for presuming to discuss these abstruse legal matters when so many of my colleagues are infinitely better informed than am I.

As old as the history of civilization and its literature is the expression, "in time of peace prepare for war." This expression has been proved to be basically true hundreds of times. I wish to rephrase the expression in a way which, under the present conditions of the world, carries equal or greater truth. In time of war, prepare for peace. Because of the firm conviction of millions of our citizens as to the wisdom contained in those words, there has been widespread discussion throughout our Nation during the past year with particular reference to various proposals, plans, and suggestions looking to the world's peace—security after the present war has terminated. Recognizing that the detailed lines, shades, and colors of the post-war picture cannot be drawn or even envisioned at this time, every American citizen who gives thought to the world situation knows that after hostilities have ceased, immediate action will be necessary, looking to the solution of a host of problems covering every phase of international relationships—political, economic, financial, sociological, and commercial. They further know that it is possible to take limited action now while hostilities still rage, looking to a mitigation of the difficulties and dangers of post-war planning and post-war adjustments. In line with this thinking, the Senate of the United States has recently by a vote but little short of unanimity registered approval of a resolution submitted by the distinguished chairman of our Foreign Relations Committee, looking to peace security in the post-war era. This resolution was the culmination of months of careful thought, study, and labor on the part of members of that committee under the unusually able and thoughtful guidance and judgment of its chairman. The House of Representatives also within the past few months has given an all but unanimous expression of approval of international cooperation for peace security. In addition to these tremendously important steps which have been taken, another committee of this body, under the astute leadership and guidance of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has been for weeks engaged in laborious study of plans for economic soundness and security in the period after the armies have ceased to battle.

But, Mr. President, there is still another step which can be taken now and which, in my opinion, it is essential to take now, in order to save this Nation from turmoil and dissension which might seriously impede post-war rehabilitation. I do not hesitate to say further that failure to recognize certain difficulties in connection with the ratification of treaties of peace and agreements incident thereto might well bring irremediable disaster to our post-war efforts.

Whenever and however and wherever this war stops, each and all the nations concerned will be parties to a treaty of peace. Whether this peace compact is imposed or negotiated, its provisions will most certainly outline the pattern for war adjustments, and its form must be approved under the methods and systems provided in the constitutions of the various signatories. No nation will have a greater stake in the provisions of this peace treaty and its supplemental compacts than the United States of America. Before I take my seat, I shall try to present a picture of a situation which might conceivably confront the Nation, should there be hesitancy or confusion in the selection of the instrument or instruments under which the international agreements are negotiated. I shall allude to a possible situation under which no formal treaty of peace is planned, signed, or completed. But before speaking specifically of this possible contingency, I wish once more to review some of the historical phases of treaty making in our Nation with a view to supporting my own conviction that we have not made the necessary preparation for the negotiation of the necessary international agreements for peace and for political and economic security.

I yield to no one, Mr. President, in my admiration and almost reverence for the immortal document of our fundamental and organic law, the Federal Constitution. I realize fully the truth of the oft-repeated statement that our Constitution was not intended to be a governmental strait jacket, that it is not a static thing, but wholly dynamic in that its cardinal principles can, by wise, judicious, and judicial interpretation, be applied to the changed and changing needs of a great people. But there are certain provisions in our Constitution which were adopted to meet the exigencies and conditions then extant, and that do not and cannot properly meet and solve all the varying problems that more than a century and a half of phenomenal development of our country has posed.

The fathers of the Constitution recognized this and provided slow but very certain methods for change and amendment. In the way they provided we have met the demand for discarding most of the cumbersome machinery of the original conception of the electoral college. In this way we have discarded the original methods for selection of United States Senators. In this way we have discarded the unwieldy machinery for the assembling of the Congress, which, while meeting the needs of a century ago, became senseless and burdensome as the Nation and its means of communication and transportation developed.

But, Mr. President, unless we initiate action soon, our country will find itself face to face with the necessity for consideration of the most vital treaty agreements which ever have been, and perhaps ever will be, presented to our Nation, and, at the same time, find the means and methods for such consideration designed for conditions and situations of a century and a half ago. Furthermore, we must consider that even that antiquated machinery was based on conceptions and conditions which have long since ceased to exist. We shall find also that even that machinery was a compromise design adopted in the attempt to reach an accord on strongly held and strongly contended viewpoints. We shall find further that as a consequence of the compromise, the machinery developed such faults that, over the years, interpretations have been made by sufferance, rather than by clearly accepted decision and conclusion. We shall find that some of the most eminent thinkers of the Nation in the judicial and legislative branches have held divergent views as to the proper interpretation of the constitutional treaty provisions. We shall find that, in all too many instances, treaty pacts and agreements of tremendous importance and great potential value to the Nation have been rejected, amended, or allowed to lapse because of the absence of clear interpretive understanding.

We have repeated historical instances of various Presidents abandoning treaties which have been negotiated after long and careful preparation, as the result of their distrust or chagrin over delays and changes or failure of approval, rather than continuing efforts to renegotiate them or to present them for reconsideration.

We could not fight and win this war today with the ox teams, the muskets, and the sailing vessels of the wars of the Revolutionary period, and we cannot easily secure the goals of our peace efforts through use of the antiquated tools provided in 1787 for the negotiation and ratification of international pacts and agreements.

Let me be more explicit. It is somewhat startling for us to realize that a treaty of peace or a treaty of accord and cooperation could conceivably be rejected by 17 Members of the United States Senate. It is by no means probable that this would occur, but it is mathematically possible. Forty-nine Members of this body constitute a quorum with full authority to consider a treaty submitted to it, and 17 of the 49 could prevent approval by two-thirds of those present, as required by our present constitutional provision. It is even more startling to realize that 17 Senators could be Members representing States which, under the 1940 census, have no more than approximately one-twelfth of the Nation's population. I say, Mr. President, that such a situation is extremely improbable, but again I say that it is mathematically and constitutionally possible that the Senators representing but one-twelfth of the population of the United States could

prevent the exercise of the will and judgment of the other eleven-twelfths of the population as reflected in its representation here, and let us further consider that the judgment of eleven-twelfths of the population would be thwarted even when coupled with the will, the wish, the decision, and the purpose of the executive department represented in a treaty presented to the United States Senate for ratification.

I have just directed attention to the obstructive force of a minority based on population. How much more dangerous and destructive would be a situation where all the efforts of our executive department and the will and wish of two-thirds of this body, less one, could be thwarted by a small group of Senators who were offensively partisan, or by a similar small group of arbitrary radicals, or by a similar small group of hard-headed reactionaries, or by any other group, small and compact, motivated by partisan antagonisms, political prejudices, or personal antagonism and ill will against an Executive, based on the resentments which found their genesis in campaign contentions, patronage distribution, or equally unworthy situations. I do not think so meanly of any of my colleagues in this body as to believe that they would be actuated by any such despicable motives, but I cannot close my eyes to the record of our national history, and I am convinced that we should not approach the parlous period following the cessation of hostilities without making every effort to clarify beyond the peradventure of misconstruction and misinterpretation the provisions of our Federal Constitution relating to the negotiation and ratification of treaties.

What were some of the reasons for the anomalous treaty provisions of our Constitution? Why did the framers depart from the almost unbroken record whereby the handling of international compacts among sovereign nations had been for centuries wholly an Executive function? Why did it become, under our procedure, a joint executive and legislative function? When it thus became a joint function, why was it that the legislative relationship was limited to the Senate alone? What were the reasons for the very unusual requirement of approval of treaties by two-thirds of the Senators present?

Answers to all these questions are readily furnished when we review the debates of the Constitutional Convention on this subject matter. First, we should recall that at the time of the adoption of the Declaration of Independence in 1776, the colonists were impelled to that drastic action in large measure, at least, by bitter resentment against the British monarch. This bitterness was directed almost wholly against the executive branch of the British Government, and it will be recalled how large a portion of the Declaration of Independence was devoted to an enumeration of the injustices by George III and the encroachments on the rights of British subjects by the King. Some of the members of the Constitutional Convention, 13 years later, were even reluctant to admit the necessity for a national executive of any kind. They planned, rather, for the exercise of such central powers as were necessary by a national congress of the sovereign States. Even some of those who admitted the need for a national executive officer insisted that the powers to be conferred on such an officer must be few, indeed. Some of the first drafts proposed for a Federal Constitution reflected this deeply rooted suspicion of and antagonism to a powerful Executive.

Then it also should be recalled that few, indeed, of our revolutionary leaders considered that they were setting up a new nation. On the contrary, they believed that they were establishing independence for 13 sovereign nations whose association as a group was to be limited to matters essential to mutual safety from foreign aggression.

Consider, Mr. President, the specific language of the Declaration of Independence:

> These united Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States.

Again:

> That as free and independent States, they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do.

On the accepted concept, then, that Senators are ambassadors of sovereign States, with full rights in those States to determine war and peace, is there any wonder that there should have existed such strong antagonism to the thought of a central or national excutive clothed with treaty-making power?

As a matter of history, some of the early drafts of proposals for the Constitution gave the almost exclusive treaty-making authority to a senate. The Pinckney draft, introduced almost at the beginning of the discussion, lodged all but complete control of foreign affairs and international relationships in a senate. Under that draft the only powers in the foreign field to be exercised by a President were to receive the ministers of foreign nations and to correspond with the executives of the different States.

I have just tried to direct attention to the prevalent concept of 13 independent States at the time of the adoption of the Declaration of Independence. Let us direct our thoughts to a period 2 years later, when the Articles of Confederation, covering the purpose of the union of those States, was adopted. I quote from the Articles of Confederation:

> Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right which is not by this Confederation expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled.

By the same document those express delegations of power to the central authority, while providing for the determination of peace and war and conferring authority to enter into treaties and alliances, were made, not to an Executive authority, but to Congress. The delegation was made in article 9, but was under the specific restriction that no treaty of alliance or declaration of war could be made without the assent of nine States. All voting was to be by States, each State to have but one vote. In that provision we shall see, Mr. President, the first presentation of the two-thirds concept. War and peace and the making of treaties with foreign nations were to be functions of the representatives of the Confederation in Congress assembled; and probably through a resurgence of the fear that the more powerful States in the alliance might encroach on the prerogatives of the weaker States, the provision was made that nine of the States must assent through their Representatives in the Congress. Nine of the States constituted two-thirds of the group.

It is especially to be noted, then, that when the Constitutional Convention met a decade later, the framers of the Constitution were accustomed to a central Congress in which the States themselves, as sovereign and independent entities, voted as such on a complete equality of voting strength and with a requirement that more than two-thirds of those sovereign States should concur in the negotiation of all treaties with foreign nations. Congress was the sole organ of government. There was no Executive; there was no national judiciary. Every treaty, then, had to be negotiated and adopted by the specific ambassadors of the associated governments, appointed by them respectively, and responsible to the agency which had selected them and from which they derived their power.

The records of the Constitutional Convention and its debates further disclose the interesting fact that the first proposal for vesting the control of foreign affairs in an Executive came from that arch advocate of a strongly centralized Federal Government, Alexander Hamilton. It is recorded that on June 18, 1787, Hamilton arose and pleaded for a strong Executive, and suggested the English kingship as a model. He praised the hereditary principle, but, in deference to existing antagonism, suggested the election of a President for a life term. He also suggested that the Senate should have the sole power of declaring war, but that the President should be clothed with authority to make all treaties, with the advice and approbation of the Senate.

It is interesting in connection with the recitation of the views of Alexander Hamilton to quote from certain statements of his in The Federalist, which show that even this advocate of strongly centralized Executive power recognized that the advice and consent of the Senate was planned, not as a postlude, but as a prelude to the negotiation of treaties. Alexander Hamilton said:

> It seldom happens in the negotiation of treaties of whatever nature but that perfect secrecy and immediate dispatch are sometimes requisite. There are cases where the most useful intelligence may be obtained if the persons possessing it can be relieved from apprehensions of discovery. Those apprehensions will operate on those persons whether they are actuated by mercenary or friendly motives, and there doubtless are many of both descriptions who would rely

on the secrecy of the President but who would not confide in that of the Senate and still less in that of a large popular assembly. The Convention have done well, therefore, in so disposing of the power of making treaties that, although the President must in forming them act by the advice and consent of the Senate, yet he will be able to manage the business of intelligence in such a manner as prudence may suggest.

It must be particularly noted in the quotation which I have just cited that the great champion of expanded Executive power explicitly stated that the President must act by the advice and consent of the Senate, not in ratification of the treaty, but in the forming thereof.

More than 2 months later a committee of 11 made a report to the convention, and again made provision in its recommendations that the power to make treaties and to appoint ambassadors should be lodged in the Senate. At the time of this report, Mr. Madison stated that the Senate represented the States alone, and it seemed to him proper that the President should be at least an agent in the making of treaties.

The first full debate on the subject took place on the question of the ratification of treaties by both branches of the Congress; and, Mr. President, one of the measures I have introduced is presented on the basis of that proposal. Considerable discussion was had as to the inconvenience of requiring that negotiators trying to formulate a treaty with a foreign nation would have to contact Members of Congress both before and throughout the negotiations. Once more Mr. Madison took the initiative, with the suggestion that treaties should be divided into two categories—peace treaties and those pertaining to other subjects—and that the different types should have different consideration and ratification machinery.

The whole subject matter of treaty making was then referred to a committee of five. That committee reported on the 4th of September, and its report contained the provision which finally went into the Constitution, clothing the President with power to make treaties with the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senators present. A few days later, Mr. James Wilson moved that the advice and consent of the House of Representatives should also be required, but Roger Sherman insisted that the needs for secrecy and dispatch in the formulation of treaties were paramount, and that they would be seriously hampered by such a provision as the one Mr. Wilson proposed. The convention supported the viewpoint of Mr. Sherman by a vote of nine States to two States.

Mr. Madison shortly after offered an amendment to carry out his idea of differentiating between the types of treaties. He moved to authorize a concurrence of two-thirds of the Senate to make treaties of peace, without the concurrence of the President. He gave it as his opinion that a President might derive so much power from a state of war that he might be tempted to impede the negotiation of a treaty of peace. That proposal of Mr. Madison was defeated on a roll call vote—seven States to two States.

Shortly after that vote, Mr. Rutledge and Mr. Gary offered an amendment to require the approval of two-thirds of all the Members of the Senate in order to ratify a treaty. They were outvoted—eight to three. Mr. Sherman then offered a motion that no treaty should be ratified without a majority of the whole number of the Senate. It is an interesting fact that the debate on that proposal, which has come to us by way of reports of the Convention, consists of two lines, as follows: "Mr. Williamson stated: 'This will be less security than two-thirds, as now required.' Mr. Sherman replied: 'It will be less embarrassing.' "

The proposal to limit the number required to ratify a treaty to a majority of the whole membership of the Senate was defeated five votes to six. So it will be noted, Mr. President, that the provision now found in the Constitution came after the presentation of a welter of opinion and contention, and then was adopted by a majority of only one vote. Had the representatives of the two other States been present, or had one of those present changed his vote, we should now have in the Constitution a provision for the ratification of treaties by a majority of the whole membership of the Senate, rather than a section which is now a part of the Constitution and which became a provision of our Federal charter by a vote of a majority of one, and which, as the record shows, was based on the concept of an association of sovereign States with equal vote and equal authority.

Former Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels termed the present treaty-making paragraph of the Constitution "archaic." Former President Wilson expressed the opinion that the treaty-making power could better be called the "treaty-marring power." The learned former Secretary of State, John Hay, termed this constitutional provision "the irreparable mistake of the Constitutional Convention."

This same great Secretary of State is quoted by Henry Adams, one of our great historians, on the same subject. On page 374 of Mr. Adams' book, The Education of Henry Adams, he stated as follows:

> The Senate had grown more and more unmanageable, ever since the time of Andrew Johnson, and this was less the fault of the Senate than of the system. "A treaty of peace in any normal state of things," said John Hay, "ought to be ratified with unanimity in 24 hours. They wasted 6 weeks in wrangling over this one and ratified it with one vote to spare. We have five or six matters now demanding settlement. I can settle them all honorably and advantageously to our own side; and I am assured by leading men in the Senate that not one of these treaties, if negotiated, will pass the Senate. I should have a majority in every case, but a malcontent third would certainly dish every one of them. To such monstrous shape has the original mistake of the Constitution grown in the evolution of our politics. You must understand, it is not merely my solution the Senate will reject. They will reject, for instance, any treaty whatever on any subject with England. I doubt if they would accept any treaty of consequence with Russia or Germany. The recalcitrant third would be differently composed, but it would be on hand. So that the real duties of a Secretary of State seem to be three: to fight claims upon us by other states; to press more or less fraudulent claims of our own citizens upon other countries; and to find offices for the friends of Senators when there are none."

Mr. Adams then, in further discussion of the matter, states:

> These three foreign forces, acting with the regular opposition and the natural obstructionists, could always stop action in the Senate. The fathers had intended to neutralize the energy of Government and had succeeded, but their machine was never meant to do the work of a twenty million horsepower society in the twentieth century.

But, Mr. President, in my opinion, whether the action was a mistake or whether it has proved to be a mistake in the light of subsequent experience, in either event the mistake is not irreparable. The Founding Fathers provided the machinery for making in our basic document the necessary changes that changing conditions and full experience might indicate. It is to that end that I have taken the initial step necessary to effectuate a change in the provisions relative to treaty-making power by the introduction of the several alternative amendatory proposals.

I have already referred to some of the dangers and incongruities of the present provision. I wish to refer to still another incongruous situation that pertains to our present method which I feel we might consider ridiculous if it were not for its tragic implications. Most, if not all, of our authorities agree that the Senate has full power under the Constitution to amend and change any treaty laid before it for consideration. Up to the year 1901, the Senate had so amended and changed between 80 and 90 treaties which had been placed before it, and because of amendments adopted by the Senate to these proposals, almost one-third of them failed entirely or were abandoned.

In the following 25 years, 58 proposed treaties were changed by the Senate, and of this number, almost 40 percent were definitely abandoned or discarded because of these changes. Without attacking in any way this right of amendment and change by the Senate, let us call to mind that these amendments or any amendments can be adopted by a majority vote of a working quorum of the Senate. In other words, the Senate can amend, change, emasculate, mutilate, or completely destroy a treaty proposal by a majority vote, but cannot give it approval in any form except by a two-thirds vote of assent.

It might be interesting to recall at this point two or three historical instances of the expression of irritation on the part of some of our Presidents as the result of senatorial attitudes toward pending treaties which were before the body for consideration. President George Washington came before the Senate in person pursuant to the provision providing for seeking advice and consent of the Senate before the actual negotiation of the treaty. He concluded this personal visit

to the Senate floor in a frame of mind which former Senator McClay described in this way:

> Had it been other than the man whom I wish to regard as the first character in the world, I would have said he left with sullen dignity.

Former President Theodore Roosevelt in 1904 abandoned entirely, because of his displeasure over Senate action, nine treaties of arbitration which had been negotiated with certain European powers. Former President Taft took similar action on somewhat similar treaties because of the changes which the Senate had made by majority vote and which the President thought destructive of any value in the proposals.

Mr. President, I shall now leave the field of historical reference and attempt to express what I conceive to be as important a problem as ever has faced the American people in the light of the certain difficulties ahead of us in fomulating the documents under which we shall cooperate with other nations throughout the world in the many fields of international activity.

I have referred to the fact that in activities already initiated in this body there is assurance that the United States will assume a proportionate, if not a leading, role in the post-war peace protection and in the post-war reconstruction and rebuilding. There will undoubtedly be disagreement as to particular means and methods of American participation. But there can be no substantial disagreement now as to the fact that our participation is inevitable. But almost as important as the substantive questions of how we shall participate is the question of what machinery we shall use in this participation. There has been considerable debate and considerable dissension over what will be the conditions of peace and what will be the nature of post-war cooperation, but very little has been said as to the machinery by which the United States will accomplish its participation. And it is my belief that we cannot overemphasize the importance of taking necessary steps in the way of determining the selection of the means and the tools for our participation now.

What shall be the vehicle of American international cooperation? Shall it be by means of treaties, or shall it be by means of contracts which we have designated as "Executive agreements" and through the implementation of these agreements by legislation? There is widespread confusion because it has been almost impossible to define what is meant by these respective terms. What do we mean and what does the Constitution mean by the term "treaty"? The Constitution said nothing about Executive agreements, but what definitely do we mean by the expression?

Recently I picked up a little booklet well and concisely written by William B. Whittington, of the Treaty Division of our Department of State, which set forth an address delivered by Mr. Whittington before the Conference of Teachers of International Law in 1938. On page 5 of this booklet, Mr. Whittington says:

> Before proceeding to a study of the various types of agreements and the procedure for their negotiation, we should have a definition of terms. What do we mean by treaties? What do we mean by Executive agreements?

Then the learned gentleman answers these queries as follows:

> Those international agreements which are submitted to the Senate of the United States for its advice and consent to the ratification thereof are deemed to be treaties in the constitutional sense. For general purposes it may be said that all those international agreements which are not made with the advice and consent of the Senate and which are made by the Executive in pursuance of the authority vested in him with the respect to the conduct of foreign relations, whether or not such agreements have been made under expressed statutory authority, are comprehended within the term "Executive agreements."

In other words, Mr. President, instead of defining the difference between a treaty and an Executive agreement, the learned gentleman contented himself by stating that whatever is presented for ratification by the Senate is a treaty, and such agreements as are not so presented are Executive agreements. This would, of course, place the determination of what is or what is not a treaty entirely in the judgment of the Chief Executive, and would be predicated on what he chooses to send to the Senate for ratification or to implement without such ratification. This explanation, Mr. President, strongly reminded me of a friend of my boyhood who told me that he could inform me as to how to tell a male from a female pigeon. His instructions were to put some corn down in front of the pigeon. If he picked it up it was a "he" and if she picked it up it was a "she."

In a debate on this floor some months ago on an Executive agreement which had been negotiated with the Republic of Panama the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] said:

> Today there is some sign of a general attempt to guide the foreign policy of the country by Executive agreements.

Mr. President, that is a gross understatement of the tendency, but it is not and has not been confined to the present administration. Because an Executive agreement can be implemented by both Houses of Congress by a simple majority vote instead of the two-thirds vote required for approval of a treaty by the Senate, this means has been used throughout the Nation's history, and particularly so since the famous senatorial battle relative to American participation in the League of Nations. Nearly one-half as many Executive agreements have been made in the last 20 years, or since the First World War armistice, as in the 130 years of the Nation's history preceding that armistice. Examples of these agreements were the negotiations to fund the war debts of Great Britain and other European countries, to regulate radio communication with Canada, to alter the international courts in certain Chinese cities, to stipulate reciprocal trade with various countries, to set up a mixed-claims commission for Germany, to cancel an agreement which our Secretary of State Lansing had made with Japan, and to exchange 50 destroyers for certain rights in Atlantic area bases. None of these was presented to the Senate as a treaty. Avoidance of Senate minority veto power over treaties is not at all new or novel.

In attempts to define Executive agreements very few of the students use as a basis the authority for the President's action in negotiating these contracts or understandings. Very little is said as to whether the agreement has been entered into by the Chief Executive under his constitutional authority as Commander in Chief, or under his constitutional authority as Chief Executive, or under authority purported to be delegated to him by the Congress enabling him to negotiate such international agreements. It is also well to keep in mind a great difference between the international and domestic effect of all international agreements. Under conventional international law only states are subjects of international law and the obligations bind the states and not the individual as such. It is the state that is liable for any violation of international obligations whether committed by the state or by one of its individuals.

The Federal Constitution provided that treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land and doubtlessly did by this provision extend the responsibility for the observance of treaties to each and every individual subject to the Constitution. I think no one can dispute the further statement that a state is not responsible for obligations created by unauthorized agents, or in violation of its clearly established constitutional procedures and that it is the duty of foreign states to know these clearly established procedures of other states. A cogent example of this would be that if a President should ratify a treaty which had not received the consent of two-thirds of the Senators present, the treaty would not be binding upon the United States and no cosignatory would hold it to be so.

This brings us face to face with a very pertinent question: What is the position of Executive agreements under international law and American constitutional law? Is there any distinction as to validity of Executive agreements, internationally or domestically, between those entered into by virtue of the President's own authority and agreements supported by legislation purporting to authorize or ratify the agreements? Is the Executive-agreement procedure preferable to the treaty method from the point of view of public policy? Should the President act alone? Should the President cooperate with Congress in entering into Executive agreements? These are some of the questions that present themselves with regard to the use of the Executive agreement as an instrument of international accord.

So far as the Constitution itself is concerned, it is wholly silent on the subject

of so-called Executive agreements. Its references to treaties, however, are especially significant. Article VI, section 2, in the so-called supremacy clause, states that the Constitution and "all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land." Again, in article III, section 2, the provision is made that "The judicial power shall extend to all cases in law and equity arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority." Under these provisions of the Constitution there can be no question that a treaty negotiated as provided by the Constitution becomes the supreme law of the land and supersedes legislation which may have been in existence and which contravenes the purposes and provisions of the subsequent treaty. The Constitution not only fails to define any other type of Executive agreement but similarly fails to make any other type of agreement the supreme law of the land or within the provisions of the definition of judicial power in article III, section 2, which I have just quoted.

But, Mr. President, some of our ablest writers have held that authority to negotiate international agreements other than treaties by the Chief Executive inheres in the Executive Office itself and is comprehended in the opening sentence of article III, where it is said:

> The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America.

In conformity to this view, our courts have somewhat consistently held that the Constitution contemplated the use of international agreements other than treaties. In *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Corporation* (299 U. S. 304), Mr. Justice Sutherland said, in discussing treaties and international understandings and compacts:

> As a member of the family of nations, the right and power of the United States in that field are equal to the right and power of the other members of the international family.

Quite recently Mr. Justice Douglas, in *United States* v. *Pink* (315 U. S. 230), said:

> A treaty is a law of the land under the supremacy clause of the Constitution. Such international compacts and agreements as the Litvinov assignment have a similar dignity.

From the decision in the Pink case and other decisions it is apparent that the attitude of the Supreme Court in discussing Executive agreements is to hold them and place them on an equal footing with treaties as the supreme law of the land under the supremacy provision of the Constitution. But, Mr. President, I am constrained to wonder whether in the all-important problems of the future this line of decisions or any other will hold that an international Executive agreement can modify or supersede previous legislation, as is the case with treaties.

This brief discussion which I have presented brings into the clearest of relief the great question of the future as to how the documents formulating and defining our international relationships of the future are to be drawn, negotiated, and established. Realizing that there must be continued recurrence of the question of what international relationships and obligations can be imposed by compacts other than treaties and how far our executive department can bind the Nation and its citizens in the multiple field of international intercourse, is it not imperative that we should shape our course as clearly and lucidly as can be done at this time and remove from our course every obstacle that might obstruct the successful negotiation of compacts? The historical evidence which I have cited certainly should convince us that our Chief Executives have been given much cause for being skeptical and reluctant in the matter of laying international pacts before the Senate for ratification as treaties. Are we not wholly justified then in seeking to change the archaic provision of our Constitution so that the machinery for the negotiation and ratification of treaties can be brought within our modern concept of a nation acting for itself and its people rather than the retention of the original concept of the collaboration of two-thirds of a group of sovereign and independent States?

Mr. President, I shall now speak of another phase of this problem which we are wholly justified in keeping constantly before us for consideration. First, I wish to cite the fact that at this very moment we are engaged in the formulation of international compacts which will have the most momentous incidence on America's future and America's liberties and resources. I shall list a dozen of these, and the list is not at all comprehensive:

First. The negotiation of the United States relief and rehabilitation agreement.

Second. The constitution of the United Nations organization for food and agriculture which implements the Hot Springs food conference.

Third. International trusteeship for German industry and properties.

Fourth. International trusteeship of large property holdings and responsibilities in various colonial areas.

Fifth. Further expansion of the International Labor Office.

Sixth. International agency for exchange stabilization, including participation and supporting funds.

Seventh. Proposals for an international investment agency.

Eighth. International agreements involving production and distribution of commodities other than foods.

Ninth. Reconstruction of devastated war areas.

Tenth. International agreements on control of air lines and air-borne commerce.

Eleventh. International development of technical economic services under the League of Nations organization.

Twelfth. International trade supervision authority.

As if the question of how these pacts, or protocols, or conventions, or agreements are to be entered into in commitment of our Nation and its people were not of sufficient import to challenge our most careful thought and attention, I shall refer to another conceivable storm cloud on the international horizon toward which we are traveling. To aid in the prosecution of the war we have very properly and necessarily delegated to several executive agencies through the Chief Executive a maximum of authority to enable that department to carry on the stupendous enterprise of global war with a minimum of delay, friction, and confusion. I refer to powers of such magnitude as that contained in the Lend-Lease Act and the War Powers Act. Many of these delegated authorities are, by the provisions of the act which made the delegation, limited in their exercise to a specified period to be determined by the end of the war or the war emergency.

Mr. President, I am convinced that I do no disservice to my country and make no improper reflection on any of its officials or agencies if I call attention to the fact that if we increase the difficulties of the executive department in entering into the necessary peace and economic treaties, we increase the possibility, even though remote, that the extraordinary powers which we have delegated can be extended indefinitely through the substitution of an armistice instead of a definite treaty of peace. It has already been seriously suggested that the best interest of our Nation and its allies would be conserved by simply suspending hostilities through a prolonged and indefinite armistice and to postpone for an extended transition period of the formulation of a definite peace treaty. It has even been seriously contended that no treaty of peace would be necessary; that in such a period of cessation of hostilities as can be accomplished by an armistice, international agreements covering the whole field of post-war activity could be accomplished; that powers delegated for the period of war emergency would be automatically extended; that during such a period of armistice it would be necessary to keep in being and intact our armed forces, and that such action could be plausibly predicated on the fact that hostilities might be resumed.

I do not wish to be understood, Mr. President, as suggesting or insinuating that anyone in a position of authority plans such drastic action as I have suggested, which in the last analysis would amount to a coup d'etat. But the mere fact that such a condition could exist as to permit an action of this kind, it seems to me should challenge the attention of every American citizen and bring a determination to canvass thoroughly and consider even the remotest possibility, to the end that we take such steps now as shall furnish a maximum of security against such a contingency.

It is with these and similar thoughts in mind, Mr. President, that I have introduced the alternative resolutions to which I have referred seeking to provide constitutional means whereby our executive department can make and conclude the necessary negotiations for the participation of our country in its international role in the post-war era with the cooperation and support of the legislative branch, under constitutional au-

thority which will not impede or obstruct the executive branch but will facilitate their labors as greatly as can be done consistent with the security of the American people and their future. I hope, Mr. President, that the eminent Senators composing the subcommittee to which these resolutions have been referred will proceed as expeditiously as possible to consider not the resolutions alone, but the whole field of international agreements which is now with us or immediately before us, with a view to facilitating our governmental agencies in the work they have to do. If none of the proposals which I have presented has merit in the thinking of these able jurists and statesmen, may I venture the hope that they present to the Senate in lieu of the resolutions I have introduced, such proposals as shall give the best machinery for our international duties and participation and the best promise of a successful operation of such machinery.

In closing, Mr. President, I wish to urge the subcommittee as well as every Member of the Senate to ponder carefully the very serious situation confronting us which certainly may be alleviated, even if not wholly corrected by the adoption of any one of the amendatory resolutions which I have introduced.

The Constitution made explicit provision for the making and approval of treaties without defining them.

The Constitution made treaties the supreme law of the land without defining them.

The Constitution gave the judicial branch jurisdiction over questions arising under treaties, but still without defining them.

Our courts have held that the Executive authority can properly be exercised in the formulation of pacts with foreign nations which are other than treaties without defining either a treaty or an Executive agreement.

Our courts have further held that these Executive agreements, like treaties, become the supreme law of the land, and they still fail to define either.

Our courts have suggested and representatives of the State Department have expressly stated that the determining factor as to when an international agreement becomes a treaty is that it has been submitted to the Senate for Senate approval.

If this reasoning, then, Mr. President, is followed to its logical conclusion, the question as to whether any international agreement shall be raised to the dignity of joint Executive and Senate action as a treaty is wholly dependent on the judgment or the discretion or the whim of the Chief Executive then occupying the Presidency. It would also be a logical conclusion that a decision not to submit to the Senate an agreement with a foreign power even one of as high import as a treaty of peace, could not properly be questioned in any judicial proceeding for mandatory action.

If this situation is to continue to prevail, Mr. President, then all reference to the treaty-making power as presented in our Constitution is irrelevant, superfluous, and mere verbiage because no international pact could be considered under the treaty provision, unless the Chief Executive saw fit to submit the proposal to the United States Senate for its approval.

I refuse to believe that the fathers of our Constitution intended to clothe the executive branch with discretionary authority to subvert, ignore, or negate the expressed provisions set forth for the formulation of treaties. But unless and until lawyers whose legal erudition is to mine as the light of the sun to a tallow candle, shall have clarified this continuing problem, it seems wise and even essential that we prepare for the coming peace by removing, through such amendment as I have proposed, all logical or plausible excuse for the exercise of any real or claimed discretion by the executive branch through either refusing or neglecting to submit to the United States Senate all treaties dealing with the peace security and the political, social, and economic security of our Nation in the postwar world.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the able senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] relative to a proposed constitutional amendment with respect to the making of treaties. For some time I have discussed this subject, both in the public prints and in the forums, and have been contemplating the submission of a proposed amendment to change the present provision of the Constitution requiring that two-thirds of the Senators present concur in the ratification of treaties, and to insert in the Constitution, in lieu thereof, a requirement or provision that treaties may be ratified by a majority of the Senators and the Representatives present when a vote is taken upon the ratification of a treaty.

I have incorporated in the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution, which I shall send to the desk, a further provision which I believe to be essential. That provision reads as follows:

> Either the Senate or the House of Representatives, by a majority vote, without debate, may fix the time for any vote, including final vote, concerning a treaty.

Mr. President, that is very important, to my mind, if we are to deal with this subject; because the United States Senate received the Treaty of Versailles on the 10th of July 1919, but it was not finally disposed of in this body until the 19th of March 1920, more than 8 months later.

So, Mr. President, if we are to have democracy in the world and in this country, we must keep open and clear the channels of the democratic process; or, to put it another way, the machinery of democracy must be capable of functioning without any minority having the power to clog or obstruct those channels and that machinery.

What could be fairer, therefore, Mr. President, in furtherance of our principle of checks and balances upon the power conferred upon governmental officials than to have the power of the Executive in respect to the making of treaties checked by a requirement that a proposed treaty shall not become in fact a treaty until it is ratified or concurred in by a majority of the present Senators, when a vote is had in the Senate, and by a majority of the present Members of the House of Representatives, when a vote is had in the House of Representatives?

What could be fairer than to give the majority of either body the power, without debate, to fix the time when any vote concerning a treaty, including the time of the final vote, may be had?

This matter is particularly important now, because all of us envisage that soon we shall be endeavoring to make the kind of treaty which will protect and maintain the peace of mankind, which is being so dearly bought by the men and women of the world. When that treaty comes back here at some time, Mr. President—and God speed the day when it will come, to declare world peace—we should let it be received by a machinery in this Congress which would assure it speedy consideration and speedy conclusion and not give the power of filibuster, not give the power of delay, not give the power of obstruction to a little group of Senators who might not reflect the majority sentiment of the Senate or of the House of Representatives or of the country.

If we are fighting for democracy, Mr. President, that means the majority rules. At the present time a minority rules in the Senate with respect to the ratification of treaties, and, of course, the House has no voice in the matter.

I give my solemn assurance, my solemn, lamentable belief, that with the present constitutional provision not changed, Mr. President, the Senate would not ratify another treaty which was as adequate in respect to present-day problems as were the League of Nations and the Treaty of Versailles with respect to the problems following the First World War.

If we let this chance be lost—this chance to gain a permanent peace, Mr. President—it will inevitably mean World War No. 3. Though it may seem remote from the beginning of another war to be considering these techniques and processes of peace here in the Senate, the time to be sure that there will be democratic machinery which will be effective to preserve the democratic process is now, Mr. President.

So I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment relating to the making of treaties.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 102) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the making of treaties was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

VOTING BY TENNESSEE SOLDIERS—RECOMMENDATIONS OF SENATOR McKELLAR

Mr. MURRAY obtained the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? I regret to ask him to do so, but I have a call to attend a conference in a few moments. I shall not take long.

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words this afternoon concerning the Eastland-McClellan-McKellar bill which was passed by the Senate last week, calling upon the States to enact amendments to their election laws so as to enable the soldiers to vote freely in all of next year's elections. I strongly favored that bill.

Tennessee now has an absentee voting law, but I hope Governor Cooper will call a special session of the Tennessee Legislature for the purpose of making the exercise of the privilege of soldier absentee voters as easy, as light, as fair, and as just as possible.

I want to recommend to the Governor and the legislature to amend the absentee ballot law of Tennessee so as to provide that all soldiers and sailors and other absentees over 21 years old who are members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Corps, or any other war activity, shall be excused until the war is over from the provision of our present voters' registration law and that registration in the armed services shall be the equivalent of registration for voting.

In the next place I should like to urge the Governor and the legislature to declare all persons absent in the Army or Navy or other armed forces exempt from poll taxes during the period of the war because of the inconvenience and difficulty, even the practical impossibility, of paying them while away.

In the next place I hope the legislature will pass an amendment providing for the transmission of absentee voters' blanks in ample time before the election in order that the soldiers and the sailors may receive such blanks and return them in time to be counted in the election next November.

I think every safeguard should be placed around this privilege given the voters so that it may be made as certain as possible that no vicious practices or fraud of any kind shall be practiced in this voting. The substance of the provision in the substitute bill passed by the Senate might well be placed in the State law.

Likewise the substance of the amendment placed in the Senate substitute relating to the voting of others in the war service who may be absent at the time of the election should be included in the right to vote under the State law as if they were soldiers, where they have registered in a similar way to the soldiers themselves.

These amendments would make the Tennessee State law accord with the recommendations contained in the substitue bill as passed by the Senate.

FILIPINO REHABILITATION COMMISSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 94) establishing the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission, defining its powers and duties, and for other purposes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the unfinished business is the joint resolution having to do with the Philippines, to which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] made some objection last Thursday. I am authorized to say for the Senator from Ohio that, with the adoption of the amendment which I offered earlier today, he will have no objection to the joint resolution. As a matter of fact, the measure would bind no one. It would merely set up a commission to hear facts and to recommend policy. I therefore hope it can be disposed of, since, so far as I know, there is no objection from any quarter to the joint resolution as it is written.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment of the committee.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In section 2, page 4, line 10, after the word "appropriated", it is proposed to strike out "the sum of $ " and to insert "such sums as may be necessary", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying on its duties, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will now state the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maryland.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, in section 1, page 3, line 22, before the word "members" to insert "United States"; in line 23, after the word "under" to strike out the word "each" and insert "the United States"; in line 24, after the word "annum" and the period to insert "The compensation of the Philippine members of the Commission shall be determined by the Government of the Philippine Commonwealth", so as to make the section read:

That the first paragraph of section 13 of the act of March 24, 1934, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 13. There shall promptly be held a conference of representatives of the Government of the United States and the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, such representatives on the part of the Government of the United States to consist of three United States Senators appointed by the President of the Senate, three Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House, and three persons appointed by the President of the United States, and on the part of the Philippines to consist of nine representatives to be appointed by the President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines; the said Commission to be known as the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission, subject to the following conditions and with the following powers and duties:

"(a) The members of the Commission shall be appointed not later than 15 days after the passage of this act. Within 10 days thereafter the ranking member of the Senate appointees and the ranking member of the Filipino appointees shall jointly call a meeting of the Commission to be held in the Capitol of the United States for the purpose of organization. In case of death or resignation of a member, such vacancy shall be filled by the original appointing power.

"(b) The Commission shall investigate all matters affecting post-war economy, trade, finance, economic stability, and rehabilitation of the Philippine Islands, including the matter of damages to public and private property and to persons occasioned by enemy attack and occupation.

"(c) To formulate recommendations based upon such investigations and for future trade relations between the United States and the independent Philippine Republic when established and to consider the extension of the present trade relations or otherwise for a period of years to replace the period of occupancy by the Japanese of heretofore agreed on trade relations, and to consider if in addition thereto other time for trade adjustments is required for the reestablishment of trade relations as provided for in the original Independence Act.

"(d) The Commission is authorized to employ expert legal and clerical assistance, to establish offices in the Philippine Islands and in the United States, and to make rules and regulations for the transaction of its business pertinent to the provisions of this act.

"(e) The Commission shall make annual reports to the President of the United States and to the Congress, and to the President and the Congress of the Philippines, and more frequently if so desired, and make such recommendations from time to time as it deems necessary to carry out the purposes and intents of this act.

"(f) The Commission is authorized to fix the salary of all necessary expert and clerical assistance, to provide for travel and other expenses incident to its labor, and to do all other things pertinent to this act. The annual compensation of the United States members of this Commission, other than those holding official positions under the United States Government, shall be $10,000 per annum. The compensation of the Philippine members of the Commission shall be determined by the Government of the Philippine Commonwealth. The United States, as herein provided, shall compensate the members of the Commission who represent it, and the Commonwealth of the Philippines, or the Filipino Republic, as the case may be, shall compensate the members of the Commission appointed by it or them. Otherwise, the expenses of the Commission shall be equally borne by the United States and the Commonwealth of the Philippines, or the Filipino Republic, as the case may be."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I knew of the opposition of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the joint resolution. I know of no other objection on this side, and I understand that the Senator from Maryland has given assurance that the amendment is sufficiently satisfactory to the Senator from Ohio so that his opposition has been withdrawn.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Ohio has authorized me to say that, even without the amendment, he is in favor of the joint resolution, because he has communicated with the Philippine officials, and they have told him that no one will serve on the Commission who is not now an officeholder and is drawing a salary. Nevertheless, the position taken by the Senator from Ohio was a good one, and I think it wise that we state our position affirmatively, which is what the amendment does.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONCENTRATION OF BUSINESS—MANUFACTURE OF TIRES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, there has just come to my attention a statement in the December 7, 1943, issue of the Wall Street Journal, made by Mr. Paul W. Litchfield, chairman of the board of directors of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., discussing the matter of concentration of business. I should like to bring this to the attention of the Members of the Senate, and especially the members of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee who are now considering the so-called rubber tires bill, S. 1122. The statement I refer to was made by Mr. Litchfield on or about December 6, 1943, at a meeting of the Goodyear Co.'s board of directors at Phoenix, Ariz. It was made in relation to an agricultural project comprising 35,000 acres of land which the Goodyear Co. is breaking up into 80-acre irrigated farms which the company proposes to sell to young men who are first put through a course of training in specialized farming. According to the Wall Street Journal story, the Goodyear Co. selects these men on the basis of their interest in agriculture and their desire to own a farm. Mr. Litchfield gave as the Goodyear Co.'s principal reason for fostering this independent ownership of farms its desire to halt the trend toward totalitarianism. I quote from the Wall Street Journal:

Mr. Litchfield said that ownership of land and capital in the United States has become concentrated in too few hands; that it is a danger to the Nation to have too much capital concentrated either in big business or government. "We are trying in a small way to reverse that process," he said.

I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate, and especially to the attention of the members of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, this statement of Mr. Litchfield, for the reason that it is in almost identical agreement with a statement I made before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on November 17, 1943, in connection with the rubber tires bill, S. 1122. It would almost seem that he had my remarks before him when he uttered these words. This is what I said at that time:

I do not need to dwell on something with which I believe your committee is thoroughly familiar, something that is reiterated almost constantly in the press and on the floors of the Senate and the House of Representatives. That is the evident concentration of control of our trade and industry and the threat this has to our democratic system of government. I think we are fairly well agreed that this concentration, if not reversed, leads inevitably to bureaucracies and totalitarianism.

This Congress must take a positive step to break up concentration of control of industry. This tire bill is designed to do that for the tire industry. There is no other proposal similar in purpose before your committee, or before any other committee of the Congress, of which I am aware.

Mr. Litchfield is the chairman of the board of directors of the world's largest manufacturer of rubber tires. I am gratified, indeed, to find that his fundamental philosophy is in agreement with my own, and with that of the other members of the Senate Small Business Committee, with respect to the dangers threatening free enterprise and the future welfare of the Nation inherent in the concentration of ownership in too few hands.

But, Mr. President, notwithstanding Mr. Litchfield's statement, we find the rubber-tire manufacturing companies reaching out to compete with the independent clothing merchants, the hardware store, the sporting goods store, the electrical appliance store, and the department store. They are thus contributing to the destruction of the small merchants engaged in these lines, who are now faced with serious difficulties due to the lack of goods on their shelves caused by wartime restrictions. Only recently, the Washington Post denounced this practice in an editorial entitled "Chiseling."

In connection with this problem, I should like to read a few extracts from a letter just received from a business concern in Montana, the Missoula Mercantile Co. The letter is dated November 27, 1943. I quote:

We are receiving letters from many manufacturers saying they cannot sell us merchandise, yet we find the chain stores able to buy without any difficulty and apparently in great quantities. These chains are able to buy toys, clothing, etc., even though in past years they did not handle such items and confined their sales to hardware, tires, and auto accessories. This is just a sample of what is going on. * * * I am sending you some ads so that you will understand that the manufacturers who obtain priorities for merchandise make former sales to concerns like the Missoula Mercantile Co. and small independent stores the basis for obtaining merchandise and then sell the merchandise to chain outfits who never heretofore handled these lines. There seems to be no rule in effect which would compel a manufacturer to distribute to former customers.

* * * * *

They seem to make a definite practice of selling their merchandise to as few customers as possible and those few are the chains. This Christmas market is a chain-store boom holiday because they have been able to buy the merchandise and independents have been turned down. We have many letters from manufacturers which indicate that they do not want to serve their former customers. There must be some reason for this and I wish you would ask the War Production Board to make some investigation of the situation and find out what can be done to procure merchandise for independent stores operating in Montana. It is my understanding that Senate bill 1122 and House Resolution 2817 are designed to protect to some extent independent merchants against manufacturers who are attempting to put them out of business. * * * I am writing this letter not only on behalf of the Missoula Mercantile Co. but on behalf of the associated merchants of Montana also.

Mr. President, a situation similar to that described by my Montana constituent exists in the meat industry. When quotas for civilian supply of meat were established at 75 percent of the 1941 consumption, the quotas were based on the record of sales by the packers to all customers, including processors and wholesalers. These processors and wholesalers had been regular purchasers of supplies from the packers, and were wholly dependent upon such supplies for their existence. The large packers, however, found it more profitable to cut off supplies to large numbers of these processors and wholesalers, and market their total output direct through chains and other more profitable outlets. The hotel and restaurant trade brought bigger prices, so they were substituted by the packers. This, of course, meant ruination to many processors and wholesalers, although the big packers were able to retain their high quotas based on their record of previous sales to these processors and wholesalers which they undertook to cut off.

This destruction of small business enterprise has gone on in many lines. S. 1122 is designed to meet this problem in the national retail tire business. It is based on a "live and let live" philosophy. The big tire manufacturers have been greatly expanded during the war, and have made tremendous profits. They should be satisfied with their domination of this profitable manufacturing field, and permit the system of small business enterprise to continue as an essential part of the community life of the Nation.

The Springfield Union, of Springfield, Mass., discussed this problem in an editorial on December 3, 1943. I quote from that editorial:

The trend toward liquidation goes on. Small businesses cannot get enough materials to continue operations; they are taxed into oblivion; the centralization brought about by the necessities of war production have caused many of them to suspend. In many cases, one-man businesses have had to fold up, for the duration at least, when the key man was called into the armed services. There are multifarious factors working against small business. They are evident in this report of the Commerce Department—a report that shows nearly 500 concerns a day were forced out of business, for one reason or another, during a 2-year period, only a few months of which are included in our record as a belligerent.

The small business is emblematic of our national spirit of independence in a very real sense, for through it the modest fortunes of successful men in our communities are most often made; through it the comparative handful of employees are working in the villages and towns and cities of their choice and leading the kind of lives they want to live.

Unimportant as the unit in our economy, it is of surprising importance in the aggregate, for only one-tenth of American business is big business. The very existence of many American villages and towns depends on the single plant, whatever it may produce, that is run by home-town people and for home-town people, and that continues in business through generation after generation without affiliating with big business.

It would be a tremendous loss to our way of life if the trend toward centralization evident during the war were to continue when the war ends. The alternative, of course, is restoration of small business, to restore the economic equilibrium that has been thrown off as a result of the war effort.

Mr. President, I ask that several telegrams dealing with this subject, which I send to the desk, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMPHIS, TENN., *December 8, 1943.*
Senator JAMES E. MURRAY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SENATOR: Reference rubber tires bill most large manufacturers such as General Motors, Ford, etc., have successfully merchandised their products through independent dealers thereby affording small businessmen a fair opportunity. Now after the small businessman has weathered the storm of pioneering his products the large tire manufacturers through their own stores are selling their products direct to the consumer and with all of their obvious advantages are making it more and more impossible for us to survive. Such practices are monopolistic and un-American. We appreciate your interest in our behalf and are depending upon your great influence in the committee as well as in the Senate to lend your good office in our behalf in promoting the passage of this bill which means so much to all of us.

Respectfully.

Swift's Tire Service, Dixie Tire Co., McCollum Tire Shop, McFall Tire & Battery Shop, Shelby Tires, Southern Tire Co., Spaulding Tire Co., Suburban Tire Co., Third Street Retread Tire Co., The Tire Mart, Ellis Tire & Battery Co., State Tire & Oil Co., C. W. Stewart Tire Co., Hale Mosley Co., Connable-Joest Ball Tire Co., Ashworthy Specialty Co., G. & M. Tire Co., Walter Hunter Co., Walter Hunter, Inc., Page Tire Co., Liberto Vulcanizing & Rubber Co.

AMARILLO, TEX., *November 20, 1943.*
Senator JAMES E. MURRAY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please be advised that the testimony given this week before your committee by Cal Farley does not represent the feelings of the Amarillo independent tire dealers, signed below. We very definitely hope to see the early passage of the rubber tire bill in its entirety, as we feel it means the difference between success or failure for us, the independent tire dealer, now and the future.

Amarillo Garage & Storage Co., by J. S. Sudson; Ted Lokey Tire Co., by Ted H. Lokey; Hamilton Tire Service, by G. B. Hamilton; Henkins' One Stop Service, W. Jinlim Kelly Tire Service, by W. Jinlim; Adkission Baker Tire Co., Jack Baker.

CHICAGO, ILL., *December 8, 1943.*
Senator JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Senate Small Business Committee, Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.:

Our association represents the majority of retail gasoline service stations in metropolitan Chicago. Many of these stations are independent tire dealers, who have requested us to inform you that we are in favor of Senate bill No. 1122, and are looking forward to its passage and its enactment into the laws of the United States.

B. M. PROVIS,
President, Gasoline Retailers Association of Metropolitan Chicago.

WILLIMANTIC, CONN., *November 30, 1943.*
JAMES E. MURRAY,
Senate Office Building:

The Willamantic Chamber of Commerce with 250 members representing a cross section of this city is in favor of Senate bill S. 1122, known as the rubber tire bill.

ALBERT B. SMITH,
President, Chamber of Commerce.

WILLIMANTIC, CONN., *November 30, 1943.*
Senator JAMES E. MURRAY,
Senate Office Building:

We urge your support of rubber tire bill. Thank you.

THE WILLIMANTIC GASOLINE DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
JOHN D. ROY, *President.*

MARVIN HUNTER McINTYRE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, we have all heard with the profoundest sorrow of the death of Marvin McIntyre, one of the secretaries to the President. I would not want this session to conclude without saying a word of appreciation of this outstanding American citizen.

Marvin Hunter McIntyre was born in Kentucky. He lived there until he had arrived at manhood, and is to be taken back there, where his remains will rest forever in the soil of that great State.

He had had a varied career in the newspaper and political world, largely in the newspaper world, because he was essentially a newspaper man and not a politician, although he was versed in the science of politics in its broadest sense as meaning the science of government, which is the real meaning of politics, though sometimes we give a different connotation to the word. He has been associated with President Roosevelt during his entire tenure in office as President. He was one of the correspondents who traveled with him in 1920 when he was a candidate for Vice President on the Democratic ticket. They became fast friends. When Mr. Roosevelt became President of the United States it was a natural thing for him to bring Mr. McIntyre here in his official family as the secretary to deal with the public.

Marvin McIntyre was one of the kindliest, one of the most generous, one of the most cordial, one of the most sincere men it was ever my privilege to know. Never pretentious, never egotistical, never vain, he possessed the qualities of gentility, of courtesy, of consideration for everybody with whom he came in contact, and especially for the "underdog," as we say.

I have often heard him quote the words attributed to Abraham Lincoln, "God must have loved the poor because He made so many of them." Marvin McIntyre was a friend of the poor, and at the same time he did not disdain the friendship of men in more favorable circumstances. He drew no distinction in his friendship and in his acceptance of friendship on account of race, color, religion or condition. It is with the deepest sadness that I take note here of his death.

We have all known that for some years he has not been in robust health. We had hoped that a little rest, which he began to take a month ago, would restore him, that he might be preserved for us for many years in association and in work, and that he might be restored to his daily duties. It was not to be. He has passed on to his reward in the great beyond, and joined his fathers in that bourne from which no traveler returns, from which no message can come back to us except the message of hope that all is well with him, and that he will forever bask in the sunshine and the goodness of Almighty God. Certainly he deserves that sort of a fate.

Though I am sad at his departure, I am happy to be able to say that no nobler man, in all that nobility means, has lived and died than Marvin McIntyre.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have heard with most genuine sorrow of the departure of Marvin McIntyre. It is difficult for me to think of him as a public official, for one remembers him above all else as a warm and a generous friend, one radiating cheer, one making the sun shine brighter in the lives of all of those privileged to come in contact with him.

He was a public official diligent, efficient, distinguished above all else, I believe, by an extraordinary fidelity and loyalty to his Chief, the President of the United States.

Mr. President, in behalf of the minority Members of this body I express their regret that he has left us. I give assurance of our sympathy to all the remaining members of his family.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it is a sad privilege to be able to join in the sentiments which have been expressed in lamentation over the passing of Marvin McIntyre. I have never known a man who was a kinder, gentler, sweeter character than the man whom we all affectionately called "Mac." I never saw "Mac" lose his temper, or lose his poise, or lose his equilibrium, or lose his kindness. He was an extraordinarily wise man in public affairs and in human relations and in a knowledge of people.

He had an unusual career. It just happened that yesterday in my home in Tallahassee, Fla., I picked up a book, "This Is My Story," by Mrs. Roosevelt, and I saw in it a photograph of a group including the President taken at or about the time he was a candidate for the Vice Presidency, and in that little charming group was Marvin McIntyre. I did not know that I should come back today to the sad news of his demise. All of us know with what heavy heart the President will return to find "Mac" no more with him, to aid, to counsel, and to assist him.

Those of us in the Congress, particularly, who have had years of contact with "Mac," will miss him exceptionally, because we could always call "Mac," and feel that we would get at least an understanding and sympathetic consideration of our problem or of our constituents' problem. I never heard "Mac" say an unkind word about anyone; and, although he lived close to a controversial figure, I never heard anyone say an unkind word about "Mac"; but everyone seemed to recognize the beauty and warmth of his character and the honesty of his loyalty and courage.

It is, therefore, with a deep sense of grief that we shall reflect upon the terminated career and the abruptly ended life of Marvin McIntyre.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment, and appointment, by transfer, and/or promotion, all in the Regular Army.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Willard A. Kitts 3d, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, to rank from the 1st day of December 1943.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Gladys B. Kyle, to be postmaster at Rogersville, Tenn., in place of K. P. Hale, deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified of the confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified forthwith.

That concludes the calendar.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, December 15, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 13 (legislative day of December 7), 1943:

POSTMASTERS

MINNESOTA

Henry E. Hunter, Stephen.
Delbert I. Bjorklund, Winthrop.

PENNSYLVANIA

Caroline A. Smith, Lackawaxen.
Loretta M. McCloskey, Mountaintop.
Ralph McKean, Shohola.
Helen M. Nichols, Tullytown.
Stephen Rohart, Winburne.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1943

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord and Father of mankind, our abiding hope on the way to life, to liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, consider and hear us. Keep us steadfast in our faith that the most blessed truth is to labor for the things which cannot die and always ready to affirm them.

Thou who didst give Thine only Son to be made perfect through suffering, grant that by the measure of our love we may show our willingness to suffer and endure. In this time so full of solemn lessons, we pray Thee to make a place in our lives for worship and prayer, having the law of the Lord in our minds and the love of Christ in our hearts. Every great line of honesty, of honor, and heroism runs back to these values. O deliver us from the fallacy which allows men to do as they please with their station and influence; these belong to our Lord and country and we would make complete surrender at their altars. Almighty God, unify us with patience when the way is uphill and forbid that we should become a prey to contention. Heavenly Father, this gigantic struggle which is smothering the mind of the world, can be settled by what is in the hearts of men and women by grace, courage, and unselfishness, then will spring the crowning races of mankind. We pray that Thy providential care will guard and preserve our President and return him to our dear homeland. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 10, 1943, was read and approved.

TRANSFERRING CERTAIN FUNCTIONS OF PRICE ADMINISTRATOR WITH RESPECT TO PETROLEUM TO THE PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATOR FOR WAR

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule XXVII, I call up Calendar No. 2 of motions to discharge the Committee on Banking and Currency from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2887) transferring certain functions of the Price Administrator, with respect to petroleum and petroleum products to the Petroleum Administrator for War.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] is recognized for 10 minutes, and if the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is opposed to the petition, he will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the petition.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced in the House some months ago. During the summer there were some conversations between the then chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, who was not in good health at that time, and myself. While the Ways and Means Committee was considering the subject of renegotiation of war contracts in connection with the tax bill, the Committee on Banking and Currency was quite busy with the subject of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

At the time the petition to discharge was filed and laid on the Speaker's desk the Banking and Currency Committee was very busy, as Members of the House know. I cannot in frankness say to the Members of the House that I insisted upon the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee fixing a definite date for hearings on this matter. An attempt was made all fall to get this condition rectified without legislation, but it was apparent that could not be done; therefore, the petition to discharge the committee was filed.

More than a hundred letters went to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency asking for hearings on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I feel it my duty to object to this motion to discharge the Banking and Currency Committee from the consideration of this bill in order to preserve the ordinary functionings of the House and the integrity of the committees. We all know that there are a great number of bills introduced every year which the committees cannot consider. It is absolutely impossible for the committees to consider all bills. The only bills that the committees consider are bills that the committees have been urged to consider by the introducers of the bills or those interested in them.

The secretary of our committee has searched the records and has found no written request from anyone for the consideration of this bill. I do not think there is any issue on that subject. I believe this will be admitted. Of course, the conversations that our distinguished friend had with the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, whose lips are now sealed because of his sudden and almost tragic death, I know nothing about; but it seems to me that is not the proper way to request action by the committee. The committee, like a corporation, speaks by its records.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] was long a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and he had our respect and admiration because of his ability and legislative experience. A letter from him to the committee and a request for consideration of this bill would have had great weight. I feel it is my duty, in order to uphold the approved procedure of the House, that I protest against this action. Experience has shown since the foundation of our Government that committees are necessary for the handling and reporting of legislation.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. If this matter is postponed, will the new chairman of the

Banking and Currency Committee promise to give this matter immediate consideration before the Banking and Currency Committee? I am a member of that committee and I would like to have a hearing. If the gentleman will agree to give an immediate hearing to both sides, that may alleviate the matter.

Mr. SPENCE. Under the circumstances, and as a majority of the House have requested it, yes.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman will give immediate consideration to hearing?

Mr. SPENCE. I do not say "immediate," because that means now, but as soon as can reasonably be done.

Mr. PATMAN. The next 2 or 3 days.

Mr. SPENCE. We are holding a hearing now. As soon as that hearing is completed, we can have a hearing on this bill. I think that is the proper way to proceed.

The committees give consideration to these bills; they have exhaustive hearings, and they report the bills. They give the Members of the House their reasons for their decisions. When a bill comes before the House in that manner the committee has it in charge and can answer questions of the Members of the House.

I think if you want ill-considered and half-baked legislation, the way to get it is to discharge committees from the consideration of bills. As far as I am concerned, I make the promise that we will give consideration to this bill. I think I would be recreant to my trust as chairman of the committee if I did not protest against this proceeding which robs our committee of its jurisdiction under the rules of the House without any reason.

I do not know that any statement I make will have any effect on those who signed the petition, but I do think you are doing something that will form an evil precedent. I think that when you decide you can take a bill from the Committee on Banking and Currency without giving it any chance to consider the bill, you are setting a precedent that will take jurisdiction away from every other committee of the House. We operate under precedents. Parliamentary law is something like the common law. It is truly remarkable how our able Parliamentarian can find the precedents for every decision. Take this bill away from the Committee on Banking and Currency, that has never been requested to consider it, and you have set a precedent that will be effective as to every committee in the House; and every one of my colleagues, I know, has some particular interest in maintaining the jurisdiction of some committee.

I ask you to vote down this motion, and we promise to give the people interested an early hearing before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. It is awkward that I did not file with the then chairman of that committee a written request for consideration of the bill, and get his reply. Unfortunately, that was not done.

Of course, there are many precedents here for the discharge of committees. The wages-and-hours law, the Townsend bill, the Bonus bill and many others have been petitioned out of committees. The House would gain nothing in rejecting this motion to discharge, on the very good faith promise of the very distinguished chairman that hearings would soon be had. Let me remind you that hearings have been had. There were hearings before the committee of Mr. Cole, when he was a Member of the House, very exhaustive hearings. There were hearings before the Naval Affairs subcommittee of which the gentleman from South Carolina, [Mr. RIVERS], was chairman. That committee went about over the United States and looked into this subject and made a thorough, positive, and forthright report. Chairman LEA of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been holding a hearing on the subject. The Petroleum Administration for War has had hearings on the subject. All possible evidence and factual data that could possibly be presented to the Committee on Banking and Currency have already been presented and are ready for re-presentation here before the House. I doubt if anything would be gained by going over. I think the result would be delay, that should not continue to keep the production of oil down.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. None of the committees that have investigated this matter have had any authority to report a bill. The Committee on Banking and Currency would have that authority.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. SPENCE. That is the very distinguishing difference between holding general hearings and the hearings to be held by the committee.

Mr. DISNEY. I am sorry the demand was not made for a hearing. As I have said, at least 100 letters went to the then chairman of the committee. I believe, and it is my good-faith judgment, that if the written demand had been made it would most likely have been rejected, or possibly delayed.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. Is it not also a fact that in addition to the hearings the gentleman from Oklahoma has mentioned, for the past several months, almost every week, this proposed legislation has been discussed from the Well of the House under special orders and under permission to address the House for 1 minute by various Members from all over the country, not only from the oil-producing States but from other States urging that something be done in connection with the subject matter of this proposed legislation.

Mr. DISNEY. The House will remember that during the late summer and fall every possible effort was made to get the executive department to look at this matter as the facts, in our judgment, would justify. That was the reason for not having more speedy action in taking it from the committee or in asking hearings.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Is it the judgment of the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, who is the author of the bill, that although this measure does not happen to come from the committee at this time, there is any other measure that has been discussed more thoroughly on the floor of the House during the past 3 or 4 months?

Mr. DISNEY. I never have heard one more thoroughly discussed than the famous bonus measure, and in that instance the matter was taken from the committee.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does the gentleman believe that even if the Committee on Banking and Currency, that has this bill in charge, should report this bill, the Members of the House would gain anything in the way of information with respect to this legislation?

Mr. DISNEY. Not more than we have here today.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I am not altogether in sympathy with this way of bringing a bill on the floor.

Mr. DISNEY. Neither am I, but it was the only weapon we had.

Mr. REED of New York. This is the point. I think there is the most alarming condition existing now in this particular field of operation as it relates to the war than anything that has occurred since the war began. These stripper wells that are necessary to produce the oil needed to flow to our armies abroad, and to keep our ships and our planes running, are being depleted at a terrific rate, because they are pulling these wells, pulling the machinery, and the wells are going out of production with great rapidity every single day. Time is of the essence in the situation.

Mr. DISNEY. I agree there should be no delay.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentlemen who have raised objection to the procedure which is followed here are clearly within their own rights because, of course, they speak for the committee of which they are members, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency is speaking for the committee over which he presides. I should like to recall to the House, however, that there has been a clear-cut cleavage on this issue between two main branches of our Federal Government, namely, the Office of Price Administration in opposition to an increase in oil prices and the Petroleum Administrator for War in advocating a needed rise. The Members of this body are fully conversant with the facts. Two hundred and eighteen Members have signified their intention

of desiring the issue debated and voted up or down. It would seem logical the House should proceed today.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. I did not sign the petition. I did not sign it because I tried to follow the principles of legislative procedure. This, to me, is almost as important as the legislation. I want to ask the gentleman, Does he consider that a precedent embalms a principle? There is an old saying, "Once a precedent is established, a principle is embalmed from then on." Is the procedure that we should do business in an orderly way and hold committee hearings receiving a permanent injury? I am frank to say to the gentleman I want to vote with him, but I still want to retain established and orderly procedure. I want to ask him this question, Does the gentleman recall any measure brought up in this way that passed the House? It is suggested that the anti-poll tax was passed by this route. It is extremely doubtful if that was wise legislation.

Mr. DISNEY. This is substantially procedural. It is an unusual procedure, I agree. But it has been done before. But it is time to get this issue settled here and now, and we can give the House the facts as well as the committee can.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. I favor and have so reported not only a 35-cent increase on oil per barrel, but more than that. The committee of which I am chairman investigated this matter thoroughly and we came to that conclusion. But we have a new chairman on the Committee on Banking and Currency who has never heard this testimony and neither have the members of that committee. This would be rather unusual, certainly very unusual when the chairman of the committee promises early hearings almost immediately. I trust the gentleman from Oklahoma will agree to a postponement, say for 1 week or 2 weeks or something like that, so we can have all the different people who are interested and who have information on this subject here before the committee to give us the benefit of their views. I want to know why I should change my mind about the price increase. I am for it in view of my present information. This bill is being brought in here under circumstances in which I doubt fair and deliberate consideration would be given to it. So I hope the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] will agree to presenting this bill to the Banking and Currency Committee. You are assured of a hearing and the committee can get all the facts and bring them back to the House and let us thresh this thing out.

Mr. DISNEY. The petition for discharge was filed long before the unfortunate passing of our great friend, Mr. Steagall, former chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. He raised no objection. I saw him several times and he did not complain.

Mr. PATMAN. But here is a direct promise of immediate consideration of this matter by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. DISNEY. I saw Mr. Steagall several times and he did not complain because he realized the thing was pending downtown and he realized we had a peculiar situation.

Mr. PATMAN. But here is a direct promise of an early hearing by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. We must not destroy all the stabilization program. I do not claim this one thing would do it but it would be a step in that direction. I do not know what the answers are. I would like to know what the answers are. Our Committee on Small Business investigated it a few months ago and came to the conculsion that the gentleman was right. But let us bring the facts up to date. It will only take a very short time to hear the witnesses and I hope the gentleman will agree to a postponement. I am against breaking up price control and I do not expect to vote for this bill unless a hearing is conducted and I am convinced its passage will be in the public interest.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, from hearsay evidence, some of it obtained by listening to special orders, I have come to the conclusion that the legislation proposed was wise and I have not changed my mind, but I do believe that a safe, sound, and orderly way ought to be pursued in this case under the circumstances and I can hardly conceive of any circumstances that would change that policy. I do not believe we ought to break it. Of course, the gentleman from Oklahoma does not hesitate at all to accept fully the statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency that what may be termed an immediate hearing will be furnished. This has sort of been pressing on my thought. I would like to have hearings and I know you would, too, to base our judgment on the recommendations of a committee of this House, after hearings which, I feel, would have the confidence of the membership.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have 1 minute left.

The SPEAKER. Yes, the gentleman has 1 minute left.

The gentleman is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. DISNEY. If the gentleman will yield to me.

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DISNEY. In the first place, I have not the authority to yield to a discontinuance because 218 Members have signed the petition. I do not feel that this is any disrespect to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The SPEAKER. Any Member of the House who signed the petition can ask unanimous consent to postpone the consideration of the matter.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced on June 7. The vacation intervened. On October 4, the petition was filed. During most of that time, after the vacation, we were engaged in the hearing on the Commodity Credit Corporation. There was no time to give consideration to this bill and I am willing to promise the House that if we vote down this motion we will start hearings next Friday on this bill.

Mr. PATMAN. And continue the hearings until they are finished?

Mr. SPENCE. And we will continue the hearings until they are finished.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SPENCE) there were—ayes 86, noes 20.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 247, nays 71, not voting 111, as follows:

[Roll No. 168]

YEAS—247

Allen, Ill.	Dworshak	Hoffman
Allen, La.	Eaton	Holifield
Anderson, N. Mex.	Elliott	Holmes, Mass.
	Ellis	Holmes, Wash.
Andresen, August H.	Ellison, Md.	Hope
	Ellsworth	Horan
Andrews	Elston, Ohio	Howell
Arends	Engel, Mich.	Jeffrey
Auchincloss	Engle, Calif.	Jenkins
Barrett	Fellows	Jensen
Bates, Ky.	Fenton	Johnson,
Bates, Mass.	Fish	Calvin D.
Beall	Fisher	Johnson, Ind.
Beckworth	Fogarty	Johnson,
Bender	Fuller	J. Leroy
Bennett, Mich.	Furlong	Johnson,
Bennett, Mo.	Gale	Luther A.
Bishop	Gallagher	Johnson, Okla.
Blackney	Gamble	Jonkman
Boren	Gathings	Judd
Bradley, Mich.	Gavin	Kearney
Brehm	Gerlach	Keefe
Brooks	Gibson	Kelley
Brown, Ga.	Gifford	Kennedy
Bryson	Gilchrist	Kerr
Buffett	Gillette	King
Burchill, N. Y.	Gillie	Kinzer
Burdick	Goodwin	Kleberg
Busbey	Gossett	Kunkel
Butler	Graham	LaFollette
Camp	Grant, Ind.	Landis
Carlson, Kans.	Gregory	Lanham
Carrier	Griffiths	Larcade
Carson, Ohio	Gross	Lea
Carter	Gwynne	LeCompte
Case	Hagen	Lemke
Chapman	Hale	Lewis
Chenoweth	Hall,	Luce
Chiperfield	Leonard W.	Ludlow
Church	Halleck	Lynch
Clevenger	Hancock	McCowen
Cole, Mo.	Hare	McGehee
Cole, N. Y.	Harless, Ariz.	McGregor
Compton	Harness, Ind.	McKenzie
Costello	Harris, Ark.	McLean
Cravens	Hartley	McMillan
Crawford	Heffernan	McWilliams
Cunningham	Heidinger	Maas
Curtis	Hendricks	Mahon
Day	Hess	Manasco
Dirksen	Hobbs	Mansfield,
Disney	Hoch	Mont.
Dondero	Hoeven	Martin, Mass.

Mason	Randolph	Sumner, Ill.
Merritt	Rankin	Sumners, Tex.
Merrow	Reece, Tenn.	Sundstrom
Michener	Reed, N. Y.	Taber
Miller, Conn.	Rees, Kans.	Talbot
Miller, Mo.	Richards	Talle
Miller, Nebr.	Rivers	Thomas, Tex.
Mills	Rizley	Thomason
Mott	Robsion, Ky.	Tibbott
Mruk	Rockwell	Tolan
Mundt	Rodgers, Pa.	Towe
Murray, Tenn.	Rogers, Mass.	Treadway
Murray, Wis.	Rohrbough	Troutman
Norman	Rolph	Vincent, Ky.
Norrell	Rowe	Vinson, Ga.
O'Brien, Mich.	Schiffler	Vorys, Ohio
O'Brien, N. Y.	Scrivner	Vursell
O'Connor	Sheppard	Weichel, Ohio
O'Hara	Short	Welch
Outland	Sikes	West
Patton	Simpson, Ill.	Wheat
Peterson, Fla.	Simpson, Pa.	Wickersham
Philbin	Smith, Ohio	Wigglesworth
Phillips	Smith, Wis.	Willey
Pittenger	Snyder	Wilson
Ploeser	Somers, N. Y.	Winter
Plumley	Springer	Wolcott
Poage	Stanley	Wolfenden, Pa.
Poulson	Starnes, Ala.	Wolverton, N. J.
Powers	Stefan	Woodruff, Mich.
Price	Stewart	Worley
Ramey	Stockman	

NAYS—71

Abernethy	Ford	O'Konski
Angell	Gordon	Patman
Barden	Gorski	Priest
Barry	Hays	Rabaut
Bonner	Hull	Ramspeck
Bradley, Pa.	Jarman	Robertson
Bulwinkle	Johnson,	Rowan
Burgin	Lyndon B.	Sabath
Byrne	Kean	Sadowski
Canfield	Kefauver	Sasscer
Clark	Keogh	Satterfield
Cochran	Kirwan	Sauthoff
Coffee	Lesinski	Smith, Va.
Colmer	McCormack	Sparkman
Cooley	McMurray	Spence
Cooper	Magnuson	Sullivan
Crosser	May	Voorhis, Calif.
Doughton	Miller, Pa.	Weaver
Durham	Monroney	Whitten
Eberharter	Morrison, N. C.	Whittington
Feighan	Murphy	Winstead
Flannagan	Myers	Woodrum, Va.
Folger	Newsome	Wright
Forand	O'Brien, Ill.	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—111

Andersen,	Fernandez	Martin, Iowa
H. Carl	Fitzpatrick	Monkiewicz
Anderson, Calif.	Fulbright	Morrison, La.
Arnold	Fulmer	Murdock
Baldwin, Md.	Gavagan	Norton
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gearhart	O'Leary
Bell	Gore	O'Neal
Bland	Granger	O'Toole
Bloom	Grant, Ala.	Pace
Bolton	Green	Peterson, Ga.
Boykin	Hall,	Pfeifer
Brown, Ohio	Edwin Arthur	Pracht
Brumbaugh	Harris, Va.	Reed, Ill.
Buckley	Hart	Robinson, Utah
Burch, Va.	Hébert	Rogers, Calif.
Cannon, Fla.	Herter	Russell
Cannon, Mo.	Hill	Scanlon
Capozzoli	Hinshaw	Schuetz
Celler	Izac	Schwabe
Clason	Jackson	Scott
Courtney	Jennings	Shafer
Cox	Johnson,	Sheridan
Cullen	Anton J.	Slaughter
Curley	Johnson, Ward	Smith, Maine
D'Alesandro	Jones	Smith, W. Va.
Davis	Kee	Stearns, N. H.
Dawson	Kilburn	Stevenson
Delaney	Kilday	Tarver
Dewey	Klein	Taylor
Dickstein	Knutson	Thomas, N. J.
Dies	Lambertson	Wadsworth
Dilweg	Lane	Walter
Dingell	LeFevre	Ward
Domengeaux	McCord	Wasielewski
Douglas	Madden	Weiss
Drewry	Maloney	Wene
Elmer	Mansfield, Tex.	Whelchel, Ga.
Fay	Marcantonio	White

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Bland with Mr. Shafer.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Brumbaugh.
Mr. Burch of Virginia with Mr. Jones.
Mr. Grant of Alabama with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Harris of Virginia with Mr. Dewey.
Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Rogers of California with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Pracht.
Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Slaughter with Mr. Hill.
Mr. D'Alesandro with Mr. Clason.
Mr. Cannon of Missouri with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Jackson with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Izac with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Gearhart.
Mr. Baldwin of Maryland with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

On this vote:

Mr. Elmer for, with Mr. Hart against.
Mr. Kilday for, with Mr. Bloom against.
Mr. Schwabe for, with Mr. Wasielewski against.
Mr. Morrison of Louisiana for, with Mr. Fitzpatrick against.
Mr. Knutson for, with Mr. Klein against.
Mr. Anton J. Johnson for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.
Mr. Reed of Illinois for, with Mrs. Norton against.
Mr. Baldwin of New York for, with Mr. Cullen against.
Mrs. Smith of Maine for, with Mr. Delaney against.
Mr. Arnold for, with Mr. Capozzoli against.
Mr. Fulbright for, with Mr. Dickstein against.
Mr. Ward Johnson for, with Mr. Fay against.
Mr. Cannon of Florida for, with Mr. Buckley against.
Mr. Monkiewicz for, with Mr. Celler against.
Mr. Douglas for, with Mr. Gavagan against.
Mr. LeFevre for, with Mr. O'Leary against.
Mr. Anderson of California for, with Mr. O'Toole against.
Mr. Green for, with Mr. Marcantonio against.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself in a Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2887) transferring certain functions of the Price Administrator, with respect to petroleum and petroleum products, to the Petroleum Administrator for War. Pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled between the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency and myself, and at the end of the 2 hours' general debate, the bill may be read for amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY]?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not think 2 hours debate is sufficient. That bill has never had any consideration by a committee. It should have a whole day debate. I ask that 8 hours be allowed, 4 hours on each side.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma has preferred a unanimous-consent request. The Chair must put that. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. FORD. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DISNEY. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be fixed at 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2887, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] is recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is recognized for 1½ hours.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes of the time allotted to me to be controlled by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] and 1 hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the agreement is accepted.

There was no objection.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have not prepared any fixed speech on this subject. I believe it would be more interesting to the House to discuss the matter rather off the cuff, and try to present the salient features of what is involved. It involves some detailed discussion and I hope the House will be patient with me in the discussion.

I would like to proceed a few minutes without interruption, so as to get the chief features of what I intend to say before the House, and then yield for questions, if Members desire to interrogate me.

I would like to reimpress, if I may, upon members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, that there is no idea of disrespect for that committee, of which I was formerly a member, and for the members of which I have the greatest respect. We are in an awkward situation. The matter was being considered downtown. The Banking and Currency Committee was in the midst of that highly controversial Commodity Credit Corporation legislation. Frankly when the petition was filed, I had not

the slighest expectation it would be made use of. I had a very definite impression that the price would be raised without legislation. Legislative action is, of course, awkward, and the discharge of the committee merely is procedural, and I hope no sense of pride on that subject will enter into anybody's thought, especially those members of the Committee on Banking and Currency for whom I have such great respect.

We are not trying to break this line. We have been hearing a lot of conversation and many comments and statements by people in all walks of life, high and low, that we must hold the line. We realize, of course, that we must hold the line to prevent inflation. We are not trying to break this line; we are trying to get up to the line. We have not been within calling distance of the line for a long time. I will come to that a little later.

In order to take, if I can, some of the fear of the consequences from the minds of Members, I have some charts here, official charts prepared by the P. A. W. These are exact photostatic copies of those charts borrowed for that purpose. They speak more graphically than any words that could be said to you here so that you will not get badly worried or bothered about the effect upon the consumers. This is going to cost some money to the consumers but I have yet to hear of a consumer who would not rather pay a little more for his gasoline and get it, than to pay less and not have it. We have rather been educated into the matter of a 35-cent-per-barrel raise for crude oil. That is less than 1 cent a gallon. If we pay 50 or 75 cents for a cocktail and we pay a nickel for a bottle of Coca-Cola, why should we feel there is something ominous and that the country cannot afford another cent a gallon, less than a cent a gallon, for crude oil, or fear the effect upon the consumers if the price were raised 35 cents a barrel? The effect would be eighty-five one-hundredths of 1 cent per gallon raise in the price of gasoline. I do not know of anybody in the United States who would not rather pay that and get it, than to save it, and not have it.

Now we come to the effect upon the population of the price raise. The armed forces use 32 percent of the oil. The drivers of passenger cars use only 15 percent. It gets down into fractions, do you not see—eighty-five one-hundredths of 1 cent per gallon on gasoline at 35 cents per barrel increase on crude. The drivers of passenger cars get only 15 percent. Industries, 12 percent; public utilities, 2 percent; operators of trucks, busses, and taxicabs, 12 percent. They may complain of the price being raised a little bit, for they get all the gas they need anyway. Railroads and transportation, 8 percent; householders heating with oil, 5 percent; farmers, 5 percent; all others, 9 percent.

I remind you again that this is an official document published and put out by the organization upon which the President placed the responsibility for procuring more crude oil; that is to say, the Petroleum Administration for War headed by Mr. Ickes; but the President's order does not give to the Secretary of the Interior and the Petroleum Administrator for War the right to fix the price.

Now to get down to figures in actual dollars and cents, these being percentages—does that frighten any of you about raising prices when you see these percentages? Fifteen percent of the oil only going to drivers of passenger cars. Are they going to mob you? Are the farmers going to do anything to you when they get only 5 percent? Or the householders?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question just before he leaves that subject?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Can the gentleman tell the Committee just how the rise in the price of gasoline and other crude oil products compares with the rise in the price of other commodities?

Mr. DISNEY. I am coming to that. We are at the bottom of the trough; I am coming to that with some language and a chart. I know the chart is graphic and I hope I may make the language graphic.

Drivers of passenger cars average $71.37 annually for gasoline. This would add $2.97 to the average cost of driving a passenger car. Would the driver not rather spend $2.97 and have some more gasoline than to save $2.97 and not have it? Then getting over here to the trucker; they spend $265.48 per year. This would add $10.06, that is on a 35-cent rate of increase on crude. Farmers operating tractors average $119.08 per year. This would add $4.96, keeping in mind the 35-cent raise; it would add $4.96 to the bill of the farmer, but he would get more gasoline, we hope, we believe, and we know we can prove to you that he would. Householders heating with oil spend $124.96 a year. This would add $11.93 to the householder's bill on the average.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. FORD. How much additional money would it cost the Government, the United States Treasury?

Mr. DISNEY. I do not know.

Mr. FORD. I notice the gentleman omitted that.

Mr. DISNEY. The more oil that is produced and sold, the more taxes the Treasury will receive.

Mr. FORD. Yes; but also the more it will cost the Treasury to buy it.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes; it would cost more, but that is not the point that is worrying them; what is worrying them is whether they can get enough oil at any cost.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. As a matter of fact, unless they do increase the price of crude oil and develop more areas where oil is found they run the chance of not getting oil for anything but the military, do they not?

Mr. DISNEY. Let us get this thing straight. This is not just a scheme of a lot of oil men to get more money; the whole economy of this country is involved in this proposition. I could not state it more graphically than Mr. Dempsey, former Member of this House, now Governor of New Mexico, when he was here last week. He said, "I am not interested in my oil men getting a better price. When the price is low, and it affects the economy of my State, then I am interested as Governor and it is my duty to go into the subject and see if it cannot be rectified."

Let me give you some figures on that subject. See how it affects the economy of this country? Take this country off wheels and the economy takes a nose dive. About one-fourth of the trucks are on the farms, about 1,500,000 tractors are on the farms. Fifty-six percent of all the livestock moves to market by gasoline automotive equipment.

The military program it is estimated will take 38 percent of the oil in 1944 and from 40 to 45 percent in 1945. It is 32 percent this year. I think that chart is a minimum. Fifty-four thousand communities in the United States, cities, villages, and towns, one of them a State capital, are dependent upon motor transportation. Take kerosene, for instance, the day of the old kerosene lamp has not gone. The citing of a few instances will illustrate to you how the whole economy of the country is affected.

Mr. Chairman, my distinguished friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] asked how oil compared in the parity index with all commodities. It startles you. I have a chart on that subject.

First, let me tell you the story. Along about 13 years ago the Texas fields came in. Other big fields came in. That drove the price down, but it gradually became more or less stabilized and hung along at a low price. Then the major companies were emboldened with the liberty they had under the trade agreements and they had a tendency and did keep the price down. It should have been 20 cents a barrel higher in 1938 than it was. They found out they had made a mistake, but they kept the price down because they were the chief buyers of oil. In 1941 oil was $1.17 on the average. Frank Phillips, of the Phillips Petroleum Co., a big independent producing company and buying company, posted a price raise of 25 cents a barrel. Mr. Henderson, then price administrator, demanded that he withdraw that offer, which he did. Mr. Henderson asked for 90 days in which to investigate to see whether or not to permit the price to go up 25 cents a barrel. July 1, 1941, was that date. After he had the 90 days he asked for more time and being cocoperative, the Phillips Petroleum Co. agreed to wait on posting the price. If the oil were not worth it, would the buying company be offering that for it? He was willing. We had been entitled to a price raise prior to that time. After Mr. Henderson asked for more time, we passed the Price Control Act on October 2, 1942, and oil was frozen at the bottom of the trough.

If you will look at this chart, you will see oil at an average of $1.17 a barrel. First, there is the freeze by Mr. Henderson, and by agreement the companies did not post the larger prices, then on October 1 or October 2 the official freeze was made.

Here is what raw materials other than oil did. Everything went up to 110. Oil stayed at 58.9. I tell you oil is the lowest on the parity index of any commodity in America at 58.9. The average index is 102.8. This is a comparison with other raw materials which run up above 110 to 115. Compared with the index of all commodities, oil is 63, still at the bottom.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. What about labor costs?

Mr. DISNEY. Labor costs, of course, have gone higher, and, I may say, labor goes into the construction of the machinery that oil men use and is an essential element of everything involved in the oil business. It is highly technical machinery, costly machinery, the value and cost of which have been enhanced by high wages and labor costs. Labor in the fields has gone up also.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I call the attention of the gentleman and the Members of the House to the fact that we in Montana today are paying $19 a day to oil drillers. We are also paying 100 percent for connections for oil pipes necessary in connection with drilling our wells, more than we did before the war.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Wages are 100 percent higher than they were before the war.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes. The oil industry has always paid the highest wages of any industry in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. This bill is for the purpose of transferring certain functions.

Mr. DISNEY. Let me come to that a little later.

Mr. STEFAN. We are endeavoring here to transfer the oil industry over to Secretary Ickes, because Secretary Ickes favors an increase in the price of oil. We people who consume oil, our people out in the Middle West who want more gasoline, desire me to tell them how they are going to get more gasoline if we pass this legislation.

Mr. DISNEY. I will show you that in a minute. Here is where you get more gasoline. Take a look at this chart.

Here are crude oil prices compared with oil-well drilling activities in the United States. In 1920 and 1921 we drilled 32,000 wells. See how it runs? The red line is the price. Here is the drilling of oil wells. Here is the drilling of dry holes. When you have a good price you get oil wells drilled. That is the answer. When there are more oil wells drilled you get more oil. Lately it has been more difficult to get oil, it is scarcer, and it takes more drilling than ever. That ought to be a complete answer. When oil was $3.50 a barrel, or nearly $3.50 a barrel, this country drilled 32,000 wells in one year.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. As I understand it, this low price is affecting the oil business in another way very materially. I refer to these subwells, these stripper wells. By killing your stripper wells you lose oil in that way.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes, and understand when an oil well is pulled it is gone. Water overtakes it; it is through. We lose a lot of stripper wells every year anyway. When the price of oil is low, the number of wells is less, 15,000 wells in 1 year back in 1931 and 1932 when the price was so low. See the range here? It follows the price just like the production of cotton, beans, peanuts, hogs, and cattle. You produce more when you have a price and you quit producing when you do not have a price. I have heard it said by the coalmen they are going to stop the running of coal mines because they cannot produce unless they get a price raise.

These charts illustrate it better than words I can use. Some may say, "What about these reserves?" I have heard it said there are 20,000,000,000 barrels of known reserves, and there are. But can you imagine getting that oil out as if it were a flowing pool of oil? It is not a pool of oil by any manner of means. Oil sands that produce oil in the deeper wells are nearly as hard as the concrete paving you drive over. And they will not give up all of their producible oil in less than from 50 to 75 years. Here is one of the softer sands.

It is asked, "Why does not Texas open up her wells and turn them loose?" They have done that, we hear recently, under the exigencies of war, and they are going to ruin all the wells that way. East Texas has produced several billions of barrels. No less an authority than Col. Ernest Thompson, the best-posted man on conservation in the United States, tells me that east Texas, with all its billions of barrels, probably will produce, if improper methods are continued, only a third as much as it should. If they turn these wells loose and let them go, they lose gas pressure, they lose water pressure. Gas pressure and water pressure force the oils out of these sands and into the hole that is drilled. The pressure down there thousands of feet below the earth is tremendous, and it forces the oil out.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. I should like to ask the gentleman two questions. First, in view of his very illuminating statement, we should like to know whether or not the total oil production is increasing or decreasing annually.

Mr. DISNEY. That brings out one thing that you ought to understand right off the bat. Fifty percent of our production comes substantially from new wells. Wells take a nose dive. They may come in at a thousand barrels and go down to 10 or 15 or 50 or maybe 2 or 3 barrels in a short time. Keep in mind that half of the oil consumed comes from new or substantially new wells.

Mr. HARE. The next question is this. We have passed a law providing for stabilizing prices.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes.

Mr. HARE. I am wondering whether or not an action of Congress singling out one industry would interfere with that law, and whether we would not be called upon then to increase the price of other commodities, such as consumer goods, raw cotton, and so forth.

Mr. DISNEY. I do not know, but those who are at the bottom of the barrel are entitled to complain, and they are entitled to ask to be brought up some place along with the rest of the people, especially when an important international and national issue is involved, where the economy of the country is involved, and where our national defense is at stake.

Let me answer further. Judge Vinson denied this 35-cent raise. He cites the President's directive:

> No further price increases are to be sanctioned unless imperatively required by law.

Then he cites again an Executive order:

> No further increases in ceiling prices except to the minimum percent required by law.

As I construe Judge Vinson's decision he practically put it back in Congress' face to "require by law."

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman is a distinguished lawyer.

Mr. DISNEY. Thank you.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have great confidence in the gentleman's ability. I wish to submit this question. Has the gentleman from Oklahoma seen anything in any law which this Congress has passed during the past 5 years having to do with the stability of prices or holding the line or otherwise which carries the intent on the part of this Congress that a price be fixed and held at a line which prevents the production of foodstuffs, oil, or whatever the subject may be?

Mr. DISNEY. I have not talked with a Congressman or Senator who ever thought that the Price Control Act required the Price Administrator to require people to produce at a loss. I do not think it was ever the intent of Congress that that should be the case.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it not a fact that the law provides that where it is necessary to modify prices in order to get production the President is directed to do so?

Mr. DISNEY. When Judge Vinson's decision said what it did—and it was practically an invitation to Congress to require it by law—then I came to the conclusion that this legislation ought to be pushed.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not true that the low price of oil is driving out of business the independent oil operators?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes, certainly.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not also true that the independent oil operators are the ones who have brought in the new wells to the extent of 78 percent of known production in the past?

Mr. DISNEY. Seventy-five or eighty percent of the new wells have been discovered by the independents. The independent has nobody to sell to except the majors. He cannot sell to an insurance company or a bank. They do not want to buy. He has to sell to the major oil companies. When they are confronted with these conditions, with labor costs going up and the price frozen, what is there for a discouraged man to do but to sell out? What good are the experienced, independent oil operators, the group that drill 75 percent of the wildcats, to the Nation when they have sold out to the majors? One of these days, if this nonsensical condition continues, you are going to have a monopoly problem on your hands that you will not know what to do with. Let us be sensible and reasonable about it. Let us not hold on to the idea that because there was a Teapot Dome once the oil group wants everything.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. I call the attention of the gentleman to this. Did not Judge Vinson by his denial admit the inequities in the price of oil, but did he not want to take care of the matter by means of a subsidy?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes. Do you know what would happen if we had a subsidy on oil? People would be going out and drilling for subsidies, they would not be drilling for oil. It is nonsense, it is almost an insult to the oil business, to talk about subsidies.

Mr. Leon Henderson, in a way all his own, told me one day, "Give me $250,000,000 and I will go out and drill the wells and do the job." I said, "I can get you a job for $100,000,000 a year, Leon, if you do that." He said, "What?" I said, "Hundreds, even thousands of executives in the oil industry are trying to do that very thing. If you can do that, they will fire all those men and hire you."

Even Mr. Leon Henderson used this language:

> At the time the defense program was launched the petroleum industry was depressed. Production of crude oil in Illinois had been unrestricted and the excess supply had resulted in a weakened price structure throughout the midcontinent area.

These boys down in O. P. A. talk nice and accept the facts, but put a distorted and unreasonable view upon them, in my judgment.

> Under the influence of the defense program, payment for motor fuel and other petroleum products increased at a rapid rate and prices began to rise.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. WORLEY. I understand the hold-the-line order was passed for the benefit of everybody alike; is that correct?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes; but I must reiterate we are trying to get up the line. We will help hold it when we get there.

Mr. WORLEY. I simply want to bring out a few points. The figures which I am about to read which were submitted to me by an independent operator in the Texas Panhandle, indicate the disparity between the way some things have risen while the cost of oil has remained in status quo. In 1941 the hourly wage of a rotary driller in the Texas Panhandle field was $1.12½ an hour. As of September 28, 1943, the hourly wage of a rotary driller was from $1.58 to $1.82. A derrick man in 1941 was getting 87 cents an hour. Today he is getting from $1.10 to $1.20 an hour. A fireman and engineman in 1941 was getting 96 cents an hour. Today he is getting from $1.05 to $1.21 an hour. The question is certainly not whether or not he is entitled to that wage in the light of all rising costs of living, but how far the independent operator can continue to produce oil at a loss if the hold-the-line order was passed for the benefit of everybody alike, and certainly the fellows who are going to have to produce this oil for war purposes are entitled to more consideration than they are apparently receiving at the present time.

Mr. DISNEY. They are entitled to stay alive. Conditions existing at the present time do not permit them to stay alive. Along the same line mentioned by the distinguished gentleman from Texas, take a look at this chart entitled "Expenditures for Exploration in the United States per Barrel of New Reserves Discovered." From 1934 to 1936 the average cost per barrel of discovering oil was 12 to 15 cents, according to this official chart. This is an official document prepared by the experts that the President himself appointed to furnish this information to the country. In 1942 it was up to nearly 65 cents per barrel for discovering oil. That is the rise in the cost It is an absurd situation.

Now, is anybody scared about the big companies making some money? Well, if they do make some money, what are they going to do with it? They are going to pay it in to Secretary Henry Morgenthau, of course, in the main. The excess-profits tax eats up 80 to 90 percent. What are they going to do with it if they get the money? Business is business. Some little hotels make more money net than big hotels. Some big hotels make more money net than little hotels or than the average. Some big grocers make more money on the average net. Yet some little grocery man may make some money. Let us just imagine you have a fine bottomland farm especially adapted to raising corn, and I have a hillside farm. You can raise two or three times as much corn on your bottom farm as I can on my hillside farm. Have we got to that stage in America that we have got to give me more of a price and give you less of a price because you have a good farm and can raise more corn? Look what a Pandora's box we are going to drift into when we talk about subsidies for the oil business, no matter how these things may be for other matters. Business is business clear on through. And when we start fixing one price for one producer of the same thing and another price for another producer, then we are putting our hands into something that is going to burn.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not true that the recovery from a barrel of crude oil by the refineries and these companies that are engaged not only in production but in refining and in distribution is about $8 per barrel, and they buy this crude oil for about $1.10 a barrel? In other words, the relation of the price of gasoline to a barrel of crude oil is on about the same basis as the relation of the price of a loaf of bread to a bushel of wheat?

Mr. DISNEY. I think that is right.

Now, I want to discuss with you the matter of wildcat wells and refer to this chart. At the expense of boring you by reading I want to read almost verbatim what experts in the Petroleum Administration for War, after going into this matter thoroughly with the best minds that could be found, what they say about the matter of discovery wells. If this does not startle you, then you cannot be scared by a ghost. In this first panel, in the 4 years ended December—and mark these words—in the 4 years ended December 1938 new reserve discoveries averaged 2,041,000,000 barrels annually. In the 4 years ended December 31, 1942, new reserve discoveries averaged 941,000,000 annually. That is down not quite a third, but more than half; 2,041,000,000 barrels in that first 4 years and only 941,000,000, or a drop of 1,100,000,000 barrels annually. In the year ended December 31, 1942, new reserve discoveries totaled only 507,000,000 barrels. That is only 507,000,000 barrels of reserves that are in these difficult sands to operate. The 4 years ended December 1938, new reserve discoveries exceeded the annual production by 894,000,000 barrels annually. That is, the reserves exceeded the average annual production.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 more minutes.

The 4 years ended December 31, 1942, the average annual production exceeded new reserves by 410,000,000 barrels annually. In other words, we have got to drill nearly twice or nearly three times as many wildcat wells now to get the same amount of oil.

On this second panel, 90 new fields were found in 1934. Three hundred and eight new fields were found in 1942. It looks like we are doing pretty well. There were 90 fields in 1934 and 308 fields in 1942. In 1934 discoveries for these fields average 24,750,000 barrels. In 1942 discovery for these new fields averaged only 1,650,000 barrels. You are going to have to drill more and more now for less and less oil.

Now to go to the third panel. In 1937, 2,224 wildcat wells were drilled. In 1942 it went up and 3,219 wildcat wells were drilled. That is nearly 1,000 more in 1942 than in 1937.

In 1937 the average new reserves discovered for wildcats, total 934,000 barrels. In 1942 the average new reserves discovered for wildcat wells drilled, totaled 158,000 barrels. More and more are drilled for less and less oil. That means we are going to have more drilling in order to keep up with consumption.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Under date of November 15, 1943, I received a letter from Harold L. Ickes, Petroleum Administrator for War, in answer to a communication which I had addressed to the Secretary on October 25 of this year. I had attempted to take certain of the statements which were in opposition to a price increase for crude oil and to ask the Administrator to make certain statements which I believed might clear the situation. In connection with reserves, I note that he says:

> At the end of 1944 we shall have a deficiency in crude oil supply of approximately 300,000 barrels a day. We shall be forced to rely upon importations from foreign sources if we are to meet the projected demands for petroleum products at this time.

The gentleman believes that figure of 300,000 barrels is not high?

Mr. DISNEY. I agree.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the gentleman should point out, you have been dealing with barrels all the way through in your discussion; you should point out to the House and the country the price per gallon might mean 3 cents in the present price.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes; an average of $1.17; 42 gallons to the barrel.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I expect to vote for the gentleman's bill, but I am not happy about it for this reason: I wish we could pass general legislation that would apply to everything where the producer is not getting the cost of production. I thought we did it.

Mr. DISNEY. So did I.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. What are we going to tell our milk producers when they say, "You voted to give the oil producers a necessary price for their product, but you did not do anything for us"?

Mr. DISNEY. My answer to my coal people and my dairymen, who are just as mad as yours, is that for the war effort we must have more wells drilled, and the wells will not be drilled except for a reasonable price, and the price of oil was so far below the general commodity index that they could not possibly have a complaint.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Could not the gentleman suggest language that would cover all of these? Milk is certainly an essential commodity.

Mr. DISNEY. If we get into that, we rewrite the whole price-control bill.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Was it not estimated by the Petroleum Administrator for War that it was desirable to have approximately 4,500 wildcat wells drilled in 1943?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. And as a matter of fact only about 3,400 wildcat wells were drilled?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes. We will not nearly reach the goal or get the oil that we need.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. There has been a total increase in the price of crude oil per barrel from 1938 to the present time of how much?

Mr. DISNEY. I do not know that I have those figures.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Has the gentleman any idea?

Mr. DISNEY. It went up about 15 cents between 1938 and July 1, 1941. I think that is approximately correct.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I would like to direct the attention of the gentleman to the fact that during this time the price of fuel oil for domestic consumption has gone from 6 cents to 9 cents a gallon, an increase of 50 percent. I paid 6 cents a gallon in 1938 for oil and I am paying 9 cents a gallon today, on an increase of 15 percent in the price of crude oil per barrel.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield to answer the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. In 1938 the average price of crude oil was $1.13. At the present time the average price of crude oil is $1.18.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. And a 3-cent-per-gallon increase to the consumer. You had better consider that when you think of this increase.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Like the gentleman from Connecticut I, too, am worried about the possibilities emanating from this and its effect on other groups suffering like hardships. But, to get back to the question under discussion, is it not true that the price on crude oil was frozen as of October 1941, before we entered the war?

Mr. DISNEY. In fact, on July 1, 1941, at the request of Price Administrator Henderson.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Prior to the war, most of the oil in this country was produced by independents?

Mr. DISNEY. Not most of it produced. A majority of the discoveries were by independents.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. A majority of the discoveries were by independents. All right. If my memory serves me correctly the major oil companies produced 48 percent of the Nation's supply before the war and the independents produced 52 percent. Since that time the independents have had a hard time because of rising labor costs, shortage of well drillers and other field workers and a lack of the right kinds of machinery. These independents are, in general, the people who take the chances and bring in the wells in the new and often unexplored areas.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. The result is the independents are going out of business, because recent figures show that at the present time the majors control 78 percent of the total oil supply and the independents control 22 percent. What I am primarily interested in is the welfare and protection of the "shoestring" operator and a continued flow of crude for the conduct of the war. I fear that if something is not done that the independent will be squeezed to the wall and the net result will be the creation of a monopoly which would take the competition out of the oil business.

Mr. DISNEY. I think so.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. FORD. We are really discussing the transfer of this from one department to the other, are we not?

Mr. DISNEY. No.

Mr. FORD. The other is collateral. I realize that.

Mr. DISNEY. I am going to offer an amendment on the question of parity, the first part of which goes to the question of parity and the second part of which fixes 35 cents as the least raise they can make.

Mr. FORD. One question further. You admit that if we raise the price of oil, the milk producers will want to be raised and other men will want to be raised, and everybody will want to be raised. What we are doing by the Congress stepping in and making this change in legislating on prices is simply opening the door to a wild orgy of price increases all along the line.

Mr. DISNEY. I doubt if any of those amendments would be germane to this bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to ask the gentleman this question in reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY]: If I have understood this presentation, it has been strictly in the interest of the consumer of petroleum products, in that you are seeking an eco-

nomic adjustment which will continue the present production and bring forth additional production?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Has that not been your presentation this morning?

Mr. DISNEY. I intended it to be, sir.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Can you tell me how you can protect me as a consumer unless you get production?

Mr. DISNEY. I think that answers itself.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. With reference to the question asked by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY], as a matter of fact, if we take the over-all picture of the price of crude oil, it has not been raised to any extent at all, since the date mentioned by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DISNEY. That is true.

Mr. O'CONNOR. In my own State crude oil today is selling for $1.10 per barrel, just about the same price it was selling for in 1938.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Here is the point: If encouragement by way of price is not given to the independent producer, he will go out of business and then you will have an oil monopoly that will raise the price of my friend's oil, not from 6 cents to 9 cents, but up to 10 or 15 cents per gallon. With the independent out of business the country will be at the mercy of the oil monopoly.

Mr. DISNEY. Candor requires me to say this to you—and I should have said it at the outset—our production has been about 3,900,000 barrels daily in round figures up until just recently and our consumption around 4,400,000 barrels. That has been the general way it has been running until the last 60 or 90 days. Above-ground stocks are about 239,000,000 barrels. Both have been depleted just as far as they can go. They have to have these pipe lines full to operate the refineries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

It takes about that amount to operate the refining end, 239,000,000 barrels. In the last 60 or 90 days we have been bringing in production to the extent of 4,400,000 barrels per day. They have turned things loose and they are destroying wells by doing that. It is in violation of all the conservation policies to do that; it is temporary and we are taking a final loss in doing it, but production has been upped under the very stress of circumstances.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman state how much additional oil we are consuming now as compared to pre-war years?

Mr. DISNEY. The rate is about as I have been indicating.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DISNEY. I ought not to yield; I have taken nearly an hour and I did not want to do that, but I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Can the gentleman tell the House how many wells are going out of existence annually?

Mr. DISNEY. We ordinarily figure we lose from 3,000 to 5,000 stripper wells per year. Little wells get down to nothing and you cannot profitably operate them, but you see when the price got so low we lost 15,000.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I understand the number now is about 10,000.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, in this concluding minute I should like to quote from Wirt Franklin, one of the best-posted men I have ever known in the oil business, a man who takes a statesman's view of this and puts it on a higher basis than dollars and cents. He says:

> Our only safety as a Nation depends upon our having developed at all times within the continental limits of the United States a supply of crude oil adequate for peace and war. If we depended upon sources of foreign oil and should get in a war with a first-rate power we have no guarantee that we would not lose control of our ocean lanes making it impossible to transport to this country the foreign oil. In such case we would be helpless. On the other hand, if we continue to keep up continuous discovery and development we will at all times have sufficient oil to take care of our needs both for peace and for war.

And this speech, Mr. Chairman, was made in June 1929.

It seems to me that states the case, and subsequent facts have proven it. The issue is bigger than dollars and cents and this legislation ought to pass and be on its way.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma has consumed 59 minutes.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to disagree with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] who preceded me, but I want to complain very bitterly about the procedure by which this matter is brought before the House. I realize that an important part of the machinery of the House is the petition to discharge a committee. I think that in some cases where the committee is sitting upon a bill which the House wishes considered, it is one of the guaranties of democratic procedure in the House; but I wish to assure the committee that at the present time the Committee on Banking and Currency has had no opportunity to consider this matter, and no disposition to delay it. The bill introduced by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] was filed sometime last June. I will leave it to any member of the Banking and Currency Committee, whether on the minority or the majority side, if in the meantime the Committee on Banking and Currency has not been busy practically every morning and sometimes in the afternoon. We have had before us in that time the very controversial matter of consumer subsidies, a matter which many feel to be one of the most important domestic issues before the House. We have considered also other bills, including the bill to extend the F. H. A.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HARE. Is the gentleman in position to assure the House that if this bill is not passed his committee will consider it, hold hearings, and make a report in due course?

Mr. WRIGHT. I certainly am, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], who is acting chairman of the committee, made that statement this morning, that he would be glad to hold hearings on this bill beginning next Friday to continue constantly until the matter is concluded and reported out.

What are we doing here today? We are coming before the Committee of the Whole House and asking the members to consider a very important and far-reaching bill which the Banking and Currency Committee has never had an opportunity to consider, upon which no testimony has been taken, and no study made of its relation to our over-all economy. If we adopt this procedure generally we may as well abolish the committee system; we may as well bring every matter before the House to be considered without any study, without the benefit of any testimony; and we shall as a result pass legislation which is inexpert, disorderly, and uninformed.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. WRIGHT. In just a moment; I should like to make my statement; then I shall be happy to yield to my friend.

I have always been taught by the study and reading I have done about the history of our institutions and the history of Congress that the committee system is the system which has made Congress great, because committees have an opportunity of considering in great detail important and complex questions and of listening to expert testimony on both sides of these questions before reporting a bill for the action of the House.

Then when the legislation is reported the committee members speak as experts before the House and the House customarily follows the position that they have taken.

If we follow the procedure we are following today we might as well abolish that system entirely. It is not only the people in the oil business who feel they are entitled to a raise in price but there are others. We know, for instance, that the coal men feel they should have a higher price for coal and they may be able to make out a pretty good case. I hear from Pittsburgh that the steel industry wants a higher price for steel. I hear from my good friend from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER], who claims, and in my opinion with a certain amount of justice, that the price of milk at the present time is inadequate to give a fair return to the milk producer.

What are we going to do? Are we going to pass piecemeal in the House on every bit of legislation which seeks to fix

prices and, in addition to that, Mr. Chairman, are we going to do that without the benefit of any testimony or hearings? That is what we are asked to do today. Quite frankly, I do not know much about the oil business. I wish I did. You gentlemen know that we are called upon to consider in this House such vast and complex matters that it is impossible for every Member of the House to inform himself upon every bit of business presented to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, that is the reason for the committee system.

Mr. LEWIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEWIS. Will the gentleman tell the Committee exactly when this bill came before his committee?

Mr. WRIGHT. It was before the committee last June. We have had constant hearings in the interim except for the time we were in recess during the summer. We have had constant and almost daily hearings.

Mr. LEWIS. On this bill?

Mr. WRIGHT. No, on other matters. We had the Commodity Credit Corporation bill which was before the committee and even as important as this bill is I do not think the gentleman would maintain that the Commodity Credit Corporation matter is not equally important. It had precedence as it was in the committee prior to this bill.

Mr. LEWIS. Will the gentleman say whether he thinks it is necessary for this country to maintain its oil supply inasmuch as we are using vast quantities in the war effort? Is that not a necessity?

Mr. WRIGHT. In answer to the gentleman, may I say that of course it is necessary, but in order to pass legislation upon such an important matter which not only affects the oil industry but also affects the price index of every commodity in the country we should have the benefit of testimony on both sides so that we can act in an informed manner and not act in a reckless way such as we are doing today.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. For the gentleman's information, may I say that the Naval Affairs Committee appointed a subcommittee which held hearings on this subject and made certain recommendations. I participated in hearings held by the Small Business Committee of this House. We had hearings and we made recommendations and those hearings are available to the Members of this House.

Mr. WRIGHT. Why does not the Naval Affairs Committee report a bill out of the committee having to do with the Navy situation as to oil? They could report a bill out of the committee. Here we are asked to pass on a bill that not only has to do with the Navy but with oil generally. I want to make one further point. Any one realizes that we are engaged in a tremendous task today, we are trying to hold our economy together because we appreciate that we have at stake in the war all we own and hold dear. We are operating under an economy of scarcity because we do not have enough supplies and this applies to oil as well as other commodities. Once you disturb your price structure by referring the determination of oil prices to a bureau entirely unrelated to the bureau which has been asked by this Congress to fix prices generally, you are in danger of upsetting the entire stabilization program. You cannot stop in fixing one price. You gentlemen know you are not. You will affect all prices if you meddle with this basic price. It is a matter of history in this country that one of the worst procedures in Congress in the past has been the piecemeal fixing of tariffs. We have had log-rolling, one community with another, one group or one industry interested in one commodity, another industry and another group interested in another commodity; consequently each performed the old political trick of backscratching. There was jockeying back and forth, there was no attention paid to the over-all economic interests of the country, merely a desire to improve the position of their own commodity. If you pass this bill today and attempt to pass legislatively upon the oil business you are going to be asked to do it with every other commodity that is produced in this country. I think you should realize the confusion we are going to face.

It is possible that a mistake has been made in oil regulation. Very many sincere people, including the gentleman from Oklahoma and my friend from Pennsylvania, believe that the oil industry, particularly the independent producers, is being stifled by the present prices. If that is the case, can we not in an orderly way bring the matter before a committee, can we not have a hearing, can we not tie this problem in with the rest of our price structure and let those agencies which have been appointed by the Government and authorized by this Congress to fix prices consider the matter instead of passing this bill today? Does any gentleman in this House feel that our late lamented colleague from Alabama, Mr. Steagall, and the present chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], would unfairly sit by and prevent a bill from having hearings? This is not the type of bill that a petition to discharge a committee was meant to reach, this is not the type of committee that should be discharged. The Banking and Currency Committee is willing to consider all reasonable bills and to appoint a time for hearing them as soon as possible, take testimony upon them, dispose of the bills, and report them to the House. I suggest that is what we should do today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Under previous agreement, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT]. As a matter of fact, I do not consider it is the slightest reflection upon the Banking and Currency Committee to bring this matter in by petition.

We are facing an extraordinary situation. We all know that that committee has been very busy with the Commodity Credit Corporation bill and undoubtedly it has not had the time to consider this very vital legislation. As I said once before, time is of the essence in this whole situation. This great war is being fought in Europe, thousands of men are falling by the hour on the various battle fronts in a desperate attempt to gain control of certain oil areas.

Why? Because oil is vital to their mechanized warfare. We do not know how long this war is going to last. We know it is absolutely essential almost to the life of this Nation, and certainly to the lives of hundreds of our boys, that there be no cessation in the flow of oil to our submarines, to our Navy, the largest in the world and growing larger every day, to our great fleet of airplanes, flying over the Axis countries, to our tanks, to our motorcycle corps and to others. We are simply eating up our oil reserves at a tremendous rate.

I am speaking particularly today for the stripper wells in Pennsylvania and in western New York. I think I have said before on the floor of this House that the lubricating oil that comes from the crude oil of western New York and of Pennsylvania is superior to any other lubricating oil in all the world. Almost since the day the first plane took the air, they have come into my district to get the oil to lubricate the planes, and they are doing it today. They are also doing it in the Pennsylvania field.

These stripper wells are going out of existence day by day and the machinery is being junked, it is being sold. We cannot afford that. We cannot afford to be losing 10,000 wells a year because of the low price of crude oil. Oil of the type that is being produced in Pennsylvania and western New York is almost pure gold, and far more important than gold at this stage of the war.

According to the testimony that has been offered by experts, there are only about 14 years of oil reserves in the United States of America. We do not know whether this war will last 1 year, 2 years, or 10 years. It is of the utmost importance that we have a price on crude oil that will enable the people to go out and risk their capital in trying to find new pools of oil in every part of the United States of America.

I know that this Congress realizes the seriousness of this situation, and that when the time comes to vote on this bill you will think of what it means to 7,000,000 men whose lives, as well as the ultimate result of this war, depends upon the mechanized equipment, which can only be operated by oil and by gas. So I urge you who are interested in the outcome of

this war to give your support to this bill, regardless of the fact that it has been brought in here under a procedure which in ordinary times none of us would approve.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman from New York, as always, is making a constructive and realistic contribution to this debate. There is one point the gentleman has omitted. What about the hundreds of thousands of workmen in this country who must get to the factories in their automobiles to produce the machinery and equipment for war?

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman for the contribution. They must also get there to operate the machinery upon which they work to produce the goods for this war.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. In other words, the critical situation which exists in the oil industry justifies the drastic action taken in bringing forth the discharge petition?

Mr. REED of New York. Certainly. It is no reflection on the committee.

GENERAL

Crude oil requirements for United States refineries for military and essential civilian use are at record levels and are increasing steadily under the further impact of the war. Production of domestic crude oil has been substantially exceeding discoveries of new crude oil reserves since 1938, and, as a result, United States crude oil productive capacity has been declining steadily and is no longer sufficient to meet future minimum requirements of United States refineries. The importation of foreign crude oil is not a certain answer to our inadequate domestic crude supply because there are definite limitations on productive capacity, particularly in the Caribbean area, as well as limitations on refinery and transportation facilities in the Middle East. The crude oil supply program for the Western Hemisphere provides for full utilization of all productive capacity in the United States and the Caribbean area, but this will still leave a shortage of the proper types of crude oil. In order to reverse the declining trend in new reserve discoveries and thereby provide a safe margin of domestic productive capacity, it is necessary that the economic health of the producing branch of the domestic petroleum industry be improved through the 35 cents per barrel increase in crude oil price ceilings recommended by P. A. W. Higher crude oil prices are necessary because the costs of finding a barrel of new crude oil reserves have approximately quadrupled since the middle 1930's while production costs have also gone up substantially. It is necessary that domestic producers be given the financial means, through a price increase, for expanding exploratory operations and increasing secondary recovery operations and rehabilitation work and preventing premature abandonment of stripper wells, in order that a safe margin of domestic crude oil productive capacity may be provided for the war program.

ANNUAL DISCOVERIES NEW CRUDE OIL RESERVES

(NOTE.—Revisions and extensions are credited back to year of discovery)

The chief significance of this graph is the sharp decline in the discovery of new reserves that has taken place since 1938.

First panel—Total discoveries

The declining trend in new reserve discoveries indicated in this panel must be reversed.

(1) Four years ended December 31, 1938, new reserve discoveries averaged 2,041,000,000 barrels annually.

(2) Four years ended December 31, 1942, new reserve discoveries averaged 941,000,000 barrels annually, or a drop of 1,100,000,000 barrels annually.

(3) In year ended December 31, 1942, new reserve discoveries totaled only 507,000,000 barrels.

(4) Four years ended December 31, 1938, new reserve discoveries exceeded average annual production by 894,000,000 barrels annually.

(5) Four years ended December 31, 1942, average annual production exceeded new reserve discoveries by 410,000,000 barrels annually.

Second panel—Reserves per new field discovered

It is necessary to discover more and more new fields to reverse the declining trend in new reserve discoveries.

(1) Ninety new fields were found in 1934.

(2) Three hundred and eight new fields were found in 1942.

(3) In 1934, discoveries for each new field averaged 24,750,000 barrels.

(4) In 1942, discoveries for each new field averaged only 1,650,000 barrels.

(5) The quality of new fields discovered has been declining steadily.

Third panel—Reserve per wildcat well drilled

It is estimated that at least 5,000 wildcat wells should be drilled annually.

(1) In 1937, 2,224 wildcat wells were drilled.

(2) In 1942, 3,219 wildcat wells were drilled.

(3) In 1937, average new reserves discovered per wildcat well drilled totaled 934,000 barrels.

(4) In 1942, average new reserves discovered per wildcat well drilled totaled 158,000 barrels.

(5) It is necessary to drill more and more wildcat wells in order to reverse present decline in new reserve discoveries.

Source of reserves data: Reserves Division, P. A. W.

CRUDE-OIL PRICES COMPARED WITH OIL-WELL-DRILLING ACTIVITY

An increase in crude-oil prices is necessary to increase the rate of drilling activity, especially of exploratory wells:

(1) The number of producing oil wells drilled increases when crude prices go up and decreases when crude prices go down.

(2) The drilling of dry holes, which is another rough gage of exploratory activity, increases when prices go up and decreases when crude prices go down.

(3) Past peaks in drilling activity have coincided with peaks in crude-oil prices.

(4) Sufficient materials and manpower will be available to permit increased prices to perform their historic function of expanding drilling activity.

Source of data: Bureau of Mines.

PRICE OF CRUDE OIL VERSUS CHANGE IN NUMBER OF OIL WELLS IN OPERATION

Recommended price advance will cause many presently shut-in wells to be placed back in production and will retard the rate at which other wells are abandoned:

(1) Declines in crude-oil prices cause wells to be taken out of production.

(2) Increases in crude-oil prices cause wells to be put back into production.

(3) Sufficient materials and manpower will be available to permit operators to put wells back into operation at higher crude-oil prices.

Source of data: Bureau of Mines, 1926–42; Geological Survey and Department of Commerce, 1918–25, year-end data.

CRUDE OIL PRICE INDEX COMPARED TO INDEX OF RAW MATERIAL PRICES

If crude oil prices had shown the same percentage increase as all raw material prices between June 1941 and September 1942, crude oil prices would have increased to about $1.49 per barrel by September 1943. This is without regard to whether crude oil prices were frozen in June 1941 in the proper relationship to the general price structure.

(1) In June 1941, when crude oil prices were unofficially frozen, the crude oil price index was reported at 58.9.

(2) In June 1941, the index of all raw material prices was reported at 83.6.

(3) In September 1943, the index of raw material prices was reported at 112.4.

(4) In September 1943, the index of crude oil prices was still reported at 58.9.

(5) All raw material prices increased 35 percent from June 1941 to September 1943, while crude oil prices remained stationary.

Source of data: This graph is based on Bureau of Labor Statistics wholesale price indexes—1926 equals 100. Crude price used in this index is Mid-Continent 33–33.9° gravity.

EXPENDITURES FOR EXPLORATION PER BARREL OF RESERVES DISCOVERED

The oil operator is in the position of a merchant selling a low-cost item off his shelves at a profit, but forced to replace it with a high-cost item on which he will not be able to show a profit at present frozen price levels. Although he is presently showing profits, he is doing so at the cost of liquidating his assets.

(1) Finding costs have increased sharply since the middle thirties largely because of the decline in reserve discoveries per wildcat well drilled, but also because of the increased cost of geophysical and geological work and the increased cost of drilling.

(2) The cost of replacing the crude oil currently being produced has increased sharply. A large part of present production is coming from fields discovered in a period when finding costs averaged 12 to 15 cents per barrel. If producers cannot afford to replace the crude oil currently being produced, the net balance of crude oil reserves will continue to decline.

(3) The present frozen crude oil price structure was geared to a finding cost figure of around 12 to 15 cents per barrel. It must now be geared to the higher finding cost figure of 50 to 60 cents per barrel. A price increase is necessary for this purpose.

Source of data: Reserves Division, P. A. W.

WHO WILL BEAR PROPOSED PRICE INCREASE

The amount of the price increase that will be borne by the public is relatively small for any single class of consumer.

(1) P. A. W. estimates total annual cost of recommended crude price advance, based on third quarter 1943 consumption, at about $500,000,000.

(2) O. P. A. has estimated annual cost of price advance at $552,000,000.

(3) In its estimate of the cost of crude price advance, O. P. A. has failed to consider that a portion of the crude run by the refiner is used by him for refinery fuel, either in the form of crude oil, still gases, or residual fuel oil. The cost of crude or products so used by the refiner will have to be absorbed in part by him and will not be passed along to the consumer.

(4) This accounts for the difference between the P. A. W. and O. P. A. estimates of the cost of the price advance.

(5) Based on consumption in the third quarter of 1942, 32 percent of the price advance would have been borne by the Federal Government through military purchases.

(6) As military purchases expand still further, an even larger proportion of the total cost will be borne by the Federal Government.

(7) Only 15 percent of the price advance will be borne by passenger car operators.

(8) Utilities will bear only slightly more than 2 percent of cost of price increase.

Source of data: Production Division, P. A. W.

NOTE.—The cost per year of the recommended crude price advance is equal to less than 2 days' cost of the war. Total war expenditure averaged $280,000,000 daily in the 5 months through September 1943, or $560,000,000 for a 2-day period.

EFFECT OF PROPOSED PRICE INCREASE ON REPRESENTATIVE CONSUMERS

It is not anticipated by P. A. W. that there will be any resistance to these moderate price increases, and it is expected by P. A. W. that representative consumers will gladly pay slightly higher prices, especially when they know it is for the purpose of protecting and augmenting the petroleum supply for fighting the war, and for essential civilian purposes.

(1) The average passenger car operator will be required to pay only $2.97 a year additional for gasoline.

(2) The average home owner will be required to pay only $17 a year additional to heat his home with fuel oil.

(3) The average truck operator will be required to pay only $10.06 additional per year for his gasoline.

(4) The average operator of the farm tractor will be required to pay only $4.96 additional per year for his gasoline.

(5) The price increase will not be a burden to representative consumers.

(6) Increased costs resulting from price advance will be insignificant part of total operating expense for most classes of industrial consumers.

Source of data: Production and Marketing Division, P. A. W.

UNITED STATES CRUDE OIL PRODUCTION AND REQUIREMENTS

(1) Crude oil production has met requirements in the past. Until recently productive capacity has been in excess of crude requirements.

(2) Anticipated future demand for United States crude oil is projected at record levels.

(3) If there is no exploratory drilling, crude oil productive capacity will decline drastically.

(4) If wildcat drilling continues at recent rates, crude oil productive capacity will still decline substantially. Although it is likely that 3,400 wildcat wells will be drilled in 1943, there is no assurance that this rate of wildcat drilling will continue in subsequent years under existing economic conditions.

(5) Additional productive capacity will be added through rehabilitation and secondary recovery. Rehabilitation including reopening of some wells presently shut-in will account for about 50 percent of the increment in this segment, the balance will be due to increased secondary recovery operations.

(6) If 5,000 wildcat wells are drilled annually, the decline in productive capacity will be reversed and new productive capacity will build up to substantial proportions in the next several years. There is no certainty that a 35-cent per barrel increase will cause 5,000 wildcat wells to be drilled annually.

(7) If 5,000 wildcat wells were actually drilled each year as a result of the price increase and if the rehabilitation and secondary recovery results shown in the chart were achieved, domestic productive capacity would be sufficient to provide a substantial cushion against any failure on the part of the foreign program to be fully met. It would also provide a cushion of crude oil supply for the post-war period.

Source of data: Production Division, P. A. W.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, we approach a decisive step. It is one that we have hesitated to take. It is apparent now that our hesitancy, which came from our acquiescence in the administration's professed ability to manage the war economy, has lasted too long.

The Congress voted to the administration the most sweeping authority to coordinate all the phases of military, industrial and civilian effort. The administration asserted that in no other way except by a completely managed economy could the war be prosecuted to a victorious conclusion.

The Congress conferred, among other phases of authority, the power to regulate prices to the end that inflation might be avoided and excessive living costs prevented. But there was also implied in the price control act the direction to see that essential production should not be stifled through the operation of the act.

We are now considering today the oil situation. From the very beginning of price control there has been a determination on the part of the controllers to see that nothing was done to increase the productive capacity of the oil industry in the United States.

Price is the crux of the situation. No oil producer can pay out more than he takes in. No oil producer can go out and take the kind of chances needed to discover big new fields under the prices he is getting today—and has been getting ever since we entered the defense program which preceded our actual participation in the war. The producers cannot maintain even their present wells in efficient producing condition unless they have more money. They have demonstrated this by selling thousands of the small wells to the salvage dealer and abandoning them forever, and the oil lost.

This condition is nothing that has been discovered overnight. It was made known to the price control authorities long ago—two and a half years ago.

We need spend no more time in analyzing the reasons for our present and constantly growing shortage. The O. P. A. and those above it took an arbitrary stand on the price question at the outset, and they have maintained their stubborn resistance in the face of all facts and all logic. They offer no program for relief of the conditions. They have nothing in prospect except further reductions in the amount of petroleum products for the civilian users.

Theirs is the responsibility for present conditions. It will be partly our responsibility if we permit a continuance of the do-nothing policy.

The price increase was due 2½ years ago. Long before now it would have shown results. The productive capacity of the Nation's fields would be greater. That has been time wasted.

There is no excuse for letting this go on any longer. Of course, a price increase now will not get us more oil in a week or a month. There are no miracles in sight. It is going to take hard work and continuous effort to get the supply up to the point where the essential needs are met. It will take time to repair the damage that has been done.

But we must make a start, and the sooner we do it the sooner the results will appear. A price increase large enough in size will set the oil producers in motion again. They have been frozen along with their price.

More money will bring the drilling of many additional wildcats of the kind that we need. In the past 2 years they have been drilling for small results—staying close to the established fields—and thus trying to reduce their chances of total loss. Small fields are what they have found. They are going to have to go into wholly unexplored territory and seek the larger results.

They will get those greater results if enough of them go to work. There has never yet been a better method of finding these new fields than that of having a great many people looking for them. The country has plenty of prospects left. This theory that we had run out of territory to explore was invented by the O. P. A. as another excuse for refusing the price increase. It has no support from the men who really know oil.

Just last week one of the country's eminent geologists said that we have enough oil reserves in the United States, including those to be discovered, to last a century. The important point is that most of this has to be discovered and that it will take a great deal of drilling and many failures to do the finding. We know that the finding will not be done under the price that is now paid for crude oil.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, the discoveries have yet to be made, but there are 20,000,000,000 barrels whose location is known. It takes money to get that out of the ground. The producers have to keep on coaxing and stimulating the wells to get them to maintain their yield. There are many known methods of doing this. Old wells can be cleaned out, shot with nitroglycerin, some of them treated

with acid. Secondary recovery methods can be applied to old fields and the production greatly increased. These are all methods which have been used for years and they are of established value. They were never so badly needed as now. Little is being done to make available to the consumers and to the military program this 20,000,000,000 barrels at a rate faster than is possible under the present routine operating programs and nothing will be done under the present prices.

We have a choice to make here today. We can let this oil situation drift along and by this time next year, if they do not find a method of doing it sooner, the people of the Nation will have told all of us what they think of us. That is one way we can perform, one course we can follow; just do as the O. P. A. has done and do nothing about it.

The other course is plain and it will get some oil for the Nation. We can act here to end this policy begotten of some philosophies, inimical to the welfare of the people, and of the hold-the-line program.

The line has been held. It has been held against an increase in the oil-producing capacity of the Nation, while millions upon millions have been added to the national debt by such fantastic affairs as the Canol project.

Let us turn the domestic oil producers loose and let them get to work. They will find and produce the oil. They always have. The war did not put an end to their ability nor snuff out their knowledge. The oil resources of the Nation have not dried up. Never before in the history of the oil industry of the United States has the industry failed to meet all the demands that were made upon it. Its only failure was caused by the maladministration of an act of Congress.

It is our duty today to our men in the armed services and to those at home who are trying to keep the Nation going to give the price agencies their directions on how to meet this oil crisis. If we do not, then we must prepare ourselves for complete national demoralization.

In conclusion, I might add, a finer and more patriotic and more devoted group of Americans never lived than the oil producers. Even though they have been badly treated they did not lay down their tools; they have stayed on the job doing their best with the limited money available. Even though labor and materials have advanced several hundred percent, they continue to supply the oil at 1941 levels. The oil producer has turned in a magnificent record in this all-out war effort. They deserve the consideration and the heartiest commendations of the Members of Congress for the excellence of their performance.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, acting for the gentleman from Oklahoma, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, the bill pending before us would increase the present price of crude oil. In my judgment, such increase is necessary. Today in the midst of our supreme war effort our supply of vital oil is rapidly dwindling, yet few new fields are being explored and stripper wells are being abandoned before they have yielded their full potentialities of the fuel so essential to the success of our mechanized might on the battlefield and our security at home.

Why does this alarming situation exist? In large measure it must be attributed to the present low price of crude oil in the midst of rising costs of production and the upkeep of wells which make it so hazardous for the producers of our oil to risk new exploration or provide for the reworking of old wells. To meet this situation the hope of possible fair returns must be accorded those upon whom we must depend to take the chance of assuring our adequate supply and the proper utilization of the sources at our command.

Mr. Chairman, we are dealing today with no ordinary situation and no ordinary commodity. Without petroleum and its products our planes could not fly, our ships could not operate, and our tanks could not roll. Oil is a vital requirement also of our commercial life and our domestic comfort and welfare. And of oil there is only one crop. A scarcity of corn or wheat may be relieved by the next annual yield. Of oil there is one yield and one yield only.

In this war and in the peace to follow our national progress and our international relationships are very largely dependent upon our supply of oil. In war and in peace we need it imperatively to hold the line abroad and at home, and the legislation now proposed is an effort to get it up to the line in order that it may play its important and strengthening part. In the price indexes it occupies today a low and dangerous level in the plan of preservation of our present and future security.

Ah, but some will say, though we know it is highly important in this war and the subsequent peace, though we realize if another war should come we may a generation from now find ourselves deprived of it, still it must be borne in mind that a price increase of crude oil would likely lead to a slight increase in the cost of gasoline to the consumer. First, let me remind you that when the price of oil was at its highest peak the long range and permanent results effected many economies for the consumer. That is graphically shown on one of the charts which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] explained. But more important still, let me remind you that if we do not give an impetus to production in the light of our rapidly diminishing known reserves and supply, the consequent scarcity of oil and its products in the relatively near future will increase immeasurably the price the consumer will have to pay. This bill has but one purpose, and that is to effect and stimulate and assure insofar as possible the production that will protect the Nation and its people in both their collective and individual capacities.

What is the situation today? We all know that the Secretary of the Interior and those associated with him in an investigation of our petroleum status have labored diligently to find the accurate answer to that question. As a result of that inquiry and research, the Secretary has recently had published two articles, each of which appears in a magazine of national circulation. His article in the January number of the Amercan is entitled, "We're Running Out of Oil." Any student of this problem knows that statement is true. In support of it the Secretary says, among other things:

> As we begin to take stock of our own petroleum supplies, the first thing that arrests us is the indisputable fact that if there should be a World War III it would have to be fought with someone else's petroleum, because the United States wouldn't have it. * * *
>
> We furnished 80 percent of the petroleum that was used in winning World War I, and I believe it will be shown ultimately that we are putting up 95 percent of the aviation gasoline which is being used to blast the Hitlers and the Tojos from their strongholds and the Quislings from their burrows. * * *
>
> We know that we are passing over the threshold from an oil-exporting Nation to an oil-importing one. * * * Consumption has been outdistancing our new discoveries. * * * We can now be certain that our known reserves have a relatively short life expectancy of 14 years and it is up to us to take out some form of mutual insurance. * * * So badly has our natural crude supply been hit that there can be no doubt as to our future dependence upon imports or synthetic production.

Those staggering statements must challenge our attention and our action. Their very serious import is further enhanced by another article by the Secretary of the Interior in a recent issue of Collier's magazine, in which he said:

> At the risk of being called a scarcity-monger, or something even worse, I insist that we must proceed without further delay to produce gasoline from coal.

The Secretary labels this article as a "Must" for America. A bill with such purpose has already passed the Senate, and a similar bill has been reported by a House committee and is now on the calendar. Such provision for additional supply may be necessary, but in all fairness the consumer must be reminded in advance that gasoline from such a source will necessarily involve a much higher price from his standpoint than could possibly arise from the increased production contemplated by the pending bill. And in the measure passed by the Senate for the establishment of plants to experiment with reference to the production of petroleum from coal and oil shale, $30,000,000 of the taxpayers' money is requested as an initial appropriation.

I repeat that our serious situation may require this research also in order to assure proper reserves, but let it be kept in mind that the risk and hazard of increasing our production under the bill now before us will fall not upon the taxpayers but upon private industry and private capital. Those venturesome spirits that undertake it will bear, but bear willingly, the burden of the high cost of dry holes. The taxpayer and the consumer will profit from their successes, but they alone will suffer the loss of their

failures. Surely some honor is due to those brave souls who make the hazardous tests for new fields of production. To the majority of them their efforts bring more heartaches than happiness. In the main they are the independents who have no refineries, no pipe lines, no service stations from which to recoup any losses in production or price their labors may involve. How wonderfully they serve to keep alive the vigorous spirit of free American enterprise!

We have had, and very properly, much comment and discussion concerning our place in world-wide aviation when this war is over. It is a matter of vital importance in our post-war plans and purposes. We shall have the planes. We shall have the pilots. Will we have the oil? Without it the planes and the pilots will be idle.

Where will we get it? Our own crude oil productive capacity under existing circumstances has shown a steady decrease and is insufficient to meet future minimum requirements of our country's refineries. Shall we rely upon foreign production? That is necessarily an uncertain factor, and it must be remembered that post-war competition in the activities involving the use of petroleum may restrict our opportunity for such supply. Discovery and production costs have advanced by leaps and bounds within our own borders. Our only certain safety must be predicated upon our own sufficiency to meet our needs. We must obviate the premature abandonment of stripper wells that are capable of furnishing so much of our requirements and we must encourage the exploratory operations that will open up new sources of supply.

Are there such new sources to cheer us as we face a future petroleum production in this country otherwise gloomy and depressing? It is certainly gratifying that we have rather confident assurances in this regard. Besides the new fields which may be found, there are abundantly hopeful prospects in the drilling to probable deeper pools in many parts of our land. Such exploration is expensive, but there are many who with even the moderate incentive of this bill are ready and willing to undertake it. Some are sufficiently confident to believe that as much as 90 percent of our possible production is still untapped. We need that patriotic enthusiasm and the results its proper encouragement will bring. Let us give American genius and American ingenuity a fair chance to operate. We shall certainly face a crisis if we don't.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. May I ask this question for information. We have passed the Connally Hot Oil Act which limited the production of oil wells in most of our States, I believe. Is that not true?

Mr. LANHAM. It makes it a Federal offense to move oil in interstate commerce that was produced in violation of the laws of the State in which produced.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Does that limitation still obtain?

Mr. LANHAM. That is my understanding, but I can think of nothing more urgent for us to do at this time with reference to petroleum than to take such steps as may be necessary to assure our safety and our security in this war and in the place that our Nation will occupy in world trade and world relationships when this war is over.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I want to say, as I previously stated, that I am opposed to the bill presently under consideration.

Mr. Chairman, in yesterday's press there was a statement from the secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in which he opposed the provisions of the so-called Lucas-Green soldiers' vote bill. In doing so, he consoled himself by saying that our State at least did have a law which was better than the law of some States and better than no law in other States. He went further and said it was a model soldiers' voting law.

I am quite sure that the secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania did not make this statement without previous review, censoring, and approval on the part of Joe Pew, because it would be a little bit of history if any official of a Republican State administration in Pennsylvania would make any statement publicly on any issue without previous approval by Mr. Pew, who controls and dominates the Republican Party in Pennsylvania and a great many other places throughout the Nation.

Let us see just how fine a law we have in Pennsylvania permitting the soldiers to vote. First of all, a soldier cannot secure a ballot to vote in Pennsylvania elections without requesting it by mail at least 30 days prior to an election.

In the congressional elections in Pennsylvania a year ago when Members of this House were elected, in the city of Philadelphia, which has a voting registration of approximately 1,000,000 and about 160,000 men serving in the armed forces, less than 700 soldiers cast bollots. In the recent municipal election in Philadelphia, out of a total vote of about 650,000, about 1,200 to 1,500 soldiers voted.

He ignores entirely the fact that those soldiers who have been inducted into the armed forces or who have enlisted before they are 21 years of age are in effect disfranchised by the Pennsylvania voting law because under our law they must be registered, and there is little opportunity for any serviceman to register while he is serving in the armed forces.

Our secretary says he takes his stand because of State sovereignty. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to him and I want to say to others, who pretend to have so much regard for States' rights, that the quickest way to destroy the sovereignty of the States in this Union is to use that issue always to retard progress and to deprive American citizens of their constitutional rights. I know no quicker way to destroy the sovereignty of the States than to continually use that issue to deprive American citizens of the rights which they are guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States.

I hope the committee of the House which is presently considering the soldiers' vote bill will bring in a committee amendment that will materially change the provisions of the bill as it left the Senate. If it does not, it is my intention when that bill is on the floor of this House to offer an amendment, which will contain the provisions of or provisions similar to the Lucas-Green bill, in order that this House may have an opportunity to give the soldiers who are fighting our battles the right to cast their ballots in this next election.

I hope that Republicans and Democrats, that Members on both sides of the aisle, will join me for that purpose when we consider that legislation, so that those who are out in all corners of the world will not be deprived of their right to vote in the Presidential election.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. I think the gentleman need not have worried about the fact that his discussion had some relevancy to the bill, because I understand Mr. Pew is at least slightly interested in oil, is he not?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is correct. Mr. Pew is interested in a lot of things, among which I believe is oil.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, so far as I know, not one drop of oil is produced in my congressional district. If it were produced I think I would know it, because I know every cowpath and hog trail in that district, which is bigger than Massachusetts in area. But I wish to say my people use gasoline and oil, when they can get it, in the mines, on the farms, and in the forests, and they would not object to paying a fraction of 1 cent more on a gallon of gas, provided they could get the gas. They cannot get it today, Mr. Chairman, for the reason that under present O. P. A. regulations and ceilings oil operators in this country cannot receive the cost of production. More than 10,000 stripper wells have been shut down this year. The situation is fast becoming critical. It seems to me that the price consideration in this present measure is

of secondary importance. The big and important thing, the thing that is of paramount consideration, is to maintain and increase production. That is what we need. That is what we must have, not only to maintain our domestic economy but to win this war. We all know that oil, next to food, is the most strategic, critical, and necessary item in the whole war program, and unless we have it in sufficient quantities this war could well be lost. Mr. Chairman, however much different Members of the House might differ with Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, and many times I have differed with him, and often violently, I wish to say that that old salty, self-styled "curmudgeon" is controlled by nobody except himself. I think he spends a lot of time even arguing with himself, which is a pretty good thing for any man to do. When I look at Harold Ickes I do not know whether to kiss him or kick him. At times I would not take a million dollars for him. I am sure I would not give 15 cents for another one like him. But I have read carefully the 2 splendid articles he has written to which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] has referred, and every Member of this House, if he had read those articles, would not hesitate one moment to vote for this pending bill. In spite of all the criticism that might be leveled against the Secretary of the Interior, I do believe he is a man of ability, and I think he knows more about the present oil situation in this country than any other individual in the whole country. For that reason and others, that I do not now have the time to enumerate, I am pleased to give my hearty approval to this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, for over a year now there have been a number of Members of this House who have been intensely interested in the attempt to get the price of oil up a little closer to the parity line that Mr. DISNEY spoke of this morning. We have pointed out many times that a higher price must be had, some profit must be had to get the proper production. We have also pointed out many times that we have been using more oil than we have been producing for the past year. We cannot expect finally to have enough oil to supply the Army and Navy and military forces, if we attempt to try to hold down the price of oil to about 60 percent of parity in comparison with the general commodity index of prices. For that reason this bill has been petitioned out on the floor of the House. Now we have an opportunity to correct an economic and fundamental problem that is before the Congress which lies heavily upon the minds of the people of this country. We have expanded the Army and Navy many times. We must have oil for our ships, tanks, trucks, and planes. This is a war measure. We might yet prolong or lose the war for lack of oil. We can go forward today by passing this bill in the hope that it will be sustained by the other departments of Government, and in the hope that it will help to bring greater production of oil. It will bring forth greater production and will bring much needed relief to our civilian economy. If we fail today we may turn on to the subsidy route, that has been advised by the administration. We cannot afford to take a chance on such a course. I must agree with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] that subsidies will not produce oil; that they are more likely to drill for subsidies than they are to drill for oil.

So I think the choice is easily made. We should, and in my judgment we will, pass this measure by a splendid majority, and when we have done this it does seem to me that we have put the power in the proper place and we have provided for a minimum raise and established a sort of parity policy wherein other inequities can be taken care of by those whose duty it is to take care of them and we can have a sort of over-all, even balance of the price of oil. The Congress, by this bill, can make the price practically mandatory to a certain extent in line with the thought of the people of this country and then we will not have to listen and the people will not have to suffer by having arbitrary and unfair and unjust prices put upon a commodity like oil that is holding down production.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Does not the gentleman feel many people in our country have the erroneous impression that all oil men are millionaires? Of course, they read of the gusher that is struck and of the rare individual case where a man can make a million dollars, but they fail to consider the thousands of dry holes drilled at great expense all over the country and they fail to consider that capital will not risk itself unless it is given a fair profit.

Mr. VURSELL. I think the gentleman from Missouri is quite right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Disney bill. I do not want to rehash a lot of facts and figures that has already been discussed. This situation has been discussed by me in several speeches previously appearing in the RECORD. It seems to me that we all agree that we are faced with a petroleum crisis. Further, we all agree that something must be done. We have the anomalous situation of some half dozen committees of this Congress investigating the petroleum situation and all recommending the need for a substantial increase in price.

The Petroleum Industry War Council, composed of petroleum experts from all over the country, have long been recommending that an increase in price be given.

The Petroleum Administration for War, headed by Secretary Ickes, has several times recommended an increase in the price of crude oil of not less than 35 cents per barrel.

The only instrumentality of this Government that has refused to acknowledge the immediate importance of an increase in the price of crude oil is the Office of Price Administration, and even that agency recognizes that a crisis faces the country and that something ought to be done.

Now, this is not an oil producer's bill, although many small independent oil men are going broke under the existing price structure. This is an oil consumer's bill. This is a war measure. In this age of machines and motors, and mechanized war, there is nothing so important to both the war effort and the domestic economy of this country as oil, with the one exception of food.

Reference has been made to the fact that we have spent some $150,000,000 already on the Canol oil project in Canada. Reference has been made to the money spent and requested for experimentation on synthetic oil production. Is it not an absurd and ridiculous situation that in a country where we could and would discover much additional new petroleum reserves with an increase in the price of crude oil, we hold that commodity down to around 58 percent of parity? It is the only thing in our whole range of vital commodity products that is held down to such a low price, and the one thing that is absolutely essential to keep both domestic and war machines going.

For the first time since the first oil well was drilled in this country there are being closed down in Texas this year more wells than are being drilled. There are literally thousands and thousands of marginal wells. They cannot continue to operate at a loss. This stripper well production is a vital part of the entire picture, particularly when petroleum products are scarce. Let me remind you that we have not even begun to experience the hardships of gasoline rationing as compared with what we will experience within 12 months unless something is done to increase crude-oil production. If the war continues, by this time next year, the A and B coupons will probably be entirely eliminated. Half the domestic vehicles now operating may be put up in garages, and most of us will probably be walking to work. Many essential trucks will be laid up in garages because they will not have gasoline to operate.

So we are confronted with a situation that must be handled, and handled immediately. Some folks say that these oil men are making a lot of money or they would not continue to produce oil. Many of them are remaining in business on the slim hope that we will get something through this Congress and get an increase in the price of crude oil before it is too late.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to observe that we only get $1.10 for crude oil in Montana.

Mr. GOSSETT. Well, the price varies. It is an average of something like $1.17 per barrel. I want to give you some figures which may seem facetious but which illustrate the point. One gallon of Coca-Cola sirup sells for $3. One gallon of beer sells for 60 cents. One gallon of milk sells for 45 cents. One gallon of vinegar sells for 30 cents. One gallon of drinking water 5 cents. One gallon of crude oil sells for 3 cents. Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to gamble with further petroleum shortages.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I was interested, as many other Members were interested, in the brief colloquy between the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY] when they discussed the matter of holding the line. I agree with the reply of the sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY], when he says that it is not so much a matter of holding the line against inflation as it is to allow these men who are in this industry to bring the price of crude oil up near the line. I believe an upward price is a necessary oil-production stimulus which can and properly should be stressed again and again in the discussion of this proposal this afternoon.

It has been mentioned by other members that there is a terriffic drain upon the petroleum pools of this country in the prosecution of the war. Certainly that is true—true because this is a mechanized war. It is being fought on wheels and wings, and the resources of America, not only from the standpoint of the materials which go into the construction of mechanized units but also the fueling of those mechanized units, is of tremendous importance.

I believe this House would like to know that which has been brought to my attention—perhaps it is not particularly new to you—that when we have one of these 60-minute bomber raids over occupied Europe, or over a target in Germany, with approximately 700 or 800 planes taking part in the armada which goes on the mission, there are consumed approximately 1,000,000 gallons of high-octane gasoline.

To produce that 1,000,000 gallons of high-octane gasoline we have to draw from the earth approximately 4,000,000 gallons of crude oil because the ratio is approximately 1 to 4.

The Acting Petroleum Administrator for War, Mr. Davies, in writing a letter to me under date of November 8, 1943, said that—

> We are faced with a shortage of crude oil supply, that discovery and development of new crude oil reserves have not kept pace with the mounting demands of the armed forces and essential civilian requirements for petroleum products.

As of today, Mr. Chairman, we are faced with a daily deficiency of approximately 175,000 to 200,000 barrels of crude oil in the operation of this war and in meeting the necessary civilian needs at home. By the end of 1944 this figure, according to the P. A. W. experts, including Mr. Ickes and Mr. Davies, who are charged with this responsibility, will amount to the figure of 300,000 barrels daily.

If this happens we shall become an importing country from the standpoint of petroleum because our oil resources in America cannot keep pace with the demand. It is important to consider that, of the 20 oil-producing States, there are 14 which have decreasing oil reserves. In our State of West Virginia we have had downward spirals for a 3-year period. In 1940 we had a reserve of 52,000,000 barrels; in 1941 it was 50,000,000. Last year it had dropped to 47,000,000—a decrease of 5,000,000 barrels.

There is no oil production in the congressional district which I represent. I was born and lived my early youth, however, in a section of West Virginia which was once a substantial oil and gas area. My father was a producer, and I can recall seeing derricks rise on a hundred hills. I remember, even now, the sturdy driller, the robust tool dresser, the patient pumper. The operator was, and is, in a venturesome business. In time of peace he needs encouragement. With our Nation at war his very existence, and the welfare of our country, are dependent on courageous action by Congress.

I am not particularly interested today in denouncing the Office of Price Administration and praising the Petroleum Administrator for War. I wish the debate would not hinge so much on that sort of premise. I do say, however, that I fear very much there are too many individuals today in the structure of the Office of Price Administration who, when they consider oil production, fail to be practical.

I feel that those men who go out into the wildcatting fields, those individuals who work with the small producing areas and those other operators who have the stripper wells, should be given relief. Those pathfinders who take the chance, who operate on a slim margin—and many of them, as has been truly said today, are losing whatever financial backlog they have as they drill for war production—must be considered. It is, Mr. Chairman, harder to get the necessary oil from the ground by using a drill bit than it is by using any yardstick of the pencil, a map, or a chart.

Members of Congress, when convinced a gross inequity exists, cannot be expected to remain inactive from the standpoint of legislative functioning. As for myself I am convinced, after careful study of all factors, that this bill before us today is meritorious.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 11 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] 45; and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] 13.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, when the idea of increasing the price of oil 35 cents a barrel was first proposed to me I was inclined to agree that it should be done if it could be done in the regular way and through the regular agencies that this Congress has set up for the purpose of allowing price increases or rolling back prices; and on that basis I favored the measure; but if we, the House of Representatives, the Congress, in other words, are going to start out on a foray of raising every price that every pressure group brings in and makes a case for, we might just as well repeal O. P. A. and all the other agencies we have set up for the purpose of controlling inflation. We cannot go on the basis that this will be the only increase requested, for already there are the railroad men coming in, other groups will be coming in, other producers will be coming in, the steel people, the coal people will come in and I suppose later on the cotton people will come in, then the wheat people, then the rest of them will come in, and finally we just have not got any price control at all and Congress itself, instead of being a legislative body, will become the executive body of the Government and it will say what prices are to be paid for what. I want to say to my friends who are proposing other measures of a similar nature that they are making a very grave mistake when they ask Congress not to legislate but to execute. In other words, that ancient principle of the separation of powers.

H. R. 2887, brought to the floor on a petition, provides that the control of petroleum products be removed from the jurisdiction of O. P. A. and placed under the jurisdiction of the Petroleum Administrator.

The purpose of this measure is, in fact, to secure for oil producers an additional 35 cents per barrel for crude oil. The bill does not say so, but that is its objective.

I regret that I cannot support this measure for the reason that it is just one more attempt to chip away the powers of O. P. A., and bring about an increase in the price of one more commodity.

I could not consistently vote against a bill to abolish subsidies and thus permit food products to rise on the one hand and vote for an increase in the price of petroleum products the next day.

This congress directed the President to stabilize prices and wages. This he has tried to do. Not altogether successfully, but on the whole pretty well.

If Congress now wants to take back its directive, it can do so. But for God's sake do it openly and honestly and directly.

This chipping away process is a dangerous and devious method.

It is just as our courageous Speaker said a few days ago on the floor of this House.

Ceiling prices for the other fellow, but not for me.

That way, gentlemen, lies chaos and black night. I want no part in it.

The mere fact that only one side has been presented, that the proper committee has been bypassed, indicates that the proponents fear a hearing by the proper committee of the House.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

PRICE INCREASE SHOULD BE MADE REGULARLY AND NOT BY LAW

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious step that the House is about to take. There are two ways to increase the price of a commodity or to decrease it. One is by legislation, and the other is through the executive branch of our Government. The Constitution very wisely defined the powers of each. Any time the legislative branch assumes the functions and power and duties of the executive branch we shall be criticized and shall become just as vulnerable as the executive branch of the Government when it undertakes to usurp the functions of the legislative branch.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DISNEY. There are two ways that we can affect prices. One is by direct legislation, and the other is by delegation of power to the executive department.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. DISNEY. The executive department has no power over prices at all except what Congress delegates to it.

Mr. PATMAN. There is no difference of opinion there at all, I may state to the gentleman from Oklahoma, but when he said we delegate power to fix prices I remind him there are 8,000,000 different commodities.

Obviously the Congress cannot fix the price of 8,000,000 different commodities. It would be the old tariff logrolling at its worst if we would attempt to fix all prices. This just happens to be oil. I am from an oil section of the country. There is oil produced in the district I represent, and it would be of interest to the people I represent, but I would rather they have dollars, although fewer dollars, that are worth more money than to have a lot more dollars that are worth much less. We are on the verge of a dangerous situation, an inflation condition that is just about to break out in this country, and any time it does our dollars will not be worth 10 cents. Inflation has already taken hold in Russia, in China, and in some of the other countries of the world. It can take hold here. What is to keep us, if we are going to legislate on oil, from introducing a bill raising the price of cotton? What about wheat, what about corn, what about coal, what about the salaried workers whose wages have been frozen?

Are you going to increase the price of oil, then say to the low-salaried, low-income persons, "No, we cannot do anything for you. Of course, the oil people are strong enough to make us do something for them, but we are not going to attempt to do anything for you." Anyone who does this puts himself in the vulnerable position of taking sides for one industry and letting all the other industries go.

HOUSE IS INFLATIONARY

The price-control law, as bad as some people claim it is, has been a wonderful thing for us. Our Government would have been destroyed and ruined without O. P. A. The Congress is in the idiotic, ridiculous, position of having given a directive to the President of the United States to hold the line as of September 15, 1942, to hold prices, wages, and salaries down, then every time the Congress gets a chance, particularly the House, they do something to retard the efforts of the President of the United States. First, the O. W. I. was doing a wonderful job in teaching the evils of inflation. The House cut out its entire appropriation for that purpose. This House is inflationary. This House is putting the country on the ruinous road to run-away inflation and if we do not look out we are going to be sorry for it.

We would like to increase prices on oil if done properly; but we are setting a precedent and a policy here that would be taking the longest step in the direction of ruinous and run-away inflation this country has ever taken. We cannot administer price control by law and our friends have no right to ask us to do it in this particular case.

REPUBLICAN PARTY INFLATIONARY

There are lots of people who hate O. P. A., who hate the President of the United States, who hate this administration, and they are glad to do anything that will be against them; but at the same time they are working against the country—they are doing something that is damaging to the country. I am not criticizing my friends on the Republican side. They have as much right to be on that side as I have to be on this side. I have no criticism of them for their views. They have a right to their views and I have a right to mine. I represent my district and any individual Republican over there represents his district. I want to ask them to give serious consideration to the question of putting this House on the ruinous, run-away road to inflation, and I can cite instances.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, first there was the O. W. I. appropriation. There was a direct vote in favor of inflation and by a solid Republican minority voting together they voted to cut out that part of O. W. I. which was doing a lot against inflation. Then a bill came along to us to enforce O. P. A., and by the Republicans voting solidly they again succeeded in reducing the appropriation of O. P. A. about $30,000,000, a sufficient amount to render enforcement of O. P. A. laws and rules absolutely impossible, crippling and harming the only other agency that has to do with keeping down prices, wages, and salaries and preventing ruinous inflation. Right here we have a case of something that we would all like to do, have a better price for oil, but we are setting a precedent, a very dangerous precedent, one that I am afraid will rise up to haunt us in the future.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman, as the membership knows, is chairman of the Small Business Committee of the House. I am privileged to serve on that committee.

Mr. PATMAN. As the ranking Republican member, and a good one, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it not true, having regard to the price of crude oil and what might be said about inflation, that the Small Business Committee some months ago vigorously recommended an increase in the price of crude oil?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, and I am strong for it, but let us do it like we do everything else. If we do it by law, let us do everything else by law. If we are going to take over the Executive functions, let us take them over. If we are going to leave 8,000,000 commodities to O. P. A., let us leave all of them to O. P. A.

Mr. HALLECK. I may suggest to the gentleman that I have been concerned about that provision of this bill which transfers out of O. P. A. certain price-fixing functions. It has been my view from the beginning that price control should be in one agency. Now, insofar as this bill undertakes to establish a floor which is in a measure a parity price beneath which the ceiling cannot be fixed, will the gentleman agree with me that it follows in a measure at least the precedent that was contained in the price-control bill with respect to the price of farm products?

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, obviously I cannot discuss that in the limited time I have at my disposal, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman has spoken about the danger of regulating the price of one commodity on the floor of this House. I would like to have the gentleman's comment upon considering such a matter in a proceeding such as this where there has been no testimony, no hearings, no opportunity for either the Committee on Banking and Currency or this Committee today to consider all the possible implications and effects of such proceeding?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right. Remember this, the chairman of the committee promised that he would commence hearings on this next Friday. It has hearings on until then. That committee will give full and complete opportunity for both sides to be heard and the investigation will continue—the hearings will continue—until completed, and a report will be made to this House. What can be fairer than that? Maybe we do not

know both sides to this story. Maybe we should have every side. Any time you attempt to put oil under Mr. Ickes, and I am opposed to it, and food prices under Mr. Jones—I am going to oppose that as much as I like Marvin Jones—you are running into danger. I would like to see some things done for agriculture that are not being done. I am against the rubber price being under the organization that Mr. Jeffers organized. I am against transportation prices being under O. D. T. Any time you attempt to break up O. P. A. and assign price fixing all over the country, you will get prices in charge of people who cannot resist these groups and will grant increases and you will have ruinous inflation. You have got to have an economic stabilization and you can only have it under one head. If you have a dozen heads, you will not have it.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Will the gentleman favor an amendment retaining this thing under the O. P. A. instead of transferring it to the P. A. W.?

Mr. PATMAN. I am against the whole thing.

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman will vote for an amendment retaining it in O. P. A.?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, I would vote for an amendment retaining it in O. P. A. Is the gentleman going to offer an amendment like that?

Mr. RIVERS. It will be offered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman does not intend to say he would accept this new parity provision, too?

Mr. PATMAN. No, that does not mean I would vote for the bill, but I would certainly favor the amendment over what is in here. As between the two evils I would choose the lesser. I do not see any reason, because it is under O. P. A. now.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DISNEY. With that attitude, what chance would this bill have of coming out of the Committee on Banking and Currency, after all your promises?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not run the Committee on Banking and Currency, I am just one member out of 26.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that at this stage we can agree that certain things are apparent. One is the importance of oil to the winning of this war and to the normal pursuits of our civilian life. I am sure there is no disposition on the part of those of us who are opposing this bill to question that important statement.

Secondly, the oil industry is in difficulties. They have a problem that they are entitled to bring to the Congress in asking relief. As a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I for one am ready to hear them sympathetically, because I come from an oil-producing State.

Another thing I should like to express myself on is the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] at the outset that he did not wish to embarrass the members of our committee. We accept that statement at face value. We have the same high respect for him that he expresses for our committee.

We are grown-up men and women. We are not questioning these actions on the part of those who feel strongly about the need for relief. We are not criticizing the oil industry for pressing their claims vigorously. I have been in Congress but a short time, but long enough to recognize that now and then great distress exists in particular parts of our economic life. It is inevitable that this Congress should become sort of an economic council, a high court from which the people might expect relief. We are their responsible Representatives. We should not criticize the pressure groups if it means that we are trying to evade our responsibility. So, as one who comes from an oil-producing State and who has many friends who feel that some action should be taken, I am ready to say that we should examine this question.

But we come to the difficult question of whether or not we are going to have craftsmanship in legislation that we can be proud of, and whether or not that legislation is to be hammered out by discussion and by exploration and by seeking every kind of possible alternative that will avoid disturbing the economic balance of this Nation. Therefore, those of us who feel that hearings should be held, and it is the assurance of the chairman of the committee that they can be held quickly, are simply asking for a chance to hear this complaint and work it out and bring in legislation that we can defend.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. I am sure my colleague is well advised that there are a number of committees in the House, and one in the Senate particularly, who have given special study to and had extensive and exhaustive hearings on this question. Is it not a fact that the Subcommittee on Petroleum of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has made a thorough study of this matter and reported to Congress? Is it not a fact that the Small Business Committee of the House has made a thorough study and reported to Congress? Is it not a fact that the Committee on Naval Affairs of this House has made a thorough study and made a report? And is it not a fact that a special committee of the Senate has made a thorough study and reported to this Congress?

Mr. HAYS. I appreciate what the gentleman has said. It seems to me, however, that that fortifies what I am saying, that we could get a quick report with all of these facts he mentions and the recommendations that might be followed. It seems to me our committee could take the particular proposal and say that, in the light of all available information, it should be changed at this point or that, or perhaps discarded for a better plan.

Now I have a comment about the bill that is proposed as the answer to the oil price problem. If we agree that the problem exists, that no hearings have been held, and that it is thrown in without deliberation on the part of a responsible committee, then it follows that the proponents must defend their particular proposal. And what is it? It is an oversimplification of the whole issue by saying, "We will simply bring the oil price up to the average, and place a floor under that price that will keep it not less than average."

The concept of an average is often a delusion. It can be simply stated this way, I think. Here are three items at 75 cents and three items at 25 cents. The average is 50 cents. But if you are going to bring one of those up to 50 cents, or the average, what do you do? You immediately establish a new average. You would have to take two jumps. You would have 54 cents, roughly, as the next average. So, using that as an illustration, I insist that the idea of averages is not the answer to the problem. It is impossible to guarantee an average price to any commodity without giving that commodity preferred treatment. When preferred treatment is sought the basis for it must be indicated. I cannot believe that the House wants to get into the business of fixing specific price ceilings or floors by legislation.

I suggested that some type of relief might be afforded by the Banking and Currency Committee, that the urgency of the oil business at least is entitled to consideration, but I would insist that when we try to carve out of our general price legislation some special provision for any commodity it ought to be done judiciously and without imposing rigid price formulas that would establish precedents upon which other industries could depend in the drive for higher prices.

I fear we are taking inflation threats too lightly. If we resort to this device when an industry is in trouble we are inviting price spirals that will not only get our price relationships bodily out of order but in turn will react upon the oil industry itself in a disastrous way.

Mr. Chairman, we must soon decide whether we want inflation or not. We are dangerously near to the point now of causing people to believe the Congress desires general price increases. When buying practices gain momentum on that theory they are hard to stop. The bill

ought to be recommitted for study and action by the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I suppose what I am doing is telling you a little bit about what I do not know rather than undertaking to tell you all about what I do not know, for on the latter I'd have to get more time than 2 minutes. I do not know much about this bill. I have heard of it. I have heard something about the Committee on Naval Affairs having some sort of an investigation, and maybe a committee over in the Senate giving some attention to the matter of petroleum products and needs. I have heard some very fine statements under the rule of the House which permits us to speak under special orders. But this is so important I should like to know something more about it. There has been no hearing by the committee to which the bill was referred.

When I read the bill, I find that in the bill there is something that would take me a long time to analyze and survey its implications and satisfy my own mind as to what it would amount to.

In the bill I read this:

> To that end no price ceilings for crude petroleum or the products thereof or derivatives therefrom shall be fixed or maintained by the Administrator below a price, the index of which is equal to the price index of "all commodities" as reported from time to time by the United States Department of Labor.

I do not know what that requirement amounts to. I should like an opportunity to hear some talk about that and an explanation of all of the provisions and implications of this bill. I have been inclined, if the bill came in in an orderly way, to the belief that something ought to be done, but as it is coming this way, I do not see how I can satisfy my own mind about it. Hearings ought to be had and the whole matter arrived at according to the usual procedures of the House.

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] such time as the gentleman may require.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman and colleagues, it is not my purpose to enter into any lengthy discussion of this bill. But I do want to report to you, lest there be some mistaken impression, that this subject has had the very thoughtful and careful consideration of a congressional committee. Your Special Committee on Petroleum has made a careful investigation into the price and the effect of price on oil production, studying the problem for considerably over a year. On December 31, 1942, the Committee on Petroleum, headed by the Honorable CLARENCE LEA, of California, and Members with whom you are acquainted, recommended through the Congress to the administrative branches of government that the price of petroleum be increased in order to furnish the Nation that needed incentive for the search for new discoveries. Again, in the first session of the present Congress, on July 3 of this year, that same committee, after careful study of many, many months and careful investigation into this situation, again reported and recommended that a price increase be given to petroleum in order to stimulate a very necessary search for new discoveries. Now, gentlemen, petroleum rests on 60 percent of parity. But it is not simply a matter of justice for the petroleum industry for which I enter my plea. It is in our national interest. Certainly we know that oil is a sinew of war. Three out of every four tons of deadweight tonnage that leaves for our offshore establishments is petroleum. Our Nation needs what this bill would provide, an incentive for search for new discoveries.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege during the past few months to give a good deal of attention to the petroleum situation as particularly related to the great consuming section of the northeast part of this country. We all know how our economic life has been completely turned upside down as a result of the petroleum shortage, not because there was not oil being brought to the ground at that time but because of the submarine menace which broke down our only means of transportation which previously brought over 95 percent of all the petroleum products from the oil-bearing States to the eastern seaboard. Now we are reaching the time when transportation facilities are being made available either through pipe lines, additional barges, additional tankers, and other means of transportation, which means, if we can get the oil, that the other parts of the country, as well as the eastern seaboard, will have the opportunity to again get back on wheels. I need not tell you, in the eastern seaboard a great deal of suffering has been taking place and a great deal of economic loss along with it ever since the shortage of oil has occurred. As a result of the work of several investigating committees, including the subcommittee of the Committee on Naval Affairs, of which I am a member, we are all convinced something must be done to stimulate production. We know new discoveries in the form of new reserves are nowhere near as great as they have been in previous years. And consumption, daily and annual consumption, of oil today, of petroleum products in all its forms, is far in excess of what our new discoveries in reserves are at the present time.

We also know many wells, stripper wells and secondary wells, are closing down simply because they find it unprofitable to continue. I am one of those who firmly believe we must provide an incentive to develop new sources of oil in this country if we are going to get out of the mess we presently find ourselves in. I cannot, however, go along with this bill. This bill goes far beyond the recommendation of the Petroleum Administrator for War and his 35 cents a barrel. This bill—and I understand there will be a further amendment offered—provides that no ceiling prices shall be fixed or maintained below a parity price. Well, from the Office of the Petroleum Administrator for War I am informed that simply means an increase not of 35 cents a barrel but 75 cents or 80 cents a barrel. I understand further that an amendment is going to be made to strike that provision out and substitute another provision that the Administrator shall give consideration to a parity, which indirectly means the same thing. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, what we ought to do is empower the Petroleum Administrator for War with the authority to recommend and have his recommendation approved by the President. I believe that then we will get some relief, and I am going to offer an amendment to that effect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, on the 5th of August 1943, approximately 25 Members of this House and 8 Members of the Senate met with Mr. Ickes and Mr. Davis and some others of his Department in Chicago. This meeting was in fulfillment of a promise made by Secretary Ickes to the Members of the House and the Senate, prior to the recess, if any contemplated change was going to be made in the amount of gasoline for the consuming public we would be notified and be given an opportunity to be heard. Also, at that meeting there were present representatives of the oil industry throughout the United States as well as the motor-vehicle industry and many other lines of industry. From this meeting the following facts and conclusions were developed, which have, up to this date, as far as I know, and particularly at that meeting, not been challenged. At the present time, or rather as of August 1943, the known oil reserve supply in the United States was sufficient for 14 years under pre-Pearl Harbor conditions. But with present conditions and the tempo of the war effort, that supply would only last for 7 years. If we are to have sufficient oil supplies for the future of our people in our country it will be necessary to raise the price of crude oil and encourage venturesome capital to go in and discover new oil fields and increase the known oil supply reserve. Further, that the increase of 35 cents a barrel as a minimum increase would prevent the closing down of many stripper wells and margin wells that are bound to be closed down if the price is not increased. Further, that an increase of 35 cents per barrel for crude oil would amount to not more than 1-cent-per-gallon increase to the consuming public.

At that meeting Secretary Ickes himself stated that he was in favor of an increase of 35 cents per barrel and had so recommended for some time to the Office of Price Administration.

Also at that meeting a representative of the Deep Rock Oil Co. made the statement that if an increase of 35 cents per barrel for crude would be put into effect at once, by July 1, 1944, it would be unnecessary to ration gasoline in the Midwest and the West.

Just previous to the convening of this meeting in Chicago a similar meeting was held in Kansas City, Mo., attended by Members of this body as well as Members of the other body, and some 8 Governors of Midwestern States. A resolution was passed at the Kansas City meeting and forwarded to the Chicago meeting, which supports the statements I have just quoted to you from the Chicago meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS].

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, today we will be given an opportunity to make a real contribution toward victory in this war through the passage of H. R. 2887, which is designed to increase the production of crude oil so that more gasoline and fuel oil will be available in this emergency for both military and civilian purposes. Our drive-for-action committee has worked hard to get the required number of signatures on the petition to bring this bill before the House. According to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 23, 149 Republicans, 68 Democrats, and 1 Farm-Laborite signed the petition. Fifty-eight members of the drive-for-action committee signed the petition.

New Deal bungling delayed the synthetic rubber program 18 months, and we must not permit similar shortsightedness to bring about a break-down in our oil and fuel supplies. The Roosevelt administration has been repeatedly warned of an oil shortage, but very little has been done to remedy the situation. It appears that the O. P. A. is more interested in regimentation and control than increased production. They may have planned it that way. It is about time for Congress to do something about the oil situation.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to my distinguished colleague from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I want to say that I agree with the gentleman from Indiana that this is a situation into which the Congress should step at the present time, in order to bring about some order. I wonder if the gentleman will agree with me that one of the greatest difficulties which we have run into in this whole problem is the operation of the "Gwibits" downtown on this problem.

Mr. LANDIS. You might tell us the definition of a "Gwibit."

Mr. MUNDT. If the gentleman is not familiar with "Gwibits" I may say that on Wednesday next I expect to address the House for some length on the menace of "Gwibits." Permit me to say they are one of the most insidious influences now at work among the bureaus in Washington, and until they are eliminated, and until the Congress steps into the breach, we may expect further difficulty such as we are now having on the matter of oil. I hope the gentleman will be here Wednesday when I discuss the subject of how to identify and stop a "Gwibit."

Mr. LANDIS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I shall be here on Wednesday.

Oil-well drilling is an expensive business. Dry wells cost money every year. Whenever the cost of oil falls below the cost of production wildcat drillers are forced to quit the business. Under prevailing conditions independent operators cannot afford to operate stripper and marginal oil wells. Once they remove their machinery vast quantities of crude oil are forever being lost to this Republic. The result is a curtailed supply of gasoline and fuel oil which is crippling our domestic economy and slowing our war effort.

Wildcat oil drilling has been the principal source of new oil supplies. The record shows that they have discovered three-fourths of the new oil pools. About 20,000 small oil men produce about 50 percent of the Nation's oil supply.

On April 12 I discussed the oil shortage on the House floor. I warned of this general decline in our present oil production and the decline in the drilling of new wells, all of which is due to low prices set by the O. P. A.

The present oil fields and the production of oil is not sufficient to maintain the war effort, and it is necessary that new wells be drilled. Due to the bungling of the oil program, our civilian population is being rationed on gasoline and fuel oil. Defense workers must have the necessary gas and oil to get to work. Farmers must have a sufficient amount to market their farm products. Essential men in business and other walks of life, such as doctors and ministers, must have a certain amount to carry on the business of America.

Information has come to me through reliable sources that our oil supply will only last about 14 years from oil pools, 65 years if oil is taken from shale, and 1,000 years if taken from coal. If this is true, it is high time we were developing the process of taking oil from coal and shale. Our coal supply in America is almost unlimited. We have trillions of tons beneath the earth's surface. Not long ago we voted out a bill from the Mines and Mining Committee, of which I am a member, to set up pilot plants in America to develop the process of taking oil from coal and shale. This bill has now passed the Senate and should be before the House in the near future.

As a move in the right direction, H. R. 2887 will transfer the oil problem to the Department of the Interior, and that Department will have complete authority and will also be responsible for an increased production of oil.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] has expired.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, we have heard some reference made to the Naval Affairs Subcommittee which has just recently, within the last 2 months, completed a very exhaustive and lengthy investigation of the oil industry. The Naval Affairs Committee is charged, among other things, with the operation of the Navy, which is geared entirely to the consumption of petroleum and its by-products. Our report brought some very alarming figures to the attention of that great committee. I should like to tell you some of them at this time. I wish I had more than 3 minutes today. I would like to tell you something about our report.

First of all, I want to tell you there is no oil within 600 miles of my district. As far as I know, South Carolina is a long, long way from an oil well. I have no pecuniary or political interest in this question, but I know that prosperity is not sectional. I know that if your country dries up on oil, my country will suffer. I know that if your country has no production of this vital material, the people in New England, the people in New York, the people in other frigid sections of this country will be very cold. Therefore, I say to you this is as much my problem as it is the problem of any of you where this oil is located. I think we should approach the question from that angle.

We found in one State alone, Texas, that $75,000,000 of drilling equipment is being stacked because they cannot operate under the conditions now imposed on the producing end of the industry. We found that out of 20 producing States of the Union, 14 of them are going into a nose dive on production. We brought these facts to the attention of our committee.

I would like to read you a list of the States which are going down in production, because they cannot continue in business. Of all the oil produced, 77 percent of that was found by wildcatters. Of all the oil produced, 43 percent was produced by independents. The independents are being run out of business because they cannot stand the burden placed on their shoulders.

Then you say it is not a congressional question. I say it is. It is as much the problem of New England and South Carolina and Virginia and Georgia as it is any of the other States. If we do not get oil, the Navy does not operate. If we do not get oil, the Army does not operate. The airplanes are still and the tanks do not move. Therefore, it is our problem. We have got to drive that home. This is our problem.

This is the list of States which are now in a nose dive of production: Illinois, Arkansas, California, Kansas, Mississippi, Kentucky, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia. You say it is not our problem. I say it is our problem, and unborn generations will say to us that it was our problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] has expired.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is a Member of this House who was more disappointed than I when the Stabilization Director denied the increase in the price of oil. I am as fully aware, I believe, of the independent producers' hardships as any other Member from an oil-producing State. Five out of my counties are the biggest oil-producing sections in the State of Oklahoma, and, I believe, in this Nation.

But, Mr. Chairman, I think we are indeed playing with fire when we attempt to tear down the dam that is holding back inflation by putting a charge at the base of this dam to let any one single product through. I think that this issue here today before us is more important in relationship to inflation control than was the subsidy fight.

SETS DANGEROUS PRECEDENT

With the subsidy fight we were dealing merely with one of the important weapons to combat inflation. Here we are dealing with congressional policy, of whether we will fix the responsibility for price control and anti-inflation efforts in the hands of one agency or whether we will choose to spread it all over the departments downtown without any single one charged with trying to hold down the cost-of-living end of it.

I have many oil producers and enough of my dearest friends who are oil producers who should realize the impending danger of inflation, the danger that this bill would cause to their insurance policies, to the millions of dollars' worth of bonds that are held by these people, to the life savings of many of their employees.

I feel if they realized how great these dangers were, they would not be asking that we blast away the dam in order to give them the 35 cents added per barrel increase that they seek.

NO TARIFF-WRITING JOB

Mr. Chairman, the Congress cannot begin to attempt to fix wartime prices on a tariff-writing basis; it simply will not work. You will find if we set the pattern here today in this bill that it will not be long before we shall have to continue it almost every day, continue making adjustments in prices on some 10,000 commodities that are under price control for the war.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I will yield when I complete my statement, if the gentleman will permit.

I am as fully aware as anyone that an impending oil shortage faces this country, but, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that Members of the Congress of the United States are the only people in America who are concerned with this shortage. I think the Army, the Navy, and the high command having brought in some of the best brains in the oil industry know also about the shortages and are watching that. So we ourselves are not the sole custodians of this production, and I feel that they will help us get a justified increase through regular price-control machinery.

If the Congress does not go about an abortive attempt to secure price increases by legislation, I believe the necessary price increase for the maximum production of oil could be worked out. We should get the oil industry and the price-control officials together to realize that through a careful and selective adjustment of price to take care of the high-cost producers and hardship cases we can bring in the maximum production of oil.

USES WRONG METHOD

But, Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is for us to grant this request for a price increase, for we will be faced with another one tomorrow, another one the next day, and so on down as long as Congress is in session. When you give these succeeding price increases you will not be giving increases in real dollars. You are going to be effectuating these increases pretty soon in "two bit" dollars, and the people themselves who will get them will find they are not very far ahead in buying power when this cycle of inflation is completed.

It seems to me that the only way the oil industry can get a real price increase is through the regular machinery that is set up to handle all of these commodities. If they get it by this legislative method, others also will get it through the legislative process, with the result price advances will not have a real purchasing power increase, because every other industry in the country will be here soon to try it.

SHOP-AROUND METHOD

This bill proposes two things: One, it proposes that any commodity dissatisfied with the rulings of the Price Control Administration or the Stabilization Director, Mr. Vinson, can shop around the town and find a favorable administrator under which the Congress will transfer the control of prices. That means that soon we will transfer food control to the War Food Administrator, we will transfer control of wages to the Department of Labor, we will transfer control of prices to the Department of Commerce, and so on, and there will be no one individual who will be responsible for these growing increases in cost of living that are bound to occur.

FIXES UNCERTAIN PARITY

The second point in this bill presents a very new, interesting, and startling parity formula, so-called. It proposes to increase the price of oil by providing that no ceiling can be put on the price of oil until oil reaches the average price of all of the commodities in the wholesale price index.

If you do it for oil you are going to find other powerful groups in here insisting that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. Let us see what possible price adjustments this policy would mean.

These figures are from the December 4 All Commodity Index. They show that under this plan other products if given similar treatment—and they will be asking for it—the textiles products division would have to receive an increase of 5.6 percent; fuel and lighting materials, 20.7 percent; agricultural implements, 7.1 percent; iron and steel—and that is the biggest thing that Uncle Sam is buying today—would go up 7.7 percent under this so-called new parity formula if applied. Another interesting item is the nonferrous metals with a 17 percent increase; plumbing and heating supplies, 12.3 percent; cement, 9.2. Chemicals, another thing that the United States Government is buying in huge quantities, 6.4 percent. Fertilizer and materials, which people on the farms have to buy, 21.3 percent; mixed fertilizer, 17 percent.

SET STAGE FOR INFLATION

So if you go into this now, an unexplored parity price formula for one product, you can see that you set the stage for a new spiral of inflation. It seems to me the best way to do this, if we are in earnest in trying to help the oil industry, is to go about it in an orderly way. I grant you that many, many statistics given by my good friend, Mr. DISNEY, and others on the floor, are absolutely true, that the oil producer is in a squeeze, and that he needs relief. But this problem needs careful treatment in order to take care of these hardship cases. We will not be doing the oil industry a real service by passing this bill and saying, "We love you, oil industry." There will be a veto and when it comes back the veto will be sustained by the Congress. Then the oil industry will have wasted another 6 months under this fallacious reasoning. Instead of its price increase it will have received some congressional "love making."

Mr. DISNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DISNEY. What does my good friend from Oklahoma suggest? We have exhausted every remedy.

Mr. MONRONEY. I disagree with the gentleman that we have exhausted every remedy. When merit is on your side, and we have set up these various agencies to adjust and make possible these adjustments, right will always triumph and I do not believe we ought to pull the thing into Congress and ramrod it through such as this bill proposes to do.

Mr. RIZLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma believe that the price of oil should be increased?

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe the price of oil should be increased but it should be increased so that the increase will have a real dollar value rather than a two-bit value. When you bring in this bill and pass it, they will have no real increase when succeeded by other bills of this nature.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman knows, does he not, that for weeks and weeks and months and months not only the

people who are interested in the oil industry but people who are interested in the economy of this country, and if it would not be violating confidences I could say the most influential men in this House have gone to the O. P. A., to Mr. Vinson and others, and tried to get them to increase the price of oil, but he has refused to do so. Does the gentleman think when they have refused that the Congress must just do away with its entire responsibility and do nothing about it when the gentleman says it is necessary to have an increase in the price of oil?

Mr. MONRONEY. I say to the gentleman that our responsibility not only rests with the oil industry but it also rests with the millions of consumers who will be ruined by inflation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. In answer to the question asked by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] and also the last question propounded, does not the gentleman think that a more orderly way of accomplishing this would be to recommit the bill back to the committee, let us have some hearings, let us have the people who are responsible for creating the conditions and who are complaining here today appear before us and see if we cannot reconcile the differences between these various groups and get to a scientific determination of this question in relation to the rest of our economy rather than through a haphazard attempt to do it on the floor of the House.

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania. You cannot treat price control as an unrelated series of prices because when you do the break in the dam for one price becomes a gigantic hole that lets the whole flood through. You will destroy wartime control by that type of treatment.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Did the gentleman state what the increase would be under the formula provided in this bill?

Mr. MONRONEY. My understanding is it would increase oil to around $2 a barrel from about $1.35 a barrel, far more than the 35-cents-per-barrel increase stated. This new so-called parity formula, which would unquestionably be applied to other commodities if Congress sanctions it for oil, would indeed be the most devastating inflationary step that any Congress has ever attempted to take.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Let me preface my observation by saying that I follow usually the gentleman in his reasoning because he is sound. I feel, however, that today when we, as the Congress, are faced with a responsibility, we must discharge it as individuals and as a collective group. I make that statement because for more than 2 months the Petroleum Administrator for War has asked Judge Vinson, Director of Stabilization, for an alternate plan, and it has not been forthcoming.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is that not partly due to industry opposition to paying additional money for high-cost producers, not by the Stabilization Director, I may add?

Mr. BOREN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. On the question that was asked recently about holding hearings on this bill, does the gentleman know that the Petroleum Committee especially designated to that subject by the House has held hearings over a period of almost a year?

Mr. MONRONEY. But not on this bill to establish a new parity price formula.

Mr. BOREN. On the subject of whether or not the price of oil should be raised.

Mr. MONRONEY. But not on the transfer of authority out of Price Control and Stabilization Director Vinson to Secretary Ickes. That was not covered by the committee.

Mr. BOREN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Was the new parity formula gone into?

Mr. BOREN. As long as a year ago, lacking about 20 days, your committee did recommend that the price of oil be increased and recommended it in a report I do not believe any man can read without seeing the justification for it.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not argue with my colleague against the need for an increase in the price of oil. What I am trying to say is that by legislating an increase in the price of oil we destroy the price-control law. We begin that process here today if we formulate such a policy by Congress, in which event I fear that we have done the oil industry an irreparable damage as we would also do to the consumers of this country.

Mr. WRIGHT. There has been much said about other committees having made studies of this bill. I would like to remark that the committee responsible to this House for explaining and defending this bill has had no hearings and no opportunity to study it.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would like to add right there that these committees that have brought in reports have not brought in any legislation nor did they recommend going about it in this way.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I wonder if in the opinion of the gentleman any responsibility rests upon the Congress to give relief to this class of producers that have been given a raw deal by the administrative agents of the Government?

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not believe we can do it by legislative action without destroying innumerable millions of people who will be crushed by inflation.

Mr. COX. What form of relief would the gentleman suggest?

Mr. MONRONEY. I have suggested the relief that we can have: rehearings with the officers downtown, and with the information at hand that has been developed today, surely we can at least hope for common sense and equity in the solution of this problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. It is understood, is it not, that if this bill is recommitted hearings will commence Friday and continue until a report is made back to the House on this measure?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is my understanding.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman has talked about inflation. I cannot imagine anything more inflationary than a program of scarcity. If you do not produce the oil you will have inflation, and you will have it right.

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree with the gentleman that supply has a great deal to do with inflation, but I say that when you destroy price control, which this bill does, then you find yourself inviting the very spiral that is going to make your dollars worth quarters before this thing is through.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, having been convinced now for some considerable time that the cry of help from the Nation's oil producers, and especially the small independent operators, warranted serious consideration, I was among the first to sign the discharge petition which would force the Disney bill to be brought up for consideration by the House.

Due to the tremendous calls, on the one hand, upon the United States for oil and more oil, which a mechanized war such as this is naturally calls for, and due to what, on the other hand, I believe is a mistaken attitude on the part of Judge Vinson in not allowing what has been found by the War Petroleum Administrator to be a justifiable rise in price to take care of added costs and also to answer continued production, we are faced with two very serious problems.

First of all we are faced with the hard, cold fact that a slump in oil production at this time could seriously jeopardize the war effort, and, secondly, we can, or

should be able to see, that if the problem is allowed to continue very much longer without a life line being thrown out to especially the small producer, that due to the rapid depletion of our petroleum reserves, which are being consumed much more rapidly than we are discovering new sources of supply, the home front will also suffer. In other words, for the successful prosecution of the war we must be assured of an adequate supply of oil not only for the fighting fronts but also the home-front needs must be met.

I doubt very much that any great number of people have a clear picture of the Herculean task of carrying on a war on 55 fighting fronts as we are now doing. For a clear picture of that almost miraculous job that is being done I recommend the reading of Fighting Oil, a remarkable and revealing work by Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Petroleum Administrator for War.

Mr. Ickes points out that nearly 2 out of every 3 tons of supplies sent overseas to our expeditionary forces are oil—that the gasoline supply for the military services in north Africa alone is on the basis of a planned requirement of 10 gallons per day per vehicle and that there are literally hundreds of thousands of supply trucks and armored vehicles belonging to the Allied Nations that are drawing on the United States for the major portion of their fuel supply. Then, too, undreamed of gasoline is needed for the thousands and thousands of bombers and fighters taking off every hour of the day to engage the enemy. Mr. Ickes goes on to point out that the British claim that a battleship on a short cruise will consume in the neighborhood of a million gallons of oil and that the consumption of oil by the British Navy is measured by tens of millions of gallons a week. What is true of England's Navy is not only true of our own but with the seven-ocean navy we will shortly have that figure will go up accordingly.

Georges Clemenceau, the old Tiger of World War No. 1, described petroleum to be "as necessary as blood."

Petroleum Administrator Ickes reechoed that thought when he quoted a New Mexico oil driller of long experience as follows:

> Being an oil driller since the last war hasn't blinded me to the fact that this war is going to be won with five essential things: Guts, steel, oil, groceries, and a lot of faith.

That the Nation's oil output is falling behind requirements has been repeatedly asserted. As far as Montana is concerned that is a fact.

On August 1 the Oil Conservation Board of Montana advised President Roosevelt that oil production in all Montana's fields has been 20 to 25 percent below market requirements for essential uses in Montana, Canada, Washington, and Idaho throughout 1943 and that a study of current reports of operations indicates no prospects for material improvement under present conditions. The board stated that crude storage stocks on August 1, were 300,000 barrels low as compared with the same date last year, which forecasts a serious shortage this winter when the usual seasonal slump in production must be expected. Records show that 74 percent of all producers operating in Montana's 10 oil fields have not commenced even 1 well this year and in only 3 of the fields have any wells been started. A total of 23 wildcat structure tests have been completed to August 20, 18 of which were abandoned. The board recommends as the only effective remedy, that the price ceilings be raised enough on crude oil at wells to assure all producers of the additional income required to finance new operations.

I think further figures on Montana's production will throw valuable light on this subject and I am sure Montana is the rule rather than the exception.

The figures of that board show that out of 201 registered oil producers in all Montana's fields on January 1, 1943, only 58 commenced new drillings up to November 30, which would indicate that 143 of them either did not have the money to pay for new wells or else didn't consider the risk as a justifiable chance. Of those 201 registered oil producers 194 were independent operators with 7 classified as big company or major operators. The 194 independents had a total daily production of 17,000 barrels and the 7 majors, 5,000 barrels, or 77 percent and 23 percent of all production, respectively.

On December 1, 1943, the record stood as follows: 23 of the independents out of 194 listed as active on January 1, had suspended operations or sold out, and left were 181 independents with a total of 10,970 barrels daily, and 8 major companies with a total of 11,666 barrels daily. So the present estimate of production ownership and control as divided between independents and majors is 48 percent in the independents—down 29 percent—and 52 percent in the major companies—up 20 percent—of all current oil production in Montana.

Now those figures are susceptible of no other interpretation than that the independents are in the process of liquidation and at an alarmed rate.

It is also of interest to point out that the remaining independents comprise a great majority of the stripper-well operators who are for the most part dependent upon the major refineries to market their product. Those refineries are now buying all the oil they can get and since they are buying at the frozen ceiling prices they are undoubtedly profiting by doing so. So that as far as the small producer is concerned the more oil he produces under the present conditions and sells at present ceiling prices the more surely and quickly he is liquidating his capital asset—oil under his land—and forcing himself out of business because he is not getting enough money for his product to build up any cost reserve for use in drilling new wells, or utilizing present known methods of "secondary recovery" designed to revive and stimulate production in oil wells.

Oil drillers are paid as high as $19 a day and while price ceilings have been set on pipe, no ceilings have been set on connections, which are necessary to equip a producing well, and the price of which has risen 100 percent since before the war. The cost of a 1,500-foot well before the war was $5,000, while now this same well costs $7,000. It seems very incongruous to me that oil with the place of importance it holds in this war, is not bringing any more than the $1.10 a barrel that it is now bringing when compared with other and less vital commodities. Why, eggs are selling for 71 cents a dozen in Montana. Evidently eggs are more important to the O. P. A. than oil. Some of these independents would find it more profitable to close down their oil well and get a few hens and go into the egg business.

Another factor which is working against the small independent oil producer, and which has been overlooked for the most part, is the type of lease he has to work under. In the usual form of lease it is provided that the lessee must drill offset wells against wells drilled on adjacent territory and if this is not done the lease is forfeited. Now, as I have tried to point out, in many cases the lessee is not financially able to drill these offset wells and as a result these operators are losing their leases and their investments made in former years in producing wells. This condition is one the major companies will quickly take advantage of and acquire the leases so forfeited.

It is needless to say that the present price of crude oil and the present cost of production will soon see the end of the 22 percent of independent oil operators in this country. Then you will have a controlling monopoly existing from the oil beds of the earth into the homes of every person. Thus no matter how much the big operator is benefited by such an action as contemplated here today I contend that its justification would rest upon the continuing of these small independents who would be materially benefited by this bill.

I therefore question Judge Vinson's finding that oil operators can and will continue to drill enough oil wells in proven producing areas to maintain present producing schedules without any additional price incentive. I also question his conclusion that new well drilling in wildcat areas will not supply any additional oil for 1 or 2 years.

Records in Montana fields in 1943 show that 3 wildcat wells have been completed to date in the deep sands of the old Elk Basin, Mont., field, each to a depth of approximately 5,000 feet, the first of which was commenced April 2, 1943, and by November 1, all 3 were supplying oil daily to the pipe line in total amount over 2,000 barrels average daily of good, refinable, crude oil.

The Gage structure was started in May of 1943 and completed in October of this year and some oil has already been shipped from the well into the Billings refinery.

The first commercially producing oil well in the Midway area was started in August of this year and is now producing considerable oil.

Within the past 28 years the independent operators have discovered all except four of the oil- and gas-producing fields in Montana of any commercial importance and I feel confident that many more good fields will be discovered and developed if the independent operators are not forced out of business by the unjustifiably low prices they are now receiving for their product.

In closing I would like to submit for the RECORD a very fine and highly informative letter I received on this subject from a man with a quarter of a century of experience in this game in Montana. It was sent to me under date of August 21, 1943, and reads:

Speaking as an independent oil man who has been 23 years in the game, I wish to present my viewpoint on this particular matter. It is very evident to me that these representatives of the various labor organizations do not understand the true situation and while it is a fact, as they point out, that 18 major oil companies' net earnings rose 10 percent over the corresponding period in 1942, this was due to increased turn-over and demand, but these organizations gave no consideration to the thousands of independent oil producers who derived no revenue except the price of crude oil while these major companies make their profit not from low-priced crude oil but from the sale of refined products. Let me suggest at this point that there is no more relationship between a barrel of crude oil and a gallon of gasoline than there is between a bushel of wheat and a loaf of bread. We, as producers, must take the price offered by the major corporations and they sell their products for all the traffic will bear. My contention is that the price of crude oil should be raised to keep these independents in business, while the price of all refined products should and could be held at their present level so that the consuming public would suffer no economic inconvenience. The majors would only lose on that portion of the oil that they purchase from the independents at an increased price.

Before the war the independent oil producers of the United States produced 52 percent of the production, leaving 48 percent for the majors. At the present time, due to the purchase of independent operators, the majors now control 78 percent of the oil production, leaving the independents only 22 percent, and this 22 percent will soon be wiped out unless we can get some relief from an increased price of crude oil.

Thus these labor organizations are only tending to help out a complete monopoly of the oil industry by from 18 to 35 companies, while thousands upon thousands of independents will be forced out of business, as we are now producing oil near or below the cost of production.

No doubt the majors have put out some propaganda about an increased price of crude, at the same time hoping that it would not be granted unless there was a corresponding increase in the price of refined products, which is very unnecessary. Right here in Montana we are paying 23 to 25 cents retail price for gasoline under the nose of the refinery and at the same time the market in Montana, which is dictated by the Continental Oil Co., insists on 18 cents a gallon delivered in any quantity from 1,000 to 6,000 gallons. This gasoline is produced from $1.10 per barrel crude oil and they make a recovery of approximately 80 percent, so it is evident that these major companies are receiving $7.72 for the gasoline from 1 barrel of crude, plus a small additional amount for fuel oil, distillate, and other products, which would undoubtedly bring the total revenue derived from a barrel of $1.10 crude up to $8 per barrel.

It is in the interests of the major oil companies to hold down the price of crude oil to drive these independents out of business. At the same time they are presenting propaganda to import foreign crude oil which is produced with cheap labor, water transportation, and these majors own and produce this crude oil in said foreign lands. This will help to keep the price down and create an additional monopoly in these United States.

You hear a world of propaganda about the lack of oil reserves in these United States. Personally I have heard this same story for the last 25 years, but with deeper drilling, more scientific methods of detection, crude oil will be produced in these United States until such time as other fuels will economically push it out of the picture. An example of this situation is the Elk Basin oil field in Wyoming and Montana, which has been under production since 1915 and very recently they tapped lower sands and the wells are producing from 1,200 to 10,000 barrels a day, and an estimate of these reserves cannot even be calculated. Wyoming as well as Montana has immense oil reserves that have not even been discovered.

During the past 80 years the independent oil producer has been the backbone of the oil business as the majors do not see fit to wildcat new territory, but they merely buy up the production and properties after they have been developed and proven. There is a move on now in Montana as well as every other State in the Union for these same majors to control by lease all possible prospective oil lands. In Montana recently these majors have leased up approximately a million acres of additional lands and they are going through the territory with a fine-tooth comb doing a world of wildcatting which eventually will be paid for out of taxes that they would ordinarily pay the United States Government in income tax, which will leave newly developed reserves in their hands at the expense of the United States Government.

I have no animosity against these major oil companies, as I have dealt with them over a period of years, but they should be required not only to live but to let live instead of forming the greatest monopoly that these United States have ever seen. The Rockefeller interests controlled the picture at one time and then were disintegrated to a certain extent but the industry has expanded to a point where the same condition exists and every district in the United States is controlled by the same major companies.

Let me plead with you to reconsider this increased price of crude oil and if the public sentiment so demands, hold the price of all refined products at their present level. This will give an opportunity to live and let live and the independent oil man will be able to carry on and do his bit toward the winning of this war as we are going all out, spending every dime we can get hold of to develop more production which we know is now being sold at or less than the cost of production.

Very sincerely yours,

E. B. COOLIDGE.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, at the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES].

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I wanted these few minutes just to say a word in connection with this legislation. I am from an entirely consumer area. In my humble opinion, this is a serious problem, a problem that Congress must settle.

In 1935 this House passed a resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate then the conservation and waste of petroleum. Even in those days the thought was that we should husband our resources and not allow any waste of petroleum. Here we find ourselves in a position that should have been rectified 18 months or 2 years ago, where one person should have the authority of producing the oil to prosecute the war, to heat our homes, and to drive our ships, and also the authority to regulate price so that it would be an incentive to explore and wildcat new fields. If we do not do this now, we are going to be at the mercy not of the American producers but the foreign producers, and when they get us to that point price will be no consideration whatever. The situation will be comparable with that of the American people trying to buy rubber from the cartels that control rubber. They will control oil on the same basis.

This may amount to five-tenths of a cent increase in the price of fuel oil or gasoline to the consumer on the east coast, but that is insignificant if otherwise he cannot get the oil or the gas. However, the finding of new reserves and the production of a greater volume of gas and oil will to my mind offset that, and there should not be and will not be any increase in price on either fuel oil or gasoline to the American people.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, at the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT], I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill. I know something of what the political consequences of opposition to it are. Oil companies are especially powerful politically in my State. But especially in the situation in which we now find ourselves I just cannot support it.

The gentleman from Montana said something about protecting independent producers. The main thing independent oil producers need is effective representation in the office of the Petroleum Administration for War.

The basic reason I am opposed to this bill is this. I think there are much more cogent arguments for giving control over food prices to the Food Administrator or for attempting to fix food prices by law than there are for giving control of oil prices to the Petroleum Administration for War or for raising oil prices clear across the board by act of Congress. I know perfectly well, however, that if we start this process on oil we logically must continue it with regard to commodity after commodity throughout the length and breadth of our whole economic system. Does Congress propose to undertake that? If so, we should do a thorough job.

In the next place, I do not personally believe that price is the major factor involved in the production of oil at the present time. I am convinced that there are at least three other factors of much greater importance and which will limit

production even if the price were doubled. One of them is the steel shortage. Applications for steel for oil production have far outrun the amount that could be allocated up to this time by the War Production Board for that purpose. This has operated as an absolute check on increased oil production. Unless increased steel allocations can be made by War Production Board steel will continue to absolutely limit the number of wells that can be drilled.

In the second place, the 40-acre drilling rule promulgated by the Petroleum Administration for War has meant that even in proven fields where oilmen knew they could get oil they could not drill more than one well every 40 acres. It is in proven fields, of course, more than anywhere else, where for the minimum expenditure of critical materials increased oil production can be obtained.

Further, that ruling has played directly into the hands of the major oil companies, because in their case, with vast acreages under lease or ownership, it does not make very much difference, whereas in the case of the small operator the 40-acre limitation has in many instances forced him to drill off structure, so that he has many times gotten dry holes, whereas if he could have drilled independent of such a ruling he might well have brought in oil. Restriction of production by the 40-acre rule will not be ended by a change in price.

As a matter of fact, oil production today is at an all-time high peak. All things really necessary to get the maximum production must, of course, be done. But I do not believe this proposed over-all price increase is the answer. I agree that certain producers—mostly independents, stripper-well operators, and explorers—should have a better return. I want them to have it. But, I wonder how many Members know that the Office of Economic Stabilization instructed the Petroleum Administration for War to bring forth immediately a program for increased financial returns for the wildcatter, for the independent and high-cost producer, and for the stripper-well operator. No such program has yet been presented to the Office of Economic Stabilization. In my judgment the problem of getting increased income for the 15 percent of the industry can be solved without this general price increase. I am not against people making money. I want not only the independents but major oil companies to make money. But earnings in the industry except for the 15 percent of it I have spoken of are higher today than in any other year in history except 1941. So that an over-all price increase means giving a very large increased income to the major companies for them to use, in part at least, to increase their monopolistic control over the industry.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the case of copper we did not increase the price of copper straight across the board and thus unnecessarily increase the profits to those copper companies which were making large earnings indeed at the 14-cents-per-pound price. Instead of that, in order to get high cost producers in a position where they could profitably operate, we pay a higher price to those high-cost producers. Some such program, Mr. Chairman, in my judgment ought to be used in the case of oil also.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks. I have not had time to say nearly all the things I wanted to say in this short speech.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. FORD. You have made the point that I have been stressing, if this thing had gone to the committee and been properly studied, all these angles would have been developed and this House would have known more about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I believe in orderly procedure. But a precedent has already been established. I have read that a precedent embalms a principle. Therefore I expect to yield today to this method of procedure. The O. P. A. has made such a mess of things. We created it, and we seem to be the ones to bear the burdens of their errors. Our people blame us and not the O. P. A., who are unknown to them and not accountable to them. Therefore, I intend, so far as I can, to remedy O. P. A. blunders, even to help take from them the power granted, which they have so grossly misused or failed to use. Gasoline is vitally important, not only to the military, but to civilians. They must have oil. This scare of inflation is greatly overdrawn—slight increases in prices are absolutely necessary to keep production moving. The real danger of inflation is soft-pedaled by the administration. Read the able speech of Mr. CRAWFORD on last Wednesday. You will then understand where the real danger lies. You tried to get inflation for 10 years. You cut the gold dollar in half and promised two dollars for one; you did most everything to bring about inflation. Now you are bellowing in the other direction to carry out political planning. This bill will do but little to bring about inflation. It will stimulate production. I am still my people's Congressman. I want to bring them relief and to act promptly. That is why I feel forced to vote for this unusual method of bringing legislation to the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, if the Office of Price Administration will not establish a price for crude oil that will encourage additional oil production needed for our military and civilian use, there is but one remedy. Congress can and must pass this bill which provides for a parity price for crude oil.

It seems to me the O. P. A. is following a short-sighted policy by establishing and retaining a price for crude oil which is so low that the independent producer cannot replace his stocks without financial loss. Oil stocks are being depleted so rapidly that we are approaching the place where it is impossible to take care of the demand. We need more oil and gasoline—not less.

The present price policy of the administration will eventually lead to further restrictions in oil rationing. This is action in reverse, on a vital necessity of military and civilian oil requirements. Already there has been too much temporizing with an agency that would strangle our present economic system. We must have a supply of gasoline for transportation in areas where we do not have a network of railroads and truck lines. Gasoline must be available that will supply fuel for tractors and power equipment needed to produce the food for our Nation and our allies. We need fuel oil for our industrial and domestic use. A further reduction in the use of the automobiles and trucks on our highways will require the reorganization of the whole economic structure.

The solution is simple. It is amazing to me that steps have not been taken to solve it. In fact it is an indictment against the present New Deal administration. The Office of Price Administration is offering its usual remedy, namely, subsidy. A Government financed subsidy oil well drilling program would no doubt drill wells, but would it produce oil? We need a price for crude oil that will encourage private initiative; we need a price for crude oil that will save thousands of stripper wells which cannot operate on present price ceilings.

The increase in cost of labor and material in the oil industry has increased so much during the past 3 years that there is no incentive for new production. Present ceiling prices are set at about 60 percent of parity. This bill is so drawn that its approval would require the O. P. A. to set a parity price for oil based on the year 1926. This is not only fair and just, but also a sound approach to replenish our diminishing available oil reserve. Our people are willing to pay a slight increase in price for this commodity. An abundant supply of gasoline and fuel oil is necessary if we are to maintain our present domestic economy.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to myself.

Mr. Chairman, I have divided the 30 minutes of time allotted to me to other Members who wanted to have a chance to express their views on this subject. I have spoken on the floor of the House with respect to this important matter on numerous occasions. So I shall speak briefly.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation, in my judgment, is a war measure. We are discussing a war measure this afternoon.

It is not just a question of providing more money for oil producers. It is a question of increasing the production of a highly necessary strategic material needed for carrying on the war; for planes, and trucks and ships and other things, as well as to carry on our transportation, our farm operations and other things that must carry on during these crucial times. I say to you, it is a question of getting a greater supply of oil at a crucial time—to meet the ever-increasing demand for it. I am not talking about gasoline for unnecessary driving, but I am deeply concerned about gasoline to fly our bombers and to run our ships, our tanks, and our trucks.

Mr. Chairman, let us take a look at some comparative figures. According to a report of the Petroleum Administration for War, 32 percent or almost one-third of the output of gasoline goes to our armed forces and our allies. Fourteen percent goes to industries. Trucks and busses and taxicabs get 12 percent. Passenger cars use about 15 percent of all the output, and farmer operations only get 5 percent. We just cannot realize how much gasoline is needed for our armed forces. Mr. Ickes, Petroleum Administrator for War, in a statement a few months ago, said it takes an average of 600,000 gallons of high-octane gas for our armed forces every day. That demand is likely to increase in the next few months to 750,000 or 800,000 gallons per day. Now look at these figures: Four years ended December 1938, new reserve discoveries averaged 2,041,000,000. During the 4 years ending last December 1942, they averaged less than one-half that amount, being 941,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to have to increase the supply of crude oil, and we cannot wait too long about it.

Mr. Chairman, we are not advocating excessive prices for crude oil. Crude oil price is now almost the same price it was 5 or 6 years ago. It is only 60 percent of parity. We are not even advocating parity for it. In 1937 the average cost per barrel for each new oil well was $56.92. In 1941 it was $72.48. In the year 1943 it is approximately $207.69.

Mr. Chairman, this measure follows the recommendation of Mr. Ickes of 35 cents increase per barrel for crude oil and fixes a ceiling that cannot go beyond parity of other commodities. That ought to be fair.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vinson, Stabilization Director, to whom a request for increase was submitted in order to have an increase in the price of crude, said, among other things, that there is no law under which an increase would be permitted. This measure provides the law. It certainly cannot be inflationary when it increases the cost of gasoline about 1 cent per gallon.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

My esteemed friend the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], said one reason oil was not being produced was because they had the 40-acre spacing. Well, bless you, the 40-acre spacing was on account of steel being short last year. They had to do it that way. Now the steel situation has eased up and the 40-acre spacing is relaxed. My friend from Oklahoma says that Judge Vinson said the P. A. W. ought to furnish a program. Now you know what that means. That is the belt on the chin. That is the idea of subsidy you all love so well. That is all that is involved, the fool idea of subsidies in the oil business; nonsense, nonsense. And all that is suggested here is delay, delay, delay, when we have less and less oil, when we need to drill more and more wildcats. Talk to me about subsidies. The Economic Stabilizer practically invited us to amend the law. Mr. BATES of Massachusetts said he did not like this idea of parity. Well, parity for farm products is already in the price-control law. Why shiver about that now? It is a reasonable thing. It has been well thought out. It has been thought out by oil men themselves, the independent oil men. The men who are having to struggle for their existence have thought that out and they prepared this bill and finally prepared an amendment which I am going to offer and which relates to parity. The country has been educated at 35 cents a barrel. The amendment I will offer provides for that, a minimum of 35 cents a barrel price raise and then a policy that will permit the O. P. A. or Mr. Ickes, if you leave it with him, to administer a policy of parity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Chairman, we have the promise from the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], chairman of the committee, that if this bill is recommitted, hearings will be held upon it commencing Friday. We shall have the opportunity of listening to testimony from those people who are in favor of the bill and also from the various departments who will have the responsibility of carrying it into effect and maintaining our present price levels.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BOREN. Has not the committee had the bill since last June?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes. And I might remind my friend that during that time the committee had the Commodity Credit Corporation bill and also had a bill to extend the F. H. A. We have been in constant session, morning and afternoon. Does not the gentleman trust the promise of the committee? Does the gentleman think this committee is trying to sit on this bill? I am sure the gentleman does not believe that. As a member of the committee, I feel certain no member of the majority or the minority desires to suppress this legislation. But, we want to bring it to the floor in an orderly fashion, after mature and deliberate consideration so that we may pass upon it in the proper manner, instead of in an ex parte fashion as we are doing this afternoon.

I intend to offer a motion to recommit. I want the House to believe me when I say that I do not offer that motion as a motion to bury the bill. I am offering the motion to recommit the bill in order to hold hearings on it and to report it forthwith. If it is the will of this Congress that we make different provisions for oil than for all other commodities, and by act of Congress, raise the price of oil, I shall abide by the will of the majority. However, as a member of the committee, until the House has information which will be afforded by these hearings, I think it is my duty and my obligation to resist this ill-considered action that you intend to take here today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the powers and functions conferred by the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, upon the Price Administrator, with respect to crude petroleum and the products thereof and derivatives therefrom are hereby transferred to the Petroleum Administrator for War, provided for in Executive Order No. 9276, issued by the President of the United States. In the fixing of prices for crude petroleum and the products thereof and derivatives therefrom, the Petroleum Administrator for War shall consider the necessity for exploring for crude petroleum and the maintenance of a competitive position in the petroleum industry and to that end no price ceilings for crude petroleum or the products thereof or derivatives therefrom shall be fixed or maintained by the Administrator below a price, the index of which is equal to the price index of "all commodities" as reported from time to time by the United States Department of Labor in its wholesale commodity price index for all commodities as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 1, line 3, strike out lines 3 to 8, inclusive, and strike out all of line 9 down to the period.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, as the bill is drawn we are placing the fixing of prices of crude oil in Mr. Ickes. This amendment leaves it in the O. P. A. I realize there is a great deal of difference of opinion with reference to this question. There are some on both sides of the aisle who do not feel that Mr. Ickes should have charge of it. Others feel the O. P. A. may not be fair about it. I want to give the Members of the House a chance to vote on this amendment and determine where you want to put the authority.

As it stands at the present time, the price fixing on all other commodities is in the Office of Price Administration. This amendment requires the Office of Price Administration to fix the price of crude oil, as provided by the terms of the bill.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Is not this the exact resolution that was signed by 218 Members of the House?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The way it stands now; yes.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. I should think that would be an indication of where they wanted it to go, instead of making a lot of amendments.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It may be. If the Members feel that way about it, it is all right with me. I am presenting the matter, because the question has been raised on both sides of the House, and a number of Members have suggested the logical place, after all, is in the Office of Price Administration. We have a law on the statute books that places the fixing of prices of commodities in the O. P. A. Under the present bill you would remove that authority to another agency. It may be more reasonable, after all, to leave the authority for fixing prices as provided in this bill, in the agency where the Congress fixed it in the first place.

I am submitting the amendment for your consideration. I suggest you vote this authority where you feel it is for the best interest of the country.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield further, in view of the fact that I brought the subject up?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes; I yield to the gentleman. I am glad to have his opinion.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Of course, I for one would never have signed that petition transferring it to Secretary Ickes, if I thought for a minute that the price was going to still be administered by the O. P. A., because nothing has been done for 18 months.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Very well. There will be an amendment offered which will require an increase of 35 cents per barrel. That may take care of the gentleman's position.

I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do I understand the gentleman correctly that we now have before us in bill form a proposal which, among other things, would transfer the authority from O. P. A. to the Department of the Interior and Mr. Ickes?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct, the Petroleum Administrator for War.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; and the gentleman's amendment will correct the bill as here presented so as to leave the price-fixing authority in the office of O. P. A.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. To which we have already given ample directions in laws previously passed along with an amendment which is to be offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] that will place a minimum price increase on crude oil; in other words, we direct O. P. A. to place a minimum price increase of not less than 35 cents a barrel on crude oil.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If that is the gentleman's proposal I think it is one of the most constructive steps that has been taken here in Congress and I am in favor of his amendment.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is it not true, as has been stated, that Mr. Ickes was asked what he would do about this proposition by the Economic Stabilizer and has not yet made a report?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That ought to be explained, perhaps. The difficulty with that is, being fair to Mr. Ickes—and I want to be fair with him because I have a great deal of respect for Mr. Ickes with regard to the manner in which he has tried to deal with this problem. He has really tried to work it out in a practical manner, and has made some pretty clear statements. As I understand it, he has been requested to submit a plan for providing an increase in the crude-oil supply, but that it must be done without any increase in prices of crude oil. The only thing I can read into that statement of the Stabilizer is that he must do it by the payment of some form of subsidy, as near as I can tell.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Texas who has made a very informative statement on this bill.

Mr. LANHAM. In other words, this measure is in the nature of a mandatory direction with reference to the price of oil by reason of the great urgency for the production of oil and the amendment that the gentleman has offered will not interfere with the present governmental organization but leaves that directive to the agency which now controls prices.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman has stated the situation very clearly.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas who has also taken a great deal of interest in this problem.

Mr. THOMASON. Like my colleague from Texas, I want to support the bill that will come nearest to insuring a raise in the price of crude oil, but at the same time it occurs to me that O. P. A. as well as Judge Vinson have definitely and apparently finally said that under no circumstances, after full investigation to their own satisfaction, will they stand for an increase in the price. If that be true why not stand by the original bill? Secretary Ickes is our friend and favors an increase, so why this sudden change?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's viewpoint, but if we place a mandatory provision in the bill which requires that the price must be increased by 35 cents how can they escape complying with the mandate of Congress?

Mr. THOMASON. You are certainly putting it in the hands of those who say they have and will refuse to grant an increase.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished member from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I should like to ask my friend from Texas if there is the slightest doubt in his mind that Judge Vinson would violate any directive that this House might give him.

Mr. THOMASON. No, I do not doubt that for 1 minute; but O. P. A. has very definitely said, after study, that they are opposed to it; and my good friend, Judge Vinson, has done the same. I want legislation on this vital war measure, and have actively supported it from the beginning.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What assurance have you or the House that O. P. A. will carry out the orders of the Congress? We gave them the Price Control Act to administer 13 months ago and that act certainly has not been enforced to the satisfaction of either the Congress or the country.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We make it mandatory. I do not know of any other way in which we can do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas may have 3 additional minutes. I should like to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I will necessarily have to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Supposing the gentleman's amendment is adopted by the House, will the power of fixing the price of crude oil rest with the Secretary of the Interior or not?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It will not under this amendment.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Who will have the power to do it?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The Office of Price Administration will have it and with the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] it will be absolutely mandatory that the price be increased by 35 cents a barrel.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Then Secretary Ickes will be out of the picture.

Mr. REES of Kansas. No; he will still be in the picture as the Petroleum Administrator for War.

Mr. O'CONNOR. He is not in the picture at all now.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. There is a saying as old as the ages: "By their works ye shall know them." Can the gentleman think of anything in the past history of O. P. A. that would cause us to believe that they would act favorably now?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It is my opinion they will be required to act favorably to the extent of 35 cents a barrel under the bill as amended by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY].

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. Does the gentleman think it would be right for those of us who believe in a single food administrator to vote to leave it under O. P. A.?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I will leave that to the gentleman's judgeship. I do believe this situation is different from the one just mentioned by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. PRIEST. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I wonder if the gentleman from Kansas will agree with me that the very fact the proponents of this bill now find themselves very much divided on a very important provision of the bill indicates the importance of recommitting it and holding hearings?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No; I do not think so. Not on the general intent of the legislation.

Mr. PRIEST. It occurs to me that it does.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the gentleman will agree with me, and the House will agree that in the price legislation that has heretofore been approved, we have directed with respect to certain floor prices, you may say.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If I understand the situation correctly, the gentleman from Oklahoma is to follow with another amendment which directs the O. P. A. to place a floor that will be no less than an increase of 35 cents per barrel.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In doing that we meet the opinion of Mr. Vinson, who has said he wants further directions, or words to that effect.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We do to that extent, at least.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It seems to me this amendment straightens out the whole situation.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. It is true, is it not, that the Petroleum Administrator for War is responsible for the production under our oil program?

Mr. REES of Kansas. At the present time; yes.

Mr. CURTIS. How can he carry that on unless we give him authority to follow through and see that he has a price structure to bring about production?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is exactly what we are attempting to do, to arrange that price structure so he can carry on. And, incidentally, he suggested the 35-cent price increase.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DISNEY., Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, we are confronted here with a practical situation. I have no pride of authorship in this bill. Further study of it has made me wiser. I have worked with gentlemen who understand these things.

Let me call your attention to the fact that last year when Chester Davis resigned he did so because of a collision of opinion between himself and higher authorities. He took the view that if he was to be Food Administrator he should also have the right to fix prices.

I would like to see this bill passed and become law. In my judgment, it is highly important that that be done. I am afraid, if we transfer this to Mr. Ickes, that will be an additional reason for a veto or for argument against the bill. Nobody else wants to come and take a position on it. I will. I am friendly to Mr. Ickes, I like him, but I say to you that, in my judgment, we better pass this bill and leave the price control in O. P. A. than to have a veto on it. With all due respect to everyone's opinion, and I have the deepest affection for Mr. Ickes, that is my judgment. I think Mr. Ickes is a very fine administrator, the best administrator in the Government, probably, with one or two exceptions. I take my hat off to men like him and Mr. Jones, who know how to select other men and delegate power to them to go and do the job. I do hate to make the admission, but I believe in the interest of getting the legislation passed, getting it through, and with the possibility of getting it signed, we better do it this way. No one has to follow my judgment, but I am ready to take a position, and that is the view I take of it.

Mr. GAVIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. This will determine, I would say, if we enact this legislation, and the O. P. A. bypasses us, whether or not the O. P. A. is going to run the country or the duly-elected Members of Congress are going to run the country.

Mr. DISNEY. Under the amendment I am going to offer, they will have to increase it 35 cents; then a parity formula is set up which, if necessary in certain fields, may permit it to go as high as 74 cents, a little less than 2 cents a gallon on gasoline. It could go that high. We have parity for farm products. Why not have a parity for oil? Keep in mind that is a ceiling that may be put on. Buyers would not have to pay the high price. The fact they permitted it to go that high would not make it compulsory for them to buy. The buyers will buy oil as cheaply as they can.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If I understood the gentleman correctly, his amendment has a proviso in it which will direct an increase in price of no less than 35 cents?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes; the country has been educated to a 35-cent increase. In addition there is the parity policy.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It would leave the O. P. A. with the power to do the proper thing in certain fields if it found it necessary to do so?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We have had an experience like that in the Guffey Coal Act.

Mr. DISNEY. There are various grades, types, and kinds of oil at varying prices. Pennsylvania oil brings $3 right now. It is high in price.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. Does the gentleman mean to say that a different price increase could be given to different producers under his amendment?

Mr. DISNEY. That is not a good way to say it. The best way to say it is competitive conditions and grades of oil create different prices. Transportation differences make a difference.

Mr. WRIGHT. But there is a directive to increase all oil at least 35 cents in the gentleman's bill?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes. There is no dispute about that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I have the highest respect and regard for Mr. Ickes as Petroleum Administrator for War. He is trying to do a good job and I think if the situation were different he might handle it differently.

Mr. DISNEY. I know how I would do it if I were handling it. But we are confronted with a condition, not a theory.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let us who are in favor of this bill, we who actually believe that if the economy of this country is to be preserved and if we are to obtain suf-

ficient production of oil to guarantee a sufficient supply of petroleum products to carry on the war and the economy of civilian industry, we must increase the price of oil, not get disturbed now and divide forces against the crowd who are here to defeat this legislation. I watched the strategy over there of the gentlemen who are so jealous of the fact that they want their committee to now consider this bill. They have had the bill for months, without considering it. Now that we are about to pass it they are much exercised. It is passing strange that every member of the Committee on Banking and Currency who spoke about being so jealous of the jurisdiction of that committee and the functions of that committee—and I am jealous about committee functions, too—is against the bill. They are against an increase in the price of oil. They want the matter handled through subsidies. Those of us who believe that this price increase is necessary and that that is the proper way to handle this economic question, rather than to treat it as they want to treat it, namely through subsidies, believe that this bill should be passed now.

My good friend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] said, "Send it back to the committee." I asked him on the floor, "Are you in favor of an increase in the price of oil?" He said, "Yes," he believed he was. Then my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] asked him, "Well, what do you suggest?" He said, "Send the bill back to us, and we will talk to Mr. Vinson some more about it."

They have been talking about it for months and months. Mr. Ickes recommended that the price be increased, and everyone who knows anything about the oil industry and what is necessary to secure increased production has recommended that the price be increased, and the O. P. A. has refused to do it. These gentlemen who now are clamoring to send the bill back to their committee know they are going to continue to refuse to do it. What they want is a subsidy program.

I am going to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas, but I say to you, who, I think, understand what is going on—I did not need to warn you—do not be fooled by this strategy over here of the gentlemen who want subsidies for the oil business, of trying to divide the forces who knew what they wanted when they signed this petition for discharge. Let us put this bill over this afternoon and not send it back to some committee so that they can fool around with Mr. Vinson until they finally bring before the country a subsidy for another industry. They want subsidies for everything down there; do not be fooled about that.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I just want to remind the gentleman that the same committee in which he has no confidence recently reported out a bill against subsidies.

Mr. RIZLEY. I refuse to listen to that kind of talk. I have confidence in the gentleman's committee and I have confidence in him.

Mr. WRIGHT. Then why does the gentleman say we are trying to rig the bill?

Mr. RIZLEY. You stand for one policy, a policy of subsidies. I am against that policy and I think the 218 or 220 men who signed this petition are against that policy. They want to get increased production through a price increase instead of subsidies. I respect the gentleman. He has a right to his opinion.

Mr. WRIGHT. I want the gentleman to realize that the majority of the Committee on Banking and Currency are against subsidies. I am for them, but they are against them. So why not give them a chance to consider the bill? Do not be afraid of the committee.

Mr. RIZLEY. I have not heard anyone from the Committee on Banking and Currency except those who favor subsidies saying they want the bill back before the committee for further consideration. No one has said so this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of doing something for the oil business in order that we may get more oil. I am not at all interested in recommitting this bill to the committee. They have had it since last June, 6 months, and they have known for the last 3 months of the move that was on to bring out this bill. I know that a number of them are certainly familiar with the chaotic conditions now existing in the oil business, yet nothing has been done. If we recommit the bill and they follow the line they have heretofore followed—and the only way we know to judge the future is by the past—it will be 1956 before they get through satisfying themselves with their hearing on this matter, for every one of the members of that committee who speaks on the bill is against it.

Mr. Vinson, the stabilizer, in setting aside the request of Mr. Ickes, admitted the necessity for an increase in the price of oil, but, as has been stated heretofore on the floor of the House and as I reiterate, he wants to help the situation by taking care of present and future production by the subsidy method.

Some people do not like subsidies. Some oilmen do not like subsidies. I came to Congress opposed to subsidies. I spoke against subsidies here. I can see in special instances, especially in trying times like we are going through now, that they might be necessary, but a great many independent American people feel that subsidies are nothing more nor less than a dole. Those people are too much American to want to take a dole to help them out. They would rather go out and paddle their own canoe and make it their own way.

Oil is ammunition. We all know that. It is necessary for us to have more oil in the future. It has been shown that our reserve is being depleted, and unless this situation is remedied, the present price is prohibitive to proper development, and the situation may reach a calamitous stage.

Let us take the independent oilman in whom I am interested, because he is the pathfinder; he is the trail blazer in the development of the oil business in going out and finding the oil. The majors are not interested very much in that. So, I am interested in this man who has given his life in that occupation that has meant so much in the development of our country and has meant so much to the winning of this war. What condition is he in today? Wages have increased, not 35 cents, but 170 percent. The material he has had to buy has increased not 35 cents, not 50 percent, but 150 percent. He has been placed under the Wages and Hours Act in the oil business. It is more destructive in the oil business than any other occupation in the world. It is almost impossible for him to carry on in that business and work under the Wages and Hours Act, as they are required to do. This, taken together with the low price of oil, has put many of them out of business. More are yet to go unless they get some relief. Thousands of them have already gone out of business. Thousands more will go. If we had this increase in the price of oil, at least 20,000 stripper wells would now be producing a small amount of oil, which would be of material help to us at this time. When you put the independent oil companies out, then you are going to leave it in the hands of the majors solely. I do not need to tell you what the result will be in a few years. Common sense will tell you that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUSSELL] has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, in the closing moments of this debate I want to call the attention of the Members to a very serious situation concerning the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] and the proposed amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY].

I have given months of study to this problem. I want to say just this thing, particularly to the people representing the consuming areas of the country. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] simply provides

that this matter shall be left in the hands of the O. P. A. That will be followed by an amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY], which establishes a parity price. The recommendation of the Petroleum Administrator today is an increase of 35 cents per barrel. If we establish a parity price, and that is the direction that is intended to be given to the Office of Price Administration by the Disney amendment, then the price of oil will be increased 75 or 80 cents per barrel according to word I have just received from the Office of Petroleum Administration for War.

I have discussed this problem all over the East over a period of many months. Something ought to be done about it. I believe there ought to be a price increase granted. I firmly believe that if we pass this bill with the Disney amendment and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas, we are just getting into a lot of deep water by placing a parity price, which will bring about an increase, not of 35 cents a barrel, but an increase, according to the Office of Petroleum Administration of 75 or 80 cents per barrel. I do not believe the Members of this House want to do that.

I am going to offer an amendment that this matter be placed in the hands of the Petroleum Administrator for War, his recommendation to be approved by the President. I hope this amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I have heard so much about oil that it seems to me we ought to have a little more oil on the legislative machinery of this Congress. Here you have a situation of a group in Congress saying that they want to take the functions of a committee from the committee, and they want to give control to the O. P. A., but they want to control the O. P. A. in what the O. P. A. shall do. It seems to me that this is piecemeal legislation. It is unwise. It is not statesmanlike. It is bad legislative procedure.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I am one of those individuals, who along with 217 others, signed this original petition. I want to register my opposition to this amendment, as it would permit control to remain in the Office of Price Administration. Eighty-six thousand small businesses have gone out of existence in the past year, thousands of them because of the attitude of O. P. A. toward profit.

They do not seem to realize that when you destroy in America the incentive to accumulate, you destroy the initiative that built this country. I think that at the time the O. P. A. was created it was the intention of Congress that it control prices and not profit. But that has not been its policy. The only Administrator I find in Washington, who has a complete knowledge of the effect of price fixing on the petroleum industry, is the Secretary of the Interior. We were under the impression when we signed the discharge petition that pricing was to be placed in his hands. Let us keep faith with the signers by keeping it there.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 72, noes 42.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DISNEY. The adoption of the amendment just considered makes it necessary to offer a perfecting amendment, on page 2, line 1. I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DISNEY: On page 2, line 1, strike out all of line 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "as provided under the Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, consideration shall be given to the."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DISNEY: On page 2, line 4, after the word "end" strike out the rest of line 4, all of lines 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, and insert, "shall give consideration to the parity prices as indicated by the relationship between the index based on the national average price of crude petroleum and the index of all commodities as reported by the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, in its wholesale commodity price index based on the year 1926: *Provided, however,* That such ceilings shall not be fixed or maintained at less than 35 cents per barrel above the present respective price ceilings for crude petroleum. Concurrently with the establishing of maximum crude petroleum prices as provided herein, maximum prices for petroleum products shall be increased sufficiently to compensate for additional prices paid for crude petroleum."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, as one who has spent a great deal of midnight oil on this bill and who has worked most earnestly on it to try to bring a fair bill before the House, I assure you that this represents the best thought and consideration that can be given to this legislation from the standpoint of those who are interested in a fair price for crude petroleum. I doubt if there is any other way of doing it. When it goes to the Senate and goes to conference, it will be thought out thoroughly, and this is what is bound to emerge if you want to do what we have been talking about here today.

Let us remember, too, gentlemen, those of you who are especially interested, that this is the first step of this bill. The next step is the Senate, and then the conference has to settle the differences between the two Houses. So this is one step; and if it takes any concession on the part of anybody now, remember we have two other considerations to be given to it. In short, what this does is this: It does what the country has been educated to for the last 5 or 6 months. It fixes 35 cents as the lowest price raise that the O. P. A., as the bill now stands, can embody in any order. Then it furnishes 35 cents a barrel minimum, as recommended by the Petroleum Administrator for War, who has studied this thoroughly. It fixes a floor of 35 cents a barrel on what the O. P. A. can do. And this is one of the things you want. But that is not sufficient in this legislation. Not that we do not need more of a price, not that we do not need a higher price; I think we do, I think the minimum ought to be 50 cents a barrel, or maybe 60 cents; but the public has been educated to 35 cents. Now, the rest of this language on parity provides that the O. P. A. must consider two things: First, it must consider one definite thing; that is to say, the relationship between two things, the relationship between the crude-oil index and the all-commodity index, both of which are kept by the Bureau of Labor's Statistical Department. That is what is involved. Remember that the floor limit, the extreme price raise that they can permit to be had, is 74 cents a barrel on that. That is the extreme. That does not mean anybody buying oil has to pay 74 cents more. Competitive conditions will take care of that kind of situation—maybe not in Pennsylvania for their extraordinary oil, where you have to pay more and pay the 74 cents. In California you would not have to pay it. Competitive conditions would take care of that.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Translating that floor price and the high price you have mentioned into the price for the increase to a gallon of gasoline, what does it mean to the average citizen of the United States?

Mr. DISNEY. It means less than 2 cents a gallon.

Mr. DONDERO. That is what the country wants to know.

Mr. DISNEY. And you motorists are using less than 15 percent of the oil.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is it not true the Petroleum Administrator's recommendation of 35 cents a barrel increase is an average increase?

Mr. DISNEY. I think so, yes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is it not true under the parity formula that increase would be double 35 cents, or 70 cents to 75 cents or 80 cents?

Mr. DISNEY. May I say to my good friend from Massachusetts the possibility, I do not think that I answered you correctly, that 35 cents was a uniform price increase. If you get into uniformity——

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I did not use the word "uniformity."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. My question was whether or not the recommendation of the Petroleum Administrator of 35 cents was not an average increase of 35 cents a barrel.

Mr. DISNEY. I am not sure I understand what the gentleman means by an average—an average, over-all, yes; but that means there would be different prices in different fields for different grades.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. But the average increase would be 35 cents a barrel.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes; and in Montana my information is that it would not be that, that it would be only 21 cents.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Under the parity formula the gentleman is setting up in his amendment is it not true that the increase if the parity formula is approved by the Office of Price Administration will mean an increase instead of 35 cents a barrel of 75 or 80 cents a barrel?

Mr. DISNEY. No; 74 cents, to be exact.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is right; that will be the average.

Mr. DISNEY. Now, wait a minute. That means that is the limit of the ceiling they could place; that does not mean the buyers would have to pay it; no; it does not mean they are compelled to pay that. That resolves itself into a different proposition. It may be possible up in Pennsylvania where oil is so valuable that they would raise the price 74 cents, but not so in other fields from my experience.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. We are speaking about the average parity over the country.

Mr. DISNEY. Now let me ask about parity: What is so wrong about parity so far as oil is concerned? You heard today and have seen from these charts that it is at the very bottom of the barrel. The House of Representatives passed a bill fixing parity for farm products. What is so sacred there and so sacrosanct here?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I do not know, in answer to the gentleman, but I do know that the Petroleum Administrator for War has recommended 35 cents a barrel increase.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I know the industry generally has accepted that as being fair. Of course, some want it more, but under the gentleman's formula he is setting up a parity which means an average increase according to the Deputy Petroleum Administrator for War, Mr. Davies, of from 75 to 80 cents a barrel.

Mr. DISNEY. The average ceiling, yes; all over the country.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to make a speech in the time of the gentleman from Oklahoma, but while we are worrying about this so-called parity price the important thing—and we must not lose sight of it—is to get the production of oil and take no chances on this war.

Mr. DISNEY. And price is what will produce oil.

Mr. REED of New York. Here is one other thing we must remember—there are 113,000 stripper wells.

Mr. DISNEY. No; the gentleman is mistaken. There are about 300,000.

Mr. REED of New York. I am talking about the East. They require more money to carry on the secondary operations in order to get this valuable oil.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes.

Mr. REED of New York. So price is the important factor.

Mr. DISNEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. If these stripper wells are not kept in production, their possibilities of production go out of the picture.

Mr. DISNEY. Oh, they are gone; if they are once closed, they are gone.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Here is the concrete proposition as I understand; it is impossible to operate these stripper wells at the price they are getting for crude oil.

Mr. DISNEY. Many of them.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. And if they do not continue to operate, then the possibility of using the oil that could now be produced from those stripper wells really passes out of the picture.

Mr. DISNEY. It is gone forever.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. It is a permanent loss.

Mr. DISNEY. It is a permanent loss.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. As a matter of fact, as I read the amendment, it states that the O. P. A. shall give consideration, too.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. There is nothing mandatory in that language is there?

Mr. DISNEY. It is intended to be advisory: "Shall give consideration."

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Yes, "shall give consideration." The language is not that it shall allow the parity price.

Mr. DISNEY. No; the mandatory thing here is 35 cents a barrel.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I want to ask the gentleman from the great State of Oklahoma which he in part represents whether or not he believes what we put in this bill will be carried out by the O. P. A. if it is sent back there, under the circumstances?

Mr. DISNEY. With a mandate from Congress, surely it will.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. May I say to my fine friend from Oklahoma that the O. P. A. has been operating under suggestions from Congress from the beginning of their life and up to date they have shown no desire so far as I can see to meet the wishes of Congress.

Mr. DISNEY. It seems to be in more successful hands now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not a fact, however, and is not this one reason why the parity formula is written into the bill. A lot of times production almost ceases in the shallow wells. Then it takes a terrific cost to go deeper. In my own State and in Wyoming we have the situation of fields being practically abandoned. A well might have been sunk a distance of 5,000 feet. Today we have a potential field for 300,000,000 barrels of oil which may be developed at a higher cost on account of the depth of the well.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes.

Mr. GAVIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Explain to the Members of the House in connection with parity that the price of oil was not all the same in 1926. Texas oil might have been 75 cents a barrel and Pennsylvania oil may have been $1.75. This 74 cents is not an over-all for everything. It would take in the smaller fields.

Mr. DISNEY. That would be the limit to which they could go.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. With reference to the statement made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] it has not been mentioned in the debate, but should be, that in the aggregate the stripper wells yield a very large volume of production.

Mr. DISNEY. Half of the consumption of oil in the United States comes from new or practically new wells and the other half from strippers. When the strippers go out they are gone forever.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. In the gentleman's amendment he has put a floor at 35 cents above the present price.

Mr. DISNEY. Yes.

Mr. PLOESER. That amounts to 80 percent of parity?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes.

Mr. PLOESER. In order to keep this amendment in conformity with the practice of the House heretofore in its meth-

ods of handling the Price Control Act, I wonder if the gentleman would not consider an amendment to the amendment, first restating the language and stating 80 percent of parity as the floor.

Mr. DISNEY. This is all I have. I do not know how to fix up anything else.

Mr. PLOESER. And, second, eliminating the last sentence.

Mr. DISNEY. The gentleman better do that in conference with the Senate. This is all I have. I have studied it for a week and I cannot do any better.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to offer an amendment to the pending amendment?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. A substitute for the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts offers a substitute for the Disney amendment, as follows: Page 2, line 4, after the word "end", strike out the rest of line 4 and all of lines 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided, however,* That such ceilings shall not be fixed or maintained at less than an average of 35 cents per barrel above the present respective price ceilings for crude petroleum."

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is simply to strike out the parity provision of the Disney amendment. It seems to me that we are getting into a lot of hot water in advocating a price formula for fixing of prices on petroleum products at double the amount which the Petroleum Administrator for War has already recommended.

Many Members of this House have served on a number of special committees. For over a period of 5 months I have served on one of those committees. I have gone along with the Petroleum Administrator for War and his recommendation of 35 cents a barrel feeling that that would stimulate and be an incentive for the development of new fields and the building up of a reserve of oil throughout the country. I feel that we can go along with the Disney bill as it was withdrawn from the committee because the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] recommended that this matter be left in the hands of the Petroleum Administrator for War. He now comes along, following the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] which was adopted by the committee, and wants to keep it in the hands of O. P. A. which over a period of many months has refused to approve the increase suggested by Mr. Ickes.

The controlling factor, as I see it, and the very purpose of the Disney amendment, is to create parity based on the cost of commodities as of the 1926 figure. I have just discussed this matter with the Office of Petroleum Coordinator. I asked a member of his staff just what it would mean to increase the price that much and he came back with the words that such a parity payment, even by direction of Congress, and it is an implied direction by the words of the Disney amendment, must be applied to the increase in price of petroleum products. The Office of Petroleum Coordinator informed me that the parity formula would bring about an increase of 75 to 80 cents a barrel.

Many of us in the great oil consuming areas of the country want to go along with the Petroleum Administrator for War. His recommendation of an increase of 35 cents has been generally accepted by the oil industry. I know because I have attended many meetings throughout the country, and I have traveled in many States throughout the country. I have discussed the question with all phases of the oil industry and while it is true they would like more than 35 cents they were generally agreeable to the 35 cents recommended by Mr. Ickes.

There seems to be a feeling of confidence in Mr. Ickes. My amendment simply provides that even though it is kept in the hands of O. P. A. as provided by the Rees amendment, adopted by the committee, the average price that will be given will not exceed 35 cents a barrel.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. In other words, the gentleman's amendment will put the force of Congress behind the recommendation of Secretary Ickes and demands that the O. P. A. carry out the suggestion he has made as essential to the production of sufficient oil?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is precisely the purpose of my amendment, it maintains a constant level and, as far as the Members of this House are concerned, it saves them a great deal of Nation-wide criticism.

Mr. DISNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DISNEY. The gentleman has stressed the increase in price heretofore. He does not want to give the House the impression the increase of 75 cents a barrel is mandatory under the parity provision of this amendment? That is not the necessary implication.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. There is an implied direction in the language of your amendment that the Office of Price Administration shall give consideration to the parity price. If the gentleman did not intend that they should do that, he should not have offered the amendment.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to get one or two things straight. In the first place, the 40-acre drilling limitation is still in effect except in one or two small areas, in spite of a statement to the contrary here on the floor a short time ago. That is a real limitation on production in many instances. In the second place, the gentleman from Oklahoma spoke about competitive conditions keeping prices down. Does not the gentleman know gasoline is rationed, that millions of people stand ready at this moment to pay any price at all if they could secure more gasoline or more of other petroleum products? Furthermore, does anybody seriously think that competitive conditions determine the price of oil in America? I for one do not. Standard Oil together with a few other major companies have controlled those prices for years.

Further, on the general proposition that we can restore competitive conditions in the middle of this war and rely upon supply and demand to operate and control our economy, I do not think reasonable people can expect that to happen. The whole economy of the United States has been twisted completely out of shape by this war. How could it be otherwise?

This is what we are up against in this bill, as I see it. Congress is attempting to legislate as to what the price of a certain commodity is going to be. Obviously, if Congress is going to do that with one commodity it must do it with other commodities. I voted against the prohibition against using subsidies as a means of keeping food prices from rising. I did it with some reluctance. I thought some of the arguments against those general subsidies were forceful. Indeed, had the really poor, fixed-income group of people in this country been protected in some effective manner, such as by a stamp plan, I might have voted differently.

Certain it is that if you are going to vote a bill to increase by congressional action the price of petroleum when that price increase is needed by no more than 15 percent of that industry at the outside, you are in duty bound to pass legislation regulating the price of other commodities as well. Perhaps we are going to come to the place where we have to do it. In this instance the choice is here. If you pass this bill there will be a general over-all increase in petroleum prices. If you do not the Petroleum Administrator and other people in charge of this program are going to have to come in with the kind of program that the Office of Economic Stabilization has already told them to come in with, namely, a program of direct financial incentives to high-cost operators of stripper wells and to wildcat explorers.

You say you do not like subsidies. Neither do I. Neither do I like war or people getting killed all over the world. But I tell you, it is not reasonable to say that an industry which today is making more money than it ever made in history, after taxes, except for 1 year, has to have a general over-all increase in prices like this. And that statement applies to many of the independents as well as to major companies. I do think the high-cost producers have to have help. I am frank to say I think it ought to come by some means similar to that used in the case of copper. We could have increased the price of copper to

Anaconda, Kennicutt, and Phelps Dodge to 17 cents if we had wanted to, and then said excess-profits taxes would take back part of the increased profits. But we did not. Instead, we said, "There are certain high-cost producers who can, with increased returns, bring in production we need now, and we are going to go directly to them and bring them into production by giving them a price of 17 cents a pound."

There was Member after Member on the floor in the subsidy debate on farm commodities who said, "What we ought to do instead of subsidizing the whole of the United States is to subsidize those low-income people who really need it." I think there was much in that argument, but if there was, Mr. Chairman, the same argument applies with equal force to the instant bill.

To illustrate the fact that the great bulk of this industry does not need this price increase, I ask to include herewith tables on earnings of the major companies and those independents which publish statements:

Statement of earnings before and after income taxes of 26 crude-oil producing companies, years 1936–42

[000 omitted]

Name of company	Fiscal period ended	1936		1937		1938		1939		Average 1936–39		1940		1941		1942	
		Before income taxes	After income taxes	Before income taxes	After income taxes	Before income taxes	After income taxes	Before income taxes	After income taxes	Before income taxes	After income taxes	Before income taxes	After income taxes	Before income taxes	After income taxes	Before income taxes	After income taxes
Amerada Pet. Corporation	Dec. 31	$2,119	$1,984	$2,532	$2,400	$1,707	$1,634	$1,297	$1,231	$1,914	$1,812	$1,893	$1,776	$2,770	$2,570	$3,572	$3,272
Bishop Oil Co. (California)	do	219	178	369	320	48	46	(1)	(1)	159	136	24	23	69	55	96	74
Darby Pet. Corporation	do	444	444	478	478	244	244	11	11	294	294	394	394	808	750	1,022	753
Devonian Oil Co	do	824	777	1,040	1,021	563	552	506	506	733	714	406	374	820	804	626	584
Eason Oil Co	do	142	123	(25)	(25)	(85)	(85)	(127)	(127)	(24)	(29)	(52)	(52)	118	65	116	96
Honolulu Oil Corporation	do	1,116	1,071	1,193	1,181	964	949	814	809	1,022	1,003	907	907	1,101	1,101	1,615	1,592
Houston Oil Co. of Texas	do	491	486	1,787	1,651	1,552	1,448	1,090	1,010	1,230	1,149	1,044	871	1,620	1,353	1,831	1,149
Louisiana Land & Exploration Co	do	1,976	1,901	1,945	1,727	1,472	1,327	681	648	1,519	1,401	1,020	858	1,647	1,327	1,598	1,100
Midwest Oil Co	do	421	344	1,038	945	1,021	932	1,078	990	890	800	1,021	882	925	776	951	702
North American Oil Consolidated	do	380	376	404	370	277	249	359	309	355	326	218	184	207	170	177	138
North Central Texas Oil Co., Inc	do	80	70	157	134	105	90	83	73	106	92	113	93	96	78	78	65
Pacific Western Oil Corporation	do	1,732	1,582	1,489	1,389	1,267	1,217	864	814	1,338	1,251	(213)	(213)	524	438	755	790
Penn Valley Crude Oil Corporation	June 30	43	43	37	37	65	60	(3)	(3)	36	34	(36)	(36)	(184)	(184)	(33)	(33)
Plymouth Oil Co	Dec. 31	1,816	1,740	3,154	2,935	2,819	2,609	2,680	2,475	2,617	2,440	1,582	1,443	1,613	1,547	2,202	1,774
Republic Petroleum Co. (California)	do	121	114	245	233	123	111	134	120	156	145	(140)	(153)	123	107	(28)	(50)
Roeser & Pendleton, Inc	Sept. 30	789	701	[2] 566	549	634	596	349	316	585	541	315	295	319	301	372	315
Seaboard Oil Co. of Delaware	Dec. 31	2,726	[2] 2,486	2,637	2,447	2,076	1,896	1,896	1,746	2,334	2,144	1,401	1,301	1,397	1,257	1,664	1,464
Signal Oil & Gas Co	do	1,084	951	1,252	966	866	691	1,104	1,001	1,077	902	1,051	922	1,421	1,200	1,678	1,215
South Penn Oil Co	do	3,590	3,590	4,913	4,643	1,456	1,441	2,923	2,837	3,221	3,128	2,183	2,101	3,803	3,269	6,825	5,089
Sunray Oil Corporation	do	610	550	1,079	951	680	569	707	606	769	669	658	528	1,165	853	1,169	819
Superior Oil Co. (California)	Aug. 31	[3] 2,370	[3] 2,185	[4] 1,111	[4] 1,111	(281)	(281)	896	816	1,024	958	(1,069)	(1,069)	1,742	1,742	4,713	4,513
Superior Oil Corporation (Delaware)	Dec. 31	154	148	446	446	333	333	62	62	249	247	164	152	165	147	193	185
Texas Gulf Producing Co	do	852	823	655	605	783	766	615	615	726	702	560	560	317	317	405	405
Texas Pacific Coal & Oil Co	do	646	642	985	983	1,037	1,036	892	889	890	888	481	480	1,222	1,180	959	861
Transwestern Oil Co	do	[5] 49	[5] 44	375	362	(88)	(88)	(1,065)	(1,065)	(182)	(187)	(439)	439	572	561	799	749
Universal Consolidated Oil Co	do	244	240	43	41	366	351	562	513	304	286	237	228	350	309	122	118
Total		25,038	23,583	29,905	27,900	20,004	18,693	18,408	17,202	23,342	21,846	13,723	12,410	24,730	22,093	33,427	27,730

[1] Less than $1,000 ($310).
[2] 9-month period to Sept. 30.
[3] 10-month period to Oct. 31.
[4] 10-month period to Aug. 31, allowable tax deductions exceed income.
[5] Period from Nov. 20 to Dec. 31.

NOTE.—Figures in parentheses ( ) indicates loss.
Source: Moody's Industrials; Standard and Poor's; Securities and Exchange Commission Report on Crude Oil Production, Costs and Profits, 1939–42.

Statement of earnings before and after income taxes of 21 fully integrated companies, years 1936–42

[000 omitted]

Name of company	1936		1937		1938		1939		Average 1936–39		1940		1941		1942	
	Before income taxes [1]	After income taxes [1]	Before income taxes [1]	After income taxes [1]	Before income taxes [1]	After income taxes [1]	Before income taxes [1]	After income taxes [1]	Before income taxes [1]	After income taxes [1]	Before income taxes [1]	After income taxes [1]	Before income taxes [1]	After income taxes [1]	Before income taxes [1]	After income taxes [1]
Atlantic Refining Co. (Pennsylvania)	$8,386	$7,348	$11,114	$9,942	$5,602	$4,317	$6,500	$5,028	$7,900	$6,659	$10,575	$7,847	$23,106	$15,872	$8,305	$5,297
Cities Service Oil Co. (Delaware) [2]	777	730	1,838	1,827	(675)	(675)	(401)	(413)	385	367	1,106	1,060	6,568	6,043	11,383	9,552
Continental Oil Co. (Delaware)	10,226	9,622	14,566	13,959	5,303	5,149	6,470	6,317	9,141	8,762	4,715	4,331	17,201	15,407	18,034	14,929
Gulf Oil Corporation (Pennsylvania)	28,069	26,355	33,641	31,854	14,736	13,017	18,209	15,316	23,664	21,635	25,904	22,151	44,309	35,569	35,633	27,982
Mid-continent Petroleum Corporation (Delaware)	5,101	4,778	5,990	5,305	1,123	1,044	2,759	2,651	3,743	3,445	3,332	2,968	6,273	4,866	9,319	6,112
Ohio Oil Co. (Ohio)	8,254	7,886	12,937	11,869	5,355	4,588	2,385	1,499	7,233	6,460	10,134	8,740	14,176	11,898	17,997	13,243
Phillips Petroleum Co. (Delaware)	20,258	17,876	26,745	24,114	9,701	9,049	11,279	9,833	16,996	15,218	14,907	11,590	24,741	18,123	21,973	13,901
Pure Oil Co. (Ohio)	9,003	8,456	12,404	11,992	6,536	6,023	9,103	8,775	9,261	8,812	10,083	9,275	20,004	15,894	22,149	15,872
Shell Union Oil Corporation (Delaware)	21,727	19,721	24,217	20,709	14,831	11,318	12,951	11,805	18,431	15,888	19,455	15,655	31,316	21,334	41,660	17,727
Sinclair Oil Corporation (New York) [3]	17,931	16,729	22,246	20,809	8,160	7,737	7,946	7,541	14,071	13,204	4,302	3,792	24,472	18,972	30,108	20,561
Skelly Oil Co. (Delaware)	5,371	4,933	7,118	6,578	3,024	2,763	2,486	2,383	4,500	4,164	2,981	2,806	6,996	5,230	9,199	5,633
Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc. (New York)	52,337	43,174	68,895	57,265	47,846	40,340	42,799	37,064	52,969	44,461	50,947	43,266	79,097	58,583	59,226	36,639
Standard Oil Co. of California (Delaware)	24,876	23,330	46,348	42,035	32,476	28,876	19,283	17,883	30,746	28,031	23,988	22,488	40,286	34,267	41,309	30,501
Standard Oil Co. (Indiana)	54,240	47,689	65,184	57,513	31,043	28,147	41,564	35,490	48,008	42,210	44,578	35,126	75,541	53,089	74,291	45,722
Standard Oil Co. (Kentucky)	4,589	3,947	5,081	4,183	4,630	3,780	4,895	3,980	4,799	3,973	5,003	3,818	6,551	3,671	7,065	3,185
Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey)	157,587	131,535	234,168	198,377	143,574	112,777	138,798	114,893	168,532	139,395	180,034	145,026	259,352	197,240	161,161	111,161
Standard Oil Co. (Ohio)	5,187	4,194	4,241	3,518	2,428	2,159	6,709	5,619	4,641	3,873	9,257	6,177	15,235	7,966	17,760	6,148
Sun Oil Co. (New Jersey)	9,390	7,164	11,533	9,546	3,701	3,087	8,357	6,961	8,245	6,789	9,389	7,970	20,944	16,533	17,020	8,251

[1] Before provisions for possible war losses, post-war adjustments, and contingencies (extraordinary) and before gains or losses from sale of fixed capital assets (which can be determined from the sources used).
[2] Before interest on advance by parent company (Empire Gas & Fuel Co.).
[3] Consolidated Oil Corporation (New York) prior to May 19, 1943.

Statement of earnings before and after income taxes of 21 fully integrated companies, years 1936–42—Continued

[000 omitted]

Name of company	1936		1937		1938		1939		Average 1936–39		1940		1941		1942	
	Before income taxes	After income taxes	Before income taxes	After income taxes	Before income taxes	After income taxes	Before income taxes	After income taxes	Before income taxes	After income taxes	Before income taxes	After income taxes	Before income taxes	After income taxes	Before income taxes	After income taxes
The Texas Co. (Delaware)	$41,904	$38,424	$62,495	$55,395	$26,773	$24,063	$36,991	$34,306	$42,041	$38,047	$50,779	$42,444	[1]$74,900	$58,763	$66,544	$49,832
Tide Water Associated Oil Co. (Delaware)	11,556	10,344	17,125	15,802	11,020	10,428	9,229	8,959	12,233	11,383	10,078	9,519	21,290	17,576	17,767	13,276
Union Oil Co. of California (California)	6,272	6,133	13,197	12,062	7,330	6,863	6,523	5,854	8,330	7,728	5,317	4,978	6,607	5,145	8,237	5,537
Total	503,041	440,768	701,093	614,654	384,519	324,850	394,835	341,744	495,869	430,504	496,864	411,027	818,965	622,041	696,140	461,06
Total income taxes		62,273		86,439		59,669		53,091		65,365		85,837		196,924		235,079

[1] After State and foreign income taxes, amounts of which are not stated, but before Federal income taxes.

NOTES.—Parentheses ( ) indicates a loss (red figure).
Sources: Moody's Industrials and published statements.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in looking over the original bill we find it was originally proposed to transfer this authority to the Secretary of the Interior, who occupies a job created by Executive Order 9276. What has bothered me all the way through in considering this bill is the thought that the President, if he desired to do so, could eliminate everything we were about to accomplish through the enactment of such a bill, by abolishing that office. So when the situation moved around to where I could support a proposal leaving this proposition in the hands of the Office of Price Administration, and in addition thereto issuing a directive as to no less than a 35-cents-a-barrel increase in price, that then straightened the matter out as far as I am personally concerned.

We have gotten into a policy in this country which we now see is forcing one group after another to come to this Congress for relief. That is due to the fiscal policy we have followed and which we continue to follow, and which I am certain we will follow right on through until the consummation of this war. We have the white-collar class approaching us under the subsidy bill. We have a situation here where you must have petroleum products in order to prosecute a war, and that group has gotten into a financial position as related to cost where it must have relief if you are to get the production. It is the production in which I am interested, not so much the cost. Why? Because you have to have production. That is why I am interested in it. If we did not have to have it, then I would talk about the cost.

The Congress can leave this affair in the hands of the O. P. A., and it can direct upon O. P. A. to take into consideration certain factors. For almost 10 years we moved heaven and earth in the way of pump-priming to push the price level back up to the 1926 level, and that is what is recited in this bill. We fought for almost 10 years, and where did we get it? We got it up to 87. That is where you reached in 1941. From 1930 to 1941 you got it up to 87. You came within 13 points of your goal.

I do not get excited when you talk about pushing prices up to the 1926 price level, because I am in favor of prices going up to the 1926 price level, and that is what the Disney amendment proposes here. Therefore, I am supporting the Disney amendment. So with the Rees amendment we adopted just a few moments ago, plus the amendment now before us, I think if you would go out and spend 2 or 3 hours with yourself and God Almighty you would find it straightens out a lot of things as far as these particular problems before us at the present time are concerned.

If the 35 cents is necessary to get the production, then let us get along with the job and leave this in the hands of the O. P. A., not get out on that limb of transferring it to the Secretary of the Interior where it could be abolished through canceling the Executive order, and in addition give this additional direction to the O. P. A. with respect to considering these things in connection with the 1926 price level. This part interests me very much:

the Petroleum Administrator for War shall consider the necessity for exploring for crude petroleum and the maintenance of a competitive position in the petroleum industry—

and to that end do these other things. I want exploration work. I want competition in the industry maintained, so it fixes a lot of things up for me.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. We might clear the air as far as the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts is concerned. This 74-cent over-all increase that he is talking about would not take place; he is of the opinion that a 74-cent-price increase would be granted over-all because in 1926 the price of oil in Texas might have been 75 cents and in Pennsylvania it might have been $1.75. Different areas command different prices. Various qualities of crude command different prices.

That is up to the O. P. A. to determine, the parity price increase. They are the ones who would determine whether or not the price increase would be greater than the 35-cent base price increase and it would not be an over-all 74-cent increase to the producer as he has led the House to believe. In my State, I might say, thousands of wells are being abandoned and the casings are being pulled and sold for junk and scrapped. We are going out of the oil business. We have to have more than 35 cents to exist. We should have a dollar.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, a while ago I tried to make the point it is a pretty hard, if not impossible, proposition for this body to legislate intelligently on the very important and complex items that go into our economy, particularly with reference to prices.

I would like to call your attention to proof of this, which I think we all admit is here in the House today. After 218 Members of the House have carefully studied this bill and weighed its values and its merits, they signed a discharge petition. Such a petition is a highly preferential procedure, to take away from one committee jurisdiction of the bill, and so this bill was brought to the floor.

FOUR AND ONE-HALF LINES

Today, after three amendments, we find that there are exactly 4½ lines of the bill that 218 Members thought so very fine as to use this unusual procedure to bring it to the floor.

Not only do we find that, but the original bill started out to put jurisdiction under Petroleum Administrator Ickes. Now we find the House has turned the corner and put it back under the O. P. A. Then we find the mandatory so-called parity index which was to be used would not just raise the price of oil 35 cents a barrel, but some of the consuming districts find it will raise it 75 cents a barrel. So we find now another amendment and a substitute thereto is pending.

One amendment says we must raise it by 35 cents a barrel to a new floor, and then maybe we hope it can be raised 75 cents a barrel, because we find that in fixing the price, that consideration shall be given to this index. I personally think a point of order would have stood against the amendments linking in this so-called commodity index. This index has no standing at law and its com-

ponent factors are uncertain and not specific. Frankly I do not know how much weight is given in this all-commodity index to such items as fertilizer as compared to steel or whether leather goods outweigh oils or not. And I do not believe even the proponents of these amendments would dare to say they can tell how much weight is going to be given to the items included in this to the all-commodity index in arriving at the price of oil.

I think we illustrate here by our action today that Congress, sitting as a price-determining body, is destined to fail and yet we are taking this step today and inviting not only criticism and disaster on the price-control program, but threatening and endangering the very stability of our country. There is confusion and lack of understanding. In fact, you do not even have the bill in its present form making complete sense, because you have stricken out everything after the enacting clause down to line 9 and start a new sentence beginning with "in." Congress will find if it passes this bill and if it becomes law, that we have established a most dangerous precedent.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GAVIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I might say to the gentleman, we have acted; and this is democracy at work and it is not by executive session or directives. We are ironing out this oil legislation in a satisfactory manner, getting some results after months of delay.

Mr. MONRONEY. Are we at work for the people of this country or for the few people who want to tear down price control?

Mr. GAVIN. We are at work for the people of the country who are insisting that something be done.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that 15 minutes be fixed as the time for discussion of this amendment and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I believe that I am well within the facts to state that the ultimate victory of the United Nations over the Axis Powers depends to a greater extent on crude oil and its derivatives than it does upon any other one war material. Crude oil and its derivatives are the lifeblood of mechanized warfare. An oil bank is as essential to the survival of the ships, tanks, and planes as a blood bank is to the life of our fighting men.

Without an adequate supply of crude oil and its derivatives the lives of millions of our men would, in consequence, be needlessly sacrificed for lack of the means with which to operate the mechanized equipment so indispensable as weapons of offense and defense in modern warfare. A victory can be won by the United Nations only with an adequate supply of crude oil and its derivatives. I am sure that every well-informed person will admit the truth of such a statement.

I believe that the danger of a crude-oil shortage presents one of the most critical problems of the war. Already, the situation has arrived where the crude-oil productive capacity of the United States is inadequate to meet the future minimum requirements of existing domestic refineries.

There has been, during the past 4 years, a steady and most alarming decline in the annual discoveries of new crude-oil reserves. It is inevitable that this decline in new crude-oil reserves will continue unless there is an increase in the price of crude oil, sufficient to encourage the search for new producing areas. I have the honor to represent a stripper-well area where what is known as secondary recovery operations are required to bring the oil to the surface. This method is most expensive, yet, regardless of cost, the grade of lubricating oil is so vastly superior to any other lubricating oil in the world, especially for use in planes, that not a quart of it should be lost during this war. The low price prevailing under the O. P. A. ceiling has forced operators to pull the pipes and pumps and abandon production at an increasing and alarming rate.

The O. P. A., by its stubborn resistance to the urgent appeals of Congress and of the office of the Petroleum Administrator for War for an increase in the price of crude oil, has created a most dangerous threat to a vital phase of the war effort. The failure to supply gas and lubricating oil to our armed forces, even for a few hours, could produce a holocaust of ghastly consequence to our men at the fronts.

I maintain that the pending resolution, H. R. 2887, brought to the floor by petition, is one of the most vital war measures upon which the membership of this House has been called to vote. I deplore the fact that at this critical time, when the lives of millions of our heroic men may depend upon an ample future supply of an essential war material, there should be a bureaucratic agency such as the O. P. A. permitted, by its stubborn and arbitrary failure to act, to endanger the security of the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, we must all realize that the depletion allowance is in jeopardy if this amendment is adopted. I shall not have time to discuss all the points in this proposal, but, what does the year 1926 mean as a base? For agriculture that was pretty good. That was originally agreed upon because of agricultural prices, but how it would affect oil we do not know. It might double the price of oil, or it might reduce it 50 percent. I do not know. That is one of the many things we do not know about this bill. There are only two lines of this bill that remain untouched by amendment. At least a dozen lines have been added, which is evidence of the fact that some committee consideration should be given to it.

If you will notice the last sentence of Mr. DISNEY's amendment, it will compel a price increase to consumers to take care of the price increase on the crude, although maybe a producer would not want to do it. Perhaps he could absorb that in some particular field. Yet this will compel a price increase on all consumers. That is one of the things that we do not know about.

This bill was introduced in June. There was a recess in July and August. So it is not fair to accuse the committee of being indifferent and failing to work during July and August. There was no petition filed on this bill until in October. During that time our committee was working night and day on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill. Only up to this time has our committee had an opportunity to give it consideration. Are you going to take it away from a committee that promises to give it consideration speedily? The chairman of our committee has promised this House that if this bill is recommitted, hearings will commence on Friday of this week and continue until we make a report. There is no reason why a report should not be ready next week. Is there any Member who does not want all the facts in this case? Certainly it involves a lot, just for the House to take it away from a committee, without knowing what is being done.

If you will read Mr. Disney's amendment, you will discover how little you know about this whole thing. I have studied oil and oil prices for many years. Being from an oil district, I know a little something about it, but I cannot take this Disney amendment and make any sense out of it. Maybe Mr. DISNEY can because he has studied the particular amendment, but, we have not had that opportunity. The committee has never seen it. We did not know what was in it. So, why not send this bill back to the committee and then we will hear testimony on both sides, and I believe within a week the bill can be brought back here—a bill that this House will not be ashamed of, and one that will be in accord with the principles and precedents established by this House, and give the oil industry everything it is entitled to receive.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY].

You have heard a great deal about parity in the past 10 years. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] just asked the question as to what basis we had for using 1926 on oil parity. The figures I am going to use are furnished by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In 1941, they set the parity price on oil at 58.9 or, as we say, 60 percent. At that time the raw materials average in the United States in 1941 was 83 percent. In 1943, oil is still 58.9 or 60 percent of parity, while raw materials used in comparison in establishing this parity is 112 percent, plus.

I want to assure you members this afternoon that we need to give consideration to parity in order to get oil

production. That is what we need. I do not like to see this bill brought to the floor this way. I think the executive department has not only been negligent, but they have been derelict in their duty. They should have taken action on the price of oil. I certainly hope that the committee will vote down the amendments and support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY].

Mr. DISNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. DISNEY. Does the gentleman know of any other means by which we could have got this price feature before the Congress than this means?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I do not. I am one Member who has hoped that this bill would come up in orderly procedure in order that we could get a vote on it. We are going to have further rationing of oil and gasoline unless we get additional oil. When they set the parity price on oil it cost from 12 to 15 cents a barrel to get new production.

Today it costs 50 to 60 cents a barrel to get the production. The bill asks them to give consideration to parity in order to get the full needed production.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I should like to ask my friend from Kansas, in view of the statements that have been made here that the committee is willing to hold hearings on this bill and bring back a bill within 1 week, if that would not be the sensible thing for this body to do, get both sides of the case and then come back here in a week and intelligently dispose of this highly controversial and important measure?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I do not believe the committee promised to bring a bill back. They promised to hold hearings but did not say they would bring a bill back within a week.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. We have been given every assurance by the chairman of the committee that they would do that very thing.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows that in New England last year people died of cold. It is becoming intensely cold up there now. We shall have deaths this winter if we do not have oil, and there is great scarcity of coal.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. There is no doubt about it. We need additional oil for our military and civilian requirements.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to give my version of a statement made by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], to the effect that the oil industry has made more money in the last 2 years than ever before. That statement is somewhat true but applies only to the major companies.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Not yet. It applies only to the major companies. It is a fact that they have made money and the way they have made that money is by purchasing crude oil at $1.10 a barrel, and then getting $8 a barrel for their refined products. It makes little difference to them what they pay for crude oil or what they get for crude oil as they make their profits out of the refined products.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? He mentioned my name.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I will yield when I get through, but there are one or two things I must say before my 3 minutes expire. If the gentleman will wait I will yield.

Before the war 52 percent of the production of oil in this country came from the independents, leaving 48 percent for the majors. At the present time due to the purchase of independent operators and their going out of business because of increase of costs of production the majors now control 78 percent of all oil production and there is 22 percent left for the independents.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to my friend from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield but just for a question.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman is quite right, the majors are getting greater and greater control, but the figures which I submitted are broken down as between independents and majors. I said in my own speech that there were many independents that needed help in this manner. The gentleman's proposal in this bill would give it to everybody.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I can yield no further as my time is short. First, this is not my bill but if in order to save the small percentage of independents still doing business, it is necessary to increase the price of crude oil which will be shared by the major companies, I say it should be granted for the reason that the major companies do not make their profits out of the crude oil but out of the refined products as they not only produce but refine, transport, distribute, and sell to the consumer, such increase will save the independents. We cannot draw the line in this bill between independent and major companies and say to the major companies you can have only so much for your crude oil but the independents can have a greater price. That would be class legislation and everybody knows that would be unconstitutional. Members of the Committee, I want to show you how costs of production of crude oil have increased. Before the war, in the Kevin-Sunburst field in Montana, one of Montana's oldest fields, we used to bring into production at a depth of 1,500 feet a well and get oil at commercial quantities at a cost of $5,000. Today that same well costs $7,000 at the same depth, namely, 1,500 feet. Now I want to tell the O. P. A. that in that same territory you permit a price of 71 cents a dozen for eggs and you limit the price of oil to $1.10 a barrel. The O. P. A. is dignifying and glorifying the hen above the commodity without which our merchant marine, our Navy, our entire transportation system, outside of railroads, would be only hulks of steel, iron, and so forth. Now remember the independent oil producer has nothing to sell but crude oil. He is not in the position of the major companies who produce, refine, distribute, and sell to the public. If the independent oil producer has any sense he will dispose of his oil interests and buy a few cackling hens because eggs are just one item in connection with our food menu that are given more consideration by our O. P. A. than oil which has been characterized on how to win war as being the lifeblood and which Mr. Ickes says is next to steel in importance in the winning of the war. Mr. Ickes has asked for an increase in the price of oil. Why? Because he wants production. Why? Because he wants to win the war. He knows if the Allies have more oil than the Axis Powers they will ultimately win. He wants production to fill the storage places that are today empty because of the tremendous demand for oil. He, like ourselves, does not want to see the independent producer choked out of existence. One great warrior said, "My kingdom for a horse." I say, "Our country for more Ickeses."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr KELLEY], is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, this whole thing is strangely inconsistent. Here we are asked today to put a floor under the price of oil. Two or three months ago the Committee on Ways and Means, of which my good friend from Oklahoma is a member, pulled the floor out from under coal. Coal had a floor price for several years. They thought that it was not a proper thing. Now, they come in here and they want to put a floor under oil.

Mr. DISNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DISNEY. Of course, that was the Bituminous Coal Act and was not a price-control bill.

Mr. KELLEY. Yes, but the same thing applied in both cases. Here we are asked to put a floor on oil. Why not a floor on coal?

Mr. DISNEY. I do not think the two situations are alike. I thought it was regimentation of business at that time.

Mr. KELLEY. I cannot agree with that statement. Do we want to give preferential treatment to the oil industry? I think it is proper, if this is recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency, that the fuel problem should be reviewed because coal is in much the same position as oil today. Coal production could be increased if the

price were made satisfactory. That is the least that the Congress can do.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. In answer to a question of the gentleman from Kansas just a moment ago, I want to assure him that the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency not only said he would have hearings promptly but that he would report a bill promptly. He made that statement on the floor this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] and all amendments thereto.

The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my substitute may be again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the substitute offered by Mr. BATES of Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FORD) there were—ayes 105, noes 34.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PLOESER. I had an amendment pending which I asked the Chair to present at the conclusion of the vote on the Bates substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not see the gentleman seeking recognition.

Mr. PLOESER. I realize that, Mr. Chairman; but I wonder if it is too late to have the amendment considered now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may obtain unanimous consent to do that.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes to explain the amendment, if I may, then I will ask unanimous consent to offer the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman would be entitled to 5 minutes in support of his amendment if he secured unanimous consent for its consideration.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to present my amendment at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PLOESER to the amendment offered by Mr. DISNEY: Strike out the words "35 cents" and insert "80 percent of parity and not to exceed parity" and strike out the last sentence.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, the people of this Nation need a greater supply of oil and gasoline. Present rations are apt to be drastically reduced if some one in authority in this Nation does not act soon. What does it matter what the price of oil if we cannot get oil? If this bill will eventually bring an increase in the war supply plus the civilian supply, and I think it will, then I will support the bill.

I did vote for the amendment to keep authority over price in the Office of Price Control. I do not pretend that the O. P. A. is the single price-control authority. We all know it is not. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to keep the legislation in line with the custom of this House in legislating on price control. All of us will admit it is without precedent to set a specific dollar and cents price in this Congress. Eighty percent of parity is an increase of 35 cents per barrel figured according to the Disney formula. I have put in another ceiling to prevent increases above parity.

As I understood the Bates substitute, it did not change the Disney amendment one iota except to condense it into shorter language. I have read both of the amendments. My amendment is in line with the practice of the House in legislating on agricultural prices. The amendment to the Disney amendment goes further in that it strikes out the last line of the Disney amendment, which seeks to cause the Office of Price Control, by virtue of legislation, to increase all other price levels whether they are needed or not simply because the price of crude oil is increased. There is little or no reason why the major oil companies should raise their retail prices because of a 35-cent increase in crude.

The O. P. A. can hold the retail price line very effectively and still grant an incentive production price on crude. I am one of those who realizes the critical oil shortage and who is advocating a big increase in American oil production. I realize that unless this action is taken civilians risk the danger of being without fuel oil, lubricating oil, and gasoline. I am one of those who signed the unanimous report of the Small Business Committee last spring asking for a 35-cent increase in oil, and I am still of the same opinion. I put in this amendment so as to stay in conformity with congressional precedent and I based it upon the parity formula, 80 percent.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I am impressed by the amendment the gentleman has offered. As the gentleman has suggested, we one time wrote in the price-control law of the land a provision that farm prices could not be fixed at a point lower than 110 percent of parity. Subsequently we revised that to say that they should not be fixed at a point lower than 100 percent of parity. Now, it might have been 90 percent of parity or 85 percent of parity.

The amendment that the gentleman suggests does not adopt the practice of writing in dollars and cents, as has been pointed out, but follows the precedent established by the Congress in writing the price-control law for agricultural commodities. It does not do violence to that precedent, but at the same time does fix a floor beneath which the O. P. A. cannot go in fixing the price of crude oil, and, as the gentleman has suggested, recognizes the position taken by many of us over a long period of time that the national interest absolutely demands an increase in the price of crude oil, an increase that should have been given and would have been given but for the obstinate refusal of a governmental agency to recognize the national need.

Mr. PLOESER. This establishes a floor at 80 percent of parity and an overall maximum ceiling at parity, so that there will be no reason to run away with an unusually high price structure.

Mr. HALLECK. There would be no compulsion on the O. P. A. to fix a ceiling price higher than 80 percent of parity?

Mr. PLOESER. It removes that compulsion. Neither is the O. P. A. compelled to increase retail prices.

The maximum ceiling at parity prevents this legislation from breaking the so-called dangerous inflation line.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the parliamentary situation, all time has been consumed on my amendment and all amendments thereto, but the gentleman from Missouri was granted unanimous consent to address the House on his amendment for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. No; the gentleman from Missouri obtained unanimous consent to offer his amendment. The gentleman from Oklahoma is entitled to 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment, if he desires recognition.

Mr. DISNEY. I call for a vote, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY].

The question was taken and, on a division (demanded by Mr. DISNEY), there were—ayes 101, noes 53.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PLOESER and Mr. DISNEY.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 93, noes 64.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON: After the last sentence insert, "The fixing of prices of any mineral through which by hydrogenation crude petroleum and the products thereof and derivatives therefrom may be produced is hereby transferred to the

Solid Fuels Administrator for War as provided for in Executive Order No. 9332 issued by the President of the United States."

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, the coal-mining industry of this Nation faces a crisis. This amendment would transfer that industry to the Solid Fuels Administrator. His department is responsible for coal production, it is responsible for distribution, and it has also been responsible for the wage increase which just recently was placed in effect. This increase in wages is costing the mining industry of the Nation approximately 35 cents more per ton. The O. P. A. recommended a compensating increase of 17 cents per ton. It is contended that with the profit which is now being made by the mines, the operators of this country should absorb the difference, but it is impossible for them to do so.

I want to cite you a condition that exists in my own State. Back in 1923 Illinois produced 60,000,000 tons of coal and 100,000 miners were employed. Production dropped down until 2 years ago it was only 47,000,000 tons, and about 45,000 miners were employed. This year it has jumped up to 60,000,000 tons, because along in April we were granted a price increase of approximately 30 cents per ton, which has now been taken away from us because of this new wage increase.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLEY. The coal the gentleman includes in his amendment is only for the hydrogenation process; it does not include coal for all other purposes?

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Any coal is subject to hydrogenation. Coal is the only mineral through which by hydrogenation crude petroleum can be produced. That is the reason I am contending that this amendment is germane. The component parts of coal and petroleum are identical. Coal is to oil what ice is to water. A chemist can take petroleum and produce coal, or he can take coal and produce petroleum. That is the reason for this amendment.

Mr. KELLEY. Could the gentleman's amendment be construed to mean that only the coal that might be taken for the hydrogenation process would be placed in the Solid Fuels Administration and all the others not? That is an infinitesimally small amount.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. No. My idea would include all types of coal and lignites of all kinds. The mining industry feels it is absolutely essential to continued prosperity that this amendment be adopted. Ickes is the only man in Washington in whom both the miners and the operators have confidence, and he has recognized the plight in which we find ourselves by recommending to Vinson that the allowance of O. P. A. of 17 cents to take care of the wage increase be increased. The 17 cents is not sufficient. We know that we cannot continue. We all know that we have had four shutdowns in the coal-mining industry this year. We know that a serious fuel shortage faces this Nation because of those shut-downs. Frankly, unless an opportunity is given to the operators to continue in business by granting them an increase in the price of coal so that they can meet this wage increase, you are going to have another shut-down, and this time it will be the operators who will exhaust their cash surplus and be unable to continue in business. We feel that we are willing to rest our case in the hands of the Solid Fuels Administrator because he has shown an understanding of our problem. For that reason I offer this amendment. I contend that it is germane, for the simple reason that coal is the only mineral through which by hydrogenation crude petroleum can be produced, and the component parts of coal and oil are identical. It is fuel.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma insist on his point of order?

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment offered is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, my contention is that the amendment is germane. Coal and oil are both fuel. The component parts of coal and the component parts of oil are identical. This bill deals with petroleum. Coal is petroleum in a solid form, which has been proven by Germany, by England, and by practically every nation, even our own, which has gone into the hydrogenation process. I contend that coal is to oil what ice is to water, that the chemical components are identical, and that there is no reason why this amendment should not be declared germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON] offers an amendment which has been reported by the Clerk, to which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] makes the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the bill under consideration.

The bill now under consideration, H. R. 2887, provides for transferring certain functions of the Price Administrator, with respect to petroleum and petroleum products, to the Petroleum Administrator for War. It will be noted that the product covered by the pending bill is petroleum.

The Chair invites attention to page 193 of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and quotes as follows:

One individual proposition may not be amended by another individual proposition even though the two may belong to the same class.

There are some 18 citations listed there, citing with approval the statement quoted by the Chair.

The Chair is of the opinion that there is no doubt that the amendment seeking to include minerals in a bill providing for petroleum certainly would bring in a proposition in addition to the one covered by the bill, and, therefore, is not germane. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, there have been so many amendments passed to what was originally a very small bill, the language of it has been changed so much, I doubt if anyone knows what is in the bill as it stands now. Would it be in order to request that the bill as it now stands be read for the House?

The CHAIRMAN. It can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be now read. I think it is important in view of the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will withdraw his objection. I do not want to ask for the engrossed copy of the bill.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, the bill will be read shortly before the vote, after it comes out of the committee. I would not have any objection to the reading of the bill, but the request at the present time is a dilatory tactic.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman correct that the bill will be read when we go back into the House?

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I mean if the gentleman will renew his request at that time, I will have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill will be read by the title unless an engrossed copy is demanded.

Mr. MAY. I move to strike out the last word and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is recognized for 5 minutes to speak out of order.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I am trespassing upon the time of the House or not and I would not desire to do that, but I think I have a statement to make very briefly in which every Member of the House is vitally interested. I have adopted this method of finding an opportunity when we have a good attendance to make another statement regarding the question of the pending legislation in relation to mustering-out pay for the armed forces of the country.

We have been having hearings this week in the Committee on Military Affairs and, pending the completion of our hearings, the Senate of the United States has reported a bill with rates fixed in it far beyond that which any bill introduced in the House contains. Since that bill was reported by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs I have been called upon by representatives of the veterans' organizations and others who are inter-

ested in the legislation and we find that there are so many vexing questions involved in the entire matter which ranges all the way from strict mustering-out-pay legislation to adjusted compensation certificates as we had after the last war. Many of the representatives of veterans' organizations are afraid that the excessive rates and the question strictly of mustering-out pay may retard and interfere with some future right of theirs. Now we have discovered in the source of this legislation that there are so many vexing problems involved in it that I have designated a drafting committee which, together with the counsel of the various departments concerned, will meet tomorrow morning for the purpose of trying to perfect the legislation. I do not know whether we will be able to get it to the floor before the Christmas recess, if there is one, but I simply wanted you to know that this committee is going along with the matter and trying to figure out something in a sane and sensible way so as not to be unreasonable either down the line or up the line, and we are trying to arrive at a proper conclusion. I just do not know when we will be able to get it to you this time, but we are doing the best we can.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, the overwhelming importance which petroleum bears to the war effort is well known to all of us. In the camp and in the field, it is vital to the quick movement of troops and equipment. The automobile and truck cannot operate; the tank and the half-tread cannot move; the airplane and the blimp cannot fly; and the Army machinery and equipment cannot function, without the use of crude oil and its products. This means that for fuel, power, and even for light, our armies depend upon oil and gasoline; and no army could live, move, and fight for any length of time under present methods of warfare without this invaluable product which comes from the bowels of Mother Earth.

On the sea, we find oil is used to operate the machinery of our warships. It is used by the naval aircraft above the ocean, by the dreadnaught which rides the waves and by the submarine which stealthily moves through the deep shadows far beneath the surface. It is just as important to the Navy as it is to the Army, and this is one product which we cannot afford to curtail without hurting the war effort immeasurably and taking a chance on its loss.

In the post-war era, the prophet can readily visualize and even the cold, calculating businessman can see, the absolute need for abundant supplies for our commerce, both internally and abroad. Already we contemplate the need of airports throughout the Nation and on the other six continents of the globe as soon as the war ends and peaceful air-borne commerce can venture again aloft into the skyways of the world. On the front of the Archives Building on Pennsylvania Avenue, in the city of Washington, is etched in solid granite the inscription, "What is past is prologue." Surely such a legend is proper for the annals of aviation provided abundant supplies of oil are available. We are about to open the door on a marvelous post-war age dependent heavily upon petroleum and its products.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, the State of Louisiana is the third largest producer of oil in the United States, and my Seventh Congressional District is one of the most important in point of production, number of fields, and opportunity for increased production, and the further exploitation and exploration to augment the production of this precious mineral, so necessary to furnish motive power to the mechanized units of our armed forces, and more particularly to produce high-octane gasoline for our air forces.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said that oil will win the war, and the progress and development of the war indicates that this statement is not very far in error. On June 17 of this year I extended my remarks in the RECORD under the title "Louisiana Firsts," which outlined the part that the great State of Louisiana is playing in furnishing oil, gasoline, high-octane gasoline, butadiene, and Buna S all used as fuel and for the manufacture of synthetic rubber, and pointed out that the State of Louisiana and my district led the United States in furnishing this important matériel in the prosecution of the war. In north Louisiana are large oil refineries; in Baton Rouge, the State capital, is the largest oil plant in the United States; and in my district are located oil refineries, synthetic rubber plants, high-octane gasoline plants, the most important installations being located at Lake Charles, Ville Platte, and Jennings, and in my district are approximately 50 oil fields; in fact, every parish in my district produces oil, and we are proud of our facilities and record in our contribution, and in our part in the prosecution of the war.

Mr. Chairman, naturally my district and many of my constituents are interested in the bill now under consideration, and I am glad to support the legislation under consideration. I have appeared before the Lea committee and the Patman committee urging increase in the price of oil, as this industry has not had any price increase for 5 years, and unless the industry obtains an increase, it will be unable to continue to maintain production, expand production, but, on the contrary, thousands of small, independent operators will face the choice of closing down their operations or face a continued loss in their patriotic efforts to furnsh our Government and armed forces this necessary product to carry on the war.

Speakers who have preceded me have covered the problems and explained the plight of the small, independent operators, as well as the large operators, and unless we do something for the industry, I fear that we are doing our country and the oil industry a great injustice.

My district furnishes a fertile field for further development and exploration, and as some of the best producing sands require the drilling of oil wells to a depth of from 5,000 to 12,000 feet to obtain reasonable production, you well can realize that the cost of drilling such wells is from $100,000 to $250,000, and unless the operators can secure a reasonable price for their production, it is plain to see that they will not risk this development under present prices and present conditions in the oil business.

In order that the Members of Congress might be able to obtain a picture of the oil situation, on September 15, 1943, I inserted in the RECORD a copy of an article entitled "The Oil Situation," by Mr. J. M. Taylor, which had been published in Collier's Weekly, which article stated clearly the present status of this important industry. We have had numerous conferences with those in authority seeking to obtain some relief for the oil industry, but without success, and my people tell me that they have been patient and suffering, and that the time has come for action, and since we have exhausted every other means of obtaining some relief, we found it necessary to proceed as we do.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that the Members of this Congress will give our plea sympathetic consideration, and that they will support this measure, if for no other reason, for the war effort, as I believe that we have proven our case from that standpoint. I wish to quote the following excerpts from a memoranda from the Petroleum Industry War Council, Washington, D. C., as follows:

The public is willing to absorb increased consumer costs if by so doing it will make available more gasoline and oil products, and refusal to permit an average raise in price ceiling on crude oil now disregards the military and civilian welfare of the Nation, William R. Boyd, Jr., chairman of the Petroleum Industry War Council, said today.

He cited the latest findings of the council's committee on cost and price adjustment which contend that—

"Economic justification for a price increase is simple, when stripped of its complex ramification.

"The present and visible supply of crude petroleum is inadequate to meet the expected demand. At present prices exploratory drilling activity is not finding a barrel of oil to replace each one now being produced.

"With greatly increased demand for petroleum, new reserves should be found, not only to replace each barrel being produced, but enough must be discovered to meet the demand without resorting to wasteful production methods. At the existing price level drilling activity is inadequate to produce the needed new reserves.

"Consumers should be called upon, even in a period of price control, to pay the higher cost of providing the supply they need.

"They do not buy crude oil. Refiners buy crude oil. But refiners cannot pay 35 cents per barrel more for crude oil, their raw material, unless they receive more per barrel for products derived."

Petroleum Administrator for War Harold L. Ickes has recommended to the Office of Price Administration an average crude oil price increase of 35 cents per barrel. The Petroleum Industry War Council, an industrial advisory group, was established by Administrator Ickes.

Crude oil, it contended, has not only failed to keep pace with other commodities in price increases, but petroleum products have advanced less in price than other important commodity groups. It cited house-furnishings, building materials, hides and leather, foods, textiles, and farm products as having advanced two to six times as much in price as petroleum products.

In conformity with the committee's findings, Chairman Boyd asserted:

"The industry would be derelict in duty if it did not insist upon a level of prices for crude oil and its products high enough to insure maximum production.

"It is a very big undertaking to provide all the oil that is required to fight the war, to supply current essential civilian needs, and to meet post-war demands. The petroleum industry is straining at the traces to meet production demands in a situation where costs are higher and where crude petroleum at an average price of $1.19 per barrel is 77 percent of the 1916–20 price, 76 percent of the 1921–25 price, 87 percent of the 1926–30 price, and only 7 percent above the 1936–39 prices."

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 2887, and directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendments? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts moves that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 129, nays 206, not voting 94, as follows:

[Roll No. 169]

YEAS—129

Abernethy	Gorski	Myers
Angell	Hare	Newsome
Baldwin, Md.	Harless, Ariz.	Norton
Barden	Hart	O'Brien, Ill.
Barry	Hartley	O'Konski
Bates, Ky.	Hays	Outland
Bates, Mass.	Heffernan	Patman
Bender	Herter	Powers
Bennett, Mich.	Hess	Priest
Bolton	Hoch	Rabaut
Bonner	Holifield	Ramey
Bradley, Pa.	Holmes, Mass.	Ramspeck
Buffett	Hull	Richards
Bulwinkle	Izac	Robertson
Burch, Va.	Jarman	Rowan
Burgin	Jeffrey	Rowe
Byrne	Johnson,	Sadowski
Canfield	J. Leroy	Sasscer
Cannon, Mo.	Johnson,	Satterfield
Clark	Lyndon B.	Sauthoff
Cochran	Kean	Scanlon
Coffee	Kefauver	Schuetz
Cole, N. Y.	Kelley	Sheppard
Colmer	Keogh	Snyder
Compton	Kirwan	Somers, N. Y.
Cooley	Lecompte	Spence
Cooper	Lesinski	Sullivan
Courtney	Luce	Sundstrom
Crosser	Ludlow	Towe
Dingell	Lynch	Voorhis, Calif.
Durham	McCormack	Vorys, Ohio
Eberharter	McMillan	Weaver
Ellison, Md.	McMurray	Weichel, Ohio
Ellsworth	Madden	Weiss
Elston, Ohio	Magnuson	Whitten
Feighan	Marcantonio	Whittington
Flannagan	Martin, Mass.	Wigglesworth
Fogarty	Merritt	Winstead
Folger	Miller, Conn.	Wolcott
Forand	Monroney	Wolverton, N. J.
Ford	Morrison, N. C.	Woodrum, Va.
Furlong	Mruk	Wright
Gerlach	Murdock	Zimmerman
Gordon	Murphy	

NAYS—206

Allen, Ill.	Costello	Gregory
Allen, La.	Cox	Griffiths
Anderson,	Cravens	Gwynne
N. Mex.	Crawford	Hagen
Andresen,	Cunningham	Hale
August H.	Curtis	Hall,
Andrews	Day	Edwin Arthur
Arends	Dirksen	Hall,
Auchincloss	Disney	Leonard W.
Barrett	Dondero	Halleck
Beall	Drewry	Hancock
Beckworth	Dworshak	Harness, Ind.
Bell	Elliott	Harris, Ark.
Bennett, Mo.	Ellis	Heidinger
Bishop	Engel, Mich.	Hendricks
Blackney	Engle, Calif.	Hinshaw
Boren	Fellows	Hobbs
Bradley, Mich.	Fenton	Hoeven
Brehm	Fish	Hoffman
Brooks	Fisher	Holmes, Wash.
Brown, Ga.	Fuller	Hope
Bryson	Gale	Horan
Busbey	Gallagher	Howell
Butler	Gamble	Jenkins
Camp	Gathings	Jensen
Carlson, Kans.	Gavin	Johnson,
Carrier	Gibson	Calvin D.
Carson, Ohio	Gifford	Johnson, Ind.
Case	Gilchrist	Johnson,
Chapman	Gillette	Luther A.
Chenoweth	Gillie	Johnson, Okla.
Chiperfield	Goodwin	Jonkman
Church	Gossett	Judd
Clevenger	Graham	Kearney
Cole, Mo.	Grant, Ind.	Kee
Keefe	Murray, Wis.	Simpson, Ill.
Kerr	Norman	Simpson, Pa.
Kilburn	Norrell	Slaughter
King	O'Brien, Mich.	Smith, Ohio
Kinzer	O'Brien, N. Y.	Smith, Wis.
Kleberg	O'Connor	Springer
Kunkel	O'Hara	Stanley
LaFollette	Patton	Starnes, Ala.
Lambertson	Peterson, Fla.	Stearns, N. H.
Landis	Peterson, Ga.	Stefan
Lanham	Philbin	Stewart
Larcade	Phillips	Stockman
LeFevre	Pittenger	Sumner, Ill.
Lemke	Ploeser	Sumners, Tex.
Lewis, Ohio	Plumley	Taber
McCowen	Poage	Talbot
McGehee	Poulson	Talle
McGregor	Price	Thomas, Tex.
McKenzie	Randolph	Thomason
McLean	Rankin	Tibbott
McWilliams	Reece, Tenn.	Tolan
Maas	Reed, N. Y.	Treadway
Mahon	Rees, Kans.	Troutman
Manasco	Rivers	Vincent, Ky.
Mansfield,	Rizley	Vinson, Ga.
Mont.	Robsion, Ky.	Vursell
Mason	Rockwell	Welch
May	Rodgers, Pa.	West
Merrow	Rogers, Mass.	Wheat
Michener	Rohrbough	White
Miller, Nebr.	Rolph	Wickersham
Miller, Pa.	Russell	Willey
Mills	Schiffler	Wilson
Mott	Scrivner	Winter
Mundt	Short	Woodruff, Mich.
Murray, Tenn.	Sikes	Worley

NOT VOTING—94

Andersen,	Elmer	Miller, Mo.
H. Carl	Fay	Monkiewicz
Anderson, Calif.	Fernandez	Morrison, La.
Arnold	Fitzpatrick	O'Leary
Baldwin, N. Y.	Fulbright	O'Neal
Bland	Fulmer	O'Toole
Bloom	Gavagan	Pace
Boykin	Gearhart	Pfeifer
Brown, Ohio	Gore	Pracht
Brumbaugh	Granger	Reed, Ill.
Buckley	Grant, Ala.	Robinson, Utah
Burchill, N. Y.	Green	Rogers, Calif.
Burdick	Gross	Sabath
Cannon, Fla.	Harris, Va.	Schwabe
Capozzoli	Hébert	Scott
Carter	Hill	Shafer
Celler	Jackson	Sheridan
Clason	Jennings	Smith, Maine
Cullen	Johnson,	Smith, Va.
Curley	Anton J.	Smith, W. Va.
D'Alesandro	Johnson, Ward.	Sparkman
Davis	Jones	Stevenson
Dawson	Kennedy	Tarver
Delaney	Kilday	Taylor
Dewey	Klein	Thomas, N. J.
Dickstein	Knutson	Wadsworth
Dies	Lane	Walter
Dilweg	Lea	Ward
Domengeaux	McCord	Wasielewski
Doughton	Maloney	Wene
Douglas	Mansfield, Tex.	Whelchel, Ga.
Eaton	Martin, Iowa	Wolfenden, Pa.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

To recommit:

Mr. O'Toole for, with Mr. Elmer against.

Mr. Bloom for, with Mr. Kilday, against.

Mr. Wasielewski for, with Mr. Schwabe against.

Mr. Fitzpatrick for, with Mr. Morrison of Louisiana against.

Mr. Klein for, with Mr. Knutson against.

Mr. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Anton J. Johnson against.

Mr. O'Leary for, with Mr. Reed of Illinois against.

Mr. Cullen for, with Mr. Miller of Missouri against.

Mr. Delaney for, with Mr. Green against.

Mr. Capozzoli for, with Mr. Arnold against.

Mr. Dickstein for, with Mr. Fulbright against.

Mr. Fay for, with Mr. Ward Johnson against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Cannon of Florida against.
Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Monkiewicz against.
Mr. Gavagan for, with Mr. Douglas against.
Mr. Lane for, with Mr. Smith of West Virginia against.
Mr. Burchill of New York for, with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania against.

General pairs:

Mr. Bland with Mr. Shafer.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Brumbaugh.
Mr. Grant of Alabama with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Harris of Virginia with Mr. Dewey.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. D'Alesandro with Mr. Clason.
Mr. Jackson with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Gearhart.
Mr. Rogers of California with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mrs. Smith of Maine.
Mr. Dilweg with Mr. Jones.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Hill.
Mr. Doughton with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Sparkman with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Tarver with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Lea with Mr. Pracht.
Mr. Whelchel of Georgia with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Gross.

Mr. LYNCH changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. GIBSON changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. CRAWFORD changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Sixty-seven Members have arisen; not a sufficient number.

So the yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The question was taken; and on division there were—ayes 171, noes 92.

So the bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the title so as to read "A bill to fix the price of crude petroleum and its derivatives, and fixing a parity formula."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the motion is agreed to.

There was no objection.

COURT REPORTERS IN THE DISTRICT COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3611) to authorize the employment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States, to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK]?

[After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. SUMNERS of Texas, Mr. HOBBS, and Mr. HANCOCK.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by a profound Irish scholar, a great student of administrative law, a former member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Mr. Thomas W. Woodlock.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMANDER EDWARD H. (BUTCH) O'HARE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 21, 1942, I stood on this floor and proudly spoke of the outstanding achievements of a young man whom I had the honor to appoint to the Naval Academy. He had just engaged the enemy and single-handed destroyed five Jap planes. I told how the people of St. Louis were likewise proud of this native son. Today the people of St. Louis, like myself, are sad because Commander Edward H. (Butch) O'Hare is reported missing in action since the night of November 27, and, in the opinion of naval officers, he has paid the supreme sacrifice.

The Navy Department has little information, but the correspondents have told the story. They have quoted his comrades, one saying O'Hare took a Jap plane with him. It was his ninth.

Commander O'Hare was assigned the job of selecting the pilots to attack the enemy. It was typical of O'Hare to assign himself to take to the air. Their duties were to protect the carriers.

O'Hare was credited with having saved the carrier *Lexington* when he destroyed the five Jap bombers in February 1942.

I was in the party when President Roosevelt presented him with the Congressional Medal of Honor, on which occasion the President read the following citation:

For gallantry and intrepidity in the area of combat, at grave risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty, as section leader and pilot of Fighting Squadron 3, when, on February 20, 1942, having lost the assistance of team mates, he interposed his plane between his ship and an advancing enemy formation of nine attacking twin-engined heavy bombers

Without hesitation, alone and unaided, he repeatedly attacked this enemy formation at close range in the face of their intense combined machine-gun and cannon fire, and despite this concentrated opposition, he, by his gallant and courageous action, his extremely skillful marksmanship making the most of his limited amount of ammunition, shot down five enemy bombers and severely damaged a sixth before they reached the bomb-release point.

As a result of his gallant action, one of the most daring, if not the most daring single action in the history of combat aviation, he undoubtedly saved his carrier from serious damage.

Following the presentation, "Butch" asked me to accompany him home, saying he was to present to the city of St. Louis the Navy E. I told him the people wanted to see him, not me, and I declined. Then O'Hare said:

The Navy has arranged a schedule for me to make some speeches at airplane plants. I don't like that job. I want to get back and help to end this war, the sooner the better.

His attractive wife whom I escorted to the White House offered no comment.

Never before had carriers launched their planes at night. It was during this night he lost his life.

Rear Admiral Arthur W. Radford, commander of the task force is quoted as saying:

"Butch" with accompanying planes saved my formation from certain torpedo hits. I am recommending him for a second Congressional Medal of Honor.

I contacted the Navy Department and other than the brief regular dispatches, advising that O'Hare was missing in action, they have no information and therefore I include as part of my remarks the article written by Charles P. Arnot of the United Press and the article written by Eugene Burns of the Associated Press. They follow:

O'HARE HELPED SAVE UNITED STATES FORCE BEFORE PLANE WAS DOWNED

(By Eugene Burns)

ABOARD A UNITED STATES CARRIER IN THE CENTRAL PACIFIC, NOVEMBER 29 (delayed).—Lt. Comdr. Edward H. (Butch) O'Hare, famous fighter pilot, was shot down in a night air battle over the central Pacific two nights ago while American airmen were breaking up an attack of 30 or 40 Japanese torpedo planes on a United States carrier force, his flying companions said today.

It was the first time in a naval action that carriers had launched their aircraft at night. Butch decided to go up himself with the squadron.

Stories told by a squadron commander, a fighter pilot, radioman, and gunner, the last to see O'Hare in the air, were not in complete agreement. But the action was swift and in the darkness it was natural that none of them would know exactly what happened.

"For 3 days Butch and I were standing by for our Japanese-stalking attack," said Lt. Comdr. John L. Phillips. "We had difficulty sticking together when it got dark. But we were lucky and were joining up when we ran smack into the Japs rendezvousing.

ONE JAP SHOT DOWN

"Butch came up on my starboard and Wingman Skon on the port. Then my gunner, Kernan, saw a fourth plane coming up below Butch. I gave him permission to fire as soon as we were within range. At that same time I overhauled a Jap and got into his slipstream and at 50 yards knocked him into a tea kettle.

"Meanwhile on the other side of our carrier task force, 30 miles distant, a Jap dropped a series of flares for a torpedo attack illumination and our ships were clearly outlined.

"I was closing in on a second Jap when the fireworks started. I was shooting at a Jap, and my gunner was shooting at a Jap who in turn was shooting at O'Hare.

"My target exploded and blew up beautifully, with at least a quarter of a mile torch of gasoline trailing behind him before he hit the water.

"While I was watching the Jap burn I saw something drop straight off into the water, making a big splash. Then I thought, 'My God, that may be Butch.'

"'Butch, this is Phil.' I attempted to make contact, calling, 'Butch, this is Phil' over and over, but I got no response. I kept thinking the splash lasted a long time, and it may have been Butch's parachute. Now I think it was a Jap plane which Butch shot down."

Ensign Warren A. Skon, 24, of St. Paul, Minn., who was flying wing on O'Hare when they started to join Phillips, said, "The air was suddenly thick with Japs.

"One Jap had dropped a flare, and this may have been the plane Phillips shot down.

"As we joined on Commander Phillips, Butch said, 'You take the side you want.' I said, 'I'll take the port.'

"'Roger,' he said, and that was the last word he said.

"Then I saw tracers around his plane. I saw it sheer off and drop quickly below us."

Another version of the last seen of O'Hare, termed by President Roosevelt one of the greatest combat flyers of all time, was told by Aviation Ordnanceman Alvin B. Kernan, 20, of Saratoga, Wyo.

"I saw Butch and Skon joining up," he said. "Then as I looked to the starboard a fourth plane was closing in on us. It was very dark, but because I could see Skon off our port I knew this was a Jap."

BLINDED BY TRACERS

"I informed Mr. Phillips, and he gave me permission to fire as soon as he was in range. My tracer fire seemed to go into him, but I was blinded by tracers and my gun muzzle, which was white with heat. I don't know whether I shot down the Jap.

"While I was firing I saw Commander O'Hare do a wing-over across the top of us, and he disappeared into the darkness. A few moments later it seemed that he reappeared and made an outside loop. Then he was gone."

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Hazen B. Rand, 25, Avon, Mass., who was shot in the foot during the action, said:

"I saw a fourth plane's guns blinking red, and he was shooting at Butch while our gunner, Kernan, was shooting at the Jap.

"I overheard Kernan tell Commander Phillips that he was opening fire, and Phil in turn told Butch, 'Butch, there's a Jap plane coming into your tail.'

"Then Butch's lights went off. I looked again, and he was gone."

Butch landed at Tarawa, for the first carrier plane landing there since American conquest of the Gilbert Islands, to study the field. He also had a personal interest because he had "hell-catted" that area before and during the landing operations at Makin and Tarawa.

Since dawn of November 27 a relentless search for him has been conducted by carrier groups and by planes from Tarawa. The search allows for a 20-mile drift due to the heavy Gilbert currents. An area of 2,000 square miles has been crisscrossed, boxed, and scouted.

Oil slicks and jetsam from enemy planes and a blue-gray overturned Japanese life raft were found by Acting Torpedo Plane Squadron Commander Bill Privette, of Chapel Hill, N. C.

The reconstructed story of the men who flew with O'Hare indicated that the lieutenant commander took one Jap torpedo plane down with him. It was his ninth.

Commenting on the action, Rear Admiral Arthur W. Radford, commander of the task force, said:

"Butch, with accompanying planes, saved my formation from certain torpedo hits. I am recommending him for a second Congressional Medal of Honor."

As I write on Lieutenant Commander O'Hare's ready-room typewriter, an aviator drifts in and sits down, avoiding his comfortable black-leather reclining chair. The aviator stares dead ahead.

Without introducing the subject, he says: "Despite our great engines of destruction, enormous tanks, guns of battleships and carriers, it remains that one determined man can settle a battle." He meant Butch's leadership in repelling the attack.

Butch O'Hare's aide, Lt. Wallace M. Parker, of Pittsburgh, Pa., adds: "Butch did it twice."

O'Hare was awarded a Congressional Medal of Honor for shooting down five Japanese planes, single handed, which attempted to attack the aircraft carrier *Lexington* in the South Seas in 1942.

"WITHOUT TRACE"—"BUTCH" O'HARE SHOT DOWN DEFENDING AIRCRAFT CARRIER—HERO OF OLD LEXINGTON IS "MISSING" IN MARSHALLS; COMRADES GIVE UP HOPE

(By Charles P. Arnot)

Aboard a United States aircraft carrier in the central Pacific, November 30 (delayed).—Lt. Comdr. Edward H. "Butch" O'Hare, one of the Navy's greatest fighter pilots, has been missing for 3 days after a sky battle in which a Japanese plane got into an American formation, apparently by mistake, and probably shot down the St. Louis ace.

UNDER HIS OWN ORDERS

O'Hare, decorated with the Congressional Medal of Honor by President Roosevelt for shooting down 5 Japanese bombers February 20, 1942, and single-handedly saving his carrier, the old *Lexington*, from destruction, went down in a Hellcat fighter off the Marshall Islands while engaging part of an estimated force of 30 to 40 Japanese torpedo planes which launched a desperate attack on this carrier force.

Just as darkness was settling down the attack came, and O'Hare was in the air to meet it.

Night flying from a carrier is one of the war's most dangerous assignments. It was the job of 29-year-old O'Hare, an Annapolis graduate, to assign pilots for the job, and he assigned himself.

Those with him included Lt. Comdr. John L. Phillips, Jr., 33, Front Royal, Va., skipper of a torpedo plane squadron, and Ensign Warren A. "Andy" Skon, 24, St. Paul, who flew a Hellcat.

INTRUDER FIRED UPON

The Hellcats took off just at dusk as reports came in that enemy "snooper" planes were spotted on the horizon.

Roaring into the main Japanese attack force, the trio spread confusion among the enemy and disrupted his plan of attack. Phillips bagged two planes and O'Hare possibly one.

After reconstructing the action, it is now generally conceded that O'Hare was shot down by a Jap plane which joined the formation of American planes apparently by mistake.

As the interceptor planes pulled into formation, Phillips was in the middle, with Skon on his left and O'Hare on his right, slightly behind and below. According to Skon and Phillips, a fourth plane suddenly appeared in the formation off O'Hare's starboard quarter and above him.

When Phillips, in a torpedo plane, spotted the extra plane his turret gunner, Aviation Ordnanceman First Class Alvin Kerman, 20, Saratoga, Wyo., opened up on the intruder.

According to the evidence, the Jap replied by firing at the closest plane, which was O'Hare. O'Hare slid from formation, passed under Phillips' and Skon's planes and faded away in the darkness.

JAP PLANES ABLAZE

Near the spot where O'Hare went down Phillips said there were two Japanese planes burning on the water.

"I thought at the time if Butch had to go he couldn't have had a more fitting monument than those flaming Jap planes," Phillips said.

The night O'Hare was lost every man aboard this carrier hoped against hope. From the ship's loudspeaker they learned that he had failed to return.

Search planes immediately began patrolling the area where O'Hare last was seen plunging into the water, but day after day the pilots returned without seeing a thing. Even those men who first were confident O'Hare would be picked up admitted tonight they have practically lost hope.

MISSING OFFICIALLY

Officially, however, he is listed only as missing.

It was established tonight that O'Hare was responsible to a large degree for breaking up the Pacific war's largest night torpedo plane attack which the Japs launched without success against this force.

O'Hare, air group commander on this ship, himself worked out the details of the interception plan with Rear Admiral Arthur W. Radford, Grinnell, Iowa, the task force commander. It was the first time fighter planes had been used from a carrier against night raiders, and it was O'Hare's own idea that he fly one of the night fighters.

Phillips was selected for the night assignment because he was a veteran of 1,200 hours of instrument flying. Skon, former tennis player at the University of Minnesota, was selected to fly a Hellcat because he had been flying with O'Hare much of the time since Butch came aboard this carrier as air group commander.

Phillips, during the encounter, had a field day. He found himself in the midst of the main Jap attack group and closed with two raiders—torpedo-carrying Mitsubishi bombers, sending both crashing into the sea.

Immediately after his return he told the following story:

"There were lights flashing below and around. I guess we were right in the middle of a Jap force. I heard Butch call me over the interplane communication system to switch on my top light so he could judge the distance between us. When I looked again I saw not only Butch's plane but off my starboard another—undoubtedly Jap. The Nipper apparently saw our running lights and figured we were some of his buddies and was pulling into formation for the homeward trip."

BELIEVE HE WAS HIT

Both Skon and Phillips said that after the Jap fired O'Hare did not communicate with them further, and they believed he either was killed outright or was seriously wounded.

"I saw Butch's plane pass suddenly below Phillips and me," Skon said. "Then over to my left I could see him swoop upward just like he was going into a wing over. I thought Butch was going to make a gunnery run since we'd spotted flares to the north and figured there were more Japs off there. But I couldn't understand why Butch didn't radio me he was going to peel off."

"Just after Butch's plane passed under us I spotted something going down toward the water," Phillips added. "It looked to me like a parachute and I figured at the time Butch bailed out. I was watching the water closely and almost was sure I saw a splash. It was pretty dark to make certain. I remember we were about 25 miles from the carrier at the time because I took a bearing on the spot."

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in two instances: In one extension to include two editorials from the Moline Despatch and in another an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in connection with Vice Admiral John W. Greenslade of the 12th Naval District and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by own remarks in the RECORD and to include a number of excerpts from the Railway Employees' Journal.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an address by Rear Admiral Thomas L. Gatch, Judge Advocate General of the Navy, entitled: "Total War—Total Peace."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, my name is not recorded on the motion to recommit. I was in the Chamber listening. I wish to have my vote recorded as "no."

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman did note vote one way or the other the RECORD cannot be corrected now because there is not anything to correct.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I wish this comment to be recorded.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a bill I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit two unanimous-consent requests: First, to revise and extend my own remarks and to include a statement by Hon. Marvin Jones; and second, that I may revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the requests of the gentleman are granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a petition which I have received from the Lackawanna Valley Underwriters' Exchange relative to certain insurance rates.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Washington Daily News by Raymond Clapper under date of December 10, 1942, entitled: "Wilson's Rebuke."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a short article from the Daily Oklahoman.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include an editorial from the New York Journal of Friday, December 10.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests: One to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include therein a letter to Mr. W. A. D'Ewart; and the other to insert in the RECORD a copy of a letter I wrote to the chairman of the Reclamation Association of Montana, along with other matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement that soldiers' wives addressed to the Congress of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE], be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a copy of the Tennessee absentee voting law.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial from the New York Daily Mirror.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made this afternoon and to include certain quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Binghamton Press.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any other special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on the subject How to Identify a "Gwibit."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BLACKNEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on three subjects and to include two brief editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an enlightening article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Spokane Spokesman-Review.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour on the subject War in the Pacific.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by George Gallup, appearing in the Chicago Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROWAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, first, by including an article in the Appendix of the RECORD by Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, and, second, by extending in the RECORD a splendid article, and very timely, by Samuel Goldman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made today certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTARY NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H. R. 3598, the first supplementary national defense appropriation bill, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would much prefer that the gentleman defer that request until tomorrow because several Members have been to the desk and have asked when the gentleman was going to make his request and that they would like to be on the floor when it is made. The Chair knew nothing about the gentleman intending to make this request.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have notified everyone, but I have no objection to letting it go over until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman did not speak to the Chair about making the request this afternoon. Several Members were here during the last roll call and asked that they be put on notice when the gentleman made his request.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to withdraw the request.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include two splendid editorials, one appearing in the Baltimore Sun and one appearing in the New York Herald Tribune, complimenting the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] on his recent speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] is recognized for 40 minutes.

THE INSURANCE BILL

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, on December 9 I extended in the Appendix of the RECORD my reasons for opposing H. R. 3270, which is generally known as the insurance bill. On the same day I made a 1-minute speech saying I had extended those remarks, and that I would be here today under special order to discuss my objections to the legislation, particularly in view of the fact that I oppose the legislation, which the majority members of the committee are in favor of, and also my reasons do not parallel the reasons taken by the minority in opposition. I also would like this RECORD to show that I mailed to each member of the Committee of the Judiciary, without regard to his position on this legislation, a copy of the remarks which I extended, which indicated that I would be here today.

The remarks which I extended in the RECORD represented about 3 weeks of earnest study on my part, because there are certain very fundamental things involved in this legislation to which I must be unalterably opposed. They are long. I do not anticipate that many Members will find the time to read them.

My objections are divided into three points:

First, I am convinced that this bill is definitely worded to deprive the Supreme Court of the United States of jurisdiction on litigation pending before it at this time. The language of this bill is most peculiar. It is seldom found in legislation which has for its purpose dealing with past legislation. The most significant words in the bill are the words that nothing in the Clayton Act or the Sherman Act shall be construed to apply to the business of insurance.

We are discussing existing legislation, which is the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act. Now we come in with a bill, in one case 50-some years after legislation was passed, and in the case of the Clayton Act some 28 or 29 years later, and say that nothing in the things that we did in 1890 or 1914 shall be construed to apply to the insurance business.

There is pending in the Supreme Court the case of the United States of America against the Southeastern Underwriters Association, a case which went up on appeal from the District Court of Georgia on a demurrer to the complaint by the defendants, and which was sustained by the lower court on the theory that the insurance business was not within the purview of the antitrust laws. Now we have that case pending. We are entitled to inquire why we say that these laws shall not be construed to apply to the insurance business when, by virtue of appeal, this case is now pending in the Supreme Court of the United States.

I got my first lead as to the purpose of this peculiar construction from a study of the hearings. At page 150 of the hearings, at the top of the page, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, who is not here now, in discussing the peculiar language of this bill, said this:

> The language is almost identical with the language of the eleventh amendment to the Constitution, and the Supreme Court in that case held that the effect of it was to control the determination of the Supreme Court with reference to a pending case.

That case, which we must assume the Judiciary Subcommittee and its chairman had knowledge of at the time this legislation was presented to them, is the case of Hollingsworth and others against Virginia. After the ruling in Chisholm against Georgia, which upheld the right of citizens of other States to sue a State, the eleventh amendment was adopted, which specifically states:

> The judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by citizens of another State, or by citizens or subjects of any foreign state.

Therefore, by that amendment, part of the jurisdiction previously granted to the Supreme Court under the Constitution was taken out. It was taken out by words which said that the judicial power "shall not be construed" to extend to certain kinds of litigation. The Supreme Court, on the day succeeding the argument, delivered a unanimous opinion that—

> The amendment being constitutionally adopted, there could not be exercised any

jurisdiction in any case, past or future, in which a State was sued by the citizens of another State or by citizens or subjects of any foreign state.

In other words, the exact same situation as that which prevailed in Chisholm against Georgia was pending in the Supreme Court in the case of Hollingsworth against Virginia at the time the eleventh amendment was adopted, which amendment said that, notwithstanding the prior constitutional authority for the Supreme Court's exercising jurisdiction in the case of Chisholm against Georgia, it could no longer exercise that jurisdiction.

Then the Supreme Court states that the effect of the eleventh amendment was to deprive it of jurisdiction of all cases similar to Chisholm against Georgia pending on its docket when the eleventh amendment was adopted.

To me it is not without design that the language which we find in this bill, H. R. 3270, adopted the language of the eleventh amendment. Because otherwise we could not stop the Supreme Court from passing upon the case of the insurance companies which is now pending in that Court. In fact, as I have pointed out above, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee seems to entertain the same view. So far as I am concerned there can be no question as to the impropriety of this interference with judicial procedure. There can be no question as to the impropriety of interference by any branch of the Government with the sanctity of the courts and their procedure. I was bitterly opposed to the so-called court-packing legislation, because that constituted administrative and executive interference with the Court. I am equally driven to the conclusion that here we have special litigants coming to the Congress of the United States and saying to us, "Will you interfere on behalf of us and make a specialty of our case even though this request will stultify orderly judicial procedure?"

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does not the gentleman agree furthermore if Congress took that action with regard to one industry, there is no logical reason why industry after industry could not come in and ask for similar legislation every time they got into trouble with the antitrust law?

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. There is no question about that, but I think there is even a stronger point to make. Time after time I have gone into court defending insurance companies. Time after time their representatives have discussed with me the danger of somebody getting to the jury, and the honesty of the judge, and the prevailing opinions and prejudices of prospective jurors in the community in which the case was to be tried. We were constantly on guard against interference by a plaintiff with orderly judicial processes. I have never been derelict in my duty to protect any of those companies in that right. And yet here we have the very people whose solvency, in effect, depends upon the maintenance of an orderly respect for the judiciary, coming in and asking for special consideration of a most unusual character by legislative interference, when they have always asserted heretofore a great interest in the purity of the judicial system and the honor of the system and have been greatly concerned lest there be some perversion of justice.

Further than that, I have also taken into court before justices of the peace some poor little fellow earning a wage who was yanked into court. He was under an obligation, we will say. There was some dispute as to his right.

I have not forgotten when I represented those people, they did not like the justice of the peace that they had to try their case before, but there was nothing for me to say to them except, "You have got to respect this judicial system. We have got to try this case to the end before the justice who is presiding. He was duly elected. I cannot do anything to interfere with the procedure. I will not practice 'fix' for you. Under the law you are not entitled to try this case anywhere else or before any other justice of the peace. We will have to try the case before the justice who is presiding."

How long can we continue to say that to the little people of the country if we adopt this legislation which accords a special privilege to a vast organization affecting the rights and the interests and property of people all over the country, a vast organization whose property rights depend upon the continued maintenance of an orderly judicial system? I cannot with good grace say to the little man, "You must respect this system," and then vote for legislation of a special character which has for its purpose depriving the Supreme Court the right to pass upon the pending litigation of any vast corporate interests; legislation which has the further purpose of freeing a defendant before that Court from the consequences of his own act.

Mr. Speaker, I took this special order out of a sense of obligation and fairness to the members of the Committee on the Judiciary in order that I might answer any objections which they might raise to the rather elaborate and involved legal and economic agreements which I have extended into the RECORD heretofore on December 9, 1943. I did not issue a challenge in the sense of being a braggart, but I did feel that I was under an obligation to give those men who supported this legislation a chance to question the soundness of my position. I am entitled to note that not a single member of the Committee on the Judiciary is present in this body as I now address it, notwithstanding the fact that I gave personal notice by mail to each and every member. Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend and revise my remarks and include therein certain excerpts and quotations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. I desire to extend my remarks at this particular time only to cover about two situations: First, in my extension of remarks of December 9, at page A5385 of the Appendix of the RECORD, I charged that the argument that Federal regulation is bound to follow unless this bill is adopted was fallacious, first, because prosecutions under the antitrust law are not Federal regulation in any sense of the term, and that is all that this bill reaches; second, that the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit had decided on June 5, 1942, in the case of *Polish Alliance, etc.*, v. *National Labor Relations Board* (136 Fed. (2d) 175, at bottom of p. 178 to top of p. 179), that the business of insurance was commerce.

Since it is elemental that any congressional enactment attempting to place Federal control over interstate commerce must first be limited to a regulation of commerce because it derives its basic authority from the Constitution, it follows that it does not make any difference what particular Federal regulation is being construed, as long as it is a regulation, which is based upon the power of the Federal Government to regulate commerce under the Constitution. It is also a fact that the Polish Alliance case is now pending in the Supreme Court. It also follows that if the Supreme Court should sustain the opinion of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals in the Polish Alliance case, that then the question of whether the insurance business is commerce as a question of ultimate fact would be expressly held by the Supreme Court upon a showing of fact which apparently, to some extent, parallels the facts in the Southeastern Underwriters Association case. Consequently, if the Supreme Court upholds the opinion of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, there can be no question any longer that insurance is commerce, therefore H. R. 3270 would, in substance, say, that even though insurance is commerce, it shall not be subject to the antitrust law; but the passage of the legislation would leave the power to regulate by regulatory bodies, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission and others, wide open, subject to the enactment of legislation to that effect if the Congress so saw fit. It clearly follows therefore that the propaganda being put out to the insurance agents and the State insurance commissions that this bill must be passed in order to avoid regulation is utterly false. The proponents of this legislation should be able to understand that fact, even though they have not yet told the Members of this Congress that that is true.

It seems proper, therefore, for me to let the membership of the House know what the holding was in the Polish Alliance case. I therefore insert the pertinent parts of that opinion:

Major, Evans, Sparks, Judges.

Major, Circuit Judge * * *: Petitioner also contends that it is not within the act, even though it be held to be in

the insurance business, for the reason that insurance is not commerce. A long line of Supreme Court decisions have so held, or at any rate have held that the issuing of a policy of insurance is not a transaction in commerce. *Paul* v. *Virginia* (75 U. S. 168); *Hooper* v. *California* (155 U. S. 648; *N. Y. Life Insurance Co.* v. *Cravens* (178 U. S. 389); *N. Y. Life Insurance Co.* v. *Deer Lodge County* (231 U. S. 495). The support which these cases afford petitioner's contention is not so real as first impression might indicate. Certainly they are not decisive. It must be noted that in each of them the Court was considering the power of the State to tax or regulate, and not the power of Congress under the commerce clause. It has frequently been held that in the line which marks the beginning of the State's power to tax or regulate is not the terminal boundary of Federal power. "It does not follow that because a thing is subject to State taxation it is also immune from Federal regulation under the commerce clause."

Binderup v. *Pathe Exchange* (262 U. S. 291, 311). To the same effect, *Swift & Co.* v. *United States* (196 U. S. 375, 400); *Chicago Board of Trade* v. *Olsen* (262 U. S. 1, 33). The cases dealing with the power of the State were again distinguished in the recent case of *Wickard* v. *Filburn* (317 U. S. 111). On page 121 the court said:

"For nearly a century, however, decisions of this Court under the commerce clause dealt rarely with questions of what Congress might do in the exercise of its granted power under the clause, and almost entirely with the permissibility of State activity which it was claimed discriminated against or burdened interstate commerce. During this period there was perhaps little occasion for the affirmative exercise of the commerce power, and the influence of the clause on American life and law was a negative one, resulting almost wholly from its operation as a restraint upon the powers of the States."

I have based my opposition to the pending legislation on the proposition that there is a distinct difference between the court as an instrument of our constitutional democracy and the personality of the judges of that court. But since it seems to be popular now to attack a court by questioning the opinions of the judges, it should be proper to say that Judge Evan A. Evans was appointed by Woodrow Wilson May 10, 1916, and was a Wilsonian Democrat; that Judge William M. Sparks was appointed by Herbert Hoover on October 31, 1929, and was not only an outstanding Indiana jurist at the time of his appointment, but a lifelong and almost devout Republican; and that Judge J. Earl Major was appointed by President Roosevelt on March 23, 1937. And, since it is also a popular practice of the proponents of this legislation to attempt to stigmatize a court by questioning the judicial mindedness of the judges appointed by President Roosevelt, as a member of the bar of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, who feels that he is acquainted with the general reputation of Judge Major among the members of that bar, I unhesitatingly say that he bears an excellent reputation among the members of the bar of that court for intellectual honesty and forthrightness. It might be added, in passing, that it was Judge Major who wrote the opinion last summer denouncing the act of Congress placing all O. P. A. appeals in Washington, which decision and opinion is used most frequently by the proponents of Discharge Petition 13, which I have signed.

It also seems proper to point out—in addition to the previous argument I made against the so-called effectiveness of the statement of Senator Turpie referred to by a member of the committee—that at page 112 of the hearings Senator Turpie's remarks are referred to and referred to again in the Majority Report at page 8 of the report on this bill.

The extent of the reference made in the hearing at page 112 was this:

To us it is clear that the principle of those decisions was the law of the land at the time of the enactment of the Sherman and Clayton Acts and therefore Congress did not intend those acts to apply to insurance. In this connection it may be noted that, when the Senate was debating the enactment of the Sherman Act, Senator Turpie, of Indiana, specifically called attention to the fact that the word "commerce" did not include insurance in view of the ruling on that subject by the Supreme Court.

In passing, the above statement, "the principle of those decisions was the law of the land" is highly inapplicable to the Sherman Act because the Sherman Act was passed in 1890 and the only case then decided was the case of Paul against Virginia, which was the only case referred to by Senator Turpie.

In the report we find the following statement:

Under a long line of decisions of the Supreme Court, insurance is not commerce and if it is not commerce, neither the Sherman Act nor the Clayton Act should apply. Those Supreme Court decisions were in the mind of Congress when the Sherman Act became the law. This is clear from a reading of the debates in the Senate attending the passage of that act. There Senator Turpie called attention to the fact that under the Supreme Court decisions the word "commerce" did not include insurance.

Again we find the same mistake made with reference to the Sherman Act as was made in the hearings. The report says "those Supreme Court decisions were in the mind of Congress when the Sherman Act became law," inferring more than one decision. But the report failed to point out to the membership of the House that the only decision in existence at the time of the passage of the Sherman Act was Paul against Virginia, decided in 1869. Every other case cited in the hearings or the report was decided after the Sherman Act was passed, so that the Congress could not have had them in mind at the time it was passed.

I think that the Members of the House are entitled to know that what Senator Turpie actually said during the debates was much more extensive than that which was developed at the hearings and which the committee has reported to the House. In CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 21, part 3, Fifty-first Congress, first session, March 7 to April 4, 1890, at page 2556, recording the debates during the passage of the Sherman Act on March 24, 1890, we find the following statements made by Senator Turpie, a Democrat of Indiana:

I apprehend there are very few of us of this generation who have the slightest conception what this domain, referring to the commerce clause, very extensive in its character, shall yet include or embrace. Congress has seen fit heretofore to enter this domain very partially, only upon one or two or at the most three times, and then to go no very great distance. The progress made in it has been always, and must be, dual. The jurisdiction conferred on the United States courts, arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States, is not self-operative. It always requires the act of Congress in the first place and the judgment of the court in the second place to make any progress at all in that domain. Congress must take the initiative. We must take action upon the subject matter, and if our own jurisdiction in respect to such subject matter is sustained by the courts the judicial jurisdiction in the courts is then sustained in respect to such subject matter and the methods by which it is to be adjudicated.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. Vest] spoke the other day about the difficulty of defining the word "commerce," especially as contained in the phrase "interstate commerce." I recollect one judicial decision upon this subject very definitely. The Supreme Court has decided that insurance is not commerce, and I suppose by following the circle of negations long enough and excluding all the things not commerce we should come at last to the residuum, which must be commerce or interstate commerce, because it can be nothing else. A fortiori, judging from this principle, I should myself have decided that transportation is not commerce or interstate commerce either. It cannot be. It is only a means of conducting commerce, notwithstanding the courts and Congress have decided and have judicially determined that transportation is a matter so nearly related to interstate commerce that both Congress and the Federal courts have jurisdiction in relation to it under the clause giving us the power to regulate interstate commerce.

On page 2557:

I feel inclined to make the prediction, as one of the things to come in this vast domain, scarcely touched, of cases arising under the Constitution and laws of Congress, that the whole mass of merchantable paper known as negotiable by the law merchant, made at one place, negotiable at another, payable at another, transcending in its negotiation State lines, will be remitted to congressional action, and with respect to its creation, its formation, its negotiation, with respect to all the rights and liabilities which may arise under it, the people stunned with the eternal dissonance of conflicting decisions and judgments of 48 or 50 tribunals of last resort in the States upon the subject of interstate negotiable paper will require Congress to act therein, and that, unconstitutional as I now deem it or think it, it will as a matter of necessity be done, and in any such legislation with respect to that paper, the whole bulk of it, the personal and peculiar conditions of litigants will not be inquired about, but simply whether the one party or the other is entitled to relief or liable to recovery against him by reason of being a party to interstate commercial paper, negotiable and payable and usable under the action of Congress which may finally take place upon that subject.

From these statements I conclude that there is grave doubt as to whether Senator Turpie accepted the opinion of Paul against Virginia as good law. I think he did not, if we read everything that he said, and I think that the Members

should know all that Senator Turpie said on the commerce clause before forming their own conclusions as to the congressional intent. Certainly the Members of the House should have more than appears in the hearings and the report before they accept the conclusions presented to them by the House Judiciary Committee from the meager disclosure of Senator Turpie's actual remarks set out in the hearings and the committee report.

Furthermore, I do not believe that Senator Turpie thought that insurance was not commerce because we find in reading what he said at page 2557 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that he reached the conclusion that engaging in the banking business was commerce—and there is certainly a close parallel between the way in which insurance business is conducted and the banking business is conducted—and was such a firm believer in a broad understanding of the nature of the term "commerce" that he anticipated by some 50 years the opinion of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in the case of *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Bank of America* (130 Fed. (2d) 624), certiorari denied April 19, 1943, 318 United States 791, petition for rehearing denied May 24, 1934, 63 S. C. 1171, which upheld the very proposition Senator Turpie made in the Senate in 1890.

From the statement made by Senator Turpie over 50 years ago by which he concluded, from the primary facts inherent in the conduct of the banking business that, as an ultimate fact, that business was commerce within the meaning of the commerce clause of the Constitution, it is proper to conclude that his thinking was quite similar to that of the present justices of the Supreme Court, as evidenced by the decisions which they are presently rendering for that Court. From this I conclude that if Senator Turpie were living today and were, at present, a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, instead of revering him with crocodile tears and calling upon his name in vain, the insurance companies, whose interests are involved in this proposed legislation, would still be asking that this same legislation be adopted, on the clearly implied grounds that they did not like Senator Turpie's ideas with reference to the commerce clause of the Constitution of the United States. I think Senator Turpie is an authority for the opponents of this legislation, not its proponents.

And, I am not afraid to have my analysis of this matter judged by people who will undertake the arduous process of thinking with their brains rather than the currently prevalent easy process of forming emotional decisions which seem to originate in their bellies, or wherever the source of emotional decisions of humans is located. These are truly times when those who hold responsible positions in the people's government should think with their heads and not with their bellies.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include certain parts of the record of hearings before the Public Lands Committee on the naval oil reserve in a series of insertions within the prescribed limitations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. WENE, for 1 week, on account of illness.

To Mr. MALONEY, for 10 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. KLEIN, for 1 week, on account of illness.

To Mr. PACE, for today, on account of the flu.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 255. An act for the relief of Col. E. H. Tarbutton;

H. R. 302. An act for the relief of Robert Griffin;

H. R. 977. An act for the relief of Clare A. Miller;

H. R. 1379. An act for the relief of Gerald Estell Proctor;

H. R. 1640. An act for the relief of Mrs. J. D. Price;

H. R. 1933. An act for the relief of Ronald A. Cox;

H. R. 2080. An act to provide temporary additional pay for equipment maintenance for each carrier in Rural Mail Delivery Service;

H. R. 2545. An act for the relief of Samuel J. D. Marshall;

H. R. 2641. An act to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain lands for addition to the Sequoia National Park;

H. R. 3039. An act for the relief of Mrs. C. W. Selby;

H. R. 3299. An act for the relief of Victor H. Loftus, disbursing clerk, American Embassy, Mexico, D. F., Mexico; and

H. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution to provide for the proper observance of the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of the adoption of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 14, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

953. A letter from E. G. Allen, rear admiral, United States Navy, Director of Budget and Reports, transmitting report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of service, with special qualifications therefor, of each person commissioned from civilian life into the Coast Guard Reserve during the period October 1, 1943, to November 30, 1943, who have not had prior commissioned military service, and in the Marine Corps and United States Naval Reserve for the period September 30 to November 27, 1943, inclusive; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

954. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the month of September 1943; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

955. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting a list of 18- to 38-year-old registrants deferred because of their employment in or under the Federal Government on October 15, 1943, as provided for in subsection C, Public Law 23, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved April 8, 1943; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

956. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire lands and provide facilities to replace Indian fishing grounds submerged or destroyed as a result of the construction of the Bonneville Dam; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

957. A letter from the President of the Commission on Licensure, Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, transmitting the report showing the activities of the Commission for the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1943; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

958. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed bills in reference to United States commissioners recommended by the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges at its recent annual meeting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

959. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting in behalf of the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges, a draft of three proposed bills relating to selection of jurors and the jury system in the Federal courts, which were recommended by the conference at its last annual meeting on September 28 to October 1, 1943; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

960. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

961. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

962. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

963. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936, one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

964. A letter from the Administrator, National Housing Agency, transmitting copies of the requests for personnel needs during the second quarter of fiscal 1944 as placed before the Bureau of the Budget on October 1; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

965. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting copies of letters addressed to the heads of various agencies which establish limitations on the amounts which may be expended for travel, printing, and binding and the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; to the Committee on Appropriations.

966. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting information forwarded to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget covering a requested revision in the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of Howard University; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

967. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of C. Guy Evans, Garland Mineral Springs, Index, Wash.; to the Committee on Claims.

968. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting revised quarterly estimate Working Fund, Office of Education, and consolidated quarterly estimate form for the Office of Education, together with a consolidated report of Federal civilian employment, Form 3257, for the month of September 1943 for the Office of Education and the Federal Security Agency; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

969. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualification therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service, for the period October 1 through November 30, 1943; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BARRETT: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 3807. A bill to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases; without amendment (Rept. No. 949). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. Special mission by aviation subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, United States House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 950). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3602. A bill to amend the act making it a misdemeanor to stow away on vessels; with amendment (Rept. No. 951). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2126. A bill for the relief of David Cowan; with amendment (Rept. No. 953). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 3835. A bill to incorporate the United War Mothers of America, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 3836. A bill to provide for payment of mustering-out pay to members of the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 3837. A bill to amend paragraph 1772, Tariff Act of 1930, to provide for the exemption from duty of imported paper conforming to certain specifications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 3838. A bill to provide for the reincorporation of the National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEWART:

H. R. 3839. A bill to authorize the purchase of certain interests in lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. Res. 205. Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1944; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. Res. 379. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 205, making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1944; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURCHILL of New York:

H. R. 3840. A bill for the relief of Albert Barrett; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 3841. A bill for the relief of Dr. J. D. Whiteside and St. Luke's Hospital; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 3842. A bill for the relief of W. E. Noah; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4027. By Mr. ARNOLD: Petition of Amanda Weed, Mr. and Mrs. W. B. Collins, and about 50 other citizens of Laredo, Mo., urging support of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition within the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4028. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. B. D. Sutton and 22 other citizens of Clarence, Mo., urging passage of House bill 2082, which calls for enaction of legislation to prohibit manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4029. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. H. T. Huzeler and 36 other citizens of Kahoka, Mo., urging passage of House bill 2082, which calls for enaction of legislation to prohibit manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4030. Also, petition of Mrs. W. E. Candall and 14 other citizens of Brookfield, Mo., urging passage of House bill 2082, which is a bill to prohibit manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4031. By Mr. HORAN: Thirty-nine petitions of 923 residents of the Fifth District of the State of Washington against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4032. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Mrs. R. F. Hart and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4033. By Mr. LEFEVRE: Petition of the members of the Schoharie County Ministerial Association of Schoharie County, petitioning the Congress to pass House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4034. By Mr. NORMAN: Petition of H. P. Buck, of Vancouver, Wash., and 37 other citizens of Vancouver, Camas, and Orchards, Wash., urging passage of House bill 2082 which would stop manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and during demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4035. By Mr. PLOESER: Petition of Francis E. Meckle and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4036. Also, petition of Adolph Buckowitz and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4037. Also, petition of J. C. Farrell and 19 petitioners, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4038. Also, petition of the Riverside Manufacturing Co. and 20 petitioners, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4039. Also, petition of Harold W. Mulligan and 20 petitioners, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4040. Also, petition of E. C. Fisher and 20 petitioners, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4041. Also, petition of Charles Murdoch and 19 petitioners, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4042. Also, petition of Frank J. Mohr and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4043. Also, petition of Lemms Restaurant and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4044. Also, petition of Herman J. Pohl and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4045. Also, petition of Addie Rogers and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4046. Also, petition of the Amertorp Co. and 41 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4047. Also, petition of Ernst Zeitler and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4048. Also, petition of C. J. Fleming and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting

against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4049. Also, petition of George V. Brown and 24 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4050. Also, petition of John O'Hare and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4051. Also, petition of Perry K. Sparks and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4052 Also, petition of Mrs. H. J. Haas and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4053. Also, petition of John Grigaitis and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4054. Also, petition of Shelby O. York and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4055. Also, petition of Richard Kanzler and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4056. Also, petition of R. F. Dempster and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4057. Also, petition of Fred Sinn and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4058. Also, petition of John Fabbio and 22 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4059. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Nick C. Savone and 20 petitioners of Du Page County, Ill., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4060. By Mr. SATTERFIELD: Petition of L. H. Waters and 59 citizens of the Third Congressional District of Virginia, urging the passage of House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4061. Also, petition of William J. McNamara and 22 members of the Eagles Home Club, of Richmond, Va., protesting against the enactment of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiicary.

4062. Also, petition of Davis G. Bottom and 22 members of the Samis Grotto Club, of Richmond, Va., protesting against the enactment of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4063. Also, petition of F. H. Poston and 19 members of the Fort Mosby Social and Political Club, of Richmond, Va., protesting against the enactment of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4064. By Mr. TALLE: Resolution of the Iowa State Commerce Commission, opposing House bill 3420 on the grounds that its enactment would destroy the right of the several States to regulate intrastate service, rates, and operations of carriers by air and would assert the right of Congress to deprive the States of the right to regulate the intrastate services and rates of all forms of transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4065. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Mission Parlor, No. 38, Native Sons of the Golden West, at San Francisco, respectfully requesting the President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the United States Army, to remove the war relocation centers from the jurisdiction of the War Relocation Authority, and place the same in charge of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4066. Also, resolution of the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, at San Francisco; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4067. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the executive secretary, League of California Cities, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to post-war planning by the State and local government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4068. Also, petition of the Ninety-first Division Association, Inc., San Francisco, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to quotas on the growing of tobacco for the manufacture of cigarettes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Edward Hughes Pruden, pastor, First Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee that in a rapidly changing world Thou art the same yesterday, today, and forever; that in a world filled with so many cruel and destructive forces Thou art our living and eternal Heavenly Father; that in a world with so much sin and transgression Thou art our adequate and only Saviour.

We look to Thee this day for the wisdom and understanding that is necessary for the proper carrying forward of our responsibilities. We know that without Thee we can do nothing, but that through Christ we can do all things.

As we meet together in this important assembly, help us to remember that we are not only the representatives of the people but that we are the representatives and ambassadors of Jesus Christ, our Lord, through whom we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution establishing the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission, defining its powers and duties, and for other purposes.

THE LATE MARVIN H. McINTYRE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the passing on of Marvin H. McIntyre, the President has lost a loyal and devoted friend and secretary, and the Nation, one of its most lovable and able sons.

Performing his serious duties and many confidential tasks quietly and efficiently, he impressed those who knew him with the fine attribute of loyalty he possessed and exemplified with his devotion to his Chief—the President of the United States; and underneath his kind and gentle personality the spirit of determination that enabled his frail body to physically carry on to points far beyond human endurance.

One of the definitions of "loyalty" or "loyal" is "true to any person to whom one owes fidelity; constant."

Marvin McIntyre, or "Mac" as he was fondly and respectfully called by his friends, was true and constant to President Roosevelt. It is a trait so lacking in many persons that when we meet one who possesses it we admire and respect him. Over and above all of the other fine qualities he possessed, Marvin McIntyre will be remembered for his unselfish, constant loyalty to the President and to his friends, and his untiring energy in expressing his loyalty by words and action.

When the history of President Roosevelt and of this trying period of our Nation's and the world's history is written in the future, the devotion and fidelity of Marvin McIntyre will receive prominence and proper recognition.

In his passing on, the Nation sustains a great loss.

To Mrs. McIntyre and her daughter and son, I extend my deep sympathy. I also know that my colleagues of the House, without regard to what side we sit on, join with me in expressing and conveying to them our profound sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

[After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. POWERS.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and to include a short article in each.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks

in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. McLean, of Covington, Ky., on flood control, conservation of water, and propagation of fish.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle of November 26, 1943, on the death in action of my beloved friend and neighbor, Col. H. Gardiner Conroy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address by Mr. J. W. Fessler, of Indianapolis, Ind.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Washington Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial and a short magazine article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE MOSCOW CONFERENCE

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, many battles and episodes have been scored as the turning point of this war for the United Nations. But today there is no question as to what episode marks the turning point of the peace and of world harmony. The recent successful conclusion of the historical conference between Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin, the chosen leaders of the three most powerful Allies, can rightfully accept the honor of being the first major step toward world peace.

This Nation can be proud of its part in this conference. It can be as proud of its part in this conference as it can be of its contribution to the actual military defeat of the Axis. And I will say here and now, that 2 years ago, that even 1 year ago, this Nation had not yet earned the right to sit in on any conference deciding the ultimate outcome of the war and the peace to follow. But today we stand once more as an honored Nation, a Nation whose sons' record in combat, and whose war production, have earned for it the right to sit with our allies, even though their sacrifices in human lives have been far greater than ours.

This Nation cannot afford to let those few of little minds who would decry and sabotage the effect of this great and historic conference have their way.

The courage, the wisdom, and the world view of President Roosevelt, our Commander in Chief, has presented this Nation with the greatest opportunity it has ever had to assist in assuring world peace. For the first time the leaders of the world's most productive peoples have met face to face. Met, in the words of the declaration: "With hope and determination"; left "* * * friends in fact, spirit, and purpose."

Upon this beginning the world can build a new human friendship, a productive universal peace, a progressive plan for human development.

Of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the man, the leader, the President, this Nation can be proud; and for him the entire world can be thankful.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the special orders heretofore provided for I may address the House for 20 minutes on the Bill of Rights.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein excerpts from a radio address by Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, on the soldiers' vote bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES COMMITTEE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include a couple of statements on the so-called Fair Employment Practices Committee's activities with reference to the southern railroads and the brotherhoods.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the disposition of the business on the Speaker's table and other special orders I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a poem published in the Valley Times-Star of Newville, Pa.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

UNLAWFUL EXTENSION OF WAGES AND HOURS ACT

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention through letters from a department store in Cleveland that the effort is being made to bring the retail business under the Wages and Hours Act. It was understood that the act did not apply to retail stores.

Because it is indicative of what private enterprise is facing, I am going to make this letter a part of my remarks. If you are not already aware of what is going on, of bureaucracy in action, it is well for you to know.

Recently we have been approached by an official representative of the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor, who advised us that the Division would make an investigation to determine whether or not our store at Cleveland came under the Wages and Hours Act.

We were advised that due to the fact that we manufacture candy, which is delivered out of the State, this brought us under the act. The representative also stated that regardless of whether or not we shipped the candy direct to the customer or delivered it to him in our store, but knew that it was to be sent out of the State, we were subject to the provisions of the Wages and Hours Act. The representative also stated that our canteen shop, in which we sell boxes for soldiers, brought us under the act, although he conceded that nothing that went in these boxes was manufactured by us, but stated that the mere fact of assembling the merchandise and packing it for out-of-State or overseas shipment constituted production and, therefore, brought us under the act.

We were also advised changing buttons in our alteration department constituted manufacturing—that changing the trimming on hats was manufacturing—that assembling merchandise of different kinds through a transfer department, even though none of the merchandise was manufactured by us, brought us under the act.

When we read the provisions of the Wages and Hours Act to the representative and told him it was the plain intent of Congress not to include retailers, he made the statement that regardless of the intention of Congress, it was the present intention of the Administrator, wherever possible, to bring retailing under the act. We were advised that the Division was selecting certain stores and would attempt to bring these stores under the provisions of the Wages and Hours Act by assembling sufficient evidence to establish their contention.

We have been advised on many occasions that retailing does not come under the Wages and Hours Act. We understand, however, that Government agencies frequently pick and choose among possible cases until they find a set of facts which are most favorable to their contentions. They bring a suit on these facts and use a favorable decision as a precedent in other similar but weaker cases. From the Government's viewpoint, the weight of the precedent established in the first case then influences the court to rule for the Government in the succeeding cases.

Occasionally the Wage and Hour Division manages to persuade a company to stipulate

to a consent decree in which coverage of the act and past violations are admitted. While from a legal viewpoint, such a decree is of little value as a precedent, as a practical matter the publicity given to the decree (and the Wage and Hour Division and various reporting services give such decrees extensive publicity) induces the execution of still other consent decrees, and exerts considerable influence on a court which must rule on a similar, but contested case.

We are advised that retailers in other cities are now being approached along the same lines and an attempt is also being made to bring such retailers under the Wages and Hours Act.

We are strongly of the opinion that it was not the intent of Congress to include retailing under the provisions of the Wages and Hours Act and we, naturally, look upon this matter as quite serious. We think it is the beginning of a drive to have retailers, in general, covered by the Wages and Hours Act, even though such procedure is contrary to the desires of Congress. We anticipate that the Division will attempt to use our Cleveland store in order to accomplish their purpose.

Retailers are faced with many problems during these trying times and, frankly, we believe it unjust to burden them with unnecessary investigations such as the one contemplated by the Wage and Hour Division. If it was the intent of Congress to bring retailers under the act, then we would not be justified in this position, but we are convinced that the contemplated investigation is a means by which the Division is attempting to circumvent the powers of Congress and they are attempting to place a strained interpretation on the provisions of the Wages and Hours Act so as to make it applicable to retailing when it was clearly the intent of Congress not to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech recently delivered by Governor Bricker of Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, the same being varied and sundry observations under the general title, "Campaign Facts, Not Campaign Oratory."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I secured unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including an address made by the Governor of Kansas. The Public Printer advises me it will slightly exceed the limit; that it will cost $120. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed notwithstanding this estimate from the Printer.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for today of 20 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that it be extended to 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, along the lines of the statement made by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] in reference to the extension of the Fair Labor Standards Act to retail merchants, may I say that I prophesied when the act was passed after attending the hearings 4 or 5 years ago that it would be the distinct intention of the administration to extend it to all labor. That has gradually, year by year, come to be true.

RETURN OF REPATRIATED AMERICAN CITIZENS

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, it has been called to my attention that the repatriates returning on the *Gripsholm*, many of whom are physically and financially destitute, with no hope of rehabilitation for several years to come, must give notes to the Federal Government for their transportation back home.

Mr. Speaker, since we have been taking from the Treasury millions of dollars to rehabilitate the citizens of other nations, it seems to me that we could certainly afford to provide transportation for our own American citizens back to their native land.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein a certain editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests—one to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in reference to official statistics obtained from the Veterans' Administration since June 30, 1943, on veterans' matters, and to include a letter from the Louisiana department of the American Legion in reference to a compilation of statistics from American Legion headquarters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a poem by Mr. Horace C. Carlisle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]?

There was no objections.

LEGISLATION PERMITTING SAILORS AND SOLDIERS TO VOTE

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, it may seem strange that I rise this morning to say a word in praise of the action taken by the Young Republican National Federation a few days ago in the adoption of a resolution urging Congress to enact legislation so that our soldiers and sailors can vote.

I hope my Republican colleagues to the left of the aisle will follow that recommendation and desert the leadership of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

All of us know that the Rankin bill will not give the right to vote to our soldiers and sailors. The Rankin bill is not even a worthy gesture and will deceive nobody—least of all the boys and girls in the service when election time comes.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN OIL AND GAS LEASES

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1576) to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases, the House Committee on Public Lands having reported favobably a House bill of similar language.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what this bill does?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this extends until December 31, 1944, rights under certain leases. Normally they would have expired on December 31 this year, but there has been difficulty in getting materials in many instances and if they expired now many

people who had worked under the leases would lose the benefit of their lease. These leases would be thrown open to bids. It was testified before the committee that the independent operators would probably be pushed out of the picture by the large oil companies. This bill has been unanimously reported by the House Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. BARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I may say further than that, that a number of these 5-year leases issued in 1935 expire on December 31 of this year. Operations have been carried on, and operations are being carried on at the present time, but under the terms of the lease there must be production by the 31st of this month. In some cases they have been precluded from carrying on operations because of the manpower situation or because they could not get steel. This bill merely extends the life of the leases for 1 year.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The Senate has already passed this bill?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes; the Budget has approved it and the House Committee on Public Lands unanimously reported it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I want to say that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] a while ago certainly did not properly represent what the paper said about those young men who advocated letting the soldiers vote, and what he said about the Rankin bill was not what those young people said in their resolution. Those young people stated that they wanted the soldiers to have the right to vote under State laws. In other words, they did not ask us to violate the Constitution of the United States as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] would have us do.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act of July 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 726), entitled "An act to grant a preference right to certain oil and gas leases," is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The term of any 5-year lease expiring prior to December 31, 1944, maintained in accordance with the applicable statutory requirements and regulations and for which no preference right to a new lease is granted by this section, is hereby extended to December 31, 1944."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 3807) was laid on the table.

THE RAILROADS AND THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Members of the House received a letter from the railroad companies which in my opinion constitutes a sneak attack on the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practices. Instead of complying with an order which is in keeping with the war effort, instead of cooperating by using all available manpower, irrespective of race, creed, color, or national origin, these railroad companies have seen fit to send to this Congress a message misrepresenting what has been done and at the same time attacking the fundamental principles of democracy, for which American men are fighting and dying all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, I have sent a reply to the railroad companies and I ask unanimous consent to insert that in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

DECEMBER 13, 1943.

Mr. ERNEST E. NORRIS,
Chairman, Southeastern Presidents' Conference, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have read your letter to me of December 13, its accompanying enclosures, as well as the summaries, findings, and directives of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, following hearings in which charges of violation of Executive Order 9346 on the part of the carriers you represent and other carriers were developed. Your letter invites the reply I make at this time.

Full consideration of all the facts forces me to state that your letter and the actions of the southeastern presidents' conference which it reflects are wholly lacking in patriotism which should characterize the actions of all Americans and all American corporations in this critical war period in the life of our country.

On June 25, 1941, the President of the United States and Commander in Chief of our armed forces, acting under wartime powers properly delegated to him by the Constitution of the United States and the acts of Congress, promulgated Executive Order No. 8802 providing that in the interest of the most efficient mobilization of America's manpower for the war effort there should be no discrimination in employment in war industry on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin. That Executive order became the law of the land and corresponded precisely with the pressing war needs of this country for fullest mobilization of her manpower for victory. On May 27, 1943, the President issued Executive Order No. 9346, reemphasizing the principles established in Executive Order No. 8802.

Despite the clear expression on the part of our Commander in Chief in this matter, a full examination of the record fails to disclose a single action on the part of any carrier in your conference to end its practices of discrimination against workers on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin. In fact, shortly before the promulgation of Executive Order 8802, it was precisely your conference which entered into an agreement with certain railroad unions, whereby your Negro employees were placed in an even worse position of employment than had theretofore been your practice.

The hearings revealed evidence—evidence at no time contradicted by your counsel, who was present at the hearings—that there was an extreme shortage of manpower for the operation of our vital railroad industry. The evidence showed that Negro employees of your companies, with decades of experience as firemen and brakemen, were not being permitted to serve on Diesel engines; that freight cars containing vital war material needed by our fighting men, who were then giving up their lives on Guadalcanal, Sicily, and other theaters of war, were unable to move to ports of embarkation for the lack of sufficient competent firemen and brakemen, despite the fact that had the railroads used available competent Negro railroad workers, many lives of our gallant soldiers and marines might have been saved.

I am confident that you and your associates are fully aware that much-needed railroad manpower is going to waste because of your continued policy of discrimination against Negro workers. I am confident that you are fully aware of the fact that not only have you failed to use such manpower, but have only recently instituted practices leading to the diminution of Negro workers on your roads. Yet you seek refuge behind the claim that the prevailing sentiment in the area served by your lines will not tolerate the employment of Negro workers. Such a claim is false. Your own record of employment of Negroes will show that for decades you employed them as firemen and brakemen, with not the slightest disruption of service, and that only since the advent of the Diesel engines have you replaced Negro workers. You cannot reconcile this fact with your spurious claim that the traveling and shipping public are opposed to the upgrading of Negro railroad workers.

It is significant that the Virginian Railway Co., operating in the same area as some of your roads, has found it possible to say to the President's Committee that it will comply with the Executive order. Significant also is the fact that other patriotic railroads, such as the Union Pacific Railroad, have remedied immediately the violations complained of at the hearings; while still other carriers—the Pennsylvania system and the New York Central Railroad—are now engaged in amicable discussion with the F. E. P. C., looking toward compliance with the Committee's directives.

Contrast this patriotic conduct with the action of your group of carriers. In the first place, you take no initiative to work out a plan of fullest use of available manpower to carry out the heavy war responsibilities placed on all railroads. You completely ignore the twice-expressed directives of the President of the United States. You attend the hearings of the F. E. P. C. in a desultory manner and then impudently defy the directives of the Committee. Your conference then seeks to enlist the support of Members of Congress in bringing pressure to bear to discredit or destroy the President's Committee and to nullify the effect of his wartime Executive order. This action on your part is reprehensible. It is unpatriotic. It is a sneak attack upon our war effort.

Continued refusal on the part of your roads to employ Negro railroad workers for positions where there is need for additional manpower and for which they are competent can lead only to endangering our war effort. If such becomes the case, it is clear that the

President of the United States will either have to take over the operation of your roads in the interest of the security of our country or the Congress of the United States will have to take appropriate legislative action. Not even your companies are bigger than the safety of the United States.

I urge your conference to recognize its obligation in the present war crisis and promptly and patriotically comply with the directives of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice.

Sincerely,

VITO MARCANTONIO,
Twentieth District of New York.

LT. GEN. THOMAS HOLCOMB, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3760) authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Lt. Gen. Thomas Holcomb, United States Marine Corps.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to object because I have great admiration for the record of the distinguished head of the Marine Corps, we should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under the law a Distinguished Service Medal may be awarded to any person who, while serving in any capacity with the Navy of the United States, since April 6, 1917, has distinguished himself by exceptionally meritorious service to the Government in a duty of great responsibility. It may be awarded for combat or noncombat action.

The Committee on Naval Affairs felt that, in view of the fact that Lieutenant General Holcomb has rendered such outstanding service and has been a Marine for some 43 years, it is nothing but proper that the Distinguished Service Medal be awarded to him by Congress. Therefore, we unanimously reported this bill to the House.

As the House and the country know, Lieutenant General Holcomb is the Commandant of the Marine Corps. He is one of the most outstanding officers in the armed forces of the United States. On January 1 he retires on account of having reached 64 years of age. Before his retirement, it is to be hoped that Congress will permit in its name the Distinguished Service Medal to be given to him by the President of the United States.

It is appreciated that the President is empowered, without further action by the Congress, to present a Distinguished Service Medal to Lieutenant General Holcomb, but enactment of the bill would announce the special approval of the Congress of his services and is therefore deemed appropriate.

During the general's tenure as commandant, the corps has expanded to an unprecedented size, has greatly increased its training facilities in every field, and has mastered the utilization of the most modern weapons of war. The corps today is 22 times its size at the time General Holcomb became commandant, and is 6 times the size of the corps during World War No. 1.

Last June, just prior to attaining the age of 64, which is the statutory retirement age, General Holcomb submitted a request to relinquish his office upon reaching that age, with a view to permitting the appointment, if the President should see fit, of a successor who had rendered distinguished service in the present war. Amenable to the President's desires, the general agreed to continue as commandant until January 1.

General Holcomb's service as commandant for 7 years climaxed one of the most illustrious careers in the history of the corps. During his 43 years as a marine, General Holcomb played a key part in guiding the corps to its present high point of efficiency, and was largely responsible for making the corps the most skillful amphibious force the world has even known.

For the past 20 years, in particular, the general has been especially active in the study, practice, development, and teaching of amphibious landing operations, and thus he was singularly qualified to lead the Marine Corps when the United States after the Japanese sneak attack on Pearl Harbor found itself confronted by the most complex amphibious war of all time.

Under the skillful guidance of General Holcomb, the Marine Corps has taken the leading part in the development of the technique of landing operations and the soundness of the training policies inaugurated by the general has been demonstrated by the success of American forces in the Atlantic, Mediterranean, and Pacific theaters.

American forces conducted no amphibious operations in World War No. 1 and as a consequence General Holcomb had no opportunity to display his ability in that field. However, he proved himself an adept and progressive leader in the violent land fighting in France. He served brilliantly with the Sixth Marine Regiment, A. E. F., from February to August 1918, as major in command of the second battalion of the regiment, and from August 1918 until July 1919 as a lieutenant colonel and second in command of the regiment.

He participated in all engagements in which the Sixth Regiment took part—the Aisne defensive, Chateau Thierry; the Aisne-Marne offensive, Soissons; the Marbache sector; the St. Mihiel offensive; the Meuse-Argonne—Champagne—offensive; the Argonne Forest offensive, and in the march to the Rhine following the armistice.

In recognition of his past distinguished services, the general has been awarded the Navy Cross, the Silver Star with three oak-leaf clusters, a meritorious service citation by the commander in chief, A. E. F., the Victory Medal with Aisne, Aisne-Marne, St. Mihiel, Meuse-Argonne, and defensive-sector clasps, and the Purple Heart. He was three times cited in general orders of the Second Division, A. E. F. The French Government conferred on him the Cross of the Legion of Honor and the Croix de Guerre with three palms. The general also holds the Expeditionary Medal, China, 1911–14, the Asiatic-Pacific ribbon bar with numeral I and one star, the American Defense Service Medal and the Cuban Naval Order of Merit, first class.

General Holcomb was appointed a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps 43 years ago, in 1900; and he was commandant, Marine Corps schools, Quantico, Va., in 1936, when President Roosevelt appointed him Major General Commandant. In 1940 he was reappointed commandant. On January 20, 1942, the general was elevated to the rank of lieutenant general and thus became the highest ranking officer in Marine Corps history.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I agree with everything the gentleman from Georgia has said.

It comes as a great relief after the shocking statement just made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] backing up this rump organization known as the Fair Employment Practice Committee that is harassing the white people of the Southern States, if not of the whole country, whose sons are fighting and dying in this war. I have just had news of a young man I appointed to the Naval Academy and who went down on the *Liscome Bay*. I have also had a message from a young man whom I knew as a boy, who was killed in one of the battles of the far southwest. These sad messages are coming every day.

I am tired of a little group of radicals in New York and elsewhere, headed by PM, maligning the white people of the South when they are doing everything they can to help win this war, keep our transportation system going, and save those sacred American institutions for which our boys are fighting.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Lt. Gen. Thomas Holcomb, United States Marine Corps, for exceptionally meritorious and distinguished service to the Government in a duty of great responsibility as Commandant of the United States Marine Corps from December 1, 1936, to the present time.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in order that I may

give the history of the military service of General Holcomb.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD in regard to the award to General Holcomb.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, in the long list of distinguished Commandants of the United States Marine Corps, there has been none more distinguished than Lt. Gen. Thomas Holcomb. During his administration of the Marine Corps, it has grown to unprecedented size, and yet its efficiency and fighting effectiveness has been maintained on its traditional high standard. As glorious as has been its traditions of the past, the corps has added new glory and new traditions unexcelled in its long colorful career. General Holcomb has been a fighting marine all his career. He has fought both on the battlefield and within the corps to keep it abreast and ahead, in fact, in the professional field. General Holcomb was a tremendous inspiration to all of the officers and men in the corps when he personally visited the marines at Guadalcanal during their darkest days in that grim battle area. He subjected himself to all the combat hazards that the other marines on Guadalcanal were exposed to. It is indeed fitting that Congress should have presented in its name the Distinguished Service Medal to this most distinguished marine. His influence on the corps will be felt long into the future. The whole country, as well as all marines particularly, are very happy that he is being succeeded by a worthy successor in the person of Lt. Gen. A. A. Vandegrift. The corps is proud of General Holcomb, and I am sure the Congress is equally proud of him.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with the deepest regret and profound sorrow that I listened to the words of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER]. He can cease to weep over the fate of the Republican Party. Nor need he bewail the fate of the legislation designed to permit those in the service to vote at the next general election. Republicans, western and southern Democrats, are determined that the servicemen shall be afforded an opportunity to vote. They are equally determined that no New Deal politician—no group of New Deal politicians—be permitted as one Member of the other body intimated they would like to do—to steal the coming election. Republicans, Democrats who believe in constitutional government, will see to it, if they can overcome New Deal obstructionist opposition, that every serviceman be given the opportunity to vote, not only for Federal officials but for State and county candidates. I suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], if the suggestion be in order, that he use some of those handkerchiefs he was going to use to mop up the tears of the Republicans in wiping the dirty noses of the new dealers, because the election trends show that the country is on the mend and neither the people nor the Republicans will have need for the gentleman's sympathy. The gentleman need not worry at all about the Republicans. Let him clean house over on that side, as some of the southern Democrats over in the other body suggest you do, especially in Pennsylvania. Clean house up there in Pennsylvania and in certain cities and the country will be all right again. Do not cry about the Republicans.

GOVERNOR DEWEY

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, relative to the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois with respect to "campaign facts, not campaign oratory," I was under the impression that the issue in the approaching campaign would be the question of the conduct of the war. I was mistaken. The News of New York in its editorial last Sunday indicated that this is going to be a beauty contest. As you probably know, the News advocates the nomination of Governor Dewey. Among the attributes ascribed to him, by the News, as qualifications for the nomination, are that he has a radio personality and is a racketbuster. I quote the News further and here is his greatest qualification:

> To top it all off, he is handsome in an entirely masculine way, which should do him no harm with a lot of women voters.

Oh, shade of Abraham Lincoln. There was a time when the Republicans nominated as their standard-bearers men of ability, but in 1944 the Republican standard will be pulchritude.

EXEMPTION OF FIRE-INSURANCE COMPANIES FROM ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have, prior to this time, expressed my opposition to the bills before the House, one of which has been reported out by the Committee on the Judiciary, to exempt fire-insurance companies from the antitrust laws. I should like to read from a letter I received from an insurance agent after I made my speech in opposition to these bills.

> I have been in the insurance business, as you know, for many years and have had many scraps with the bureaucratic Board of Underwriters of the Pacific, in fact I was one who was fined for using my own judgment as to the company in which to place a policy. It's needless to tell you, I did not get scared nor have I ever ceased to tell them of their unfair methods. I place my business where I please, but if this legislation should be passed, with the present set-up in California, I and other independent agents may be in difficulties. It would take too much space to say what I think of these bureaucrats who are always criticizing and calling their Government officials bureaucrats, and are working overtime to take us back to the Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover debacle.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein an editorial that appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of December 10 and in the Boston Post of December 10, editorially commenting on the recent speech made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at two points in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. A comment on pulchritude: The gentleman who mentioned that is possibly the handsomest man in the House. I am confident that he won handsomely on his own pulchritude and it is amazing to me that he would criticize that attribute in a candidate. He said he thought that the conduct of the war would be the campaign arguments this year. Far from it. We are united in our war aims. That is not to be political. Why, in the olden days of emperors and kings, when trouble came on the home front they always provoked a foreign war to distract the attention of the people. That is an old game. We are not going to forget the home-front stupidities in this campaign, you handsome gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

INSURANCE BUSINESS AND THE ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include a review of tables prepared by Best & Co. of the tables inserted in the record of hearings on H. R. 3270 on November 3, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, December 9, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD 38 columns outlining his opposition to H. R. 3270, a bill recently approved by the House Judiciary Committee by a vote of 17 to 5 and soon to be presented to this House for consideration.

I do not intend to use 38 columns in replying to my colleague from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] for the reason that 90 percent of his argument is immaterial and irrelevant. What under the sun has the question of rates, profits, and so forth, to do with the question raised by this legislation, namely, should the business of insurance be construed as commerce under the Clayton and Sherman Acts? All the talk that has been indulged in about rates and profits is simply the drawing of a red herring across the trail.

The gentleman from Indiana states further that this bill is a democratic measure. He failed to include as one of the author's of this legislation, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK], who has demonstrated his republicanism on the floor of this House over a long period years. The record clearly shows that there is no partisanship involved in the consideration of this important legislation.

Surely the gentleman from Indiana will accept the platform of his own party as adopted in 1940 as to what constitutes republicanism. We find the following language in the Republican platform of 1940: "We condemn the New Deal attempts to destroy the confidence of our people in private insurance institutions. We favor a continuance of regulation of insurance by the several States." The Democratic platform of the same year carries this provision: "We favor strict supervision of all forms of the insurance business by the several States for the protection of policyholders and the public." Again I repeat, partisanship should not be injected in this discussion.

I do not pose as an expert on insurance although I have been engaged in that business for several years. As I stated 2 weeks ago, I have never been directly employed by any insurance company. However, I am definitely interested in the welfare of the insurance business and I am vitally interested in the effect of any legislation on the policyholders of this Nation.

If any Member of the House is interested in referring to the authorities on which I base my contentions that the business of insurance is not, and never has been considered commerce under the Clayton or Sherman Acts, I respectfully refer him to page 8638 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 21.

The gentleman from Indiana expresses his conviction that H. R. 3270 is deliberately worded for the purpose of preventing the Supreme Court from having unfettered judicial freedom of action in deciding the case of the United States versus South Eastern Underwriters Association. This reflects little understanding by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] of the significance of the bill.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to ask the gentleman this question. Does the gentleman believe that it is an effective way for any industry to protect itself against Federal regulations by attempting to immunize itself from enforcement of the antitrust laws which would prevent monopolistic practices in that industry?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. My answer, and I will answer your question later in more detail, is we are not granting insurance companies any immunity that they have not always had. If the Department of Justice wanted a determination as to whether Congress intended the insurance business to be considered commerce, it seems to me, as I will develop later, that the orderly procedure would have been for the Department to come up here and introduce a bill if there was any doubt in their minds as to the intent of Congress. I cannot find anything that would cause any doubt in a reasonable person's mind, that neither Congress nor the courts have ever indicated insurance was to be considered commerce under these acts.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think that is an arguable point. The only point I want to make at the moment was as a practical matter it appeared to me if any industry wants to escape Government regulations the thing it should seek is effective enforcement of the antitrust laws, so competitive conditions can prevent monopolistic practices, which, to my mind, is the basic justification for Federal regulation.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I shall attempt to answer the gentleman a little more fully in just a moment.

Its purpose is to preserve the regulation of the insurance business by the States and to make certain that the intent of Congress shall not be thwarted by application of the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act to that business. In the light of this broad purpose, it is of small consequence whether the bill also affects a pending legal proceeding. When an important issue of governmental functions is at stake, not to mention the entire future of a great business, it matters little whether as an incidental effect the prosecution of a few companies and individuals is interfered with, particularly when the acts for which they are brought to bar were done in reliance upon long-standing decisions of the Supreme Court and upon the clear intention of Congress that the antitrust laws should not apply to insurance.

If the gentleman from Indiana really believes that the purpose of those who introduced this bill and those who are supporting it is as he has stated, he must have little faith in either the intelligence or the integrity of his fellow Members of Congress. Surely, he cannot think that they are motivated by the wish to free the defendants in a criminal proceeding from the consequences of their wrongdoing or that they are not concerned with the broader and enduring consequences of this legislation. Admittedly, the case which is coming before the Supreme Court was the occasion for this bill, since it involves the possibility that the Supreme Court may reverse its decisions of many years, thereby throwing the insurance business into chaos and destroying the structure of State regulation. I am not a lawyer, but I have discussed this legislation with several lawyers.

As a matter of fact, it is probable that the bill, if adopted, would have no effect on the pending case. If, under a correct construction of the law, the Sherman and Clayton Acts are now applicable to the business of insurance, then this bill is a repealing bill which removes that business from the scope of those acts. If that is the case the bill comes within the provisions of title I, United States Code, section 29, which provides:

> The repeal of any statute shall not have the effect to release or extinguish any penalty, forfeiture, or liability incurred under such statute, unless the repealing act shall so expressly provide, and such statute shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper action or prosecution for the enforcement of such penalty, forfeiture, or liability.

If, on the other hand, the bill represents a declaration of what was the legislative intent at the time of enactment of the antitrust laws or an interpretation of the meaning of those laws, then it seems probable in the light of language used by the courts in the past, that the Supreme Court would not be bound by such a declaratory act in interpreting the antitrust laws as applying to past transactions. The bill would be persuasive but not controlling on the court.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. I have no doubt about the power of Congress to state that insurance should not be considered within the terms of the Antitrust Act. What this bill attempts to do is to have the present Congress interpret the intent of a Congress of a decade or so ago.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I do not think so.

Mr. WRIGHT. Does it not say the act shall be so construed as to exclude the insurance business, or words to that effect?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. No. It is a determination of a fact now.

Mr. WRIGHT. My impression was that the bill stated that the antitrust acts should be so construed as to exclude

the insurance business. Is that not correct?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. No, it is not. I have heard that argument. It is certainly not contained in the bill. I refer the gentleman to the resolving clause of the bill. That contention is made, but it is not in the bill. It is a misconception that has developed during the discussion, I fear.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] has attempted to draw an analogy between the language of this bill and that of the eleventh amendment to the Constitution, which provided that the judicial power of the United States should not be construed to extend to any suit against one of the United States by citizens of another State or by citizens or subjects of a foreign state. In order to sustain his analogy, he pictured the effect of this bill as carving out of the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act a portion of the jurisdiction of the courts over prosecutions under those acts. The fallacy of his argument lies in his use of the word "jurisdiction" in two different senses.

The eleventh amendment of the Constitution took away the jurisdiction of the courts as to the class of cases to which the amendment referred—the amendment dealt with judicial power and cut off the authority of the courts to act in any such cases. The bill under consideration is not directed at the power of the courts at all. It deals with the meaning of a criminal statute. Of course, the courts cannot impose a penalty for acts which Congress declares to be lawful, and in that sense it may be said that they do not have jurisdiction over those acts. But that has nothing to do with the question of jurisdiction which the eleventh amendment dealt with—that is, the question of judicial power and the constitutional authority of the courts to act.

The gentleman from Indiana also characterizes this legislation as an immoral attempt to interfere with orderly judicial procedure and compares it with the attempt made in 1937 to destroy judicial freedom by Executive interference.

This bill does not, however, contemplate any interference by the legislative branch with the proper functions of the judiciary. Congress is still the law-making body in this country and its power to make the laws is not to be hampered or limited by reason of its effect on pending litigation. It is the function of the judiciary to interpret and enforce the laws, but it has no vested interest in the issues of a pending lawsuit which bars Congress from acting to affirm or modify, as it sees fit, the law involved. If the Supreme Court had already acted and had determined that the antitrust laws are applicable to insurance, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE], we may be sure, would not for a moment deny the right of Congress to take action immediately to amend the antitrust laws and provide explicitly that they should not apply to insurance. It is difficult to understand why the power of Congress should be diminished because of the fact that the Supreme Court has not yet passed on the question. If Congress can repeal or amend an act which has been construed by the Supreme Court, surely it can adopt such legislation as may be necessary to remove any possible uncertainty as to the proper construction of that act and thereby avoid the confusion and great harm which would result from an interpretation which is not in accordance with the desires of Congress.

The Congressmen who support this bill do not intend any affront to the Supreme Court nor do they impugn the motives of the Justices. Whatever may be thought of the legal reasoning which might lead to a reversal of the decision of the lower court in the South Eastern Underwriters case, the bill does not deal with judicial processes but merely affirms the intent of Congress as to the scope of the antitrust laws.

In the report of the Judiciary Committee, it was pointed out that the bill does not grant an exemption of the insurance business from the antitrust laws since the antitrust laws have never been applied to the business of insurance. My colleague from Indiana differs from this statement on the ground that the Supreme Court may depart from its earlier decisions and that it cannot be said as a matter of law that the business of insurance is not now commerce.

Leaving aside the very debatable question as to whether a decision of the Supreme Court continues in force until the time when the Supreme Court reverses itself, or whether the law which the Supreme Court may establish tomorrow must be conceived of as having always been the law, notwithstanding an earlier contrary decision of the same Court, the legal hairsplitting which the gentleman from Indiana seems to relish so much does not go to the substance of the question.

As I pointed out on October 21, the Supreme Court on numerous occasions has held that insurance is not commerce. This was well known to the Members of Congress when the Sherman and Clayton Acts were adopted and they clearly understood that the consequence was that those acts did not apply to insurance. They did not concern themselves with the fine distinctions which my colleague from Indiana has discussed at length. They were not interested, for example, in distinguishing between the evidentiary facts presented to the Court in Paul against Virginia as to the manner of conducting the business of insurance and the evidentiary facts in other cases involving insurance, nor did they attempt to pass on the question whether the Court had drawn its conclusions on the basis of "correct and common modes of reasoning." The nature of the insurance business was considered in detail by the Supreme Court on more than one occasion and found not to be within the commerce clause of the Constitution. Common sense requires the conclusion that this bill does not grant an exemption but merely confirms what has always been the law.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Is not the effect of this act to have Congress interpret the law?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. No. I do not think so; that certainly is not my intention.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. That is the way I read it hurriedly. It impressed me that way. It is the function of the courts to interpret the law.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Absolutely. I can only refer the gentleman to the resolving clause of the bill itself. I am sure he will find that we are not asking for any interpretation of the law. We state a fact.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I wanted to ask the gentleman one more question, if I may. Is it your view that we cannot have any Federal control of insurance companies? That that would be derogatory to the insurance business?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Of course, we can have some Federal control, but we cannot have a situation such as would develop if the Court should now reverse its previous decisions and the decisions of the Judiciary Committee of a previous Congress and certain other rulings that the insurance business has relied on over the years. We find a situation where many States require by State law that insurance companies create rating bureaus; that they confer as to rates. You would find a situation where company X in carrying out the clear mandate of the law of the State of New York or California, or Massachusetts, would be in violation of the Sherman-Clayton Acts. They would be indicted for a Federal offense for simply obeying the law of a State.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Is there any analogy between the regulation of railroads, for instance, and the insurance business? For instance, in my State, we have a very good commission regulating intrastate transportation and of course, we have the Interstate Commerce Commission regulating interstate commerce. As far as I know, their jurisdictions have not come in conflict. Would that apply to the insurance business?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. There certainly would be a great deal of conflict if the Court should reverse its previous decisions.

In the second part of his speech, my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] took up first the question whether application of the antitrust laws to insurance would interfere with State regulation of the business, and he pointed out several cases of industries against which antitrust suits have been brought but which were at the time State regulated or at least not federally conrolled. In none of these cases, however, had there been devel-

oped a pattern of State regulation at all analogous to that which is applicable to the insurance business.

The proponents of this bill have never argued that the antitrust laws would destroy every vestige of State regulation and authority. Clearly, the States have certain police powers which they can exercise over those who do business within their borders. It is beyond question, however, that where interstate commerce is involved, the Federal law is controlling and State laws which are inconsistent with Federal laws must fall.

The regulation of the insurance business by the States has been built up over many decades on the basis of the law as it has been established for 75 years, that insurance is not commerce and that accordingly the full and exclusive power of regulation is in the States. As a result of long experience and careful investigation by legislative committees and others, the States have determined that competitive methods—at least, as far as rates are concerned—are not appropriate in the insurance business.

They have learned that the public has an interest in the solvency of the insurers and that cooperation and accord among the insurers should be encouraged and not forbidden. As a consequence, State regulation permits and in many instances requires, cooperative methods which would clearly not be lawful if the Sherman and Clayton Acts are applicable to the business. This is the conflict which must be resolved if the Supreme Court reverses its previous decisions; indeed, it is one of the compelling reasons for the adoption of this bill.

The gentleman from Indiana suggests that it would be a more orderly procedure to await the decision of the Supreme Court and then for Congress to pass legislation staying the execution of judgment until a solution for the chaotic conditions could be found. Of course, speaking of orderly procedures, it would have been more orderly and proper if the Department of Justice had come to Congress in the first instance with its recommendations that the antitrust laws be made applicable to insurance instead of attempting to persuade the Supreme Court to change the law and extend the scope of statutes enacted by Congress. In any event, the time for Congress to act is now. If Congress does not act now and the Supreme Court reverses itself, there would ensue a period in which the insurance companies would not know what to do from day to day. They would be faced with the immediate problem of reorganizing their business in an attempt to comply with conflicting State and Federal legislation without any sure knowledge of how that legislation would be interpreted. Acts which they are required by State law to do might involve criminal violations of Federal statutes, and attempts to comply with the Federal statutes might result in violations of State laws. Congress would be compelled to take hasty action and would not be able to give adequate consideration to the many perplexing questions involved. The most probable result would be an ill-considered act superimposing Federal regulation and adding to the already excessive body of administrative bureaus in Washington.

If the experience of the States is any criterion, the method of doing business which is required by the antitrust laws is not the method which is best suited to the special nature of the insurance business. Of one thing we can therefore be sure—even if Federal legislation on the subject of insurance is found to be necessary, it will be legislation entirely different from the antitrust laws. By making certain that those laws are not applicable to insurance, Congress is not giving up any of its power to enact other legislation on the subject. The adoption of this bill does not prevent Congress from investigating and studying the subject further and taking whatever action it may find desirable.

The gentleman from Indiana has inserted in the RECORD some tables which were placed by the Assistant Attorney General in the record of the hearing before the subcommittees of the two Judiciary Committees, and states that there is not one word of evidence challenging any of the figures in these tables. It is not surprising that there is no contradiction of these figures in the printed RECORD as they were submitted at the conclusion of the final hearing on November 3. The hearings have subsequently been reopened and the figures have been very vigorously challenged by a representative of the insurance companies. Moreover, it is expected that there will be presented to the House an analysis of some of the figures submitted by the Assistant Attorney General which will show that they are in many respects completely misleading, and that even where they are accurate they cannot properly be used as the basis of conclusions such as those which have been drawn from them by the opponents of the bill.

The charts inserted in the printed report of the joint hearing before the subcommittees of the Committees on the Judiciary following the close of the hearings on November 3, by the Assistant Attorney General appeared so confusing and misleading that I secured a review of the various tables by the Alfred M. Best Co. This company publishes all kinds of insurance publications and reports.

I am inserting the chart as prepared for the Attorney General's department and following it by the Best analysis of that particular chart.

TABLE I.—*Fire and marine insurance business in the United States 1935–39*

Year	Total assets	Capital stock [1]	Net surplus	Net premiums	Total income	Losses paid	Net earnings [2]
1935	$2,556,122,000	$347,576,000	$1,211,381,000	$837,035,000	$954,073,000	$295,966,000	$365,161,000
1936	2,815,293,000	337,132,000	1,268,922,000	890,855,000	1,021,068,000	371,744,000	170,629,000
1937	2,630,815,000	343,407,000	1,143,983,000	972,128,000	1,092,907,000	373,779,000	−9,949,000
1938	2,751,313,000	342,787,000	1,255,379,000	921,673,000	1,034,031,000	397,310,000	238,622,000
1939	2,840,489,000	351,323,581	1,312,288,000	956,642,000	1,085,168,000	388,325,000	163,918,000
5-year average	2,718,806,000	344,445,116	1,238,378,000	915,666,600	1,037,449,400	365,424,800	185,675,000

Year	Percentage capital paid up to total assets	Percentage losses to total income	Percentage losses to net premiums	Percentage net earnings to losses paid	Percentage net earnings to capital paid up
1935	13.6	31.0	35.4	123.4	105.1
1936	12.0	36.4	41.7	45.9	50.6
1937	13.1	34.2	38.4		
1938	12.5	36.4	43.1	60.1	69.6
1939	12.4	35.8	40.6	42.2	46.7
5-year average [3]	12.7	35.2	39.9	50.8	53.9

[1] To the capital stock of stock companies reported by Statistical Abstract has been added 2.75 percent of the total to cover the guaranty fund of mutuals as reported by Best's.
[2] Represents annual change in surplus plus dividends paid.
[3] For all corporations reporting to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, capital stock is equivalent to about 33 percent of total assets.

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1941, p. 326.

TABLE 1. FIRE AND MARINE INSURANCE BUSINESS IN THE UNITED STATES 1935–39 (P. 144)

This table is apparently intended to give a comprehensive picture of the fire and marine insurance business in the United States for the years 1935 to 1939. The presentation is a meaningless mass of statistics.

The first distortion appearing in this table is the mixing of stock and mutual company figures and the arbitrary adjustment of "capital stock" making 2.75 percent allowance to cover the estimated guaranty fund of mutuals. All earnings of mutual companies belong to the policyholders, and it is therefore ridiculous to combine such earnings with those benefiting the shareholders of stock companies.

The greatest distortion is in the last column "net earnings." Far from reflecting net earnings the column as indicated by footnote "Represents annual change in surplus plus dividends paid." (Dividends paid to policyholders during the period aggregated about $200,000,000.) It is clearly evident that "annual change in surplus" may come from a great many sources which have nothing to do with earnings; for example, insurance companies are required by the various States to make bookkeeping adjustment annually so that surplus may reflect the prevailing market value of security holdings. Fulfilling this legal requirement, the fire and marine insurance carriers decreased the value of their security holdings by more than $700,000,000 during the years 1930 to 1934, inclusive, and made corresponding reduction in surplus. Yet the table treats as earnings additions to surplus resulting from subsequent recovery of a large part of this loss in

book value which was regained during the 1935–39 period of rising security prices. Furthermore, during the latter period the purported net earnings include no less than $35,000,000 of outright contributions to surplus made by shareholders of insurance carriers. In the same years, also, it was not uncommon for insurance companies to transfer capital funds to surplus. The transfers do not represent one penny of earnings, yet under the column as set up every dollar of such transfers appears as earnings.

Any one of these items alone would be enough to destroy the value of column "net earnings" as being a basis for drawing any conclusions. All of these factors and many others are involved in view of the comprehensiveness of the figures, so the net result is that the figures are of absolutely no value.

In the second schedule of this table there is a column "Percentage net earnings to capital paid-up." The percentages are preposterous because, coupled with a totally erroneous conception of what constitutes earnings, the purported net earnings of the nearly 3,000 fire and marine insurance companies operating in the United States are ratioed to the total capital stock maintained by no more than 400 companies. The same objection applies to the first column, "Percentage capital paid-up to total assets."

All the comparisons dealing with capital alone mean nothing. One element of distortion involves funds transferred from capital to surplus, another is that all stock companies are formed with a substantial surplus through sale of stock at a price running as high as five times the par value, and still another is the arbitrary inclusion in "capital" of the small amount of guaranty capital maintained by a few mutual companies. The fact is that the total capital shown in the table represents the aggregate par value of outstanding shares and in no wise reflects the capital investment of stockholders.

The second column, "percentage losses to total income," is most misleading. Losses paid cannot properly be compared with total income as the reported income of insurance companies, besides premiums and interest from investments, also includes such items as borrowed money, surplus contributions, remittances by foreign companies to United States branches, gains resulting from adjustment in book value of assets, recovery of bad debts and other adjustments too numerous to mention. Premium income, included with total income, cannot properly be compared with losses, as a premium payment may be for insurance protection, without further payment, for 3 or 5 years, and in some cases forever under contracts written on a perpetual basis.

Another objection is that the figures of mutual companies and stock companies cannot logically be combined because of varying plans of operation. Mutual companies are usually able to show lower losses in relation to total income because they write generally on a selected-risk basis. There are the member companies of the Associated Factory Mutual Group operating on an assessment basis and collecting a premium deposit exceeding stock company rates by as much as 500 percent, depending upon period of policy contract. Losses of these companies, as a consequence, averaged less than 6 percent of premium deposits over the 1935–39 period. Combining the premiums (or total income) of the specialist companies with those of stock companies, and the losses of the two widely different classes, reduces the loss ratio, but means nothing.

The same objections apply to the next column, "Percentage of losses to net premiums."

The next column, "Percentage of net earnings to losses paid," is, of course, based upon figures appearing in the last column of the preceding exhibit. We have already demonstrated that the net earnings figures are hopelessly inaccurate.

The same objection obtains to the last column, "Percentage of net earnings to capital paid up." A supplementary objection is that the ratios are meaningless. Earnings of an insurance carrier, even when accurately computed, bear no relationship to capital paid up. The proper comparison is percentage of net earnings to shareholders' capital at risk.

Summed up, this whole schedule is distorted by two major misconceptions:

(1) The inclusion of mutual figures with stock company figures.

(2) The treatment of "net earnings" as if it were identical with "annual change in surplus plus dividends paid."

With these two basic errors, all of the conclusions drawn in the second schedule are distorted.

TABLE 2.—*Dividends paid by the 10 largest[1] fire-insurance companies since 1909*

[Basis: $100 per share equivalent]

	Home Insurance Co. (New York)	Hartford Fire Insurance Co.	Continental Insurance Co. (New York)	Insurance Co. of North America (Philadelphia)	Aetna Insurance Co. (Hartford)	American Insurance Co. (Newark)	Fidelity Phenix Fire Insurance Co. (New York)	National Fire Insurance Co. of Hartford	Great American Insurance Co. (New York)	Springfield Fire & Marine Insurance Co.
1910	$30.00	$40	$55	$12.00	$17	$20	----------	$20	$30	$10.00
1911	35.00	35	50	12.00	16	23	$10	20	30	10.00
1912	35.00	35	50	12.00	16	24	10	20	30	10.00
1913	30.00	40	50	12.00	18	28	10	20	30	10.00
1914	20.00	40	50	12.00	18	28	10	20	30	10.00
1915	20.00	40	50	12.00	18	28	10	20	30	10.00
1916	22.00	40	30	15.00	20	32	20	20	30	10.00
1917	12.50	40	12	17.25	20	27	20	20	31	10.00
1918	25.00	40	14	16.00	20	20	22	20	30	10.00
1919	25.00	40	20	21.50	25	20	30	20	25	13.00
1920	25.00	30	20	23.00	24	20	30	20	15	16.00
1921	25.00	30	20	23.00	24	20	30	20	16	16.00
1922	25.00	30	22	23.00	24	20	40	20	16	16.00
1923	18.00	20	24	25.00	24	20	24	20	16	16.00
1924	18.00	20	24	25.00	24	20	24	20	16	16.00
1925	18.00	20	24	27.50	24	20	24	25	16	16.00
1926	18.00	20	24	20.00	24	20	24	25	16	16.00
1927	24.00	20	24	20.00	24	20	16	25	16	20.00
1928	20.00	22	20	25.00	24	20	20	25	16	16.00
1929	20.00	24	20	25.00	20	20	20	25	16	16.52
1930	20.00	24	24	30.00	20	20	26	20	16	18.00
1931	20.00	24	24	25.00	20	20	26	20	16	18.00
1932	20.00	20	36	20.00	20	18	37	20	18	18.00
1933	20.00	20	48	20.00	17	20	48	20	20	18.00
1934	23.00	20	48	20.00	16	20	48	20	20	18.00
1935	44.00	25	54	25.00	16	20	54	20	20	18.00
1936	25.00	20	58	25.00	16	20	58	20	24	12.00
1937	32.00	20	72	25.00	16	24	72	20	24	12.00
1938	32.00	20	72	25.00	16	24	72	20	24	12.00
1939	32.00	20	72	25.00	16	24	72	20	24	12.00
1940	32.00	25	80	25.00	18	24	80	20	24	12.00
1941	32.00	25	88	30.00	18	24	88	20	24	12.00
1942	32.00	25	88	30.00	18	24	88	20	24	12.00
Total, 33 years	829.50	914	1,367	703.25	651	732	1,163	685	733	459.52

[1] Selected on basis of net fire premiums written.

Source: Moody's Manual of Investments.

TABLE 2. DIVIDENDS PAID BY THE 10 LARGEST FIRE-INSURANCE COMPANIES SINCE 1909 (P. 144)

This table purports to be a report of dividends paid by the 10 largest fire-insurance companies since 1909 up to and through 1942.

This table is apparently designed to leave the impression that the sums shown in each column are the dollars paid in dividends per share of stock. A close examination of the table shows, however, in brackets and small type these words: "Basis: $100 per share equivalent."

It is obvious these words do not mean par value and they certainly do not mean market value. The par value does not reflect the amount of assets behind each share of stock. The correct way of determining the percentage of profit is to relate actual dividends to the amount, per share, at the risk of the business.

A graphic illustration of distortion in this exhibit is shown by a comparison for the year 1942 of the amount shown in the exhibit and the amounts actually paid as dividends by the 10 companies. For the purpose of showing the yield to the stockholders in relation to capital at the risk of the business the last two columns below indicate the per share capital at risk of the business on December 31, 1941, and the percentage of return on invested capital on basis of the actual 1942 dividends paid by the companies.

	1942 dividend		Per share capital risk of business, Dec. 31, 1941	Percent dividend return on capital at risk
	Table shows	Actually paid		
Home	$32	$1.60	$25.83	6.19
Hartford	25	2.50	96.88	2.58
Continental	88	2.20	39.64	5.54
Insurance Co. of North America	30	3.00	76.42	3.92
Aetna	18	1.80	61.04	2.94
American (New Jersey)	24	.60	15.88	3.77
Fidelity-Phenix	88	2.20	41.74	5.27
National Fire	20	2.00	78.95	2.53
Great American	24	1.20	27.87	4.30
Springfield Fire & Marine	12	4.75	131.92	3.60

TABLE 2 (*a*).—*Relation of premiums to losses paid by stock fire-insurance companies*

Year	Average premium per $100 insurance	Average losses paid per $100 insurance	Percentage losses to premiums
1921	$1.05	$0.61	58.3
1922	.99	.57	57.2
1923	.97	.51	52.9
1924	.97	.54	55.4
1925	.97	.53	55.1
1926	.93	.49	52.6
1927	.95	.44	46.6
1928	.92	.43	46.1
1929	.89	.41	46.2

TABLE 2 (*a*).—*Relation of premiums to losses paid by stock fire-insurance companies*—Continued

Year	Average premium per $100 insurance	Average losses paid per $100 insurance	Percentage losses to premiums
1930	$0.86	$0.49	56.8
1931	.81	.48	59.2
1932	.78	.48	61.5
1933	.74	.34	45.6
1934	.72	.31	42.8
1935	.71	.24	33.5
1936	.71	.27	38.5
1937	.69	.25	35.8
1938	.69	.27	38.5
1939	.67	.28	42.3
1940	.67	.28	42.6
1941	.65	.26	39.6
			Percent
Decline in premiums 1941 compared with 1921			38.1
Decline in fire losses 1941 compared with 1921			57.4

Source: Best's Fire and Casualty Aggregates and Averages.

TABLE 2 (*a*). RELATION OF PREMIUMS TO LOSSES PAID BY STOCK FIRE-INSURANCE COMPANIES (P. 145)

Apparently this is intended to show that the decline in cost for $100 of insurance was not as great as the decline in fire losses over the period of 20 years—1921–41.

This is true. The period taken included the years of the boom and post-depression years. It shows that rates dropped steadily, and then in the post-depression years (that is, subsequent to 1932) losses decreased in a most phenomenal way. People generally were being more careful because tangible property was very valuable in those post-depression years. Rates continued to drop, but beginning with 1938 losses rose substantially. From long experience underwriters knew that if rates were precipitately reduced during the few years of abnormally low losses, the inevitable reversal of the cycle would later make the reduced rates inadequate—as the event proved.

Furthermore, it must be remembered, in comparing loss ratios based on premiums with burning ratios based on values, that the figures have only a limited relationship. For example, assume a $1 rate on a policy, with a burning loss of 50 cents: A decrease in the burning loss to 25 cents is a reduction of 25 cents, but a 50-percent reduction. If rates are decreased by the same amount, to wit, 25 percent, there is only a 25-percent reduction.

The schedule shows that in 20 years the companies reduced these rates 38.1 percent—a rather creditable record in a score of years which has included two boom periods, when all other prices were rising.

TABLE 3.—*Important groups of stock fire and and marine insurance companies*

Group or "Fleet"	Premiums written 1941	Percent of total
Home	$102,677,887	
American Fore	58,373,155	
Hartford	50,492,982	
Royal	43,336,041	
North America	39,946,434	
5 largest	294,826,499	32.3
General Motors	41,069,461	
Aetna	37,195,150	
Crum & Forster	36,322,210	
Loyalty	27,201,810	
Firemen's Fund	27,003,285	
10 largest	463,618,415	50.8
Great American	21,947,611	
National Fire	20,936,992	
Phoenix, Hartford	20,024,055	
Aetna Life	19,539,806	
American	19,273,871	
15 largest	565,340,750	61.9
Springfield	18,827,656	
St. Paul	18,747,922	
Travelers	17,566,696	
Fire Association	17,295.008	
North British	17,234,220	
20 largest	655,012,252	71.8
Total, 348 companies	912,843,095	100.0

TABLE 3. IMPORTANT GROUPS OF STOCK FIRE AND MARINE INSURANCE COMPANIES (P. 146)

This exhibit attempts to show concentration of the total fire and marine insurance business on basis of 1941 premium income. While the table is headed "Group or Fleet," the comparison made at the bottom shows:

		Percent
20 largest	$655,012,252	71.8
Total, 348 companies	912,843,095	100.0

Here the premium volume of the "20 largest" is compared with a figure which is far below the actual $1,263,722,000 income from premiums reported in the year 1941 by all fire and marine insurance companies. There is also the implication that the "20" refers to companies, and that therefore 20 companies have a high percentage of the total business. Examination of the records discloses that the business of the so-called 20 largest was actually the combined returns of 109 companies as shown below:

Home	11
American Fore	6
Hartford	8
Royal	12
North America	6
	43
General Motors	2
Aetna	4
Crum & Forster	9
Loyalty	5
Fireman's Fund	3
	23
Great American	8
National Fire	4
Phoenix, Hartford	7
Aetna Life	3
American	3
	25
Springfield	4
St. Paul	2
Travelers	2
Fire Association	4
North British	6
	18
	109

Fleet membership does not necessarily mean interlocking financial interest. Many of the 109 companies are not owned by the parent companies of the named groups. In such cases there is merely a managerial affiliation. It is obvious, therefore, that the table leaves an erroneous impression and gives a distorted picture.

TABLE 4.—*Financial record of the 10 largest stock fire-insurance companies, 1941*

	Home Insurance Co. of New Jersey	Hartford Fire Insurance Co.	Insurance Co. of North America (Philadelphia)	Aetna Insurance Co. (Hartford)	Continental Insurance Co. of New York	Fidelity-Phenix Fire Insurance Co. (New York)	National Fire Insurance Co. of Hartford	American Insurance Co. (Newark)	Great American Insurance Co. (New York)	Springfield Fire & Marine Insurance Co.	Total, 10 companies
Premiums earned	$66,747,406	$43,884,124	$30,989,818	$25,589,632	$23,422,108	$18,650,181	$16,512,629	$16,323,320	$15,228,184	$14,394,453	$271,741,855
Total assets (statement)	$123,976,772	$129,671,484	$117,816,917	$59,965,970	$98,946,705	$76,901,768	$53,220,107	$34,241,024	$50,806,481	$36,779,842	$781,607,070
Capital and surplus	$51,289,853	$81,266,143	$75,656,834	$30,712,967	$65,204,868	$51,010,301	$31,580,996	$14,046,544	$30,145,557	$19,075,508	$449,989,571
Capital paid up	$15,000,000	$12,000,000	$12,000,000	$7,500,000	[1] $5,000,000	[1] $3,750,000	$5,000,000	$3,343,740	$8,150,000	$5,000,000	$76,743,740
Net earnings (Best's)	$6,681,212	$7,009,375	$5,920,573	$1,931,343	$5,888,665	$5,124,115	$1,288,534	$1,525,717	$2,443,045	$1,786,287	$39,598,866
Percentage net earnings to capital surplus	13.0	8.6	7.8	6.3	9.0	10.0	4.1	10.9	8.1	9.4	8.8
Percentage net earnings to capital paid up	44.5	58.4	49.3	25.8	117.8	136.6	25.8	45.6	30.0	35.7	[2] 51.6
Dividends to stockholders	$4,800,000	$3,000,000	$3,600,000	$1,350,000	$4,399,980	$3,299,900	$1,000,000	$802,498	$1,752,250	$950,000	$24,954,718
Percentage dividends to capital paid up	32.0	25.0	30.0	18.0	88.0	88.0	20.0	24.0	21.5	19.0	32.5
EARNINGS ON UNDERWRITING											
Statutory underwriting profit or loss	−$307,318	$2,664,182	$750,383	−$652,598	$196,311	$732,269	−$744,421	−$74,678	−$136,163	$52,805	$2,480,772
Changes in unearned premium reserve [3]	1,729,779	1,081,024	832,236	1,144,990	983,900	485,221	722,895	775,691	609,752	645,726	9,011,214
Policyholders equity in investment for unearned premium reserve [4]	1,777,222	1,146,953	741,762	704,839	702,254	516,803	534,625	464,173	455,960	443,044	7,487,635
Total underwriting profit (Best's)	3,199,683	4,892,159	2,324,381	1,197,231	1,882,465	1,734,293	513,099	1,165,186	929,549	1,141,575	18,979,621

[1] Continental and Fidelity-Phenix, both members of the American Fore group have changed the paid-up capital several times during the past 20 years, first by increasing it and then by reducing it to the present level which has prevailed since 1936.

[2] Average earnings for 5 years ending in 1941 were about 49 percent on the paid-up capital.

[3] Best's estimate is on the basis of a 60 percent fire loss. Actual losses for these companies averaged only 48 percent for the 5 years ending 1941, therefore Best's figures underestimate the profit for that year.

[4] Calculated by Best's on the basis of 3 percent of the reserve. This estimate seems to be a little high because of low earnings on high-grade securities.

Source: Best's Insurance Reports Fire and Marine.

TABLE 4. FINANCIAL RECORD OF THE 10 LARGEST STOCK FIRE-INSURANCE COMPANIES, 1941 (P. 147)

This purports to be an official record of the 10 largest stock fire-insurance companies for the year 1941, and the purpose apparently is to show what the Department of Justice claims to be an excessive profit.

Here again there is a distortion for the following reasons:

(1) The year taken, 1941, was an exceptionally profitable year.

(2) One year's record in the fire-insurance business is of no value at all in determining whether the profit being made by companies is excessive. There are years in which the companies sustain substantial underwriting losses. The figures of such years would be of no more value than this 1 year, 1941. Only by considering results for a period of years can a sound conclusion be reached. For the 5 years 1938 to 1942, inclusive, the average earnings of these 10 companies was 6.3 percent on the capital at risk, which is moderate considering the hazardous nature of the business.

(3) In the schedule there is an item, "Percentage dividends to capital paid up," and the average of the 10 companies is 32.5 percent. The figure is of no value in getting a correct picture of earnings because again it ignores what the earnings were on the capital at risk. The stockholders had at risk not only the capital but also the surplus and the equity in unearned premiums, representing the prepaid acquisition cost. As a matter of fact, the percentage of dividends to capital at risk of these 10 companies for the very profitable year 1941 was 4.6 percent as contrasted with the figure 32.5 percent set up in the schedule.

(4) Another item on the schedule is "Percentage net earnings to capital surplus," showing an average for the 10 companies of 8.8 percent. Here again the table ignores the equity in unearned premium reserve. The actual earnings were 7.2 percent of the capital at risk for the year 1941 for these 10 companies, and, as already stated, this was an unusually profitable year.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. May I read just a portion of this act? It says:

That nothing contained in the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, or the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, shall be construed to apply to the business of insurance or to acts in the conduct of that business or in any wise to impair the regulation of that business by the several States.

It strikes me that is an attempt by this Congress to construe the intent of the Congresses of 1890 and 1914, to forestall a judicial decision. I freely admit, of course, that Congress could specifically exempt, by positive enactment, insurance from these statutes, but I do not think they can go back to the acts of those previous Congresses and say what they meant. I think that is a judicial function and not legislative.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. If I interpreted the language as the gentleman does I would have to agree that it is a judicial function; but certainly the Congress has a perfect right to declare our present intent, as long as the question has been raised; and I refer the gentleman to the hearing and report of our own Committee on the Judiciary a number of years ago when a message was sent up requesting that Congress go into the subject of insurance and the control of insurance. I believe I referred to the report of that committee when I addressed the House on this subject on October 21. I know the gentleman is trying to get the background and the truth of this situation, because I know you realize, as I do, that it is very, very important.

I do want to express the hope that when the bill comes in we will have ample time to debate it, because while it is short in form, it certainly affects every policyholder and everybody engaged in any way in the insurance business, which means most of us, for most of us have some kind of insurance. The only reason I took this time today was to stimulate discussion and thought.

Mr. WRIGHT. I congratulate the gentleman from Connecticut. I know he is always sincere in his approach and in his presentation, and even though I might find it necessary to disagree with him occasionally, I know he approaches his problems from a statesmanlike point of view.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. If the gentleman would only disagree occasionally and agree often, all would be fine.

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial which appeared in the New York Times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SUPERHIGHWAY SYSTEM A MILITARY NECESSITY

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I share the feeling of the poet who longed for the time—

When war drums shall throb no longer
And the battle flags be furled
In the Parliament of Man,
The Federation of the World.

We all subscribe to that ideal, and the time may come with advancing civilization when the ideal is reached. It should be the one outstanding objective of all, but the Congress is not a body of idealists; we should always be realists. The time longed for by the poet has not yet arrived. It was not reached prior to the present world conflict, and it will not be established by any kind of an agreement between the parties involved following the cessation of hostilities. Nations are no more ready to keep their word tomorrow than they were yesterday. We should not delude ourselves. We should be practical and consider the situation both as it exists and in the light of history and experience. We cannot lose sight of the great law of growth which is but the law of necessary and inevitable change. We dare not forget the great distinctions God made in the races, although all are created in His image. We must realize that laws and customs cannot be successfully imposed upon a people from without; that institutions, to be beneficial to a people, must be the outgrowth of the peculiar life and environment of that people. As long as Nature persists in producing diversity and not uniformity in races or nationalities, or as long as the axis of the earth remains inclined 23½° to the plane of its orbit, making zones of varying temperature, or as long as the sentiment of patriotism is kept alive in the human breast and there are men whose hearts are stirred by the love of home and native land, and as long as there is competition in the economic life of people and nations there will be wars, and permanent or universal peace will remain the dream of ambitious genius or phantoms of the foolish.

I am not afraid of this country developing the spirit of imperialism or desire for world domination—the primary or contributing cause of most wars—but I am not unmindful that the virtues and success of a nation, like the virtues and success of individuals, are frequently the objects of envy and jealousy by neighbors and competitors—another contributing cause of war. And I can see the possibility in no great distant future when envious and jealous nations may unite in an effort to destroy our own country and its people. It may be a half century from now, a century, or several centuries, but regardless of when it may come or whether it ever comes, it is not too soon to begin the construction of lasting defenses.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, with these reflections in mind I have introduced bill, H. R. 56, with two distinct purposes in view, one to create an indispensable means of transportation for use in case of war, the other to promote the national economy of our country in time of peace.

The proposal in H. R. 56, illustrated by the chart before you, and now before the Committee on Roads, provides for the construction of a military highway from the Canadian line near Minot, N. Dak., southward to points near St. Paul, Chicago, Cincinnati, Knoxville, Birmingham, to the Mexican border near El Paso, Tex., thence northward through New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, Utah, Idaho, and Montana to the Canadian line near Glacier Park. The idea is to extend the Alaskan Highway from near Minot, N. Dak., to connect with the Pan-American Highway at or near El Paso, Tex., and from there northward to the Canadian border with the hope that the Cana-

dian Government will extend the highway from there to Edmonton, Canada, to connect with the Alaskan Highway.

In addition to the main road there will be at least three auxiliary highways, possibly more, on the east; one running from near Cincinnati, Ohio, to Columbus, Cleveland, Buffalo, Albany, and Boston; another from near Knoxville, Tenn., to Charleston, S. C.; and a third from near Birmingham, Ala., to Pensacola, Fla. On the west there would be three such highways, one running from Los Angeles, another from San Francisco, and a third from Seattle, all connecting with the main highway.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I notice the road depicted on the map runs from Montana down through a small part of northwestern Montana, western Idaho, northeastern Nevada, southwestern Utah, western Arizona, southwestern New Mexico, to El Paso in Texas, and then into Mexico. Why was that particular route picked out when we already have a route extending from northwestern Montana down through western Montana, Idaho, Utah, and then to other areas in the South which would eventually connect with the Pan-American Highway in Mexico? I am referring to the so-called Four States Highway which can, and should fit into the worthy and necessary endeavor you are describing.

Mr. HARE. There is no reason why this should be an additional route if there is one there already. The object is to make it a road to meet the military necessities of the country.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. The gentleman, then is not sold on the idea that the north and south road has to go along any particular pattern.

Mr. HARE. By no means; I am only suggesting a general outline showing the military necessity for such a road throughout the country. The engineers will determine the exact location.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. Has the tentative route the gentleman has sketched in on this map been submitted to the Army engineers?

Mr. HARE. It has not. I am submitting it today for the information of the House and for the information of the members of the Committee on Roads with the hope that it may be considered of sufficient importance to justify consideration.

Mr. RIVERS. Whatever route is decided upon would be by and with the advice and consent of the Army engineers.

Mr. HARE. That is correct.

Mr. RIVERS. May I ask one further question?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. RIVERS. Is one termination of this road at Charleston, S. C.?

Mr. HARE. Yes; one of the auxiliary roads, and I am sure the gentleman would be in favor of that.

Mr. RIVERS. That would not be surprising. One further question: What will be the total cost of this road when finished?

Mr. HARE. No surveys have yet been made and the cost, therefore, has not been determined or estimated, but I would say it would be in the neighborhood of $15,000,000,000.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. This proposed highway goes from Texas, through Mississippi, Alabama, and the extreme northwestern part of Georgia.

Mr. HARE. Yes; and thence northward to the Canadian line.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the interest being manifested, but trust I may be permitted to proceed without further interruption at this time, because I would like to discuss the proposal in some detail.

Part of the proposal in this project is not a new idea. After the War of 1812, when our Navy had given a surprisingly good account of itself, both Army and Navy experts were of the definite opinion there was an outstanding military necessity for a better transportation system leading from the grain fields and industrial cities of the Midwest to the southeastern seaboard, and it was considered sufficiently important to warrant construction at the expense of the Federal Government. Andrew Jackson, hero of the Battle of New Orleans, and later President of the United States, shared the opinion of the military experts, although his idea was that such a system should run from the Great Lakes to the Gulf or from Canada to Mexico, but was very definite in his conviction that the system should touch some outstanding and improved port on the Atlantic seaboard. Charleston, S. C., being the most prominent port at the time, he suggested the system should run from there to Cincinnati, Ohio, and from there to Canada or the Great Lakes. He felt the military necessity for such a transportation system so strongly that when he became President he appointed Army engineers to make surveys with the idea of constructing a double-track railroad system from Cincinnati, Ohio, to Charleston, S. C. A number of routes were considered, but Colonel Long, of the Engineer Corps, recommended that the most feasible and strategic route at that time would be from Cincinnati direct to Knoxville, Tenn., thence to Maryville, Tenn., and from there via Walhalla to Charleston, S. C. Both military experts and national leaders felt that such a system would insure the Government the necessary materials for the manufacture of munitions and implements of war, a supply of coal and equipment sufficient for our Navy, and the transportation of an army from one section of the country to another. Naval experts insisted that if this country should again become involved in war with any country of Europe, it would probably be a naval war, and the scene of action would be along the Atlantic seaboard. Our experience for the last 2 years has shown their prophecy was not far wrong, for the progress of our defense in the present war has probably been interfered with by enemy U-boats and submarines more on the Atlantic seaboard than any other section of the world.

It is considered by many that if it ever becomes necessary to defend the Monroe Doctrine our South Atlantic and Pacific Coast States will furnish the rendezvous for our military activities, the loading place for our Navy supplies and the storehouse for every implement of war, and that there should be no delay in providing transportation facilities to the scene of operations, because speed, distance, and direct transportation are extremely vital factors in any defense program. But regardless of where the attack may be the proposed superhighway will mean extraordinary service from every standpoint in meeting the enemy anywhere on the Western Hemisphere. It will facilitate the transportation and concentration of many essentials that will be indispensable should an attempt be made to attack the United States from any direction; it will afford easy access to those sections where our soldiers are trained in peacetime and assembled in wartime; it will afford better connection with munition plants, iron and steel plants, storage plants, aircraft plants, and other supply centers of war implements; it will furnish quick service in the delivery of coal, iron, and other materials to plants engaged in the manufacture of implements of war; it will furnish an outlet for transportation from every section of the country to the Atlantic and Pacific coasts and solve the highway problem of transportation to Canada and Alaska on one end, Mexico, Central America, and South America on the other. It will mean that all the steel mills, munition plants, airplane factories, packing plants, grain elevators, cheese factories, garment factories, and every other industrial and essential enterprise will all be nearer the base of concentration of our Army and Navy. In addition to facilitating transportation, it will make a tremendous contribution to the efficiency of our air forces by having runways or landing fields thereon at points at regular intervals to accommodate the landing and taking off of any type of airplane.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not see how the gentleman can neglect connecting the ports of Boston, New York, and Philadelphia with the industrial sections such as the New England States, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan. It strikes me that a good bit of our movement right now in this country is from those industrial sections to the ports I have mentioned.

Mr. HARE. I agree with the gentleman, but my thought has been that the delivery of material and equipment coming out of the plants may be made over our State highways or Federal-aid highways; but such highways would not be sufficient to carry the enormously heavy tanks and other machines of war. We therefore need a superhighway system traversing the entire country of such character that should it be necessary in

time of war the heaviest tonnage could go over it without injury to the highway. I submit and I fully feel there will be additional auxiliary roads running out from the main circular highway to the points suggested if the general idea is approved by Congress.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I hope the gentleman will make it clear that these highways he is suggesting here by these marks on the map are merely marks on the map; they are not proposed routes. Is that correct?

Mr. HARE. That is correct, further than to indicate sections to be traversed.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. For example, to illustrate what I am getting at, where the gentleman has marks in the western country, there are no highways there at all to speak of at the present time. The main arteries of trade on the main highways are not on the gentleman's map that you fix in these Western States at all.

Mr. HARE. Wherever there is already a trail or highway constructed, that could be enlarged and put in shape to meet military necessities and where there is no road fitting in with the surveys to be made a new one can be constructed.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The gentleman, I am sure, would not want the people who live along the marks there to get the idea that the gentleman is proposing now to construct a highway in that particular area?

Mr. HARE. That is correct, for if this proposal is approved the roadbed may be located 50 miles or more from that indicated on the chart, and it is not proposed to be a part of our present highway system.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. What the gentleman is talking about is a military road?

Mr. HARE. That is the primary purpose.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. And the roads will be located to fit into that idea. He has no intention of locating any roads any particular place?

Mr. HARE. You are again correct.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Especially so far as the western part of the country is concerned.

Mr. HARE. I submit that if anyone has a superhighway to locate which will meet the military necessities of this country to a greater and higher degree of efficiency than the one outlined, I will be glad to subscribe to the idea. The point I am making is that this country has reached a point in its history when military highways are absolutely essential and we should begin to construct them.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. One other question. Does the gentleman think that the military highway should be separate from our regular commercial highways?

Mr. HARE. Absolutely.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is the idea the gentleman has in mind?

Mr. HARE. Yes, decidedly.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. It is a fact, however, that during this war our highways that have been constructed for commercial purposes have served the military purposes to a very great extent and a very good piece of work has been done on these highways so far as the war effort is concerned.

Mr. HARE. I recognize that. They have rendered a wonderful service. What I am trying to emphasize is that if this country is ever invaded the highways that we have today would be of little value in serving our military forces, the Army, and equipment that would be essential for warfare. This proposal, in addition, will provide landing places for airplanes and bombers of different types at irregular intervals throughout its entire length.

Well-designed and constructed highways have always been considered an essential factor in war or a military campaign. History discloses that such highways have proven to be as effective in prosecuting and winning a war as other outstanding factors. The construction and maintenance of such roads date back to ancient and medieval days. They contributed much to the development and history of ancient Babylon, one time famous for its numerous military roads. One of the most celebrated highways of the world paralleled the southern boundary of the Assyrian Desert between Persia and Media as far as the Caspian Gates and then down the Parthian Mountains to Bactria. It is referred to by Greek historians as "the great military road" and is said to have been used by Alexander the Great in his expedition against the Bactrians.

Although stone-paved roads were constructed in Egypt, Cyrene, Crete, and other countries, the first system of paved highways for either commercial or military use was built by the Carthaginians when they developed a scientific formula and constructed a road system which was so complete and well arranged for military purposes the Carthaginians were able to defend themselves against all enemies for a period of more than 400 years. It was here the Romans learned both the art and the value of paved roads in time of war.

Probably one of the greatest engineering accomplishments in highway construction is found in the Inca road of Peru which extended from Quito in Ecuador to Tucuman in Chile, a distance of over 4,000 miles in length. It traversed some of the most mountainous areas in the world, scaling mountain ranges 14,000 to 15,000 feet in height, crossing canyons thousands of feet deep, and traversing vast and burning deserts. Like the highway system here proposed, there were a number of branch or auxiliary roads leading off from the main line, one of which paralleled the western coast of South America for a distance of over 2,000 miles. Historians tell us that this remarkable system of highways was used primarily by the ancient Peruvians for military purposes. We are told that throughout the system, sentry stations, watch towers, and forts were established. In addition there was a system of signal fires and lights located in such a manner they could be used in transmitting messages from one end of the system to the other in an incredibly short time. Army supplies were stored at irregular intervals along the main road. To illustrate the rapidity of commercial traffic over this road, even before the use of wheeled vehicles, it is said that fresh fish could be caught in the Pacific and delivered to the Incan capital of Cuzco within 30 hours, a distance of more than 300 miles and over mountains 15,000 feet high.

Napoleon I is credited with inaugurating the modern system of military highways in France and in countries conquered by him. Perhaps the most famous road to be constructed is what is known as the Simplon Pass over the Alps into Italy, constructed primarily to overcome the difficulties in leading his armies over the St. Bernard Pass in order to attack the Austrians 150 years ago. It is reported that over 30,000 men were employed at one time in the construction of this road, which necessitated upward of 600 bridges and ascended a height of more than 6,500 feet. It was one of the great engineering accomplishments of modern days and contributed immeasurably to the success of his invading armies. This was well recognized by his enemies for after his downfall, they attempted to destroy this highway lest it should prove a monument that would outlive the fame of his military victories.

Mr. Speaker, think of what would happen to this country if there should be an attempted invasion. Suppose we had not succeeded in securing the good will of the people south of us and an invasion had been started from that section of the country 2 years ago, with our present transportation system. It could have been tragic, and preparation for the future from the standpoint of transportation cannot be inaugurated too soon.

One of the first outstanding programs undertaken by Adolf Hitler in preparing for the Second World War was the inauguration of a program providing for the construction of highways designed to meet the needs of speed of 100 miles per hour or more over long distances. His original plan called for a little more than 4,000 miles of roadways suitable for fast military transportation purposes, but the program was later expanded to cover upward of 6,000 miles.

This brings out the thought advanced a few minutes ago by the chairman of the Committee on Roads that the roads constructed in Germany by Hitler had little or no reference to the then existing roads, although we are told they have other excellent highways in that country.

These roads are separate and distinct from the long-established road-building policy of the Imperial Government and were designed from the standpoint of location to be of strategic military value, the standard width for such roads being 80 feet, and constructed so as to carry the heaviest possible load at the highest possible speed.

THE ALASKAN HIGHWAY

The construction of a highway from the United States to Alaska was discussed for quite a number of years, but no definite proposal for a route was made until about 1928, when Donald MacDonald, associate engineer of the Alaska Road Commission, proposed a road from Hazelton to Fairbanks. Mr. MacDonald organized an international highway association and obtained official support for the project from Mr. Hoover, President of the United States, and Premier Tomlie, of British Columbia, in 1930. In 1938, the President, under authority provided for by an act of Congress, appointed five men to the Alaskan International Highway Commission, to cooperate with a similar commission appointed by the Dominion of Canada, to study, survey, and locate what is now known as the Alaskan Highway. With the bombing of Pearl Harbor and the invasion of the Aleutian Islands by the Japanese, the necessity for the United States to build a military road to Alaska became evident. On March 6, 1942, the Canadian Government announced its approval of the recommendation of the Permanent Joint Board of Defense—United States and Canada—that a highway be built, and accepted the offer of the United States to construct it. On the same date Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, addressed a request to the Federal Works Agency that the Public Roads Administration cooperate in the location and construction of the highway.

Largely by the use of aerial reconnaissance, a route was quickly determined to serve the dual purpose of a supply line to Alaska and a feeder road to a chain of airports established in 1941 through Canada and Alaska by the United States and Canadian Governments. Covering vast stretches of unmapped wilderness, the 1,671-mile international highway from Dawson Creek, British Columbia, to Fairbanks, Alaska, was opened within about 6 months, an engineering feat of first magnitude. Begun in March 1942, the road was ready by November for truck traffic over its entire length.

THE PAN-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

Writing in the Geographic Review in January 1943, Mr. William E. Rudolph said of the Pan-American Highway: "Most important of all strategic highways, from the long-time point of view, is that connecting the United States with Latin-American countries." This system of routes designed to connect all the countries of the Americas will be, when completed, a means of knitting together these countries, facilitating the interval exchange of commodities and otherwise developing national economy.

The first suggestion for a pan-American system of highways was made at the fifth international conference of American States which met in Santiago, Chile, in 1923. A resolution of this conference called for an official pan-American highway congress. This congress, comprised of engineers from 19 Latin-American nations, met in Washington in 1924. The Pan-American Highway was the inspiration of the group. A series of conferences, resolutions, official visits, and reconnaissances have followed.

Until 1942, that part of the Pan-American Highway located in Mexico and Central America, known as the Inter-American Highway, was being financed and built mainly by the countries through which is passes, but with technical and financial assistance from the United States. Each affected country had constructed some part of the road. Three-fifths, or nearly 2,000 miles, of the approximately 3,400 miles of road from Texas to the Panama Canal had been opened for all-weather travel in unconnected sections.

The completed highway will open up a large area of the North American continent capable of producing many commodities for which the United States has been dependent on the Far East—rubber, wool, hard rice, tea, cinnamon, camphor, quinine, copra, oils, varnish gums, abaca hemp, and others. Together with lateral roads that are developing from it, the highway will greatly stimulate the productive capacity of Central America and facilitate an exchange of production among the various Central American countries.

In the Panama Canal Zone the Inter-American Highway connects with the Trans-Isthmian route between the terminal cities of the Canal, Cristobal, and Balboa, and also between the two Panamanian cities of Colon and Panama. Working day and night, the United States Public Roads Administration completed, in 1942, two highways of great value to the defense of the Panama Canal, namely, the Trans-Isthmian Highway and the Chorrera-Rio Hato Highway, a section of the Inter-American Highway leading to important air defenses for the Canal.

THE BURMA ROAD

Following the outbreak of the war in eastern China in July 1937, the Chinese Government determined upon the construction of a military road to Burma. The difficulties, however, seemed insurmountable. Two routes were considered, both necessarily crossing a number of mountain ranges separated by some of the deepest canyons in the world. The longer route was chosen because it could make use of about 263 miles of provincial road already constructed. The new sections were built through rugged mountain country. Within one 40-mile stretch the route dips from 7,200 to 2,500 feet and rises again to 7,500 feet.

With a subsidy amounting to less than $2,000,000 from the Central Government of China, the Yunnan Provincial government took charge of the construction of the road. Most of the work was done by the people of the Province, each country being responsible for building its section of the road and furnishing its own quota of workers. The completion of the task was the more remarkable because of the lack of modern machinery. An American engineer studying the construction is said to have exclaimed, "My God, they scratched these roads out of the mountains with their fingernails."

The wisdom of a planned international highway system as a basic part of a war program has been exemplified by the Burma Road. However, observers who have compared this road with finished sections of the Pan-American Highway, such as those in Peru and other American republics, rate the Burma Road as really a back-country, grade D highway. Yet, in 1941, the Burma Road provided 20,000 tons of vital military and hospital supplies per month for the fighting Chinese armies.

When the Burma Road was first opened its capacity was limited to about 5,000 tons a month. Despite lack of machinery and equipment, lack of organization, technical difficulties, lack of fuel, inadequate surfacing, and an unremitting rain of Japanese bombs, this artery continued to function until Burma was conquered by the enemy. Over this road moved strategic materials, such as tin, antimony, tungsten, wolfram, lead, quicksilver, tung oil, mica, acids, and TNT. Other items reported to have been trucked over the road included heavy and bulky material, such as iron, steel, railway parts, shipbuilding parts, and copper.

Leaders of the United Nations have continually stressed the fact that the present world conflict is basically a war of transportation. Every medium of transportation is included in this battle line. These lines of communication are the very fiber of world strategy. And in the vast interplay of movement of men and machines on the global battle fronts, military highways, long and short, are playing a significant wartime role.

Our final victory over Japan may be made possible by the long survival of war-torn China at the end of heroic supply routes, such as the Burma Road and the reconstructed Silk Route.

On the other hand, a North American Newspaper Alliance war correspondent from the southwest Pacific has pointed out that largely because of the failure to construct adequate military highways, the Japanese have recently been compelled to yield territory which they conquered, saying that during the major part of the ground fighting at Guadalcanal the Japanese had great superiority in both manpower and firepower, but for lack of useful roads through the jungle they were never able to deploy and maneuver effectively and were unable to bring their superiority to bear upon the point of attack.

The Alaskan Highway and the Pan-American Highway will prove to be of inestimable military value to the United States should an invasion of any kind be attempted, but so long as the connecting link between the two roads is not constructed, they cannot reach maximum military importance, nor can they be of the greatest commercial value in peacetime. The proposed highway, or a road serving the same purpose, is indispensable, and our failure to construct it would be nothing less than an exhibition of bad faith in light of the interest we have manifested up to date in the construction of the two roads through our

neighboring countries to the north and south of us.

In conclusion, may I say that so far I have endeavored to outline justifications for the proposed highway from the standpoint of a military necessity. Should opportunity afford, I shall at a later date undertake to justify its construction from the standpoint of both national and international economy. A number of us would like to see the proposal approved and construction begun at the earliest possible date because this war is not over; it has been going on in Europe for 4 years and if the European segment of the war continues for 4 years longer my prediction is we will be greatly in need of this highway. In the meantime, we may be able to construct the entire road with prison labor and alien-enemy internees at a lesser cost than if delayed. Others feel that the proposal should be approved and surveys made in order that it may become a part of the post-war program. But regardless of whether the highway should be constructed immediately or whether it should become a part of the post-war program we want to emphasize the danger that may follow unnecessary delay in the consideration of the proposal.

It will be observed that the main highway and the suggested auxiliary roads will touch 32 of the 48 States and will, therefore, meet one of the military necessities of practically every State in the Union and afford better transportation facilities in time of peace to practically every locality in the United States.

The approval of this proposal as a part of any post-war program that may be evolved can well be justified from the standpoint of national economy. In the first place, it will furnish immediate employment to several hundred thousand people following the war during the transition period when industry is being changed from a program of production primarily for war purposes to a program for the production of civilian goods. It will obviate the necessity of returning to former relief programs that contributed little or nothing to our national economy. On the contrary, it will be a business-like program and make a constructive contribution to the Nation's wealth; it will help stimulate the spirit of personal business ambition and encourage private enterprise to provide additional post-war employment; it will in the meantime assist and encourage an additional post-war policy designed to encourage the establishment of new enterprises by persons who will be able to utilize and further develop the training and experience obtained in the war production program.

It has been suggested from time to time that at least three superhighways be constructed to extend across the entire country from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I subscribe to the necessity and value of such a system but I submit that the circular proposal would serve the domestic needs of the United States to a much greater extent and would have the added value of meeting our international requirements with the countries both north and south of the United States, and can be constructed with about one-half the mileage. In other words, the proposed circular highway, including the six auxiliary roads can all be constructed with 10 percent less mileage than that of any three coast-to-coast roads, and, in addition, include direct connection with the two international highways at the Canadian and Mexican borders. Further than that, the circular highway including a similar additional road running from one side of the circle near Chicago across the middle of the United States and connecting with the opposite side of the circle and the auxiliary road near Salt Lake City has only 80 percent of the mileage involved in the construction of any three coast-to-coast roads.

I would like for it to be understood that I am not opposing the proposed three-road system but am endeavoring to show that the proposed circular system will give the same or better service with less mileage with a corresponding reduction in the cost of construction.

This road will have the added value of connecting with Canada and Alaska at the north and the further value of connecting with Mexico, Central America, and the South American republics.

From the standpoint of economy, from the standpoint of meeting military demands, and from the standpoint of national economy, this circular proposal meets all of them.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Public Roads.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Has the gentleman in connection with his statement about the economy of roads taken into consideration that only about 15 percent of the travel in the country today is travel from coast to coast, either from the Pacific to the Atlantic or from Mexco to Canada, that at least 85 percent of the travel today is short travel within say 100 to 200 miles around the larger cities?

Mr. HARE. I am sure the gentleman from Utah is correct in his observation but what I have tried to emphasize is that the suggested superhighway is proposed primarily as a military necessity, brought about by the inadequacy of our present road system, despite its marvelous contribution to our national economy, to meet demands and requirements in case of an invasion. I cannot get away from the idea that the objective of the next great war, which we hope will be long-delayed, will be an attempted invasion of the United States or the continent of North America, and it is not too soon to begin preparations to meet the invader at the border.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman's present remarks emphasize something that has been going around in my mind since I have been looking at that map. Would it not be necessary to have some kind of superhighway down the Atlantic seaboard, because there are so many points of strategic importance from New York to Washington and Norfolk where a landing could be made and, under that set-up, there would be no way of getting to any of those points with a superhighway.

Mr. HARE. The point may be well taken, but I am not a military expert. I am not even an engineer, but the difficulty in placing the road along the coast would be the danger of its destruction by bombs coming from ships miles off shore, which would seriously interfere with our military program on land. My idea is that a circular highway as here proposed would be better and from that circular highway build the auxiliary roads out to the coast or the points of strategic importance suggested by the gentleman from Texas. I have no doubt that if this proposal is accepted additional auxiliary roads will be constructed running to New York, Philadelphia, Norfolk, Wilmington, Savannah, and other points on the Atlantic, the Gulf, and Pacific coasts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRANGER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

ARMY SERVICE FORCES

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, the most significant statement that came out of the Teheran Conference was made one evening last week by Premier Stalin.

It was a simple statement, calm, plain, and as direct as the man who made it. It contained neither boast nor threat. It pointed not to the future but to an accomplished fact.

The marshal of the Red Army lifted his glass at dinner and drank a toast of gratitude to American supply. Without it, he asserted, "the United Nations never could have won the war."

In the midst of his great victory, Stalin was willing to share the credit with the millions of working Americans who made that victory possible. And he shared credit, at the same time, with that division of the American Army which many of us sometimes forget in our enthusiasm for front-line troops—the Army Service Forces.

Without the brilliant planning, the skillful execution, the stupendous labor, the great daring of Army Service Forces, victory on the Russian front still would be a long way off. Not only the Russian front, but every front—American, British, Chinese, and French—is utterly dependent on this vast, world-circling organization.

This is a war of battle lines, assembly lines, and supply lines, and the supply lines are the longest in history. Wherever our soldiers and the soldiers of our allies fight, the Army Service Forces supply them with all the ingredients of victory. Theirs is an humble role. Theirs is the labor and the drudgery. Theirs is the task of getting the right number of the right men with the right amount of the right equipment to the right places at the right time. The field commander who makes an error of judgment and feels the battle turning against him may

attack again and attain his victory. If the Army Service Forces make an error of judgment that results in too little or too late, defeat is inevitable.

So, I say, let us give to these soldiers of supply and to their great, hard-working commander, the credit that is their due. Without detracting in the slightest from the splendid achievements of our air forces and ground forces, let us see to it that the service forces receive their share of homage, too.

It is fitting that Premier Stalin should have chosen the old city of Teheran as the scene of his terse but all-important tribute to American supply.

For that ancient town for more than a year has been one of the most important bases in the world, a base established and operated by Army Service Forces. There, on the road to Russia, American skill, American determination, American industrial know-how and military genius have joined in formulating at least part of the pattern of victory.

When the history of this war is written the importance of that base, halfway around the world, will assume its proper proportion. Teheran and the road and the railroad that pass through it have literally been the life line of the Red Army. And the job of pumping blood through that life line was the job of Army Service Forces. Premier Stalin attests the fact that it was a job well done.

A year ago when the Russians were falling back and the Nazi Army was swarming across the steppes on its way to Moscow, a vast portion of the Russian war industry was overrun and destroyed. Then it was that the American Army Service Forces quickly stepped in, as they have stepped in so many other theaters of war, and turned a rout to victory.

Packs of submarines prevented our sending munitions by the northern route to Russia's Arctic ports. The Black Sea ports were closed. Remaining open was one rocky, narrow road, 700 miles long, from Russia's southern border to the steaming ports at the upper end of the Persian Gulf. There were a few docks, a few cranes, a few warehouses down there on the gulf. A rusty railroad wound its uncertain way over mountains and deserts into the tropic heat of the gulf ports.

If Russia were to remain in the war, Russia must have help. And this breathless, blistering far corner of the world was the only gate through which we could offer our aid.

The Army Service Forces saw another need for taking the long chance and took it. There was no time for detailed plans or for thoughtful preparation. Maybe it would be impossible to open the line. Maybe the quantity of material that could be shipped over this long route was too small to save the situation. Maybe the difficulties were insurmountable. Maybe the plan would be expensive.

Call the decision reckless if you will. The situation was so desperate that only a reckless decision was possible. There was no time to figure out in advance the thousand intangibles that could lead to failure or success. There was no time for anything except action; quick, decisive, all-out action. General Somervell and the Army Service Forces took that action. They did not delay a single second. They did not count the cost of success; they saw only the fearful cost of failure that they must avoid.

Our supply lines to the far southwest Pacific, to India and China, to England, and the Mediterranean already stretched our shipping to the breaking point. But here was a challenge to our ingenuity that surpassed all the others.

Our ships, sailing from American ports, must cross both North and South Atlantic Oceans. They must circle the tip of Africa and steam up the East Coast of that continent through the Indian Ocean, infested with Japanese raiders. They must enter the narrow waters of the Persian Gulf, traverse its length to the moldering ports on the marshy coasts of Iraq and Iran, then push overland 900 long, hot miles to the Russian frontier.

The total distance is 17,000 miles. Scoffers said it could not be done. But the Army Service Forces have been beset by the voices of scoffers and the taunts of second-guessers ever since they were organized. General Somervell and his staff have never had a single minute to spare on the luxury of deliberation. They have just had a job to do, and they have done it, and they have done it well.

They did this job on the road to Russia and they did it magnificently. In cooperation with the Navy they pushed their ships up the steaming waters of the Persian Gulf to the few rotting piers in the ancient ports of Basora, Bandar, Shapur, Abadan, and Kharramshahr—names out of antiquity rather than out of any modern shippers' guide.

They tied up at the piers and began to unload. While truck companies rushed supplies north, companies of engineers began to rebuild the docks. Other engineers went to work on the road. Still others on the railroad. Heavier rails, heavier bridges, freight yards, locomotive shops sprang up. The Signal Corps of Army Service Forces began to put in a telegraph and telephone system. The Medical Corps of Army Service Forces built hospitals and began the endless fight on malaria and other tropical diseases.

Big cranes took the place of small cranes on the docks. They soon were swinging new locomotives down to the new tracks. A car shop was built almost overnight, and hundreds of freight cars a week took to the rails, laden with the implements of war.

Great truck assembly plants sprang up on the desert and in the Tropic marshes along the gulf, and soon the trucks were rolling off the assembly lines. They, too, were loaded with munitions and guns and food and medical supplies. The great northern movement had begun.

Where three or four ships had berthing space a year ago, whole fleets sail in today. Where it took weeks to unload a single ship, now half a dozen ships are unloaded in a matter of hours.

It has been said that the operation is expensive.

Of course it is. Measured in dollars, each shell exploded on the Russian front is an extravagance. Measured in terms of ultimate victory, in terms of American lives saved, in terms of days and weeks and months saved, the operation is dirt cheap. It is as fine an investment as we have made anywhere in this whole war.

The important point is that we are getting results. We are getting such results that Premier Stalin's one comment at the Teheran Conference was in praise of those results. Until today no one has attempted to list the amount of the supplies we have sent in or their variety.

But I can give an over-all figure.

Since General Somervell opened the Persian Gulf ports, he has sent into Russia a million and a quarter tons of munitions. I repeat, a million and a quarter tons.

You can translate that into more dramatic statistics. You can translate it into the heroic defense of Stalingrad and the turn of the tide against the Nazis. Stalingrad was a triumph not of Russian soldiers alone but of Russian soldiers and American guns and shells. The tanks that routed the Nazis out of the Caucasus were American tanks. Many of the planes that blasted the Nazis from the bend of the Dneiper were American planes, assembled on the Persian desert, and the bombs they carried were American bombs, transported the long, hard way, half around the world.

Yes; Stalin knows. He knows that his soldiers, no matter how brave, would have been helpless without the aid of American industry and the aid of the Army Service Forces on the earth-circling road to global war.

Not only in Russia but everywhere the men of the free nations are fighting, the Army Service Forces sustain them in their fight. In the hills of Burma it is the bulldozers of the Army engineers, who are part of A. S. F., that lead the way in building the link between China and our forces in India. In Alaska and in the southwest Pacific, in Africa, and in Italy and in England, the men of the Army Service Forces are keeping open the roads to victory and hauling the tools of victory.

Whenever a plane takes off to blast our enemies, the gasoline that powers it has been secured and shipped and stored and preserved and guarded by Army Service Forces. Each bomb that falls is an Army Service Forces bomb. Each shell that bursts on a hostile strong point is an Army Service Forces shell. Each gun that fires, each tank that rumbles forward, each sack of cement poured into one of our own pill boxes comes from Army Service Forces.

The duties and responsibilities of the Army Service Forces are so extensive and so varied it is hard to catalog them. The A. S. F. not only designs our implements of war, procures them from private industry or manufactures them itself, but it transports them and maintains them and has them ready at a moment's notice to go into the fighting lines. Once there, the A. S. F. repairs

them under fire, and in the end hauls them away for salvage.

It, too, is charged with the responsibility of feeding and clothing our individual soldiers, building their camps and posts, their airfields, hospitals, theaters, their sewers and roads and bridges and water supplies. They nurse the wounded and the sick—for the Medical Department is part of this vast organization—entertain soldiers when off duty with radio and motion pictures, maintain their morale, look after their spiritual needs through the Corps of Chaplains.

The Finance Department of Army Service Forces not only pays the soldiers but pays all the Army's other debts. The A. S. F. handles military traffic and maintains order through the new Corps of Military Police; it administer military justice. It handles all Army communications as part of the Signal Corps; is responsible for protection against poison gas; it lays smokescreens; it operates military railroads; it transports men and materials; it keeps all Army records; it carries the soldiers' mail overseas; it is responsible for collecting, classifying, and holding prisoners of war; it trains the men who establish civil government in occupied territory; it buries the Army's dead.

How gigantic the A. S. F. task has become can best be illustrated by comparing this war with World War No. 1.

In 1918 we raised an army of 4,000,000 men.

We now approach a total of 7,500,000.

In the first war we sent 2,085,000 men overseas.

Today the number of soldiers overseas is half a million higher.

In 1918 we maintained a short shuttle service across the Atlantic to the western ports of Europe. Our troops fought in 13 campaigns, 1 in Italy and the others on the short western front in France.

Today our supply lines circle the globe. To date our troops have fought in the Central Pacific, the Philippines, the East Indies, Papua, New Guinea, Guadalcanal, the northern Solomons, Burma, the India-Burma frontier, China, the Aleutians, Egypt, Libya, Algeria, French Morocco, Tunisia, Sicily, Italy, and in the air offensive from England. They have been stationed besides in Alaska, Greenland, Iceland, in Arabia, the west coast of Africa, in South America, Australia, the Caribbean. Each campaign and each distant station requires its own supply line.

During the First World War we manufactured 132,000 machine guns of all types. In 2 months recently we produced 282,000.

In the other war we produced a grand total of 80 tanks. In 2 months this year we produced 5,000.

This month we built more planes than we did in the whole span of the first war.

We are turning out 80,000 Garand rifles a month, 419,000 aerial bombs.

No wonder Premier Stalin drank a toast to American production and to the men in industry and labor—and in the Army Service Forces—who have made it possible.

Not only all America, but all free, fighting men everywhere owe a debt of gratitude to Lieutenant General Somervell and the officers and men who have made possible the triumph of American supply.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word in personal appreciation of the very excellent statement the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] has just delivered to the House. It is a thrilling story of the achievement of the Army Service Forces. I particularly appreciate his reference to the brilliant achievement of Lieutenant General Somervell. I am sure he will understand the pride that the people of my district and State exhibit in General Somervell's brilliant leadership. He is a native of Arkansas, and I listened with great interest to the thrilling story which the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] presented to the House today. I wish to thank him for it.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. POWERS. I deeply appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Arkansas. I cannot believe that the gentleman or anyone in his district is more proud of the achievements of Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell than the country as a whole. I wonder if the country at large realizes just what this man has done, the stupendous job he has done. I wonder if we realize that in tonnage and dollars and cents he has handled more than any other 10 large corporations in the United States combined in any 1 year. He has done a magnificent job. We are all proud of him.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman very much. I am sure the country, as they read the words of the gentleman from New Jersey, will be thrilled by his inspired statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of aviation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

POWER OF CONGRESS TO APPROPRIATE PUBLIC MONEY AND RESTRICT THE USES THEREOF

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, Congress must not recess until its power over the purse strings of the people is protected. That power is seriously challenged right now, this week, in the Court of Claims, by Lovett, Dodd, and Watson, for whose salaries Congress denied appropriations. That challenge should be met and defended with vigor, courage, and great ability by counsel whose appointment Congress must immediately authorize, before it recesses, because its counsel must be prepared before January 12, when the time expires for the filing of proper pleadings. Congress must not recess until that is done.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to talk today on the power of Congress to appropriate public money and to restrict the uses thereof.

I arise again today in defense of the Constitution of the United States and the age-old power therein conferred on the Congress—the elected representatives of the people—to appropriate public money and to restrict its uses.

This power to appropriate public money and to provide for its uses is contained in article I, section 9, of the Constitution in the following words:

> No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law.

And that power is nowhere limited in the Constitution except in section 8 where it is provided that—

> No appropriation of money to that use (for the support of the Army) shall be for a longer term than 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court of the United States has for the first time recently stated in *Butler* v. *United States* (297 U. S., at pp. 65 and 66), with respect to this power of the Congress to appropriate money, that—

> Since the foundation of the Nation sharp differences of opinion have persisted as to the true interpretation of the phrase. Madison asserted it amounted to no more than

a reference to the other powers enumerated in the subsequent clauses of the same section; that, as the United States is a Government of limited and enumerated powers, the grant of power to tax and spend for the general national welfare must be confined to the enumerated legislative fields committed to the Congress. In this view the phrase is mere tautology, for taxation and appropriation are or may be necessary incidents of the exercise of any of the enumerated legislative powers. Hamilton, on the other hand, maintained the clause confers a power separate and distinct from those later enumerated, is not restricted in meaning by the grant of them, and Congress consequently has a substantive power to tax and to appropriate, limited only by the requirement that it shall be exercised to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Each contention has had the support of those whose views are entitled to weight. This court has noticed the question, but has never found it necessary to decide which is the true construction. Mr. Justice Story, in his Commentaries, espouses the Hamiltonian position. We shall not review the writings of public men and commentators or discuss the legislative practice. Study of all these leads us to conclude that the reading advocated by Mr. Justice Story is the correct one. While, therefore, the power to tax is not unlimited, its confines are set in the clause which confers it, and not in those of par. 8 which bestow and define the legislative powers of the Congress. It results that the power of Congress to authorize expenditure of public moneys for public purposes is not limited by the direct grants of legislative power found in the Constitution.

This great power to appropriate public money, for the first time authoritatively decided in the case just quoted to be unlimited in the Congress was no accident. Almost identical provisions are found in nearly all of the 13 State constitutions which antedated the Constitution of the United States and which were adopted at the suggestion of the Congress of the Confederation following the adoption of the Declaration of Independence. Back of this great power is not only the experience of the English people with their arbitrary kings but the experience of the people of each of the Thirteen Colonies, at one time or another, with arbitrary and despotic governors sent to rule over them by either the English kings or by lord proprietors.

As the great student of our constitutional history, John Randolph Tucker of Virginia, stated in the extract from his address on the floor of this House, which I quoted in my remarks on December 7, 1943, this power over the purse has been proven necessary in the history of Anglo-American governments for the control of rulers and bureaucrats. The late ex-President of the United States, William Howard Taft, who later became Chief Justice of the United States and the only man in our entire history to have held successively the two highest offices in our executive and judicial branches of Government, had this to say in his book, Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers:

> The power over the purse is, however, practically the greatest power, and that Congress exercises without control by either of the other branches. * * * The legislative power to withhold appropriations is that which in the history of constitutional government has always been the most powerful agency in defense of the people's rights.

MESSRS. LOVETT, DODD, JR., AND WATSON

Mr. Speaker, it is exactly that legislative power "to withhold appropriations" that has been questioned by Attorney General Biddle and by Messrs. Dodd, Lovett, and Watson. The appropriation bill which became law on July 12, 1943, did not attempt to remove Dodd, Lovett, and Watson, or any of them, from the public pay roll. The Congress withheld the use of that appropriation, or any other appropriation to make any payments to any of these three men after November 15 unless in the meantime they had been nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

There has been much misrepresentation as to what Congress did do in the matter. I want to make it very clear that no action was taken by Congress to remove any of these men from the executive service. Congress, I believe, fully appreciates that it could remove these men only by impeachment. But Congress does not have to resort to impeachment proceedings. It resorted to the constitutional grant of power, older in its source than the Constitution itself, and exercised the right contained in that grant of unlimited control over appropriations to withhold all appropriations for use in paying these three men or any of them unless certain conditions were met within the reasonable period between July 12 and November 15.

The Congress created each and every one of these executive agencies of Government. The Congress prescribed their duties and powers. In the exercise of its power to legislate, as granted in article 1 of the Constitution, these powers may be as wide or as narrow as may suit the convenience or even the whim of the Congress. It may prescribe conditions of public employment in these agencies and it did prescribe the conditions under which these three men could be employed after November 15—namely, nomination by the President and confirmation by the Senate. Those conditions have not been met. Under the constitutional right of the Congress, it had, in effect, notified all concerned in the terms of a public statute that all appropriations made to pay these men were limited to November 15, and that none would thereafter be made to pay them unless such conditions were met of nomination by the President and confirmation by the Senate.

It is this power which has been challenged by Dodd, Lovett, and Watson, with the encouragement and support of certain persons in the executive branch of the Government. There was encouragement in the agencies themselves. The men in charge of these agencies employing Dodd and Watson and the one employing Lovett knew on November 15, 1943, that they had not been nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate and that there was no appropriation authority to pay them. Yet these men were permitted to keep on working, building up a claim against the United States and this in the very teeth of a statute enacted by the Congress many years ago which prohibits any agency of the Government from accepting voluntary services. This prohibition is contained in section 3679, Revised Statutes, as amended by section 3 of the act of February 27, 1906 (34 Stat. 49), now title 31, section 665, United States Code, as follows:

> Nor shall any department or any other officer of the Government accept voluntary service for the Government or employ personal service in excess of that authorized by law, except in cases of sudden emergency involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property.

Mr. Speaker, the punishment for violation of this statute is fixed therein and I quote:

> Any person violating any provision of this section shall be summarily removed from office and may also be punished by a fine of not less than $100 or by imprisonment for not less than 1 month.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, before this issue is settled, the attorney whom I hope we shall employ to defend the rights and powers of the Congress, may be directed by us to proceed against those responsible for the violation of the terms of the law prohibiting the acceptance of voluntary services on behalf of the United States. Such proceedings may take the form of both a writ of quo warranto to try in the courts their rights to remain in office as well as criminal proceedings.

But the violation of this statute is not all, Mr. Speaker. Section 3662, Revised Statutes—now title 31, section 591, United States Code—provides that:

> All estimates for the compensation of officers authorized by law to be employed shall be founded upon the express provision of law and not upon the authority of executive distribution.

Also, section 5 of the act of August 15, 1876—19 Statutes at Large 169—now title 5, section 45, United States Code, provides:

> That the executive officers of the Government are hereby prohibited from employing any clerk, agent, engineer, draftsman, messenger, watchman, laborer, or other employee, in any of the executive departments in the city of Washington, or elsewhere, beyond the provisions made by law.

Estimates were submitted by the agencies of Government employing Dodd, Lovett, and Watson sufficient to pay their salaries, but the Congress did not see fit under its constitutional power to appropriate any money to pay these men any salaries whatever after November 15, 1943. In order to secure any salaries after that date they must be nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. No office or employment had been theretofore fixed or created by statute for any of these three men—and none could be in this Congress, it is safe to say. The only authority to employ them in the first instance was an appropriation sufficiently large to provide for the payment of their respective salaries. Such appropriation authority expires by operation of law and probably by the appropriation having been used or rendered unavailable after the expiration of the fiscal year for which made. In the appropriation act approved July 12, based on estimates contained in the Budget as presumably prepared in accordance with

law, the appropriation authority for paying these men in their present status ceased on and after November 15. They had to acquire a different status, that of having been nominated and confirmed, before any more appropriated money could be used to pay them any salary for any purpose whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, all these laws and more are involved in the suits filed on December 3, 1943, by each of the three men in the United States Court of Claims, seeking to defy the constitutional and legislative authority of the Congress. Attorney General Biddle having expressed his opinion in favor of the claimed lack of constitutional authority of the Congress to withhold appropriations to pay Messrs. Dodd, Lovett, and Watson, has now suggested that Congress might provide its own counsel "to file a brief and to argue on behalf of the position of the Congress" in the Court of Claims. A copy of part of Mr. Biddle's letter to the Speaker and to the Vice President appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 8, page 10401, as follows:

> I shall be glad to suggest to the court that anyone you may select be given the right to file a brief and to argue on behalf of the position of the Congress. I shall also be glad to confer with whomever you name for the purpose of working out the best procedures finally to dispose of these cases. * * * I regret that in these cases I find it impossible to advocate with conviction the views of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, unless we push through legislation this week for special counsel to represent Congress, we should remain in session during the Christmas week if necessary. It is already being proposed that Congress recess the latter part of this week until January 10 or 12. It is of the utmost importance that before January 12, 1944, when the time expires for the filing of the proper defense pleadings in the Court of Claims on behalf of the power of the Congress that we be represented in such suits by an attorney of our own choice and by a man who knows the appropriation authority of the Congress, its history and purposes, backward and forward. This issue must not be lost through the failure of the elected representatives of the people to be properly defended.

The public press recently reported, by what authority I know not, that the Attorney General had stated that a demurrer would be filed so as to raise the constitutional questions as to the constitutional power of the Congress in the premises. I now and here, and most emphatically, object to the filing of any such demurrer and litigating the issue thereon. Lawyers know that a demurrer admits for the purposes of the case the facts well pleaded in the petition. I for one do not want these cases defended in any such manner.

The Congress had each of these cases under investigation for literally months. Hearings were given these men. On the basis of such investigations and hearings, Congress concluded that these men held political views harmful to the basic purposes of our constitutional form of government; that they belonged to, or had belonged to, organizations openly bent upon destroying our form of government and our system of free enterprise; and that we did not want these men on the public pay roll, boring from within and spreading their slimy doctrines among their fellow employees of the Government.

Each of these men made the record for himself. We are in possession of that record, or at least a part of it. I for one want the Supreme Court of the United States, as well as the Court of Claims, to have the complete record before them when the case reaches them for consideration and determination. I want the courts to know why Congress exercised its constitutional authority to refuse to appropriate public money to pay these men after November 15, 1943. We want no "You first, Alphonso" stuff in this defense. I want an able, unafraid, vigorous defense of the constitutional power of the Congress over the withholding of appropriations and over its power to prescribe the qualifications of officers and employees of the United States.

January 12 will come almost immediately after we return following the holidays. Our counsel must necessarily have some time, with such assistance as we and employees of the various committees can give him, to prepare himself on the facts in these cases. He will probably want to file a general denial, a "traverse," I believe it is called in the Court of Claims, and force each of these cases to a hearing on the facts for the record in the courts. We should act now so that such counsel can be selected before we leave for the holidays. The time will be too short for action by Congress before January 12 after we return and our counsel will not have time in that event to do any preparatory work on the cases before filing the appropriate defense pleadings.

Mr. Speaker, Messrs. Lovett, Dodd, and Watson are represented by the Washington law firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb in the United States Court of Claims, a court held by the Supreme Court of the United States to be a "legislative court."

The Acheson of this law firm filing the suit for these three men contesting the power of Congress to provide in an appropriation act that public moneys could not be used to pay them any salaries on and after November 15, 1943, unless they were nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, is Assistant Secretary of State Acheson and the former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Acheson. He is also the Acheson who was appointed by Attorney General Biddle as chairman of his committee on administrative law. This committee brought in a draft of a bill approved by Acheson which would confirm and approve the Frankfurter theory of government that the bureaucratic agencies of Government should not be reviewed by the courts in any effective manner, thereby confirming the present state of chaos and anarchy in administrative agencies permitting, I repeat, no effective review of government by bureaucratic decree and regulation. This bill is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary of the House.

Also, this Acheson is a brother of Professor Acheson, of George Washington University, who was a student of Harold Laski at the London School of Economics for several years. Laski was the socialistic secretary of Prime Minister MacDonald, of England; a well-known socialist of England; and a friend and collaborator of Frankfurter. Acheson of this law firm is known to be a friend and admirer of Harold Laski.

Attorney General Biddle has expressed the opinion that Congress had no such constitutional authority as was exercised in the above-referred-to appropriation act denying the use of public money on and after November 15, 1943, to pay the salaries of these three men unless they were nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Normally, under the applicable statutes, it is the duty of the Attorney General's office to defend suits against the United States in the Court of Claims and in the Supreme Court of the United States. Normally, under the appropriate statutes, it was the duty of the Attorney General to prosecute suits for frauds against the United States. However, in the cases of the Teapot Dome scandal, Congress did not have sufficient confidence in the then Attorney General Harry Daugherty and his staff to permit him to prosecute the Pan Petroleum and Sinclair Oil Co. cases, and Secretary of the Interior Fall and Doheny, who were involved in the Teapot Dome scandals. Congress enacted a special statute to provide that former Senator Pomerene, of Ohio, and now Mr. Justice Roberts should prosecute both the civil and criminal cases arising out of that scandal, and they did so. Mr. Speaker, Congress should take like action because the present Attorney General Biddle is not competent in this case and does not even wish to defend Congress in the exercise of its constitutional rights.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] be permitted to address the House for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances of this case, where the constitutional authority of the Congress over public money is involved, the Congress should, before January 12, enact a similar statute to provide that special counsel should defend these suits in the Court of Claims and in the Supreme Court, if necessary, to protect that constitutional power. The power over the public purse is the greatest power which a free people may have for the protection of their liberties. During the long ages of Anglo-American government it has been the power of the elected representatives of the people of England and of the United States over the purse-strings of their Government which has

held in check the officials of such governments.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. WRIGHT. I agree with the gentleman that Congress should employ private counsel, and I intend to vote for a resolution such as that if it comes up. I also agree with the gentleman's proposition as to the liberal construction of the power of the purse. I do not agree with the limited theory which some other people, notably the Attorney General, apparently seem to entertain. But the Attorney General has the right; he even has the duty, if he honestly disagrees with that interpretation which the gentleman puts upon the power of the purse, to so state and to decline to take a legal position in which he does not believe. I do not agree, therefore, that any punitive action is in order against any officials who are expressing honest doubt as to a constitutional question. Constitutional writers agree that if a President or any executive officer believes an act of Congress is unconstitutional it is his duty to disobey that act and obtain a determination by the courts of the constitutionality of the law. That has occurred several times in our history, notably in the case of Jefferson's refusal to obey a subpena in the Burr case, and also in Johnson's refusal to obey the Tenure of Office Act. Although I find it perfectly consistent to believe in the good faith of the Attorney General and also the various department heads, I agree with the gentleman as to the interpretation of the law.

Mr. CHURCH. I appreciate the gentleman's statement that he will insist on appointing special counsel for Congress in this important matter. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think we should. In this case is involved not only the particular case of these three men, but the broad prerogatives of Congress, and not only the prerogative of this Congress but of succeeding Congresses, and it is the duty of Congress, both the present Congress and the Congress of the future to defend its own power and prerogative against any other department of the Government.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I want to say I find myself in rather complete agreement with the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the Attorney General is quite within his rights to follow the compunctions of his conscience wherever they happen to lead in the dictates of his judgment. Knowing the Attorney General's position makes it all the more reasonable why Congress should follow the suggestion you have just recommended and arrange for our own counsel. I certainly agree that this is really an historical case because it is going to determine whether or not the Congress, which has the right to appropriate money, also has the right to withhold money. And unless we have the right to withhold appropriations, the power to make them is of small consequence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] may address the House for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman has spoken about this matter. Have you introduced any bill or resolution to employ counsel?

Mr. CHURCH. I have devoted much time to the preparation of a bill, but it is my thought that such a bill should be brought in through our colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR, chairman of the subcommittee, or the chairman of either the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HOFFMAN. When are we going to get it so that we can vote on it?

Mr. CHURCH. I hope the bill will come in tomorrow or the next day. I understand the Committee on Appropriations is meeting again tomorrow to consider, perhaps, recommendations from its subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therewith an article entitled, "Six Ways to Make Peace," written by Edgar Ansel Mowrer and appearing in the New York Post today, December 14, 1943.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, for some reason some mothers of soldiers and some soldiers are concerned that they may not get to vote. I hope that immediately we may pass the bill or a bill that every soldier in the armed forces everywhere may vote. I do not care whose name is on the bill. I do not care which political party has the bill. I hope that we will not get to the point where we will wonder what will happen to this community or that community as to the method. The big thing is that every soldier may know now and that his parents and friends may know that each and every soldier may vote. They should know it and know it now. Let us not be disturbed as to who may influence his vote. His vote is his sacred right and the soldier may be depended upon to do straight voting. He shoots straight. As to how he votes is his own business. But he must be allowed to vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Chicago Daily News and another from the Daily Calumet of Chicago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the House on Thursday of this week for 30 minutes, following the disposition of all business and any other special orders that may have been entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

KENTUCKY ELECTION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to renew a request which has been made to me many times, that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION], who had so much to do with the recent election in Kentucky, some time in the immediate future tell the House some of the facts in connection with that election; that he give us some idea of the arguments that were used, both from the public platform and in the newspapers, against the Republican candidate; that he tell us something of some of the stories that were circulated down there. In short and in brief, that he give us an account from the home front of just what happened in Kentucky, because there has been an attempt to make us believe that the election was not a repudiation of the New Deal.

This request comes not from two or three on the minority side, but from many Members on that side, and I am sure it would be very instructive to many Members on the majority side.

I hope the gentleman will favor us soon with an account of that election.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 15, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3843. A bill to incorporate the American Gold Star Mothers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution to assist in making additional manpower available during the war emergency and for 6 months thereafter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 380. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the second intermediate report (H. Rept. No. 862) of the Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, for the use of the committee; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 3844. A bill for the relief of Henry O. Heuer; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 3845. A bill granting a pension to Lula Alice Parr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4069. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County, Calif., opposing the passage of House bill 3018 and Senate bill 1257, permitting the Secretary of the Interior to purchase privately owned land in unlimited quantities under the guise of increasing food production; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

4070. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Carl Lippman and 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4071. Also, petition of Edw. L. Korkain and 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4072. Also, petition of E. N. Peter and 30 other St. Louis citizens protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4073. Also, petition of the American Legion Post, No. 299, and signed by 30 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4074. Also, petition of the Mayfair Hotel and signed by 30 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4075. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of employees of the Southwestern Portland Cement Co. of El Paso, Tex., urging "freezing" of pay-roll deductions under the Social Security Act at present levels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, author of liberty, we thank Thee this day for the wise and brave men who brought to the cradle of our infant Nation their gifts of unselfish devotion. We give Thee thanks for the clear vision of our forefathers who, when their own crimson sacrifice had broken the hateful chains of tyranny, refused to accept the coercive reins of even a benevolent government, setting the rights of the people above the rights of governors who are but the servants of freemen. We hail with joy the safeguards they erected, guaranteeing that in the sanctity of his person and the royalty of his convictions "man is man, and who is more." As we boast of these deeply grounded rights, which are the bulwark of our freedom, may we not lean upon them for selfish safety but constantly strengthen them by the same self-giving to the Nation's weal which marks for our immortal gratitude those who in dark and doubtful days pledged their lives, fortunes, and sacred honor to maintain the rights which are our heritage.

As soldiers of the common good deliver us from any thought or action which is treason against the freedom wrought for us by the founding fathers. Give truth to our words, sincerity to our hearts, and courage to our deeds in these times which are testing as by fire the treasure bequeathed to us. So may we in our day make patriotism beautiful with loyalty and dedication. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, December 13, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he also announced that on December 3, 1943, the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

S. 630. An act to amend section 107 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee;

S. 759. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of W. I. Dooly;

S. 770. An act for the relief of Eddie Percle;

S. 862. An act for the relief of the Grafton Boat Works;

S. 950. An act for the relief of the Milford Trust Co. and Blanche R. Bennett, as administrators of the estate of Charles E. Reed, deceased;

S. 1008. An act for the relief of Gerald G. Woods;

S. 1246. An act for the relief of Ervin S. Finley;

S. 1309. An act for the relief of Pan American Airways, Inc.;

S. 1382. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; and

S. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Ferguson	Murdock
Austin	George	Murray
Bailey	Gerry	Nye
Ball	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Green	Overton
Barkley	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bone	Gurney	Reed
Brewster	Hatch	Revercomb
Bridges	Hayden	Robertson
Brooks	Hill	Smith
Burton	Holman	Taft
Bushfield	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Capper	La Follette	Truman
Caraway	Langer	Tunnell
Chandler	Lodge	Tydings
Chavez	Lucas	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Wallgren
Connally	McFarland	Walsh, Mass.
Danaher	McKellar	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Maybank	Wheeler
Downey	Mead	Wherry
Eastland	Millikin	White
Ellender	Moore	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business, holding hearings in Mississippi.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is detained on public business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Sen-

ator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of public matters.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1576) to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. POWERS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3611) to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States, to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SUMNERS of Texas, Mr. HOBBS, and Mr. HANCOCK were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2887. An act to fix the price of crude petroleum and its derivatives and fixing a parity formula; and

H. R. 3760. An act authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Lt. Gen. Thomas Holcomb, United States Marine Corps.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1544. An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels, landing craft, and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 255. An act for the relief of Col. E. H. Tarbutton;

H. R. 302. An act for the relief of Robert Griffin;

H. R. 977. An act for the relief of Clare A. Miller;

H. R. 1379. An act for the relief of Gerald Estell Proctor;

H. R. 1640. An act for the relief of Mrs. J. D. Price;

H. R. 1933. An act for the relief of Ronald A. Cox;

H. R. 2080. An act to provide temporary additional pay for equipment maintenance for each carrier in Rural Mail Delivery Service;

H. R. 2545. An act for the relief of Samuel J. D. Marshall;

H. R. 2641. An act to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain lands for addition to the Sequoia National Park;

H. R. 3039. An act for the relief of Mrs. C. W. Selby;

H. R. 3299. An act for the relief of Victor H. Loftus, disbursing clerk, American Embassy, Mexico, D. F., Mexico; and

H. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution to provide for the proper observance of the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of the adoption of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights.

EXPRESSION BY DOMINICAN REPUBLIC ON ANNIVERSARY OF PEARL HARBOR OF SOLIDARITY WITH THE UNITED STATES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following radiogram from the presidents of the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies of the Dominican Republic, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD:

[Translation]

HON. HENRY A. WALLACE,
Vice President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.:

The Senate and Chamber of Deputies of the Dominican Republic in joint session today unanimously approved a resolution sponsored by the Honorable President Trujillo on the first anniversary of the treacherous Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. It has just commemorated the day by reaffirming the solidarity of the Dominican Republic with the United States of North America and by affirming the faith of the Dominican people in the final victory of the United Nations. With this high motive, we have the honor to greet you and through you the honorable representatives of that great Nation which maintains with such glory and honor the highest ideals of liberty and justice for all the peoples of the earth.

M. DEJ. TRONCOSO DE LA CONCHA,
President of the Senate.
PORFIRIO HERRERA,
President of the Chamber of Deputies.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LAWS OF MUNICIPAL COUNCILS IN VIRGIN ISLANDS

Two letters from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation enacted by the Municipal Councils of St. Croix, and of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF DEFENSE WORKERS

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first quarterly report of the United States Commissioner of Education on the education and training of defense workers, covering the period from July 1 to September 30, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Two letters from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War (11), Navy (2), and Interior; Executive Office of the President (Office for Emergency Management), Federal Security Agency, National Housing Agency, and the War Manpower Commission (National Youth Administration) which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the State Aeronautical Commission of Colorado protesting against Congress taking any action upon legislation giving to the Federal Government regulation and control over intrastate air commerce until the conclusion of the present war; to the Committee on Commerce.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from Ernest Folkerts, of Mount Olive, Ill., remonstrating against the imposition of taxes on nonbeverage alcohol, so that such alcohol may continue to be used in certain extracts and medicine at present ceiling levels; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MCCARRAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1546. A bill to amend an act relating to the incorporation of Providence Hospital, Washington, D. C., approved April 8, 1864; without amendment (Rept. No. 599);

S. 1554. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to change the name of Conduit Road in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 600);

S. 2199. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1898, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 601); and

H. R. 3691. A bill to permit the construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for steam-heating purposes in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 602).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1543. A bill to provide for payment of mustering-out pay to members of the armed forces, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 603).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. 1579. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act relative to restrictions applicable

to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma," approved January 27, 1933; without amendment (Rept. No. 604).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1593. A bill for the relief of the heirs and assigns of Widow Cesaire De Blanc; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1594. A bill for the relief of Dr. Joseph H. Plant; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. LANGER also introduced Senate bill 1595, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration, and appears under a separate heading.)

NATURALIZATION OF CERTAIN NATIVES OF INDIA

Mr. LANGER. I introduce a bill to permit approximately 3,000 natives of India who entered the United States prior to July 1, 1924, to become naturalized. I request that the bill be appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1595) to permit approximately 3,000 natives of India who entered the United States prior to July 1, 1924, to become naturalized, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in this connection I desire to say that I think it is peculiarly appropriate on the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of the adoption of the Bill of Rights to recall that America has been the haven of free institutions and the asylum for the disowned and oppressed of the human race. In view of this noble heritage of our great democracy it would seem incongruous indeed to find that people from India, who have entered the United States and lawfully resided for periods of 15 to 25 or more years, engaging in the free and legitimate pursuit of life and sharing in the blessings as well as difficulties peculiar to this land, are subjected to a legal discrimination that denies them the privilege of naturalization.

More than 25 percent of the people from India in the United States have been married to native-born American citizens and have raised families. Their wives and children are American citizens by birth.

Since these Indian residents have voluntarily given up their former domiciles and cast their lot for better or worse with the land of their adoption, in the name of human justice and American sense of fair play, it is only just that they be granted the right to become naturalized and saved from discriminating limitations due to the national-origin clause.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 2837. An act to fix the price of crude petroleum and its derivatives and fixing a parity formula; to the Committe on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3760. An act authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Lt. Gen. Thomas Holcomb, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

MUSTER-OUT PAY TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1543) to provide for payment of mustering-out pay to members of the armed forces, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

IMPORTATION OF GRAINS AND OTHER PRODUCTS FOR LIVESTOCK AND POULTRY FEED—AMENDMENT

Mr. ANDREWS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 171) to permit the importation from foreign countries free of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—AMENDMENT PERTAINING TO SUBSIDIES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to Senate bill 1458, the so-called subsidy bill, and ask that it be printed, printed in the RECORD, and lie on the table. The amendment proposes, in substance, a compromise on the question of subsidies and the provision of money sufficient to pay all subsidies except the subsidies on beef and the present proposed subsidy on milk, which are outlawed, with some additional margin; a total sum of not to exceed $600,000,000 being allowed for 1944. That sum is based upon a plan of having subsidies paid only when they support prices announced and maintained for the farmers.

I may say that I have not secured the agreement of any Senator, or of the committee, to this amendment. The Committee on Banking and Currency will meet tomorrow to vote on amendments and on the bill itself, and I hope that possibly this compromise may be satisfactory to a majority of the committee and to the Senate.

There being no objection, the amendment was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed and to be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. TAFT to the bill (S. 1458) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, is as follows:

On page 5, strike out all of line 16 after the colon, and all of lines 17 to 25, inclusive; also, on page 6, lines 1, 2, and 3 to the colon in line 3, and insert: "*Provided further*, That nothing herein shall apply to payments made to the shippers of commodities or others to cover the increased costs of transportation resulting from the war emergency.

"In order to secure the maximum necessary production of agricultural commodities in the calendar year 1944, the Administrator of the War Food Administration shall, as soon as practicable after the passage of this act, list and announce such support prices as he finds necessary pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of Public Law No. 147, approved July 1, 1941, as amended, and of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended. Whenever any such support price has been announced, the Administrator shall maintain such price in the open market throughout the United States (unless the support price is limited to particular marketing areas, in which case he shall maintain such price in such areas), either by regulations fixing prices or by causing actual purchases to be made by some agency of the United States Government. No maximum price heretofore or hereafter established for any commodity shall be below the support price therefor so announced, or below the prices specified in section 3 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942. In any case in which a support price for an agricultural commodity is announced and maintained, and a fixed maximum ceiling is prescribed for the sale by processors and distributors of any article processed from such agricultural commodity, the War Food Administrator may direct the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay to the processor or distributor of any such article an amount per unit of the processed article (without relation to the profits of such processor or distributor) for the purpose of reducing the margin between the producer and the consumer, provided that such margin is reduced by the amount of the payments made per unit by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation may accomplish the same purpose, when it purchases any agricultural commodity, by selling such commodity to the processor to be used solely for the purpose of processing, without affecting the general market price for such commodity. No support price shall be announced for beef cattle or calves or the products thereof, and no subsidy therefor shall be payable in connection therewith, but nothing shall prevent the control of beef and veal prices by the regulation of the margins of processors and distributors, and by rationing. No subsidy shall be paid on liquid milk unless in any particular area a support price is announced and maintained to the producers of milk within that area, in which case payments may be made to the distributors of milk within such area under the authority hereinbefore conferred as if such distributors were processors of milk, in order to reduce the margin in the price of milk between the producer and the consumer.

"The total payments made to processors and distributors in the calendar year 1944 plus all losses taken by the Commodity Credit Corporation during said calendar year, under the provisions of the preceding paragraph, shall not exceed $600,000,000."

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. WHEELER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 220), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures authorized by Senate Resolution 46, agreed to January 14, 1943, authorizing the Committee on Interstate Commerce to hold hearings during the Seventy-eighth Congress, is hereby increased by $5,000.

SUBSIDIES—LETTER FROM MRS. MARY WRIGHT JOHNSON

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received from Mrs. Mary Wright Johnson, chairman for the District of Columbia of the National Organization of the Women's Economic Council, a statement in opposition to the subsidy program, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Our understanding is that subsidies are to keep prices lowered to the consumer without loss to the producer. If there are to be subsidies the owners of small properties should be included as producers because under price ceilings ruled by O. P. A. rents receivable are set far below monthly carrying costs to the owners, including aged persons who have invested their life savings in this form of small support for their old age; investors to whom the Government appealed to provide small homes for defense workers; and boys on the battle front who arranged for their families to live with relatives and rent out their small homes. All of these owners are losing their properties under O. P. A. rent regulations, the regulations seemingly having been written by persons opposed to individual ownership of property. One of the men who wrote these regulations published a book in 1931 in which he stated he was "against the Constitution of the United States because it was written by property owners." Insofar as I know he is still in the Rent Regulation Division of O. P. A. at $6,500 a year; so young he should be on the battle front with your boys and mine. All our early Americans became property owners as quickly as possible—that is what made America. When a family own their ground they are loyal citizens, taking pride in the ownership of that home and working for the best interests of the country, a united front without communistic tendencies. Owners who have been forced to take the losses under O. P. A. rent ceilings should be recompensed from the date these ceilings became effective. Defense workers or others lured by high wages under so-called patriotism should out of these high wages pay their own living costs whether rent or food. Shelter and food hit the pocketbook, that is why so many persons try to make another person take the loss.

An argument used in behalf of food subsidies is that we are unfair to our men in the armed forces unless we have these food subsidies. That cannot be true. These men are not in a position to strike for higher wages and thus lessen and weaken the war front. They would unquestionably prefer that each person on such wages pay their own costs instead of increasing taxes through subsidies, for future generations of their children and grandchildren to meet. The way to keep down inflation is for each person to pay their own costs, not to get high wages and then have small property owners or the people through added taxes paid the Government, pay his legitimate living expenses so he or she will have more money to throw away, thus causing inflation.

The Women's Economic Council, a steadily-growing national organization of housewives, is opposed to food subsidies and against further invasion, under the guise of war emergency, of the rights of our farmers and people.

THE GOOD NEIGHBOR POLICY—STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE AND ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. HAYDEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the Secretary of State dealing with the good-neighbor policy, and also an article on the same subject published in the New York Herald Tribune of Wednesday, December 15, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

TAXATION TO CREATE JOBS—RADIO FORUM DISCUSSION BETWEEN SENATOR O'MAHONEY AND C. W. HAZELETT

[Mr. MURDOCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a discussion on the National Radio Forum between Senator O'MAHONEY and C. W. Hazelett, on the subject Incentive Taxation as a Means of Creating Employment, and the introductory statement, which appear in the Appendix.]

SENATOR McKELLAR'S VOTING RECORD ON LABOR LEGISLATION

[Mr. McKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement of his voting record on labor legislation as a Representative and a Senator from 1914 to 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS BY PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE AND LETTER FROM RAILROAD EXECUTIVES

[Mr. BAILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a summary of findings by the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice on hearings concerning southern railroads, and a letter from railroad executives protesting against the findings, which appear in the Appendix.]

FUTURE LAND AND WATER DEVELOPMENT—ADDRESS BY MICHAEL W. STRAUS

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Future Land and Water Development," delivered by Hon. Michael W. Straus, First Assistant Secretary of the Interior, before the National Reclamation Association, Denver, Colo., October 28, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR NEIGHBORS TO THE SOUTH—ARTICLE BY DR. JOSEPH F. THORNING

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The United Americas," written by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning and published in the Catholic Courier Jubilee magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

O. P. A. REGULATION OF STOCKMEN AND FARMERS—LETTER FROM LEE A. SNYDER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Lee A. Snyder, of Fairbury, Nebr., expressing disapproval of certain requirements of the O. P. A., published in the Fairbury (Nebr.) Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAR PROFITEERS—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. OVERTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "War Profiteers," published in the Washington (D. C.) Post of December 15, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CARE AND TREATMENT OF DISCHARGED VETERANS OF WORLD WAR NO. 2

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, the care and treatment of discharged veterans of this war is a matter which concerns the Congress in a major way.

The American Legion recently conducted a survey which disclosed rather shocking conditions, conditions reported by Commander Atherton of the American Legion. I ask unanimous consent that Commander Atherton's statement may be printed in the RECORD together with the letter of Jack Williams, department adjutant for North Dakota, addressed to me, enclosing Commander Atherton's statement.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Fargo, N. Dak., December 10, 1943.

Hon. GERALD P. NYE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are enclosing a statement issued by our national commander, Warren H. Atherton, dealing with the condition which exists at the present time relative to the care and treatment of discharged veterans of World War No. 2.

It is my conclusion that the reason for all this confusion is the lack of coordination between the War and Navy Departments and the Veterans' Administration. It is my further conclusion that an office of Assistant Adjutant General should be created; that the sole responsibility of that office should be to obtain the hospital and medical records; that by regulation or law it be made mandatory that the hospital and medical records be transferred with the man as he is transferred from one hospital to another by the War Department. If that were done, much of the time delay and the confusion which is preventing the proper adjudication of the claims of these men would be eliminated.

We find, in many cases, that a discharged veteran has been hospitalized in several hospitals. Upon his return home, when he files his claim with the Veterans' Administration, they cannot rate his case or put him on a compensation basis until all these records have been assembled.

You will recall, I am sure, that this same condition existed in the Allotment Division until a separate unit was set up, whose sole responsibility was allotments. Today the Allotment Division is functioning in a very efficient manner.

There is another very serious matter that I wish to bring to your attention. The Veterans' Administration, whose job it is to handle the claims of these men who are discharged from the service, is not on a wartime basis. I believe that it should be and that all priorities for personnel, material, equipment, and supplies should be immediately made available to it. Without such priority, another bottleneck would soon develop.

In North Dakota we have 165 American Legion posts, each with an active service officer. When a man returns from the service to his home, he is immediately contacted, and every aid is extended to him such as assistance in filing his papers and an explanation of the benefits to which he is entitled under Government laws and regulations. However, we can go just so far. Our work will be of little value if the Government agencies whose job it is to look after these men are jammed and unable to consider the claims for a period of 6 to 8 months because it takes that long a time to assemble the records.

This is the beginning of a very serious situation. It is a problem that Congress should remedy before it develops the proportions of a national scandal.

Very truly yours,

JACK WILLIAMS,
Department Adjutant.

DELAYS IN CLAIM SETTLEMENTS HOLD UP AID TO WAR'S DISABLED—LEGION SURVEY DISCLOSES SHOCKING CONDITION—ATHERTON FILES REPORT WITH CONGRESS—ACTION BY DEPARTMENTS NEEDED IMMEDIATELY

Situation in nutshell: One thousand five hundred and thirty-seven cases of delay

compiled in survey; 34 States covered; 15 specific instances cited.

Average time of delay per case, 3 to 4 months.

Maximum time of delay found, 11 months.

Representations by department commanders to Members of Congress asked now.

STATEMENT BY WARREN H. ATHERTON, NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, ON RESULTS OF SURVEY OF WORLD WAR NO. 2 CLAIMS

A telegraphic and air-mail survey of American Legion service officers on pending World War No. 2 claims show that there has been and still is considerable delay from the time these men are released from service, file their claims, and receive the first check in settlement thereof. This delay is attributable to a number of circumstances according to these service officers. Some States report no undue delay, but most of them have cases of record filed 3 to 7 months ago and not yet settled. The American Legion feels that all Government agencies concerned should coordinate their activities to the end that men and women released from service because of disabilities shall not be subjected to inconvenience, embarrassment, and, at times, distress, because their claims for disability compensation are not settled promptly. The American Legion has clearly in mind that a great number of these claimants have been in service for several months, have become incapacitated in training or combat, and are now back in civil life or back in hospitals and institutions, because the armed services has no further use for them. While in service they made allotments to their dependents to which was added the Government allowance. This benefit is discontinued in each case upon discharge. Having no other income, the disabled dischargee must rely on financial assistance from private or charitable sources. Such a situation, especially for the combat disabled, should not be tolerated. Based upon the findings of the survey just completed and upon the experience of the organization in claims and rehabilitation fields, the following recommendations are made by the American Legion to the Federal Government:

1. Every serviceman whose disabilities or physical condition are reparable should be retained to the armed services to receive the maximum benefits of hospitals and medical care. If there is need for further convalescent or institutional care, the liaison between the Army and Navy on the one hand and the Veterans' Administration on the other should really function and be applicable in each case. Men should not be returned to civil or State authorities unless so desired expressly by the folks at home.

2. The Veterans' Administration hospital bed capacity, especially for the nervous and mental cases and the tuberculous patients, should be enlarged so that all those released from service and in need of further care may be accommodated. The American Legion is committed to the proposition that the Veterans' Administration be a war agency for the duration of hostilities and 6 months thereafter, to assure its proper place in the priorities rating for construction material, equipment, personnel, and supplies.

3. As a direct contribution to the informational and advisory service to prospective dischargees, the Veterans' Administration should have contact representatives at the larger discharge centers, especially those handling combat troops.

4. To obviate delays in adjudicating claims for obvious and indisputable disabilities, the War and Navy Departments should permit the assignment of Veterans' Administration rating boards at the larger discharge points or demobilization centers.

5. Mustering-out pay in amounts dependent upon length of service should be made available with a portion payable at discharge and the balance within 30 and 60 days thereafter. The national commander of the American Legion testified before a Senate committee on such a proposal December 1, 1943.

6. The furnishing of medical and clinical records from service hospitals at which the disabled person may have been treated before he reached the discharge center must be speeded up. It is understood that such records may be essential in the adjudication of many cases, but in many others they would contribute little or nothing to the identification and evaluation of the disability causing discharge. Another bottleneck was found in the furnishing of photostat copies of induction or enlistment examination reports. As the result of a former survey made by the American Legion the War Department was furnished with findings upon which officials took action. It has been reported that this bottleneck is now eliminated and that requests for these photostat records will be handled within 5 days from date of receipt.

7. The present arrangement of sending records and reports of disabled dischargees to the nearest regional office of the Veterans' Administration should be changed so that these records are dispatched promptly to the Veterans' Administration office having jurisdiction in the man's home State. This change may require Veterans' Administration contact people at the different discharge points as recommended above.

8. The lack of sufficient trained personnel in the adjudication field is a cause of delay in handling these cases in most stations. The manpower situation is recognized, but yet the Legion cannot refrain from urging and exhorting the Veterans' Administration to authorize the additional help requested by field offices, and to immediately step up recruitment and training programs for this purpose.

9. Some service officers have reported the lack of complete and clarifying instructions from the central office of the Veterans' Administration to the regional offices on the adjudication of the new claims has been an element of delay. Certainly this should be overcome immediately.

10. Each claim is assigned a C number or claim number. So far this is done by the central office. Complaints have come in that the delay in assigning these numbers has held up adjudication of cases for as long as 2 or 3 weeks. The Legion feels this is an administrative problem that could and should be met and solved right now.

11. The present fiscal arrangement whereby disbursement on vouchers and rolls certified by the Veterans' Administration are made at disbursing offices, one in each Federal Reserve district, also contributes to delay the issuance of the initial check and settlement of the claim. Up to about 8 years ago the Veterans' Administration had its own disbursing officers. Reverting to that arrangement now should serve to expedite the payment of individual and new claims.

These conclusions rest upon observations sent in by trained service officers in 34 States. They cited by name and number (if assigned) 1,537 cases of disabled men. It is understood that many cases may require development of pertinent information, but that should not be permitted to slow down the whole rating machinery. Another factor cited is that of settling the question of waiver of premiums on insurance during period of total disability. Also the payment of insurance benefits and pension to the dependents of those dying in service. The jurisdiction over both these is in central office, and the many delays reported call for prompt improvement in the system of disposing of these cases.

There may be many other considerations touching upon the broad question of delays in the settlement of disabled veterans' claims. The American Legion submits, however, that if all Government agencies concerned would redouble their efforts to effect complete coordination, much will have been accomplished toward the goal sought by the dischargees themselves, their folks at home, their representatives, and the Federal Government.

Attached hereto are brief summaries of cases taken from those submitted in the survey. They illustrate many of the points set forth above.

Related to this question are those other important programs of employment and unemployment protection. As to these, the American Legion has proposals which are being introduced in Congress and on which further detailed data will be given.

SPECIFIC INSTANCES

Case 1: In this claim the veteran served honorably in the Navy from March 4, 1932, to February 8, 1938. He reenlisted on May 4, 1938, and was honorably discharged on medical certificate on account of active tuberculosis, incurred in line of duty, on April 6, 1943. The Form 526 was received in an office of the Veterans' Administration on April 21, 1943, and it has not been adjudicated as yet on account of the fact that complete records have not been received from the Navy. Contact was made with the adjudication officer about the delay in this claim on October 22, 1943, and again on November 29, 1943.

Case 2: This veteran was discharged insane, unable to sign his discharge. Claim was filed April 12 and we have not yet been able to get this veteran examined. While it is true that the Veterans' Administration wrote to the sister and a service officer, no letters were written to either or anyone in the months of September and October. Request was made for an attendant by this office on August 2 and the Veterans' Administration under date of November 9 finally complied with this request and wrote the veteran.

Case 3: This boy enlisted on July 13, 1940, and was declared unfit for service on January 13, 1948, with this notation: "Patient was struck in the head while in combat against the Japanese in Guadalcanal, penetrating wound right parieto-occipital region produced by grenade. Diagnosis: hemiplegia, spastic, left." He was honorably discharged on C. D. D. July 3, 1943, and his claim was filed the same date. He was rated 50 percent disabled October 25, 1943, and advised of this rating on November 4, 1943, with rating effective from July 5, 1943. Vocational rehabilitation recommended.

Case 4: Claim was filed in this case July 3. The case file was transferred to central office for consideration by the Veterans' Claim Service on October 6, 1943. One reason for the delay in this particular case is that the veteran had a claim pending for officers' retirement pay which had to be disposed of.

Case 5: This claimant was discharged from the hospital on August 16, 1943, and on November 11, 1943, an office of the Veterans' Administration had to make a second request of the War Department for a medical report. He was examined at a Veterans' Administration hospital and some adjustment was made.

Case 6: This claimant was discharged August 15, 1942, from the Army Nurse Corps, and claim was filed February 4, 1943. Reports from the Adjutant General's Office for which requests had been made several times, were not received until the latter part of August 1943. The decision has been deferred until completion of the requested neuropsychiatric examination by the Veterans' Administration.

Case 7: This veteran was discharged from service July 27, 1943, with a diagnosis of dementia praecox, paranoid. The handicap estimated by the rating board is 100 percent. Action toward releasing payment on the veteran's behalf apparently is not to be expected until the facility is informed officially with respect to the character of the veteran's discharge. It seems quite evident that this veteran served honorably, but the Authorization Unit has refused to release the payments until officially reported that discharge was honorable.

Case 8: Discharge from service in this case was effected July 26, 1943. Decision by the Rating Board on October 7, 1943, recognized the veteran's entitlement to pensionable rating for weak feet. Release of payments in this case, as in the case to which reference is made immediately above, awaits the receipt of official information of the man having been discharged honorably.

Case 9: Claim for pension was filed by this veteran at the time of discharge on June 11, 1943. Before conducting the studies the medical authorities thought it advisable to have a social-service investigation made. It seems probable that another 3 or 4 months will elapse before a decision can be effected in the circumstances that exist, due to the accumulated load and number of orders for investigations.

Case 10: Claim was filed June 17, 1943. Several follow-ups by a Veterans' Administration facility have not brought the receipt of War Department reports.

Case 11: This veteran enlisted October 25, 1941, and was honorably discharged on C. D. D. December 23, 1942. Form 526 was received in an office of the Veterans' Administration on January 4, 1943. On January 5, 1943, service records were requested from the Adjutant General's Office and were received in this office on February 19, 1943. Under date of April 10, 1943, the rating board requested supplemental service records from the Adjutant General's Office which were received in the Veterans' Administration on May 7, 1943. A second supplemental Adjutant General's report concerning alleged treatment at Fort Custer was requested May 10, 1943, and on June 14, 1943, a third supplemental report of clinical records of treatment at Fort Custer was requested. Complete records of the claimant's treatment at Fort Custer were received in the Veterans' Administration on July 26, 1943. August 3, 1943, an examination and psychiatric social history were requested by the rating board and the latter was received on September 12, 1943. Then on September 14, 1943, the rating board requested an examination based upon psychiatric social report. The claimant was examined at a Veterans' Administration facility on October 14, 1943, and report of this was received November 15, 1943, in the regional office. On November 20, 1943, the rating board rated the claim and granted service connection for a nervous condition, incompetent, and in need of a guardian. On account of the claimant's having been declared incompetent, chief attorney requested that a fiduciary be appointed under date of November 24, 1943. No check has been issued as yet.

Case 12: In this case the veteran, totally blind, was discharged from an Army hospital on June 30, 1943; the Army service records were not received in the regional office until the week of November 22, 1943; therefore, the veteran has not as yet, and probably will not for 30 days, receive the pension check to which he is entitled.

Case 13: This veteran was discharged from service March 31, 1943. Form 526 was submitted to the Veterans' Administration on August 9, 1943. The regional office has only a dummy file on this case. The principal folder was sent to the Index Division, office of Chief Clerk, on August 9, 1943, for the reason that, in addition to the veteran's service in the Navy in World War No. 2, he had also had peacetime service in the Army, just prior to World War No. 2. Under date of September 14, 1943, the Chief Clerk advised the regional office that the veteran's file was being referred to the insurance claims council for attention to the veteran's claim for waiver of premiums.

Case 14: This veteran was discharged from service on March 4, 1943. He has been granted service connection for tuberculosis, pulmonary, active, under date of May 5, 1943, and has been rated 100 percent from March 5, 1943. His claim file was sent to the director of insurance on September 25, 1943, for action on a question of entitlement to waiver of premiums. The file has not been returned to this date, November 26, 1943, and no action has been reported by the insurance claims council.

Case 15: A recent survey of State hospitals for the insane in northern California alone showed 100 discharged veterans of World War No. 2 being confined therein because of lack of beds in Veterans' Administration facilities.

POST-WAR PLANS OF THE RAILROADS

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, a recent survey to determine what the railroads of the country are doing now to meet wartime emergency demands, and what they plan to do about passenger business in the post-war period, discloses some findings which indicate a significant travel trend for Americans.

Conducted by Railway Age, magazine of the railroad industry, the survey covered major roads in all sections of the country, and is published in the fifth Passenger Progress Annual in its November 20 issue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the findings, which will be of interest to the Congress and especially to the Senate committee now devoting itself to post-war planning, may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. POST-WAR PLANS

The railways are determined to fight with every weapon at their command to take as large a share as possible of the post-war passenger traffic. Without minimizing in any way the seriousness of the competition they will encounter, they are optimistic as to their chances of success.

For example, one railway executive said, "Passenger revenues are so vital to us that we have prepared to tackle post-war competition and fight it tooth and nail. Our competitors, who are gleefully anticipating a walkover as far as taking profit away from the railways is concerned, are in for a most unpleasant surprise."

Said another, "We were suffering materially from airplane competition prior to the war, but I do not expect it to be much worse in the post-war period, because I hope to combat such competition with streamlined trains, and I am confident that we can hang onto a considerable share of the business."

Post-war plans are threefold:

(a) *New equipment*

The railways recognize that present passenger equipment is outmoded and they are planning to replace it with modern lightweight equipment just as soon as possible after the war. Many of the roads stated definitely that they plan to buy up to the limit of their financial ability. Some comments were:

"Everyone on this railway is unreservedly in favor of lightweight equipment for passenger trains. We will never buy another heavyweight car."

"We will give the traveling public what it wants—streamlined trains and plenty of them."

"The reaction of the public to streamliners has been astonishing. One of our trains has jumped to earnings of over $9 per train-mile. All reservations on several others are sold for the next 6 weeks. Another train has more than doubled its earnings. We are definitely 'lightweight minded.'"

"The public reaction to streamliners has convinced us that these trains are the answer to retaining our mass transportation business. We envisage fleets of coach streamliners at frequent intervals."

(b) *Speed comfort and fares*

A majority of the railroads favor reductions in fares after the war. Many would like to make these cuts immediately rather than to wait or to make a series of small reductions.

Rail executives contend that in normal times railroads surpass airplanes and motor vehicles in passenger comfort, but they intend to increase the advantage they have in this respect after the war. Nearly all of them also feel that definite improvements in train speeds are possible. Some opinions:

"We can and will make our trains more comfortable and this applies to everything from a local all-coach train to the extra-fare trains."

"We had a maximum speed of 100 miles per hour on our streamliners before the war, and I do not think this speed will be exceeded in the post-war period. However, by improvements in operating methods and by taking out curves I believe our schedules can and should be shortened."

"We have plans for increasing the speed of all our trains. This increases the desirability of rail versus bus travel and diminishes the advantage the planes have."

"The present snail's pace of some trains will have to be improved—by days, not merely by hours."

"Since the horse-and-buggy days no railroad has needed passenger stations every few miles. I can envisage such trains that would stop only, say, every 75 miles along the main line and be day runs, giving many of the local communities fast schedules to connect with the fast through trains."

"My own preference is for an immediate slice in coach rates to 1¼ cents per mile and a reduction in first-class rates to 2¼ cents per mile."

"I make the radical but eminently sound statement that coach fares should be a flat 1 cent per mile. Merely nibbling at fares will do no good."

"Speed is a potent weapon against competition and by speed I mean an over-all schedule of at least 70 miles per hour. Nothing less will suffice, and the railways who do not wish to build up their track to permit such speed might just as well get out of the passenger business."

"I am all for standardizing equipment to reduce costs, but let's get the standard the passenger wants instead of what some designer thinks he ought to have."

(c) *Advertising*

The remarkable response to their patriotic and institutional advertising during the war has convinced the railroads that they have too long ignored the sales potentiality of advertising. Virtually all officials replying to the survey indicated that they expect to conduct far more voluminous and effective advertising than ever before in order properly to merchandise the new trains, lower fares,

higher speeds, and extra comfort of the post-war period.

2. WARTIME ACHIEVEMENTS—TROOP MOVEMENTS

Within 3 weeks after Pearl Harbor, more than 600,000 troops had been gathered from all sections of the country and sent to the Pacific coast on troop trains. This was one of the greatest emergency mass movements of troops in history.

During the first 19 months of the present war, the railroads have handled 21,754,305 soldiers in organized movements. This compares with the 19-month period which comprised the entire duration of the last war, during which time 8,874,708 soldiers were moved.

Between December 1941 and July 1943, an average of 100,000 soldiers per day was handled on American railways in organized movements.

Comparative equipment requirements for troop movements during the first 19 months of this war and the like period of World War No. 1: 359,253 coaches and sleepers now, 136,376 in 1917–18, 173,799 freight and baggage cars now, 34,784 a quarter of a century ago.

In this war, troop movements constitute 19.1 percent of the total railway passenger miles as compared with 8.6 percent in the last war.

On the average, an organized troop movement originates somewhere in this country every 5 minutes, day and night, and every 5 minutes 150 troops entrain and another 150 detrain on United States railroads.

Transport of troops is being facilitated by the building of 1,200 triple-deck troop sleepers by the Pullman-Standard Car Manufacturing Co. These were in addition to the 107 parlor cars and 153 obsolete sleeping cars Pullman converted into triple-tier sleepers exclusively for troop movements in 1942.

In the First World War only 25 percent of the troops were moved in sleeping cars. Now Pullman is handling nearly 66 percent of the troop traffic.

Up to October 1, 1943, 15,000,000 soldiers were transported in Pullmans in organized movements. This is nearly double the number of troops carried in Pullmans and coaches combined in World War No. 1.

In the first 8 months of this year 6,536,000 troops were moved in Pullmans compared with 4,312,000 in the same period of 1942. This is an increase of 52 percent.

3. WARTIME ACHIEVEMENTS—PASSENGER TRAFFIC

A record of 80,000,000,000 passenger-miles is expected to be reached by the railroads during 1943. This exceeds by more than 50 percent the 53,675,562,000 passenger-miles recorded in 1942 and the previous high of 46,847,534,000 miles set in 1920. The 1920 record was surpassed in the first 7 months of this year when 47,950,173,000 passenger-miles were produced.

These records not only show that the railroads have been doing a tremendous job but also a highly efficient one because they have available about one-third less cars now than they had in the last war.

About half of the Pullman cars and a third of the railway-owned coaches are devoted entirely to troop movements.

In order fully to utilize passenger-carrying equipment, cars are loaned by owning roads to roads needing them. This program is operated under the supervision of the Association of American Railroads and at present an average of 3,300 cars per day is operating on other than owner roads.

Nearly half of Pullman's fleet of 7,000 cars is constantly engaged in group troop movements. Pullman passenger-miles are running just over 2,000,000,000 per month and it is expected that the total will reach 25,000,000,000 or more for 1943. This would be 31 percent above the all-time high of 19,000,000,000 passenger-miles established in 1942.

Streamliners are doing more than their share of transporting wartime passengers. Though no new streamlined trains have been put into service during the year, these newer trains spend less time in the repair shops and are in almost continuous use. Most of these trains are earning from 200 to 300 percent more than in pre-war years.

Streamliners of the Burlington, Rock Island, and Chicago & North Western-Union Pacific Roads are transporting approximately 250,000 passengers annually between the two vital war production centers of Denver and Chicago.

Streamliners are carrying between 3,000 and 4,000 people daily between Chicago and Minneapolis. Traffic on the Chicago & North Western's four Hiawathas alone is up 60 percent, with an average daily load of 1,862 people during August.

Sample percentage increases in passenger traffic during 1943 as compared with 1942: Pennsylvania, 55; New York Central, 56; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy, 63; Southern, 65; Florida East Coast, 164; Denver & Rio Grande Western, 216.

Sample percentage increases in passenger revenue this year over last: Boston & Maine, 45; Pennsylvania, 62; St. Louis-San Francisco, 69; Pere Marquette, 90; Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific, 110; Northern Pacific, 131.

Sample percentage increases in passenger miles this year over last: New York Central, 71; Southern, 72; Pennsylvania, 75; Lehigh Valley, 104; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy, 178; Denver & Rio Grande Western, 180.

SKY-ROADS, EXHIBIT BY CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MEAD obtained the floor.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BURTON. Before the Senator from New York proceeds with the report he is about to make for the Truman Committee, on the general subject of transportation, I should like to say a word as to the exhibit relating to sky-roads, which is being presented by the Civil Aeronautics Administration in collaboration with the Museum of Modern Art of New York City in the auditorium of the Department of Commerce in this city.

Mr. President, yesterday evening I spent an hour and a half at this exhibit. Former Senator Josh Lee, who was in the Senate Chamber a moment ago, now a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, was present at the exhibit while I was there, as well as many others from Government departments. No other Members of the Senate, however, were present, and I was there asked to call the exhibit personally to the attention of other Senators as being one of extraordinary interest in enabling the people of today to orient themselves in relation to the air age in which they live.

The exhibit consists of seven sections. The first deals with progress in mapmaking, in 25 exhibits, covering the time from the early days, even before the Romans, to the present.

The second relates to the progress of flight, with exhibits consisting of 60 photographic enlargements which trace the evolution of flight, including the flight by the Wright brothers, which the Senate recognized by the passage of a joint resolution a few days ago. On December 17 we will celebrate the fortieth anniversary of their flight.

The third exhibit relates to air strategy. It points out one of the faults in the German strategy arose from too great reliance on the Mercator projection, instead of a global map, in working out world-wide strategy in the present war.

The fourth exhibit relates to the nature of the atmosphere.

The fifth has to do with transition to peace.

The sixth relates to the development of flying resources and training in this Nation.

The seventh exhibit relates to sky-roads, and gives an excellent demonstration of the way in which planes coming into commercial airfields are guided into their respective airports, and the methods which will be used in the future to increase the traffic that can be handled at an airport.

The exhibit concludes with a quiz board, where a person can ask himself questions relating to the location of places on the earth with relation to each other, and with respect to their relation to one another by air. I am sure no Member of the Senate could attain a 75 percent passing grade on that board, probably not more than 50 percent. It is a demonstration of the extent to which the world today is misinformed as to the possibilities of transportation by air.

The exhibit will remain here through January 8, and will be open daily from 10 a. m. to 9 p. m. Members of the Senate were invited by the Secretary of Commerce to visit the exhibit for a preview yesterday evening. I wish to add high commendation of the exhibit as an unusual one, scientifically prepared by the Museum of Modern Art in New York City, and supplemented by an exhibit of the Department of Commerce. I believe it will well repay any Senator for the time spent in examining it.

THE PETROLEUM SITUATION

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I have a letter which explains the British contribution to the petroleum supply program of the United Nations. I desire to read the letter for the benefit of the Senate; and in connection with the reading of the letter, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Foreign Oil and Post-war Planning," by K. C. Sclater, published in the October 1943 issue of The Petroleum Engineer.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

FOREIGN OIL AND POST-WAR PLANNING—OIL INDUSTRY SEEMS DESTINED TO ASSUME A WORLD-WIDE PATTERN, AND POLICIES NOW BEING FORMULATED SHOULD CONSIDER THE BEST INTERESTS OF ALL, BOTH HERE AND ABROAD

(By K. C. Sclater)

Under what conditions will foreign oil operations be conducted after the war? This is a highly pertinent question, inasmuch as new international oil policies are now in the making. If it were possible to give an answer to this question now, it would afford the

industry a clearer view of its post-war problems and aid in their appraisal; also, it would provide a basis for sound post-war planning. Concentration on war work has given the industry little opportunity to give much consideration to post-war problems. All its energies have been, and will continue to be for the duration, bent on keeping our fighting forces and war industries and those of our allies adequately supplied with vital petroleum products. This is as it should be. International oil trends in recent months, however, are such that the oil industry cannot afford to be too complacent about what is taking place.

It becomes increasingly clear that the manner in which foreign oil operations will be conducted after the war will depend on the policy the Government will follow with respect to the development of oil deposits in foreign countries. What that policy will be or whether a definite foreign oil policy has been decided upon is not known; if it has, it has not been officially announced.

The creation of the Petroleum Reserve Corporation in June of this year is evidence that the Government plans to assume, at least for the duration, some form of Government participation in foreign oil development. Further evidence of this is the issuance of P. A. W. Directive 70, the provisions of which fit into the plans of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation. Just what the ultimate plans of the Petroleum Reserve Corporation are have never been divulged. Secrecy has surrounded the Petroleum Reserve Corporation's activities since it was created, and this has given rise to much speculation and not a little apprehension.

Petroleum Administrator Ickes, who is president of the Petroleum Reserve Corporation, until a few days ago refused to reveal, on the grounds of military secrecy, any information regarding the program and activities of the Corporation. When he did make a formal disclosure in this connection he said that "preliminary studies have been completed and solid ground work has been laid for more comprehensive action looking toward an increasingly efficient utilization of foreign petroleum facilities for the fighting forces abroad and closer integration of foreign production and distribution into our domestic supply pattern.

"It is now necessary to undertake studies in the field to perfect our information from first-hand surveys and observations. The P. R. C., whose directors are Secretaries of State, War, Navy, Interior, and the Director of Office of Economic Warfare, made arrangements several weeks ago to send a mission to the Middle and Near East oil fields."

Since the Petroleum Reserves Corporation has been formed, it has been working behind the scenes on the problem of oil production, refining, and distribution facilities in the Middle and Near East. The P. A. W., through its Foreign Operations Committee, is simultaneously engaged in accelerating oil operations in foreign fields.

SCOPE OF P. R. C.

According to the charter of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation, its powers are broad in scope. It was created under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act on June 30, 1943. The objects and purposes of the Corporation, as stated in the charter, "shall be to buy or otherwise acquire reserves of crude petroleum from sources outside the United States, including the purchase or acquisition of stock in corporations owning such reserves or interests therein, and to store, transport, produce, process, manufacture, sell, market, and otherwise dispose of such crude petroleum and the products derived therefrom; and the Corporation shall have the power and authority to do and perform all acts and things whatsoever necessary thereto, including, but without limitation, the power to borrow money and issue its secured or unsecured obligations therefor; to adopt and use a corporate seal; to make contracts; to sue and be sued; and to construct and operate outside the United States such refineries, pipe lines, storage tanks, and other facilities as are necessary in connection with carrying out the objects and purposes of the Corporation as above stated." Although the total authorized stock is declared to be $1,000,000, it has unlimited borrowing power.

The course of action the Corporation will pursue has great significance. It may be far reaching in its effect on foreign oil-development operations in the immediate post-war period.

Judging from the plans as they have thus far developed, the course in world oil on which the United States has embarked covers every phase and branch of the petroleum industry. The P. R. C., through the State Department, has the power to deal with foreign governments on petroleum matters.

The further fact that the Foreign Operations Committee of the P. A. W. is also engaged in coordinating foreign oil activities is indicative of the extensive participation of the Government in forwarding war plans connected with foreign oil problems.

Post-war settlements will be concerned with the access of the various nations to raw materials, of which petroleum is one of the most important. Foreign oil operations are therefore entering a new phase.

THE POST-WAR ERA

In the post-war period, the oil industry will witness an era of greater activity and greater competition in foreign oil than it has ever known before. This is one good reason why international oil trends should not be overlooked by the oil industry at large. What trend foreign oil settlements will take are closely related to post-war planning in the oil industry both at home and abroad. They will be more closely tied in with domestic oil development and for this reason the oil industry will have to develop a world-wide viewpoint on oil matters.

Petroleum as a natural resource and an essential raw commodity in nearly every country of the world is of such paramount importance that it will be the subject of the closest study in post-war settlements. The oil industry of the United States may find that it must fit its operations into the pattern of world economics. Any program embarked on by a private oil company operating in foreign fields will have to stand the test of scrutiny not only by the United States Government but by the governments of other nations. Cognizance will have to be taken of other countries and their economic status.

What course world settlements will take with respect to natural resources is not known, but there will have to be a give and take attitude among nations. Political questions and economic considerations will enter, but they should not be confused one with the other. As the world oil situation begins to take more definite shape, including the preparations the United States Government has in progress for controlling foreign oil operations during the war, there is a lurking fear that the extensions of Government control to foreign operations may be extended into the post-war period. There is no definite assurance even that Government control of domestic oil operations will be discontinued following the close of the war, or that private enterprise will replace Government bureaucracy immediately the war ends.

Far-reaching effects are likely to be felt by domestic oil operations in having to conform its activities to meet international conditions in the post-war era. Fuller utilization of petroleum and its products may be necessary to prevent undue dissipation of domestic crude oil reserves. Failure to observe this point may invite large importations of foreign oil.

Pogue, in a paper elsewhere in this issue, points out that for the duration of the war the American petroleum industry has become indissolubly linked with foreign sources of supply and that no major oil problem can now be resolved except in the light of all foreign alternatives. He also points out that the manner in which the petroleum resources of the world are disposed of in the post-war era will play a large part in the economic and social progress of nations. These are factors to be borne in mind when the question of a foreign policy is under consideration. Pogue states that our oil policy must be such that it will not only serve the interests of the Nation, but that it will also further the productive capacity and volume of trade of foreign countries. He states further that there should be a freedom from burdensome operating controls, stability of contracts, and parity with all competitors. "If these conditions are provided with international understanding this country and its petroleum industry can make an outstanding contribution to the future stability and well-being of the entire world."

EFFECT ON WORLD TRADE

Oil's place in the post-war world and its effect on world trade therefore merit the closest study today when foreign oil policies are being developed and commitments being made.

Post-war plans for the oil industry must take into account the vast losses of crude oil stocks that have occurred in war and also the accelerated consumption of petroleum products in carrying on the war. In addition, there is the devastation of oil fields, refineries, and other petroleum facilities; these all must be replaced. The rehabilitation and reconstruction problems that confront the oil industry are tremendous, and are world-wide in scope.

In the United States alone a vast exploitation program will be necessary in the post-war period to increase the Nation's oil reserves. There will also be a great need for replacement of equipment in the field, plant, and refinery. In the immediate post-war period the oil industry in all its branches will be taxed to the utmost in meeting the problems that now confront it. Many new competitive factors will arise in the post-war era. There will be drastic changes in refining processes and products. There will be increased competition from other countries. There will be the need for new designs in equipment. It is hoped that there will also be a wise foreign economic oil policy that will conform to the best interests of the oil industry here and abroad.

PERIOD OF TRANSITION

The period of transition from war to peace will provide an opportunity to discard inefficient practices and equipment that can be replaced by modern methods and materials. Many new conditions will be met that will render useless past performances and experience. Many other questions arise: Will the petroleum industry of the United States be prepared to resume dominant leadership in petroleum when the war ends? What will be the changes in purchasing arrangements with foreign countries? Where will oil exploration be pushed, here at home or in foreign fields? What changes in machinery and equipment may be expected? What about war substitutes? Who will operate the Big Inch line after the war? What effect will the Big Inch and other war emergency lines have on the location of refineries and manufacturing facilities? When all oil tankers are released how will it affect transcontinental and world commerce? What about increased capacity for high-octane gasoline after the war? Will commercial and air transportation grow fast

enough to absorb all this product or will it necessitate drastic changes in auto-engine design? What part will synthetic fuels play in the post-war era? What about synthetic rubber facilities? What about drastic changes in refining technology? Will the industry be allowed to conduct its own operations here and abroad with minimum governmental control?

These are among the important questions that will come up for solution in the post-war period. They are all closely related and hinge on the policy the Government will adopt in regard to foreign oil. A wise foreign-oil policy will accomplish the transition from war to peace in the oil industry with a minimum of dislocation and preserve the well-being of the oil industry and particularly those companies operating in foreign fields.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the controversy over the petroleum-supply program for the war effort has been discussed in the public press, over the radio, and in the Senate very frequently of late. Perhaps in great measure the importance given to this program or problem is one of the results of the investigation conducted by the subcommittee of the Truman committee in its recent trip during which it visited the battle fronts of the world. I hold in my hand a letter which I received from Secretary Harold L. Ickes. The letter is dated December 10, 1943, and gives a very clear explanation of the current situation. In his letter Secretary Ickes states:

PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR,
Washington, D. C., December 10, 1943.

Hon. JAMES M. MEAD,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR MEAD: I am pleased to give you the following comments upon the British contribution to the petroleum-supply program of the United Nations:

Statements to the effect that the oil supplies under British control are being drawn upon at a lower rate than are those of the United States have been extensively circulated in the public press. And, in general, such statements are factually correct. It should be recognized that American interests are supplying a disproportionate share of the oil required for the conduct of the war—both upon the civilian and upon the fighting fronts. The situation with respect to 100-octane aviation gasoline is a good case in point. I believe it will be shown ultimately that we are putting up 95 percent of the aviation gasoline which is being used to blast the Hitlers and the Tojos off the map.

While recognizing the disparity in the relative oil contributions of ourselves and the British, it would be unfortunate if this should give rise to the implication that the British are not supplying their fair share of the petroleum that is needed for the war program, or that they are not furnishing all that they could. For such an implication would not be justified in the light of all of the facts.

The truth is that American and British oil resources have been employed jointly from the beginning of hostilities. Our plans have been developed in close collaboration and with a view to making the most effective use of the available oil and facilities, wherever located and regardless of ownership. The British and the American contributions may have been unequal, but they have not been inequitable.

It is first necessary to understand that for the fulfillment of the petroleum program we have had to depend for the most part upon existing facilities in various parts of the world for the production, processing, and delivery of petroleum and its products. Undeveloped oil reserves play no part in the present struggle. The war cannot be won with oil in the ground—the only oil that counts is that which can be produced, refined, and shipped to the places where it is needed. With respect to the latter, when the war started companies under American control had a far greater capacity than did those under British control, and this fact accounts for the much larger volume of products that have had to be supplied by us.

If we had had the necessary time and materials we might have been able to drill wells and construct new pipe-line, refinery, and terminal facilities, as well as tankers, which would have enabled the British to draw more heavily upon their reserves and so supply a larger part of the petroleum products needed for war. But we had neither, and so the expansion of plant capacity had to be confined to only the most essential installations, such as 100-octane gasoline plants. Some of those were built in British-controlled areas, but only in the United States did we have the required volumes of special charging stocks which had to come from existing refineries, and only here could the additional capacity be installed with a minimum of risk and delay and with the most efficient use of critical materials and equipment.

The oil fields of Iran, which are under British control, have been and are being produced at the highest feasible rate in view of the necessity of operating the connected refineries in such a manner as to produce the maximum amount of war products. In other areas where British companies are operating, either independently or in partnership with American interests, they are also fulfilling completely their share of the world oil program by producing and refining all that they can, subject only to the physical limitations of available facilities.

It is true that the use of middle eastern oil was restricted somewhat during the period when the Mediterranean was unsafe for tankers and when our Allied tanker fleet was dangerously inadequate. Since ships and time were scarce, we had to move all of the oil that we could from the nearest source of supply. In the case of north Africa and England that nearest source was the east coast of the United States. However, during this entire period the British-controlled refineries were operating in such a way as to produce for the joint use of themselves and their allies the maximum possible quantity of critically needed war products, such as aviation gasoline and high octane gasoline for military vehicles. As a necessary corollary to the production of these materials fuel oil was produced in these British refineries in greater volume than could be hauled away at the time.

With more tankers available today, we are able to use more oil from these foreign sources—British oil and American oil as well—though not as much as both we and the British would like to see supplied from these sources. As materials can be made available, it is hoped that the necessary pipe line and refinery capacity can be installed so that the British oil reserves may be drawn upon to a greater degree. Plans to this end are now under way and it will be a matter of great satisfaction to me when the time comes that the heavy drain upon American reserves may be offset by correspondingly greater withdrawals from British resources.

There is little enough oil left in the Western Hemisphere, and in the United States in particular, even though it be measured in terms of a good many billions of barrels. Our reserves in this country have a relatively short life expectancy of 14 years, and it is up to us to look to the conservation and prudent use of what we have left. But we are now at war and at such a time we cannot afford to be penny wise and pound foolish. If we are able to supply oil—or any other essential munition of war—in greater measure than our allies can match, and with greater speed, surely we should not hold back. We are joined in a common cause, and any inequality in the present contribution of the partners is a matter that may well be put aside for some eventual balancing of the books.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Petroleum Administrator for War.

Following the insertion of that letter and the article from the recent issue of the Petroleum Engineer, I also request unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article by Secretary Ickes, entitled "We Need A Policy," published in last Sunday's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE NEED A POLICY—ICKES STRESSES UNITED STATES POST-WAR OIL NEEDS

(By Harold L. Ickes)

Tell me the sort of agreement that the United Nations will reach with respect to the world's petroleum resources when the war is over, and I will undertake to analyze the durability of the peace that is to come.

Let us make no mistake about it—the accessibility of oil to the nations that want it after the war is going to be one of the most important and knotty problems that the Allies will have to face.

We furnished 80 percent of the petroleum that was used in winning World War No. 1, and I believe it will be shown ultimately that we are putting up 95 percent of the aviation gasoline which is being used to blast the Hitlers and the Tojos from their strongholds and the Quislings from their burrows.

It did not take so much oil to win the First World War, and at that time we were still comforting ourselves with the assurance that "we have more oil than the rest of the world together." Fortunately, we have been awakened, even if rudely, from that enervating delusion. We know now that we are passing over the threshold from an oil-exporting nation to an oil-importing one.

UNITED STATES STILL HAS OIL

The United States, of course, will continue for many years to be important as a producer of oil. Any country that has 20,000,000,000 barrels of proven oil inside of her cannot be counted out in the near future. And it is reasonable to expect that we shall continue to discover new oil pools, perhaps even substantial ones.

Nevertheless, America's crown, symbolizing supremacy as the oil empire of the world, is sliding down over one eye, for the obvious reasons that our development has been much more intense than that of any other country and that consumption has been outdistancing our new discoveries. We have been, in other words, living on our fat.

The United States has been the oil center of the world—not because there has been more oil here than elsewhere, or because we have more than all of the rest of the world combined, but because we have had the enterprise, the technical genius, and the resourcefulness to produce it.

We have also been using it faster on highways and railroads, and in ships, planes, homes, and factories—so fast, indeed, as to be prodigal. Although we shall continue to meet civilian and industrial requirements after the war, even though they are sure to be greater than we have ever known them, the American oil industry will gradually but inevitably migrate abroad. The capital of the oil empire is on the move to the Middle East—to the Persian Gulf and countries adjacent thereto,

such as Arabia, Iraq, Iran, Kuwait, Bahrein, and perhaps even Afghanistan. Nor is it traveling on a camel.

MUST GO WHERE SUPPLY IS

If we are to maintain and extend our gasoline civilization we must be prepared to go where gasoline is to be had. I am speaking objectively, not imperialistically, and with the fixed conviction that the petroleum of the world, as with all other great natural resources, belongs to the people of the world on some basis that will be equitable, considering all of the circumstances.

As Petroleum Administrator, I can say authoritatively that the petroleum which lies within our continental limits cannot be depended upon to supply us forever, or even for long. On the contrary, we cannot be certain that our known reserves have a relatively short life expectancy of 14 years and it is up to us to take out some form of mutual insurance. Fourteen years are little enough in the life of an individual; in the life of a nation they are as a short click at the hand of a telegrapher.

If I may suggest—again nonimperialistically—the kind of insurance we ought to have, it is that Uncle Sam formulate and adopt a foreign oil policy consistent with our democratic principles and with due regard to the just claims of others. John Bull has been doing this for a long time, with striking benefits both to himself and to the British oil industry.

SHOULD BE REIMBURSED

In view of the alarming rate at which our petroleum reserve position is being weakened by the abnormal drain due to our own and other Allied military demands, it has been suggested in some quarters that it might help to balance our petroleum budget if, at the end of hostilities, we were to be reimbursed in kind from reserves which have not taken the punishment that our own have.

So badly has our natural crude supply been hit that there can be no doubt as to our future dependence upon imports or synthetic production. Repayment in kind would ease the pressure, which is certain to increase as known reserves decrease and demand shows no signs of falling off.

One of our very first undertakings ought to be to store in this country vast quantities of crude and even, if necessary, of refined products. We should store underground where possible and aboveground where necessary. This is not only a practical measure, it will be an urgent thing to do as soon as peace comes. We shall be carelessly exposing ourselves to grave risks unless we build up and maintain reserves that will last at least 20 years, regardless of what the demands may be. We can all remember the day when we had known estimated reserves for 20 years, and we have anxiously learned how rapidly a supply of even that amount can be diminished.

So far as oil is concerned, the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China should mutually covenant: (1) to share as a post-war responsibility the rehabilitation of war damage to oil facilities in all parts of the world, including Russia, the Dutch East Indies, Rumania, etc.; (2) to make oil supplies available upon fair and equitable terms to all nations and peoples; and (3) to forbid oil supplies to any nation which violates the basic principles of international law as defined by the United Nations at the peace table.

ADMINISTRATION ACTING

Naturally, the Administration in Washington is keenly aware that the day is rapidly approaching when this Government must take more than a casual interest in foreign fields where concessions are or may be acquired by American interests.

If the British oil industry and the British Government are satisfied with an arrangement that protects the oil interests and assures the British Government of oil when it needs it the most, why might it not be possible to work out an equally advantageous understanding between the American Government and the American oil industry wherever it seems to be to their mutual interest?

This is the question that we are asking ourselves. It has been carefully pondered to the extent that the Petroleum Reserve Corporation, a Government agency, was born a few months ago—born but not yet weaned. Its officers are the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration. The Secretary of the Interior is the president of the Corporation.

The Petroleum Reserve Corporation will attempt to explore and encourage the national interests of the United States in the petroleum fields of the world where private industry is willing to go, and to propose safeguards for those interests.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, from that article, I desire to read a few excerpts which are both timely and apropos:

The United States, of course, will continue for many years to be important as a producer of oil. Any country that has 20,000,000,000 barrels of proven oil inside of her cannot be counted out in the near future. And it is reasonable to expect that we shall continue to discover new oil pools, perhaps even substantial ones.

* * * * *

The United States has been the oil center of the world—not because there has been more oil here than elsewhere, or because we have more than all of the rest of the world combined, but because we have had the enterprise, the technical genius, and the resourcefulness to produce it.

We have also been using it faster on highways and railroads, and in ships, planes, homes, and factories—so fast, indeed, as to be prodigal. Although we shall continue to meet civilian and industrial requirements after the war, even though they are sure to be greater than we have ever known them, the American oil industry will gradually but inevitably migrate abroad. The capital of the oil empire is on the move to the Middle East—to the Persian Gulf and countries adjacent thereto, such as Arabia, Iraq, Iran, Kuwait, Bahrein, and perhaps even Afghanistan. Nor is it traveling on a camel.

* * * * *

If I may suggest—again nonimperialistically—the kind of insurance we ought to have, is that Uncle Sam formulate and adopt a foreign oil policy consistent with our democratic principles and with due regard to the just claims of others. John Bull has been doing this for a long time, with striking benefits both to himself and to the British oil industry.

SHOULD BE REIMBURSED

In view of the alarming rate at which our petroleum reserve position is being weakened by the abnormal drain due to our own and other Allied military demands, it has been suggested in some quarters that it might help to balance our petroleum budget if, at the end of hostilities, we were to be reimbursed in kind from reserves which have not taken the punishment that our own have.

So badly has our natural crude supply been hit that there can be no doubt as to our future dependence upon imports or synthetic production. Repayment in kind would ease the pressure, which is certain to increase as known reserves decrease and demand shows no signs of falling off.

One of our very first undertakings ought to be to store in this country vast quantities of crude and even, if necessary, of refined products. We should store underground where possible and above ground where necessary. This is not only a practical measure, it will be an urgent thing to do as soon as peace comes. We shall be carelessly exposing ourselves to grave risks unless we build up and maintain reserves that will last at least 20 years, regardless of what the demands may be. We can all remember the day when we had known estimated reserves for 20 years, and we have anxiously learned how rapidly a supply of even that amount can be diminished.

So far as oil is concerned, the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and China should mutually covenant: (1) to share as a post-war responsibility the rehabilitation of war damage to oil facilities in all parts of the world, including Russia, the Dutch East Indies, Rumania, etc.; (2) to make oil supplies available upon fair and equitable terms to all nations and peoples; and (3) to forbid oil supplies to any nation which violates the basic principles of international law as defined by the United Nations at the peace table.

ADMINISTRATION ACTING

Naturally, the administration in Washington is keenly aware that the day is rapidly approaching when this Government must take more than a casual interest in foreign fields where concessions are or may be acquired by American interests.

* * * * *

The Petroleum Reserves Corporation will attempt to explore and encourage the national interests of the United States in the petroleum fields of the world where private industry is willing to go, and to propose safeguards for those interests.

I am pleased to learn of the enterprise and activities of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation and of the Secretary of the Interior. The subcommittee and the Truman committee are now at work preparing a report which will emphasize the importance of petroleum, both now and in the post-war period, and the necessity for serious and immediate consideration of a petroleum policy on the part of the Congress, so that the known reserves of the world, particularly those in which we have interests, may be developed along democratic lines, as indicated in the statement published in the press recently, emanating from the Secretary of the Interior.

To my way of thinking, Mr. President, with the coming emphasis on aviation, the adoption of a permanent petroleum policy by the United States Congress is of vital and immediate importance. To my mind also, we have neglected this problem, which should have recommended itself immediately after World War No. 1 had concluded. Therefore, the delay of the past 25 years, which has been a serious one, should prompt us to expedite the formation of a policy which will relieve the strain on hemispherical petroleum supplies and permit us to participate with other nations in the known petroleum reserves of other parts of the world.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I am in complete agreement with what I have heard of the speech of the Senator from New York. As one of those who have interested themselves in the oil situation, I am grateful that he has shown such industry

and interest in making this contribution. It cannot be too greatly stressed.

I should like to ask him whether he and the subcommittee of which he is a member intend to explore the question of Government cooperation and assistance to Americans who are seeking to develop oil resources for us in foreign countries.

Mr. MEAD. That is a very appropriate question, and one which in my judgment is vitally important in any approach to the solution of this problem. We are going to hear from the representatives of American interests before we conclude our report. We are going to hear from those in charge of the official agencies which have to do with petroleum. Furthermore, before we finish our report, I hope it will embrace suitable recommendations for the consideration of a policy by the Congress which will include the thought just expressed by my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I am very glad to hear that statement, because, as the Senator very well knows, since he and I were together at the time, in the case of Great Britain there is a very close working relationship between the Government and individual oil men in the foreign field, which has been very beneficial to Great Britain and to the oil industry. I am glad to hear the Senator say that his committee is going to hear testimony from our oil men and from representatives of our Petroleum Reserves Corporation. I wish him success in working out the problem.

Mr. MEAD. I appreciate the interest of my colleague, because I know that he realizes the importance of the problem. I am sure that with his interest, we shall be able to effectuate a policy which will be helpful to the United States Government and beneficial to those who are concerned in the development of resources abroad in which we have an equity.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded.

INVESTIGATION OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—TRANSPORTATION (PT. 13 OF REPT. NO. 10)

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to submit a report from the Truman committee on the question of transportation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, first of all, I wish to say to my colleagues that the Truman committee has devoted considerable time to the question of transportation. That question is of vital interest to several committees of the Senate, including the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Interstate Commerce. Other committees have made notable contributions since the beginning of the emergency in the way of legislation for the improvement of our transportation facilities.

The province of the Truman committee does not interfere with the activities of the several committees which I have mentioned. Within its scope come all activities included in the Nation's war effort, and such transportation facilities as are necessary to improve and expedite the delivery of material, supplies, and equipment vitally necessary for our Nation's war effort. I trust that the report which I shall submit will be read by every Member of the Senate, for I am sure that Senators will find a great many constructive suggestions in the report, and that the report will be the forerunner of an improved policy affecting transportation and transportation facilities generally. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Truman committee, I shall file this report with the Senate today.

The importance of transportation to the war effort cannot be overemphasized. War materials and essential civilian goods must be transported during every stage of their development from the raw materials in the ground through manufacturing and distributing facilities to the point of final consumption. This is indeed a gigantic task.

At the beginning of the war the United States had the finest transportation system in the world. It consisted of a vast and intricate maze of railroads, air lines, highways for trucks and busses, water routes for barges and ships, and pipe lines for gas and petroleum products. Without this magnificent transportation system it would have been impossible for us to accomplish the miracles of production that have been performed.

When the German submarines sunk our ships and it became necessary to throw upon the railroads the overland movement of oil and other shipments theretofore carried by our coastwise and intercoastal shipping, Goebbels chortled gleefully that transportation would be the Achilles heel of the United States.

Goebbels was wrong. Our transportation system has carried an enormously greater amount of traffic than had ever before been thought possible. It has done so despite steadily diminishing facilities, the loss of our coastwise water routes, and our sources of rubber, primarily by working harder and using equipment more efficiently. Management and labor of transportation agencies and the shippers deserve commendation.

But the war is not over, and the volume of traffic to be handled in 1944 is expected to exceed substantially the record-breaking volume handled in 1943. In the case of many transportation services, the volume estimated for 1944 is determined not by the demand but by the estimated limit of capacity. It is vitally important that the transportation system be not permitted to break down. The results of any such break-down would be far reaching and might be disastrous. It would take from 6 months to a year or more to produce and put into operation the new facilities which would correct the break-down. For these reasons, the committee was of the opinion that the subject of transportation required an investigation to make certain that in the press of other war activities we would not neglect our transportation facilities beyond a safe point. Locomotives, freight and passenger cars, rails, trucks, busses, and tires wear out. We must be prepared either to replace them or to do without the transportation which they could provide.

The committee has found that additional conservation of transportation is possible particularly if the public understands the seriousness of the situation and gives its wholehearted cooperation. But, by and large, the savings through further conservation of transportation facilities, although substantial, will be relatively small and not sufficient to offset the need for additional transportation equipment.

Just as in the case of farm equipment, which was investigated by the committee in the latter part of 1942, the committee found that the manufacture of transportation equipment was being neglected in favor of the manufacture of war matériel. To some extent this was necessary, and it was also natural because the need of war matériel is more readily apparent. The significance of transportation and maintenance of food production, even in total war, is less conspicuous.

However, the committee is pleased to be able to report that during its investigation of transportation, many important steps have been taken to provide additional new transportation equipment. This indicates an increased appreciation of the essentiality of transportation service. Barring unforeseen developments, these steps, and others which the committee has been assured will be taken, should avoid any breakdown or substantial diminution of essential transportation. But further and constant attention should be given to the problem if we expect the transportation system to be adequate to meet all the important demands our war effort will make upon it in 1944.

The production of locomotives during the first 9 months of this year was substantially below schedule, but this has been rectified. Recently, provision was made for the manufacture of additional freight cars. Still more are needed.

Practically no new trucks have been produced for our trucking industry since 1941, and the need for repair parts as vehicles wore out became very great. The committee found that adequate supplies of parts were not being produced because of the low priority assigned to them as compared to the priority for production of military matériel. This has now been changed, and parts for medium and heavy civilian trucks are given the same priority as parts for military trucks, although parts for light trucks and passenger cars still have an inferior priority.

Similarly, the committee found that even the small quantities of new trucks authorized for replacement purposes were not being manufactured because of the higher priorities assigned to trucks for military use. In 1941, 576,000 new trucks were required for replacement needs alone. Only 7,500 trucks were to be manufactured for civilian use during the last half of 1943, and only 19,218 during the first half of 1944. Despite

these small numbers and the great need for replenishment, the committee found that unless prompt action were taken the manufacture of the 7,500 trucks for 1943 would not be completed until June 1944 and that it was doubtful that the 19,218 trucks would be completed by the end of 1944.

At the same time, for our armies and those of our allies, the War Department had requested the production of 742,000 trucks in 1944 in addition to the more than 600,000 trucks estimated to be produced in 1943 for military service, and the additional hundreds of thousands of military trucks produced for us and our allies in prior years.

Lend-Lease had requested more than 52,000 trucks, and the Office of Economic Warfare asked for 15,000. The committee called attention to the serious situation with respect to trucks for our motor-transport industry, and on November 2, 1943, lend-lease requirements were reduced by more than 50 percent, the Office of Economic Warfare by 36 percent, and the War Department by 3 percent, and the 1944 truck production for domestic use was increased from 19,218 for the first 6 months to 81,000 for the entire year. Priority equal to military production was accorded to civilian trucks. This is an improvement. Yet production will not be sufficient to furnish needed replacements. The committee does not want to take even the slightest risk of impeding the progress of the war by insisting upon the reduction of what might prove to be unnecessarily large requests by the War Department for trucks; but the committee has pointed out to the War Department the great need for trucks in the domestic motor-transport industry, which is so essential to military production. The committee has requested that the War Department itself subject its new-truck program to the most rigorous scrutiny. The committee will also inquire as to the War Department's plans for improving the efficiency of utilization of the trucks it has already acquired for noncombat purposes.

Also, trucks cannot run without tires, and the situation with respect to heavy-duty truck and bus tires is extremely critical. This is due to the constantly increasing requests of the War Department for new trucks, and to the fact that we have not yet learned how to make heavy-duty truck tires of synthetic rubber, whether rayon or cotton cord is used, equal in performance to natural-rubber truck tires. This presents an additional and formidable reason for the committee's recommendation that the War Department subject its estimates of truck requirements for 1944 to the most rigorous scrutiny.

Similarly, the air lines are suffering from lack of equipment. In May 1942, the military services acquired approximately half of the 324 planes then owned by the air lines. The air lines increased their efficiency by operating planes in excess of 11 hours a day instead of 8, and carrying loads more nearly approaching total capacity.

These efficiencies enabled the air lines in the year ending June 30, 1943, with only about 170 planes, to handle almost as many passenger-miles and a far greater quantity of mail, express, and excess baggage than they had handled in the preceding year with 324 planes. The air lines deserve great credit for this magnificent achievement. However, additional air transportation is needed, and the committee has recommended to the Army and Navy that some of the planes taken from the air lines be returned to them as rapidly as possible. Up to December 1, 1943, only 20 planes had been returned to the air lines, 6 of which were replacements for destroyed planes. Seven additional planes are now in the process of being returned. More should be returned as soon as it is possible to do so, especially as neither the War Department nor the Navy Department can show a record of using the planes allocated to them with efficiency comparable to that of the air lines. Although this should not be the sole or controlling factor, it is very important and should be given most careful consideration before transport planes are assigned to other uses where the efficiency factor will be substantially less.

To summarize, our transportation system requires new facilities and equipment, and it is extremely important that action be taken far enough in advance to insure that the new facilities and equipment will be available when they will be required. Substantial progress has been made in this direction, especially during the last few months, but further and constant attention to the problem is required.

Mr. President, what I have said is in substance a summary of the subcommittee's report. The complete report I now send to the desk and ask that it be printed, and I trust that it will be read by every Member of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report submitted by the Senator from New York will be printed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I desire to speak on the report submitted by the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, as a member of the Truman committee, I desire to make a few observations about the report on transportation which has just been presented to the Senate by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD].

During the course of this investigation and the preparation of this report I have had occasion to take part in some of the inquiries and to observe the progress of the study.

Transportation, of course, is an extremely large subject, and it was obvious that the committee could not explore all of its fields in the time and with the staff at its disposal, and therefore the committee restricted its attention to matters concerned with transportation which had a direct and substantial relation to the adequacy of the system to carry essential traffic during the war.

In a sense the committee has been concerned with transportation since it was first appointed, now nearly 3 years ago, because transportation is involved in practically every other activity, and many industries are not only affected by it but produce materials and components on which transportation facilities depend.

The specific investigation of transportation as a subject in itself, however, has been in progress for over 6 months and has involved exploring many matters not even referred to in the report. Some of these, of course, were of a type which in the judgment of the committee were not related to the war effort directly enough to require discussion.

There is a great field for improvement in transportation to which our attention should be directed when peacetime activities can again be resumed and concerning which there are many problems, both governmental and operative, which will have to be worked out. An example of one improvement which could be made is the tremendous saving and economy that could be achieved through closer coordination of our various forms of transportation, through such measures as unit packaging, transshipment, and the establishment of joint rates. The problems to be solved in achieving this improvement are tremendous but not insuperable, and they must be solved with fairness and equity to all concerned, and in such a way as to preserve in its full vigor our competitive system of free enterprise.

While, of course, improvement in utilization of transportation facilities is most necessary to the war effort, improvement in the type of coordination I have referred to could be obtained only after extensive study and by the use of materials and facilities which are now fully absorbed by direct and immediate war demands.

Another example of a study in which I participated but which is not referred to in the report is the subject of the Army's spare parts procurement policies and practices. At a private hearing in Detroit the committee was told that by reducing the list of spare parts bought for anticipated first-year replacement needs concurrently with the purchase of the vehicle itself and by buying other parts directly from their actual manufacturer rather than through the assembler of the vehicle, a saving of a billion dollars annually would be made. The question, of course, naturally arises why such savings could not have been achieved earlier. Making due allowances for the fact that the Army grew tremendously in a very short period of time and did not in the earlier stages of the war possess the staffs and the experience which it now possesses, still a much more businesslike job of acquiring replacement parts should have been done.

By buying replacement parts from the vehicle manufacturer it is true that the Army was able to take advantage of the vehicle manufacturer's procurement, engineering, and inspection staffs, plus whatever value might be realized from the vehicle manufacturer standing behind his product. But the Army lost through that practice the advantage of

economy and usefulness which result from full information as to parts that are interchangeable.

Many vehicle manufacturers buy many of their component parts from a common source. If the Army had bought its parts from that same source it would have been able simultaneously to ascertain the extent to which those parts were interchangeable. The unit manufacturer's part number would have identified the part, or in the case where many unit manufacturers produced an identical part proper notation of that fact could also have been made. Full interchangeability information renders the parts more useful since the same stock of parts can service more vehicles. The importance of this fact alone at a time when shipping facilities to front line combat areas were very short because of the rate of sinkings cannot be overemphasized, nor can an accurate appraisal be made of the effect of the lack of it upon the progress of the war.

The committee was informed that steps have been and are being taken to improve the use of parts through the development of interchangeability information, and the committee is following the progress that is being made. At the same time it is regretted that the policies and practices established by the War Department were such that earlier advantage could not be taken of the economies and efficiencies which would have resulted from a more businesslike method of buying.

Because of the nature of the subject, which called for a great variety of minor investigations and assembly of statistics and reports from Government agencies and transportation trade associations and individuals, no public hearings on transportation and comparatively few private hearings were held.

As to the report itself, there are a few matters which I should like to mention specifically:

I come from a State where motor-vehicle production has its center and where manufacturing plants and war workers are especially dependent upon rubber-borne transportation for the continuance of the splendid production record they have made.

Motor-carrier transportation is essential to the war production of Detroit and other Michigan cities, primarily because the industries in Detroit and our other cities use a type of operation called progressive manufacture. By that it is meant that raw materials are shunted around from one subcontractor to another until finally fashioned into a finished product. For example, the Chrysler tank is said to embody materials from 3,000 subcontractors, and those subcontractors for the most part are located either in Detroit or within 300 or 400 miles from Detroit. The materials must be fed into the production lines to meet the schedules. There is no bank of parts or materials. They must arrive approximately at the time they are to be used. Detroit is noted for not using the old flour-bin method of production. To build up a bank of materials now would not only be expensive but would absorb manpower, materials, and facilities, and would retard production.

Progressive manufacturing is a device that grew out of the production of automobiles. It started more than 20 years ago. I think that W. C. Cowling, of Ford Motor Co., was the first man who thought of letting transportation agencies take care of the inventory. That method has proved very efficient. That is one of the reasons why Detroit and Michigan are able to produce the tremendous volume they now turn out. Detroit is more advanced in this respect than many other industrial areas. Our plants are built on that basis. That is why there is not any storage space at the ends of the production lines that would permit taking care of the materials if they could be maintained. It is a hand to mouth existence in manufacturing.

Here is an example of Detroit's dependence on truck transportation. The truck schedule from the Cleveland area is 10 to 12 hours. The railroad schedule from Cleveland into Detroit is about 3 days. We simply cannot afford to rely on railroad transportation for many materials we get from Cleveland. For some of the heavy basic materials, it is necessary to use rail. Coal, lumber, and sometimes steel come from great distances and move principally by rail. But, in general, if highway carriers are not available to keep up the flow of components, the production lines shut down and all the men who come to work that day are sent home. Production hours are lost.

That, Mr. President, is why I am so concerned about the slowness of the program to provide replacements of equipment for the motor carriers.

The industries in Detroit, in 1940, seeing the war coming on for the United States, made a rather extensive survey and came to the conclusion that Detroit would not be tied up for transportation as it had been in the last war, when from 1917 through 1921 the area was intermittently under embargo. This conclusion was based partly on the improved condition of the railroad plants and the know-how the railroads had gained and partly upon the knowledge that we had a reservoir of transportation that we did not have in the other war, composed of the fleets of trucks in the area. We said: "We manufacture transportation and we can also produce enough to take care of our needs," but we found that the stopping of the production of trucks for civilian use partly destroyed that reservoir and now if they are not going to supply the for-hire carriers with sufficient parts and new equipment, the reservoir will dry up.

In this war, assembly lines have been extended, and what is true of Detroit and other Michigan cities is, in a sense, true of the entire country, namely, that the motortruck is an important part of the conveyor belt of industry. I might mention as an example the fact that the B–24 Liberators rolling off the end of the assembly line at Tulsa, Okla., have traveled over 1,000 miles in the progress of their assembly. Main components fabricated at Willow Run are loaded in trailers and hauled by truck all the way to Tulsa, where they are assembled into a finished plane.

Even if this method of manufacture were not the most efficient and economical, we have little choice at this stage but to continue it, because reverting to the "flour-bin" method of manufacturing would involve the building up of substantial inventories at all the points of production where the progressive method of manufacture was being discontinued. Building up such inventories would involve excessive amounts of materials, manpower, and facilities which we do not have. The same system of small inventories will at the close of this war save our taxpayers millions of dollars in the termination of war contracts, and that is why we must support it by sufficient trucking equipment.

For these reasons I have desired to call attention particularly to the committee's observations and recommendations in the motor-transport section of the report concerning the need for replacement parts, new trucks, and busses, tires, and speed.

Not only do I approve of the statements in the report with regard to replacement parts, but I believe that one of them should be emphasized, that is, the need of providing sufficient parts so that farmers and war workers will be able to maintain the vehicles upon which they are so dependent. I think the rating for parts for automobiles and light trucks should be equal to military production, not alone because interchangeability as to many of the parts with the heavier trucks renders it wise to schedule the entire anticipated production of parts as one run, but because it seems to me that unless the farmer and the war worker can carry on their activities, our entire production, much of which is of military articles, will surely suffer.

I also desire to say something about the matter of speed limitation. Slowing speed in our rubber-borne commercial transportation arteries limits the service they can render. The committee's original recommendation of a 40-mile limit was confined to trucks and busses. Unless reliable tests show substantially increased tire wear at the higher rate, I recommend strongly that it be permitted.

With respect to the section on tires, I should like to add that the figures included in the report as to requirements and production capacity, based on information recently furnished to the committee by the Office of the Rubber Director, are substantially different from those furnished in the report of the Rubber Director's office on October 25, 1943, only 7 weeks ago. In that report the total truck and bus tire requirements were stated at over 22,000,000, being 1,000,000 more tires than the figure of 21,000,000 given to the committee last week. The estimate of the capacity of production facilities given in the October 25 report was approximately 15,000,000, or 3,000,000 less than the more recent

and more optimistic estimate given the committee. Based on the October 25 report, therefore, the deficiency in truck and bus tires would have been 7,000,000, or almost one-third of the total requirements, whereas on the figures received last week the deficiency is only 3,000,000, or one-seventh of the total requirements. Although, no doubt, the Rubber Director's change of estimates is based upon his familiarity with the whole tire-production situation, the October 25 report represents a much more serious situation than the later figures indicate.

Furthermore, we have a very important unknown factor which affects the reliability of either set of figures. That factor is that no one, including the Rubber Director and the tire manufacturers, apparently knows just how good the synthetic heavy-duty truck and bus tire is going to be.

In this connection I should like to read to the Senate a passage from the testimony of the Deputy Rubber Director before the committee on Thursday, December 9, 1943:

Mr. TOMPKINS. Are you referring to the quality of a synthetic tire?

Senator FERGUSON. Yes. We had some evidence here this morning that we expected some trouble.

Mr. TOMPKINS. We may have trouble. Bear in mind, your truck and bus tires are not made of synthetic rubber yet in the larger sizes.

Senator FERGUSON. No; but, as I understand it, we are going to start about midyear to do it.

Mr. TOMPKINS. And by that time it is our hope and belief that the manufacturers will have learned how to make a tire that is satisfactory out of synthetic rubber. If they don't, then we will have to find some other way of doing it.

An important decision awaits the American public on large truck tires. If we are successful in manufacturing them with a greater percentage of synthetic rubber as soon as expected by the Rubber Director, we should be able to get over the hump. But in the meantime it is well for us to have in mind the necessity of recapping all our present tires before they are worn to the point where they cannot be recapped, and of conserving all our tires through frequent inspection, proper inflation, easier starting and stopping, slow speed on curves and in turning corners, proper wheel alinement, and all other methods of preventive maintenance.

I want to add this about air lines. The war has proved the airplane to be a most vital part of our transportation system, for many times it is speed that counts. The air lines have done a magnificent job in carrying the traffic they have handled with the equipment they have been permitted to retain. No other form of transport has experienced so great an actual loss of equipment because of being needed for direct military use, as have the air lines. Certainly if the need for military transport planes will permit it, we ought to turn back to the air lines more of the planes taken from them as soon as we possibly can.

Soon the rate of plane production will be such that 2 weeks' production of transport planes of the type used by the air lines will be sufficient to double their present equipment. The air services ought to consider seriously whether the general transportation benefit that would result from adding this much, or some smaller amount, of equipment to the air lines would be sufficiently valuable to the war effort to justify modification of their procurement program so as to obtain it.

I think we all realize that we owe a debt of gratitude to our transportation agencies, including both operators and employees, for the way they have risen to overcome the serious and unforeseen obstacles which the war emergency has thrust upon them. We should, however, take all necessary steps to insure, beyond any doubt, that essential transportation service will be maintained. Therefore, Mr. President, all our Government agencies should, from time to time, reappraise their war requirements, so as to release to civilian use any unneeded manufacturing capacity and manpower for the purpose of improving our transportation plant and the service it can render to the country in time of war.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I desire to say that the report submitted by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is the unanimous report of the special committee and has the complete endorsement of every member of that committee. I think the report is a good one.

COURT REPORTERS IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3611) to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States, to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. KILGORE, Mr. MCCARRAN, and Mr. FERGUSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

ELIMINATION OF PRIVATE SUITS ARISING OUT OF FRAUDS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I send to the desk the conference report on House bill 1203, an act to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of fraud against the United States, and move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1203) entitled "An act to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with the following amendments: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment numbered 1, insert "A" after "SEC. 3491" on page 1, line 6, of the House engrossed bill, and on page 2, line 2, after "suit." strike out the quotation mark and insert the following:

"(B) Except as hereinafter provided, such suit may be brought and carried on by any person, as well for himself as for the United States, the same shall be at the sole cost and charge of such person, and shall be in the name of the United States, but shall not be withdrawn or discontinued without the consent, in writing, of the judge of the court and the district attorney, first filed in the case, setting forth their reasons for such consent.

"(C) Whenever any such suit shall be brought by any person under clause (B) notice of the pendency of such suit shall be given to the United States by serving upon the United States attorney for the district in which such suit shall have been brought a copy of the bill of complaint and by sending, by registered mail, to the Attorney General of the United States at Washington, District of Columbia, a copy of such bill together with a disclosure in writing of substantially all evidence and information in his possession material to the effective prosecution of such suit. The United States shall have sixty days, after service as above provided, within which to enter appearance in such suit. If the United States shall fail, or decline in writing to the court, during said period of sixty days to enter any such suit, such person may carry on such suit. If the United States within said period shall enter appearance in such suit the same shall be carried on solely by the United States. In carrying on such suit the United States shall not be bound by any action taken by the person who brought it, and may proceed in all respects as if it were instituting the suit: *Provided*, That if the United States shall fail to carry on such suit with due diligence within a period of 6 months from the date of its appearance therein, or within such additional time as the court after notice may allow, such suit may be carried on by the person bringing the same in accordance with clause (B) above. The court shall have no jurisdiction to proceed with any such suit brought under clause (B) or pending suit brought under section 3491 of the Revised Statutes whenever it shall be made to appear that such suit was based upon evidence or information in the possession of the United States, or any agency, officer or employee thereof, at the time such suit was brought: *Provided, however*, That no abatement shall be had as to a suit pending at the effective date of this Act if before such suit was filed such person had in his possession and voluntarily disclosed to the Attorney General substantial evidence and information which was not theretofore in the possession of the Department of Justice.

"(D) In any suit whether or not on appeal pending at the effective date of this Act brought under Revised Statutes, section 3491, the court in which such suit is pending shall

stay all further proceedings, and shall forthwith cause written notice, by registered mail, to be given the Attorney General that such suit is pending, and the Attorney General shall have sixty days from the date of such notice to appear and carry on such suit in accordance with clause (C).

"(E) (1) In any such suit, if carried on by the United States as herein provided, the court may award to the person who brought such suit, out of the proceeds of such suit or any settlement of any claim involved therein, which shall be collected, an amount which in the judgment of the court is fair and reasonable compensation to such person for disclosure of the information or evidence not in the possession of the United States when such suit was brought. Any such award shall in no event exceed one-tenth of the proceeds of such suit or any settlement thereof.

"(2) In any such suit when not carried on by the United States as herein provided, whether heretofore or hereafter brought, the court may award to the person who brought such suit and prosecuted it to final judgment, or to settlement, as provided in clause (B), out of the proceeds of such suit or any settlement of any claim involved therein, which shall be collected, an amount, not in excess of one-fourth of the proceeds of such suit or any settlement thereof, which in the judgment of the court is fair and reasonable compensation to such person for the collection of any forfeiture and damages; and such person shall be entitled to receive to his own use such reasonable expenses as the court shall find to have been necessarily incurred and all costs the court may award against the defendant, to be allowed and taxed according to any provision of law or rule of court in force, or that shall be in force in suits between private parties in said court: *Provided*, That such person shall be liable for all costs incurred by himself in such case and shall have no claim therefor on the United States.

"SEC. 2. Section 3493 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 234) is hereby repealed."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same.

Amendments numbered 3 and 4: That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3 and 4.

Amendment to the title: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

FREDERICK VAN NUYS,
PAT MCCARRAN,
JOHN A. DANAHER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
CLARENCE E. HANCOCK,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the Senator from Indiana moved that the Senate proceed to consider the report. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Indiana. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt. Senators who favor the motion will stand.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection to consideration of the report. I have no objection to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the report will be considered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I understood there was to be a vote on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Those opposed to the motion will stand. The "ayes" have it, and the motion is agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and called Mr. AIKEN's name.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois desire to ask the Chair a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I desire to ask the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] to yield before he proceeds further.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I am opposed to taking up the conference report. I do not wish to withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum unless the matter of taking up the conference report is suspended so the Senator from Illinois may make his request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the motion to take up the report has already been agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator from Illinois desire to address himself to the motion to take up the report?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to consider the report has been agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; it was not agreed to. The question was put to a vote, and I suggested the absence of a quorum, pending the matter of a vote on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the Chair is of the opinion that the Senator from Missouri suggested the absence of a quorum after the motion to consider had been agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A standing vote was had, and I suggested the absence of a quorum while the vote was being taken. I do not think there will be any time gained by arbitrary decisions on the part of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not desire to make any arbitrary decisions. If the Senator wants a quorum, the Chair will order a roll call. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Caraway	Green
Austin	Chandler	Guffey
Bailey	Chavez	Gurney
Ball	Clark, Idaho	Hatch
Bankhead	Clark, Mo.	Hayden
Barkley	Connally	Hill
Bone	Danaher	Holman
Brewster	Davis	Johnson, Calif.
Bridges	Downey	Johnson, Colo.
Brooks	Eastland	Kilgore
Burton	Ellender	La Follette
Bushfield	Ferguson	Langer
Butler	George	Lodge
Byrd	Gerry	Lucas
Capper	Gillette	McCarran
McClellan	Overton	Tunnell
McFarland	Radcliffe	Tydings
McKellar	Reed	Vandenberg
Maybank	Revercomb	Van Nuys
Mead	Robertson	Wallgren
Millikin	Smith	Walsh, Mass.
Moore	Taft	Walsh, N. J.
Murdock	Thomas, Idaho	Wheeler
Murray	Thomas, Okla.	Wherry
Nye	Thomas, Utah	White
O'Mahoney	Truman	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is, Shall the conference report be taken up? [Putting the question.] The Chair believes the "ayes" have it, and the motion of the Senator from Indiana is therefore agreed to.

Mr. VAN NUYS obtained the floor.

Mr. DANAHER and Mr. MOORE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. VAN NUYS. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I suppose that every Member of the Senate will be called upon to give his views with reference to Senate bill 1285, the so-called soldiers' vote bill. The importance of the objective of the bill is such that one is obliged, and it is his duty, to make an explanation of his stand.

All of the arguments made for or against the measure were, of course, prefaced with an approval of its objectives. It should not be necessary for one to have to go into great detail to prove that he is willing to grant every right and privilege to every American citizen who unfortunately finds himself, either by his own voluntary will or by compulsion, in the armed forces of the country. I know that every Member of the Senate wants every soldier to have all the rights and privileges that it may be possible to accord him. One of those valuable rights or privileges is his exercise of the ballot in elections that may be held while he is away from his voting precinct.

I hope I am as anxious to give every consideration to every right or privilege to the soldiers as any other man, and I hope I am as ready as any Member of Congress to go as far as I legally can to accord that right or privilege. I want the ballots to be cast by the soldiers, or by any other citizen in a legal manner and in accordance with the laws of the States of which they are citizens, and I am willing and anxious to go as far as the Congress can go in aid of the States to facilitate the privilege of those absent from their States to cast their votes. I would go as far as I had a lawful right to go as a Member of Congress to provide means for casting the vote and having it fairly counted.

Since this is a party government, naturally any law having to do with elections is partisan, whatever we may say about it. All of the sparring and maneuvering in connection with this voting bill has been partisan. It became so

definitely partisan that bitterness developed, which is lamentable, but inevitable. The direction of the voting machinery was finally left in the hands of the President, who presumably will be a candidate to succeed himself in the coming election. This in itself is unprecedented, to say the least.

If it be urged that to raise this objection manifests a lack of confidence in the President, I cite his record concerning nominations and elections with which he has heretofore been connected as a possible justification for not having full confidence in him with respect to elections. I cite the spectacle of the so-called Democratic National Convention in Chicago in 1940, at which he was "drafted." I was a helpless delegate in that convention. One of the authors of this bill was also a delegate, and I remember well the inadvertent statement made by him, that "if this had been a free and open convention, I would have allowed my name to go before the convention as a candidate for Vice President." I remember one of our own delegates from Oklahoma placing the name of Paul V. McNutt before the convention in the form of a draft for the Vice Presidency, and I remember that Paul V. McNutt said that he could not under any circumstances allow his name to be placed before the convention, because "my commander in chief has spoken." I remember that the venerable CARTER GLASS came from a sick bed to place the name of James A. Farley before the convention as a candidate for President, and I heard him say: "I never expected to live to see the day when the name of Thomas Jefferson would be hissed in a Democratic convention." I remember when the order came, through Harry Hopkins, that HENRY A. WALLACE was the demand of Franklin D. Roosevelt; and I remember when the First Lady was hurried to the platform to still the uproar that was imminent at the high-handed conduct of the convention; and I remember when our present Vice President came to the platform to deliver an already prepared speech of acceptance and the then Senator Byrnes, now "Assistant President," foresaw the turmoil and hastily warned the Vice President against any such indiscretion before an almost rebellious convention. When memory is on her knees, there returns the nightmare of that tragic mockery as played at the Chicago convention, where a precedent, as strong in the minds and hearts of the people as if it had been written into the Constitution, was arrogantly flouted to secure a third term to satiate the greed of an ambitious man for more power. And now his appetite having grown by what it fed on, we are being led through sophistry into the danger of a fourth term and dictatorship that can never be dislodged short of revolt.

Is there any justification then, or any reason, for lack of confidence in the candidate for a fourth term? I cannot see how any American devoted to the principles of Thomas Jefferson can help but hang his head in shame when the memory of that convention comes to him.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I listened to the Senator for several hours on this same subject. If the Senator will accord me the privilege of finishing my address, I shall be glad to yield to him in proper time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma declines to yield at this time.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I meekly submit to the distinguished Senators from Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, that they should join an alliance that could be made effective against a repetition of such tyranny.

I cite the conduct of the affairs of the people of this country by the administration under the New Deal as a possible reason why there should be a lack of confidence in the administration of this voting machinery. I cite the vote in the Senate upon every issue raised by the partisans for and against this administration. I share a distrust, with millions of others, of the honesty and integrity of the New Deal administration.

I would, however, have resolved my distrust in favor of the support of this bill and its administration by the machinery set up in the bill, because of my anxiety and desire to see the soldiers exercise their privilege of voting, but for the reason that we have not the power.

I voted against it because I believe it to be unconstitutional. To me that is a valid reason; and no political results to me or the party to which I may belong will swerve me from that course. That is the reason I voted against the bill. It was not the result of any conspiracy, or the fear of the results of the elections by reason of full participation of all of the categories contained in the measure. I have no idea, and I doubt if anyone could make an intelligent guess, as to how the soldiers would vote in the coming election. Anything that I might say as to how they would vote would be guess-work entirely.

It is so desirable and just that soldiers be provided with the facility for voting that a means should be found to effectuate that facility by a legal and constitutional method. I do not believe that many Members of Congress, of either party, want to disfranchise the soldiers because of any fear of the results of the election by reason of participation in the election by the soldiers. It is naive, though, to say that the general structure of this bill does not provide at least a means of fraud in conducting the elections and a propagandizing to the end of the desired result.

History provides an example, in the Hayes-Tilden case, of an election in which there was danger of a civil war ensuing because of the partisan character of the decision in that election. Except for the magnanimity and patriotism of Mr. Tilden, civil war might have ensued. Certainly, this Congress, on the heels of a victory over our foreign foes, wants to avoid an intensity of feeling such as would be aroused as was occasioned by the contest in 1876.

The election for which this measure is proposed is 10 months off, and if the war continues then, as we hope it will not, ample time exists for the States to provide the facilities, in conjunction with the military authorities of the United States, to enable the soldiers to cast their ballots. This can be done without any violation of the Constitution of the United States. It is the responsibility and duty of the States to provide means by which the soldiers may vote.

The Constitution of the United States was written and adopted with the thought in mind that politicians in power might invade the rights of the States and of their citizens, because politicians have always schemed to get around the Constitution in order to obtain more power than it gave them. The Constitution therefore limits the power of Congress, and the Federal Government in its power is limited by the Constitution, and one of the definite limitations has to do with elections.

In order to explain my concept of the character of the Constitution and its purpose, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an address delivered by former Senator James A. Reed, of Missouri, at Toledo, Ohio, on October 9, 1936.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MOORE. The address to which I have referred is as follows:

I propose tonight to depart from my usual custom, which is to express whatever views I may have, hoping that they will meet with the approval of at least some of my auditors. I am doing so because I was handed a paper by a man whom I may call a plain, ordinary citizen, who is neither a statesman nor a politician, but just a layman who has done some thinking for himself. It contains so much of sound, plain logic that I intend to present it to you. He says:

"A statesman is only a successful politician. If he wins, many people follow him blindly. They forget that he is a man controlled by the same motives and impulses as all other men. He may be better than the average; he may be worse; but you can count on one thing—that ambition is the besetting sin of all politicians."

Politics is one of the oldest trades in the world. Every President that this country ever had was a politician. Every Congressman and every Senator, every Governor of every State, and every candidate for public office is a politician. All of the New Dealers are politicians. Roosevelt is a politician. So are Farley, Ickes, Wallace, Hopkins, Tugwell, and Miss Perkins. They have the same ambitions that every politician in history has had—to get in office and to stay there.

History is mainly the record of what good politicians did for their people and what bad politicians did to them. By and large, the record is not very good. Unfortunately, there have been more bad rulers than good ones.

History is full of politicians who started out as good rulers and wound up as bad ones. Napoleon was a very good ruler for France at first. He put France on its feet after a terrible revolution. Then he became ambitious to be Emperor of all Europe, and millions of Frenchmen died because of his lust

for power. He told Frenchmen they were dying for the glory of France. They thought they were. But we know better—they died because of Napoleon's ambition for more power.

That was the great sin of Napoleon. But he does not stand alone. Nearly all of the wars which have been fought during the entire course of history were brought about by the ambition of rulers to extend their domains, to magnify their power, and to glorify themselves.

The American Revolution was fought because the people of this country did not like the way the English politicians ruled them. After they found they had no more peaceful ways left to get rid of these bad rulers they revolted against them and by bloodshed established a country where they and their children and you and I and our children could live in freedom from political interference with our private lives. When the Colonists won their liberties, they were faced with the problem of choosing a new set of politicians to rule them.

The leaders of the American Colonists were very wise men.

They knew they had to have politicians. But—

They had all studied a lot of history and they knew there were more bad politicians than good ones, and that the bad ones wanted the citizens' hard-earned money, seized their property and, when the citizens protested, threw them into jail.

They also knew why this was. It was because the citizens had to obey the laws the politicians made, but they had no way to make laws the politicians had to obey.

So these wise men decided to set up our Government in such a way that before it was turned over to the politicians to run, it would be fixed so that those politicians would have to behave themselves.

The way they did it was to write a constitution. The Constitution is a law made by the people to govern politicians. It tells them what they can do and what they cannot do to you. It tells them that they may have so much power to control you and no more.

But since no law is any good unless somebody enforces it, these wise men set up an independent court that the politicians do not control, so that if the politicians did seize power that was not given to them by the Constitution, there would be someone who could say to them, "You can't do that." This is the Supreme Court. Our Constitution and our Supreme Court were the first effective schemes in all history to control politicians and limit their power to govern and to tax.

As a result, in this country we have free speech because if the politicians tried to put someone in jail for attacking them, the Supreme Court will say, "Let him alone."

Also, we have freedom of worship, which many other nations have lost. And our politicians can't take your money or your property from you without paying you for it, like they can in so many other countries today.

These are only a few of the things we have because we have a law (the Constitution) to govern our politicians and a Court to make them obey that law.

What has happened in this country under this law to keep politicians in their places? Since it limited their power, it has prevented them from meddling in our private affairs and plundering us. As a result, our cost of government, until the last few years, has been low and this country grew and prospered like no country in all history. Millions of people from other lands where they were tyrannized by their politicians came over here. My father and mother did, and so did the fathers and mothers of most of you. And if the immigration laws let them, there would be millions more who would rush over here from Europe and the rest of the world. Today it is still the finest and best country on earth to live in.

Ever since the Constitution was established, politicians have schemed to get around it—to get more power than it gave them, and to weaken the Supreme Court. They have frequently tried to limit the Court's power and, as usual, are talking about it again. They have tried to get the people angry with the Court for its decisions. They have tried to scare the people by saying the country would go to pot after some of the Court's decisions. That is what President Roosevelt tried to do when the Supreme Court threw the N. R. A. and the A. A. A. out.

But in the past all of these attacks have failed. The people of this country still realize that the Supreme Court is the only protection they have against politicians seizing more power—the only protection of our rights we have short of revolt.

Of course, politicians do not like to have their power limited by constitutions. They would like to substitute their own schemes and make you obey their will instead of having the rights the Constitution says you shall have.

Now a lot of politicians have been telling you the Constitution should be amended to give them more power, and have been promising you a lot of things for the liberty they want you to give up. Well, that is what Hitler said, too, but I don't want that kind of a bargain. I want no politician as my nursemaid. I want none of his "brain trust" planning me and my life and, if you knew politicians and braintrusters as I do, neither would you.

What these politicians really want is more power to tax you and to order you around, which means less liberty for you, because the more power you give them, the more they have to say about what you do, and the less you have to say about what they do to you.

And, if you didn't have a constitution to control them and a court to enforce that constitution, their power would be unlimited once they got in office. They wouldn't even have to run for reelection if they didn't want to. Then your only remedy to get rid of them would be revolt, just as it was the only remedy Washington and Jefferson had. And we must not have revolt.

Whenever any politician says to you, "I want more power," and makes a lot of promises about what he will do for you if you give it to him, think of what has happened in Russia, Germany, and Spain, and ask yourself, "What does he really want to do to me?"

If you don't think that what is happening in those countries can happen here, read the story of what happened to the people in the Southern States after the Civil War. After the North won, Congress deprived the people of the South of their votes and sent northern politicians and the Army into the South to rule them. The years that followed were the blackest pages in our political history, and the South has never fully recovered from the way those "carpetbagger" politicians robbed and plundered them. Read the history of reconstruction in the South, and you will understand what happens when politicians take the Constitution away from the people.

This is also a good example of what happens under a centralized government without States' rights.

Politicians, regardless of party, are all the same kind of people—they are ordinary human beings, except that they are ambitious for power, and when they get it they want to keep it.

And the lesson of history is that you don't dare trust any of them very far.

How, then, are you and I to choose our politicians? We can never be sure in advance that they are going to be good ones. We only judge on their records whether they have been honest and have tried to keep their word. If a politician's record shows he does not keep his word, we are fools to trust him further.

What is Roosevelt's record? Certainly business is better. Any child could make business better at the candy store if you let him spend all the money he wants—until you have to pay the bill. I can make business better that way. So could you.

The rest of Roosevelt's record is one of broken promises. After taking a most solemn oath to uphold the Constitution and having received the greatest power that we ever entrusted to any man in this country, he ordered Congress to pass a law "in spite of any doubts, however reasonable, regarding its constitutionality." Mind you, he ordered Congress to act against its own oath of office. What he was really saying was, "I don't like the limits which the Constitution places upon my power, and even though you swore to uphold it, I want you to ignore it."

Politician Roosevelt also referred to the Constitution as a "horse and buggy" instrument. Well, maybe it is, but if you were traveling through a strange country on a dark night with no stars and no signs to guide you, which would you rather ride in—a horse and buggy that you drove yourself, or a high-powered car driven by someone else at top speed without brakes?

I repeat, the only way that we have to select the politicians who will be safest as our rulers is by their records. On the face of his record, I cannot trust Politician Roosevelt any longer, because I cannot trust any man who breaks his word to me and does not even apologize for it. That is why I shall vote against him.

Governor Landon's record is one of honesty and sincerity. His record shows that he tries to keep his word and to make good on his promises. That is why I shall vote for Landon. But understand this. If Landon is elected, as I hope he will be, I shall watch him, too, and if at any time he should disregard his oath of office and try to seize more power than you and I think is safe for him to have, or if he acts in a way which I consider is a betrayal of my trust in him, I shall turn on him and fight him just as hard as I am fighting Franklin Roosevelt.

Mr. President, I have given this analysis by one whom I may distinguish as Lincoln did: one of the plain, common people. It is filled with common sense. I commend it to the consideration of the Senate.

I am very glad to accommodate the Senator from Illinois. I am happy to note that he remained in the Chamber to listen to the speech which was delivered by former Senator Reed of Missouri. So far as I know, it is the first instance on record since I have been in the Senate that any Senator has objected to the inclusion of remarks of this character in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. President, most of what I shall say from now on is a review of the proceedings had in connection with the soldiers' vote bill recently passed by the Senate and its predecessor, Public Law 712, of which the bill passed by the Senate is a revision.

I now quote from the Senate committee's report on the bill. In the Senate committee's report on S. 1285, the so-called soldiers' vote bill, it is stated:

The question as to the constitutionality of this bill (S. 1285) has already been determined by the Congress.

The constitutionality of this bill has been determined by the Congress. Let the constitutional lawyers of the Senate take note.

This bill is a revision of Public Law 712. Prior to the enactment of that measure the question of its constitutionality was raised and carefully considered by the Seventy-seventh Congress. When the two Houses of Congress passed and the President approved Public Law 712 at the last session of Congress, they formally expressed their considered judgment that, for Federal elections in time of war, Congress has the constitutional authority to establish an absentee balloting procedure for members of the armed forces and to eliminate registration and poll-tax obstacles to voting by members of the armed forces. Since no new constitutional issues are raised by S. 1285, that judgment is applicable to the new bill.

Even if the question of constitutionality had not already been so determined, it should not now be raised because this bill is not a general bill operative in peacetime, but is limited to wartime. It is clear that both Public Law 712 and S. 1285 are within the war powers of Congress under the Constitution.

But the question of the constitutionality of S. 1285 was raised in the debate on the floor of the Senate, and again the alleged constitutionality of the original soldiers' vote bill, Public Law 712, was cited by Senators who favored the passage of S. 1285 as proof of the constitutionality of S. 1285. On December 3 the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], one of the authors of S. 1285, made the statement:

I do not wish to discuss the constitutionality of the bill. I take that position for two reasons. In the first place, the constitutionality of the bill was discussed at length when the first soldiers' voting bill was passed, more than a year ago. It was discussed in the House; it was discussed in the Senate. The bill passed the House, passed the Senate, and was signed by the President, and such action would not have been taken if the doubts about its constitutionality were well founded.

In the second place, the question of constitutionality has been discussed at length on the floor of the Senate in connection with the bill reported by the committee.

It is true, the question of the constitutionality of S. 1285 was discussed at length on the floor of the Senate, but almost entirely by those who opposed its enactment on the ground that it was unconstitutional. On November 22, one of the authors of the bill, the chairman of the committee who reported it favorably, in making his statement to the Senate was drawn into a discussion of its constitutionality, but for the most part doubts as to constitutionality of the bill were sought to be turned aside by those favoring it with assertions that the question had already been determined by the Congress in the enactment of Public Law 712.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] soared into the rarefied atmosphere of superconstitutionality in their support of S. 1285. On November 22 the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] stated:

Mr. President, I am trying to make it clear and unequivocal that my position is not that of passing on the constitutionality of this measure. I approve it without passing upon that question, because today, in time of war, a higher law than the Constitution commands us.

A little later in the debate on that day, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], referring to the stand of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], said:

But, as the Senator ably pointed out, the necessities have brought out a power which comes from the Constitution itself, to defend and protect the country, a higher power than these other matters being discussed today.

Since those who favored the enactment of S. 1285 insisted that the question of its constitutionality was determined with the enactment of Public Law 712, let us look at the record in the Senate and in the House when that measure was being debated and voted on.

It is true, there was discussion of the constitutionality of the bill, but it was not resolved finally into any decision on the question, nor, indeed, could it be. Determination of the constitutionality of legislation is not the province of Congress; that is a matter for the Supreme Court of the United States. But if congressional opinion were controlling in such matters, the vote in Congress on H. R. 7416, Public Law 712, by no means justified the assumption that the issue of its constitutionality had been settled.

In the House the vote on original passage of H. R. 7416 was taken on July 23, 1942. There was no record vote, but on demand for a division, the vote was 134 in favor of passage and 19 against. So the bill was passed in the House by less than 31 percent of its membership.

The bill was amended in the Senate, and on August 25, 1942, 47 Senators voted for its passage, 5 against it, and 44 were recorded as not voting.

The bill then went to conference, and on September 9, 1942, the House voted on acceptance of the conference report. The vote was 248 for, 53 against, 125 not voting, and 1 answering "present." The Senate accepted the conference report on September 10, without a record vote. With the President's signature, the bill became a law—and the basis for the claim for constitutionality of S. 1285.

A great deal of doubt and apprehension were expressed in both the House and the Senate as to the constitutionality of H. R. 7416, Public Law 712. On July 23, Representative Nichols, of Oklahoma, a New Deal Democrat, not now a Member of Congress, after stating that he was going to support the bill, said:

There is no danger in this bill. The danger is what might follow. As sure as I stand in the well of this House, after this war is over, a bill will be offered in the House or the Senate laying down Federal rules and regulations controlling Federal elections, elections of Federal officers. Nothing in this bill is dangerous of itself, but it is dangerous that the people know now, and there were few in the past who knew, that the Constitution of the United States gives the Federal Government the right to prescribe rules and regulations for the election of constitutional officers, and I hope I never live to see the day when that right shall be enforced by the Congress of the United States, because, if we are to continue in a close approach to a democracy, we have got to stay with State rights. The day that you control Federal elections, State rights have gone out of the window. That, in my judgment, is the only danger in the bill.

In the debate on July 23, Representative WILL M. WHITTINGTON, of Mississippi, stated:

Mr. Chairman, franchise is not a matter of right, it is a privilege, and it is a privilege that, under our system of government, can be granted or withheld only by the States. * * * I oppose this bill because I believe that while the Government of the United States wages war the States and their functions abide, in war and in peace. * * * Mr. Chairman, the soldiers and sailors, the lads who are fighting, want something more than gestures, something more than friendly gestures from their Representatives in Congress. They are out there in strange seas and foreign lands, fighting for liberty, for freedom under the Constitution, to use the language of our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, and they will have little regard for their statesmen on the floor of Congress who surrender their convictions as a friendly gesture to the men who fight. I say to you that, under the terms of this bill, we are likely to have confusion worse confounded in elections if the courts hold in contests in elections under this bill, as they have repeatedly held, that the qualifications of voters is for the States and the States alone. We are undertaking to pass a bill here that will be declared unconstitutional, as I believe, as an invasion of the rights of the States, and one under which we, ourselves, as Members of Congress might have to face contested elections one after the other. In an effort to do a friendly gesture to the men who fight, we are striking at one of the very fundamental rights reserved and guaranteed to the States under the Constitution. The men in the Army and Navy are fighting for the rights guaranteed by the Constitution, and they do not ask or expect Congress to invade the rights of the States.

They are entitled to vote, but this is the function of the States. If five or six States fail to pass absentee voting laws, it is the fault of the States. I favor absentee voting for soldiers, but all the States should not be deprived of their rights because five or six have not passed absentee voting statutes, such as Mississippi passed in the First World War. I advocated such a law as a member of the State senate, but I oppose the pending bill as it is in violation of the Constitution.

It is not a question of soldiers voting; it is a question of who makes provision for their voting. It is for the States and not for the Federal Government. In usurping and assuming a function possessed by the States, the soldiers who are fighting for rights under the Constitution will not appreciate their Representatives in Congress surrendering the rights guaranteed to the States under the Constitution.

The bill does not involve a technicality; it involves the Constitution and rights under the Constitution. I believe that the Constitution is something more than a technicality and something more than a scrap of paper.

The freedom accorded to the States and the rights guaranteed under the Constitution are as sacred to the soldiers and sailors who are fighting in the greatest of all wars as they were to the patriots, many of whom fought with Washington, who founded the Republic.

On July 23, 1942, Representative RANKIN, of Mississippi, stated:

I have never seen such demagoguery in the name of the servicemen as I have witnessed here today. The danger of this measure is that it is the beginning of an attempt to destroy the election laws of the various States. * * * It is not the soldiers they want this bill for. I know who is behind it, and you will find that out, too, if you dig into it. They want to control not only the elections, but the primary laws, and if they can get rid of the registration laws, possibly, so that they will not have to register or prove citizenship, with no obligation to your State in the way of paying taxes to help maintain the schools or the roads.

You are not helping the soldiers at all; you are merely playing to the grandstand, and at the same time interfering with the election laws of your own State and of every other State in this Union.

In the Senate on August 17, 1942, the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], stated:

In connection with the question asked by the Senator from Nebraska (whether any consideration had been given by the committee in preparing the report, or by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] to the constitutional question involved in the bill), which did not contemplate, it may be, a differentiation between the States that permit absentee voting and the States that do not permit absentee voting, let me say that some years ago the State from which I come passed a bill permitting absent citizens to vote by mail.

They exercised that right until the supreme court of our State passed upon it and held the State law to be unconstitutional on the ground that the Constitution of Kentucky requires the personal presence of the voter and his personal delivery of the ballot to the election officers or his personal depositing of it in the ballot box. I have very grave doubt whether Congress can pass a law amending the constitution of any State that does not permit absentee voting, even though that voting be limited to the election of Representatives and Senators in Congress and to the election of Presidential electors; because if we could do that with respect to soldiers who are absent, it is conceivable that we might pass a law relating to other absentee voters.

I should not want the bill to pass without calling attention to the possibility that in States which have not permitted absentee voting, especially in States where the highest court in the State has passed upon the validity of such effort, it seems to me we may raise a serious question by attempting, through congressional action, to amend the constitutional provisions of a State on the ground that the absentee voter is in the Army. It is conceivable that if a question were raised concerning the right of the men to vote under State laws, it might involve the election of the Members of the House and Senate. It is possible to conceive of a situation where an election might be so close that the ballots of the soldiers in the Army throughout the world might determine that matter. That would naturally raise the question of whether they had the right to vote in States like mine, for instance, where neither the laws nor the constitution permit it.

On the same date, August 17, the distingushed Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], in the debate on the Senate floor, said:

Once the Congress embarks upon the course of fixing the qualifications of electors in the several States, even for soldiers in wartime, it has opened the door for all kinds of future legislation along that line.

There is no doubt that by the passage of the bill we would subject the elections in every State, insofar as they involve elections to the House of Representatives and to the Senate or for President and Vice President, to absolute Federal control. * * * when the Congress passes a law saying whose vote shall count in the election in the State, Congress has taken jurisdiction of the whole field.

What I am trying to impress upon the Senator is that the pending bill is not an innocent step for the good purpose of permitting soldiers to vote, without attendant possibilities, at least, of very great evil and of very great abuse.

Extending Federal power over elections would be a dangerous thing to do in this country. I do not know of a better way of creating a dictatorship. There may be a better way, but none occurs to me immediately.

Again, on August 20, 1942, our distinguished Senator from Georgia said in the Senate:

Of course, the purpose and aim of the proposed legislation is agreeable to us all. No one wants to deny to the soldier the right to vote. I often feel that he ought to have the right to vote simply because he is a soldier. I used to say, Mr. President, that I thought that every mother should go to heaven because she was a mother. The sentiment is the same.

The step which is now proposed to be taken is one of no small consequence, because if the Congress can now, under the pressure of war, say who in any State shall vote for membership in the House and in the Senate, it will not be long before the Congress will be exercising that power in peacetime, and it will not be long before it will be exercising that power with respect to matters which Congress ought not to think of seriously.

The thing which troubles me about it all is that, as I said last Monday, the moment we invade this field we have opened the way for Federal control of elections in every precinct in America.

Again, Mr. President, I do not concede for one moment, and I do not believe for an instant, that the Federal Congress has any authority or power to regulate the qualifications, to prescribe the qualifications, to fix the qualifications, of electors in any State in the Union.

There is no necessity whatever for the proposed legislation. Let the American States have the opportunity to deal with this matter. The soldiers are their citizens. Every man and woman in the armed forces of this country, by and large, at least, is a citizen of one of the 48 States. Their States will take care of them and give them every opportunity to vote.

So, Mr. President, I feel I am justified in the position I take. This is one of the most important bills that has been before the Senate in my time. I do not care anything about anyone saying that I am opposed to the soldiers voting.

I have but two sons, and both of them are in the service. I do not care anything about any plea to give to the soldiers the right to vote. I know that the States will give them the right to vote. I know that the States should give them the right to vote, and I know that American freedom, the glory of the American system, Mr. President, has been built upon the integrity of the several States. I see it passing away with not a word of protest by men who should protect the legitimate rights and prerogatives of the States.

I presume that perhaps the Senate will pass the bill. I do not think that if the Senate thought of it in the right way it would approve the measure, to be frank about it, but I do not think the Senate will give it that thought. We are in a war, and we are in a state of thought and pursuing a loose way of proceeding here, and the most important things which can be presented to Congress are sometimes acted upon without much deliberation.

I regard the pending measure as one of the most important bills that has been before the Congress in my time, because it proceeds on the assumption that henceforth during wartime all the election machinery in the States will be under Federal regulation and control, with Federal officers sitting around seeing that the State officials act as they think they should act.

On August 24, 1942, the eminent Senator from Georgia again warned:

I do not see how in the long run the dual system of government can prevail in America if the present tendency to invade the States shall continue, simply because we in the national legislative body do not like what the legislative body of Illinois, or of Massachusetts, or of Florida, or of Georgia, may have seen fit to do. Here is the Constitution on which both State and Federal Governments stand. That is the only basis on which unity, under the dual form or system of government such as we have, can continue.

I have full respect for the courts, but I have seen a definite tendency on the part of some members of the highest court of the land toward enunciation of the doctrine that the Constitution is mere words and can be interpreted by the juggling of language. It cannot be done rightfully, Mr. President, by any such process.

The Senator from Georgia was one of the five Senators who voted against the passage of H. R. 7416. His unwavering devotion to constitutional government was reiterated in the debate in the Senate on the passage of S. 1285. At that time, he said:

I would feel I was not discharging my full duty if I did not rise and say, as an humble Member of this body, that in my judgment there is no power in the Constitution, none whatever, to do anything in wartime that cannot be done whenever the conditions demanding the action arise. In other words, war does not suspend the Constitution, and war adds nothing to the American Constitution. So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, I think the whole argument might well be summarized by a suggestion that we amend the oath we take at the desk by saying that we will support the Constitution except in wartime.

On August 25, 1942, the distinguished Jeffersonian Democrat, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], said on the floor of the Senate:

Like the Senator from Missouri, I should like to vote for anything which would make it easier for the soldiers to vote, if I could do so under the Constitution and without swallowing the oath which I took to support the Constitution.

The Senator from Texas was one of the five Senators who voted against the passage of H. R. 7416.

On the same day another leading Jeffersonian Democrat, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], stated during the course of the Senate debate on the soldiers' vote bill:

Because it has been necessary to have national control in order to promote the war effort, we have in a way gone drunk on that kind of wine and are forgetting that we are

losing, to a large extent, the very thing our men must sacrifice so much, and even die, to achieve and maintain. The tenth amendment reads:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

Sometimes it might be wise when we speak of the Bill of Rights and freedom of speech, and so on, not to forget the tenth amendment, which is the safeguard for local self-government.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] further stated in the Senate on August 25, 1942:

Mr. President, in these perilous times, when nations are being overrun, when standards of sovereignty are being pulled down, when ruthless conquest is stalking over once free and happy peoples, it is no time for the people of the United States, great and powerful though we are, to treat lightly the fundamental concepts of free government and of representative institutions.

Shall we in a fitful moment, as a handsome gesture to the brave boys who are out yonder on the battlefields, barter away the fundamental things of this Government, trifling though they may seem to some?

The Constitution of the United States is not one single syllable. It is made up of countless words and phrases and adjectives and nouns, but every one of them, Mr. President, has a place. Every provision in that old instrument was regarded by the fathers as necessary for its symmetry and for its completion. One of the most fundamental of them all is the rights of the voters. Every voter has an interest in every vote that is cast. These powers originally, before there was a Constitution, were vested in the Thirteen Original States.

The wise old fathers who gathered around the table yonder in Philadelphia decreed that those powers should remain with the States, and they wrote them down, as they hoped, in living letters, which might last through the years. But if the Senate, if the Congress, through some maudlin sentiment, or some maudlin theory, may erase it, may wipe it out by an act of the Congress, then no clause, no provision of that fundamental document, may be safe or secure from political assault.

There is no legal act, no lawful course I could take which I would not take to aid them (men in uniform) or sustain them or strengthen them. I know they do not want me, as their chosen Senator on this floor, simply in response to some impulsive wave of sentiment, to barter away the things which they sent me here to defend, and protect, and secure, and have ready for them when they return in triumph, with the traditions of their country wrapped all about them.

When the conference report was under discussion in the House, Representative SUMNERS of Texas stated:

Mr. Speaker, this is called a bill to give to our soldiers a right to vote. That is a very catchy sort of designation. It is proposed in the name of democracy. An examination of its provisions discloses that it is a proposition to have the Congress by its own enactment oust the States, which are the organized democracies in our system of government, from their reserved power to control the elections participated in by their citizens except as that control has been limited by specific constitutional provisions agreed to by the States and incorporated in the Federal Constitution. It is a bill to strengthen the stranglehold of this great Federal bureaucracy upon the throats of the States.

About one-fourth of this bill is devoted to shifting power to control elections from the States to the Federal Government and nearly all the rest of the bill is Congress telling State officials what they are to do under Federal direction.

This bill is an example of how it is being done, how this democracy as I see it, is being destroyed. This bill violates not only the provisions of our written Constitution but it violates the fundamental constitution of democratic government which inheres in the nature of things, which determines sound governmental policy, which limits the discretion of human beings and which would guide them in the operation of a free government if they would submit to its guidance as distinguished from being directed by the theories of men and controlled by the political exigencies of the next election.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. MOORE. Yes; I am glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is the Senator still reading from Judge Sumners' remarks?

Mr. MOORE. Yes, Mr. President. I continue to read from his remarks.

I will tell you what we owe to these soldiers, and that is to stop this concentration of governmental powers here, with the resulting increase of bureaucratic development. We ought to be working at the job of getting some of this power away from here, feeding it back into the States, so that democracy shall survive in this country and that these soldiers may have a government to come back to worthy of their sacrifice.

When the conference report was considered by the Senate, on September 10, 1942, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] said:

If any curious historian should ever mull over the records of the Senate in the years to come, I want him to find the Senator from Texas, humble though he may be, standing over the prostrate form of the Constitution with a sword broken in its defense still in his hand.

On the same day, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] stated on the floor of the Senate:

Mr. President, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has made a very able speech against the bill in which he presented the constitutional argument against the bill. I do not wish to reiterate what the Senator from Texas has said. I do wish to join with and associate myself with him in the argument he has made.

Mr. President, under the clear language of the Constitution and under the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, I cannot escape by any processes of the imagination the very fixed conclusion that the bill is unconstitutional.

I favor giving the right to vote to every soldier who is qualified in the State of which he is a resident. However, I shall not make a gesture with respect to giving soldiers the right to vote when to do so would involve doing something which would be unconstitutional as well as a violation of the rights of my State and of every other State.

The Congress has only that power which has been delegated to it under the Constitution. Congress cannot give something which it does not have.

Mr. President, I have been quoting from eminent leaders in Congress. What they have said certainly must challenge the attention of everyone who is concerned with the preservation of our Government. It cannot be casually dismissed as the vagaries of men moved by a sinister desire to deny to our men in uniform the right to vote. I submit they speak with a sincerity of purpose and from a deep conviction.

The proponents of the pending measure repeatedly urged that the constitutionality of the bill had been settled by the passage of Public Law 712. That bill was passed by the Seventy-seventh Congress in 1942. It came to the floor of the House for debate on July 23, 1942, and was rushed through the House on that same day. If there were hearings before the House or Senate committees on the bill, none were printed and available to the Members. There was no word in the committee reports in reference to the constitutionality of the measure. The committees knew and recognized that this was definitely an issue in the minds of leading Members of the Congress, and must necessarily be dealt with on the floor. The author of the bill stated on the floor of the House that—

Many legal questions have been raised about this procedure. Some say we have no authority whatever to pass any law relative to elections. It seems to me that the great trouble with those who say that is that they confuse regulation of elections with qualifications of electors. There is a vast difference between the qualifications of electors and the mere regulation of elections.

Then the author proceeded to quote provisions of the Constitution that, I contend, belie the very argument that he employed in support of the measure, and I assert, in the language of the Supreme Court, that—

Every journey to a forbidden end begins with a first step, and the end of that journey may be to reduce the American States to little more than geographical subdivisions of the national domain.

Another Member of the Congress was bold enough to say:

I am in favor of this bill for a second reason—that it takes a long step into a field into which I think some day the Federal Government must proceed, and that is the control and regulation of the election of its own officials. * * * I have come to the conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that the Federal Government under the Constitution has complete authority to regulate the election of the President, Vice President, Senators, and Members of the House of Representatives, including both the primary and general elections, and everything that has to do with it. * * * It is my view that the Federal Government, and the Federal Government alone, has the power to determine the qualifications of electors as they relate to the election of Federal officials.

This power might have been placed in the Constitution, but it was not. Anyone employing such discussion as quoted above is stating what he would himself have embodied in the Constitution, but which does not now exist. These appeals were made to the emotions, not to reason. They belittle the importance of the Constitution when men are fighting and dying for the principles it enunciates.

As another sample of the emotional temper of Members of Congress, I quote the following:

I am not going to discuss the legal phase of it. I do not think it is the time or the place. The author of the bill has advised me that the Department of Justice vouches for the constitutionality of the bill.

The report shows no opinion, so far as I can find, from the Attorney General.

I continue the quotation:

I for one do not believe that anyone here should quibble about the niceties of legal fiction, at a time when our boys are in the service and when they should, if possible, be given the privilege to exercise the right to vote.

I have gone somewhat at length into the consideration of the vote and debate on the original soldiers' vote bill, Public Law 712, because the question of constitutionality of this bill to a great extent was evaded by its proponents in the Senate, with the assurance that the issue had already been determined in the enactment of Public Law 712. I have shown that it was not debated and given the sufficient consideration which its importance justified. I assert now that the passage of a bill by both Houses of Congress and the approval by the President is no evidence of its constitutionality.

So the whole argument revolves itself around the question, to my mind, as to whether the bill is constitutional or whether it is not constitutional. The principle as to whether its constitutionality can be sustained because of an emergency is well stated in the language of the Supreme Court of the United States:

Emergency does not create power. Emergency does not increase granted power, or remove or diminish the restrictions imposed upon power granted or reserved. The Constitution was adopted in a period of grave emergency. Its grants of power to the Federal Government and its limitations of the power of the States were determined in the light of emergency, and they were not altered by emergency. What power was thus granted and what limits were thus imposed are questions which have always been and always will be the subject of close examination under our constitutional system. If the provisions of the Constitution be not upheld when they pinch, as well as when they comfort, they may as well be abandoned.

I hope I may never cast a vote for the enactment of a law that I think to be violative of the Constitution. The President of the United States wrote the Ways and Means Committee of the House in 1936:

I hope your committee will not permit doubts as to constitutionality, however reasonable, to block the suggested legislation.

Mr. President, for me to follow the President's suggestion in this respect would be to violate my conception of my oath to support the Constitution of the United States. I want to maintain my reverence for the Constitution, and I want these young men and women for whose benefit this legislation is proposed likewise to have a reverence for the Constitution. However much I should like to see the men and women in the armed forces have the privilege of voting at elections, I shall not yield at the expense of violating the Constitution and my oath to support it. No man may take a seat in this Senate until he solemnly swears before God that he will support the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. One who violates his oath disowns his God and dishonors himself.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it has been rather difficult to hear what the Senator from Oklahoma had to say. In view of the fact that he refused to yield to me to make some inquiries about certain statements which he made, I feel that it will be necessary for me to review the address which was made by the Senator from Oklahoma, and perhaps tomorrow I may have something to say in reply. That is especially in view of the fact that the Senator saw fit to single me out in the beginning of his address.

I have never had any colloquies——

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I will not yield at all.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I have never had any colloquies with the Senator from Oklahoma since I have been here. Why he took particular delight in referring to the 1940 convention is something that he knows better than I. But there is a perfect answer to that, and I shall answer it when I have a little more time tomorrow. The Senator was at that convention, and he did not like the way things went, so he became a convert to the Republican Party. Political converts should always be watched. Whenever they become converts, they always become bitter and more bitter. Why the Senator from Oklahoma has seen fit to take all this time to dig up the soldiers' vote bill after we had passed an amendment to his liking, and no other Senator has seen fit to discuss it since that time, is another question. Perhaps he has been receiving editorials and letters from home—as I have been—since the failure to pass the original Lucas-Green bill.

The Senator has also seen fit to use the illustrious CARTER GLASS, and to quote him as to what happened in the 1940 convention. If he is so fond of the great Virginian—as most of us are—he probably has not seen the latest report as to what CARTER GLASS said with respect to the Lucas-Green bill.

He followed him 3 years ago at the convention, but he cannot follow him today with respect to the bill, and he hides behind the Constitution. Oh, the crimes that have been committed in the name of the Constitution, and the subterfuges and hypocrisy which have been practiced in the name of the Constitution of the United States. I will answer the constitutional question perhaps tomorrow or at some later date.

No, Mr. President; the Senator from Oklahoma, in the statement he gave to the press, which no one has yet dignified with a reply, announced his real reason for opposing the soldiers' bill, and he uses the Constitution as a cloak to hide behind, and he knows it.

When he gave that statement to the press he charged every Democrat and every Republican who voted for the Lucas-Green bill with a conspiracy——

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. I do not yield.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I think I have a right to reply as a matter of personal privilege.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well. I will read what the Senator said. When he gave out that statement he charged every Democrat and every Republican who voted for the bill with a conspiracy to steal the election in 1944. I will read what he said, and if the newspaper misquoted him, he can deny it. This is what he said. This is from the Washington Post of December 6——

Mr. MOORE. Will the Senator from Illinois state what he said?

Mr. LUCAS. I will read the whole article.

Mr. MOORE. I mean, will the Senator tell us what his statement was, as to which I asked permission to reply as a personal privilege?

Mr. LUCAS. I said that if this article is true, the Senator charged every Democrat and Republican who voted for the bill with a conspiracy with the New Deal to steal the election in 1944.

Mr. MOORE. That is the Senator's construction.

Mr. LUCAS. That is exactly what the Senator says. I want to say to him that I will place my integrity, my honesty of purpose, and my good faith alongside his any time, from what I know about his history in Oklahoma.

Mr. MOORE. That is fine.

Mr. LUCAS. I read from the newspaper article:

Senator MOORE, Republican, of Oklahoma, last night charged that Democratic and Republican Senators who on Friday defeated the bill providing a Federal soldiers' vote had blocked the most gigantic vote stealing in history.

Did the Senator make that statement?

Mr. MOORE. Read the statement again. I think I did.

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly the Senator made it; and he says that he does not charge by implication that every man who voted for this kind of a bill was in on the steal.

Mr. MOORE. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. LUCAS. Any fair and prudent mind, any reasonable mind, any decent mind, cannot read any other interpretation into it but that. I have talked with men about this statement, and many people cannot understand why no reply has been made to it; but the Members of the Senate refused to dignify the Senator from Oklahoma by making any reply, until he again comes along with his contemptible speech today with respect to the soldiers' vote bill. The truth of the matter is that he does not want the soldiers to vote. That is the whole sum and substance of his argument.

Here is what he further said——

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHITE. I make the point of order that the Senator from Illinois is out of order in impugning the motives of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state the rule. Rule XIX, paragraph 2, provides as follows:

No Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

The Senator from Illinois will proceed in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I thank the Chair for reading the rule.

I will read further from what the Senator said. I undertake to say that this rule applies both ways. The Senator admitted that he made the statement. If I am questioning the motive of any Senator in what I have said, if he admits that he made the statement, if that statement questions my motive, my good faith, my integrity, and my honesty in what I am attempting to do in giving the opportunity to the soldiers to vote, then I will also make the point of order in due course.

I read further from the newspaper article:

MOORE, declaring that no Member of the Senate would deny "any constitutional opportunity for the men and women in uniform to vote," asserted:

"No one but the veriest demagog would make the public statement that those who voted to protect the soldiers and sailors against Tammany machine politics sought to keep them from voting."

Machine politics. The Senator who comes from Oklahoma, talks about machine politics? [Laughter.]

I read further from the statement of the Senator from Oklahoma as quoted in the newspaper:

The people and the boys abroad should understand that the New Deal's plan for permitting them to vote laid the basis for the most gigantic vote stealing in history.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, the head of the present administration, has never at any time consulted with a single solitary one of those who in the beginning were the sponsors of this bill.

Last summer in Illinois I made a speech in which I said that as a result of the total ineffectiveness of the present law some action should be taken in order to make it effective, and that an amendment should be made to the law which would give every soldier, whether he be on a ship, on an island, in a camp in this country, or in a camp on foreign shores, one thing, namely, the opportunity to vote. I said that when I returned to Congress I would confer with Senators who were in favor of the law which was passed more than a year ago. No one voiced any particular objection to it then. All in God's world we have tried to do, in the soldiers' vote bill, has been to expand the law to the point where it may be made to work, and give the soldier the chance to vote.

Upon my return I conferred with Members of the Senate and lawyers outside, for the sole purpose of attempting to write a bill which would give the soldiers their just deserts. Mr. President, I do not care how the soldiers vote. I want them to have the opportunity to vote, which is their God-given right under American institutions.

Mr. President, we cannot send a soldier out of this country, and require him, if you please, to give his all, even unto death, if necessary, in order that American institutions may be free and safe and our homes may be preserved from pillage and destruction, without according him the opportunity, to which he is justly entitled, of casting his vote at the next election. Is he to give his all in order that men like the Senator from Oklahoma may stand on this floor and condemn him, by denying him a real chance to cast his ballot next year. He can die for us, but he cannot vote, because of States' rights, or because of the Constitution!

I read further from the Senator's statement:

The simple facts are that the White House palace guard—

White House palace guard! God! That is all I have heard in the last year around here—"the White House palace guard." The Senator from Oklahoma has not had a single constructive thought since he has been in the Senate. He is the great businessman from Oklahoma who came here to tell the lawyers of the Senate what to do. Oh, we have heard the statement made over and over again, "Send businessmen to the Senate. Send businessmen to the Senate so they can renovate and rejuvenate the ideas of the Senate, and place it upon a business basis." Show me one thing the Senator from Oklahoma has offered in the way of a constructive suggestion since he came to the Senate. He has done nothing but gripe, nothing but complain, and nothing but indulge in condemnation of the Democratic Party, from the time he arrived here until this very moment. But he has tried to destroy a sacred American privilege.

The palace guard writing this legislation! It is an insult to the intelligence of the sponsors of the soldiers' vote bill to intimate such a thing. That was not politics, of course! The Senator from Oklahoma is just one of those statesmen who never play politics with anything. It was not playing politics to state that the palace guard were the authors of the bill. It was not politics to say that the New Deal expects to steal the election as the result of the soldier vote. No; that is statesmanship.

I quote further:

The simple facts are that the White House palace guard knows that the fourth-term jig is up.

If the fourth-term jig is up, the Senator from Oklahoma and his Republican colleagues ought to welcome Mr. Roosevelt as a candidate. They are constantly condemning the fourth term. Why are they afraid of him? If they are not afraid, they ought to say, "Thank God he is going to run for a fourth term; he will be just easy picking for us in 1944."

The psychology of those on the Republican side who constantly condemn a fourth term for Roosevelt is all wrong. They admit they are afraid of him.

I continue reading:

That the people are determined next year to rid themselves of the Roosevelt-Hopkins-Frankfurter bureaucrats.

Imagine that—indicating that the Hopkinses and the Frankfurters have had something to do with the writing of this bill. Shame on the Senator from Oklahoma.

And the Lucas-Green bill for establishing a Federal ballot commission was a bold, last-ditch effort to herd our American boys into polling booths the world over and vote them en bloc for the New Deal.

Oh, the Senator has confidence in the Army and Navy at the present time to take care of our boys all over the world. But by this statement he condemns every American officer in every camp in this land and throughout the world and charges them with conspiracy with this administration to herd American soldiers into every camp and vote them en bloc for New Deal candidates. The Senator has confidence in the Army and the Navy to send the boys out to fight for his country, but he does not have confidence enough in them to give them a ballot to vote. Yet he says that is not politics.

The statement continues:

It proposed unblushingly that the President of the United States, who presumably will be a candidate for a continuing term in the White House, should be permitted to run his own elections among 10,000,000 boys with no checkrein upon him.

Mr. President, that was all fought out in the committee. It was all fought out on the floor of the Senate, and a bill was reported which practically was agreeable to the majority, insofar as soldier voting was concerned.

Mr. President, this fight is not over. This is not the last of it. The fact that the bill was defeated on the floor of the Senate will return to plague someone, somewhere, sometime, because the bill is right; and the Senator, regardless of what he may say, cannot so honeycomb it with his sophistry of "palace guard" and "New Deal," as to destroy its solid substance of right. You cannot defeat right without having it catch up with you in the long run. And some day, somewhere, if these boys have not the opportunity to vote, some one-armed veteran from Italy or from some island battle will be running against the Senator in Oklahoma and will remind him of the time he was denied the right to vote when he was over there saving his country. He will throw his empty sleeve into his face in that campaign, and he will tell him about it. He will get results.

"Truth crushed to earth will rise again."

Mr. President, this is one of the most vital issues with which the Congress has ever had to deal. The issue is one which goes to the fundamental principles of right and free government.

I did not expect to say this much. As the Senator from South Carolina said

the other day, I may extend my remarks at a later date.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1576) to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases, and it was signed by the Vice President.

ELIMINATION OF PRIVATE SUITS ARISING OUT OF FRAUDS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1203) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Austin	Langer	Russell
Barkley	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Truman
Ellender	Moore	Van Nuys
Ferguson	Murdock	Walsh, N. J.
Green	Murray	Wherry
Gurney	Nye	White
Hill	O'Mahoney	
Holman	Revercomb	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-four Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. BALL, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. SMITH, Mr. WALLGREN, and Mr. WILLIS answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Forty-three Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CLARK of Idaho, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. DANAHER, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GERRY, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GUFFEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. LODGE, Mr. MEAD, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. TAFT, Mr. TUNNELL, Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, and Mr. WHEELER entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is detained on public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business, holding hearings in the State of Mississippi.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is detained in Maryland fulfilling speaking engagements which he made several weeks ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" have it.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, what was the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question was on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. WHITE. I ask that that vote be vacated and reconsidered. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] was on the floor, ready to proceed, and did not hear what was taking place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote will be vacated.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I had been informed by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], that he would speak for a few minutes on the conference report. For that reason, I was on the other side of the Chamber, prepared to listen to him. In view of the fact that the distinguished Senator from Indiana did not speak, I shall now repeat the things he would have said if he had spoken.

First, Mr. President, I call attention to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for November 27, 1942, when the senior Senator from Indiana spoke as follows:

Mr. President, this bill, which is recommended by the Department of Justice, is designed to repeal an old law which was enacted in 1863, having to do with the question of private suits by individuals to recover damages for frauds committed against the Government.

The law of 1863 provided that any individual having knowledge of frauds against the Government could institute private suit in his own name, together with the Government, and, if a recovery was had, it was possible to recover the sum of $2,000 and all damages proven, one-half of which went to the private citizen instituting the suit. In the congressional debate at the time the old law was enacted in 1863 it was shown that this was an inducement to coconspirators to reveal to the Government alleged frauds.

Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate particularly to the date of that speech by the senior Senator from Indiana. The speech was delivered on the 27th day of November 1942. I particularly call the attention of the Senators now in the Chamber to that date—November 27, 1942.

On July 8, 1943, the Senator from Indiana made another speech on the floor of the Senate, from which I quote as follows:

Mr. President, the bill under consideration passed the House last March, came to the Senate, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary on April 2, and was reported favorably on June 8. The bill was explained once before by me on the floor of the Senate, and I think Members of the Senate are more or less familiar with its purpose and objectives. Very briefly, its purpose is to amend a statute enacted in 1863 during the progress of the Civil War. The section of that war statute proposed to be amended applies to what are known as informer suits, which in substance means that any individual may on behalf of himself and the United States bring a suit for damages growing out of alleged frauds in connection with war contracts. The statute further provides that the so-called informer may receive half of the amount recovered.

There is no doubt that during the Civil War the statute served a certain useful purpose. It was enacted as an incentive or reward for informers with respect to fradulent contracts and false claims filed by individuals or corporations against the Government. The statute has seldom been invoked in late years. But there has been a mushroom growth of such suits within the last 12 months. There are now 28 such suits pending, the total demands of which exceed $100,000,000. One such suit was filed only yesterday in Chicago for $35,000,000 against ex-Vice President Dawes. The one who filed the suit alleged that fraudulent claims were made in connection with loans extended to the Dawes bank by the R. F. C., a transaction with which we are all familiar. The suit is brought by a minor employee of the Dawes bank, who refuses to inform the Government of any of the facts concerning which he claims to have information, and refuses to appear before a United States grand jury and testify to the facts. He is shooting for seventeen and one-half million dollars under this infamous informer's statute.

Again, Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Indiana spoke on September 17 last. This time he spoke as follows:

Mr. President, I have twice gone over in detail that aspect of the bill, once yesterday and once before the Senate recessed. Without going into it at length now let me say that the House bill now before the Senate proposed to repeal the old statute of 1863 in its entirety. The bill came to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and after laboring many days, as the Senator from Wisconsin well knows, as he is a distinguished member of the committee, the amendments submitted and now appearing in the bill were agreed upon almost unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill is designed to prevent fraud upon the part of racketeering informers and their lawyers, running into millions of dollars at this time.

In 1863 the Government did not have an F. B. I. with hundreds of trained investigators and agents all over the United States; the office and staff of the Attorney General were comparatively small; the Treasury Department did not have agents and investigators as it has today. So at that time the Government was largely dependent upon individual informers to secure information as to frauds being perpetrated on the Govern-

ment, and such informers were offered a handsome reward of 50 percent of the recovery for supplying the information.

I am not going to say that all the informers and their attorneys are racketeers, but the main purpose of the Judiciary Committee, in the days and days of hard work it put on the pending bill, was to protect the honest informer. We have reduced from 50 percent to not more than 10 percent the compensation paid under recovery resulting from a suit. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], I think, intends to offer an amendment to increase that to 25 percent. I think that is unnecessary. Ten percent is a reasonable compensation when there are billions of dollars involved and there is an alluring prospect of obtaining loot, as I call it, upon the part of some loose lawyers, not bona fide informers at all, but racketeers and blackmailers, if I may say so, for that is exactly what they are, who file these suits and then go to factories and corporations and offer to compromise for a pittance. That is all they expected to get when they filed the suit, and, if that does not smack of blackmail, I do not know what it is. I have heretofore been all over this with Members of the Senate, and we have agreed on practically everything. The honest informer, the bona fide informer, is adequately protected in the bill.

Later on the same page the Senator from Indiana continued:

If I had my full files here, I could cite a dozen cases which smack of blackmail pure and simple.

Answering the Senator's question—

That is, the question of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]—

there is a man in his State, in St. Louis, by the name of Coates, representing the Coates Manufacturing Co. He discovered that there was what he thought was a case which he should bring under this informer's statute. He appeared before the full committee and testified. That case had been on file for 2 or 3 years.

I ask Senators particularly to remember that language of the distinguished Senator from Indiana. He said that the Coates case had been on file for 2 or 3 years.

He had spent a considerable amount of money in the prosecution and preparation of the case. Mr. Tom Clark, who is an outstanding, honest public official, was present, and heard the testimony, and he told Mr. Coates that he would not move to dismiss his case, that he could prosecute it to a finish.

Mr. President, when this matter was before the Senate on a previous occasion, Mr. Coates was here. Mr. Coates is not a lawyer. He is one of the outstanding businessmen of the State of Missouri, residing at St. Louis, Mo. He and his three brothers are engaged in a manufacturing business. Not one of them has ever been arrested; not one of them has ever been in jail. But, Mr. President, they obtained from the United States Government a contract which Mr. T. J. Pendergast wanted. Mr. Pendergast wanted that contract because there was involved the sum of $100,000, and Mr. Pendergast, who had just got out of the penitentiary, wanted a part of that money.

Mr. President, I call upon the words of the distinguished Senator from Indiana himself. What I have to prove in the first part of my brief talk to the Senate this afternoon I shall prove by the words of the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee himself.

When the Senator from Indiana spoke on the floor of the Senate on November 27, there were exactly four cases pending. In every one of those four cases the plaintiffs had submitted the facts to the Attorney General of the United States; they had gone down on their knees begging the Attorney General of the United States to do his duty, and to sue the crooks and racketeers who were robbing the United States Government. Only four cases were pending, namely, the case involving Mr. Pendergast's brother-in-law in Missouri; the case in New Jersey, in which Frank Hague's friends have now been sued by the Government for a million and a half dollars; the Marcus against Hess case in Pittsburgh; and the Bausch & Lomb case, involving $45,000,000, which was pending in New York. There were four cases pending. Where were the blackmailers? Where were the racketeer lawyers who have been mentioned?

I am sorry that the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana has left the Chamber.

I again assert that the statute which Abraham Lincoln had passed in 1863 was to protect the Government, because when Abraham Lincoln was President of this country in 1863 he found that when the Government advertised for good guns it received rotten, no-good, worn-out muskets. Abraham Lincoln found that when the Government paid for good horses it received old swaybacked, spavined, no-good critters. Abraham Lincoln called in one of the then Senators from Pennsylvania and said, "We have got to do something to protect the taxpayers of the United States of America."

Mr. President, the Congress enacted that statute in 1863. I ask any Senator to name one case, from 1863 until 1942, in which the Attorney General of the United States tried to enforce the statute. From the day the statute went on the statute books to the present, the Attorneys General, whether Democrats or Republicans, fought it.

I have in my hand one of the most famous cases of all, the Griswold case. It shows how far the Attorney General of the United States went in the 1880's. When William McKinley was President Mark Hanna of Ohio said, "I do not care who is President of this country; give me the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury and you can have the President." Mark Hanna evidently knew what he was talking about.

In the Griswold case a citizen of Oregon, finding that the Government had been defrauded, brought a lawsuit. He obtained a judgment for approximately $35,000. What did the crook, the racketeer who defrauded the Government in those days do? He fought the case for 10 years. Before final judgment was secured he transferred title to his property. The plaintiff had to go to court and have the transfer set aside as being invalid. After awhile he did so. The plaintiff, mind you, paid his own lawyers, paid all his own expenses, and finally obtained a judgment.

Mr. President, what do you suppose the United States district attorney did? The record is here. The case is reported in volume 30 of the Federal Reporter at page 762. Believe it or not, the entire judgment was satisfied for $100. An effort was made to rob the taxpayer who, at his own expense, obtained the judgment. For a judgment of $100 he had to go to court to have the assignment set aside, an assignment which had been executed by the United States district attorney with the consent of the then Attorney General of the United States.

I said I would prove from the statement of the Senator from Indiana that his argument was unsound. I again read a part of the language uttered by the Senator when he spoke on the 17th day of September 1943.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], I think, intends to offer an amendment to increase that to 25 percent. I think that is unnecessary. Ten percent is a reasonable compensation when there are billions of dollars involved and there is an alluring prospect of obtaining loot, as I call it, upon the part of some loose lawyer, not bona fide informers at all, but racketeers and blackmailers, if I may say so, for that is exactly what they are, who file these suits and then go to factories and corporations and offer to compromise for a pittance. That is all they expected to get when they filed the suit, and, if that does not smack of blackmail, I do not know what it is.

Mr. President, all one has to do is to read the old law and he will know that what the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana said simply could not be true. The Senator from Indiana, on the 17th of September, said in the Senate that lawyers, whom he described as blackmailers and racketeers, would bring suit and then go to factories and corporations and try to compromise for a pittance.

Mr. President, the law as it is now written, which it is sought to wreck, expressly provides that a lawyer cannot settle a case, that he cannot go to a factory or to a corporation and compromise but must go to the Federal judge and to the United States attorney, and that a case cannot be compromised or settled without the consent of the Federal judge. How could any lawyer blackmail anybody when a lawsuit cannot be settled or dismissed unless the Federal judge, after investigation, consents?

The Senator from Indiana said on the same day:

The bill—

That is the bill I am now discussing—

is designed to prevent fraud upon the part of racketeering informers and their lawyers running into millions of dollars at this time.

Mr. President, I say that the pending bill which seeks to repeal the present law will protect scoundrels, crooks, and profiteers who have illegally robbed the taxpayers of this country. The best proof of it is that before there was instituted a single lawsuit, about which advocates of the bill now have so much to say, or before an indictment was copied, this original bill was introduced and was

upon this floor away back in November 1942, more than a year ago. At that time, Mr. President, in November 1942, there were not any racketeering lawyers; there could not have been because only four lawsuits were pending and in the case of all four of those lawsuits the Attorney General had been notified time and time again; the facts had all been laid before him time and time again, and what is more, the Attorney General had refused to prosecute.

Mr. President, I ask any Senator upon this floor to name one lawsuit brought under the Sherman Antitrust Act by the Attorney General of this country since that law has been on the statute books and to name one man who has ever been sent to the penitentiary anywhere in America for violation of the act? I shall not do it here, but if I were upon the stump speaking or if I were debating with someone outside the Senate Chamber, I would gladly make an offer of $100 to anyone who could name just one.

We have read much in the newspapers about trustbusters. When Theodore Roosevelt was President we all heard about Frank B. Kellogg, the great trustbuster. The truth is he did not put one man in the penitentiary. We heard a great deal about Kenesaw Mountain Landis, that great judge, who fined the Standard Oil Co. $29,000,000. Did he put anybody in jail? Did he put one single official of the Standard Oil Co. in jail for violating the Antitrust Act? Not one. Before I came to the Senate, out upon the rolling prairies in North Dakota I heard of another great trustbuster, Thurman Arnold. He was the man who was getting the headlines then. It was not Landis, it was not Frank B. Kellogg, of whom we then heard. They had been rewarded; the headlines had had their effect, and one had become ambassador to England before he died, and the other got a $75,000 job as baseball commissioner. I am not saying they were dishonest; I am saying that the headlines proclaiming them as great trustbusters had had their effect. But not a man did they send to the penitentiary.

When I came to Washington I thought, of course, Thurman Arnold would have the jails filled. One could pick up the newspaper almost any night and see that someone else was being sued. The Ford Motor Co., the Chrysler Corporation, the General Motors Corporation, all were sued. The claim was that they had gotten together and while purporting to ask 6 percent interest on contracts, were, as a matter of fact, charging 17 percent. The next thing we knew apparently the companies must have been in the right. We find a plea of nolo contendere, and the case was dead.

So one day, Mr. President, the President of this country nominated Thurman Arnold to be a judge on the bench of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia. Being a member of the Judiciary Committee, I asked that I might have the privilege of examining Mr. Arnold. Mr. Arnold appeared with a group of his deputies, and I propounded this question to him: "Mr. Arnold, did you as Assistant Attorney General send one man to the penitentiary for violation of the antitrust act?" He replied "Not one." That is the kind of law enforcement we have had. The big boys have run the show year after year, regardless of whether there was a Republican President or a Democratic President; it did not make a bit of difference, for none of the violators went to jail.

What has been the result? Mr. President, today a poor boy in the United States of America has no hope of building up a large business for everything is controlled by monopoly. Bootblacks, 5-and-10-cent stores, drug stores, grocery stores, banks—everything is chain, chain, chain. If a young man, no matter how good his education may be, starts out to make an honest living, the first thing he has to do is to see the head of some monopoly, and in times when we are not at war he gets $65 or $75 or $80 or $90 a month. That is the result of the nonenforcement of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act.

Mr. President, the interests which are behind this measure, the interests which desire to overcome all that Abraham Lincoln did, the interests which the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] said a few weeks ago from this floor, had one of the largest lobbies he had ever seen in the whole time he had been in the Senate—those interests stop at nothing. They know no law. They know nothing of morality, or honesty, or justice.

The Senator from Indiana himself has said that Mr. Coates had such a good case that Mr. Tom Clark said, after he had heard the testimony, that he would not move to dismiss his case, that he could prosecute it to a finish. I refer Senators to page 7609 of the RECORD of September 17. Mr. Coates, being a nice, young, gullible man, believed that.

What became of Mr. Coates? I ask the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], who is now acting in the capacity of majority leader, what became of Mr. Gordon Coates? Mr. Gordon Coates, this young, outstanding businessman from St. Louis, who made such a good impression on the Committee on the Judiciary that, instead of giving him 10 minutes when he appeared before them, gave him 2 hours, this young man to whom Tom Clark, the Assistant Attorney General, said, "Go ahead; you can finish the case," was fighting Mr. T. J. Pendergast, and apparently Mr. Pendergast, in jail or out of jail, in the penitentiary or out, is just as powerful today as he ever was in his life.

First of all, Mr. President, I wish to quote a short resume of the Coates case. I will show what happened to poor Gordon Coates. This was written November 22, by Gordon Coats:

NOVEMBER 22, 1943.

DEFENDANTS: MASSMAN CONSTRUCTION CO., ARKETEX CERAMIC CORPORATION, ST. LOUIS CLAY PRODUCTS CO., FRUIN-COLNON CONSTRUCTION CORPORATION, FRUCO CONSTRUCTION CO.

Re: Committee report on H. R. 1203.

DEAR SIR:—

Mr. Coates wrote this to me:

DEAR SIR: This is to refresh your memory concerning a case which was filed in the Federal court against the above-named defendants and which is affected by the change in the Lincoln statute. We cooperated with the Government and gave them 9 months in which to act against the above defendants before filing our case.

I particularly want the distinguished junior Senator from New York to listen to this. He is sitting here in the capacity of acting leader. I want him to know what has happened to the Democratic Party, formerly the liberal party of the United States. I want him to defend it if he can.

Mind you, Mr. President, here is an outstanding young man, who never went to jail, who never was arrested, a college man, who, with his three brothers, has a flourishing business, with connections with almost every country in the world. They get a contract from the United States Government, and this is what happens to it:

In proceeding against these men I was well aware of the fact that the Massman Co. of Kansas City was financially interlaced with the T. J. Pendergast organization of that city. The source of this information is Dun & Bradstreet Inc.

The Massman Co. was one of the general contractors building the St. Louis ordnance plant. I was also aware of the fact that the former Governor of Illinois, John Stelle—

A Democrat, who was elected as Lieutenant Governor on the Democratic ticket, and succeeded to the governorship of Illinois on the death of Governor Horner—

who is president of the Arketex Ceramic Corporation, had a large loan from the R. F. C.

Listen to this. I know that is not nice for some to listen to, but it is true:

Our materials were specified by name by the architect for use in this plant. Our bid was filed on time and we were the low bidder and were awarded the contract. We furnished the first carloads of material and were paid for the same. Approximately 14 days after the closing date a bid was submitted by the St. Louis Clay Products Co. on the Arketex Ceramic Corporation's material. The St. Louis Clay Products Co. charged approximately $92,000 more than our bid price.

Mr. President, what do you suppose happened? I am sure the distinguished junior Senator from New York could not even guess. This is what happened:

After submitting a belated bid this company failed to deliver the material and this delayed the completion of the buildings.

We were called in then, in September and October, to furnish the material to complete this job. Their failure to supply this material delayed completion of a vital war plant. During this period the St. Louis Clay Products Co. furnished material for several private jobs.

As I understand it, the main reason for this law is to give the Attorney General the protection to exercise his rights in these cases, but it was never the intent to encroach upon the right of a private citizen to act as a true informer.

Suit was brought, and I have here a photostatic copy of the rating in Dun & Bradstreet, showing the connection of Mr. T. J. Pendergast. This is a photostatic copy, the original being in the hands of the Attorney General of the United States. Mr. Massman is a partner of T. J. Pendergast. Eight hundred thousand dollars of graft; $800,000 of the

taxpayers' money gone. And when this young man brought suit, after he had gone to the Attorney General for 9 months begging him to bring suit, he finally came to Washington. I know that the distinguished Senator from New York, who is the acting majority leader, will be glad to know what happened to Mr. Coates, and I shall tell him. They did not want him around Washington. They did not want him around anywhere. So they said, "We know where to put him. We will put him in the Army and get rid of him."

Put him in the Army, Mr. President, and get rid of him. This man who at his own expense, was trying to save $800,000 of the money of the taxpayers of the country. So on December 11 Mr. Coates wrote me as follows:

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: One of the most shocking things that ever happened to me occurred this week. Representative COSTELLO, of California, member of the House Military Affairs Committee, wrote Col. C. O. Earp, head of the Selective Service Board of Missouri, requesting a review of my draft classification.

My board of Webster Groves, Mo., complied with Colonel Earp's request and my file was sent to him and he in turn sent it to the appeal board and they placed me in 1-A. I was never given a voice in this matter and I never requested that my draft status be appealed. Over this action my local board has felt that they were entirely bypassed and that this matter was never duly taken up with them.

Mr. President, if this kind of thing is countenanced what is the use of a local draft board at all? When a man comes here and petitions, as he has a right to do in this country, when he comes here to the Senate and to the House of Representatives, Mr. Pendergast, whether he be in the asylum, the penitentiary, or whether he be out on a suspended sentence, can reach his long, long arm, not 1 mile, not 10 miles, not a hundred miles, but over a thousand miles, from St. Louis, Mo., to Washington. That long arm and hand can pick up this brave young man who offered to go to war sometime ago, and take him by the nape of the neck. This crook, this scoundrel, this man who has gone to the penitentiary because it was proven that he had defrauded the taxpayers of Missouri—this man Pendergast can reach his long arm from St. Louis, Mo., and take by the nape of the neck this fine young college boy, this young man who is married and has two children, this man who never tried to avoid the draft, simply because he tries to fight for the interest of the taxpayers of the country. Mr. T. J. Pendergast is powerful enough and has sufficient influence to take this young man from Washington and put him in the United States Army, so that Mr. Pendergast may be safe, and he and his associates may reach into the money of the taxpayers of this country, and scrape up a lousy $800,000.

Mr. President, I know the distinguished junior Senator from New York well. I am proud to be a friend of his. I do not believe the Senator from New York would countenance this sort of thing for one single moment, and I do not think the overwhelming majority of Senators would countenance it if they knew about it. But they are not now present. They will not know about it. They are going to vote with the majority of the committee.

We have the same kind of trouble, Mr. President, with any liberal movement which starts out fine, as did this liberal movement in 1933. Ah, Mr. President, in my lifetime I have had much experience with so-called liberal movements. I have seen men in liberal movements and organizations with the highest ideals, but after they have been in the movements for a year or 2 or 3 years, they have become mixed up with attorneys for the public-utility companies, or mixed up with other persons who can make use of their acquaintanceship with those at the head of the liberal movements, in order to betray them.

Mr. President, the movement originated by Franklin Roosevelt started out well. When he was inaugurated he said, "I am going to drive the money changers out of the temple." Those words inspired the youth of America. Those words led the common people of this country to believe that at last we had a man in the White House who was going to fight for the unprivileged one-third.

Now, Mr. President, what do we find? We find Nelson Rockefeller, old John D.'s grandson, an integral part of the administation. We find Harriman, with his $100,000,000, representing Franklin Delano Roosevelt in Russia. We find Hague of New Jersey, Kelly of Chicago, Pendergast of Missouri, all part and parcel of the administration.

The only reason why I voted for the confirmation of Thurman Arnold was that Thurman Arnold was honest. He was honest, and he wanted to get out and to get away from this administration just as fast as he could.

Mr. President, what would you think if you were Thurman Arnold, and if, in good faith, you had brought a lawsuit against the three largest oil companies in the United States, and Professor Clark of Yale University had entered the case in connection with the prosecution, and then a man wrote to you and said, "I have some evidence; I want to be sure that the oil companies are not going to come forward some day, when I am not around, and plead nolo contendere." Mr. President, only a few weeks ago I had printed in the RECORD Mr. Thurman Arnold's letter showing that he said, "This case will never be settled unless Congress is notified."

Then, in 1941, on a beautiful day, a day when the sun was shining nicely, Mr. Arnold sued 18 more oil companies—21 all together—and the amount which he said they had taken was $1,500,000,000. What happened? Those oil companies were sued at 10 o'clock in the morning on the 21st of December. Believe it or not, at 2 o'clock in the afternoon of the same day they were before a judge in Washington, pleading nolo contendere. Not one went to jail; not one paid a single penny of fine. Two Assistant Attorneys General resigned, because they would not stultify themselves by signing the stipulation. A billion five hundred million dollars. Mr. President, I will say to the everlasting credit of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] that when the Senator from Iowa found out about it, he rose from his seat on the floor of the Senate and condemned the entire transaction.

Mr. President, I do not know; I am not in the inner council; but the rumor is and has been that one leading Republican, a man who formerly was a member of a Republican Cabinet, got $100,000, and that two men who formerly had been on the Democratic central committee got $100,000 apiece—a deal so rotten that, after two Assistant Attorneys General resigned, when the stipulation was laid before the judge in Washington, the judge was so horrified that he said, "Well, this must be Christmas time."

Thus have the interests of the people of the country been protected.

But, Mr. President, more than that, other developments have occurred. I picked up a copy of the Saturday Evening Post for this week. In it there is an article entitled "White House Dormitory." Mind you, Mr. President, scores of good American citizens who fought for the President, who helped him, are no longer with him. Out of all that group about the only one left is Harry Hopkins. Harry Hopkins! Mr. President, this country is 150 years old, but I will venture the assertion that during the last 2 or 3 years we have had in Washington more kings and queens, dukes and duchesses, princes and princesses, ex-kings and ex-queens, ex-dukes and ex-duchesses, and ex-princes and ex-princesses than came here during all the other 147 or 148 years put together. Indeed, Mr. President, one must take care. When these people come to Washington it is not as if a farmer from North Dakota or from elsewhere in the Northwest came to Washington. A farmer or a labor leader or a small businessman could sleep anywhere. If a house were not available he could sleep at a tourist camp, certainly.

I was always under the impression that we gave the President of the country a salary—$75,000 a year. He is also given $400,000 for expenses for entertainment purposes. I know that if the figures I have stated are not correct, the distinguished junior Senator from New York will help me; I know he will correct me. I know he is engaged in a very confidential conversation with the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana. I wish I were a part of it but unfortunately I am not. However, if my statement was not correct, if the President has not been receiving half a million dollars a year for salary and for entertaining, I know the distinguished junior Senator from New York will correct me.

So, Mr. President, we have the President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt, in the White House, but he gives his house away to Mr. Hopkins, and Mr. Hopkins has his quarters there. Mr. Hopkins lives there. Mr. Hopkins! Mr. Hopkins is in the White House. So, when some of these kings and queens, ex-kings and ex-queens, dukes and duchesses, ex-dukes

and ex-duchesses, and all the rest of them came to Washington, there was no room for them in the White House. What was to be done about it? That was simple. It was said, "We will buy another house. What kind of a house are we going to get? Get a good one—not only buy a house, but get all the furniture. Not only get all the furniture, but get all the silver. Not only get all the silver, but get all the carpets. Buy it just the way it stands. However, even though we buy it all, who is going to take care of it? We will buy the servants with the house, buy the people who run the house, right along with the house—buy them all."

Mr. President, that is what they did. They bought the Blair House, No. 1651 Pennsylvania Avenue, near the White House, right across the street from the office of the Secretary of State. Buy it. We must see that kings and ex-kings, duchesses and ex-duchesses, princesses and ex-princesses are taken care of. The soldier boys can sleep in Union Station on the floor. They can sleep on the hard benches. When I led the fight here a while ago to convert the old Senate garage into a place where soldier boys might sleep, Representative TOLAN and I got no cooperation. Let the soldiers sleep anywhere. What of it? But we must take care of kings and ex-kings, queens and ex-queens, and all their children. Let me read what excellent care is being taken of queens and ex-queens, kings and ex-kings. This is from the Saturday Evening Post of December 11, 1943. Of course, the distinguished junior Senator from New York is busily occupied in confidential conversation, and cannot listen, but I am sure he knows all about this anyway. I have not the least doubt that he has been a guest at Blair House. A man with his distinguished presence has undoubtedly met all the kings, ex-kings, queens, and ex-queens, princesses and ex-princesses who have stayed there, because New York is a great State, and, of course, a man who represents New York State would be invited there. One day the Senator was at my hotel. He was in a hurry to get away. I have not the least doubt he had an engagement at Blair House.

Reading from a Saturday Evening Post article:

When a real king is on the lam, as kings so often are these days, a likely place to find him is at Blair House in Washington. Blair House, which bears the name of the distinguished American family that once occupied it, is a cream-colored Georgian mansion of four stories, with a white Ionic portico and green shutters. It stands across from the State Department at No. 1651 Pennsylvania Avenue.

I now skip a little, and come to one of the first kings.

It was pure jail for King Peter of Yugoslavia, who was only 18 when he visited the United States in the summer of 1942. King Peter was eager to absorb American life on the fly, and in New York he got it in heavy doses. * * * He arrived in Washington, however, 3 days before his appointed visit with the President, and it was necessary for him meanwhile to pretend that he wasn't there.

It must be hard work to be in a place and to pretend you are not there. For 3 days the young king was here, but pretended that he was not here.

The young king's embassy bought him a convertible coupe, and he had a grand time zipping along the highways of Virginia like any American brat his age. But girls were what interested King Peter most about the American scene.

At Blair House, he spent many lonesome hours staring out the window at the female saplings strolling past. One evening—

I knew I would have the attention of the distinguished junior Senator from New York—

One evening, unable to stand it any longer, he tried to slip out and go to a night club—incognito, of course. A young friend of his in the State Department, who had some good telephone numbers, agreed to escort him, and together they made for the door. Unhappily, an eagle-eyed attaché of the Yugoslav Embassy caught them and King Peter was sent to bed instead.

The article then tells about King George, of Greece. It is most interesting. The same lady, Mrs. Geaney, who was bought with the house, still operates the place.

I now turn to page 74. It is most interesting. I know that the distinguished junior Senator from New York will be interested in this.

Speaking of Blair House, the article says:

When the house is vacant, as it usually is—

If Harry Hopkins were not in the White House, distinguished guests could be taken care of in the White House; but Harry is still there. I notice from a newspaper clipping that the Hopkinses are preparing to move pretty soon. They are remodeling a house over in Georgetown. Although the farmers of North Dakota cannot get lumber even to repair a chicken coop, Harry is having no trouble in getting all the material he needs to remodel his house in Georgetown. The Hopkinses are expected to move pretty soon. I do not know just on what date they are expected to move from the White House, but I understand it is to be soon. In the meantime, kings and ex-kings, queens and ex-queens, dukes and ex-dukes, duchesses and ex-duchesses, must be taken care of at the Blair House. Of course, when Queen Wilhelmina comes, there will be no difficulty. I understand that she owns the largest apartment house in Washington, the Westchester Apartments, with 2,500 rooms; but the United States taxpayers had to buy a house to entertain her, so Blair House was bought.

Continuing with the Saturday Evening Post article:

When the house is vacant, as it usually is, there is a single policeman on guard at the entrance to the house next door. When guests are present, however, two policemen stand on the Blair House stoop, and on either side of Pennsylvania are a number of husky young men who seem to have nothing to do but stare at passers-by.

The article then tells about a beautiful young lady who got in there at one time. I shall not take the time of the Senate to tell about that incident.

The article tells about whom they have to operate this place.

Blair House has no permanent staff of servants. Whenever a visiting mission is expected, Mrs. Geaney simply notifies a list of stand-bys, and they come to work in the house on a temporary basis. Usually seven persons, in addition to Mrs. Geaney and Paul Washington, the negro janitor, suffice to run the house when guests are present. They include Andre Gerard, the chef, and his assistant, two butlers—

They must take care of the queens, princesses, duchesses, kings, and all the rest of them, so they have Mrs. Geaney and Paul Washington, the negro janitor. Then they have Andre Gerard, the chef, and his assistant, two butlers, one parlor maid, and two chambermaids. If two guests are there at the same time, there is a chambermaid to make up the bed of each of them. That is why there are two chambermaids.

The maids come a day or two early to put the house in order for the new arrivals, and remain a day or two afterward to clean up after their departure.

There are two maids, and they come there a day or two ahead. After the guests have gone, they stay a day or two to clean up.

Only when guests require special services are additional employees needed. So far they have been needed only on two or three occasions when unusually large receptions or dinners were given.

Mr. President, who pays for those dinners which the kings and ex-kings, dukes and ex-dukes, duchesses and ex-duchesses, princesses and ex-princesses, give? When they arrive in Washington, they are met at the train by a beautiful car, and taken to Blair House.

The king or ex-king, can give any kind of a party he wants to. Who pays for it? We will find out. I continue reading:

Though visiting dignataries have been encouraged to treat Blair House as they would their own homes, to have breakfast in bed if they feel so inclined—

Yes, let them go to bed and sleep and sleep and sleep until the day is all gone, and then they are ready for another nightclub party.

To have breakfast in bed if they feel so inclined, and to do all the entertaining they wish at State Department expense,

A farmer in the Northwest gets up at 4 o'clock in the morning, and goes out when it is 20 degrees below zero and pulls the cows' teats so that he can get a little milk, a little butterfat, in order to keep his family alive. He is paying for Blair House so that kings and ex-kings, queens and ex-queens, can sleep and sleep. And in a few minutes I will tell Senators what beautiful furniture they sleep on.

Though they can have breakfast in bed if they feel so inclined—

and to do all the entertaining they wish at State Department expense, they have all proved relatively modest in their desires.

They usually give a press-radio conference, a state reception, and a dinner for their nationals.

That means that if Prince George of Greece were here he could invite all his nationals, and he could invite every Greek whose address he knew to come to Blair House and have a good time, and the taxpayers of the United States would pay for it.

I continue reading:

They usually give a press-radio conference, a state reception, and a dinner for their nationals, and one or more smaller dinners for their friends, depending on the length of their stay. The average length of a visit is 5 days.

* * * * *

Most of the Latin-American guests have preferred to rise at 10, to have late meals, and to retire very late. Some of them retired so late, in fact, that they customarily had breakfast just before going to bed.

That is sitting up pretty late. I know that is later than the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana sits up. I have known him for a long time. He goes to bed early. But in the article from which I am reading, it is said that the guests at Blair House sleep until 10 o'clock in the morning.

Some of them retired so late, in fact, that they customarily had breakfast just before going to bed.

Blair House guests are served their meals on fine china and with magnificent silverware.

I wonder if Haile Selassie of Ethiopia had all these fine doings when he was here. The article continues:

In the butler's pantry are some 300 pieces of rare Lowestoft—

I do not know what that is, but, of course, any Democrat could tell us what it is—

supplemented with secondary sets of French and English ware, all of it gilted and painted by hand.

An ordinary plate would not be good enough for an ex-queen, or an ex-king, or an ex-prince, or an ex-princess. Common ordinary china, the kind which an ordinary Senator would eat off, of course, would not be good enough. They have 300 pieces and they are all painted by hand. I continue reading:

Besides, there is a set of 24 game plates.

It would not do to have an ordinary plate on which, for example, there might be served a hot dog or a hamburger. It would not do to use such a plate for a meal in which quail was served. So, over in the magnificent Blair House, when they serve game, they have an entirely different set of dishes. I again read:

In the butler's pantry are some 300 pieces of rare Lowestoft, supplemented with secondary sets of French- and Englishware, all of it gilded and painted by hand. Besides, there is a set of 24 game plates, each painted with a delectable still life of quail, grouse, pheasant, or some other fowl.

They are not satisfied with merely eating quail or pheasant, but they have the birds painted by hand on the plate so that the kings and ex-kings, queens and ex-queens, and duchesses may enjoy the meals.

The china is stored in unlocked cabinets.

Oh, I tell you, Senators, Mrs. Geaney is a smart woman. She is not going to trust the silverware with any of those kings and ex-kings, dukes and ex-dukes, who come around, without locking it up, so she has a burglar-proof vault in order that no one can walk off with the silverware. She locks it up. She is a smart woman.

The china is stored in unlocked cabinets, but Mrs. Geaney keeps the silverware locked up in a burglar-proof vault behind the pantry. Before each dinner of state, she opens the combination lock of the steel door and ceremoniously hands out the silver to the staff. * * * The silver is said to be worth in excess of $25,000.

Mr. President, that is more than the sharecroppers have on an average in the great State of Mississippi. I was down there one time and I did not find a single place where a sharecropper had silverware of the value of $25,000. But at Blair House the silverware is said to be worth in excess of $25,000.

Most of it is of English and Early American workmanship—plain large knives and three-tined forks with solid silver pistol handles, like those of derringers.

I tell you, Mr. President, that is some silver.

There are solid silver candlesticks of every description and three tankards from the hand of Paul Revere.

Oh, old Paul Revere! How happy he would be if he knew that as a blacksmith he had forged three tankards which are now in Blair House and from which every visiting king and ex-king, every queen and ex-queen, prince and ex-prince, and every duke and ex-duke may drink.

Mrs. Geaney says that a collector once offered $5,000 for the largest Revere tankard.

Just one little tankard, and the collector offered $5,000 for it. Of course, she said she did not sell it.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I wonder if the Senator will indicate how long it will take to conclude his remarks?

Mr. LANGER. It will take me some time. In fact, I have just got a good start.

Mr. WHITE. Would the Senator be agreeable to a recess being taken at this time if there be an understanding that he may continue when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow?

Mr. LANGER. I am agreeable.

Mr. WHITE. May I ask the Senator from Louisiana if it is agreeable to him?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is.

Mr. WHITE. The understanding is that the Senator from North Dakota will have the floor when the Senate meets tomorrow?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Very well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to call the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gladys B. Kyle to be postmaster at Rogersville, Tenn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Willard A. Kitts 3d to be rear admiral, while serving as Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. ELLENDER. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, December 16, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 15, 1943:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Hugh B. Cox, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Solicitor General of the United States, vice Hon. Oscar S. Cox, resigned.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

George Hofferbert, of Baltimore, Md., to be collector of internal revenue for the District

of Maryland, in place of M. Hampton Magruder, resigned.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Lt. Gen. (temporary) Alexander A. Vandegrift to be the Commandant of the Marine Corps with the rank of lieutenant general for a period of 4 years from the 1st day of January 1944.

Col. Merritt A. Edson to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 1st day of December 1943.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 15, 1943:

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

William Ward Currence
Raymond Joseph Getz
Avery Parsons King
Frank Wisner Lynn
Lester John Olson
Richard Coffman Shrum

To be first lieutenant, Dental Corps

Clare William Sauser

To be chaplain, with rank of first lieutenant

James Joseph McMahon

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To Corps of Engineers

First Lt. Mathew Valois Pothier

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be colonels, Medical Corps

Lucius Kennedy Patterson
Charles Robert Mueller
Charles Fletcher Davis
Clarence Mansfield Reddig

To be major, Medical Corps

Clifford Gordon Blitch

To be captain, Medical Corps

Joseph Arthur Gautsch
Albert Robert Larchez
William Thayer Smith

To be colonel, Dental Corps

Daniel Sumner Lockwood

To be captain, Dental Corps

Kenneth Cheney DeGon

To be colonel, Chaplains

Claude Skene Harkey

To be captain, Chaplains

Leslie Albert Thompson

TEMPORARY SERVICE IN THE NAVY

Willard A. Kitts 3d to be rear admiral, while serving as Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, to rank from December 1, 1943.

POSTMASTER

TENNESSEE

Gladys B. Kyle, Rogersville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Immanuel, through whom we are made heirs of the living God, direct our thoughts and cleanse our hearts that Thy will may be magnified in all our labors. Give us plenteously of Thy wisdom and grace that we may not forget the source of Him who built this world in order.

Grant the Congress such understanding that makes error difficult, the light that makes darkness fade, and the bread of Heaven that quickens the best impulses of our souls. We pray that the devotion to our country may be as a sacred flame dedicating ourselves to righteous duty and authority and above all to the authority of a righteous and a just God. We pray that our daily demeanor may be consistent and in harmony with those precepts our mothers taught us when we made their knees the altars of our young hearts. Pour Thy redemptive grace into all breasts with that beautiful and sincere simplicity which is the terminal point of all human progress. In these approaching days, O let the moral beauty and the spiritual excellence of Jesus of Nazareth be revealed unto us. In His holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein remarks at the ceremony of the one hundred and sixty-second anniversary of the surrender of Yorktown, Va., on October 19, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects, in one to include an address by Admiral Vickery, of the Maritime Commission, and in the other to include an address by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] at Roanoke, Va.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday business in order today may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in two instances; in one to include a letter from the Veterans of Foreign Wars and in the other a letter from Mr. Mersfelder of the Kansas City Life Insurance Co.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONALITY LAWS 1940—CONFEREES APPOINTED

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2207) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, with Senate amendments; disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DICKSTEIN, LESINSKI, and MASON.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including therein a speech I made at Philadelphia.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADMISSION OF REFUGEES TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. DICKSTEIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE FIRE INSURANCE BUSINESS

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, serious charges have been made in connection with the conduct of the business of fire insurance, and in order that Congress may be able to intelligently pass on this question I have today introduced a resolution calling for the appointment of a special committee to investigate the entire matter.

The Honorable Louis H. Pink, a director of one of the largest insurance companies and until recently superintendent of insurance for the State of New York, had this to say:

> A review of fire insurance rating systems reveals two weaknesses—(1) lack of proper statistical information, and (2) rating methods unsupported by statistical experience.

This criticism by one of the best qualified insurance authorities in the United States has not, to my knowledge, been disputed or denied. A study of the hearings being conducted by another body would justify the appointment of this special committee.

The insurance companies do an annual business running into hundreds of millions of dollars and this business is done in all the States of the Union. It seems to me that it is most important not only for the insurance companies themselves but for the public to know exactly upon what basis and by whom fire-insurance rates are established. If this inquiry is had it will be a fair and impartial one, with the one object in mind of obtaining the necessary information as to

the manner in which the fire-insurance business is conducted.

THE TEHERAN CONFERENCE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, nothing that we say here today can add or detract from the great accomplishment of the Roosevelt, Stalin, Churchill conference. But it is only fitting that this body give recognition to what may be one of the most important meetings in the history of mankind.

The meeting between these three chosen leaders of their respective nations is a personal triumph for our President and Commander in Chief. Without his courageous leadership, his vision, his belief in world humanity and cooperation this meeting would probably never have taken place. It has always been his belief that if the chosen leaders of the various countries could get together, face to face, that they could solve their differences, and could propose better plans for the ratification of their peoples than could be done through the medium of lesser officials. The results of this meeting have borne him out. It is indeed a personal triumph for the President. But it is more. This meeting can be the beginning of world cooperation to prevent war in fact, not just in desire. It presents an opportunity for all nations who are desirous of the common good to work out their destinies in a cooperative manner. It is an opportunity that this Nation cannot afford to let go undeveloped. America cannot afford to let mental reservations, fear, or the sway of little minds sabotage the possibilities of this conference.

The statement of the conference has struck the keynote to future world peace and cooperation. This is the theme for the future, I quote:

> We shall seek the cooperation and active participation of all nations, large and small, whose peoples in heart and mind are dedicated, as are our own peoples, to the elimination of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an essay written by a young constituent of mine.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD an address by Sumner Welles which appeared in the Washington Post of December 15.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE INSURANCE BILL

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain a situation for the benefit of the Members, who may be following the controversy in which I am currently engaged with the proponents of H. R. 3270, the insurance bill. Through no fault of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] nor of my own, I was not present when he delivered his speech yesterday, December 14, as a proponent of that legislation. I was attending the hearings of the Judiciary Committee of the other body on exactly the same legislation pending there.

I addressed the House on December 13 on this subject, but the gentleman from Connecticut, although present, did not have my revised and extended remarks of that date before him at the time he addressed the House on the insurance legislation on December 14, but only the extension that appeared in the Appendix on December 9 at page A5377.

I should like to add that I gave each Member of the House Judiciary Committee 3 days' personal written notice that on December 13, under special order, I would defend my remarks appearing in the Appendix of the RECORD on December 9. No member of that committee who favors H. R. 3270 appeared. I want those Members to know that I recognize the old "brush off" when I see it. They cannot destroy the correctness of my legal position with a "brush off." I just do not want them to think I am so dumb I did not recognize it. I am not that dumb.

I have only had a chance to glance at the remarks of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER]. In the first two paragraphs he says, first, that I use too many words; and, second, that what I have said is irrelevant and immaterial. As to the second charge, other Republican lawyers equally as competent as the gentleman from Connecticut hold otherwise.

As to the first, let me say to the gentleman from Connecticut that it takes much more powder to fire a 155-millimeter howitzer than it does to fire a 20-gage shotgun. The shell of the first is far more destructive than the pellets of the latter. The armor of truth is impervious to pellets.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise for a double purpose: I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the subject of Federal crop insurance and also on the subject of whisky.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. SPRINGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Fairbury, Nebr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a statement on disposition of Government-owned tools and equipment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There was no objection.

POST-WAR EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR SERVICE PERSONNEL

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, on October 27, 1943, the President of the United States sent a message to the House to which he attached a report furnished by the Armed Forces Committee on Post-war Educational Opportunities for Service Personnel. That message was referred to the Committee on Education.

Since that time in conjunction with others I have been working on a bill. Today I am introducing that bill.

It is not as simple as you might think. We are doing a bit of pioneering in this particular field. I am quite sure the bill is not satisfactory to every Member of the House and probably never will be, but I do want to call upon the membership of the House and the representatives of the various service organizations and the educational people of this country to give their best thought and consideration towards assisting the membership of the House and the Committee on Education in working out a sound, sensible, constructive, and economical program for carrying on this much deserved educational work.

Most of us will recall that at the time of the passage of the teen-age draft bill there was an intimation that such a program would be put into effect. I hope that this bill will be a framework at least upon which we can write the answer to an important national problem.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the bill which the gentleman is introducing and hopes to report out seek to take care of the education of those young men whose schooling was interrupted or may be interrupted by their induction into the armed services?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes, and knowing the interest of the gentleman from Arizona in educational matters, I am counting on him to help me with the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article written by Ernest Lindley which appeared in the Washington Post today on the subject of votes for the armed forces.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a news release concerning the regionalization of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BROOKS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks just made and to include the letter which General Hines wrote me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

REHABILITATION INFORMATION COMMITTEE (CLEVELAND)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Veterans' Commission of Cleveland has organized a rehabilitation information committee which has acquired space on Cleveland's public square to advise servicemen and servicewomen and their dependents how to take advantage of all services available to them.

This commission has compiled a manual listing organizations, legislative rights, and concessions designed to aid servicemen and servicewomen and their dependents.

The women's auxiliaries of the joint veterans' commission will staff the information center, which is opening December 16, and the joint veterans' committee will give every assistance to the end that servicemen and servicewomen and their dependents will receive proper advice and consideration.

This joint veterans' commission is composed of members of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, United Spanish War Veterans, the Jewish War Veterans, and the Polish-American Veterans.

To my knowledge this is the first undertaking of its kind, and I feel that the joint veterans' commission and its auxiliaries deserve the gratitude of the citizens of Cleveland and the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, recently there were presented to the Director of Office of War Mobilization, petitions signed by more than 28,000 citizens of Cleveland, urging that wages and prices be stabilized, and that all measures, including Government subsidies to processors, should be used to effectuate the orders issued by the President.

Signatures to these petitions were obtained on street corners, in workshops, stores, and factories by the Cleveland Industrial Union Council.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on three different matters, and to include, first, a resolution adopted by the Massachusetts Department, Disabled American War Veterans, favoring a national lottery; second, a resolution adopted by the same organization favoring a national tuberculosis hospital; and, third, a resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea, Mass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two statements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. William H. Webb, executive vice president, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, before the Union League Club, at Philadelphia, Pa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]?

There was no objection.

GOV. JOHN W. BRICKER, OF OHIO, AND HIS ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, in 1939 John W. Bricker became Governor of Ohio. He inherited from the debacle of the previous Democratic administration a deficit of $40,000,000.

During his first two terms, with no new or increased taxes but with increased governmental operating costs, Ohio not only operated on a pay-as-you-go basis but finished his first two terms with a surplus of over $30,000,000.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] is quoted as saying Governor Bricker has only one policy. How right the Massachusetts gentleman is. Governor Bricker does have one policy of common honesty, common decency, and common sense, and what an innovation it would be if that single policy could be applied to some of the present rudderless policy makers on the home front.

The cat in Aesop's Fables had one policy, while the fox had many tricks, but he went the way of all tricksters.

Thank God for a man today with at least one single, clear-cut policy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial and letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MUSTERED-OUT VETERANS

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a short news item from the Chicago Herald-American.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LEMKE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and further to extend my own remarks and include a release from the Department of the Interior concerning irrigation in the Salt River Valley of Arizona.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, for some time the matter of socialized medicine has been a matter of Nation-wide discussion. I have always opposed it and shall continue to oppose it, but I want to say here and now that if the medical profession of this country do not want their profession socialized they had better clean house of the racketeers within the profession.

It has come to my attention that the wife of a certain young Congressman is about to have a baby. He went to a doctor to whom a good many Congressmen go and asked him to recommend a physician, which he did. He went to see that doctor, and the doctor said, "I will be glad to take your case." When he asked, "What will you charge me?" the doctor said, "$1,000."

I have been told that more than one Congressman has paid $1,000 for these services.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow. The purpose of this, I may say, is for the consideration of the conference report that we expect will be filed tonight, in accordance with the request just submitted by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will hold a very important meeting with reference to railroad labor pay. Judge Vinson will be there. I just wanted to call to the attention of the gentleman that some of our committees are meeting.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE LATE KATHLEEN SEXTON HOLMES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we have learned with profound sorrow, and the people of Mississippi will hear with profound sorrow, of the passing of one of the most popular members of the press gallery, Mrs. Kathleen Sexton Holmes, of my State, who died suddenly in New York this morning.

Mrs. Holmes was the daughter of one of Mississippi's most distinguished lawyers, the Hon. James S. Sexton, a leader in the State for many years.

On this anniversary of the adoption of the Bill of Rights, which guarantees a free press, this distinguished lady, who had always stood for a free press and an honest press and a fair press, was suddenly called to her eternal reward.

She never attempted to impose herself on Members of the House, but was always reticent and courteous in her dealings with Members with whom she came in contact. In all my years of service, I have never known a more popular, a more pleasant, or more impartial representative of the American press than this elegant Christian lady from Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] and I may be permitted to extend our own remarks at this point in the RECORD, regarding the late Mrs. Holmes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, it was with a feeling of deep sorrow that I learned this morning of the untimely passing of a most beloved Mississippian, Mrs. Kathleen Sexton Holmes, who for many years has been a very popular member of the House Press Gallary, representing one of Mississippi's great daily papers, the Jackson Daily News.

Mrs. Holmes was an alert, brilliant character and a most interesting writer. Her feature column, Mississippians at the Capitol, was widely read and enjoyed by thousands throughout my great State.

It was last December, shortly following my arrival in Washington, that I was privileged to meet this charming and lovable woman. From this meeting a friendship developed that has been genuinely appreciated and enjoyed by me.

I join with my colleagues in extending sympathy to her loved ones.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, as the dean of the Mississippi delegation has just so truthfully said, those of us who knew Mrs. Kathleen Sexton Holmes were deeply shocked this morning to learn of her sudden death. Mrs. Holmes, as a member of the press gallery and as a correspondent for the Jackson (Mississippi) Daily News and other publications, has endeared herself, I am sure, to all of the Members of the Mississippi delegation in Congress. And I am equally positive that I speak for the whole delegation when I say that we shall miss her very much. Her column carried in the Jackson Daily News, Mississippians in the Capitol, was a most interesting and informative column; and I am confident that the people of Mississippi will miss it.

Mrs. Holmes was the daughter of one of the outstanding members of the bar of Mississippi. Her father, Judge Sexton, was respected and loved all over the State. She, in her own right, was a woman of unusual ability, intelligence, and charm. We shall all miss her here on the Hill. We shall miss her friendly greeting and her vivacious habit of creating an atmosphere of geniality and friendliness wherever she moved.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, it is proper and fitting that we should pay tribute to our departed friends of other professions who have worked so patiently alongside us. Today it is my privilege to speak a word of tribute to the memory of Mrs. Kathleen Sexton Holmes, a member of the press, a correspondent for one of Mississippi's greatest newspapers, the Jackson Daily News, the daughter of a most distinguished Mississippi family and a most worthy character.

Mrs. Holmes was one of the first Mississippians I met on my arrival in Washington. From that day I found her cordial and sympathetic, a keen thinker, alert to present-day problems, and active in the discharge of the duties connected with her work.

Her sudden and untimely death, coming when her usefulness was at its peak, brings the realization that the Members of Congress, particularly the Mississippi delegation, have lost a most valuable friend.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I from Mississippi today are deeply grieved at the death of a distinguished Mississippian, Mrs. Kathleen Sexton Holmes. A member of a distinguished Mississippi family, Kathleen Sexton was a splendid credit to her family and to our State.

For some years she was Washington correspondent for the Jackson Daily News, largest newspaper in Mississippi. Mrs. Holmes was one of the first persons

I met upon my arrival in Washington. From that day she was ever helpful to me as a new Congressman. She knew Washington and the Congress. Her writings were in line with her character, true, fair, and a credit to herself and the paper which she represented.

We shall miss Kathleen Sexton Holmes and join with her family and many friends in their sorrow at the passing of a splendid woman.

AUTHORIZING THE APPOINTMENT OF AN ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 381), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2801) to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

LIBERALIZING CERTAIN SERVICE PENSION LAWS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 376), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2350) to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Pensions, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 376.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution.

Mr. SABATH. This rule, Mr. Speaker, makes in order H. R. 2350, and provides for 2 hours' general debate. The chairman of the Committee on Pensions, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY], however, has assured the members of the Committee on Rules that he will not use the 2 hours for debate and, instead, 1 hour will suffice. I am making this announcement so that the membership will know approximately how much time will be taken for general debate.

The Committee on Pensions, after holding hearings on the bill, reported it by unanimous vote, and the Committee on Rules, after hearing the splendid and intelligent explanation of the provisions of the bill from the chairman of the Committee on Pensions, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY], voted unanimously for the granting of a rule. Mr. Speaker, it is a meritorious bill and I feel that every Member of this House will support and vote for it, because it will increase the pensions of the deserving Spanish War veterans from $60 to $75 a month, a $15 monthly increase, and the pensions of widows from $30 to $40 a month, a $10 increase.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from Illinois that it is a meritorious bill. These veterans and widows are entitled to the consideration extended by this bill and we are giving them this increase at about the same time that a past Congress, I think around 1920, gave a similar increase to the veterans and widows of those who served in the Civil War. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY] and all the members of the committee are to be congratulated for their constructive action in reporting this bill out.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his timely information relative to the legislation and I know that he always was in favor of such beneficial legislation. I may say from the moment that the Committee on Pensions acted favorably, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] our Democratic leader, informed me of his deep interest in this legislation and urged that early and expeditious action be taken by the Committee on Rules in order that the bill could be immediately considered by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I regard this legislation as meritorious and needed in view of the ever-increasing cost of living that has made it impossible for the Spanish-American War veterans and their families, as well as millions of other people in our country, to properly live. It is generally known and recognized that not only the Spanish-American War veterans and their widows and dependents, but all other persons living on small allowances and fixed incomes find it extremely difficult to make both ends meet and to live in a decent American manner. The increased cost of living brought about by the pressure blocs who are seeking to eliminate price ceilings has caused a soaring of prices from week to week so that today the veterans, their widows, and people drawing low wages or with a fixed income do not have sufficient money to purchase their accustomed foods and clothing and they are thus forced to buy the cheapest of foods and wearing apparel. Therefore, it is indeed regrettable and deplorable that the highly paid leaders of the pressure blocs continue with their pressure and influence to obtain the passage of legislation that would still further increase the cost of food, yes, the cost of living. For 35 years I have supported legislation to improve the lot of our farmers and agriculture in general, but I feel that the prices and the parity payments which they now receive are more than sufficient to encourage greater production and provides not only a fair price but a fair profit.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that those responsible for the ever-increasing cost of living will realize that there must be a limit to the prices that can be paid by the 20,000,000 of persons who are earning less than $1,200 a year, not as much as $20 a week, and the additional 12,000,000 wage earners who make from $20 to $38 a week. Something must be done to hold down the prices for these wage earners who now can only buy bare necessities and the cheapest of foods. A few weeks ago I inserted some official statistics which showed that it cost a family of four from $1,400 to $1,700 to live in any of the 33 larger cities of the United States. Surely, it does not cost that much to live on a farm or even in a small town, but most of the workers are located in industrial sections where the increased cost of living is felt especially. They cannot understand why increases in the prices of food and necessities of life should be permitted. I was in hopes that the organization which we created, the Office of Price Administration, would be able to fix prices and put ceilings on many products, not only on farm products, but all other products. While they have done exceedingly well, they have not succeeded in holding prices down to the extent as the President and the Administration intended. Consequently, something must be done for the 33,000,000 low-pay workers and persons having small fixed incomes. However, I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that the bill before us will take care, in a small measure, of 75,000 to 100,000 of the deserving Spanish War veterans, their widows and dependents that have been so sorely in need of some relief.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not take up additional time to explain the provisions of the bill, but shall leave that to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Pensions [Mr. BUCKLEY], who, I know, will explain the bill to the satisfaction

of the membership. He is so well informed and can give the House such an intelligent report on this bill that I am satisfied in my own heart that every Member who will listen to him will vote for the bill and that it will pass unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZIMMERMAN). The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FISH. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Rules digressed somewhat to discuss the question of inflation. I assume in wartime that there is always a certain degree of inflation. When this administration came into power some 12 years ago, the national debt was $20,000,000,000. Today it is upward of $200,000,000,000. It is inevitable that there is and must be a certain amount of inflation in time of war. The question is, How can we best stop that inflation? One of the best methods is to stop the spiraling of our national debt and the waste and extravagance in the bureaucratic agencies of the Government. The Congress must scrutinize all expenditures, both in war and peace.

Mr. Speaker, this is a war measure, not of this war but of the Spanish-American War.

If the Members of Congress will analyze the bill, they will realize the staggering cost of war. We all know what war costs in blood and money. Some of us forget what it means after the war is over, and what it entails in the way of further staggering burdens to the taxpayers.

I am for the legislation before us, as it is a simple act of justice to the Spanish War veterans. It was reported unanimously by the Committee on Pensions and it was also reported unanimously by the Rules Committee. It will cost the Government approximately $24,000,000 a year. It raises the pension of Spanish War veterans from $60 to $75. It practically includes all Spanish War veterans, because it sets the age limit at 65 years. Of necessity, as the war was fought 45 years ago, practically all Spanish War veterans are now 65 years of age. Therefore, by this resolution, we are raising the pension of practically all Spanish War veterans from $60 to $75 a month.

We are now establishing a precedent for World Wars Nos. 1 and 2. When veterans of World War No. 1 become 65—and that is not so far away, unfortunately, because some of us in this House were in that war—the Government will then be called upon by the establishment of this precedent, to pay World War veterans, and there were 4,000,000 of them as opposed to 300,000 in the Spanish-American War, the same amount of $75 a month, which will involve a staggering total. It will run into billions of dollars, not millions.

This is no puny or unimportant legislation. We are establishing a precedent and we are doing so because this is a part of the war system. We might as well know that every time we get into war we will have not only to pay the war bill, but we will have to pay the pension bill afterward. I wish that would become a deterrent to some people in this country who seem to believe it is our duty to rush into wars all over the world, or to go out even looking for wars. Some people are forgetful that wars are not only paid for at the time, but subsequently and for generations to come.

I am in favor of the bill. I believe the Spanish War veterans served our Nation in that short war, although few in number, just as gallantly and bravely and just as patriotically as those veterans of the First World War, or those who are serving now in our armed forces all over the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. ZIMMERMAN]. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

It also increases the pension of the widows from $30 to $40 per month, and in some instances to $50 a month. Likewise it changes the limit of the date of marriage. I think it was in 1923, originally, and it is now raised up to 1938, so that a widow might then get this increase in pension. Perhaps that would be a controversial issue, except for the fact that the widow must be 65 years of age. That being the situation, I do not believe it will raise much controversy. What I am trying to impress upon the House is the fact that this is a very substantial increase, and does establish a precedent for the future. I am for it because of necessity; because it is one of the results of war, and probably always will be. It is placing the Spanish War veterans on the same basis as the older Civil War veterans, which went into effect in 1930, when they were about 90 years of age. But at least, it puts them on the same basis. I am not trying to fool anybody here or elsewhere, that once you adopt this rate of $75 you are not going backward in any future war. So to that extent the bill we are about to vote on—and I do not believe there will be very much opposition to it, I hope not—is an important one, not because it will cost $24,000,000, because $24,000,000 today when we discuss billions on the floor of the House, is not such a vast sum; but it does establish a precedent, and that precedent in the future will entail staggering burdens upon the American people. I see no other alternative for treating our Spanish War veterans except on the same basis as our Civil War veterans. I see no alternative, as this is a part of the war program, to take care of those who fought in defense of our country when they reach the age of 65.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the legislation, but I vote for it knowingly and openly, knowing exactly what it entails upon the taxpayers and what it will mean in the future.

I would far rather pay out Government money for these pensions to our own American war veterans than send it to foreign nations to establish world-wide glorified W. P. A.'s or boondoggling at home.

I urge the immediate passage of a liberal and generous mustering-out pay for the servicemen of the present war to enable them to provide for themselves until they have secured a permanent job. Unfortunately, the Congress has no power to pass legislation guaranteeing to the returning discharged veterans their pre-war jobs. Congress can, however, and should, provide a discharge pay of $200 and $50 a month for 6 months. There are already approximately 1,000,000 discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines of this war. We owe our first duty, however, to the disabled veterans, to provide them with the best hospitalization, rehabilitation, and with generous and liberal compensation. Congress will not and must not economize at the expense of the disabled war veteran.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am very much in favor of this bill.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I favor the immediate passage of H. R. 2350 now under consideration. Its passage has too long been delayed. Its purpose is to increase the allowances to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition and their dependents. It increases the base allowance from $60 to $75 per month for pensions. It has other liberalizing pension provisions. As explained by the Committee on Pensions these provisions are as follows:

Section 1 of the bill would increase the rate of pension payable to those honorably discharged veterans with 90 days' service, or if less than 90 days, who were discharged for disability incurred in line of duty for total disability or upon reaching the age of 65 years from $60 to $75 per month.

Civil War veterans are granted $75 per month regardless of age or disability under the act of June 9, 1930. Previously by the act of May 1, 1920, they were granted $50 per month and later by the act of July 3, 1926, increased to $65 per month regardless of age or disability. It will be noted that section 1 of H. R. 2350 requires age 65 or total disability to entitle veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition to the rate of $75 per month therein provided. With the advanced age of these veterans, 45 years after the war, and the increased living costs, the increase provided by this section is believed warranted.

Section 2 of the bill would change the marriage delimiting date governing service pension to widows and remarried widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expendition, from September 1, 1922, to January 1, 1938. The delimiting marriage date for service pension to widows of Civil War veterans is June 27, 1905, approximately 40 years after the termination of that war. The date proposed by section 2 is approximately the same length of time after the close of the

Spanish-American War. The inequalities and injustices resulting from the existing limitation by denying pension to widows married to the Spanish-American War veteran as early as 1922 and who lived with and cared for the veteran during his lifetime are accentuated by the high cost of living and advanced age precluding employment.

Section 3 of the bill would provide a reasonable increase of widows' service pension from $30 to $40 per month upon attainment of age 65, and grant $50 per month to the widow who was the wife of the veteran during his war service. The latter provision is identical with that provided for Civil War widows and is in accord with the sound principle that preference should be given that class of widows. The increase to $40 at age 65 will establish a rate comparable to that granted Civil War widows at age 70. This increase at age 65 is believed justified in the light of living costs, unemployability and general need of this group.

COST OF BILL

It is estimated by the Veterans' Administration that section 1 of the proposed bill would provide increased pensions for approximately 85,140 veterans now on the rolls at an additional cost of $15,286,000, the first year.

As to section 2, it is estimated that the cost of the first year would approximate $1,642,000, bringing on the rolls approximately 4,000 widows. However, if it can be assumed that only one-half of those eligible would apply and be paid the first year, the cost would approximate $821,000, bringing on the rolls 2,000 widows the first year.

It is estimated that section 3 of the bill would affect approximately 42,000 non-service-connected widows at an additional cost of $8,242,000 the first year.

The total cost of the bill would approximate $24,349,000.

Mr. Speaker, the veterans of these groups are among our most loyal citizens and their services for this country and their courage and valor in time of war was an outstanding contribution to our long and distinguished military history. Their average ages are 69 years. There are 84,000 in the group. Many of them are disabled and not able to perform remunerative service in civil pursuits. The passage of this bill will recognize an outstanding service to this country. I hope there will be no delay in its enactment into law.

Mr. Speaker, I have pending in the House a bill which has for its purpose this same relief and for that reason also I am happy to vote for this bill.

Mr. FISH. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein certain newspaper articles and telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that there will be no opposition of any consequence to this bill. Probably the overwhelming majority of the House and of our people are in favor of doing more than justice by the Spanish-American War veterans. Undoubtedly, too, the Congress will continue to give to the veterans of any and of all wars perhaps not what they may ask but something that will be somewhere near adequate to enable them to carry on as they did before they went into the war. As the gentleman from New York suggested, no one knows the amount of money that will be required. My own guess is that we will continue to appropriate until there is nothing left; and as far as I am concerned that is all right, because if we are to spend the money I much prefer that it be spent among our people here at home than across the sea taking care of the people of other nations and in rebuilding other countries, in putting other countries in a position where they can go into successful competition after the war is over not only with our farmers but with the men who work in our factories. Apparently this administration has reached the conclusion that we can spend ourselves into prosperity and intends to follow that policy regardless of the war. That is not my idea.

DANGEROUS TRENDS

It was my privilege a few days ago to stand with other Members of the House and cheer our Speaker as he warned us of dangerous trends which might interfere with the winning of the war and the preservation of our Government.

Some have characterized that talk, which was to the Speaker's credit, as an effort to centralize divergent views within his own party and as an admonition to the political opposition to his party to moderate its criticism of certain phases of administrative policy.

For myself, the import of the talk is accepted at its face value, and my only regret is that the Speaker did not go further and enumerate other dangerous tendencies which interfere with an all-out war effort and which are, from their very nature, destructive of constitutional government.

Perhaps, had time permitted, and it did not, the Speaker could and would have called attention to certain administrative practices which must meet the condemnation of all who believe in and desire the preservation of the Government which has brought us so far along the road to prosperity, happiness, and security.

ARBITRARY USE OF POWER NOT GRANTED

To me, one of the most alarming and dangerous tendencies is that of administrative agencies, created by Congress or by Executive order under authority granted by Congress, to assume and exercise arbitrary power which Congress never intended to grant.

Certainly, Congress never intended to grant to the President or to any Federal agency the power to deny to the father or the brother of a man serving in the armed forces the right, the opportunity, to work in a factory which is producing for, or on the transportation line which is supplying, the man on the battle front with the materials which he must have if he is to carry on the fight.

Yet that is just what the administrative agencies have done and are now doing.

WAR DISPUTES ACT

By Public Law 89 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, the N. W. L. B. was granted authority to decide certain labor disputes, but was required, in making such decisions, to conform to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, the National Labor Relations Act and the Emergency Price Control Act, as well as to the applicable provisions of law, with the over-all proviso that—

Where no other law is applicable, the order of the Board shall provide for terms and conditions to govern relations between the parties which shall be fair and equitable to employer and employee under all the circumstances of the case.

Acting under this authority, the Board contends that it has authority to make any order which it deems necessary to settle a labor dispute. That is the position of the Board, as outlined in the testimony of its chairman, William H. Davis, and public member, Wayne L. Morse, given recently in a hearing before the Smith Committee.

The Board, in a case where an employer refused to enter into a contract containing a closed-shop or a security-of-membership clause, ordered the company to enter into such a contract.

DISREGARD OF N. L. R. A.

Under the National Labor Relations Act, an employer may enter into a closed shop or maintenance of membership contract, if he so desires, but he cannot be forced to do so.

The National Labor Relations Act goes further than that and it expressly provides—section 8—that—

It shall be an unfair labor practice for an employer * * * by discrimination in regard to hire or tenure of employment or any term or condition of employment to encourage or discourage membership in any labor organization.

Now remember, the S. A. Woods Co. refused to enter into a contract with a certain union which would require it to discriminate in regard to tenure of employment and conditions of employment and encourage membership in that particular union.

Nevertheless, the W. L. B., by order, did require the S. A. Woods Co. to violate section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act.

There is no dispute about the facts. The company refused to comply with the order and the Government thereafter condemned and took over its property. The Government took over a woodworking plant, which was in part engaged in manufacturing materials which aided in the war effort. It then turned that plant over to the Murray Co., but that company has been unable, up to the present time at least, to do efficiently the work which had been carried on by the S. A. Woods Co. for 90 years.

SEIZURE OF PRIVATE BUSINESS

In this case, the Board, by its orders took away from individuals their business, turned a part of that business over to those unable to carry it on, and also

forced employees, in order to hold their jobs, to pay membership fees and dues to a union to which they did not wish to belong. The company was destroyed because it did not comply with an order of the Board.

W. L. B. ORDER CAUSES STRIKE

Now, let me cite you a case where the company did comply with a Board order, but nevertheless the plant was struck and the Board, until recently at least, has taken no action.

The Timken Roller Bearing Co. makes 75 percent of the tapered roller bearings manufactured in this country. Under a directive issued by the Board and because of fear, the company signed a maintenance-of-membership contract, with a 15-day escape clause and a provision binding the union not to strike.

In the Gambrinus war-industry plant at Canton, Ohio, was a screw-machine operator named Huffman. Huffman offended one of the union officials by telling the local director of the union in district No. 27 that he did not represent the men at the Gambrinus plant; that they were not satisfied with his representation; and that they desired to have a National Labor Relations Board election, to see if they could not be represented by other parties.

The district representative, named Abel, notified the company that Huffman was no longer a member of the union in good standing and demanded his discharge. The company complied with the contract, which it had been forced by the War Labor Board to sign, and discharged Huffman.

Evidently the employees of the company sided with Huffman, for around the 2d of April 1943 they went on strike, notwithstanding the no-strike provision contained in their contract.

That strike lasted 10 or 12 days. It threw out of employment between fourteen and fifteen hundred men in that plant and affected some 18,000 men in other plants—all engaged in war work.

The story, as told to the president of the company at the panel hearing in Cleveland, was that the men struck because they felt that Huffman had not been fairly treated by the union officer.

Huffman, after being out of work for 6 months, was reinstated in the union by its national office at Pittsburgh, and was employed by the company on the 19th of October 1943. Shortly after he was reemployed the company received a letter from the president of the local union, saying that Huffman had again been discharged from the union. The president, however, did not ask the company to discharge him, but, under the contract, it was obligatory upon the company to discharge him.

The company, rather than bring on another strike by discharging Huffman, took a chance and wrote to Philip Murray, the president of the union; to Mr. McDonald, to Mr. Wayne Morse, and Mr. William Davis, of the War Labor Board, giving them the facts and asking them what the company should do.

That letter was written on November 8, 1943. Up until the 10th day of December 1943, no member of the W. L. B. had replied to that letter.

The company has not complied with its union contract, in that it has not discharged Huffman. It does not discharge Huffman, because it fears that if it does so the employees who believe that Huffman has been unfairly treated by a member of his union will call another strike.

W. L. B. IGNORES PLEA

Having gotten the company into this position, the War Labor Board does not even acknowledge receipt of its complaint.

December 6, there was a strike of teamsters who drive trucks loaded with war material between Chicago and Muskegon and intervening points. The companies had agreed to pay the drivers on the assumption that the distance traveled between Chicago and Muskegon was 183 miles. Actually, the distance was 178.9 miles. Adoption of the union's estimate of the mileage called for payment on an 8-hour rather than a 6-hour basis, and it made a difference in favor of the driver of $1.11 for each trip each way.

The company asked for a reopening and a reconsideration of the contract on that point, and, although it was admitted by all that the actual distance traveled was but 178.9 miles, action was delayed by the Board's representative. The company then refused to pay for the miles not traveled, and the drivers went on strike.

After the strike had held up the transportation of several million pounds of war material, the Board finally got busy and adjusted the controversy.

On occasion the Board makes a gesture, as, for example, where, on December 10, at Lansford, Pa., the Board ordered back to work 300 power-plant employees who had closed 10 collieries employing 7,000 men.

W. L. B. DENIES SEPARATE SANITARY FACILITIES

Under date of December 14 we learn that, at Baltimore, picket lines have been thrown around the plants of the Western Electric Co. because the War Labor Board has refused a demand for separate sanitary facilities for whites and Negroes. There is no question, as I understand the issue, of discrimination. That is to say, all the Point Breeze Employees Association is asking is that separate sanitary facilities, equal in every respect, be furnished for the whites and for the Negroes.

Inasmuch as the President's Fair Employment Practices Committee has ordered certain companies to employ and furnish equal opportunity to all, is there any reason why the War Labor Board should not afford equal sanitary facilities to the whites at Baltimore?

The Fair Employment Practices Committee and the President preach that there shall be no discrimination because of race, creed, or color. Why not go further and order that there shall be no discrimination because of union or nonunion membership? Why should not the W. L. B. order that companies give employment to all qualified applicants, regardless of their union or nonunion status?

Their insincerity is shown by the fact that the administration for months has been insisting upon discrimination because of nonmembership in a union.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST NONUNION WORKERS

The C. I. O. and its Communist allies insist that the poll tax, although it applies to whites and Negroes, is discriminatory and should be abolished. Yet the C. I. O. insists that no one shall work—no, not even in support of the son who may be fighting or dying across the sea—until he has become a member of the C. I. O. and contributed to its treasury—a part of which is used for campaign purposes.

Few indeed are those who believe that any individual should be discriminated against because of race, creed, or color. But it is the rankest kind of hypocrisy to give lip service to the doctrine of nondiscrimination and then uphold, as the President does, the doctrine of discrimination on the basis of union membership.

When the boys go to the draft board they are not asked to show a union card. But when their brothers or their fathers go to a war industry to aid them in their fighting they must, under the order of the President's administrative agencies, produce a union membership card.

Yes, and if, for any reason, the dues have not been paid to date, by a massed picket line they are turned back at the factory's gate.

MOTHERS, FATHERS, BROTHERS OF SERVICEMEN DENIED OPPORTUNITY TO AID FIGHTING MEN

Under date of December 10, we learned that, at Detroit, Mich., 50 women employees halted work because 2 nonunion employees had been escorted into the plant by policemen, through a picket line. There, picketing dues collectors for the C. I. O. for 2 days were endeavoring to prevent nonunion and dues-delinquent union members from entering the gates.

It was on December 10 that the president of the American Rolling Mill Co. sent the following wire to Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board:

As president of the American Rolling Mill Co. and at the instance of its directors, I am laying before you a situation of grave emergency which has arisen at our plants at Zanesville, Ohio, and Butler, Pa., where we have been devoting every energy in compliance with the urgent requests of the Government to the production of armor plate and other vital war matériel.

Last August, at the insistence of the United Steel Workers of America, C. I. O., and under order of the National Labor Relations Board, there was held in these plants elections to determine whether the employees desired, as their bargaining representative, the C. I. O. In both elections the C. I. O . was rejected as the bargaining agent.

Thereafter, the C. I. O. instituted agitation to nullify the result of these elections. Beginning last Monday, December 6, the C. I. O. established a so-called picket line at the Zanesville plant whereby individuals walk in mass formation before the entrances to the plant, with the result that we have been obliged to shut down completely. This condition continues and threats are made to see that it does continue until such time

as our company disobeys the law and fails to continue to recognize the results of the election.

The situation is doubly urgent and critical because the United Steel Workers of America—Congress of Industrial Organizations, is now withdrawing its members from vital parts of our Butler plant as well, with the effect of causing an equally acute shut-down there. Representatives of the Army and Navy Departments were at the Butler plant yesterday in an effort to secure resumption of the production so vital to the national interest.

This conduct on the part of the Congress of Industrial Organizations is in violation of the formal no-strike pledge given by that organization and now recognized by Executive order. It is also inconsistent with the national labor relations law which contemplates that the result of such an election as was held shall be observed. Furthermore, it is in complete violation of the Smith-Connally Act which provides that, before any strike is called or held in a plant engaged in the production of munitions of war, certain preliminary conditions set forth in the statute shall be complied with. None of these conditions has been complied with. Finally—and even more important—this conduct by the Congress of Industrial Organizations constitutes a grave weakening of the national war effort and imperils the success of our country's arms and the lives of our soldiers and sailors throughout the world.

The National Labor Relations Act provides an orderly remedy for any matters in dispute between the United Steel Workers of America—Congress of Industrial Organizations—and the American Rolling Mill Co.; and the union should be required to pursue its remedies under the law rather than take the law into its own hands.

We desire to lay this crisis before you so that your Board and the military departments of the Government can take such action as you deem necessary and proper to accomplish the immediate termination of the illegal and unwarranted actions above mentioned, so that the flow of these vital necessities of war from these plants can be resumed immediately and without further interruption.

If you or the military departments of the Government desire conference with me or any of the other representatives of our company, we shall be glad to meet your very earliest convenience.

Monday morning I was advised by Mr. Keenan of the War Production Board that the matter had been turned over to him and the men were back at work. Whether the picket line was dispersed, I do not know.

NO-STRIKE PLEDGE VIOLATED

But we all know from the press that strike has followed strike, practically all holding up war production.

Time and again, when there was a deadlock between employer and employee, the President has ordered seizure of the plant. But never yet has he or any Federal agency ordered seizure of a union, or called upon the armed forces to disperse a massed picket line which was keeping nonunion men or union men delinquent in dues from entering factory gates.

DISCRIMINATION MUST END

It is about time that those who would win the war on the home front by entering the factory gates and working at their accustomed tasks receive the support of the administration.

It is not enough to support the men who have been drafted and sent overseas by sending them munitions of war. It is not enough to purchase the good will and the friendship of our South American neighbors. It is not enough for the President or the First Lady, or any other representative of this Government, to travel all around the world in an effort to determine strategy, promote good will, cement the alliance with our allies.

In addition to all that, we must have support and protection for those here at home who wish to produce and to transport food, clothing, munitions of war—everything that is needed so urgently by those who are bearing the heat of the battle.

Where is the consistency, where is the justice, where is the all-out support for the war effort when strikes or massed picket lines or orders of W. L. B. deny the right to work in war industries until a union has collected its tribute? I am asking the Members of this body, what are we going to do about it? Are we going to continue to draft men, fathers, if you please, and compel them to fight, yet deny to the wives, the sisters, the fathers and the brothers that they leave at home the right to help them by manufacturing munitions of war? That is what we are doing when we permit the War Labor Board to continue to issue orders like those which they have been issuing.

Yes, Mr. President and Mr. Speaker, there are dangerous trends in this country, and some of them can be ended by Congress when it reasserts, as I hope it will, its authority; again assumes the responsibility which rests upon it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the pending bill which is covered by the rule now under discussion, H. R. 2350, I hope will be passed by this House unanimously. It simply proposes to administer justice to the veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition and to the widows and dependents of those veterans. I cannot conceive of there being any substantial argument raised against the passage of this meritorious bill. But in this very connection, while we are proposing to legislate in behalf of the veterans of the Spanish War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, it is entirely proper that we should give immediate consideration to the question of taking care of those who are being discharged from the services in the present war.

I feel that this Congress owes an obligation, an immediate obligation, to the men who are being discharged by the thousands from the service in the present war to see to it that no unnecessary delays are encountered in providing a suitable system of mustering-out pay and providing for a proper piece of legislation that will insure to the returning discharged veterans a decent demobilization compensation in line and in spirit with the provisions contained in a proposed bill offered and sponsored by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman, of course, knows that there are numerous statutes and many provisions that have been made for the benefit of all disabled, wounded, and sick soldiers as they are discharged.

Mr. KEEFE. I may say to the gentleman that I am quite familiar with the fact that this Congress under the guidance of the Military Affairs Committee of this House has placed on the statute books an enormous amount of legislation designed to provide facilities to take care of the disabled soldiers of this war. Much of the complaint that arises, I am fully aware, arises not because of lack of legislation to take care of the disabled but because of administration failure to carry out the provisions of law that are now on the statute books. I direct the gentleman's attention to the fact that I am not so particularly concerned in what I am saying now about the necessity for additional legislation to provide hospitalization and care for the disabled and the wounded as I am to see to it that the economic status of the men who are returned from the service is protected so that those men after they are discharged from a hospital facility, perchance, are not compelled to go back upon a local community without employment and without means of support.

We should provide immediate means of seeing to it that when a man is discharged he has sufficient funds in his pocket to enable him to have at least a 2 weeks' or a month's vacation with pay, in the form of a cash demobilization or mustering-out pay.

We should further see to it that that soldier is protected in his economic status so he will not become dependent upon the charity of relatives or municipalities in the time intervening until he is able to secure employment.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. May I say to the gentleman that the House Committee on Military Affairs has done exactly what the gentleman said we have done. He is very correct in that statement. In addition, we have conducted hearings day after day since the bill was submitted to us, and we completed what we thought were final hearings on the mustering-out pay. However, at the very hour when we were about ready to report a strictly mustering-out pay bill, the groups representing the veterans' organizations and pleading from the outside for these soldiers demanded hearings on an adjusted compensation bill that involves vast ramifications and billions of dollars, probably $15,000,000,000. Now we are up against the problem of having to consider them both together.

We found in the course of our hearings that 635,000 men have been discharged, and out of 15,000 men in the

State of Indiana who have been discharged, less than 300 had not gotten immediate employment when they came out of the Army.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. If there are 300 that have been unable to secure employment in the State of Indiana out of 15,000 who have been demobilized, that is 300 too many if those 300 are forced to rely upon private charity.

Mr. MAY. Those 300 went on State compensation at the rate of $60 per month.

Mr. KEEFE. That is fine. I am very glad to hear that. If the State of Indiana has provided a system of unemployment compensation for returning veterans, the State of Indiana is to be congratulated.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The gentleman has alluded to the State of Indiana.

Mr. KEEFE. I did not allude to it, the gentleman from Kentucky did.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I should state to the gentleman that of the 300,000 men in the military service from Indiana approximately 50 percent, or 150,000, are covered by unemployment compensation insurance. Fortunately, Indiana was farsighted enough to freeze these payments when the men entered the service. Hence when they are discharged from the service, if employment is not immediately available, they will be eligible immediately to weekly payments of unemployment compensation.

Mr. KEEFE. I have no quarrel with the gentleman from Indiana. I have already eulogized his State for making such provisions. My understanding is that all States have not frozen employee rights under State laws. Is the gentleman, who is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, and I understand a member of the subcommittee in charge of drafting this legislation, able to state here on the floor of the House from information which he has that is authentic that the same situation exists in the other States of this Union?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I am told that so far as the percentage of them covered by unemployment insurance is concerned, the same situation exists in the other States.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman is told. Is the gentleman able to state with authenticity that that same situation exists in other States of the Union?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I base my statement upon the testimony of Col. E. L. Gardner, Director of the Unemployment Security Division of the State of Indiana, and a distinguished Hoosier. Colonel Gardner stated to the House Military Affairs Committee that thus far about 15,000 Indiana men have been discharged from the armed services and that less than 300 of that number have applied for and received unemployment compensation payments, indicating, of course, that there are plenty of jobs now available to discharged soldiers and sailors who are able to work. I am also informed that many of the States followed the practice of Indiana in freezing unemployment compensation. However, there are States that did not freeze those payments. I agree fully with the gentleman from Wisconsin that this Congress should, as soon as possible, enact legislation for muster-out pay. Such legislation will not only help the few men who now cannot find employment, but it will be a great relief to many who will be later discharged when employment will not be so easily obtained.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There are a good many veterans today who are on soldiers' relief, so I think that answers the gentleman's question. I think a mustering-out provision should be incorporated in any draft law, so that the men when they go out of the service will know they are going to be taken care of until they can adjust themselves to normal living.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not have possession of all the facts that may be in the possession of the Committee on Military Affairs. I am not stating anything in an attempt to be critical of that committee. I am taking this opportunity to urge the necessity for immediate action, in the matter of mustering-out pay.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I have already made and the remarks I expect to make now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to hear the gentleman from Wisconsin advocate aid for the discharged and demobilized thousands, and I can assure him that we, the Democrats, are ready to do our part, because we feel that every man who has served the country should be taken care of and provided for and should not be left to the mercy of any charitable institution. We should take care of the disabled and discharged until they are reemployed. We should go the limit for them and I know that will be done. As we have heard from the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, it would have been done before this and the bill would have been in the House now if it had not been for the fact that some of those representing these men have asked for a delay so that the bill may be amended.

I was hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that it would not be necessary for me to take a little more time. I was hopeful that for once the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] would not bring politics into the discussion of this extremely meritorious and deserving bill. Unfortunately, he had to go back to the days when this administration came into power and refer to how much indebtedness there was and how we have increased the indebtedness.

I hope the gentleman from New York will refresh his memory and give the House and the country information as to the difference in our National income in 1933, when this administration came into power, and as of the present day. At that time the income was around $40,000,000,000. I am told that today it is over $160,000,000,000, four times as large as the national income then, and a sum which I know will take care of our indebtedness. With $160,000,000,000 we can pay all that we owe or will owe within a very few years when this war is over. Of course it would not have cost as much if we had been able to prepare our defenses in time. I believe millions would have been saved, but unfortunately the gentleman from New York and others thought it was not necessary to prepare and finally, when the Japs attacked, we were obliged to go to work, and the sky was the limit that the manufacturers demanded of the country for their production of the things the Government needed for our defense and for the prosecution of the war.

Nor did the gentleman from New York state what the prices of commodities were when this administration came in, that cattle and hogs were selling for about 3 cents a pound on the hoof and that corn and wheat were selling at from 20 to 30 cents a bushel. Eggs were about 14 cents a dozen. These low prices applied to all other commodities. A price ceiling has finally been put on cattle, as I have been advocating, and unfortunately it is now up to 16 cents, where formerly, as I stated, it was 3 or 3½ cents a pound. So why not be fair about these things and give the House and the country all the facts and all the information so that they can vote and as they vote approve the efforts of this administration in the interest of the country and the people, and also what they are doing to preserve a democratic form of government? I am not going to answer the gentleman from Michigan who continues to find fault with labor and labor organizations, and when there is a cessation of work for a few hours he calls it a strike. He criticizes the War Labor Board. It seems to me that neither the War Labor Board nor any other board can satisfy the gentleman from Michigan. And as to how much there is of political alliance and aid given, may I not remind him that a great alliance was formed in 1942—that the Republicans formed an alliance with men that the gentleman from Michigan has been criticizing, such as John L. Lewis and Earl Browder, both of whom opposed President Roosevelt.

I will say this to the gentleman from Michigan and to the gentleman from New York, that these men they charge are responsible for extravagance and unnecessary expenditures, that these charges should not apply to the established or permanent departments or bureaus which are headed by Democrats, such as the Department of State, the

Interior Department, the Commerce Department, the Treasury Department, the Department of Justice, the Department of Agriculture, or the Department of Labor, that are controlled by and have at the head of them Democrats who believe in economy as contrasted with these men whom the President was obliged to put in charge of domestic affairs when he was obliged to devote all of this time to the very serious foreign situation and to the war effort when he put in charge the outstanding Republican businessmen that he thought believed in economy.

Now let us see who they are. You all know Mr. Knudsen, you know Mr. Nelson, you know Mr. Harriman. You know Mr. Stettinius. Even the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, whose Departments spend the most money, are all Republicans. So why do you charge the Democratic administration or the President with the expenditures of these large sums of money, when you should charge and put the blame upon the Republican big businessmen whom the President appointed? I am glad you applaud, and I am glad you agree with me, because I will say I always find that there are some Republicans who recognize the truth and believe in justice instead of continuously assailing and attacking and criticizing and getting in the limelight in the unfriendly newspapers.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I will yield in a moment, as soon as I express my admiration for the speech made by the Speaker on Thursday, December 9. I regret that I was not present to hear it. When I read it and when I heard about it I was impressed that he had talked to the hearts of men, that they will take into consideration his appeal for unity and harmony and cooperation and that the sniping and criticizing and attacking and weakening our position in the eyes of the people of the world over, will cease.

I now yield to my esteemed friend, the leader of the Republican Party, of the minority, in which important position I hope he will continue.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Your dreams in that respect are not going to come true.

Mr. SABATH. As a rule they do.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Not in this instance.

I would like to ask the gentleman, in all fairness, since he has dwelt at some length upon his own fairness, who is responsible for the appointment of the head of the O. P. A. and every other bureau in this country? Is it not a fact that the man who appoints these men and keeps them in office must be held responsible? He can remove them anytime he wants to.

Mr. SABATH. I say to you, answering your question, it was President Franklin D. Roosevelt who appointed most of these men, but he appointed them because they were represented to him and he had reason to believe they were the outstanding businessmen of the Nation and that they would protect its interests.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If the President thinks otherwise today, why does he not remove them?

Mr. SABATH. In the midst of war this would not be the time to remove anybody. I would not even believe you should be removed or any other Republican who is here doing his duty by his country.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman claim that if there is inefficiency and bungling going on in time of war, when we need efficiency more than at any other time, we are going to allow it to continue?

Mr. SABATH. Let me say to you, the charge of inefficiency is bunk on the part of any man who makes such charge, because when they are called upon to testify and give evidence——

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Nobody is making any charge. You are admitting it on the floor of the House.

Mr. SABATH. No; wait a second. I am not admitting any such thing. I only point out that in the daily charges made on the floor and in the press about the bungling and inefficiency are not justified by the facts and never can be substantiated.

I want to be fair. I am told a certain Senator charged that there were about $6,000,000,000 wasted upon our neighbors to the south of us. After careful investigation the amount went down from $6,000,000,000 to $167,000,000, not even one-fortieth part of his statement was true or was borne out by the facts. In view of that fact you should see to it, you are a fair man, of course I know you are the Republican leader, but you should see to it that the Republican Members do not make these charges which cannot be substantiated because it hurts our country.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Let us get back to the original argument.

Mr. SABATH. These reckless charges and insinuations are hurting our unity and are not conducive, or encouraging, to our brave and courageous men who are giving their all for our country, who are disheartened to read these charges, not knowing, not realizing, that they are not borne out by the facts, and most of them are made for purely political reasons.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZIMMERMAN). The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2350) to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2350, with Mr. COFFEE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The bill reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That effective the 1st day of the month following the date of enactment of this act the $60 monthly rate of pension payable for total disability to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition under section 1 of the act of June 2, 1930 (46 Stat. 492; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 365), and the $60 monthly rate of pension payable to such veterans upon reaching the age of 65 years under the provisions of section 1 of the act of May 24, 1938 (52 Stat. 440; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 370), are hereby increased to $75.

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the act of May 1, 1926 (44 Stat. 382; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 364a), wherein for pension purposes, as to the widow of any deceased veteran of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, the marriage date is defined as September 1, 1922, is hereby amended, effective the 1st day of the month following the date of enactment of this act, by striking out the date "September 1, 1922" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "January 1, 1938."

SEC. 3. The act of May 1, 1926 (44 Stat. 382–384; U. S. C., title 38, secs. 364–364f) is hereby amended, effective the 1st day of the month following the date of enactment of this act, by adding a new section thereto numbered 8, to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. The $30 monthly pension payable to widows and former widows under the provisions of section 2 of this act, as amended, shall be increased to $40 per month when the age of 65 years is attained, and the widow or former widow who was the wife of the soldier, sailor, or marine during the period of his service, as defined in section 2 of this act, shall be paid a pension at the rate of $50 per month."

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, the following statement is made in support of H. R. 2350, a bill to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents.

The bill (H. R. 2350) was unanimously reported by the Committee on Pensions on October 14, 1943.

Briefly, the bill (H. R. 2350) would authorize service pensions to veterans and widows of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection and China Relief Expedition more nearly on a parity with veterans and widows of deceased veterans of the Civil War. H. R. 2350 does not go as far as the existing service pension laws pertaining to veterans of the Civil War as they receive a minimum of $75 per month and practically all of them qualify at the present time for the rate of $100 per month.

H. R. 2350 would grant the $75 rate only at age 65 or where the veteran is totally disabled. Their rate at present is $60 for age 65 or total disability with lesser rates for age 62 or disability less than total.

The marriage date for widows of Spanish-American War veterans is now September 1, 1922, which date would be changed to January 1, 1938, 40 years after the beginning of the Spanish American War and 36 years after the close of the Philippine Insurrection, whereas the Civil War widows' delimiting date is June 27, 1905, 44 years after the beginning of the Civil War and 40 years after the end of that war.

H. R. 2350 would also grant widows $40 per month if age 65 or over and $50 per month if the widow was the wife of the veteran during his service in the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, or China Relief Expedition. The $50 rate and eligibility requirements are identical with Civil War laws and the $40 rate is identical with the Civil War rate but the age for eligibility is 65 years instead of 70, taking into consideration the unemployability of widows age 65 or over. The existing law grants a widow of a Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection or China Relief Expedition veteran only one rate, namely $30 per month.

The estimated cost for the first year furnished by the Veterans' Administration is as follows:

SECTION 1. $75 for age 65 or total disability affecting 85,140 veterans	$15,286,000
SEC. 2. Widows marriage date change to Jan. 1, 1938, affecting 4,000 widows	1,642,000
If one-half apply the first year	821,000
SEC. 3. $40 rate for widow, age 65; $50 rate for widow if married to veteran during war 42,000 widows affected	8,242,000
Total estimated cost first year	24,349,000

From what I have stated you will note that this bill does not go as far as the existing laws pertaining to Civil War veterans. You will recall that the Economy Act of March 20, 1933, repealed the service pension laws pertaining to veterans and dependents of deceased veterans. However, the President approved complete restoration of those laws under date of August 12, 1935, Public 269, Seventy-fourth Congress. In the President's statement at the time of approval of the measure he stressed the case of Spanish-American War veterans as being comparable to the Civil War veterans and his action was not a precedent for World War veterans for whom other benefits had been provided. The circumstances surrounding their service and other reasons show that the Spanish-American War group must properly be afforded benefits granted Civil War cases. The President's statement appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Senate, volume 79, part 12, page 13033, August 14, 1935.

What is requested by H. R. 2350 is simple justice to these veterans advanced in years and widows who are in need of pensions and are denied although they lived with and cared for the veteran in some cases as long as 15 years. You will note that the marriage date proposed conforms with Civil War, being somewhat more conservative and by fixing the date at January 1, 1938, about 6 years back, no widow could come on the rolls who married the veteran after that date.

Further, the House recently passed H. R. 3356 and H. R. 3377, which provide increased rates for World War No. 1 and the same rates for World War No. 2 veterans and in the case of H. R. 3356 increase is provided for the widows and children of World War No. 1 deceased veterans and the same rates are made to apply to widows and children of deceased World War No. 2 veterans.

At the time of the debate on H. R. 3356 and H. R. 3377 for example, the question was asked as to increases for the veterans and widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection and the China Relief Expedition. This bill (H. R. 2350) was then referred to as the one which would meet this need.

In view of the conservative and equitable provisions of H. R. 2350 and the committment of the Government to this group, I urge passage of the measure.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCKLEY. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is it correct that this bill is predicated upon the increased cost of living?

Mr. BUCKLEY. That is right in part.

Mr. COLE of New York. That being so, I am curious to know why the committee did not make temporary, rather than permanent legislation.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Well, it is to correspond with the legislation for the Civil War veterans at the present time.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BUCKLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. What is the percentage increase? A widow is raised from $30 to $40 a month?

Mr. BUCKLEY. From $30 to $40, unless she was the wife of a veteran at the time of the war.

Mr. GREEN. The Spanish War veterans are raised from $65 to $75?

Mr. BUCKLEY. From $60 to $75, the same as Civil War veterans.

Mr. GREEN. That will give the Spanish War veterans and their dependents a similar increase to what we have already granted for the World War veterans.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Yes; exactly the same as the Civil War veterans are getting.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman yield further to me?

Mr. BUCKLEY. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. If the basis of this bill is due to the increased cost of living, why is it that the committee did not consider an adjustment of pensions for Civil War veterans and their widows, who have to bear the increased cost of living proportionately equal to the veterans of any other war?

Mr. BUCKLEY. We did not take into consideration only the increased cost of living. We also took into consideration the fact that the Civil War veterans are getting $75 a month, and we gave the Spanish War veterans who went into the war with the same understanding, the same pension.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is there any measure pending before your committee looking toward an adjustment of Civil War pensions due to the increased cost of living?

Mr. BUCKLEY. My committee does not have anything to do with Civil War veterans.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. This is permanent legislation, is it not?

Mr. BUCKLEY. Yes; this is permanent legislation.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. The marriage date of wives is advanced from 1922 to 1938?

Mr. BUCKLEY. That is right.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. And it will go into effect the first of the month immediately after the passage of the measure by both the House and Senate and signing by the President?

Mr. BUCKLEY. That is right.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I thank the gentleman. As a veteran myself, I am interested in the welfare of veterans of all wars. I want the House to know that I am in wholehearted accord with this bill and my only regret is that it was not brought to the floor before this.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. We recently passed a bill increasing the pension of World War veterans. Is the rate of increase in this bill for Spanish War veterans substantially in line with the increase for World War veterans' pensions?

Mr. BUCKLEY. I should say it is.

Mr. BROOKS. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: The bill refers to veterans reaching the age of 65 under the provisions of the original law. What of these Spanish War veterans under the age of 65?

Mr. BUCKLEY. The average age of Spanish-American War vetérans, as I have been informed, is 69 years.

Mr. BROOKS. Are there none at all living under 65 years of age?

Mr. BUCKLEY. There are not very many.

Mr. BROOKS. What about the few who are living?

Mr. BUCKLEY. There are very few.

Mr. BROOKS. Would they get less than $75?

Mr. BUCKLEY. They would get less, but the average age is 69, as I understand it.

Mr. BROOKS. Suppose they are incapacitated and are under 65?

Mr. BUCKLEY. They are provided for anyway by rates for disability or age. They get $100 a month if they are required to have an attendant, regardless of their age.

Mr. BROOKS. If the incapacity is non-service-connected, would they receive $100?

Mr. BUCKLEY. They would receive $100 if in need of aid and attendance.

Mr. BROOKS. As against $75, if they are over 65?

Mr. BUCKLEY. That is right.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCKLEY. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I notice by the bill in section 2 you change the marriage date from September 1, 1922, to January 1, 1938. Would the gentleman explain the reason for making that change in the marriage date?

Mr. BUCKLEY. To make this bill conform with the Civil War veterans' law. Their marriage date is about 39 years after the Civil War. The Spanish-American War date now will be about 39 years after the Spanish-American War.

Mr. SPRINGER. And this change, which is proposed in this measure, conforms almost identically with the change which was made in the Civil War marriage date?

Mr. BUCKLEY. Yes. The only change is a reduction in the age limit from 70 years to 65 years for the $40 rate for widows.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Was I correct in understanding the gentleman to say that the annual cost of this change would be around $24,500,000?

Mr. BUCKLEY. That is right, about $24,349,000 the first year.

Mr. CRAWFORD. For veterans and widows of veterans, both groups?

Mr. BUCKLEY. That is right; that will take care of all of them.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In view of the gentleman's explanation of the last three or four questions submitted, was the controlling factor in arriving at $75 per month the increase granted veterans of the Civil War or the increase in the cost of living?

Mr. BUCKLEY. Increase in the cost of living accounted for some of it and the other factor was to bring them in line with the treatment given the Civil War veterans.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not want to be too technical about this and I am serious in my question, but if the formula was that because the Civil War veterans had been raised to $75 a month and we move up to that, it seems to me—and I want to be clear on this—that that is the primary or controlling factor in this particular instance. Am I wrong?

Mr. BUCKLEY. No; the gentleman is not wrong in that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I undertand, of course, that the gentleman's committee did give consideration to the increased cost of living.

Mr. BUCKLEY. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would the gentleman care to commit himself in advance on his own personal opinion or that of his committee so far as he can with respect to the situation that would prevail if the cost of living continued to rise? Would it be the disposition of the committee to recommend to the House any further increase, this going primarily, I think, to the cost of living? I am not going to press for an answer.

Mr. BUCKLEY. I cannot tell what the policy of the Congress may be in the future in regard to an increase.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I was inquiring as to the committee, but I am not going to press the question because I know it is somewhat out of line with general procedure.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. There is not anything in the bill which grants increases to those who have not reached age 65 or who are not incapacitated; is there?

Mr. BUCKLEY. I have been informed there are very few under 65.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I happen to know a few under 65.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Very few; the great majority are over.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCKLEY. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. I have received more communications with reference to this legislation perhaps than any other from my district, and I am wondering what has happened that the committee was so long in having the bill brought to the floor.

Mr. BUCKLEY. That I cannot answer.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCKLEY. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I notice that section 8 provides:

SEC. 8. The $30 monthly pension payable to widows and former widows under the provisions of section 2 of this act, as amended, shall be increased to $40 per month when the age of 65 years is attained, and the widow or former widow who was the wife of the soldier, sailor, or marine during the period of his service, as defined in section 2 of this act, shall be paid a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

Does that mean regardless of whether the soldier or sailor had a service-connected disability?

Mr. BUCKLEY. Yes, service connection is not required.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as a minority member of this committee I want to say that our chairman in the interrogations here has covered this bill rather completely, and my statement will be rather brief. I think it is well to keep in mind in matters of this kind that the average age of these veterans of the Spanish-American War is 69. The average age of the widows is 65. I am informed that the Spanish veterans are passing out, are dying, at the rate of over 5,000 a year.

These men were volunteers, regardless of the trials and tribulations of the warfare of that time. The country did issue the call for soldiers to perform a duty and these men responded. They went through some very trying places upon the earth. They had yellow fever to contend with, as I recall, and they had a great deal of trouble with bad meat that made one of the scandals of that day. Many of them came back broken in health.

The committee listened to and gave consideration to all the witnesses interested in this legislation and the committee voted unanimously in favor of the bill. I believe it is reasonable and just. I hope the House this afternoon will see fit to pass favorably upon this legislation.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIS. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. As I understand, practically all Spanish-American War veterans are now above age 65; am I right?

Mr. ELLIS. The average is 69.

Mr. JENKINS. That is the average, but there are a very few under 65.

Mr. ELLIS. I should think so.

Mr. JENKINS. That being the case, this bill would apply to practically every Spanish War veteran and increase his pension $15 a month.

Mr. ELLIS. That is my understanding. I think it involves about 84,000 veterans.

Mr. JENKINS. And under this bill the pensions of the widows are increased only $10. Is that right?

Mr. ELLIS. That is my understanding; yes.

Mr. JENKINS. Regardless of her age and regardless of what she is drawing now.

Mr. ELLIS. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIS. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to inquire in this manner by reason of this coming up at this time and the witnesses having appeared and especially in the light of the fact that the average age of these people is 69 years, what evidence was shown to the committee that $75 would cover the physical needs of this particular group at this time under today's cost of necessities? Was there any evidence submitted along that line?

Mr. ELLIS. No specific evidence, to my knowledge. It was more or less an arbitrary figure. It was realized and recognized that what they were getting was not sufficiently comfortable to live on today. That was my basis of reasoning on it and it may have been the reasoning of the others, I do not know.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not informed on the Civil War pension matter. What did we pay the Civil War veterans, $75?

Mr. ELLIS. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The chairman of the committee spoke about this being related to what was paid the Civil War veteran.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is the tie-in between this pension of $75 a month and the amount we paid the Civil War veterans?

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. In answer to the gentleman's inquiry, it is my understanding that we are doing for the Spanish-

American War veterans at their age what we did for the veterans of the Civil War at a like age.

Mr. ELLIS. That is my understanding.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is what I am trying to confirm. What did we pay those veterans, $75 a month?

Mr. ELLIS. I will direct that question to the chairman of the committee who, more than likely, has the information.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The question I submit is this: What did we pay the Civil War veterans in the form of pensions at about the average age of 69? Was it $75 a month?

Mr. BUCKLEY. Seventy-five dollars a month.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That answers my question. Here is what is in my mind. We are having all this veterans' legislation come through here now for review, these sums that are being discussed to be paid men upon being released from the Army, whether they go directly back into a war industry job that pays these fantastically high wages which we are now paying or whether they remain out of a job. I am not protesting. I am trying to get something straight in my own mind. Apparently we are going now into a program which will call for vast sums and increased amounts to be paid to men who have been allied with our military activities. If this is to be somewhat the pattern, I am wondering what $75 per month will do in the way of giving a fairly decent living to a man with an average age of 69 years on today's basis of the cost of living. That is what is back of my mind, and especially as I relate that proposition to the sums that are being discussed, fixed amounts to a man if he is released from the Army and if he is physically able to go back into a war industry. I am wondering if the gentleman can give me any comfort with respect to that general set of questions.

Mr. ELLIS. That was a rather lengthy question and covered a great field. I think the gentleman is making a worthwhile observation. The gentleman from Wisconsin this afternoon brought very forcibly to our attention that in considering these things we should look at it as an over-all picture with reference to the problems we are going to be faced with in the very near future. I made an observation here awhile ago that it satisfied my own conscience in relation to this: That these men were up in years and that they were dropping off at the rate of five or six thousand a year; so, as for myself, I considered that a problem just alone. When the Second World War comes to us that will be something else.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I am very much in favor of this bill because I think it is long overdue the Spanish-American War veterans. I would like to ask the gentleman some questions that perhaps the hearings have developed. Will the members of the Philippine Scouts who participated in the Philippine Insurrection benefit by this bill?

Mr. ELLIS. I will direct that question to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman will find that answer in line 6, page 1, of the bill.

Mr. STEFAN. It does not say anything about the Philippine Scouts. I am talking about the Philippine Scouts.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman mean those who are natives of the Philippine Islands?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; but in the enlisted forces of the United States Army.

Mr. ELLIS. I am not prepared to answer that question.

Mr. STEFAN. Was anything said about that in the hearings?

Mr. ELLIS. I do not recall.

Mr. STEFAN. The bill is to liberalize the service pensions awarded to veterans of the Spanish War and the Chinese expedition. That is the Boxer Rebellion?

Mr. ELLIS. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Was there anything developed in the hearings regarding the Philippine Constabulary members?

Mr. ELLIS. I do not recall. If my memory serves me correctly, there was not.

Mr. STEFAN. Nothing was said about the Philippine Constabulary members who participated in the Philippine Insurrection. The gentleman cannot clarify my mind about the Philippine Scouts?

Mr. ELLIS. I am sorry, I cannot.

Mr. STEFAN. I am very much in favor of this bill. I would like to talk to the gentleman sometime off the record about the Philippine Scouts who are very much interested in veterans' bills that we bring on the floor of the House here because they are a part of the armed forces of the United States although most of them are now in the hands of the Japanese.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman may have answered this, but I did not hear it. Has a similar bill to this been passed by the Senate during the present session?

Mr. ELLIS. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. JENKINS. I thought the Senate had.

Mr. ELLIS. I cannot answer the question.

Mr. JENKINS. I understand from the Clerk that the Senate has not passed a companion bill. I want to congratulate the gentleman on his activities with reference to this legislation and I hope it passes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The total amount involved in this bill is about $30,000,000, as I understand.

Mr. ELLIS. No, my understanding is that it is $24,500,000.

Mr. DONDERO. This will gradually decrease, of course, as time goes on and the number of veterans grows less.

Mr. ELLIS. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. This is a good bill, in the gentleman's judgment?

Mr. ELLIS. It certainly is.

Mr. DONDERO. It ought to pass. It is the first duty of government to provide for those who bear the brunt of the battles of the nations, and their widows and orphans.

Mr. ELLIS. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. I want to support this bill.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, there is no occasion for a long discussion of this bill. It is short. The Committee on Pensions feels that the bill is entirely justified.

I want to mention something here that has not been mentioned heretofore, I believe, and that is the fact that the Spanish-American War veterans put off this issue as long as they could. They have had it in mind, as I understand, but have put it off. They did not want to send a bill to the House, but the increase in the cost of living and the increasing age of the veterans have forced them to ask for the passage of this bill.

The Committee on Pensions heard various witnesses and voted unanimously to bring this bill to the House.

The bill simply increases the pension of veterans of the Spanish-American War, and the other groups mentioned therein from $60 to $75 per month for those who are totally disabled and for those who are not totally disabled if they have reached the age of 65. Note, all totally disabled are advanced to $75 per month, and all others are advanced to $75 if they are 65 years of age. That covers nearly all of them, for the average age is 69.

As to the marriage date, that is changed from September 1, 1922, to January 1, 1938. This was done to correspond to pensions to Civil War widows. The delimiting marriage date with reference to Civil War widows was June 27, 1905, about 40 years after the Civil War. This bill fixes the delimiting marriage date for Spanish-American war widows at January 1, 1938, about 40 years after the war was terminated.

As to the widows, I understand all of them are now getting $30 per month if married to the veteran prior to September 1, 1922. This bill simply increases that amount to $40 per month, provided they are 65 years of age, and extends the marriage date to January 1, 1938, and if they were the wives of the men while they were in the service they get $50 per month. This likewise is largely in conformity to the law regulating pensions to Civil War widows. In other words, the bill makes a distinction between the widow who was the wife of the veteran during the war and those married after the war, just as the law does as to Civil War widows.

We submit it is entitled to the unanimous approval of this House. The cost of living has gone up. The veterans and widows of veterans are getting old, and it is felt that this increase is necessary and

deserved by the Spanish-American War veterans and their widows.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] asked several times about the basis of this bill. The bill is based on the fact that these veterans are now of an average age of 69 years, and also upon the increasing cost of living. Many of them are in their seventies. Perhaps very few are below 65. This Nation cannot afford to neglect these veterans. Also, as I have just pointed out, a similar treatment was given Civil War veterans when they were about that age. The Veterans' Administration has stated that the widows are at an average age of 64. Likewise, as I indicated, their treatment in this bill is similar to the treatment accorded widows of Civil War veterans. Your Committee on Pensions has tried to make this bill conform as nearly as possible with what was done for the Civil War veterans.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I wish to ask concerning section 2 of the bill, which relates to the change in the marriage date. Is the effect of changing the date from September 1, 1922, to January 1, 1938, to make eligible for widows' pensions widows who have been unable to establish service connection as a cause for the death of the veteran?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. No; this is not a service-connection bill.

Mr. CASE. Perhaps the gentleman did not get my question. As I understand, in some cases if service connection is shown the widow gets greater pension rights.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Under this bill if the widow is 65 years of age and married the veteran before January 1, 1938, she gets $40 per month. If she was the wife of the veteran while he was in the service then she gets $50 per month. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. CASE. I am not entirely sure it does. I was referring not to section 3 but to section 2.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. My understanding is that under the law now widows of Spanish-American War veterans who married the veterans after September 1, 1922, are not paid any pension at all. This bill extends that date to January 1, 1938. The marriage must have taken place before September 1, 1922.

Mr. CASE. If there was not service connection?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. That does not alter the situation. The widow must have married the veteran before September 1, 1922, in all cases. Now we bring this down to January 1, 1938, in this bill, which we understand is almost exactly in line with the Civil War situation.

Mr. CASE. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. This additional question will come up that we shall have to try to answer. If I understood the gentleman correctly a moment ago, this change in the marriage date was to make the present situation as related to the Spanish-American War veterans very closely conform to the marriage date and the status of the widows of Civil War veterans.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. General Hines told us it was almost the same.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, that is the real reason for changing the marriage date?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. That is the reason.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Louisiana, an able member of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. BROOKS. I am sure my colleague has made a long and exhaustive study of this subject. I just had occasion to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation in reference to those veterans who are under the age of 65, does the gentleman believe that this bill adequately cares for them and gives them the increase that we think those above 65 are entitled to?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I think most of them get a pension under the present law. This will help them greatly. This was requested by the Spanish-American War veterans. It is probably the best that can be done now. I am sure these veterans will welcome the benefits under this bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do I understand now that General Hines or the Veterans' Administration recommended the increases and also the change in dates of marriage?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. There is a lengthy letter from General Hines in the hearings. I would not say that he recommends it. That is not usually done. He advises the committees having to do with such legislation as to the facts and leaves the other to the legislative branch of the Government. But I will say this, that the date, January 1, 1938, as I recall, was fixed because of the testimony of General Hines. In other words, he testified that that was in line with the Civil War situation, and that is why it was fixed.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Veterans' Administration did not in any way oppose the legislation?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. They simply took the position that it was not in line with the President's program as they often do with reference to bills.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman go so far as to say that the Veterans' Administration supported the legislation?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. No; not specifically. I think the Veterans' Administration took a position similar to what it has taken in many other bills. They recognize it is a matter for the legislative branch of the Government to pass on.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. But the whole thing is this: If we want to put these people on a parity with what was done for the Civil War veterans a good many years ago, then we owe this to the Spanish-American War veterans and widows of Spanish-American War veterans.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Of course, the gentleman now is referring to age, marriage date, and dollar volume of pensions, is he not?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Well; yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, I think the gentleman will agree with me that $75 per month today to a veteran of the average age of 65, will not bring what $75 would bring a veteran of an average age of 65, say 20 years ago?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. That is a matter of elementary knowledge, I will say, to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, the bill under debate, H. R. 2350, proposes to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents. The Committee on Pensions has conducted hearings on the proposal and after careful study has recommended its enactment. I understand, however, that opposition to its passage has arisen and this causes me to rise to urge strongly on the Members of this House that they adhere to the recommendation of the committee and vote for its enactment.

Briefly, the bill proposes to increase the rate of pension payable to veterans of the Spanish War and other military operations of this country. The provisions of the bill require age 65 or total disability to entitle veterans to $75 per month.

Section 2 of the bill eliminates present inequalities by delimiting the marriage date for service pension to widows, defining the date as January 1, 1938.

Section 3 provides for a reasonable increase of widows' service pension from $30 to $40 per month at 65 years of age and grants $50 per month to the widow who was the wife of the veteran during his war service.

That these increases are justified, or rather demanded, is apparent. It is now 45 years after the war, and the veterans and their widows are advanced in age and in most cases unable to work. The other factor that makes favorable action imperative is the fact the living costs have greatly increased for the people who would benefit without any corresponding increase in income. The letters which I have received from my constituents have testified to the fact that the increases proposed are necessary if

the recipients are to cope with higher prices.

Public attention has recently become belatedly aware that there are great numbers of our people who, because their income has not increased, have been severely squeezed by mounting costs. I have repeatedly pointed out that these people, because not organized for the purpose of forcing attention to their needs, have been cruelly sacrificed before organized pressure groups and the inevitable inflation which has devaluated our purchasing power, dollar for dollar.

Not the least among these numbers are the recipients of pension payments, which are the just recognition of all the people of services rendered by men who defended our country in her past wars. They are particularly affected because their advanced age makes it impossible for them to capitalize on opportunities for offsetting decreased purchasing power which are available to most others.

Congress, together with the Nation as a whole, is now taking steps to assure adequate financial assistance for our present fighting men as they return from the war. We all acknowledge that this is as it should be. Moreover, present events have focused our attention on the necessity of bolstering and extending certain benefits to veterans of World War No. 1 and their dependents. Several bills have passed the House recently making such provisions.

Consequently, it is manifest that we would be acting from other motives than recognition of need and acknowledgment of indebtedness if we failed to support the provisions of the measure now under consideration. I have testimony sufficient to satisfy me that the need exists, in the letters which I have received. The United Spanish War Veterans of Lynn, Mass., of Revere, Mass., of Peabody, Mass., as well as their auxiliaries, acting independently, have through their commanders, impressed me with the need for the enactment of H. R. 2350. The need patently exists; why then do we hesitate?

Perhaps some may doubt then of our indebtedness to these veterans. But are not these men veterans in the full sense of the term? Did they not fight in our country's cause? Does the passage of time forgive our responsibility? Our fighting men today would have cause for concern if we confessed this. I am inclined to believe that our indebtedness is more closely associated to the need that exists than to the mere passage of time.

But we have a more definite obligation even than this. Mr. Harry B. Hershey, national chairman of the Allied Veterans' Association reminds me that "when the Spanish War broke out a definite promise was made that the Spanish War veterans would receive pension rights under the same policy and in like manner as were granted to the veterans of the Civil War and their dependents." H. R. 2350 provides for just that. The responsibility is clear and I am confident that the majority of the members will acknowledge their awareness of that responsibility.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 2350, which liberalizes the service-pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, the China Relief Expedition, and their widows. It is a genuine pleasure to me to have an opportunity to speak and vote for this measure and I trust that there will not be a single vote cast against it.

When I came to Congress years ago, I sought and was given a place on the Pensions Committee of the House, and I helped to write and report favorably the bill that became the act of June 2, 1920. This measure granted a service pension to all veterans who had served 90 days or more between April 1898 and July 1902, with an honorable discharge, and I have voted for each and every measure to increase the pensions of Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, and China Relief Expedition veterans. The last bill we passed granted a pension of $60 per month to these veterans who were totally and permanently disabled, and if they were not permanently and totally disabled they would get $60 per month when they attained the age of 65. Section I of H. R. 2350 increases this pension to $75 per month to veterans of both of these groups, those totally disabled, and also those who have reached the age of 65. I might say in passing that the average age of the Spanish War veterans now is 69 years, and in view of the increased cost of living and their advancing years, they need and should be granted this increase. There are now 85,140 of such veterans on the rolls. This will entail an additional cost of $15,286,000 the first year. I am grieved to say, however, that these fine veterans are dying by the thousands every year, and the cost will be diminished from year to year. This does not repeal the present law granting pensions of $100 per month to those requiring the regular aid and attendance of another person.

Our Pension Committee of the House reported out a bill, and I had charge of it on the floor of the House, granting pensions to the widows of Spanish War veterans, which became the act of September 1, 1922, and under the present law no widow of a Spanish War veteran can secure a pension unless she married the veteran before September 1, 1922. Section II of this bill advances the marriage date to January 1, 1938, and therefore the widows of these veterans who married prior to January 1, 1938 will be entitled to a pension. The Veterans' Administration estimates that there are approximately 4,000 widows and remarried widows of veterans who married after September 1, 1922, and before January 1, 1938, who will be entitled to pensions. If all of these apply and are granted pensions, this will add $1,642,000 per year. I might also say that our pension committee reported out a bill increasing the pensions of Spanish War veterans and their dependents 66⅔ percent, and I had charge of that bill on the floor of the House. It became the act of May 1, 1926. On a roll call this bill received every vote cast in the House, and on a roll call in the Senate it received every vote cast. Under the present laws the widows and former widows of Spanish War veterans receive $30 per month. The bill before us amends the act of May 1, 1926, and grants a pension of $40 per month to all Spanish War widows and former widows when they have attained the age of 65 years, and if such widow was the wife of the soldier, sailor, or marine while he was in the service, she is entitled to receive a pension of $50 per month when she attains the age of 65 years. The total increased expense to the Government of this legislation is estimated at $24,349,000. In view of the high cost of living and the increase in the ages of these veterans and their widows, these increases are not only just but they are necessary in order to enable the veterans and their widows to support themselves. I have said many times on the floor of the House and Senate that this great Republic should never permit its defenders and their dependents to become the objects of public charity, and I have also said many times one of the best investments for national defense is the grateful acknowledgment of the Congress and the Nation to our defenders and their dependents of the heroic, courageous and patriotic service the veterans have rendered to our country. This bill refers to the act of 1930. I helped to pass that bill as a member of the Senate over the President's veto.

It has been my pleasure to vote for measures that are helpful to our soldiers, sailors, and marines in the present great war. They are doing a magnificent job on land, sea, and in the air, and they will, as their fathers have done before, bring victory to our country, and I am very happy today that the House of Representatives by the passage of this bill will show to those who are now defending us, and the Spanish War veterans that the Congress and the Nation have not forgotten the heroic and valiant services of the veterans of the Spanish-American War. Some days ago we passed some bills in the House to increase the compensations and pensions of the veterans of World War No. 1. We must never forget those who are now defending us and those who have gone out and won our other wars. We may do too little, but we cannot do too much for the men and women who offer their lives and who give their lives or their health to preserve and protect this great Nation.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill (H. R. 2350). I think the tenor shown here today is such that the bill will pass, and I think it should, in justice to two particular factors: Unity of treatment compared with Civil War veterans, and the rise in the cost of living.

I want to divert for just a moment to give my idea on pensions in general.

Pensions to veterans and dependents are usually based on a carefully considered amount designed to barely cover

the necessities of life. Pensions are static in dollar units. Necessities of life constantly vary in dollar units. It seems to me that an adequate pension at a certain period becomes an inadequate pension 5, 10, or 15 years later. That is why it is necessary, from time to time, for these bills to come to the floor for revision. The cost of living has gone up 26 percent since 1939 and because of that fact $60 to a Spanish-American War veteran of 4 years ago, only buys today $44.40 worth of groceries and clothes. When that pension was originally set here, it was set for the purpose of providing a standard of living for these worthy people. That standard has risen and it has fallen as the prices in the commodity index of the necessities of life goes up and down. A $40 pension of a widow 4 years ago, would buy $40 worth of food and clothing and today it will only buy $29.60 worth of commodities. So, in effect, this increase is just restoring to them the purchasing power of the dollar of a few years ago.

I believe that a scientific approach to the whole question of pensions could be made. I think a commission could be set up—it may already exist—whose duty would be to gear pensions to a certain standard of living which we think commensurate with the needs involved at the time of the passage of the act. A revision of dollar units could be made every 2 or 3 years, by this impartial commission, in order to maintain this standard of living, as geared to the recognized commodity index. Then these different bills, coming up many times after 10 or 15 years of discouragement on the part of the veterans, would be unnecessary. There would be an automatic lifting and falling of dollar units, and the general standard of living would be maintained throughout the period of the veteran's dependency upon those benefits.

I trust that this pension bill—H. R. 2350—in its present form will be passed. I am heartily in support of it. The veterans and widows of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition are in dire need of this additional allowance on their pensions.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal of interest in this legislation and I have had a great deal of correspondence about it. The South Dakota State Soliders' Home is located at Hot Springs, S. Dak., in my district, as is Battle Mountain Sanitarium, a facility of the Veterans' Administration. Veterans of the Spanish-American War are found at both places and widows of veterans are members of the State Soliders' Home.

Thinking of them calls to mind the resentment that these people feel at a term that was used in Public, No. 144, a law that was passed last summer. The term was "inmate." These good people rightly feel that the term "member" should be used for the membership of homes that are established in gratitude for service rendered. The term "inmate" is more properly used for institutions of a penal or corrective nature.

The use of the term in Public, No. 144, was particularly unfortunate because of the legal interpretations that have been placed upon it, for it has resulted in a reduction of pensions for some members who were away from the Home on an extended furlough trying to help farmers handle their summer's crops. They certainly had no notice that their absence on an unannounced day would have such an effect. And they certainly had no idea that the Federal Government would penalize them for trying to do their bit. In fact, Congress had waived penalties on recipients of old-age assistance, if they supplemented their meager allowances by trying to do a few farm chores or help with haying.

Yet the mere incident that they were not in the home upon the particular day that the law was approved by the President resulted in reducing their pension from $60 to $20 per month. That was the first interpretation given the act.

Subsequently the solicitor for the Veterans' Administration advises me, a 30-day furlough was recognized as not destroying the veteran's membership in the home, but that 30-day period expired in mid-July, still penalizing the Spanish War veteran who had taken a 60- or 90-day furlough.

I may say that I have discussed the matter with the solicitor and am hoping that this matter can be cleared up by reconstructing the act in accord with what I believe was the intent of Congress. For certainly I do not believe that any Member of the Congress intended that any such discrimination should result. Indeed I think that the Veterans' Administration has no such policy, and that the matter can be adjusted by reinterpretation of the act.

It is customary, I am informed, to recognize 90 days as the logical period for a trial visit to which a veteran is entitled when he seeks to determine his ability to maintain himself before receiving a final discharge from facilities within the direct jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration.

The same 90-day rule should be applied to State soldiers' homes or other facilities recognized by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill increasing the amount to the veterans and their dependents, and regret that it has been so long delayed.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCOWEN].

Mr. MCCOWEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, H. R. 2350. I have had many letters from veterans and widows of veterans urging the passage of this bill. They are in great need because of the increase in the cost of living. Many of them are getting along in years, need medical and other attention because of advanced age and illness. It is highly important that financial help by increased pensions be given now before it is too late.

As a general rule it would be utterly impossible to, even in a small way, compensate deserving soldiers for the great service they have rendered our country. Pensions are no attempt to compensate for services. They are, however, for the main purpose, to prevent the defenders of our country from becoming dependents and to guarantee them from want.

Although the United States has been fairly generous in pensions at times and very miserly at other times in its laws for pensions, yet it is my opinion that pensions are even yet entirely too small.

I urge the immediate passage of this bill.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this measure. I think it should have the whole-hearted support of the membership of the House. I would like especially to ask a question or two of the chairman of the committee. With respect to section 8, which provides for an increase to the widows of Spanish-American veterans, under the proposed legislation, a provision is contained that the widow or former widow, who was the wife of a soldier, sailor, or marine, during the period of his service, as defined in section 2 of this act, shall be paid a pension at the rate of $50 per month. Directing my question to the chairman of the committee—does that mean that the widow of a soldier or sailor who was the wife at the time of his service, shall be entitled to draw $50 a month, regardless of any disability or regardless of service connection or nonservice connection? That seems to be the point that some of the members have some doubt about.

Mr. BUCKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is, the widow of a soldier or sailor or marine who was the wife of such soldier, sailor, or marine at the time of his service will be entitled to draw a pension at the rate of $50 a month, regardless of any other circumstances?

Mr. BUCKLEY. That is right.

Mr. SPRINGER. I want to thank the gentleman for clearing up that point. It is my considered opinion that the interpretation placed upon that provision contained in the bill is correct, and such an interpretation should prevail respecting this particular provision of this measure in its application, after passage.

With respect to the veterans themselves, after they reach the age of 65—and I assume that practically all the Spanish-American War veterans have now reached or will very soon reach age 65—they will be entitled to receive $75 per month instead of the $60 per month that is now provided by law, and, as I understand, that is regardless of any service-connected disability.

Mr. BUCKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. But it is required that they have a total disability in order to receive that sum; is that correct?

Mr. BUCKLEY. They must be suffering either from total disability or have reached age 65.

Mr. SPRINGER. Total disability is required if a veteran is under 65?

Mr. BUCKLEY. Yes.

Mr. SPRINGER. But it is not if he is over 65?

Mr. BUCKLEY. Yes; that is entirely correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. Either one of these conditions would bring him within the classification so he could draw the $75 per month?

Mr. BUCKLEY. That is right.

Mr. SPRINGER. I want to compliment the committee on bringing out this legislation. As I understand it, the average age of the Spanish-American War veterans is 69 years and that there are now approximately 84,000 of them in this country. They will all, or practically all, come within the provisions of this measure. As I have said repeatedly on the floor of the House, these men are veterans of one of our major wars, and veterans of all of our wars must be amply taken care of. These men of the Spanish-American War having attained an average age of 69 years—and some of them I know particularly in my State and my district are now over 75 years of age, many are totally disabled, entirely incapacitated—are having a hard struggle; they are largely dependent upon the old-age assistance provided by the States. They are hardly able to live under those circumstances. Those men who have fought our battles and who have stood on the battle fronts and have faced the enemy bullets should be taken care of when they attain the age at which they are incapable of self-support.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this legislation will be passed unanimously by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] as he may require.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, it is altogether too easy to lose sight of the great service rendered by the veterans of the Spanish-American War and of the hardships they endured. They have earned many times over what this legislation proposes, and I favor its passage.

Forty-five years is a long time, and recollections of the Spanish-American War are growing dim and indistinct. Many, if not most of the Members of the Congress have grown up to active and useful manhood since that war was fought. But my old friends who had a part in those stirring days of 1898 have indelibly impressed their importance upon me.

I have been told that this is the only war engaged in by the United States in which the Army was a purely volunteer organization. There was no conscription or selective service. No man served against his wishes. The Nation was just emerging as a world power and patriotism flamed hot.

The response to President McKinley's call to arms was prompt and enthusiastic, and the power of once mighty Spain was quickly crushed by American naval and land action. But health hazards were overcome with less ease, and many a Spanish War veteran went to an early grave or carries today the crippling effects of that service. Medical and sanitary services were poor by comparison with any present-day standard. Tents and cots were often lacking, and the only shelter was a blanket spread on the ground.

Today's rations are well balanced, ample, and well-cooked. In 1898 the soldiers often subsisted for days on fried sowbelly, potatoes, and coffee. Yet those old timers did not kick about conditions under which they lived. They did not enlist expecting a picnic. And those who are still alive are glad that Uncle Sam gives his boys the splendid care they receive today.

The veterans of '98 are old now. They need the additional help provided in this measure—and they have earned it. Since the Mexican War a century ago, the United States has fought four major wars. Only from the Spanish War did we emerge financially stronger than when we entered. From the Spanish War we emerged a world power. From any standpoint it is far from being an unimportant struggle, and we should not withhold adequate recognition and reward from the veterans who saw it through.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this bill. It will make up a portion of the difference between the cost of living and the meager allowances now given Spanish-American War veterans and their dependents. It should have been passed long ago and should carry greater increases. I trust the vote for passage of the bill may be unanimous.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in regard to the death of a distinguished Mississippian, my remarks to appear immediately following those of my colleague from Mississippi.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRIFFITHS].

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, having attended the hearings on the bill, I am wholeheartedly in support of it and favor its passage.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, fixed incomes have to be kept in adequate relationship to living costs. Certainly the pensions of our Spanish-American War veterans are out of date and should be increased.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JEFFREY].

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Chairman, the third district of Ohio is the home of one of the very large veterans' facilities in this country. It has been my privilege to talk and correspond with many veterans of the Spanish-American War as well as others who are cared for by the provisions of this bill. There could be no question but that the present allowance is wholly inadequate for the essential needs of many of these men who so ably served their country. The amount which is allotted by this bill is not too great but it will nevertheless serve to ameliorate the hardships which exist for many of these men today. It is a measure that is badly needed and deserves the support of the Members of this Congress.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting a long time to see this bill brought to the floor. I am glad that at last it is here. There are many veterans of the Spanish-American War and widows of such veterans in my district, the Twentieth District of California. Also, there are veterans and widows of former members of the China Expeditionary Force. I am sure that the people of my district as a whole want to see these valiant men still living adequately, and indeed lovingly, cared for, as they wish to care for the widows of those who have passed to the Great Beyond.

It will be a particular pleasure for me to cast the vote of my district for this highly meritorious bill.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my wholehearted support of H. R. 2350, a bill to liberalize the service pensions of Spanish-American War veterans and their dependents.

This bill, which comes to the House with the recommendation of the Committee on Pensions, provides modest and reasonable increases in the pensions payable to these veterans and their widows. This adjustment is necessary to compensate for the increased cost of living and, in my opinion, is long overdue.

The average age of these veterans, I am informed, is 69 years. Most of them are unemployable and are completely dependent on their small pensions for a livelihood. Failure to pass this legislation would result in hardship and suffering for countless Americans, who fought for their country in the War with Spain.

Mr. Chairman, as a matter of simple justice to these veterans and their dependents, I urge the unanimous approval of this bill.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] such time as he may desire.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I need hardly take the time of the Committee to explain that I favor this legislation and hope for its passing here today without opposition and its soon enactment by the other body. With my own flesh and blood mixed and mingled in this present desperate global struggle and with all my young friends staking their lives and their uttermost efforts on the outcome of the present war, it might seem that I would be unable to give thought to a war that happened so long ago. However, I am of such an age that I can remember those who first "remembered the Maine." I can personally recall the stirring episode of those days.

Many in Arizona yet living can recall that three companies of Rough Riders were organized within the State of Arizona to help Theodore Roosevelt in his brilliant exploits in Cuba. Before the courthouse in Prescott, Ariz., there stands a monument of a dashing figure on horseback placed there not only as a monument to Bucky O'Neil, who was captain of one of the three companies of Rough Riders, but it stands also as a monument to all the Rough Riders furnished by Arizona. Their names are on the bronze tablet on this monument. Capt. Bucky O'Neil lost his life in a charge up San Juan Hill and is buried, not in Prescott, Ariz., but in Arlington, just across the river from this Chamber.

The Spanish-American War was of comparatively brief duration, but of great significance. It marked a turning point in American history. It is good to see the spirit exemplified here today in remembering those who "remembered the Maine," and in attempting to reward their services rendered more than four decades ago, and to deal out to them now a substantial increase of compensation to meet the rising cost of living. We are thinking both of today and yesterday.

Earlier today the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman BARDEN, indicated that he was introducing a bill designed to help the young men now in the armed services of our country whose education has been interrupted, or may later be interrupted by their induction into the services. I sought that information and assurance of the gentleman from North Carolina, and am mentioning it now that my young friends in uniform may see that I am thinking of them and of their future as befits an educator. At the same time I am supporting this legislation to mitigate the evils of inflation and the rising cost of living for the oldsters of an earlier war.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON].

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to take a few minutes of the time allotted to this bill, which I am heartily in accord with, to briefly outline my plan to solve the Japanese problem.

We have heard a great deal of discussion in the past few weeks about the outrages in the various Japanese camps out in California. Those problems are only transitory although they are serious.

When the war is over the Japanese camps will be disbanded and Japanese will to a great extent go back to their former places of abode. We want to find some way, if we can, to take care of the situation that will confront us at that time.

In view of the statement of the Attorney General the other day before the Dies committee that it is possible to denationalize a citizen, and then deport him, I want to briefly outline the plan that was presented by myself in two pieces of legislation filed with the Clerk of the House last June. My plan contemplates the deportation of all alien Japanese and also the deportation of all Japanese-American citizens who after a public hearing before a commission or court, shall have been declared to have been disloyal during the course of the war.

The underlying idea is this: In the first place over 40 years' experience with the Japanese shows that they cannot be assimilated. Every Western State has a law prohibiting their intermarriage with whites. In 40 years' experience with these people in our country, there is not 1 percent that have ever been assimilated by intermarriage. Furthermore, I am assuming, and I know you are, that we will win the war with Japan so conclusively that at the termination of the war we will be in a position to sit down and write the kind of treaty we want.

My plan provides that by a resolution the House of Representatives and the Senate state as their conclusion and their opinion that in any treaty with Japan it shall contain, among other provisions, a provision that every Japanese-American citizen who has been found by a court or other public body after a public hearing, in which all the rights of the citizen are safeguarded, to have been disloyal during the course of the war, he shall be deported, and also that all alien Japanese shall be deported.

To implement this provision of the treaty, I provide for the creation of a deportation commission consisting of three persons appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. It shall be their duty to review the cases of all these Japanese. Their records are now in the W. R. A., the F. B. I., and in numerous other places. It has been stated publicly that thousands of them in these camps have refused to take the oath of allegiance to the United States of America. Some of them have asked to be sent back to Japan. This commission shall hold hearings, give the person involved notice, allow him to be present with his lawyer, submit testimony, and have all the rights of a litigant in court. After this commission has heard the evidence, it shall make a finding as to their loyalty. If they are found, by the evidence, to have been disloyal, the commission shall make that finding and also a finding that they shall be deported. There shall be no appeal from the finding of fact in this regard, but the person involved will have the right of appeal on questions of law and the right of writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the United States to review the legality and the constitutionality of the hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. ROLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. The gentleman is making a very timely statement. I would like to make the observation that it is my opinion, and almost the unanimous opinion of the people of the State of California, that now the Japanese are out of California, we want them to stay out of California permanently. I want to commend the gentleman for the very splendid statement he is making.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I do not think we should disregard the rights of any citizen. We should ferret out all the bad ones and get rid of them. Now is the time, when we are writing a treaty, to incorporate that in the treaty, ship them back to Japan, and that will largely solve the problem.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I say to the gentleman I find that that is the sentiment in my State. I think the gentleman has correctly presented it and has given us a good plan under which to operate.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I would like to have the gentleman repeat what the Attorney General held, because it is uppermost in my mind whether we can strip a native-born Japanese, and I have no sympathy for any one of them, from the right of birth. How can we deport anybody who has been born in this country and where are you going to deport them?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I have not read the exact statement of the Attorney General but it was reported by various persons and especially by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] on the floor of the House that the Attorney General had stated that we could denationalize the Japanese, and he recommended another bill which provides for this matter. If the Japanese-American citizen is denationalized then when we are writing our treaty, if it includes the provision I recommend in my resolution, we can, by virtue of this treaty provision, direct Japan to take the persons whom we designate. The key to the problem is that after compelling Japan to accept unconditional surrender we can submit a treaty which she must accept. In this treaty will be provided that those persons whom we designate must be taken back to Japan. If a person who has been disloyal to us and loyal to Japan—as many of the Japanese, both aliens

and American citizens because of their birth here, have been—during this war with Japan cannot be denationalized it seems that we are pretty impotent. But I am firmly convinced from my investigation and from what the Attorney General said that this very thing can be done. Our treaty will give us the one opportunity that we will have to get rid of these disloyal and troublesome Japanese, and even Mr. Meyer of the W. R. A. admits that there are many thousands of them.

Also, as far as I am concerned, I want this matter handled by a commission that can do it quickly. If we get bogged down in cumbersome legal machinery we will be years or even generations in getting the job done, if the Harry Bridges deportation case is a criterion. The commisison shall hold the public hearing, make a finding, and in the appropriate cases order deportation and from this finding of fact as to loyalty there shall be no appeal. The same general type of procedure is utilized by the California Railroad Commission in rate cases and by the Industrial Accident Commission in industrial accident cases, and those bodies are noted for their even-handed justice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH].

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the legislation now before the House. Speaking in behalf of the veterans residing in San Francisco, I sincerely hope this bill will pass unanimously.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I have waited a long time to have the opportunity to vote for this bill, H. R. 2350, to increase the pensions of the Spanish War veterans from $60 to $75 a month where I think they should have been long ago. It is a happy commentary upon the record of this House that in the midst of another great war, the greatest war history has ever known, we are able to pause for a moment and give those veterans of the Spanish War and of other wars their just dues.

I hope that within the next few weeks we shall have arrived at a point where we can pass legislation which will pave the way for a perfect rehabilitation and reeducation of the veterans of our present war.

I congratulate the Committee on Military Affairs on the work they have been doing, but I submit to them that we have a long way to go in this House before we do right by the boys in the service. We have roughly three groups of men who will be mustered out of the service. I ask, what are you going to do with the men, probably at least a million of them, who will want to return to agriculture in the same capacity they occupied before the war? They owned their own farms and were able to operate them in an independent manner. We must make it possible for them to acquire property and new farm lands.

Then there is another group. What are you going to do with those who want to learn skilled or vocational trades? Let us make it possible for them to study and follow these trades and skills after the war.

There is another group of at least 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 men out of the 12,000,000 who will surely be mustered out by the end of the war or shortly afterward. They have the right to expect we will permit them to continue their basic and general studies after the war.

Last but not least, what are you going to do with those hundreds of thousands of young men who left in the middle of their advanced education, in many cases, or in many other cases had not even started their education? What are you going to do with that vast group that will be trying after the war for a more complete understanding so that they may be assisted to equip themselves for peacetime pursuits?

I ask the House, What are you going to do with all these thousands of men who will want to take their place once more in the sun after peace has been declared? What plans will we make for them outside of simple mustering-out pay, which will only start them upon the road to recovery? That is the most pressing problem of the hour and one which must be met by every one of us.

As I cast my vote with great satisfaction for raising the pensions of the Spanish War veterans, I cannot help but look into the future and hope this Congress will prepare the way of the new veteran in the same considerate manner.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FURLONG].

Mr. FURLONG. Mr. Chairman, I wish to go on record as supporting and voting for this bill (H. R. 2350) for the following reasons:

The veterans of the United States of America who served in the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and China Relief Expedition had, besides the various warriors, the unseen enemy to contend with, not only for that time but for all time after in his life.

Malaria, yellow fever, typhus, typhoid, and other diseases for which the medical profession had no cure at that time, left their marks of wear and tear which affect these veterans today.

Besides, the hardtack and "canned willie" they had to eat did not supply all their bodies needed to carry on the campaigns.

On top of all this it took a real patriotic American to fight for his country at $9, $13, or $16.80 per month, the last amount being paid for overseas duty. At the above figures the boys could not save much for the days after they were mustered out.

Nearly all the Spanish-American War veterans have reached and passed the age of 65 years; they are no longer able to go out and do a day's work that would pay them enough to keep them and their families in food, clothing, and shelter.

In the passing of this bill, this House of Representatives will be doing an act of justice not only to the veterans and their families, and the widows, but will be proving to the world that America will and does look after the ones who look after the United States of America.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, to no group in our population has the rising cost of living done more harm than to those living on small fixed incomes. Among those that have been especially hard hit have been the veterans of the Spanish-American War, and their wives and widows. The bill under consideration this afternoon, H. R. 2350, is a big step in remedying this situation, in view of the fact that it increases from $60 a month to $75 a month the pension for total disability to veterans of this war, as well as those of the Philippine Insurrection and the China Relief Expedition.

I feel certain, Mr. Chairman, that there will be little if any opposition to this measure; all of us are anxious to see justice done, and this bill provides for such justice to thousands of American citizens. Certainly while we are passing huge appropriation bills for the present war, we should not forget those who incurred disability fighting for our country in the wars of the past. I shall vote for this bill with enthusiasm, convinced as I am that it is just and fair and fills a genuine need.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN].

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill being considered before Congress today, in my opinion is one of the most important bills to come before the House, since I was elected to serve in this body 6 years ago. We all know that the death rate of the Spanish-American and World War veterans is increasing daily, and within a few years we will only have a few widows of the Spanish-American veterans to pay tribute and, in my opinion, we should do something for these veterans while they are living and can enjoy a few years without worrying about their next meal.

I can think of no better Christmas present to give the Spanish-American War veterans than for the House and Senate to pass the pending bill and send it to the White House for the signature of the President before January 1.

I think the section of the bill relating to the raising of the date for Spanish-American War veterans' widows to be entitled to a pension, is certainly entitled to serious consideration of the House. Personally I do not believe that 1 percent of the wives of Spanish-American veterans married their husbands for a pension and I do not believe that the American womanhood would stoop to anything of this nature. I can see no reason why we should crucify 99 percent of the widows in order to keep 1 percent from doing a wrong act. I can assure

the Spanish-American veterans and widows that it was a pleasure for me to have my bill incorporated in the Buckley bill so that we would only have one bill before the House for consideration. It is my sincere hope that the House will pass this bill without a single dissenting vote.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That effective the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this act the $60 monthly rate of pension payable for total disability to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition under section 1 of the act of June 2, 1930 (46 Stat. 492; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 365), and the $60 monthly rate of pension payable to such veterans upon reaching the age of 65 years under the provisions of section 1 of the act of May 24, 1938 (52 Stat. 440; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 370), are hereby increased to $75.

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the act of May 1, 1926 (44 Stat. 382; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 364a), wherein for pension purposes, as to the widow of any deceased veteran of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, the marriage date is defined as September 1, 1922, is hereby amended, effective the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this act, by striking out the date "September 1, 1922" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "January 1, 1938."

SEC. 3. The act of May 1, 1926 (44 Stat. 382–384; U. S. C., title 38, secs. 364–364f), is hereby amended, effective the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this act, by adding a new section thereto No. 8, to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. The $30 monthly pension payable to widows and former widows under the provisions of section 2 of this act, as amended, shall be increased to $40 per month when the age of 65 years is attained, and the widow or former widow who was the wife of the soldier, sailor, or marine during the period of his service, as defined in section 2 of this act, shall be paid a pension at the rate of $50 per month."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COFFEE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2350) to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents, pursuant to House Resolution 376, reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a news release.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein various letters and material, and further to extend my own remarks and include therein a letter from a constituent of mine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed at the conclusion of the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CARE OF WORLD WAR VETERANS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I came to the House of Representatives 13 years ago, when this body was so nearly equally divided between the two major political parties that a small group of Members, consisting of perhaps five or six who did not claim allegiance to either of the regular political parties, held the balance of power.

At that time there was in office in Washington a Republican administration; that is, a Republican President. I served my first 2 years under that distinguished American, then President of the United States, Mr. Herbert Hoover, and I have since that time occupied a seat in this House. During that entire time, as far as I now know, I have never in a single instance deliberately or knowingly made any remark calculated to cast reflection or unfair criticism upon one of my colleagues, and if I shall live to stay here until my hair, already partially gray, becomes entirely gray, I do not believe I ever shall, and I hope I will not.

I have asked for this time for the purpose of responding to some rather grave accusations and some rather peppery criticisms that have been cast upon the House Committee on Military Affairs and upon me personally, as well as upon the administration.

On November 11 the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] who, I am happy to say, is on the floor of the House at this time, made a rather lengthy speech in the course of which he undertook to demonstrate and did say that the conduct of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House, meaning myself, and the conduct of the committee as a whole, had been to play politics with the interests of the veterans of our wars. Such a charge is without foundation in fact. He designated it as an act of shame. Evidently I could not afford to allow such charges as that to go unanswered and it is my purpose this afternoon to answer as nearly as I may be able to do so today, the accusations made by my distinguished colleague, to whose youth and inexperience I attribute his words rather than to any intent to be discourteous to a colleague. I have lived almost 69 years. I had 35 years of active law practice before I came to Congress. I became a member of the bar 46 years ago. I have been here 13 years. I believe here, now, as I have always believed, that "there is so much good in the worst of us and so much bad in the best of us, that it hardly behooves any of us to talk about the rest of us." I realize, too, as I hope my young colleague from Missouri does, that this is a parliamentary body that is the spokesman and representative of the great common mass of the people of this country, about whose way of life we talk so much, and that if and when the time comes that this great institution of government has become crippled, discredited, or has lost its usefulness by losing its standing among the masses of the American people then parliamentary government upon this earth will be at an end. Consequently I want to report to you this afternoon, my colleagues, something about what your Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives has been trying to do with reference to the rights and interests of our fighting men in this war in particular and in other wars as well.

I shall repeat here briefly what I have written out as a general statement of the achievements of the Congress, and when I read this, my imagination goes back to the times when I have been able, a few times in my career, to travel over the country and visit some of the great veterans' hospitals with the American flag flying over them and realize in its chambers and in its beds that there were hundreds and thousands of veterans of all our wars being cared for because an American House of Representatives was a liberal institution with a conscience attuned to humanity. We have not hesitated to open the doors of the great hospitals a grateful Nation has erected for the comfort and care of those brave men who in all our illustrious history as a

Nation have carried and are now carrying the Stars and Stripes to a glorious victory over the enemies of freedom. God grant that we shall never permit them to knock in vain upon a door of mercy that should always be open to them. Here are some of the things we have done.

Attention is invited to the fact that the mustering-out pay bill is but a part of a broad program of relief for veterans and the dependents of veterans of the present war. Congress has already enacted legislation providing for life insurance, hospitalization and domiciliary care, disability and death pensions, 6 months' death gratuity, protection under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, vocational rehabilitation and training for those suffering from disability incurred in, or aggravated by, military service, when such disability results in a vocational handicap preventing reemployment, reemployment rights under the Selective Training and Service Act, as amended, maternity care for the wives and infants of enlisted men, preference to employment in the civil service, and burial and funeral expenses including burial in national cemeteries. In addition, the President has recommended to the Congress that legislation be enacted, first, to provide for the education and training of members of the armed forces and the merchant marine after their discharge or conclusion of service; second, to give insurance credits under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act for military service; and third, to provide unemployment allowances for members of the armed forces after their demobilization.

Now, let me get down to the point of stating to you what it was that impelled me to come to the floor of this House for the purpose of answering these charges. My genial young friend and colleague the gentleman from Missouri, on the 11th day of last month, Armistice Day, if you please, addressing this House, criticized the President severely and went to the extent of calling the depression of 1933 the Roosevelt depression, when, as a matter of fact, when Roosevelt came into office, more than 10,000 banks had closed their doors throughout this country, and it was necessary for the Congress to pass a resolution authorizing the President of the United States to close the banks automatically until he ordered them opened up again. My vote for that resolution was my first vote in Congress. My next one was for the veterans.

That was not the fault of Herbert Hoover or the Republican Party. That was the fault of another great world catastrophe that started in August 1914, when Germany undertook to subjugate the world, and ended on the 11th day of November 1918, known as the First World War, plus other economic considerations that entered into the picture.

Now, after denominating that the Roosevelt depression, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] proceeded to take up the President and castigate him from that day up to this. He then chastised the leadership of the House of Representatives, which, of course, means the Speaker and the floor leader, and included in that a considerable peppery rebuke for the chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, and that committee, which he says has been playing politics in reference to the rights of these veterans.

Now, I would like to yield for 15 seconds to any Republican member of the House Military Affairs Committee who is on the floor of this House, and let him—not the Democratic side of it—say whether or not the House Military Affairs Committee has ever in any instance resorted to any political methods to do anything, either in the war effort, or otherwise. I hear no denial.

I wonder if I could hear a voice substantiating that charge, of political activity, made by the gentleman from Missouri. No voice is heard.

Now the gentleman from Missouri, as shown in the RECORD of this House, at page 9421, November 11, 1943, had this to say, after describing a certain young man by the name of Troy Lucas, who had been brought to him by a lady in Washington:

> Who is this young man about whom I speak? Did he come from Missouri, or from my congressional district? No. It is an important coincidence, however, that this young man came from Kentucky, from the town of Southdown, which is located in the congressional district of the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House. To Troy Lucas, and millions of his buddies, I say the Military Affairs Committee of this House, under the Democratic leadership is too busy to give consideration to the human affairs of the men who are fighting to keep America free.

Then he heads his next paragraph with the word shame.

> The political record of the President of the United States in regard to veterans is a shame in the eyes of the Nation.

Now let me cease to read and pause to state although I have already alluded to it, that the first vote I ever cast in the Congress of the United States was for a resolution to close the banks in March 1933. The second vote that I cast was a vote against what was known as the Economy Act to take care of the veterans of all of our wars. From that date to this, although I was pilloried in the public press as a traitor to the administration, I have been followed and supported loyally by the veteran organizations in my district, almost to a man, and they would do it again, if I asked them to. They know my voting record on veterans' legislation, they know all our voting records including the record of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]. The gentleman from Missouri then continues his charges and says, and I quote:

> The political record of the majority Members of the House to give aid, to provide sustenance for the men and women who are returning from the bloody war is a shame. The procrastination of the Democratic leaders on the Military Affairs Committee of the House is a shame, and now comes a man with one leg, all he has left from the battle of Tunisia, to place the blame on the very doorstep of not only the administration, not only the Democratic leadership, but on the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives.

I wonder if the House would be interested in knowing the real truth about that. Here it is. This young man that came to see the gentleman from Missouri had previously been to see the chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, and while the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] was making that speech on Armistice Day and shaming the administration and Congress and the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, Troy Lucas was in Washington with all of his compensation and allowance paid up to date, and with a check for $95 per month permanent disability for a lost leg, that had been granted and paid by the Veterans' Administration on November 9, 2 days before the speech was made.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes, I shall yield.

Mr. PLOESER. I trust that the gentleman has read my speech in its entirety.

Mr. MAY. Several times.

Mr. PLOESER. If he has, he will note that the speech contains the information that the Troy Lucas case had been adjudicated and it had been done by the influence of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. JOHN MCCORMACK], to whom I sent Troy Lucas. It is so stated in the speech and so stated by me on November 11, and the date he received his compensation was November 9. I knew it at the time I was making the talk and it is contained in the speech. Furthermore, will the gentleman refer to page 9421 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD——

Mr. MAY. I am not yielding for a speech now.

Mr. PLOESER. No; but this is simply for a correction, where he refers to me stating that the depression of 1933 was a Roosevelt depression. I did accuse the depression of 1937, which the gentleman probably would prefer to call a recession, as a Roosevelt depression.

The RECORD so states and the gentleman can well read it.

Mr. MAY. Yes; and the gentleman from Missouri received a letter on December 6 from Gen. Frank T. Hines in which he pointed out to him the fact that Troy Lucas had been paid on November 9, before he made his speech.

Mr. PLOESER. And General Hines——

Mr. MAY. I am not yielding further.

Mr. PLOESER. Will not the gentleman yield for the purpose of correction?

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman observe the House rules and sit down, please?

Mr. PLOESER. I will, gladly. Thank you.

Mr. MAY. On December 6 this fact was called to the gentleman's attention by Gen. Frank T. Hines in a letter which he addressed to "The Honorable WALTER C. PLOESER, House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C., My dear Mr. PLOESER," and so forth, and until this day, December 15—9 days—he has never sought an opportunity to make any corrections of the statements that he made on the floor of the House charging me with disloyalty to this veteran, when as a matter of fact, long before the veteran came to see Mr. MCCORMACK he had come to my office, because he knew me in the days when he was at home and before he went into the military service, and I knew him, and I had directed him to the Veterans' Administration; but I am not going to take up more of my time with that except to say that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] has seen fit to furnish a copy of his speech to the Journal and American of New York City which carried it at length and it was sent to me by a friend with markings of the castigation that he had given me. Mr. Speaker, at this point I offer General Hines' letter for the RECORD as part of my remarks. It is as follows:

DECEMBER 6, 1943.

Hon. WALTER C. PLOESER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PLOESER: My attention has been called to the debate which occurred on the floor of the House on November 11, 1943, reported on page 9420 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with reference to the adjudication of claims of disabled veterans of World War No. 2 and a specific claim, apparently that of Mr. Troy Lucas, C-3376511, was cited.

It was stated that this veteran was presented to the Veterans' Bureau and that "he was told that his case would be adjudicated as rapidly as possible, which means that he will receive his disability pension in the future—maybe 60 days from now, maybe 120 days." It was also asserted that "we have done nothing but to tell him to get out of uniform in 90 days and that within the next 2 to 4 months he will start getting his disability compensation." Inasmuch as Mr. Lucas' claim had been adjudicated and he had actually been paid the initial pension check on November 9, 1943, preceding the debate and remarks on November 11, 1943, I am sure you would wish the pertinent facts brought to your attention. Mr. Lucas was discharged from the active service at the Walter Reed General Hospital on October 4, 1943, and filed his application for pension at that time. The medical records were assembled by the military authorities and transmitted to the Veterans' Administration on October 29, 1943. The claim was rated on that date and service connection granted. Disability was evaluated as 60 percent in degree, and the award, including the special monthly pension of $35 for the loss of one foot, was approved in the amount of $95 per month. Mr. Lucas was informed of the decision immediately and the award certified to the disbursing office on November 5, 1943. Initial payment was made on November 9, 1943.

In this general connection it is desired to bring to your attention procedure agreed to by the War and Navy Departments and the Veterans' Administration for the purpose of expediting the adjudication of claims filed by men discharged because of disability. At the time of discharge the veteran is informed of his right to file a claim for pension and is assisted in making application in the event he desires to avail himself of this right. Certain specified records essential to the adjudication of a claim for pension are assembled and, with the application, transmitted to the Veterans' Administration where the claim is adjudicated at the earliest practicable date.

It is believed you will agree that where the necessary records and properly completed application are forwarded promptly at the time of discharge for disability there will be no material lapse of time before the claim is granted or denied in the vast majority of instances. It sometimes happens that upon receipt of the records from the discharging center they are found to be insufficient upon which to take action upon the claim, necessitating further inquiry of the service branch. In these circumstances the decision in the case necessarily is deferred pending the result of further inquiry or development. With these exceptions, however, the Veterans' Administration has every reason to conclude that claims of veterans discharged for disability are promptly decided.

In closing, permit me to assure you that your interest in this subject is appreciated and that every possible effort will be made by the Veterans' Administration to see that all such claims are handled as promptly as circumstances will permit.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Just to have the record complete, I think it is only fair to the gentleman from Kentucky, the gentleman from Missouri, and, in justice to myself, that the young man, Mr. Lucas—and he is a very fine young man I think we all agree——

Mr. MAY. We have plenty of them down there.

Mr. McCORMACK. Both the people who came to see me told me they had been to see the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] prior to coming to my office and that he was cooperating in every way he could. I was glad to contact the Veterans' Administration because I would do it for any veteran no matter from what part of the United States he came, and I am sure any one of us would be only too glad to do that, particularly the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. And the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], always a friend to the needy, did all he could for my constituent, for which I am deeply grateful.

Mr. Speaker, I desire for a few moments to repudiate the charges that have been made against my committee. The House unanimously, of course, approved the selective-service legislation which came from the House Military Affairs Committee. We reported the original bill in 1940. Due to the foresight not of the chairman of the committee but of every member of the committee with the aid of the administration, the War Department, the Navy Department, and of the service organizations we were wise enough to write into that legislation a provision, section 8 of the original act, anticipating this very kind of case, a provision directing that the Selective Service Bureau should set up an organization in that Bureau to aid veterans as they were discharged, aid them in securing their compensation, their pension, and any other allowances that were due them. In compliance with that provision of law an organization has been set up and General Hershey, the Director of the Selective Service System, has obtained lists of all the men as they are discharged and of every man in hospitals before they are discharged. He has addressed a letter in this form to each one of them:

To each soldier and sailor about to return to civil life:

For your benefit the Government is glad to give you the following information: Section 8 of the Selective Service Act of 1940 provides that the Government will render aid in the replacement in their former positions or in securing positions for men who have satisfactorily completed their military or naval services. The carrying-out of these provisions of the act is made a part of the responsibility of the Director of the Selective Service System and the Replacement Division in the Selective Service System has been set up to make this part of the act effective.

Then he states a number of things and points out the organization to which they can go and to which they are directed to go. First, there is the American Red Cross, so that if a man is discharged somewhere from a camp and there is no local board near he can go direct to the American Red Cross, to the Federal Security Agency, to the Veterans' Administration, to the United States Employment Service; and then he adds:

Your agents, for information and help, are: One, the Red Cross, and while in the hospital maintain contact with their representative or their camp representative if you are returned to your unit for discharge. (b) The local employment committeeman.

Now, this is something probably all of you have not had occasion to look into:

Upon your discharge and arrival at the place to which you go you should establish connection with the reemployment committee attached to the nearest local board and with the local Red Cross chapter. Keep your contacts with them and let them know where you go.

That is signed: "Lewis B. Hershey."

In addition to that there is a long list of civilian agencies not created by Congress. He has issued a circular directed to all the State directors throughout the country in which he directs them to direct the veterans to these different organizations, and here they are:

Local boards, reemployment committeemen, cooperating agencies, and in addition to that as follows: The Veterans' Administration, United States Employment Service, Veterans' Employment Service, Vocational, Rehabilitation and Training Division of the Federal Security Agency, Red Cross, Civil Service Commission, the Armed Emergency Relief, United States Armed Forces Institution, Madison, Wis. It seems that State set up one of its own.

Then there are even a lot of clearinghouse committees. Here is where they come from: "The National Clearinghouse Committee." The National Clearinghouse Committee consists of representatives from each of the following organizations: American Farm Bureau Federation, American Federation of Labor, American Iron and Steel Institute, American Legion, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Disabled American Veterans, Kiwanis International, Lions International, National Association of Manufacturers, National Exchange Clubs, National Grange, Railway Labor Executives Association, Rotary International, United States Chamber of Commerce, United

States Junior Chamber of Commerce, and Veterans of Foreign Wars.

All of those civilian groups and organizations are participating in the efforts brought about by the Selective Service Bureau to aid the veterans as they come out of the hospitals.

Mr. ROLPH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. ROLPH. I am wondering when the Military Affairs Committee under the gentleman's chairmanship will report out the bill that carries an immediate pay for these men who are being mustered out of the service?

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman mean muster-out pay?

Mr. ROLPH. Yes.

Mr. MAY. I shall answer the gentleman very gladly by saying to him that within 2 or 3 days after the bill was referred to the House Military Affairs Committee I proceeded to go into action to do something about it. I notified all of the agencies concerned and asked them for reports of their favor or opposition to it.

I then called the committee together and started hearings. We conducted hearings all last week, and at the end of the hearings I set aside a day for Members of Congress to be heard and we heard all who came, including the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]. In addition to that, we find that most of the difficulty and the misinformation that is going out to the country which brings pressure upon the House of Representatives and the Senate goes out because of the fact that there are some hardship cases in the country where neglect perhaps has been found to exist, where hardship has been incurred by some of these disabled veterans.

Mr. ROLPH. Does not the gentleman think it should be brought out on the floor and that all those things should be cleared up?

Mr. MAY. We were going to bring it out yesterday when lo and behold the veterans' organizations on the outside that spend their time in peacetimes as well as in wartimes looking after the interest of the veterans of all our wars, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, and American Legion, asked for further consideration. We even met yesterday in a subcommittee to hear them. One of the representatives came before us and said they did not think we ought to consider simply muster-out pay but that we ought to take up at this time and consider the whole problem of muster-out pay and adjusted compensation, the latter of which will amount to some fifteen or sixteen billion dollars. We thought that was a rather large order just now.

Mr. ROLPH. Does not the gentleman think it would be advisable to consider muster-out pay to take care of these men that are being discharged at the present time?

Mr. MAY. There are many considerations that enter into that picture. The Senate has already reported for consideration, or, at least, the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate has reported for consideration what is actually an adjusted-compensation bill. We felt if we passed out some bill now and it was passed hurriedly, it might go to the Senate and be treated perhaps as unnecessary, that the Senate might pass a different bill, send it over here, it would come here and we might deal with it.

In view of all of the major problems involved we ought to give it more consideration and bring out a real bill perhaps, that will serve the whole purpose if that can be done, especially in view of the fact that out of 635,000 men already discharged—I believe 900,000 all told—there is hardly a man of them who has not a good job already. There are jobs hanging on the bushes for every man who comes out who is able-bodied and the Veterans' Administration is standing by with its billions to take care of those who are disabled. Congress has already done everything within its power to provide for the sick, disabled, and wounded.

Mr. ROLPH. I am receiving many, many communications from my district urging that this legislation be considered at once.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman is not the only Member of the House who is receiving them. I get them myself.

Mr. BUSBEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I prefer not to, because I have very little time left.

Mr. BUSBEY. I want to make a correction. The gentleman referred to the fact that there are jobs waiting for all the able-bodied men being discharged. It is my impression these men who are being discharged are not able-bodied but are physically handicapped men.

Mr. MAY. Well, the gentleman is not properly advised if that is his understanding, because there are thousands upon thousands of men who have been discharged at their own request to take jobs and the War Department has been for 2 years discharging men who are able-bodied unquestionably because some employer has a job available to them. Some of those men are now in jobs paying $300 to $500 a month and a lot of people would want us to give these men $300 just the same as men who had served on the bloody battlefields overseas for 1, 2, or 3 years.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. As a matter of fact, a great many men were discharged when the age limit was changed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to proceed for another 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. A great many were discharged when the older men in service were permitted to return to civil life?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. In practically all of those cases they were not physically disabled?

Mr. MAY. Yes; and the pending legislation would pay them the maximum amount that it would pay a man who is still fighting in Europe and when he is discharged he would be discharged at a time when he will not have available a job like the ones they are getting at the present time. The gentleman from Ohio is entirely correct.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman's statement left some uncertainty, I believe, as to the status of the action taken by the Senate. As I understand, the Senate actually passed by an overwhelming vote a bill providing for mustering-out pay, and that bill was referred to the gentleman's committee, was it not?

Mr. MAY. No, it has only been reported out of the subcommittee to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. It has not even gotten out of the full committee yet.

Mr. KEEFE. The Senate has not passed it?

Mr. MAY. No, they have just reported it to the Senate.

Mr. KEEFE. It was simply passed by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. MAY. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. So there has been no actual action taken by the Senate to provide for mustering-out pay?

Mr. MAY. No; and there likely will not be until after the holidays.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COSTELLO. Is it not true that the mustering-out pay is not intended in any way to take care of hospital cases or disabled veterans, that the Congress has already provided legislation whereby disabled veterans are entitled to hospitalization and other forms of relief, and that the mustering-out pay is not intended for that purpose? The sole purpose of mustering-out pay is simply to provide a fund whereby a soldier, as he is released from military service, can take care of the transition to civilian life, and nothing more than that. I think that is being confused a great deal in the press by coupling together mustering-out pay and hospitalization, disability benefits, and things of that kind, for in one sentence the papers are referring to those different benefits and confusing them and charging the Congress generally with laxity in not taking care of the problem, when, as the gentleman has pointed out, the Congress has taken care of everything except the matter of the mustering-out pay itself, which is only a minor problem by comparison with the others.

Mr. MAY. I should like to add to the statement very correctly made by my colleague from California that not only is that true but we have chastized the heads of every organization concerned, including General Hines, the Army, the

Navy, and everybody else concerned, every time we have had them before our committee on the question of taking care of the sick, the disabled, and the wounded. They have all expressed the deepest interest in immediate aid to all our sick and wounded soldiers, and are doing all they can.

I shall yield now to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], who has been particularly active in that respect.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. In line with the discussion of the gentleman from California and the distinguished chairman of my committee, I wonder if the gentlemen would tell the House of the action taken by our committee after we learned of those distressing cases of the disabled, whose claims for disability compensation and pension could not be immediately processed and who were forced to wait several months to get relief. I wish the gentleman would explain specifically what we have done to eliminate administrative difficulties and expedite final adjudication of these claims.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman from Indiana has propounded a question on a very interesting subject. As I just stated, we have done everything we could possibly do. We have discussed the question of whether or not additional legislation would facilitate the adjustment and settlement of the claims of these wounded and disabled soldiers. We have been told by all of the agencies that they did not need any further legislation.

One of the reasons given by Gen. Frank T. Hines, who, by the way, is one of the greatest Administrators in the Government and has one of the greatest jobs on his hands, was that he is short 4,000 men that he needs in order to facilitate this work.

In addition, we were instrumental in procuring from the Chief of Staff of the United States Army action on the matter by which he authorized the Veterans' Administration to set up in every Army hospital in this country, in the field, and in Walter Reed Hospital, facilities by which they could speed up the handling of these cases, get a list of the men as fast as they came in the hospitals, with the probable length of time they would be there, and inform the Selective Service Bureau, the Veterans' Administration, the local draft boards, the Red Cross, and all of the other agencies engaged in granting relief.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Is it not true that the Army, the Navy, and the Veterans' Administration have now agreed that men will not be discharged for physical disability incurred in line of duty until after their claims have been processed and adjudicated? Therefore, these disabled veterans will continue to draw their service pay and be hospitalized until their compensation or pensions have been authorized.

Mr. MAY. That is correct.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Have we not been working to accomplish that objective so that these boys who are returned to civilian life after having suffered wounds or disabilities in the service will not have to wait longer than their first month to get their checks?

Mr. MAY. That is correct, notwithstanding the inexcusable attack of the youthful gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The unfortunate thing about it all is that up until now disabled men have been separated from the service by discharge and have been forced to wait 2 or 3 months, sometimes 6 months, to get their disability compensation, in the meantime having no means of support and not being able to work. That is not the fault of Congress, because we have enacted adequate legislation. It is purely an administrative problem. We now think we have that solved. Am I right about that?

Mr. MAY. Not only is the gentleman right about that, but, if I should ask him a question and require him to answer whether or not the House Committee on Military Affairs is chiefly responsible for that improved condition, the gentleman would have to say yes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Undoubtedly. We have been working on it ever since these cases have been called to our attention. Nobody in this House or in any other Government position has been more interested in trying to get the problem solved so that the administrative difficulties could be overcome than have the members of this committee. Every member of the Committee on Military Affairs has worked hard and diligent on this and many other matters vital to the prosecution of the war. There has been no politics in this committee and I commend my distinguished chairman for his patriotic hard work in this committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from Kentucky that I agree with everything he has said. The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation brought out and passed some time ago legislation putting the burden of proof on the Government, when these men were discharged, to show that their disabilities existed prior to their enlistment, and that their service had not aggravated those disabilities. That brought a great deal of relief from the condition to which the gentleman from Kentucky refers.

May I say further that it comes with rather poor grace for a Member of Congress to get on the floor of the House and criticize the committees that are doing their best for these veterans, and talking about veterans from some other district. If they are from the district of the Member, it is the duty of that Member to take those claims up and have them expedited, and he can do it if he will. If they are from other districts, the matter should be called to the attention of the Member from whose district the cases come. There should not be an attempt to leave the impression with the country that the Congress of the United States is not doing everything it can to take care of the disabled veterans of this war.

Mr. MAY. That kind of thing, if the gentleman from Mississippi will permit, is almost equivalent to a stab in the back, because everybody in the community where Troy Lucas came from knows JACK MAY. Everybody in the community knows Troy Lucas, and if that was circulated in a New York paper into my district it would unquestionably raise the question of, "Has our Representative been faithful to his constituents?"

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. No; I will not yield any more. That is the reason why I say "there is so much good in the worst of us and so much bad in the best of us" that we ought to be careful what we say about each other, because we are all human beings.

I will ask, Mr. Speaker, in addition to what I have already said, unanimous consent here to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks this letter and instructions from the Selective Service System.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., September 29, 1943.

To State Directors, Local Boards, Reemployment Committee Men:

Subject: Reemployment Procedure, Revised.

From inquiries received from a number of State headquarters, some of which have forwarded questions from Reemployment Committee men, it seems advisable to issue a new bulletin on the work of the Reemployment Division.

A new procedure covering discharges from the Army will go into effect about the first of January, which is expected to be followed shortly by adoption of a somewhat similar procedure by the Navy and Marine Corps. Accordingly, a new Reemployment Bulletin No. 1 has been prepared covering the work of the Reemployment Division under the new procedure. Sufficient copies are being forwarded to you to furnish one for each local board in your State and one for each Reemployment Committee man and a reserve stock for future uses.

In addition to the new procedure covered in the Reemployment Bulletin No. 1, the War Department has under consideration, and has given tentative approval to, a policy under which it will in the future refuse to furnish medical records of veterans to prospective employers, even though accompanied by a waiver from the veteran. Since the military exit examinations are far more thorough than those given by any employer, access by employers to these records is tantamount to saying that the veteran must pass a far more thorough physical examination than the nonveteran. The cases in which employers are demanding Army or Navy medical records of veterans should be reported to this headquarters.

It would be appreciated if you would forward this bulletin to each newly appointed Reemployment Committee man at the time of his appointment.

For the Director:

LEWIS SANDERS,
Colonel, Field Artillery,
Chief, Reemployment Division.

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C.

REEMPLOYMENT BULLETIN NO. 1, ISSUED SEPTEMBER 29, 1943

REEMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

I. Reemployment organization

1. Statutory Authority

Paragraph (g) of section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, directs that a Personnel Division [1] be established to protect the reemployment rights of veterans, and pursuant to that mandate, the Director of Selective Service established the Reemployment Division. This Division is charged with the responsibility of replacing in former positions, or aiding in securing new positions for, those persons satisfactorily completing service in the armed forces. In fulfilling its functions, the Reemployment Division is authorized to utilize the services of any or all departments and any or all officers or agents of the United States, and to accept the services of all officers and agents of the State and Territories. Reemployment rights apply to all honorably discharged veterans, male and female, whether inducted, enlisted, or commissioned, subsequent to May 1, 1940.

2. War Shipping Administration Included

At the request of the War Shipping Administration, the Reemployment Division of Selective Service will handle all the reemployment benefits accorded men discharged from the merchant marine pursuant to Public Law 87 of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

3. Reemployment Program Decentralized

The Reemployment Division has been and is operating under a decentralized plan, in which operations are at the local level, supervision is at the State level, and planning and interpretations of the act are at the national level. At the local level Reemployment Committee men attached to each local board serve as the agents and counselors of the veterans with direct responsibility to restore them to their old jobs and serve as liaison agents and contact men withe other Government agencies which provide specific services for the veterans. Clearinghouse committees are being formed in each community to make available the organized resources of the community in reintegrating veterans into civilian life.

4. National Headquarters

National headquarters of the Selective Service System prepares the general plans and makes all decisions in interpreting the application of the act. This is necessary in order to secure uniformity of interpretation, since many organizations affected are interstate and a lack of uniformity in the application of the act would make it unworkable. National headquarters maintains liaison with all the national bodies interested in employment. National headquarters under the new separation procedure, when in effect, will furnish the State headquarters with classified tallies of its Reemployment Committee men's reports.

5. State Headquarters

State headquarters of the Selective Service System selects and recommends the appointment of the Reemployment Committee men, inspects their activities, sees that those not functioning are replaced, and arranges for the appointment of additional Committee men in any locality where the reemployment load necessitates it, the object being to have sufficient Committee men in each locality so that every veteran receives immediate and personal attention to his needs. It transmits the Reemployment Committee men's reports to national headquarters. The State clearinghouse committee, when formed, will maintain liaison with the State director in handling State-wide problems. The service of one officer, in whole or in part, and one full-time secretary should be adequate to handle the reemployment problems at the State level.

6. Local Boards

Local boards are the mailing addresses of the Reemployment Committee men attached to them, and local boards should refer only honorably discharged veterans who report to them to their Reemployment Committee men. The Reemployment Committee men should turn over to the local boards their records after final disposition of the cases. In case a Reemployment Committee man resigns, all his records should be turned over to the local board for transfer to his successor. Reemployment Committee men are entitled to local board stationery and have the franked mailing privileges of the Selective Service System.

7. Reemployment Committee Men

The Reemployment Committee men attached to each local board are the veterans' personal representatives, agents, and advisers. They have direct responsibility to return veterans to old jobs, see that they are properly serviced by the Government agencies set up to help them, and report to their State headquarters the disposition of all such cases. They should be informed of the veterans' reemployment rights as specified in section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. They should report all reemployment cases with controversies that they cannot adjust to the clearinghouse committees, when formed, in their respective communities; maintain close liaison with them, and, until these committees are formed, report all such cases to their State headquarters as at present. They should refer all new placement cases to the veterans' employment representatives of the United States Employment Service and follow up each case until satisfactory placement is accomplished. They should, through their community contacts, especially through the clearinghouse committee, make the organized resources of the communities available in replacing the veterans in civil life, particularly in creating preferential employment opportunities for veterans and occupational opportunities for the disabled.

(c) State clearinghouse committees: State clearinghouse committees, now being formed, will consist initially of representatives from the organizations of the national committee. After the State clearinghouse committees are formed they will establish liaison with State headquarters of selective service and will organize the local clearinghouse committees, which in turn will establish liaison with all Government agencies at the local level.

(d) Local clearinghouse committees: Local clearinghouse committees are to be organized in all the cities and towns of the Nation. These will consist of representatives of the national clearinghouse committee organizations and such other groups as are available and in position to render assistance in the local communities.

(e) Function of clearinghouse committees: The function of the clearinghouse committees will be to handle, as community problems, all reemployment cases that cannot be adjusted by the Reemployment Committee men and to make available the combined resources of the community in supporting the efforts of the Reemployment Committee men and the United States Employment Service.

II. Reemployment rights and benefits of the discharged men

1. Application May Be Made at Any Local Board

The discharged man may, at his own option, have his employment problems handled by a Reemployment Committee man attached to the local board at which he is registered (if he is a registrant) or by a Reemployment Committee man attached to any other local board, if reference to the local board at which he is registered would be inconvenient.

8. Cooperating Agencies

Reemployment Committee men must maintain personal contact with the local representatives of the several governmental agencies which are established to serve the returning veterans and be familiar with their functions. These agencies and their functions are as follows:

(a) The Veterans' Administration: This agency adjudicates pension claims of all honorably discharged persons who served in the active military or naval service after December 7, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war. It provides, in service-connected cases, hospitalization, if necessary, and domiciliary care, disability pensions, and vocational rehabilitation of all types, such as shop, commerce, university, etc., and cooperates in eventual placement with the United States Employment Service.

(b) The United States Employment Service: This agency operates under the War Manpower Commission and carries out the policies of the Commission in channelling employment to essential occupations and handles the releases of those transferring from one occupation to another, with the exception of honorably discharged veterans who have the right to reemployment in their old jobs.

(c) The Veterans' Employment Service: This agency has a State employment representative appointed to supervise the Veterans' Employment representatives attached to each local office of the United States Employment Service, through which the actual placements are made. They are responsible for the employment interests of all veterans registered with the United States Employment Service, except those veterans who desire reemployment in their old jobs.

(d) The Vocational Rehabilitation and Training Division of the Federal Security Agency: This agency, in connection with the State department of education in each State, operates vocational training in non-service-connected cases. It will assist in the training and education of those men who must learn a new trade or profession before returning to a civilian occupation and who do not come under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration.

(e) Red Cross: The home service of the American Red Cross in every community will assist veterans and their families in solving their personal problems. It is familiar with processing the necessary papers involved with the Veterans' Administration, if this has not been done at the discharging point.

(f) Civil Service Commission: The reemployment committeemen should inform any veteran who is seeking a Federal Civil Service position that he may obtain information regarding such positions at any post office or Civil Service office.

(g) Army Emergency Relief: This agency will extend temporary financial relief to soldiers and their dependents, including veterans discharged since September 16, 1940, in cases that cannot be taken care of by the Red Cross. They can be contacted through each service command.

(h) United States Armed Forces Institute, Madison, Wis.: This agency will undertake

[1] Called "Personnel Division" in the act; name changed to "Reemployment Division" to avoid confusion with the personnel division existing in all Government departments, including the Selective Service System itself.

to provide records of courses taken by military personnel while in service, for submission to civilian educational institutions, employers, and other properly interested agencies, and will, on application, give to military personnel and those recently discharged special examinations which will serve as a basis for the granting of academic credit by civilian schools and colleges.

9. Clearinghouse Committees

(a) Formation and organization: The National Clearinghouse Committee has been formed and is now organizing State and local clearinghouse committees. Fifteen national organizations constitute the National Clearinghouse Committee. In most instances, State clearinghouse committees will contain most of the organizations represented on the national committee. The clearinghouse committees are autonomous, and no Government official is eligible for membership, except in ex officio liaison capacity as may be desired under certain local conditions.

(b) National Clearinghouse Committee: The National Clearinghouse Committee consists of representatives from each of the following organizations:

American Farm Bureau Federation.
American Federation of Labor.
American Iron and Steel Institute.
American Legion.
Congress of Industrial Organizations.
Disabled American Veterans.
Kiwanis International.
Lions International.
National Association of Manufacturers.
National Exchange Club.
National Grange.
Railway Labor Executive Association—(invited—acceptance pending).
Rotary International.
United States Chamber of Commerce.
United States Junior Chamber of Commerce.
Veterans of Foreign Wars.

2. Assistance of Reemployment Committee Men

The veteran with an honorable discharge has the right to the services of his Reemployment Committee man in securing reinstatement in his old job or in assistance in securing a new job through placing him in liaison with the Veterans' Employment Service and United States Employment Service, and for assistance with the Veterans' Administration.

3. Veterans' Administration Vocational Rehabilitation

Those persons who served in the active military or naval service on or after December 7, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war and are honorably discharged therefrom, have the right to file an application with the Veterans' Administration and are entitled to the following benefits, provided the requirements of the law and regulations issued thereunder are met: (1) Hospitalization and domiciliary care. [2] (2) Disability pension. [2] (3) Vocational rehabilitation. The Reemployment Committee men will place such veterans in contact with the Veterans' Administration. The home service of the American Red Cross is familiar with processing the necessary papers involved.

III. New procedure and report of separation WD AGO form 53

(This new form should be in the field by January 1, 1944, and should eliminate duplication of efforts now occurring.)

1. WD AGO Form 53

The Adjutant General, working in conjunction with Selective Service, has developed and adopted a new report of separation officially identified as WD AGO Form 53. The servicing of seven forms and five letters has been eliminated and consolidated into the writing of this one simplified form by the discharging authority, six (6) copies being required, which will be a part of the Army's basic discharge procedure.

2. Disposition of WD AGO Form 53

(a) Insurance notice: To Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C. (To be accompanied by Soldier's Qualification Card WD AGO Form 20, when pension claim is made.)

(b) Posting copy: To The Adjutant General's Office, Washington, D. C. (Then to be transmitted to National Headquarters, Selective Service System.)

(c) Board of registration copy: To State director of Selective Service for the State of registration; to be transmitted to the local board of registration.

(d) Reemployment Committee man copy: To the proper State Director of Selective Service for transmittal to the Reemployment Committee man at the address of employment. (To be accompanied by Soldier's Qualification Card WD AGO 20, when no pension claim is made.)

(e) Veterans' employment representative copy: To the State veterans' employment representative of the War Manpower Commission through the State director of selective service for the State shown in item (d) above.

(f) Soldier's copy: Copy to be handed to the discharged soldier. This copy has the soldier's duties, rights, and benefits printed on the back, and will serve as a certificate to identify the soldier with his Reemployment Committee man, his veterans' employment representative (whether or not they have received their respective copies); also with the United States Civil Service Commission, and shows that he is entitled to a veteran's rights, such as registering as a veteran with the United States Employment Service.

3. Medical Information

Diagnosis is on copy for local board of registration. (This is confidential.) Statement of employment handicap is on the forms for the Reemployment Committee man and veterans' employment representative. This information is not on the veteran's copy.

IV. Disposition and use of Reemployment Committee man's copy of Report of Separation (WD AGO Form 53)

1. Reemployment Committee Man's Use of WD AGO Form 53

The Report of Separation, WD AGO Form 53, and Soldier's Qualification Card, WD AGO Form 20, should be retained by the Reemployment Committee man for future reference in the event the veteran concerned requires further assistance. The disposition of the case should be noted on the form, including referrals made, together with dates and other pertinent information. Every effort should be made by the Reemployment Committee man to make personal contact with the veteran for the purpose of determining whether assistance of any kind is required. Information will be forwarded later regarding special contact service that will be made available through the clearinghouse committee as they are formed. In cases where the veteran reports to a Reemployment Committee man before the Report of Separation on the man concerned is received, the Reemployment Committee man will accept the soldier's copy as evidence of the veteran's rights to consideration.

2. Reports by Reemployment Committee Man

The Reemployment Committee man will forward all reports on disposition of cases through State headquarters to national headquarters. These reports on disposition of cases will be made as at present, pending the issuance of a new form to be used for this purpose. Reports should be made as soon as possible, and in no case should they be delayed beyond 30 days from receipt of Report of Separation.

3. Final Disposition of Records

In all closed cases, WD AGO Forms 53 and 20 should be deposited with the local boards to be held separately by them.

For the Director:

LEWIS SANDERS,
Colonel, Field Artillery,
Chief, Reemployment Division.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C.

To each soldier and sailor about to return to civil life:

For your benefit the Government is glad to give you the following information. Section 8 of the Selective Service Act of 1940, as amended, provides that the Government will render aid in the replacement in their former positions, or in securing positions for, men who have satisfactorily completed their military or naval service. The carrying out of these provisions of the act is made a part of the responsibility of the Director of Selective Service, and a Reemployment Division in the Selective Service System has been set up to make this part of the act effective.

Attached to each local board in the United States are one or more Reemployment Committee men who are to act as your personal representatives in your home community and aid you in reestablishing yourself upon discharge whether you entered the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard as a volunteer or selected man.

There are several Government agencies also involved in aiding you and the reemployment committeeman cooperates with them all and will act with them on your behalf when you report to him through your local board on your return to your home community. These agencies and their functions for your benefit are as follows:

1. The American Red Cross is the official medium of communication between the people of the United States and the Army and Navy. Field Directors at Army and Navy camps and hospitals, and chapters in each home community assist servicemen and veterans and their families in solving their personal and family problems; arrange temporary financial assistance when required; and help in filing and presenting claims for pensions and other Government benefits.

2. The Federal Security Agency, whose Rehabilitation and Vocational Training Division operated by the State department of education, provides for the employment adjustment of physically impaired persons.

3. The Veterans' Administration maintains hospitals for the care of men incapable of being rehabilitated to reenter civil life, and provides them with artificial limbs or other appliances, if needed, and handles their pension claims.

4. The United States Employment Service has special veteran placement representatives at all offices and maintains contact with employers and their specific needs.

Your agents then for information and help are:

(a) The Red Cross. While in the hospital, maintain contact with their representative or their camp representative if you are returned to your unit for discharge.

(b) The local Reemployment Committee man. Upon your discharge and arrival at the place to which you go, you should establish communication with the Reemployment Committee man attached to the nearest local board and with the local Red Cross chapter.

Keep your contacts with them and let them know where you are.

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director.

[2] In service-connected cases only.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished and able ranking member of my committee, who is always cooperative and helpful.

Mr. THOMASON. Referring again to the unfair and unjust criticism and aspersions made by our friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER], I believe I voice the sentiment of the entire membership of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House, both Democrats and Republicans, and I know that I voice my own sentiment, when I say that, although there have been times when I have violently disagreed with the chairman of the committee, yet I will say this for him, that I have never doubted, and so far as I know no man on the committee ever doubted his patriotism, his integrity, his industry, or his interest, not only in his own constituents, but in the welfare of the country. But the gentleman from Missouri went further and reflected upon the committee and every member of it, including his Republican colleagues. As I construe his statement, it not only covered the members of the majority side, but likewise the members of the minority side. So for the benefit of the RECORD I would like to make this statement, and I am sure no member of the minority side present—and I see several on the floor—will take issue with what I am about to say. If I do not truthfully state their feelings, I pause for correction. That is, that there has never been a time since we were threatened with war, and even before war was declared, when the Secretary of War, and especially the Chief of Staff, General Marshall, has ever called on your committee that they have not had prompt and favorable action from the Committee on Military Affairs, and that without regard to any politics or partisanship.

If I had the time—and I do not want to consume the time of the gentleman from Kentucky—I could mention a long list of bills from our committee that are now the law, beginning from the time when we amended the National Defense Act and took the ceiling off the size of the Army; when we authorized an adequate and efficient air force; when we said we would have selective service on a fair and democratic basis; and later when we said we would extend that for another year; and later when we said we would have a soldiers and sailors relief act; and still later when we said we would have an allowance and allotment act. Only recently we pasesd the so-called fathers draft bill, and now we are working every day to report a mustering-out bill.

I repeat, and if I am wrong I invite criticism from my friends who have already had something to say, like the distinguished and able Member from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] and my good friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON], and others here on the floor, who belong to the same party as the gentleman from Missouri. Your committee day in and day out, with the exception of Sundays and holidays, either the whole committee or some of its subcommittees, have been working in a supreme effort to win this war as quickly as possible and get our boys back home. The majority side and the minority side, all of us, are patriotic citizens, and many of us, including myself, with boys overseas, and I wonder if my young friend from Missouri does not think we also have a stake in this war. We want to win this war. I, too, want my son and son-in-law back in this country in peaceful pursuits as soon as possible. We want to back up General Marshall. I will say that I have seen the chairman, when I thought he was a little impulsive, but I never saw him run from a fight. I just want to say I have disagreed with him pretty strongly sometimes and some of my friends on this floor have also, but I never questioned his industry, or his integrity, or his patriotism, or his interest in the welfare of the soldiers of this country. There has certainly never been any straddling on his part, although sometimes he just about busted up the committee, but, nevertheless, on the final wind-up we got action and I see my good Republican friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] approving my remarks. I am sure I voice the sentiments of the whole committee when I say he has been right on the job every day for the welfare of the Nation and of the Army and of the soldiers, although sometimes, like all of us, he has made mistakes because he is human.

I would like to yield to my friend from Ohio, although the gentleman from Kentucky has the floor. I do not see the ranking Republican member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], nor the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], nor the very able member on the Republican side, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], but I am sure they will confirm my statement and agree with me that there is no politics in our committee. Our business and duty is to provide necessary legislation for the winning of the war, and that we have done. Frankly, I think our colleague from Missouri was striking below the belt.

Mr. MAY. I am profoundly grateful to my colleague the gentleman from Texas for the fine tribute he pays not only to our fine Committee on Military Affairs, but to me as its chairman, and let me add that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] sits at my right hand on the committee as the majority ranking member, and if there ever was a real right-hand man in the whole wide world he surely fills the bill. He is patient, tolerant, forbearing, and always loyal and devoted to duty and to me as chairman. I can with utmost faith and confidence always turn to him for sound advice, and he is generous and very helpful.

Now, as a final word, let me suggest that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER], if he has not read it, that Christ once rebuked an accuser with these words, "Let him who is without sin cast the first stone."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield briefly.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes prior to the statement of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], if it were agreeable to the gentleman and the others who had special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). There are 65 minutes of previous special orders now pending.

Mr. PLOESER. May I say for the benefit of the Chair, I would appreciate it, if the Chair would put the question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is hardly fair to those who have special orders already granted.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes, prior to the statement of the gentleman from South Dakota.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Dakota has been recognized. If he cares to yield to the gentleman——

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER], has had plenty of time to speak and has spoken repeatedly. I have 20 minutes following the gentleman from South Dakota, in which I want to speak on the Bill of Rights. Today is the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of the adoption of that Bill of Rights.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield briefly.

Mr. PLOESER. Long enough for me to say that after I had asked unanimous consent for the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] to speak for an additional 15 minutes, the gentleman saw fit never to yield beyond that point. He yielded to others to try to build up a case, which is clear in the record.

These considerations have all come about since November 11, since the pressure has been put on to try to bring action. For 2 years there has been delay. The RECORD of December 6 gives you 14 more cases that you can ask General Hines to answer and also ask him why he did not read my address of November 11 in its entirety so that he would not have been obliged, and there would not be any necessity for him, to waste his time writing such a letter.

I thank the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Not at the moment. I want to talk about an altogether different subject and my time is limited.

HOW TO STOP A GWIBIT: JOIN THE A. A. F. E. G.

Mr. Speaker, I take the floor this afternoon to call to the attention of the country and the Congress the organization of a new association for the advancement of American ideals and interests. It will be known for short as the A. A. F. E. G., but after the true New

Deal manner, these initials are to designate the full name of the order which is the American Association for Eliminating Gwibits.

We have heard much in this Congress, Mr. Speaker, about the bungling of bureaucrats. Mail from our constituents is replete with complaints and criticisms about the inefficient and often arrogant manner in which New Deal bureaucrats order private citizens around, hamstring their activities, and circumscribe what have always been considered their American rights and liberties.

I feel that today, which is Bill of Rights Day, it is especially appropriate that we discuss the matter I have in mind. The vast growth of big government in Washington—much of it taking place long before the war in Europe, to say nothing of the date of our entrance into it—has, to an unprecedented state, put the Government into business and pushed political appointees into the private offices and individual homes of this Republic. As a result, bureaucracy has reached a magnitude and become a menace in this country far beyond that of any previous era in our national history.

The land of the free and the home of the brave is still emphatically the home of the brave but, unless brave men devote themselves to the task of restoring Government to the people, it may not much longer be the home of the free.

Prominent among the forces which are fettering freedom in this country, Mr. Speaker, is the all-American "gwibit." Just as the termite destroys the foundations of Government buildings, so the "gwibit" destroys the fundamentals of Government institutions. Slowly but surely our strength is being sapped and our future impaired by a galaxy of "gwibits" whose resistance to progress is only excelled by their proclivities for procrastination.

Before defining a "gwibit" as the white-colored wanton which he is, however, permit me to emphasize that not all bureaucrats are "gwibits." There are both good and bad bureaucrats, Mr. Speaker. Many career public servants both in and out of the civil service are able and devoted officials and workers with a zest for their job and a zeal for their country. Such honest and helpful public servants are as essential to good government as taxes and statutes and they are entitled to general respect and generous recompense. The "gwibit" is, in fact, as distasteful and damaging to the good bureaucrat as he is to the patriotic private citizen.

ALL NEOCRATS ARE "GWIBITS"

One of the fundamental reasons why New Deal bureaucracy functions so badly and serves so poorly is the fact that under the present administration the trend has been away from old-line, experienced, faithful bureaucrats and toward a new type of political appointee sometimes described as a neocrat. Webster's dictionary defines a neocracy as government by new and inexperienced officials, or as "upstart rule." It is from the ranks of the neocrats, therefore, that the "gwibits" are recruited and while not all "gwibits" are neocrats, it is almost correct to say that all neocrats are "gwibits." They seldom if ever, at least, are more distantly related to "gwibits" than the relationship of leader and follower or payer and payee. Thus, they are sort of second political cousins at best, and at worst—which is usually the status quo—they become as identical as Siamese twins.

There is room in the American Association for Eliminating Gwibits, however, to include essential Government employees and busy, useful bureaucrats, just as there is room to include all citizens, both public and private, who believe in government of, for, and by the people and who want to do something to make it work.

HOW CAN YOU TELL A "GWIBIT" WHEN YOU SEE ONE?

What then, Mr. Speaker, is a "gwibit"? How can you identify one? First of all, a "gwibit" is a bureaucrat who "nos" a good idea when he sees one. But there are other ways, too, in which you can identify a "gwibit."

WHAT IS A "GWIBIT"?

A "gwibit" is two parts cold water, fastened to the backbone of an angle worm by a lot of red tape.

He knows it cannot be done, and has the "no how" to see that nobody does it.

He knows at least one word in every language, but it always translates into "no."

He thinks that a monkey wrench is something to throw, a buck is something to pass, and that an Ethiopian is an integral part of every wood pile.

He believes that responsibility is just another name for smallpox and treats it accordingly.

A "gwibit" does not hibernate like a bear. He just gets on the Government pay roll and maintains low visibility all-year round.

Hand an idea to a "gwibit" and you would think he had picked up a time bomb. First he soaks it thoroughly for 48 hours to be sure it has stopped ticking. Then he gingerly tosses it out the window, hopping it will land in somebody's back yard.

Recently a couple of "gwibits" paraphrased an old song. The title is, "Praise the Lord, and Pass the Inhibitions."

Give a "gwibit" enough rope and he is sure to hogtie something.

The first American "gwibit" on record was in Massachusetts. He got the ordinance passed in 1680 making illegal that new fangled contraption, a bathtub.

The "gwibits" are really trying to win the war in their own way. They have made so many so-called gwibit contributions, such as court-martialing General Billy Mitchell for sinking a battleship with a plane.

HISTORICAL GWIBITZING

Patrick Henry: "Give me liberty or give me death."

Gwibit: "Your request will be forwarded through appropriate channels and you will be notified of the decision in due course. However, it is suggested you propose several other alternatives since the categories you mention may already be supplied."

General Warren: "Don't shoot until you see the whites of their eyes."

Gwibit: "No such command is in military parlance and is impossible. Interpretation must be made by ranking oculist."

Farragut: "Full speed ahead, damn the torpedoes."

Gwibit: "We must caution you never to use full speed especially in forward motion. As for damning the torpedoes, that is out of your jurisdiction, since it is the function of War Information."

Major Deveraux: "Send us more Japs."

Gwibit: "If you will fill out a request in triplicate and present it accompanied with documentary evidence proving that your supply has been entirely exhausted it will be given consideration providing it is initialed by the Immigration Authority, the Collector of Customs, and the Food and Drug Administration and signed."

P. S.: In case you still have not figured it out—Guild of Washington Incompetent Bureaucratic Idea Throatcutters.

Caution: A gwibitzer is not to be confused with a kibitzer; the latter merely stands on the side lines and watches while the former sits in the path of progress and trips those who would traverse it.

GUILD OF WASHINGTON INCOMPETENT BUREAUCRATIC IDEA THROATCUTTERS

Mr. Speaker, from the foregoing it should be apparent to all that the Guild of Washington Incompetent Bureaucratic Idea Throatcutters—which translated into abbreviated New Deal vernacular is shortened into "gwibit"—is a force against freedom and a brake against progress which must be eliminated if this Republic is to function as intended by its founding fathers. However, all congental and constant "gwibits" are members of the guild to which, however, they pay only passive loyalty since being active in anything is considered anathema by all members of this futile fraternity.

The time has now come to be on with the job of "gwibit" eliminating. Any citizen in private or public life who takes the initiative in proposing that an individual, community, or State refrain from asking the Federal Government to do for him, it, or them, anything which can be done without the aid of the Federal Government is helping to eliminate "gwibits."

"Gwibits" grow when citizens delegate to the Federal Government responsibilities and tasks which might better be handled locally. In fact, "gwibits," like guinea pigs, grow and multiply without the necessity of outside encouragement. It is doubly unfortunate, therefore, that the liquid-eyed largess of the New Deal has provided "gwibits" with such unprecedented and unparalleled encouragement. However, by refraining from delegating to the Big Government in Washington powers, authorities, tasks, responsibilities, duties, privileges, jobs, assignments,

regulations, and rights which can better be handled elsewhere, private citizens can help prevent the growth of a scourge of New Deal "gwibits" which otherwise will devitalize free government in Washington like a flock of grasshoppers devouring a wheat field in Kansas.

"PENCIL PACKING PAPA"

From the financial point of view, however, the menace of the "gwibit" is not so much from the standpoint of the amount of the people's money which he secures as salary as it is the vast amounts of the people's money which he spends as agent for the Government. Thus, a Government "gwibit" is in reality one of the world's most costly luxuries. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that some day a songwriter will write a song entitled, "Pencil Packing Papa, Lay That Checkbook Down." I am sure its popularity would be tremendous, and if its efficacy is even fractional, it should outsell and outsing the original song from which it would be paraphrased.

Slowly but surely, we Americans are learning the awful axiom that when we ask the New Deal Washington to do something for us, it winds up by doing something to us. And the "do-gooder" who pushes the prod and sets the hook ninety-nine times out of a hundred is a congenital "gwibit" whose main goal in life is to hang onto his job.

A "gwibit" never gets very far on his own power and tries never to become separated from the source of his pay check. He thrives on what he is given and manages to give perpetual life to assignments to which he is attached. He seldom attacks new lines of endeavor not delegated to him, as that requires an exhibition of initiative which in the ethics of a "gwibit" is tantamount to treason to his tribe. Therefore, while it is difficult to decrease the "gwibits" which we have, it is possible to prevent their increase by abstaining from following the inviting impulse to transfer to the Federal Government the correction of problems which we can locally solve. It follows that the best place to kill a "gwibit" is close to home, and the most effective way to stop him from gwibitizing is before he gets going.

Only citizens who will pledge themselves to take some action in some way to stop the bad American habit of asking Washington to do for them what they should do for themselves are eligible for membership in the American Association for Eliminating Gwibits. George Poindexter, of Stepney, Conn., is the president of the association; the gentleman from South Dakota now addressing you is the secretary. We have no treasurer because, unless we succeed in eliminating "gwibits," we shall soon all be without money anyhow, and if we get the job done, energetic Americans will once again become able to earn and save their own independence without benefit of Government hand-out or organizational fee.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. I would like to give you a few definitions that I have heard around Washington of a bureaucrat.

First. A person who takes a 10-page memo to say "No."

Second. The original "too little and too late" man.

Third. A lawmaker who is not elected and therefore is not responsible for his acts.

Fourth. A person who would rather plan to plan than plan.

I would like to ask the gentleman if those definitions of a bureaucrat would classify him as a "gwibit"?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. I would say they would almost make such bureaucrats charter members of the "gwibit" organization.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. WEICHEL], at the conclusion of the last special order, may have 3 minutes in which to address the House, with the right to revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZIMMERMAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, today is the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of one of the greatest events in the history of mankind, the adoption of the Bill of Rights, which is contained in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

At the risk of being tedious, I am going to take these amendments up and discuss them in detail, but, first, let me say that when the Constitution of the United States was written in 1787, Thomas Jefferson, the greatest political philosopher of that day, was in France as our Minister to that country. When he returned he called attention to the fact that the Constitution was incomplete, that, while it provided for a central government, it did not take care of the rights of human beings for which mankind had been struggling for more than 2,000 years. He made them agree that before the Constitution was adopted these 10 amendments should be approved and become a part of the Constitution of the United States.

As I said the other day, these first 10 amendments constitute the "ten commandments" of American freedom. While we are talking of freedom for the other peoples of the world, we unfortunately have a communistic element in this country that would destroy that sacred document and wipe out that freedom that has been gained as Jefferson said by so much suffering, so much blood, and so much toil, through years and years of struggle, revolution, and reformation. It is the ark of the covenant of freedom and today we find people throughout this country who are flouting it and who would wipe it from existence. When they do, American liberty as you and I know it, will have disappeared.

Amendment No. 1 provides:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

There is where the separation of church and state comes in, that enables you and me and every other American to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. That could not be done in the Old World at that time, and in some of the countries of the Old World it cannot be done now. We have had a great many religious rows in this country since that amendment was adopted, but there is not an instance on record that I have ever found where anybody had the audacity to enter a place of worship and try to break it up.

Freedom of speech and the freedom of the press are being challenged today. When they are gone, free government will have taken its flight and liberty will have gone down to the dust and perished among its worshippers. Nothing is more sacred, or more important, to the American people than free speech and a free press.

The second amendment provides:

A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

It is useless for me to comment on the value that amendment has been to the American people and the value it may be in years to come, because when you disarm a people, the weakest tyrant on earth may dominate the most populous country.

The third amendment provides:

No soldier shall, in time of peace, be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

The people of the Old World up to that time, with a few shining exceptions, never had the benefit of such protection. It has been followed in a great many instances, but not in all countries. It has been carried out to the letter so far as the United States of America is concerned.

Amendment No. 4:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

That is a freedom that had not existed in the Old World. When the Bastille fell one man had been in there 35 years. When told to go home, he said: "Home? What are you talking about?" He had been there so long without trial that he

had even forgotten where he lived, although he had been a prosperous and influential young man when he was cast into prison.

The fifth amendment provides:

No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself; nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

This is probably the cornerstone of American liberty. We lawyers know what it means when we say a man cannot be twice put into jeopardy for the same offense. When a man is tried in a court of law before a judge or jury and a verdict of not guilty is rendered, he can never be arrested again on that charge or be put in jeopardy again for that offense. That was not true, and is not true today, in many countries of the world.

Nor shall he be deprived of life, liberty, and property without due process of law.

In other words, you cannot go out and seize a man's property, deprive him of life or liberty, without due process of law; that is, without taking that legal procedure established in this country that guarantees him a fair and impartial trial.

Nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

Our State constitution in Mississippi has a beneficent addition to that language. It provides that private property shall not be taken or injured for public use without just compensation.

Today when we see the governments of the world broken down, with fascism, communism, shintoism, and every other "ism" disturbing the minds of the people of the world, we turn back to this Bill of Rights, this ark of the covenant, if you please, that has protected us throughout the years of its existence, throughout the life of this Republic.

I am speaking as a southern Democrat, I am speaking as a man who has always stood for the Democratic Party, and I do not propose to have any bunch of crackpots run me out of that party. But there are some things taking place in this country that violate that part of the Bill of Rights in a most dangerous, a most unnecessary, and a most inexcusable manner.

There has been set up, by Executive order, what they call the Fair Employment Practices Committee that is going throughout the country trying to force private enterprise to comply with regulations that cannot be enforced. Right today they are also trying to make the railroads and railroad brotherhoods of the South adopt a policy of Negro equality.

It is a hard matter to discuss this issue on the floor of the House without discussing the racial issue. If I mention the word "Jew" I am excoriated by a certain element that the better element of Jews despise, who are advocating communism from one end of the country to the other. When I mention the Negro, although I am one of the best friends he ever had, an infinitely better friend of his than any flannelmouthed Communist who has tried to use him to stir up racial trouble, I am accused of race prejudice. These Communists are using the Negro as a smoke screen. They are not only making it impossible for themselves to live in this country after this war is over but they are destroying the Negro's hope for happiness and prosperity among the best friends he ever had on the face of the earth, and that is the white people of the Southern States.

I know we of the South have been accused of being unkind to the Negro. I know that we have been misrepresented throughout the country on this subject, but as the grandson of a slave holder, I want to say that no people under the shining sun ever did more for one race than the white people of the South has done for the Negro. If you will let him alone, if these Communist elements will let him alone, he will be able to make a living in that country throughout all the years that are to come, and to live in peace and harmony with the white people around him.

But this Fair Employment Practices Committee and this War Labor Relations Board are today trying to force the white people—white women, if you please—working for the Western Electric Co. in Baltimore to use the same washrooms and the same toilet facilities as the Negroes do. They are doing the Negroes more harm than anything else has since the days of reconstruction. We have lived with them for 300 years.

Mr. Speaker, we never reduced the Negro to slavery. We elevated him from the position of savage to that of servant. Throughout uncounted centuries he roamed through the wilds of Africa, one of the richest countries in all the world, and never developed the art of agriculture to the extent of making his living out of the ground. For countless centuries he trod the soil of his native land, with diamonds beneath his feet, and never dreamed of the theory of values. He bowed beneath his master's whip at the building of the pyramids and watched succeeding civilizations rise and fall, and all he ever learned was to construct a rude shelter of bark and grass to protect him from the beating rays of a tropical sun. He saw the dawn of civilization and watched the pageant of the centuries pass without so much as manifesting a desire to participate in progress; until we brought him to this country, taught him the rudiments of civilization, and showed him the light of Christianity through the unfortunate instrumentality of slavery—unfortunate for the white man, but fortunate for the Negro. Because human slavery has been the greatest curse the South ever had, yet the greatest blessing the Negro had ever known up to that time. We are all glad it is gone, never to return.

Since the War between the States throughout the South, the Negroes have been able to live and enjoy peace and protection which the Communisits are destroying for him.

Now they are demanding that every private enterprise employ Negroes and promote them, whether it wants them or not. Who is behind all this? It is these communistic elements I am referring to. They are creating dissension that will destroy his chance for happiness and a livelihood in the years to come. Then where will he go? Are your northern cities prepared to take care of him?

There are only four possible solutions of the race question. One of them would be the extermination of one race or the other. That is not to be contemplated. Another one would be deportation, which is out of the question. Another one would be amalgamation, to send the country down to become a miserable mass of amalgamated, degenerate humanity. That is unthinkable. The only one left is segregation, the one that the South has followed successfully for more than 300 years. Yet this F. E. P. C. is trying, without authority of law, without any right whatever, to destroy that policy and destroy what we are trying to do.

They are destroying, as I said, the Negro's hope for future happiness, and in time of war, when every white home in the South has somebody in the service, when our boys are shedding their blood upon every battlefield for America and America's institutions, they issue these orders and stir up racial resentment, racial hatred, and race trouble throughout the South, and also in many of the Northern States. You had a taste of it in Harlem and in Detroit, Mich.

Mr. Speaker, this attempt to take over the election machinery of the States is another violation of the Constitution, as well as the Bill of Rights. We cannot carry freedom to the people of the rest of the world, if we permit these safeguards of our own liberty to be destroyed.

And what if it is destroyed? What will take its place? Let me read you the words of one of the great statesmen of a hundred years ago, Daniel Webster, who said:

Other misfortunes may be borne, or their effects overcome. If disastrous wars should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our Treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still, under new cultivation, they will grow green again, and ripen to future harvests.

It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these may be rebuilt.

But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government?

Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty?

Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty

with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity?

No; if these columns fall, they will be raised not again. Like the Colosseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful and a melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be the monuments of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional American liberty.

God protect America from enemies without; God save America from those elements that would destroy it from within.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Blair Moody, ace reporter of the Detroit News, in his regular column, the Lowdown on Washington, captioned, "How about Congress' alibis on inflation?" The article is unanswerable and therefore unchallengeable. I ask that it be included in toto, notwithstanding the fact that it may slightly exceed the maximum of two pages.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be granted leave of absence indefinitely, on the advice of the House physician.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FOOD SUBSIDIES

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the two schools of thought—one of which believes that the American consumer can be best protected by wholly a price approach, and the other, which believes that the American consumer is best protected by an ample food-production program—seem to be at odds as much as ever. The reasons these groups do not see more eye to eye are: First, the improper use of supposedly reliable Federal information from Federal bureaus and spokesmen; and, second, the cheap political tricks which are being used to inject the issue into future political campaigns. The only time we hear about inflation is when the low-income groups are involved or when the American farmer is in the picture.

As an example of the use of supposedly reliable information from a Federal bureau, I wish at this time to call your attention to the table in the RECORD of November 29, page 10068. It is as follows:

Net cash income above expenses of typical commercial family-operated farms

1935–39 TO 1842 AND 1943

Type of farm	Location	Dollars increased income, 1942 over average 1935–39	Farm net cash income		
			1935–39	1940	1942
1. Wheat farms	Winter wheat area	$3,700	$1,990	$1,670	$5,690
2. Wheat, grain sorghum, livestock	do	3,264	1,700	1,600	4,960
3. Cash grain	Corn Belt	3,204	1,800	2,100	5,000
4. Hog-beef breeding, fattening	do	2,626	1,360	1,280	3,930
5. Wheat, corn, livestock	Winter wheat area	2,548	1,400	1,260	3,550
6. Hog, dairy	Corn Belt	1,331	1,090	839	2,420
7. Dairy	Wisconsin	1,078	1,110	1,270	[1] 2,190
8. Dairy	New York	1,040	960	1,200	[1] 2,000
9. Flue-cured tobacco	Virginia	656	800	740	1,460
10. Texas black waxy prairie	Cotton area	400	500	500	900
11. Georgia 2-mule	do	248	300	330	648
12. Mississippi Delta 2-mule	do	306	300	246	610
13. Fire-cured tobacco	do	232	200	200	430
INFORMATION ON 1943 SO FAR AS AVAILABLE					
1. Wheat farms	Winter wheat area	$4,800	$1,990	$1,670	[2] $6,770
2. Wheat, grain sorghum, livestock	do	4,539	1,700	1,598	[2] 6,240
3. Wheat, corn, livestock	do	3,220	1,400	1,260	[2] 4,629

[1] Preliminary.
[2] 1943.
Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Nov. 5, 1943.

I wish to say at this time that this table may meet one's approval if it is properly explained, but the table is not properly explained by the Government bureau which issued it. It is wrong to lead the consumer groups to believe that the farmers are receiving the net incomes which are shown in this table unless it is carefully explained. This causes disunity. It harms the war-food program. When I saw this table, I noted what it said regarding the Wisconsin dairy farms and felt it must be wrong. It happens that I had a report of the Pure Milk Products Cooperative in my files, which is as follows:

Production and number of producers by months, 1942–43

	Total production, 1942–43	Number of producers	Milk producers, monthly average per patron	Daily average production per farm
1942	*Pounds*		*Pounds*	*Pounds*
September	72,823,036	11,532	6,315	210.5
October	73,684,982	11,601	6,352	204.9
November	70,023,837	11,577	6,049	201.6
December	79,178,962	11,517	6,875	221.8
1943				
January	86,195,472	11,477	7,510	242.3
February	84,498,089	11,594	7,416	264.9
March	100,948,872	11,450	8,816	284.4
April	105,132,186	11,481	9,157	305.2
May	119,967,316	11,569	10,370	334.5
June	123,122,700	11,632	10,583	352.8
July	103,747,729	11,724	8,849	285.5
August	86,017,194	11,766	7,311	235.8
Total	1,105,340,375	[1] 11,550	7,966	262.0

[1] Average.

As this milk averages nearly 4 percent butterfat this would make (262 x 4%) about 10 pounds of butterfat. The average price of butterfat in Wisconsin in 1942 was 58 cents per pound. The members of the Pure Milk Products Co-operative, however, received a price above the State average price. The economic life of the producer and the economic life of the communities, for that matter, are very directly affected by the price of this 10 pounds of butterfat produced on these farms each day.

What justification is there for all this talk about the large farmers being the ones that oppose roll-back subsidies?

You should also note that this one co-op handled 1,000,000,000 of the 98,000,000,000 pounds of milk that found its way into the commercial dairy channels of the Nation this last year.

With this information in mind, I called the office of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and asked for Dr. Tolley, the chief of the B. A. E. I was referred to Mr. O. V. Wells, as Dr. Tolley was not in. Mr. Wells asked that I wait until Dr. Tolley returned to the city before making any comment upon this table, which I agreed to do and which I have done. On December 7, I received the following letter from Mr. Wells:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS,
Washington, D. C., December 6, 1943.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: Reference is made to our telephone conversation of last week concerning incomes of Wisconsin dairy farmers printed on page 10068 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 29, 1943.

The Wisconsin dairy farms are typical of those dairy farms in southern Wisconsin that have about 17 milk cows and produce milk for processing. They are farms with about 115 acres of which 85 acres are cropped, and are considered to be about 2-man farms in size, including an operator, family help, and some hired labor at harvest time. The dairy herd produces about 73 percent of the farm income of which 59 percent is from dairy products and 14 percent is from the sale of cattle and calves. A fuller discussion of the subject is contained in the Agricultural Situation for January 1942, a copy of which is enclosed.

The income figures contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are representative of an important segment of the dairy farms in Wisconsin but should not be interpreted as

reflecting conditions prevailing on all groups of dairy farms in the State. The enclosed table contains comparisons between the typical Wisconsin commercial dairy farms and averages computed from the 1940 census. The main difference in the two sets of data is in the number of cows and the gross income per farm. The typical commercial farms contained an average of about 17 milk cows as compared with an average of 15 for the farms reporting dairy cows in the important 18 dairy counties of Wisconsin and 13 for the farms reporting dairy cows in the State. The average number of cows per farm for all farms in the 18 dairy counties and all farms in the State is even less than this.

The 1939 gross income for the typical commercial dairy farms was $2,115 compared with an average of $1,603 for all dairy farms in the 18 dairy counties and an average of $1,387 for all dairy farms in the State. According to the census definition, dairy farms were those that received 40 percent or more of their gross income from dairy products.

As indicated in the article in the Agricultural Situation, the main purpose of these studies is to determine for a modal group of farms of some defined type annual changes in gross and net income. As index numbers they probably also represent fairly well changes in other groups of dairy farms in the State. When the volume of income and the changes in income are expressed in dollars and cents they can be considered to be representative of the modal group of farms for which the computation was made. In this case they apply to the group of farms described which have an average of about 17 milk cows and furnish employment for the equivalent of two men throughout the year.

Very truly yours,

O. V. WELLS,
Chief Program Analyst.

Wisconsin: Comparison of typical commercial family operated dairy farms with 1940 census data

Item	Typical dairy farms	Average for 18 dairy counties		Average for State	
		All farms	Farms reporting item	All farms	Farms reporting item
Land in farms, 1939 ..... acres	114	112	112	122.5	122.5
Corn, 1939 ..... do	20	11.7	16.9	11.4	20.3
Oats, 1939 ..... do	20	12.5	14.8	11.0	15.4
Barley, 1939 ..... do	7.4	7.5	10.8	3.7	11.0
Hay, 1939 ..... do	24.3	20.9	22.1	21.1	22.7
Milk cows, 1940 [1] ..... number	17.4	13.8	15.0	11.7	13.1
Milk production per cow, 1939 ..... pounds	(, 170	6,158	.....	5,680	.....
Hours of work per year, 1939:					
Operator and family ..... number	4,356	.....	.....	.....	.....
Hired ..... do	1,721	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total (2-man farm) ..... do	6,077	.....	.....	.....	.....

DAIRY FARMS

	1939		1942
	Typical	Census [2]	Census [2]
Gross income	$2,115	$1,603	$1,387
Sales of dairy products	$1,225	$1,041	$907
Percent dairy sales are of gross income	58	65	65

[1] Typical farm—number of cows milked Jan. 1, 1940. Census farms—number of cows milked Jan. 1, and still on farms Apr. 1, 1940.
[2] Farms having 40 percent or more of their income from dairy products.

I have not the time to prove or disprove the statement that the typical wheat farmer of America made a net profit of $5,690 in 1942 and $6,770 in 1943, or whether the typical wheat-corn-livestock farmer of the winter-wheat area had a net of $3,950 in 1942 and $4,620 in 1943. If the ordinary reader looks at this table and thinks that it is the average net profit obtained by these various groups, it at least makes good propaganda for the professional subsidy rollbackers. I shall be content to confine my remarks to the State of Wisconsin. I wish to call your particular attention to these statements in Mr. Wells' letter:

The Wisconsin dairy farms are typical of these dairy farms in southern Wisconsin. The income figures contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are representative of an important segment of the dairy farms of Wisconsin, but should not be interpreted as reflecting conditions prevailing on all groups of dairy farms in the State.

In other words, the tables are set up to represent the typical commercial family operated farms of Wisconsin, but the facts are that these so-called typical farms are in southern Wisconsin, in only 18 of the 71 counties of the State, where they had 17 cows in comparison to the 11.7 1940 average for the State, and where the owners had 85 acres out of their 115 acres that are cropped, while the State showed an average of 122 acres per farm in 1940 with only 53 acres cropped.

Now I wish to call your attention to the table supplied by Mr. Wells, referred to in his letter which is as follows:

By telephone and personal conference I found that the 1939 farm net cash income for the selected dairy farms in 18 counties was only $1,019. Also that the hours of work per year for 1942 was 6,438 hours in comparison to the 6,077 hours in 1939.

You will note that on these typical dairy farms that they required 6,077 hours of work in 1939. Mr. Wells advises me that these operations required 6,438 hours in 1942. You will also note that table 1 shows a net profit to these Wisconsin dairy farms of $2,190 in 1942, and Mr. Wells advises me that this comparable net income in 1939 was $1,019.

From the above, then, it would appear that in 1939 on these typical dairy farms selected farms, it showed 6,438 man counties, with 85 acres out of 115 in crops, gave return to the farm labor of 16 cents per hour for man labor—$1,019 divided by 6,077. In 1942 on these same selected farms, it showed 6,438 man hours with $2,190 net cash income, or 34 cents per hour—$2,190 divided by 6,438. In fact, Mr. Wylie Goodsell, of the B. A. E. gives this as 33.9 cents per hour, and figures the 1939 income on the basis of 13-plus cents per hour when interests is deducted.

At this point there are a few facts which I wish to call to the attention of my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCANLON] who, according to the press, is head of the committee to protect the consumer. My personal opinion is that 395 other Members of this House are just as much interested in the consumers of the Nation as are the fighting forty. First, I would like to call attention to the fact that in 1939 the labor on selected dairy farms in Wisconsin brought only 16 cents an hour, and in 1942 only 34 cents an hour. You will also note in Mr. Wells' letter and in the table which he submitted that he says that these farms "are considered to be about two-man farms in size, including an operator, family help, and some hired labor at harvest time." In other words, this is a family income, or at least a two-man operation, and even using the selected dairymen in the 18 southern Wisconsin counties, it would not be more than $1,095 per person, or $2.71 per day. How many people in the group which Mr. SCANLON represents do you suppose have an hourly wage of 34 cents, or receive but $1,095 annually? $1,095 for 365 days is $2.71 a day only. I trust that the roll-backers will note that the farm women of America are actually working together with their children as never before in their lives to provide this needed food. I also hope that they realize that these farm people are carrying on this great work with only 40 percent of them having electric lights in their homes, and with only 1 out of 10 of them with modern conveniences in their homes. I wish that my colleague from Pennsylvania would ask his audiences how many of them in each audience have electric lights and bath tubs in their homes and what their daily income is at this time, and find out how far it is from $2.71 per day.

My good friend and colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] often asks for a better plan than the roll-back subsidies, but I have never noted that he yielded long enough to have the question answered. It is surely difficult to unscramble a scrambled egg when so many insist on further scrambling. However, at this time I wish to make a few suggestions to the professional roll-back subsidy advocates. If this group is really interested in providing food at a reasonable price to the low-income groups, why do they not support legislation like the Herter-Aiken bill, which re-

vives the stamp plan to provide this food? If this group wants to do something really constructive, why do they not bring their pressure to bear on the O. P. A. and ask this agency how much longer they are going to let the man with the price obtain cream without points and make the average citizen pay 5 points for cottage cheese made from the skim milk. They could find out how much longer the O. P. A. is going to allow cream to go point-free, so that the man with the price can secure all he pleases, from which to make butter; and yet compel the average citizen to pay 16 points for butter made from the same cream. Third, how much longer is this group going to allow the O. P. A. to knowingly or unknowingly protect the oleo interests by not putting a ceiling on oleo?

The roll-back subsidy group are making a big hue and cry about rolling back the price of butter 5 cents a pound, or with, at the most, forty to fifty million dollars a year subsidy. Yet they see the O. P. A. without protest allow the oleo interests to sell this product for from 17 to 29 cents a pound. If the price of oleo were rolled back to what some of it is being sold for and squeeze out some of this 12 cents a pound, it would represent a saving of part of this $72,000,000 annually on the 600,000,000 pounds plus of oleo that are being manufactured this year. The roll-back subsidy group could easily show the O. P. A. that they already have a ceiling of 11 cents plus on soybean oil, 13 cents plus on cottonseed oil, 13 cents plus on peanut oil, 12½ to 14½ cents per pound on powdered skim, or 1½ cents per pound on skim milk in fluid form and since the Oleo Institute shows that these products make up a large percentage of the ingredients of oleo, there should not be much difficulty in arriving at a ceiling price for this product. In other words, although some oleo is being sold at 17 cents a pound, other oleo is being sold for 29 cents a pound, and the subsidy group up to this time has made no effort to protect the consumers of America so far as this product is concerned.

However, they do insist in all their righteousness that it is imperative to roll back the dairy farmer's prices, where in 1942 the laborer has been receiving 34 cents or less per hour for labor that goes into his product. And why?

I note in the 1942 production of oleomargarine that they used 74,000,000 pounds of skim milk, although they call it milk. At the O. P. A. ceiling price, this would be not over 1½ cents a pound. As long as this is being sold as an ingredient of oleo at 17–29 cents a pound, it would seem on the face of it that this was a rather large margin that might need attention before the roll-backers start on people who are receiving 34 cents an hour for their labor in 1942.

Why do not the protectors of the consumer question the advisability of asking the O. P. A. to check up a little on the filled milk that is being manufactured at this time, if they are really interested in the welfare of the consumer of this country.

Why do not they find out why filled milk is being sold without a ceiling price and without any points, and being sold also at a price equal to the regular evaporated milk that is made from normal milk. Of course, when they find this out from the O. P. A., they can also find out why the War Production Board allocated 7,600 tons of tin plate in the last 2 years to this filled milk industry, when it has been very difficult even to get enough tin to repair a vat in a corner cheese factory in Wisconsin.

It is surprising to read in the Milwaukee Journal recently an article with a headline, "Milk picture turning sour?" Is it so surprising when you see an organized group trying to roll back the dairy group where the selected individuals of the dairy industry are on a 34-cent-per-hour basis?

There is one more situation that I would like to call to the attention of the roll-backers at this time. At Wisconsin's largest livestock market, day after day, 100-pound pigs are selling for 8 cents a pound. I receive the market prices as issued. Of course, you all know that the parity price of hogs is 12 cents per pound at this time, and that the parity does not apply to just the 200- to 270-pound hogs which have support prices. When the support price was announced, too much emphasis was not put on the weights for which the support price was made. Now, if this group is interested in providing food for all, why do they not ask the O. P. A. to remove ration points on pork for 60 days so that the average citizen can secure and process these hogs that are selling for so much less than even the support price. It has been demonstrated that the man with the price will get his product regardless, but here is an opportunity to provide cheaper meat to the great majority of our people.

Now let us get a few things here straight from the shoulder. I was home the same as most of you this summer. I spent every possible minute with the groups of my district. I tried to obtain the facts and I tried to give the facts. These groups included the A. A. A., service clubs, county agents, F. S. A., auto dealers, P. C. A. labor delegations, cheese makers, bankers, the Farm Bureau, feed dealers, newspaper editors, granges, and groups interested in social service. What were the outstanding impressions I obtained?

One was that this war is a serious business to these people, with practically everyone having a blood relative in the armed service.

Second, was the fact that at no meeting was there any mention made about prices and ways of getting rich out of this war. The whole approach was on the basis of how best they could increase the food production in 1944 and how best these other groups could carry their part of the load in furnishing the services incident to the food-production program. They realized that they had a duty to perform and that in addition to the normal desire to produce, it was now the patriotic desire to produce in order to furnish the food for their sons and daughters in the armed forces of our country. When you realize that the rural people of our country, although only about 25 percent of the population, raise toward half the children of the country, you can appreciate how these producers of food have a very personal interest in producing it. These people know that they are receiving from .6 to 2 cents less per pound for cheese than the producers in other States. They know of other injustices that have been accorded them, but the over-all objective of furnishing food to win the war overshadows any of their personal grievances. These rural people show the strain of these 2 years of increased food production and it irks me to hear people who have never done a real day's work in their lives complaining about the 34 cents per hour this group receives at this time.

When I returned to Washington, what did I hear? The same old story: Price! Price! Price! For 9 months, we have been hearing about the wonders of the roll-back subsidies. Two food czars have passed out of the picture. No doubt because they did not see that the vote crop should have preference over the food crop. We now have Marvin Jones trying to bring these forces together. He is pleading with Congress today to come to some decision on this subsidy program so that he can set up a food program for 1944. It would not embarrass me to support a roll-back subsidy program if they could be used to increase food production, but they have not and if anyone thinks they have, I shall be glad to yield for him to so state at this time and show where they have.

We rolled back the price of butter last June, and the production each month has gone down below the year previous, and in October, the production of creamery butter was the lowest of any month since the records were kept by the United States Department of Agriculture.

In fact, I really have a sympathetic feeling for the professional subsidy roll-backers. In the large, they represent the New Deal part of the administration. It must be humiliating to them to make the two public confessions to the people of America that this roll-back subsidy issue presents:

First, these roll-backers are telling the Nation that after 11 years of complete control of Congress, after seeing the people with the highest individual as well as the highest national income as a result of the war that the country has ever had—that the people cannot pay for the food they eat, although this food represents only 20 percent of the cost of living. It is surely a humiliating admission for this group to make.

Second, these roll-back advocates are publicly announcing to the farm people of America and in no unspeakable terms, that although parity is a splendid word to talk about and when the individuals and the Nation have the greatest income in the history of the country, the palace guard that is directing the Agricultural Department cannot even provide the parity for the farmers of the country. In fact, it has not been provided even when

the law said it should, nor, of course, has the cost of farm labor been included in arriving at the parities that have been allowed to prevail.

I well realize the cheap politics involved in this issue. The anti-roll-backers must face this situation. If food goes up, the anti-roll-backers will receive the criticism and the blame. Right here and now I want the subsidy roll-backers to understand also the other situation. That is when the people go to the market place and cannot find the food for their families, they will also know who to blame and can put it on the doorstep of the cheap politics involved in the roll-back subsidies where producers receiving 34 cents an hour for their labor are the victims of the roll-back.

A further situation which I wish to call to the attention of the roll-backers is that by following their leadership, a 30-percent pay-roll tax can result and a sales tax can be imposed on the people of this country in addition to the present taxes. So I say, let us unite to roll up production of food and give little heed to the professional roll-backers who are trying to roll back a group of our society which is making a contribution that the rural people of America have made, are making, and will continue to make regardless of all the fake, false, and unfair propaganda that emanates from Washington.

Marvin Jones is right in asking that this question be settled once and for all. We should give him this support. We owe this to the armed forces of our country, we owe this to the people of our country, who hope and pray that no one of us will do anything that will retard the day when this war can be brought to a successful conclusion.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to my good friend and colleague of the committee.

Mr. GILLIE. The gentleman from Wisconsin spoke a few moments ago about the points on butter. What are the points on oleo?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The points on oleo have been half or less than what they were on butter.

Mr. GILLIE. Are they 16 points on butter?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes, 16. They were 6 points, I think, the last time I saw, on oleo. One question I would like to see answered is, If oleo is equal to butter why does it not have the same points?

Mr. GILLIE. What is there to prevent a man going to a creamery and getting a gallon of sour cream and churning his own butter? What would he have to do then, pay points?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. He does not have to pay points. If you read the Washington Star last Sunday there are five groups who want to be sure they keep all the bureaucrats well greased up with cream and who are not satisfied with 75 percent of the cream they get now. They want more. Then they do not want the average person, even, to have a chance to eat cottage cheese they get out of skimmed milk. So if anyone is interested in the food program he will find the man with the price is getting pretty good care all the way along. He can get his own cream and go home and make his own butter without paying any points. But if the housewife goes to the store she has to give up 16 points. I would not say so much about that if it was not, in my opinion, part of a scheme with more or less administration backing to tell the people what they are going to eat. They have been telling them what to think and now they want to tell them what to eat.

Mr. GILLIE. Would you suggest, then, that people do that very thing, that people go to a dairyman or creamery man and get a gallon or half a gallon or quart of cream and take it home and churn it to make butter so they do not have to give up any points?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. No; I do not suggest that. I do not believe in letting the man with the price have the cream and let the children in the schools drink the skimmed milk. So far as I personally am concerned, I do not ask for any more than any citizen of the United States is entitled to have. So far I have done it that way and I expect to continue. I just make this point: If this great group of consumer protectors who are going around and being called the Fighting Forty—just as if they were the only ones interested in the consumers of this country—if they were really interested in the consumers of this country, they would do something about this thing instead of trying to make a cheap, political issue out of it. That is just exactly what is trying to be done at this time in my humble opinion.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I say I am a member of the organization known as the Congressmen's Committee for the Protection of the Consumer. First of all, there are no partisan politics involved in that organization. We have repeatedly invited all the Members of the House on both sides. We have some Republicans in the organization, and hence, there is no attempt to make cheap partisan politics out of this fight for the consumer, as the gentleman has just stated. We stand on the record in this fight. We maintain that time and events will demonstrate we were right, those of us who voted for subsidies, and that those who opposed them were wrong.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is what you may think. I do not yield to the gentleman to make a speech. I do not care whether they are Republicans or new dealers. They sure are on the wrong track, and cannot justify their position with facts. You can make a speech on your own time. I will tell the gentleman from New York right now, if he thinks his people up in New York City, who, one of his colleagues on this floor said recently, were getting at least $1 an hour, should not find it necessary to have the Congressmen figure out a scheme of rolling back a class of people getting 34 cents an hour. He can follow that course. I cannot tell him what is going to happen in the future. But I will tell the gentleman from New York right now that the people of this country have already gotten tired of having people tell them how they are going to think and it appears they are good and tired of having people tell them what they are going to eat.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. You say people are getting tired. Does not the gentleman believe that the people are getting mighty tired of prices soaring sky high and taking money from their pocketbooks?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would not admit that it necessarily has to be sky high unless we let it be run by those that are trying to run it now. But, if you will follow the leadership of Mr. Claude Wickard, who tried to give us a program of production of abundance of food, I do not think the gentleman from New York or any one else will have to worry about the food being produced and at a fair price to the consumer. But, if we follow the leadership of the people who think with your group, I am afraid that when the housewife goes to the store the cupboard will be bare, because there are no calories in these roll-backs. The sooner your group finds it out the better it will be.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I suggest to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] that if a lot of people are not willing to pay to the farmer a fair price for his milk, you will find icicles on your step some morning instead of a bottle of milk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

ELECTRIC REFRIGERATORS FOR HOSPITALS

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for a great many years the Good Samaritan Hospital in my district has served the public health by caring for the sick, lame, and infirm. During the past 2 years its facilities as well as the other hospitals in my district, have been taxed to the utmost in caring for the additional population of thousands of men and women who came into the area to work in the ordnance and war plants of the Nation. During this time the equipment has been strained to the breaking point, and like the deacon's one-horse shay, the electric refrigerator has worn out.

In its effort to preserve and safeguard the foods for the sick, the hospital attempted to purchase a new refrigerator to replace the worn-out one and found out like all the citizens of the land that it must ask some agency. It followed

the usual procedure of securing an application, then filled it out, and sent it to Washington.

The application stated its need for a new refrigerator was to care for and preserve food for the sick and infirm in the hospital. As usual, no satisfactory acknowledgment was received and I was requested to check on the matter. I talked with the agency here in Washington and finally found that such an application had been received. I then asked for the allowance of a privilege to purchase. However, the agency said, "Why, Mr. Congressman, don't you know that electric refrigerators are not being allotted to hospitals?" I said, "Why not, it is to be used to preserve food for the sick and infirm, and I see no reason for denying refrigerators to hospitals."

Further, the agency then said it was sorry. I then asked, "What can be done?" The agency said, "Secure an old-fashioned ice box and get an ice delivery." I agree it is cold on Lake Erie and the hospital along with all its additional burdens, is patriotic and would be willing to have someone go out on the Lake and chop out a cake of ice each day. However, there is a shortage of manpower and the hospital is unable to find a person who is willing to chop out a piece of ice as suggested by the agency here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, with this denial fresh in mind, I remember reading in a Washington newspaper and seeing a picture in Life magazine where one Harry Hopkins received "a brand new electric refrigerator" for his new home in Georgetown. My constituents ask me how it is that, "brand new" electric refrigerators are delivered here in Washington, but are denied to preserve and safeguard the food for those who are sick in the hospitals.

I am glad that Mr. Hopkins received his electric refrigerator so that he is not obliged to chop his ice each day from the waters of the Potomac, but nevertheless people back in my district feel that the sick and infirm in hospitals should be given an electric refrigerator for the preservation and safeguarding of food.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia for 2 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. HARRIS of Virginia (at the request of Mr. BURCH), for the remainder of the week, on account of illness.

To Mr. GAMBLE (at the request of Mr. HANCOCK), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. WALTER (at the request of Mr. HOCH) on account of illness.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1544. An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels, landing craft, and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; and

S. 1576. An act to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day deliver to the White House for forwarding to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 255. An act for the relief of Col. E. H. Tarbutton;

H. R. 302. An act for the relief of Robert Griffin;

H. R. 977. An act for the relief of Clare A. Miller;

H. R. 1379. An act for the relief of Gerald Estell Proctor;

H. R. 1640. An act for the relief of Mrs. J. D. Price;

H. R. 1933. An act for the relief of Ronald A. Cox;

H. R. 2080. An act to provide temporary additional pay for equipment maintenance for each carrier in Rural Mail Delivery Service;

H. R. 2545. An act for the relief of Samuel J. D. Marshall;

H. R. 2641. An act to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain lands for addition to the Sequoia National Park;

H. R. 3039. An act for the relief of Mrs. C. W. Selby;

H. R. 3299. An act for the relief of Victor H. Loftus, disbursing clerk, American Embassy, Mexico, D. F., Mexico; and

H. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution to provide for the proper observance of the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of the adoption of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights.

COMMITTEE FOR FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES AND SOLDIERS' VOTE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, despite the lateness of the hour and the sparseness of attendance this afternoon, I am compelled to take the floor to make certain that the RECORD will not be in a state whereby the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] will remain unchallenged.

In a speech on what purports to be a speech on the Bill of Rights, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] saw fit to make an attack on the President's Committee for Fair Employment Practices, and also to state his viewpoint with regard to the soldiers' vote bill. Throughout the gentleman's speech, the gentleman rested his attack on the Committee for Fair Employment Practices, as well as his attack on the attempt to enfranchise men in American uniform, on what he deemed to be the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson.

I think it is only fair——

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand that those words be taken down, because I made no such intimation that I was for disfranchising soldiers in uniform and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I will stand by those words.

Mr. RANKIN. It is false and I am going to demand that those words be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi will indicate the words objected to.

Mr. RANKIN. Where the gentleman from New York said that I favored disfranchising the men in uniform he not only made a false statement but he made a slanderous statement. I made no such intimation. I am doing everything I can to make it possible for them to vote.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The gentleman's request was that my words be taken down. He should indicate the words he wants taken down. The statement I made is in writing and I will stand by it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Mississippi insist on his point of order?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

(The SPEAKER resumed the chair.)

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the language objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The gentleman from Mississippi saw fit to make an attack on the President's Committee for Fair Employment Practices and also to state his viewpoint with regard to the soldiers' vote bill. Throughout the gentleman's speech the gentleman rests his attack on the Committee for Fair Employment Practices as well as his attack on the attempt to enfranchise the men in American uniform on what he deemed to be the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, those are the words I object to. He falsely accused me there of attempting to disfranchise the men in uniform. That is a violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. A point of order, Mr. Speaker. The words speak for themselves as to whether or not they are unparliamentary.

The SPEAKER. The Chair read the statement and then listened to its reading and the Chair can hardly think that the language of the gentleman from New York was more than expressing his opinion of the attitude of the gentleman from Mississippi. The Chair very seriously doubts that it is a violation of the rules of the House or a direct charge impugning the gentleman's motives or impugning his character.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to discuss this proposition, but there are very few Members here and I do not propose for that language to stand unchallenged. I therefore make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his point of order for me to pay a tribute?

The SPEAKER. No; the Chair cannot recognize the gentlewoman when a point of no quorum is made. The Chair has counted. No quorum is present. There is nothing to do except to call the House or adjourn.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m. the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 16, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Thursday, December 16, 1943, at 10 a. m., to consider H. R. 1288. Hon. Myers Cooper, former Governor of Ohio and president of the National Council of Real Estate Taxpayers, will be a witness.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Friday, December 17, 1943, at 10 a. m., to consider H. R. 2241, a bill to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument, Wyo.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 38. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 2801, a bill to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior; without amendment (Rept. No. 955). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 376. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 2350, a bill to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents; without amendment (Rept. No. 956). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 957. Report on the disposition of certain papers from several agencies of the Federal Government. Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SOMERS of New York: Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. S. 184. An act to provide for the presentation of silver medals to certain members of the Peary Polar Expedition of 1908–9; with amendment (Rept. No. 958). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 3846. A bill to provide for the education and training of members of the armed forces and the merchant marine after their separation from service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 3847. A bill to exempt certain officers and employees of the Office of Price Administration from certain provisions of the Criminal Code and Revised Statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3848. A bill to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 3849. A bill to provide mustering-out pay or credit for the purpose of reestablishment in civilian employment those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. R. 3850. A bill to provide for the education and training of members of the armed forces and the merchant marine after their discharge or conclusion of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

H. R. 3851. A bill ceding and reserving to the State of Oklahoma jurisdiction to serve civil or criminal process, and to tax railroad companies and other corporations, and their franchises and property on military and naval reservations and other Federal areas within the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution to grant furloughs under certain conditions to men in the armed services; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. Res. 382. Resolution to investigate the fire insurance and allied lines of business; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 3852. A bill for the relief of the O S. Stapley Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana:

H. R. 3853. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Leroy A. Robbins; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4076. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Paul F. Regnier and 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4077. Also, petition of Paul F. Regnier and 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4078. Also, petition of Robert Doerste and 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4079. Also, petition of the Mayfair Hotel and signed by 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4080. Also, petition of the Barry-Wehmiller Machinery Co., and signed by 30 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4081. By Mr. ELLIS: Petition of Mrs. E. F. Kincaid and about 30 other Huntington, W. Va., citizens, endorsing the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4082. Also, petition of Mrs. R. L. Hutchison and about 40 other citizens of Huntington, W. Va., urging support of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition within the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4083. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of 80 members and friends of the Calvary Baptist Church of Stafford, Kans., endorsing Senate bill 860 and House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4084. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of sundry citizens of Burlington, Iowa, urging support of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition within the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4085. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolutions of the California Wool Growers Association, adopted at San Francisco November 18 and 19, 1943, relating to predatory-animal control; and recommending that adequate ammunition be released for the use of hunters in harvesting game crops which will supply large amounts of meats and hides, which will be lost to predators if not properly harvested; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4086. Also, resolution of the County Supervisors Association of California, Sacramento, Calif., opposing passage of Senate bill 1089; to the Committee on Elections No. 3.

4087. Also, resolutions of the California Wool Growers Association, adopted at San Francisco November 18–19, 1943, relating to the purchase of domestic wool by the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, December 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Emmanuel, God with us, again by Thy grace the journeying months have brought us to the shining glory of the Holy Night—the light that shone when hope was born. In our grateful hearts we know that that heavenly beacon can never fail, because it reveals to all men the heart of God and the meaning of life, making mother and child forever sacred and softening the hurt of the world.

Amid the tumult and terror of global strife may we hear anew the tidings of the angels' song and the music that is not of earth. As gentle good will lights our eyes, we know that we are beckoned not to follow far by starlight to some distant shrine, for the Babe whose coming broke the ages in two is no longer Bethlehem's pride and Mary's joy but the whole wide world's; and the blessed gift is given to every heart that makes Him room. May an understanding sympathy that knows no boundaries of bor-

der or race find lodging in bitter hearts hardened by cynicism. May longing for purity be born in minds stained by unhallowed thoughts. May the song from the heavens lift expectant faces from the clods to the skies of hope. So at last may there come that peace wrought out of pain, when the Daystar from on high shall shine on those who sit in darkness and in the shadow of death. We ask it in the name of Bethlehem's Babe. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McKELLAR, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, December 15, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from Mrs. Jean Riley, of Denver, Colo., praying for the enactment of pending antisubsidy legislation, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 1421. A bill making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers, feeds, nursery stock, or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 605).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1102. A bill for the relief of Helene Murphy; with amendments (Rept. No. 606).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WALLGREN:

S. 1596. A bill for the relief of Paul J. Sisk; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1597. A bill to amend section 1, act of June 29, 1940 (54 Stat. 703), for the acquisition of Indian lands for the Grand Coulee Dam and Reservoir, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 1598. A bill to amend section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1599. A bill to provide for supervision by the Chief of Engineers of the Army of dams across navigable waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. NYE:

S. 1600. A bill providing mustering-out pay for certain members of the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

NOMINATIONS FOR PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Mr. WALLGREN (for himself, Mr. KILGORE, and Mr. TRUMAN) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 221), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That, during the period beginning on the date of the adoption of this resolution and ending on the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war, no nomination of any commissioned officer in the Regular Army for appointment to a permanent grade higher than the permanent grade held by him in the Regular Army on the date of such nomination, shall be considered or acted upon by the Senate, and any such nomination received by the Senate shall be returned by the Secretary to the President.

RATE DISCRIMINATION IN T. V. A. POWER CONTRACTS WITH ALUMINUM PRODUCERS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, we have two aluminum companies in the Tennessee Valley Authority District. One is the Aluminum Co. of America, at Maryville, Tenn., and the other is the Reynolds Metals Co., at Sheffield, Ala. The Aluminum Co. of America is about 18 miles from the Tennessee River, and the Reynolds Metals Co. is on the river and at the site of the Wilson Dam.

Both of these companies manufacture large quantities of aluminum. The Aluminum Co. of America, I believe, is the largest aluminum company in the world, or one of the largest. The Reynolds Metals Co. is not so large.

Naturally it would be supposed that the Tennessee Valley Authority, it ostensibly being a Government-owned corporation but with which the Government has very little to do, would sell power to these companies at the same rate. Instead of this Government-owned but not controlled institution, the Tennessee Valley Authority, fixing a price and selling to all in similar situations alike, it has fixed a price for the Reynolds Co. of $2.23 per kilowatt per month as compared with $2 per kilowatt per month for the Aluminum Co. Apparently the difference is small, but as a matter of fact during these war days, the difference is enormous. Why should the Government of the United States, through one of its subsidiary organizations, sell to two citizens power at different rates? It is unfair, unjust, undemocratic, and un-American, and the Government should not permit it to be done.

Especially it should not be done during a war, when both companies are manufacturing enormous quantities of war materials. I do not want it understood that I am complaining because the Aluminum Co. of America gets its power as cheap as possible, but it is manifestly unfair for the Tennessee Valley Authority to discriminate between two citizen corporations that are users of aluminum. It is more unfair when both companies are doing the best they can to further the war effort.

I took this matter up with the executive department, and I have a letter from Mr. James M. Barnes, Administrative Assistant to the President, enclosing a copy of a memorandum to the late Marvin H. McIntyre dated February 18, 1943.

It seems that Mr. Lilienthal, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, on February 18, 1943, wrote what he believed was an explanation of this discrimination. In part 3 of the memorandum Lilienthal admitted:

There is a difference in the rates, amounting to two-tenths of a mill per kilowatt-hour. This is computed as follows: On the basis of Reynolds' load factor of approximately 95 percent, its power cost is approximately $2.23 per kilowatt per month, as compared with $2 per kilowatt for the Aluminum Co. Moreover, the Aluminum Co. takes power at the high-tension side of a substation which it owns and operates, and it absorbs all the losses in transformation. Primary power is supplied to Reynolds under the 1940 contract at the low-tension side of a substation owned and operated by the Authority, with the Authority absorbing the losses in transformation. Adjusting for the costs of ownership and operation of the substation and for transformation losses, which aggregate about 10 cents per kilowatt per month, the Reynolds rate is $2.13 per kilowatt per month as compared with the Aluminum Co. rate of $2, a difference of 6½ percent, or approximately two-tenths mill per kilowatt-hour.

Mr. President, the facts are that Lilienthal is selling to the Aluminum Co. cheaper than he is selling to the Reynolds Metals Co., and it ought to be stopped. He should put the Reynolds Metals Co. on the same basis of rates that he has fixed for the Aluminum Co. of America.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire correspondence, including Mr. Lilienthal's letter, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 7, 1943.

Hon. KENNETH McKELLAR,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR McKELLAR: On November 16 I forwarded to the Tennessee Valley Authority the matter referred to in your letter of November 13, addressed to the President.

I am enclosing herewith a reply received from David E. Lilienthal, Chairman of T. V. A. I hope this answers your question.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES M. BARNES,
Administrative Assistant to the President.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
Knoxville, Tenn., December 4, 1943

Mr. JAMES M. BARNES,
Administrative Assistant to the President, The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BARNES: On November 16 you requested information concerning an alleged case of discrimination arising out of the rates charged the Reynolds Metals Co. and the

Aluminum Co. of America for power purchased from the Tennessee Valley Authority. A similar question was raised by Mr. McIntyre with reference to a letter to the President from Senator HILL. We responded to Mr. McIntyre's inquiry by memorandum dated February 18, 1943, copy of which is attached. There have been no significant developments since that time.

Sincerely,

DAVID E. LILIENTHAL,
Chairman.

Memorandum to: Mr. Marvin H. McIntyre, White House.

From: David E. Lilienthal, Tennessee Valley Authority.

Date: February 18, 1943.

Subject: Alleged rate discrimination in T. V. A. power contracts with the Aluminum Co. of America and Reynolds Metals Co. (Reference: Senator LISTER HILL'S letter to the President.)

You have asked for information concerning the alleged discrimination in rates charged by the Tennessee Valley Authority for power service to the Aluminum Co. of America and the Reynolds Metals Co., as referred to in Senator LISTER HILL'S letter to the President. Senator HILL further suggests that, in view of the President's directives of September 26, 1942, and October 22, 1942, providing for the assistance of the Federal Power Commission in the negotiation of power contracts for Federal war-procurement agencies, the Federal Power Commission might be directed to investigate the alleged discrimination and require renegotiation of the power contracts in question if such is found to exist.

This is a highly complicated and technical matter; therefore it cannot be stated except at length and in some detail. In brief, the situation is this: While the rate for primary power paid to T. V. A. by the Reynolds Metals Co. under the 1940 contract is aproximately two-tenths of a mill per kilowatt-hour more than the rate Alcoa pays to T. V. A. under a contract of 1937, the difference is in no sense discriminatory. The slightly higher rate to Reynolds does not result in a higher cost to the Government for war materials produced from the aluminum made at Reynolds' plant. The rate reduction the company seeks would merely add to the company's profits at the expense of the T. V. A. General acceptance of the principle urged by Reynolds would go further—it would jeopardize the financial stability of the Government's large investment in the T. V. A. power system.

The directives of the President to the Federal Power Commission, dated September 26, 1942, and October 22, 1942, relate, as we understand them, to the negotiation of power contracts by Government procurement agencies. Their purpose was to protect the Government against excessive charges by power companies. Government agencies as war contractors have no such problem as is here involved. Therefore, the T. V. A.-Reynolds contract does not seem to be related either to the letter or purpose of the directives to the Commission.

As a matter of general policy, we believe a review of the Authority's contracts by the Federal Power Commission would be unnecessary and unwise; nevertheless, if the President should desire to refer this particular matter to the Federal Power Commission for review and advice without reference to the directives of September 26, 1942, and October 22, 1942, we would have no objection.

A more detailed explanation follows:

1. The contract about which the complaint is made was entered into in 1940 after extended negotiations. During these negotiations the Reynolds Metals Co. vigorously presented every possible argument in support of its position that the Authority should sell primary power to it on the same basis at which the Authority had sold power in 1937. The Authority declined to enter into a contract on the basis of its 1937 industrial rates. Negotiations continued, and ultimately the parties reached a complete agreement on the basis of the then prevailing rate level, and a formal contract was executed. After a brief interval, however, the company demanded renegotiation of the contract and renewed all the points it had originally made. The Authority was unable to agree in the original negotiations to sell power in 1940 on the basis of its 1937 industrial rates.

2. The issue is not one of the cost of aluminum to the Government. The power is used in a plant which is privately owned and operated for private account, although most of the product ultimately goes into war equipment. The plant was financed by R. F. C., but the loan was on a commercial basis, and we understand it is adequately secured. The 1940 power contract is a long-term power contract which is not guaranteed in any way by any Government agency, nor are the charges under the contract passed on to any Government agency. Any saving in the cost of power would therefore merely increase the company's profits.

3. The primary power rate established in the Authority's contract with the Reynolds Metals Co. can hardly be called a discriminatory rate nor does the rate charged to the Aluminum Co. of America under the 1937 contract confer any unfair advantage to the Aluminum Co. as compared with the rate charged the Reynolds Metals Co. There is a difference in the rates amounting to two-tenths of a mill per kilowatt-hour. This is computed as follows: On the basis of Reynolds' load factor of approximately 95 percent, its power cost is approximately $2.23 per kilowatt per month, as compared with $2 per kilowatt for the Aluminum Co. Moreover, the Aluminum Co. takes power at the high-tension side of a substation which it owns and operates, and it absorbs all the losses in transformation. Primary power is supplied to Reynolds under the 1940 contract at the low-tension side of a substation owned and operated by the Authority, with the Authority absorbing the losses in transformation. Adjusting for the costs of ownership and operation of the substation and for transformation losses, which aggregate about $0.10 per kilowatt per month, the Reynolds rate is $2.13 per kilowatt per month as compared with the Aluminum Co. rate of $2, a difference of 6½ percent, or approximately two-tenths mill per kilowatt-hour. This does not take account of the fact that the Aluminum Co.'s minimum bill under the 1937 contract is $2 per month per kilowatt of contract demand, whereas that of Reynolds under the 1940 contract is only $1.67 per month per kilowatt of contract demand, and Reynolds is thus enabled to reduce its bill substantially below the amount per kilowatt guaranteed by Alcoa whenever it chooses to do so because of temporary adverse business conditions or otherwise.

4. This small difference in rates is explained by the fact that the Aluminum Co. contracted to purchase power from the Authority in 1937 at a time when the Authority was hard put to find a market for its power. Pending litigation challenging the validity of this and all the other T. V. A. power contracts created a serious business risk for companies which constructed manufacturing facilities in reliance on such contracts. The rate agreed upon at that time was judged to be a good business proposition both for the Government and for the buyer. The contract with the Reynolds Metals Co. was agreed upon in 1940. Conditions with respect to the power market and availability of power were quite different from the conditions and circumstances which the Authority faced in 1937. By 1940 all constitutional litigation was disposed of. Even though the prevailing rate in 1940 was slightly higher than the 1937 rate, it is a very low rate and, in the Authority's judgment, a very reasonable rate.

5. Although the amount of dollars involved in this difference of opinion between the company and the Authority is not large, an important principle and precedent is involved. The general question which is raised is whether the Authority should for the indefinite future sell power to all industrial customers at the rates at which it was compelled to sell power under the very unfavorable circumstances which existed when its first contracts were entered into. The Authority's first important industrial power contract was entered into with a large chemical company in the spring of 1936 when most of the business community believed that the T. V. A. Act would be held unconstitutional and all of its contracts set aside. Much later and under much improved conditions the Authority entered into a power contract at substantially higher rates with a competitor of its first customer. No request has been made by the latter company for a rate adjustment, but if the 1940 contract with Reynolds were put on a parity with the 1937 Aluminum Co. contract the Authority would be obliged to make the same adjustment in its contracts with chemical companies, and with all other companies where competitive conditions exist. Since this would introduce complication and confusion in our rate structure, the result might be to compel us to place all of our industrial contracts on the rate basis in effect in the spring of 1936. To do so would make it impossible to keep the Government's investment in T. V. A. on a bankable basis.

It is apparent from the facts set forth above that any reduction in power rates to Reynolds Metals Co. would benefit that company alone and not the Government. In fact, the injury to the Government's investment in the Tennessee Valley Authority would be incomparably larger than any possible saving to the company.

DAVID E. LILIENTHAL.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is my information that since October 3, 1940, there has existed in the Tennessee Valley an apparent discrimination in T. V. A. power rates between two large users employing the power for the same purpose, namely, the production of aluminum metal. I am informed that this alleged discrimination has worked to the advantage of the Aluminum Co. of America and to the disadvantage of its principal competitor, the Reynolds Metals Co.

In view of your recent directive letters to the Federal Power Commission, of September 26, 1942, and October 22, 1942, establishing the policy that public power agencies should assist in holding the cost of the war program to a minimum by arranging for the electric power supply for war plants and establishments at lowest possible cost, I am wondering if it would be possible to advise the Federal Power Commission by letter that your directive may be construed to include the investigation of alleged discrimination in power rates against establishments engaged in the war effort and operating under a Government loan with authority to require renegotiation of such contract under the Commission's established procedure in any such case in which unjust discrimination has been found by the Commission to exist.

Such action on your part would make it possible to correct any unjust discrimination that might exist.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Very sincerely,

LISTER HILL.

A SUMMONS AGAINST THE "KISS OF DEATH"—ARTICLE BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Summons Against the 'Kiss of Death,'" written by Senator PEPPER and published in the New York Times magazine for December 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ELIMINATION OF PRIVATE SUITS ARISING OUT OF FRAUDS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1203) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am sorry that the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] is not present. The bill we are debating does not involve merely thousands of dollars; it involves not merely millions of dollars, but it involves billions of dollars. I shall quote from what the Senator from Indiana stated on the 17th day of September, on page 7608 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. On that occasion the Senator from Indiana, who is the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, stated:

> The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], I think, intends to offer an amendment to increase that to 25 percent. I think that is unnecessary. Ten percent is a reasonable compensation and there are billions—
>
> Billions—
>
> of dollars involved and there is an alluring prospect of obtaining loot, as I call it, upon the part of some loose lawyers, not bona fide informers at all, but racketeers and blackmailers.

Mr. President, for every dollar any lawyer could secure in bringing one of these lawsuits, the Government would secure at least an equal amount because, under the statute, whenever a corporation defrauds the United States Government and suit is brought, the suit is for double the amount. The result is the Government gets back every dollar of which it has been defrauded, plus a fine of $2,000 for every single violation of the law. So in no way can the Government lose if the statute is left exactly the way it is. In other words, we will say the Government has been drefrauded of a million dollars by a group of electrical contractors, or, taking a case that actually occurred, the one of Marcus against Hess in Pittsburgh, we find that a number of electrical contractors got together and submitted bids for identically the same price to a penny.

The record shows that the Attorney General was notified for months but no civil action was brought. Finally a lawyer there, who had been attorney general of that State, Mr. Charles J. Margiotti, brought a lawsuit. The record shows that Mr. Margiotti and his client paid all the expenses which ran into the thousands and thousands of dollars. The record shows that it took months to try that case; indeed, it was one of the longest jury cases ever tried in Pennsylvania; and the jury brought in a verdict for $315,000.

Mr. President, the securing of that judgment for $315,000 did not cost the United States Government one penny, yet it is now proposed to repeal the law passed while Abraham Lincoln was President of the United States, which made that recovery possible. Of the $315,000 one-half would go to the United States Government.

What happened in that case? The defendants and the plaintiff got together and agreed on a settlement of $100,000; but, Mr. President, the defendants had appealed, and so the case was pending before the Federal judge, Judge Clark, of that district. Judge Clark asked the Attorney General's Office to file a brief, and, strange as it may seem, although the United States Government was entitled to one-half of the $315,000, the Attorney General's Office, appearing through Thurman Arnold, filed a brief before Judge Clark in which they stated that they believed that this Lincoln statute, the one we are now considering, had been repealed by implication. The result was that chiefly because of the brief filed by the Attorney General's Office, Judge Clark reversed the verdict of the jury, and held against the plaintiff.

The plaintiff then appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States and there, by a 5 to 1 decision, with only one Supreme Court Justice dissenting, he being Associate Justice Jackson, the verdict for $315,000 was reinstated. It was after that verdict for $315,000 had been reinstated, but before it was collected, that this measure was introduced, not in 1943, but in 1942, when there were only four cases pending, every one of which had been submitted to the Attorney General of the United States, and every one of which the Attorney General of the United States had refused to prosecute. Yet today we behold the spectacle of Senators considering a bill to eliminate and abolish the Lincoln statute, on the plea that many of the lawyers who may file such suits are racketeers and crooks, trying to enrich themselves, when as a matter of fact the record shows that this measure was introduced originally when only four cases were pending, when none of the lawyers wanted to appear, when all the lawyers had submitted all the facts to the Attorney General of the United States, and it was only in self-defense, to protect the taxpayers, that the attorneys finally brought the suits.

So, Mr. President, I say it is an illustration of the way in which money is being wasted. I quote again the words of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, when he stated that in the repeal of the Lincoln statute, by the passage of H. R. 1203, there are billions of dollars involved. The citation is page 7608 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 17 last.

Mr. President, within a few days we are to take up a tax bill. True it is that Secretary Morgenthau originally asked for between ten and eleven billion dollars; true it is that he finally got down to $10,000,000,000 dollars; true it is that in the House of Representatives the sum of $2,000,000,000 was finally agreed on, and true it is that the Finance Committee of the Senate is now busily engaged in working away on this tax bill. The fact of the matter is that the defeat of H. R. 1203 is more important than the passage of the $2,000,000,000 tax bill, because, as the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary said, in this bill billions of dollars are involved, and if we can save the taxpayers of our country these billions of dollars, then the passage of a tax bill will be entirely unnecessary.

It was in connection with that fact that I yesterday read to the Senate an illustration of how money was being wasted by the present administration. I refer again to the Saturday Evening Post for the week of December 11.

In my judgment, there is not a Senator on this floor who knows how much the United States Government paid for Blair House. I tried to ascertain. I contacted the Information Center; they did not know. They said the Secretary of State might know. Three times we telephoned the Secretary of State. We were finally told they were going to write us a letter. That letter has not yet arrived.

In this article in the Saturday Evening Post we find that the Public Buildings Administration, which bought that four-story dwelling at 1651 Pennsylvania Avenue for the use of the State Department, paid $180,000 for the property, with its furnishings, late in 1942. I repeat, Mr. President, it would have been entirely unnecessary to have bought that house if Harry Hopkins had not been living in the White House, and there had been room there available to take care of the kings and ex-kings, the queens and ex-queens, the dukes and ex-dukes, and the princesses and ex-princesses.

Particularly I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that every one of the foreign countries whose rulers and ex-rulers have been entertained at the Blair House have embassies or consulates in Washington. All these kings and ex-kings, queens, and ex-queens, dukes and ex-dukes, had to do was to go to their own consulates or to their own embassies and eat their own food, drink their own drinks, and sleep in their own beds.

Our country, I repeat, is more than 150 years old, and never until 1942 had it been deemed necessary to buy a home, to pay $180,000 for it, to equip it with a great staff of servants, so that we might in regal style entertain royalty, men and women who never worked with their hands, men and women who say they are better than anyone else by the divine right of birth. They come here; they are met at the train with an imposing automobile; they are taken to Blair House; and the record shows that

while there they can invite as many people as they choose to invite; they can wine them and dine them, and it is all at the expense of the taxpayers of the United States of America.

Mr. President, this article in the Saturday Evening Post is most revealing. The article refers to a young lady who got into the Blair House under most unusual circumstances. I read from page 74 of the Saturday Evening Post:

Under such conditions, it is understandably difficult for strangers to crash the Blair House gate. A young lady of my acquaintance managed it, though, but not without assistance from a guest on the inside. It was during the visit of one of the Latin-American missions. My friend, who had met the guest of honor at a diplomatic reception, was staring at Blair House curiously as she passed. Suddenly there was a tapping in one of the front windows.

Here we have this beautiful Blair House. Inside is the dignitary from Latin America. Outside we find a young lady going by on the street, and suddenly there was a tapping on the window in the Blair House.

It was Senor X of the night before.

Mr. President, this dignitary, this man who was at the head of a diplomatic mission, was tapping at the window in order to attract the attention of the young lady passing by on the street.

Despite the police and the secret-service men who tried to bar her way—

She must have been a very determined young girl, for the police could not stop her, and the secret-service men could not stop her.

Despite the police and the secret-service men who tried to bar her way, my determined friend succeeded in having a cocktail with the gentleman before he left to attend an official banquet. Senor X had been merely bored. He seemed to feel that my friend's companionship—

That is, the girl's companionship—

would brace him for the ordeal of facing another official gathering.

Senor X had a way with him that attracted women wherever he went. The secret service was hard put to it to protect him against potential Mata Haris.

So we see, Mr. President, what a very, very interesting place the Blair House must be. I know the people of the country will be interested in the description of this house for which the taxpayers paid $180,000; this house which the country had to buy in order to make room for kings and ex-kings, queens and ex-queens, princes and ex-princes, dukes and ex-dukes, duchesses and ex-duchesses. The country had to buy this house because Harry Hopkins was living in the White House, and, therefore, there was not room in the White House to entertain, although the President receives half a million dollars for that purpose. There was not room in the White House, so it was found necessary to buy the Blair House, and I know the people of the country will be interested to know that this house, which cost them $180,000, has a couple of butlers, and when the Government bought the house, it bought the servants with the house. The Government was not satisfied simply with buying the house alone; it had to buy the women and the men who were working there along with the house. It bought Mrs. Geaney, the article said, along with the house.

I know how interested in this matter are the people of the country who pay the taxes, the sharecropper in the South who, with his whole family, is out all day picking cotton, for which he may earn two or three dollars a day. I know how interested in this matter are the farmers of the Northwest who get up at 4 o'clock in the morning, in weather 20° below zero, walk in the dark to a cold barn with no electric light in it, but with an old smoking chimney on an old lantern to light them, go into the barn and milk the cows so they may obtain a little butterfat which they can sell in order to keep from starving to death. Those farmers in the Northwest will be interested to know just how we entertain King George of Greece, and King Peter of Yugoslavia, and Churchill, and all the other dignitaries who come to this country, and what their surroundings are.

I turn to page 75 of the Saturday Evening Post and read:

Today the house is a veritable museum of Americana. Bric-a-brac and odds and ends of every period are scattered through it in indiscriminate abandon. In the double drawing room, with its crystal chandeliers—

Mr. President, the farmer who is out in the barn in weather 20 degrees below zero does not have a chandelier lighting up the darkness while he is milking the cow. All he has is an old smoking chimney on a lantern which hangs down from the roof by a little twine string. But in the Blair House the duke or king or prince, or whatever he may be, has his room lighted by a crystal chandelier.

In the double drawing room, with its crystal chandeliers the flowered aubussons stand out in striking contrast to the familiar portraits by Copley and Sully on the walls.

Mr. President, the farmer milking his cow does not have any pictures hanging around the walls of his cow shed. All he finds on its walls are cobwebs spun by spiders, and in those cobwebs will be found many flies that have been caught in the webs. These cobwebs—and I know this from personal experience—are upon the roofs and all around the walls of the cow shed. That farmer has helped to pay for this entertainment to this so-called ruler.

In a corner stands one of John Broadwood's first oblong pianos, imported from England in 1800. There are gilded mirrors and hard-carved mantels in every one of the beautifully proportioned rooms. The third-floor den, with its concealed lights and gold-leaf flutings, displays to great effect the Blairs' collection of Sandwich, Stiegel, and other early American glassware. The second-floor library contains a collection of books on history, law, and art, in addition to snuffboxes, bouquet holders, and early American silver spoons. But the library furniture, except for a massive walnut writing table, is tasteless and anachronistically modern. The bedrooms are elegant, but their furnishings have sometimes amused the more sensitve guests.

Even though the guests sleep there for nothing the article says they are amused at what they find there.

Mr. President, in addition to all the help provided, the people of America will be interested to know that there is also a dog. It will be interesting to note from this article what fine treatment the dog receives. The dog's name is Sistie Dall.

When King George of Greece was a guest at the Blair House—

In contrast to most Blair House guests, who have usually been late for their appointments—

According to the Saturday Evening Post—

King George was not only on time but was usually ahead of time. * * * Only once was he observed in a state of relaxation. This was when a Boston terrier named Sistie Dall, who belongs to Mrs. Victoria Geaney—

Mr. President, I was mistaken. I thought the dog belonged to the United States Government. I thought when we paid $180,000 for that house, with all its furnishings, and when we bought Mrs. Geaney along with the house, that, of course, we got a dog, but it seems that the dog does not belong to us after all, but belongs to Mrs. Victoria Geaney, the housekeeper. The article says that the time King George was observed in a state of relaxation—

was when a Boston terrier named Sistie Dall, who belongs to Mrs. Victoria Geaney, the housekeeper, vanished from her usual haunts. Sistie—

The dog—

was finally found in the king's bedroom, curled up beside him while he napped.

So he also got the dog.

I am very glad the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] has just entered the Chamber, because I know that he, as well as all the other people of the country, will be interested in knowing what it costs to support a dog in Oklahoma. I wanted to find out what it would cost the taxpayers of the country to keep that dog at the Blair House, so I looked through the copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to find out. I have in my hand a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the 24th of May 1932, a little more than 10 years ago. A newspaperman in Oklahoma had a dog, and knew all about dogs; and I am sure the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma will confirm what this editor in Oklahoma said about what it costs to maintain a dog in Oklahoma.

Mr. President, I am referring to what it costs to keep a dog in Oklahoma, because to me it is typical——

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I can say to the Senator from North Dakota that I have no experience with keeping dogs. I am afraid of dogs. [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I did not say the Senator kept the dog. I said a newspaperman in Oklahoma kept the dog, and in a few minutes I shall read what it cost to keep the dog. I am re-

ferring to this tremendous waste of money because of the experience I had in Alaska last summer. The Senators who are now in the Chamber will remember that I was a member of a subcommittee which was appointed to go there and investigate the building of the new highway. During the course of our investigation the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and I arrived at the town of Fairbanks, Alaska. I wanted to find out whether the War Department was wasting any money. I shall be very glad to furnish to any committee, including the Truman committee, any time they want it, the name of the gentleman of whom I shall speak. I went over to this man, and asked him what he was doing. He said, "Do you know, I am a stand-by."

My reason for referring to him is that in the Saturday Evening Post article it is said that all the servants in the Blair House are what are known as "stand-bys"; and this gentleman I met at Fairbanks, Alaska, who was working for the Government, was a "stand-by" too. He told me that he had lived at Kansas City, Mo. For the information of the Senate, let me say I have his name and his address in Missouri, too.

He said he had been hired a little more than 3 months; that from the time he got on the train, he was paid at the rate of $1.65 an hour, for 8 hours a day; that he had been in Alaska approximately 3 months; that during all the time he had been in Alaska he had been getting paid at the rate of $1.65 an hour, but that actually in over 3 months while he had been there he had worked 5 days—5 days in 3 months—yet all the time he had been there he had been getting $1.65 an hour, 8 hours a day.

I said to him that I rather doubted his story. He said, "Come with me tomorrow morning, and I will show you." That man was working for Metcalf & Co. who have a contract under the War Department. So next morning I got up and went over with this gentleman. We arrived. He nodded to the foreman, and said, "I am here, ready to go to work."

The foreman nodded, and said, "Yeah. Come back later."

And we left. He said, "Senator, that has been going on for weeks." I said, "Have you any pay checks that I can examine?"

He pulled out his purse, and he had the last pay check for the last week. It was for a sum in excess of $100, the usual deductions had been made. He looked up at me, and said, "You know, I am almost ashamed to cash this check."

When I saw that what that man had told me was true, I got in touch with Mr. Walter P. Sharpe, Commissioner of Labor of Alaska, and said to him, "Mr. Commissioner of Labor, is this case a usual or unusual one in Alaska? Is the United States Government paying people $1.65 an hour, right and left, month after month, when in 3 months, for example, one man worked only 5 days?"

He said to me, "Senator LANGER, my job as Commissioner of Labor of Alaska makes it necessary for me to check up on labor all over Alaska; and the case you mention is not unusual at all. I can cite you scores and scores and scores of them."

So, by checking back, it will be found that for every day that laboring man from Kansas City actually worked, the taxpayers of this country were paying him for the days he worked approximately $300 a day, for common, ordinary labor, which is as much as a soldier gets for being out on the firing line for approximately 6 months.

Indicative of that waste, I cite what it cost to take care of the dog in Oklahoma. I do not say, of course, that this dog belonged to the junior Senator from Oklahoma. I am referring to a statement by a newspaper editor, who said that if he were wealthy, if he had a million dollars a year, this is what the upkeep of the dog would cost. I read from page 10981 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 24, 1932, as follows:

Upkeep of doggy

1 new sweater a day at $10	$3,650
1 hogshead of milk per day at $5	1,825
1 200-pound hog per day at $10	3,650
5 spring lambs per day at $2 each	3,650
Manicuring, massaging, and putting permanent wave in tail at $10 daily	3,650
Salary of night watchman, turning dog over in his sleep	1,000
Total upkeep of doggy	17,405

Mr. President, of course that is ridiculous. I do not believe any newspaperman or any other man in Oklahoma or anywhere else pays any such sum, or anywhere near it. But, to my mind it is no more absurd than to pay a man working for the United States Government, up in Alaska, $300 a day for his actual working time.

Mr. President, keeping a dog at $17,405 a year is not so absurd as what took place in Kansas, in the Sunflower Ordnance case. A lawsuit is now pending, and it is hoped that after the enactment of House bill 1203 the case will be dismissed. The contractor received a contract to build 4,150 houses. One of the first things he did was to buy 1,000,000 lead pencils, at 9 cents each, as disclosed in the sworn complaint filed in the case. According to testimony, anyone could have bought the same lead pencils at the rate of 2 for a nickel. The contractor bought 1,000,000 lead pencils and the taxpayers paid for them. The contract was on a cost-plus basis. When I speak of the 1,000,000 lead pencils, I am speaking on the basis of the court record in Kansas.

Paying $17,405 a year for the upkeep of a dog, even if it were true, would not begin to be as foolish as what happened in Kansas in the Sunflower case. According to the sworn testimony, a house was built; after it was built, it was torn down and rebuilt. Then it was torn down again and built the third time. It was again torn down and built the fourth time. The same kind of a house was built each time, according to the same plans and specifications.

Little boys and girls all over the country were picking up nails and iron on the farm, and on the highways and byways, so that our Government might have steel. It developed that at the same time, in the Sunflower case, for some unknown reason—God alone knows what—20 tons of steel and many kegs of new nails were buried. It developed, also, that new lumber was burned. Why? The distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who is a member of the Truman committee, and who is familiar with that testimony, suggests that there is only one answer. It is because those contracts were let on a cost-plus basis. The more steel that was buried, the more nails that were buried, the more houses that were torn down and rebuilt, the more money the contractors made. To build 4,150 houses, 1,000,000 lead pencils, costing 9 cents each, were bought. Anybody could have bought the same pencils at the rate of 2 for a nickel.

During a previous speech by me on the floor of the Senate, no Senator on the Democratic side tried to defend that waste of money, because it cannot be defended. Who has these contracts? Who has made the billions of dollars which the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] says are involved in this bill? There is more money involved in the repeal of the existing law by the enactment of House bill 1203 than will be brought in by the tax bill which is now under consideration.

Mr. President, several Senators have just entered the Chamber. In order that there may be no mistake, and in order that they may know how much money is involved, I repeat that more money is involved than will be brought in by the tax bill which we expect to pass. I again refer to the statement of the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, on page 7608 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 17, 1943, where the Senator from Indiana said that billions of dollars—not hundreds of thousands, not millions, but billions—were involved. The distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee himself said that billions of dollars were involved.

Mr. President, if it is thought for a moment that the existing law can be repealed by a bill which would put billions of dollars into the pockets of crooks, racketeers, and scoundrels who have defrauded the taxpayers of this country, without at least one voice being raised in opposition, the proponents of the bill do not know the caliber of the Senator from North Dakota. I was not sent to the Senate by any political machine. I was not sent here by Harry Hopkins' political machine. I was not sent here by the political machine of Wendell Willkie or Tom Lamont. I was sent to the Senate by the farmers, the laborers, and the small businessmen of the State of North Dakota. I hope the day may never come when I cannot represent in this body the common people of my State and of the Nation, and speak up on an occasion such as this, when the fat monopolistic interests are trying to make it impossible to recover from them billions of dollars which they have illegally taken from the taxpayers of America. As long as I live

I will fight that class of crooks, scoundrels, and racketeers; and as long as I am a Member of this body my voice will be raised in opposition.

Mr. President, this bill was shoved through the House. The RECORD shows that some of the Members of the House who voted upon it did not even know what they were voting on. One of them thought it was a farm bill. It came over to the Senate Judiciary Committee, and when it reached that committee I fought it. I am proud of the fact that when this bill was under consideration in the Senate on a previous occasion, I fought it almost single-handed, assisted by men on the Democratic side such as the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who openly spoke against it, and by men such as the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] on the Republican side. The fight was started by me in the Judiciary Committee, and it has laid bare to the people of the country the graft and crookedness of contractors who think that they can rob the people of this country and get away with it, without any opposition on the part of the minority.

Mr. President, to show that the people of this country are waking up to what is being attempted, I shall read a letter written on the 8th day of December by Mr. R. J. Thomas, president of the International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America, which is the largest union in America. Three hundred thousand members of the union are in the armed service. It has a membership of 1,200,000, not including the 300,000 who are in the armed service. What does Mr. Thomas say?

I send you herewith a file concerning H. R. 1203. I would suggest that you do what you can to defeat this bill, as I am of the opinion that the public informer is an important part of our protection against fraud on the Government.

That is what this letter from the president of an organization representing 1,200,000 workers of America states about the bill. It states that if the bill is enacted it will do away with an "important part of our protection against fraud on the Government."

Mr. President, a few weeks ago the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] said that the largest lobby in the history of the Senate since he became a Member was trying to obtain the repeal of the informers' statute, which had been enacted during the administration of Abraham Lincoln. The Senator from Missouri, of course, knows that the forces behind this bill who are endeavoring to have the statute repealed consist of Republicans and Democrats alike.

Mr. President, there is one lawsuit pending against former Vice President Dawes—Charlie Dawes—who in his prime was known as "Hell and Maria" Dawes. He reminds me of "Blood and Guts" Patton. "Hell and Maria" Dawes borrowed approximately eighty or ninety million dollars from the R. F. C. According to the complaint, he borrowed it by fraud, taking advantage of his position as Vice President of the United States. He has been sued. By whom? By taxpayers of this country. He has been sued for $45,000,000. The taxpayers could not bring the suit, or thought they could not, until after they had secured a supreme court decision in the State of Illinois. I have the decision before me. In that decision the Supreme Court of Illinois lays bare the fraud which was participated in, as alleged in the complaint, by the former Republican Vice President of this country. The defendants want to get away from that lawsuit. They know that they cannot win it in court. So they say in effect, "We will repeal the law under which we have been sued. Then we will be safe." That is the Republican side of it.

Yesterday I mentioned Pendergast, that great Democrat, and proved his connection with a scheme which reached out hundreds of miles from St. Louis and took a soldier boy by the nape of the neck and lifted him away from Washington so that he could not testify here.

In New Jersey we have Frank Hague. Frank Hague is also interested in this bill being enacted. His friends have been sued.

Mr. President, the proponents of the bill say they are going to take away from the American people, the farmer, as well as the man in the city, the power to bring lawsuits in such cases. They propose to take away from every county attorney, from the attorney general of every State, from every United States district attorney in the Nation, and from every Federal judge in the land, the power to bring to justice crooks who have defrauded the Government. The bill provides that only one man, the Attorney General of the United States, may bring suit. Shades of Harry Daugherty. Harry Daugherty was a piker. If the bill is enacted into law the Attorney General of the United States will be made prosecutor, judge, and jury. If any Senator or even the Vice President, should become aware of a great fraud, and the Attorney General should refuse to prosecute, nothing could be done about it.

Mr. President, it will be remembered that when we debated this matter before, the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan said that someone else could sue; but as we went along he finally admitted that the only way in which a suit could be brought would be by the election of a new President of the United States, who would appoint a new Attorney General, a process which might take 4 years, 8 years, 12 years, or 16 years. By that time the witnesses would be scattered to the four corners of the earth.

Mr. President, in every State in the Union—at least in all the States in the Northwest—if a crime has been committed, or if the taxpayers have been robbed, what remedy do the people have under the present laws? In my State and in other States of the Northwest they can go to the county attorney. If he does not do anything about it they can appeal to the attorney general of the State. If the attorney general of the States does not do anything about it they can go to a judge who has authority to appoint a prosecutor at any time the county attorney or the attorney general refuses to act.

But that is not all. The people themselves can bring a suit. In all the States in the Northwest any taxpayer can bring a suit, and in a criminal case 10 percent of the people, by signing a petition, can call in a grand jury and they can proceed either criminally or give an instruction to proceed civilly. But we shall have another kind of a situation here if this bill passes, because if it shall pass every businessman and every citizen will be helpless.

I do not believe many Senators who are in favor of this measure can possibly have read it, and I send to the desk the bill (H. R. 1203) and ask that the clerk read it, and I request him particularly to read it slowly so that Senators may become familiar with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read the bill (H. R. 1203) to eliminate private suits for damages arising out of frauds against the United States, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3491 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 232) be, and it hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3491. The several district courts of the United States, the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, the several district courts of the Territories of the United States, within whose jurisdictional limits the person doing or committing such act shall be found, shall wheresoever such act may have been done or committed, have full power and jurisdiction to hear, try, and determine such suit. Such suit may be brought and carried on by any person, as well for himself as for the United States; the same shall be at the sole cost and charge of such person, and shall be in the name of the United States, but shall not be withdrawn or discontinued without the consent, in writing, of the judge of the court and the district attorney, first filed in the case, setting forth their reasons for such consent: *Provided*, That no district court of the United States shall have power or jurisdiction to hear, try, or determine such suit brought or carried on by any person for himself and the United States unless based upon information, evidence, and sources original with such person and not in the possession of or obtained by the United States in the course of any investigation or proceeding instituted or conducted by it, and unless prior to commencement thereof (1) such person has made full disclosure in writing to the Attorney General of the grounds thereof, including substantially all information and evidence in his possession and has requested the Attorney General to cause such suit to be brought; and (2) the Attorney General has, after receipt of such disclosure and request, declined in writing to comply with such request, or has allowed 6 months to elapse after receipt of such disclosure and request without causing a suit to be brought for part or all of the relief requested: *Provided further*, That in the event that the Attorney General takes action hereunder following receipt of such disclosure and request, the court may award to the person who made such disclosure and request, out of the proceeds of such suit or any settlement of any claim involved therein,

an amount which in the judgment of the court is fair and reasonable compensation to such person for original information, evidence, and sources so disclosed which was not in the possession of or obtained by the United States in the course of any investigation or proceeding instituted or conducted by it, such awards or failure to award and the amount thereof to be final and conclusive. In no event shall the amount of such award exceed one-tenth of the proceeds of such suit or any settlement thereof."

SEC. 2. No district court of the United States shall have power or jurisdiction to hear, try, or determine any suit pending at the time of the enactment of this act brought under Revised Statutes, section 3491, by any person for himself and the United States over which it would not have jurisdiction if such suit had been brought after the enactment of this act: *Provided*, That the court in which such suit is pending shall forthwith stay all further proceeding in said suit until the Attorney General shall have 30 days' opportunity to move as hereinafter provided and shall forthwith cause written notice to be given the Attorney General that such suit is pending; and the provision of this section preceding this proviso shall not be applicable to any such pending suit unless the Attorney General shall within 30 days after receipt of such written notice, move the court to dismiss the suit under this act: *Provided further*, That if after the dismissal under this act of any such pending suit a person having brought such suit makes a full disclosure and request in accordance with the provisions of said section 3491, as amended by section 1 of this act, and the Attorney General declines in writing to comply with such request, or allows 6 months to elapse after such disclosure and request without causing suit to be brought for part or all of the relief requested, such person may bring and carry on a new suit based on the same act, acts, and transactions involved in the suit previously brought if prior to the previous commencement thereof, the information, evidence, and sources upon which such suit was based were original with such person and not in the possession of or obtained by the United States in the course of any investigation or proceeding instituted or conducted by it. If the previous suit by such person was timely, the time within which such new suit may be commenced by such person shall not expire until 8 months after the date of the enactment of this act, or until the expiration of the time provided by section 3494 of the Revised Statutes, whichever is later: *Provided further*, That the Attorney General may cause a suit to be brought based in whole or in part upon the act, acts, or transactions involved in such pending suit previously brought by such person either after receipt of such disclosure and request or otherwise. If the previous suit brought by such person was timely, the period within which the Attorney General may cause a suit to be brought based in whole or in part on the same act, acts, or transactions shall not expire until 8 months after the date of the enactment of this act, or until the expiration of the time provided by section 3494 of the Revised Statutes, whichever is later.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall affect any such suit which was filed prior to June 15, 1942, or in which a final judgment has heretofore been entered, whether or not the cause be pending on review in an appellate court.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. As I understand the bill which has just been read by the Clerk is House bill 1203 in the form in which it passed the House of Representatives on April 1, 1943. The bill was subsequently amended by the Senate; and what is before the Senate at this time is the conference report which makes a number of substantial changes in the text which has been read by the clerk.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct, but the bill in the form proposed to be amended by the conference report has not been printed. So we have the conference report and the bill.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. Then, as it appears in the RECORD, what the clerk has just read would hardly be a fair presentation of the issue which is precisely before the Senate at this time.

Mr. LANGER. It is the best we can get. What the clerk read was the bill in its last form as passed by the Senate. Of course, it must be read in connection with the conference report. That is all we have; we have nothing else.

Mr. BURTON. But what has just been read by the clerk was the bill as passed by the House. Then the Senate substantially amended it.

Mr. LANGER. No; not as passed by the House.

Mr. BURTON. What the clerk just read was the bill passed by the House of Representatives on April 1, 1943.

Mr. LANGER. No; the portion in italics read by the clerk was added by the Senate to the bill as it passed the House.

Mr. BURTON. So what the clerk read was the bill as finally passed by the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON. What is before the Senate at this time is the conference report, which substantially changes the bill as amended and passed by the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. The bill the House passed was almost a straight-out repeal of the old Lincoln statute on one short piece of paper, restating the first paragraph and repealing the second one.

Mr. BURTON. I think it would perhaps clarify the record if the Senator would have the clerk read at this point the amendment provided in the conference report, so that it will immediately follow what has just been read. It is not now before the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection to the amendment being read. I ask that it be read. Every Senator was given a copy of the conference report.

Mr. BURTON. But the only way in which the bill and amendment can be brought together would be through reading them.

Mr. LANGER. I ask that the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment numbered 1, it is proposed to insert (A) after "Sec. 3491" on page 1, line 6, of the House engrossed bill; and on page 2, line 2, after "suit." strike out the quotation mark and insert the following:

"(B) Except as hereinafter provided, such suit may be brought and carried on by any person, as well for himself as for the United States, the same shall be at the sole cost and charge of such person, and shall be in the name of the United States, but shall not be withdrawn or discontinued without the consent, in writing, of the judge of the court and the district attorney, first filed in the case, setting forth their reasons for such consent.

"(C) Whenever any such suit shall be brought by any person under clause (B) notice of the pendency of such suit shall be given to the United States by serving upon the United States attorney for the district in which such suit shall have been brought a copy of the bill of complaint and by sending, by registered mail, to the Attorney General of the United States at Washington, D. C., a copy of such bill together with a disclosure in writing of substantially all evidence and information in his possession material to the effective prosecution of such suit. The United States shall have 60 days, after service as above provided, within which to enter appearance in such suit. If the United States shall fail, or decline in writing to the court, during said period of 60 days to enter any such suit, such person may carry on such suit. If the United States within said period shall enter appearance in such suit the same shall be carried on solely by the United States. In carrying on such suit the United States shall not be bound by any action taken by the person who brought it, and may proceed in all respects as if it were instituting the suit: *Provided*, That if the United States shall fail to carry on such suit with due diligence within a period of 6 months from the date of its appearance therein, or within such additional time as the court after notice may allow, such suit may be carried on by the person bringing the same in accordance with clause (B) above. The court shall have no jurisdiction to proceed with any such suit brought under clause (B) or pending suit brought under section 3491 of the Revised Statutes whenever it shall be made to appear that such suit was based upon evidence or information in the possession of the United States, or any agency, officer or employee thereof, at the time such suit was brought: *Provided, however*, That no abatement shall be had as to a suit pending at the effective date of this act if before such suit was filed such person had in his possession and voluntarily disclosed to the Attorney General substantial evidence and information which was not theretofore in the possession of the Department of Justice.

"(D) In any suit whether or not on appeal pending at the effective date of this act brought under Revised Statutes, section 3491, the court in which such suit is pending shall stay all further proceedings, and shall forthwith cause written notice, by registered mail, to be given the Attorney General that such suit is pending, and the Attorney General shall have 60 days from the date of such notice to appear and carry on such suit in accordance with clause (C).

"(E) (1) In any such suit, if carried on by the United States as herein provided, the court may award to the person who brought such suit, out of the proceeds of such suit or any settlement of any claim involved therein, which shall be collected, an amount which in the judgment of the court is fair and reasonable compensation to such person for disclosure of the information or evidence not in the possession of the United States when such suit was brought. Any such award shall in no event exceed one-tenth of the proceeds of such suit or any settlement thereof.

"(2) In any such suit when not carried on by the United States as herein provided,

whether heretofore or hereafter brought, the court may award to the person who brought such suit and prosecuted it to final judgment, or to settlement, as provided in clause (B), out of the proceeds of such suit or any settlement of any claim involved therein, which shall be collected, an amount, not in excess of one-fourth of the proceeds of such suit or any settlement thereof, which in the judgment of the court is fair and reasonable compensation to such person for the collection of any forfeiture and damages; and such person shall be entitled to receive to his own use such reasonable expenses as the court shall find to have been necessarily incurred and all costs the court may award against the defendant, to be allowed and taxed according to any provision of law or rule of court in force, or that shall be in force in suits between private parties in said court: *Provided*, That such person shall be liable for all costs incurred by himself in such case and shall have no claim therefor on the United States."

SEC. 2. Section 3493 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 234) is hereby repealed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in view of the fact that billions of dollars are involved in the pending conference report, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk read the bill, putting the amendments in their proper places, so that we will have in the RECORD the bill exactly as it will appear if it shall be passed in its present form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a question whether the clerk has the bill in such shape at this time that that can be done.

Mr. LANGER. The clerk can read the original bill and insert the amendments at the proper places, so that we will have the bill just as it will appear in case it shall be passed.

Mr. BARKLEY. What is the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That the bill be read as amended by the conferees.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not included in the conference report?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; it is in fragmentary form. The clerk is not in position to read the bill as it would be if amended. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, as a member of the conference committee, I respectfully express the view that it would be a very difficult thing for the clerk to comply with the request at this time, unless there were a printed bill carrying in italics the amendments. What we are dealing with now is the conference report, and the bill brought into the Senate by the conferees. Unless the clerk has in his hands, or can get, a printed bill carrying in italics the amendments, it will be very difficult, if possible at all, for the clerk to carry out the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the clerk is not prepared at this time to read the bill in the form desired, but can probably be prepared within a short space of time.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Would it not suit the Senator's purpose if the amendments the Senate made to the House text were read, and then the conference report as agreed to were read?

Mr. LANGER. The report satisfies me. We have the bill, and we have the proposed amendments, but I wanted to get them in order, so that there would be shown exactly what we are to vote on.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, without knowing precisely what the Senator has in his hand, I still have a doubt as to whether or not it would reflect the truth, because the conferees had before them one or two printed bills so that they might have a clean bill at every meeting. I doubt very much if the Senator has before him now, or in his hand, a bill carrying the amendments as they were considered by the conferees. I am not saying that he has not, because I do not know what the Senator has in his hand.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as I understand, the House bill was amended by the Senate in various particulars. The bill went to conference in that form, and the conference report embodies changes made in the Senate amendments. There is no print, or any one paper or document, as I understand, which shows the precise changes in the language. We have to have before us the Senate amendments, and then we have to have before us the conference agreement in order to understand what has been accomplished. I simply do not see how the clerk, without being given opportunity and time, can write into the Senate amendments the changes as they have been agreed to by the conferees.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I may state that Senators are entitled to have before them the specific documents upon which they are voting. Here is a bill involving billions of dollars, as stated by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. McCARRAN. The conference report carries the bill as brought back by the conferees.

Mr. LANGER. I want to see just what we are debating.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Maine that the amendments have been read. The clerk has just concluded reading them.

Mr. WHITE. I so understood, but I could not understand how, without taking time to do it, the clerks could incorporate into a single instrument that which appears in the Senate amendments and the changes which have been effected in the Senate amendments by the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk advises the Chair that he is not prepared at this time to read them in that order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, how can a Senator, I respectfuly submit, be expected, when there is not even a committee print of it, to debate a bill involving billions upon billions of dollars, as stated by the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the conference report is before the Senate at this time in its entirety, and it speaks for the full bill and the whole bill, and it is the bill as brought in by the conferees. Concerning the amendments to the respective bills for the reading of which the Senator calls, I respectfully suggest he has the right to get those amendments for his own use, but it is not for the clerk of this body, as I understand, now to go back over the work of the committee, or to do other than to present to the Senate the conference report. That is all that can be before the Senate at this time. That report embraces the full bill and everything that is in the bill.

Mr. LANGER. But, Mr. President, if the conference report is accepted, then the Senate is all through with it. Then it means that if the House adopts it, and the President signs the bill, it is the law of the land, without the Senate once having had the opportunity to read the bill, as amended. Certainly I do not believe that that can properly be the procedure of this body. If it is, it is certainly wrong. Assuredly, a Senator, before he votes on an important bill such as this, should have a chance to read the bill in toto. Unless some Senator objects, I respectfully ask that the clerk read the bill as it will appear in case it is passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that if the clerk is given proper time to prepare it, it can be read at a later time, but it cannot be read at the present moment.

Mr. LANGER. Sometime this afternoon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It can be done, perhaps.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have already stated during the course of the debate the treatment accorded to the case brought in New Jersey. That case involved a situation which arose in 1935, when the P. W. A. was in operation, when all the large companies got together and charged the cities two and a half times as much for gravel and cement as they charged private individuals. I have shown in previous debates, on the basis of the complaint I read, that the pressure became so great that finally 37 persons were arrested in New Jersey. The record shows they were arrested in 1935. Nothing was done in 1935 except to arrest those persons. The case was still pending without anything being done in 1936, in 1937, in 1938, and in 1939. Talk about law enforcement. I have here newspaper clippings showing what the judge, Guy L. Fake, did when finally, a few weeks before the statute of limitations would run, some of those fellows were brought before him upon their pleas of nolle contendere. The judge let seven big fellows go scot free. The seven big fellows were not only let go scot free, but have billions of dollars of new contracts. With respect to those who pleaded nolle contendere, some were fined $200, some $400, some $600, some $800, and some a few more dollars, a total fine of $18,800.

Mr. President, a taxpayer of New Jersey brought civil suit for roughly $1,300,000 to make those crooks return some of the money of which they had robbed the taxpayers of New Jersey. When the lawsuit was brought the taxpayer did exactly what is sought to be done now in the pending bill. It is asserted that

if the bill is passed the taxpayer will be obliged to write to the Attorney General of the United States. In the case in New Jersey that is exactly what was done. I hold in my hand a letter from Thurman Arnold, who was then Assistant Attorney General, written on February 14, 1942, to Mr. Joseph W. Weinberger, the attorney for the plaintiff, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., February 14, 1942.

JOSEPH J. WEINBERGER, ESQ.,
Passaic, N. J.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of January 15, 1942, addressed to the Attorney General, in regard to the case of *United States on the Relation of David Bayarsky* v. *George Brooks et al.* has been referred to me for consideration and reply.

It has been necessary to delay answering your letter until a decision was made as to what position this Department would take in the case of *Marcus* v. *Hess*, now pending before the court of appeals for the third circuit. That decision has been made, and the United States has filed a brief setting forth its views. For your information I am enclosing a copy of that brief.

Mr. President, note this:

In view of the arguments advanced therein, you will understand that it is impossible for us to direct the United States Attorney to assist you in the preparation of this case.

Very truly yours,

THURMAN ARNOLD,
Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. President, in what position are we going to leave the common, ordinary citizen, when a bunch of crooks can charge two and a half times as much for cement and gravel as they are worth, and the law is changed, and the office of the Attorney General can say, "We cannot help you," as shown by the letter I have just read.

More unethical still, Mr. President, is the fact that after the letter was written and after the plaintiff had made motion after motion to obtain the records, in order to be able to prove fraud, the departments of the Federal Government refused to cooperate. They had the records. They would not produce them and could not be made to produce them. Officials in the Federal service conspired to keep the plaintiff from setting before the court the facts showing fraud. When finally the pressure became too great and something had to be done, believe it or not, the same office of the Attorney General of the United States that on February 14, 1942, refused to help, after the case was outlawed brought a suit—which is now pending—against the same defendants for a million and a half dollars. What a travesty on justice to bring the suit now, when the statute of limitations has run, against the same defendants whom they refused to help prosecute only a few short weeks before.

So, Mr. President, I am happy to be here to talk to the people of the country, to make a permanent record here, a record which will stare in the face some of the Senators who are not here this afternoon. I have waited in vain for some Senator other than the great distinguished senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] to demand the return of the $1,500,000,000 which the great oil companies have stolen from the people. Representative COFFEE, of Washington, produced the evidence in the House. He could not obtain action there. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] made a speech on the floor of the Senate, but that speech, too, has been ignored. Who, I ask, is running the country today? Is it the Senate? Is it the President? Is it the courts? Or is it the large oil companies that are invisibly in control of the Government, and can steal $1,500,000,000? When the Attorney General sued them at 10 o'clock in the morning, and settled the case at 2 o'clock in the afternoon of the same day; when it is alleged, as it has been alleged from one end of the country to the other, that a former prominent member of a Republican Cabinet and two members of the Democratic National Committee got $100,000 apiece; when two Assistant Attorneys General of the United States resigned rather than sign the stipulation; when the judge to whom the stipulation was presented on the 21st day of December said, "This must be Christmas," or "The spirit of Santa Claus must be prevailing," or something of the sort—what conclusion must be drawn? Surely, Mr. President, the common people are not going to have much respect for law enforcement so long as things of that kind can happen in this great Republic of ours.

When this bill was originally introduced the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the senior Senator from Indiana, stated why it was introduced. Yesterday, I read his statement to the Senate. He said the bill was introduced in order to limit the activities of racketeering lawyers and blackmailers. Mr. President, that statement could not possibly be true. The distinguished Senator must be mistaken, because only four lawsuits were pending at that time. The facts in all four of them had been submitted to the Attorney General of the United States; and, over and above everything else, a racketeering lawyer or a racketeering blackmailer could not blackmail a corporation or a factory worker or a factory or anyone else by bringing a case of that kind, because before a settlement could be made it would have to receive the approval of the United States district judge, and would have to be submitted to the Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. President, as I have said, only four cases were pending up to November 1942. All the facts had been submitted to the Attorney General. Although the statement about copying indictments has been made, yet not one iota of proof has been laid before the Senate that any lawyers have been copying indictments. I understood there are some thirty-odd cases, and it is just possible that some racketeering lawyer copied an indictment. Suppose such a lawyer copied 10 indictments; what of it? Every time an attorney general has someone arrested, all he has to do is to file a civil suit at the same time, and no private suit can be brought. Is not that an answer to the point which has been raised about racketeers and crooked lawyers?

But what is proposed to be done? Mr. President, we are in war. This is a very solemn time in the history of this Republic. What will the people of America think when they suddenly discover that some of the big fellows can steal billions of dollars, and that suit cannot be brought?

I should like to place in the RECORD an example of a lawsuit brought by Thurman Arnold. I wish to make a brief statement of the facts, to show what low-down, contemptible scoundrels the officers of some corporations are.

I refer to the case of a corporation which was manufacturing tungsten at a cost of $24 a pound. It was selling the tungsten at $48 a pound, which represents a profit of 100 percent, which in anyone's language, in any kind of money, ought to be sufficient. When a thing which costs $24 is sold for $48, I think even the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] who, I take it is now in charge of the Democratic side, will agree with me that such a profit ought to be sufficient.

But, Mr. President, what does the record of Thurman Arnold show? It shows that although this company was charging $48 a pound for tungsten which cost it $24, it made a deal with Germany in 1928. Germany agreed not to sell tungsten in the United States or Canada, and this company agreed not to sell outside the United States or Canada. So it had a monopoly, and it raised the price of tungsten to $408 a pound.

What would our soldier boys think of that? Is that the kind of republic for which they are fighting? Is that the kind of government for which our soldiers are dying in fox holes—a government which would permit a group of monopolists to manufacture tungsten for $24 a pound and sell it for $408? No one went to jail. Of course not. Instead of that, the President of this country placed the leader of that corporation at the head of one of the large agencies in Washington.

Mr. President, I believe the day is coming when our soldier boys, when they return, will feel the way the common ordinary laboring man feels about it. In discussing the situation today with Mr. Irving Richter, national legislative representative of the American Automobile Workers, the largest union in the United States, I was informed that the spectacle of these pampered war criminals is causing cynicism and disgust among the Nation's war workers. The war workers have brothers, wives, and sweethearts in the service. They themselves are being drafted into the Army, and more than 300,000 of the members of that union are already in the service. They know that these frauds are endangering the lives of American boys. At the same time, they see the profits of racketeers swollen, employers encouraged to cheat, and their profits further increased by the failure of the Department of Justice to act or by the failure of the courts to meet their

responsibility by imposing appropriate punishment.

How they learn of the Congress closing up the one hope of the people to meet the situation. How can we hope to sustain their morale and confidence, when we aid and abet the enemies of our war effort? Can we go back to the war workers and other plain people, to the farmers, the small businessmen, and others, and say that we have truly represented them if we permit this betrayal? Will we be able to deny that we are encouraging further frauds by this action?

Mr. President, not only am I greatly concerned over the pending bill and the serious harm it would do to this country if it should be enacted; not only am I concerned by the fact that the common people would lose billions of dollars, as stated by the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana, who is the chairman of the Judiciary Committee; but I am concerned because of the fact that if this bill should become law, it would take away from the ordinary soldier when he returns home, from the ordinary war worker, the ordinary farmer, the ordinary laborer, and the ordinary businessman, all incentive to fight to make the United States the great Nation which our forefathers intended it should be when they left foreign shores to come here and establish it.

Mr. President, time and time and time again I have been present and taken part in patriotic celebrations. Hundreds of times I have heard Senators upon this floor boast proudly of what a great Nation this is. We are a great Nation, but we will continue to be great just so long as we keep pace with other countries in the sciences, arts, and agriculture.

May I say in all sincerity to the Members of this great body that in agriculture, at least, we now are lagging far behind.

A few moments ago I spoke about being in Alaska last summer. I found that in Fairbanks we were delivering planes to Russia. Fine outstanding Russian boys came over to Fairbanks to take delivery of the planes. There were Russian girls who were servicing the planes, girls who had graduated from the University of Moscow. I talked to some of those Russian boys and girls. They do not think so much about this great Republic of which we are so proud. They do not think much of it as a democracy. No; they say we are one of the outstanding capitalistic countries. In conversation one of them suggested that when I returned home I should procure a copy of the book entitled "The Soviet Power," written by the Dean of Canterbury, the head of the great Church of England. I now have a copy of that book in my hands. If there be a Member upon this floor who thinks that we are anywhere near Russia in the promotion of agriculture, I suggest to him that he read the book to which I have referred.

After reading the book I attended a meeting of commissioners of agriculture of various States. Mind you, Mr. President, those commissioners of agriculture presumably are experts. I said to them one at a time, "Mr. Commissioner, how many kinds of wheat are there?" I was raised on a wheat farm. Certainly I thought I knew something about how many kinds of wheat there were. There was not a single commissioner of whom I asked the question who came within 20,000 of the correct answer. I venture to say that there are few Senators upon this floor who have any conception of the kind of competition in agriculture which we confront from Russia.

Mr. President, in Alaska the situation beggars description. Alaska is a country which the United States bought 80 years ago. For 80 years we have had control of it, and yet, after 80 years in Alaska, there is not even a department of agriculture. What makes it worse is that nobody seems to care. Alaska is a country twice as large as Texas, and it does not even have a department of agriculture. There is located there a little university. In that university, pitiful as it is, a little of the subject of agriculture is taught. The university is located at Fairbanks. But, Mr. President, 54 miles away from the border of Alaska lies Siberia.

What kind of agriculture do they have in Siberia? The present Russian Government is only about 25 years old. I wish to show what has been done with agriculture in Russia, and what has been done with cotton. I recommend the book to which I have referred to every Senator upon this floor who wishes to know what has taken place in Russia so far as cotton is concerned.

I will read about what has taken place in Russia within the last 25 years, compared to little or nothing, comparatively speaking, which has taken place in this country.

While we were busy killing off our little pigs—five or six million of them—when our distinguished Vice President was head of the Department of Agriculture, while to my farm in North Dakota agents of the United States Government came and took a few cows, for which I had paid $60 near Bismarck, N. Dak., to a sand pit, and shot and killed them, and then gave me $20 apiece for them, in America—and I say it with shame and regret—while every third row of cotton was being plowed under, and while in the Northwest we were plowing under our wheat, while all over this country we were being taught about the value of scarcity, what were they doing in Russia, 54 miles away from Alaska?

Mr. President, I refer to page 103 of a book entitled "The Soviet Power," written by the Dean of Canterbury of the Church of England. At the very time that we were plowing under our cotton and refusing to raise wheat, while we were killing our hogs and our cattle, Russia was sending out expeditions, 60 of them—visiting practically every corner of the earth. I quote from the dean's book:

> These expeditions have visited, for example, within the Soviet Union itself, Armenia, Altai, Azerbaijan, and the Pamirs; outside the Union they have traveled to Persia, Afghanistan, Mongolia, Japan, Korea, India, Ceylon, Java, China, the United States, Mexico, Guatemala, Cuba, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Chile, Argentina, Uruguay, Brazil, Abyssinia, Eritrea, Egypt, and other places.
>
> The president of the Lenin Academy of Agricultural Science, Prof. N. I. Vavilov, has been largely in charge of this botanical work.
>
> Under Vavilov's direction the science of botany has been approached for the first time in a really comprehensive manner, and the Soviet Union now possesses—

What?—

> the world's richest collection of different plants.

In less than 25 years Russia has acquired the greatest collection of plant life in the whole world—

> the world's richest collection of different plants. In number, variety, and exhaustive completeness it is unsurpassed. The 60 expeditions which have been dispatched have returned with 300,000 specimens of plants.
>
> This vast collection has supplied information as to the frequency of different sorts of plants in different parts of the world. Some regions are found to possess more varieties than others. A natural inference follows. Any region which possesses the largest number of any particular species of plant has presumably had that species for the longest period of time. We may assume, therefore, that such a region is its natural and original home.
>
> On this assumption—

Says the Dean of Canterbury:

> Soft wheat, rice, peas, lentils, broad beans, apricots, almonds, and other plants grew originally in southwest Asia, for they exist there in largest variety.
>
> So oats, barley, and soya bean arose in southeast Asia; onions, peach, olive, and fig in the Mediterranean area; hard wheats in Abyssinia; and potatoes, tomatoes, tobacco, and sunflower in South America and Mexico.
>
> A chance handful of Abyssinian wheat will contain as many as 50 varieties, a number as great as all the known varieties of cultivated wheat in Tsarist Russia.
>
> These lands of origin are thus the most promising ground for collecting specimens for experimental research, and from these lands the Soviet Union has steadily collected her material.

Note this, Mr. President:

> In a noble room in an old palace in Leningrad, called the world's wheat safe, the Soviet Union has collected 30,000 varieties of wheat.

Think of that, Mr. President. Russia has collected 30,000 varieties of wheat in one room, while 54 miles away, in Alaska, which we have had for 80 years, we have not even a department of agriculture. Yet men stick out their chests, and say we are the greatest country on earth.

The Dean of Canterbury, of the Church of England, goes on to say:

> Immense attention is paid to wheat; for wheat is a staple food. To extend the areas of wheat cultivation farther north, or into regions ravaged by wheat disease, is to increase the food supply. For there is no burning of wheat in the Soviet Union.

There is no burning of wheat, Mr. President, in the Soviet Union; it is not being plowed under in Russia; but time and again upon the Senate floor we have passed legislation so that wheat could be fed to hogs in the United States, and I remember in the short space of my own

lifetime that wheat has been burned in the Northwest.

Increased production means increased riches for all.

Russian wheats have excellent qualities. But they can be improved by crossing them with suitable foreign varieties and ridding them of defects such as small grain, low yield, or susceptibility to fungus attack.

Thus, for example, Abyssinian wheats are early. Some Transcaucasian wheats resist rust and mildew. Dutch wheats have large grain. Afghanistan wheats resist drought.

Intensive research proceeds, crossing and countercrossing takes place in numerous farms and experimental stations throughout the Union.

One of the younger agronomists, as the scientific investigators are called, N. V. Tsitsin, set himself the task of crossing wheat with a hardy wild plant of the wheat family in order to procure a new variety capable of withstanding cold and drought. Stalin gave him practical personal encouragement with the words, "Go on with your experiments boldly. We shall give you every support." Tsitsin has at length produced a hardy annual wheat not only yielding excellent harvests and capable of withstanding cold and drought but at the same time immune from devastating wheat diseases.

In 1937 Nikolai Tsitsin, now president of the Academy of Agricultural Science, produced something more startling still—a hardy perennial wheat, a wheat which needs no sowing, but comes up from the same root year by year like hay. It is difficult to exaggerate the importance of such a discovery, though it may take time to reap the fruits of it.

So, Mr. President, while in Alaska there is not even a department of agriculture, 54 miles away a young Russian, by working with the personal encouragement of Joe Stalin, produced a perennial wheat, which means that the farmers will not have to seed the wheat, but it will grow like hay each year. In all humility I ask, How is the farmer in the United States to succeed with competition of that sort?

I see in the Chamber the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who represents a State where cotton is raised. I suggest that if he is interested in what is happening to cotton in Russia, he can spend his time to no better profit than to read this book by the Dean of Canterbury of the Church of England, because he will find that all the cotton which is being exported from South Carolina will suddenly be without a market, and the cotton farmers of that State will find themselves in the same category with the wheat farmers of the Northwest.

Mr. President, we are so far behind in Alaska that the people there, 30,000 of them, are not even allowed to elect their own Governor. When I introduced a bill a while ago to permit those people to elect their own Governor, the Secretary of the Interior said it did not meet with his approval; and therefore my bill has not been reported. Think of it. Although we have owned Alaska for 80 years, the 30,000 Americans there, just as fine people as ever wore shoe leather, have nothing to say as to who their Governor shall be. A politician sitting in the White House will send a man up there, who was never in Alaska in his life, to rule over those people. Yet we stick out our chests, and think we are a great country.

I introduced a bill to make Alaska a State—Alaska, which Billy Mitchell said had a greater coastline than any other country in the world, 26,000 miles; a territory so situated that Billy Mitchell said that whatever country controls Alaska controls the world, because by air Alaska is within 4,000 miles of every capital of Europe, and of the world—yet the people of that country cannot elect their own Governor, and are not permitted to vote even as to whether they should be a State.

We have seen an administration in times past—I am not criticizing the present President—that has sent tools of the big mining interests to Alaska; and what have we found? We have found that one mining company alone, the Kennicott Copper Co., has taken out $200,000,000 worth of copper and other minerals, and yet has paid almost no taxes. When the copper was gone they even abandoned the place, and left the little community a deserted ghost town. Instead of paying a fair rate of tax, so that the people of Alaska could have decent public buildings, they have not even provided sufficient hospital space to take care of the hundreds of people who are suffering from tuberculosis alone. When the legislature tried last year to provide for the hundreds of cases of tuberculosis, or quick consumption, the mining company which had taken out $200,000,000 worth of copper felt they were stretching themselves to the very limit when the legislature appropriated $25,000. What a disgrace to America!

Mr. President, the pity is that here in America we have the money, if only we would not let those who have been guilty of looting the Treasury of the United States get away with it.

Now they come along with H. R. 1203. They have the audacity to walk in here before the Senate and say they want us to repeal the statute Abraham Lincoln had passed. I say to my colleagues, read again the statement of the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana, who is in charge of the bill as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. Mr. President, he said on November 27, 1942:

Mr. President, this bill which is recommended by the Department of Justice—

Several times he said Mr. Tom Clark, the Assistant Attorney General, and once at least the Attorney General himself, had come before the Committee on the Judiciary, of which he had the honor to be a member, and asked the Senate to pass this bill. Why? It is said in order to prevent a lot of racketeering lawyers from making money. But, Mr. President, a racketeering lawyer could not make a dollar unless he took it from a racketeering and crooked corporation which had stolen it in the first place, and then he could not get it unless a jury first passed upon the facts. The absurdity of saying they want this measure passed because of a few racketeering lawyers, when, on November 27, 1942, only four cases were pending, and all the evidence had been submitted to the Attorney General of the United States before suit was brought.

Mr. President, I have been a Member of the Senate for only a short time, about 3 years, but in those 3 years I have seen a great deal. I have watched the wheels go round. Possibly I did so with considerable interest because I was attorney general of my own State for 4 years, and know how easy it is to enforce the law. Possibly I did so because I was Governor of my State nearly 4 years, and know how easy it is to be the chief executive of a great State. But, Mr. President, the merest schoolboy, and humblest person, who never was an attorney general or a Governor, or who never was even a member of a State legislature, knows that under our American system of government there are three branches, the executive, the judicial, and the legislative. Why, I ask, Mr. President, should the Senate pass any measure because the Attorney General of the country asks for it? Is he not rather the servant of the Senate? He cannot even act as Attorney General unless we confirm his appointment.

Time and time again I have been sick at heart when some Senator who has been here a long time, has introduced a good piece of legislation, one that the common people are begging for, and has told me that after he has introduced it, after it has been submitted to a committee, and after the committee has discussed it and argued it, the measure was not passed because, as the Senator said to me, the head of the department involved had recommended against it. Our Constitution is rapidly getting to mean little when a group in the Senate cannot succeed in having passed legislation designed to benefit the poor people or other people, unless they first chase over to some department, or to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and bow down and kiss his big toe and say, "Oh, mister, will you not please recommend this piece of legislation so that we can get the Senate, this great deliberative body, to pass it?" That is the situation in this Republic today.

Mr. President, some time ago, at the request of the disabled war veterans of North Dakota, who had been in State convention, I introduced in the Senate 52 bills which they had drawn up and asked me to introduce. They sent me 52 bills, the purpose of which was to help the soldier boys who had lost their arms and their legs, some of whom had lost their reason. They sent me the 52 bills and I introduced them to help those poor devils who had fought and bled on Guadalcanal, where most of the North Dakota boys who were in the militia which I as Governor took pride in reviewing had been sent.

I introduced the 52 bills and, believe it or not, I found that I could not have one of them passed unless the head of some bureau first okayed the bill. All the time I foolishly thought that the House and Senate of the United States passed the national legislation. When I came to Washington I foolishly thought, as does every school child, that the House and Senate agreed on a bill, and the President signed it, and it became the

law of the land. But that is not true at all. Oh, no. The first thing you must do, if you have a bill which involves any bureau or department, is to chase over to that department and set yourself right with the head of the department so that his endorsement can be obtained. If I want to help a school or a group of Indians in North Dakota, Indians who are starving, Indians who have not had a square deal, the Senate and the House cannot do much for me until John Collier comes before the Indian Affairs Committee and says, "Yes; I recommend the measure." If he says, "No; I do not recommend it," I do not have much chance of securing its passage. I do not believe the common people of the country understand for a single minute that before we can pass a bill in the Senate, in actual reality we must ask someone else about it and obtain his approval. If they did so understand I do not believe they would tolerate such a system for a single minute.

Mr. President, I sometimes become sad when I think about the laboring men and the farmers and the small businessmen of this country. The poor devils do not have much chance. They do not have a lobby in Washington. I do not know of an actual farmer in the Senate. Some Senators own cotton land; some Senators own wheat land; but, after all, we do not work with our hands. I am of the belief that it would be a very fine thing if every Senator were required to perform actual hard work for 1 month or 2 months each year, and had to try to live under some of the laws which we ourselves have passed, as the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] said one day. When I was in North Dakota during the past summer, I went to the little town of Northwood. They were threshing at that time. I know that my friend the distinguished acting minority leader will be interested in this, because he has been a Member of the Senate for a long time. When I reached Northwood, right in the middle of threshing time, I went to a drug store. The druggist said to me, "Out here in the country a fellow who has only one truck was hauling his grain, and one of the rear tires went down, and he has been 3 days, now, trying to get a tire so he can continue threshing. In the meantime he has had to dump his wheat on the ground." So I, as one of the Senators from North Dakota, had to telegraph to Washington, D. C., 1,800 miles away, to get an honest-to-God workingman a tire so that he could keep on working in the State of North Dakota. What a marvelous system of government that is!

I talked to another farmer; he had a tire on his automobile go flat. He lived 17 miles from Fargo. He wanted a new tire, of course. So he drove 17 miles to Fargo, and made an application, at the courthouse, for a new tire. He was told that they would let him know whether he could get one or not. So he drove back home. The next day a fellow drove out to look at the tire, and then drove back to Fargo. Later the farmer received a letter saying he could have a tire; and he went to Fargo and got it. There had to be all that gasoline used, all that wear on the tires, so the man told me—a man living, not at Fargo, but at Moorhead, right across the river—in order to determine whether he could get a tire. No wonder the farmers are sick of being regulated and regimented. No wonder the record shows that in Kansas, following the death of a Republican Member of the House of Representatives who had been elected by the votes of a little more than 50 percent of the people, in the election for the new Representative the Democratic candidate was defeated, and the Republican candidate received, not 50 or 51 percent of the votes, but 67 percent.

Mr. President, the American people are not going to continue to tolerate such a situation; they are not going to tolerate a situation whereby a bunch of millionaire monopolists can run and rule and regulate this country, because, as sure as there is a God in heaven, the day will come when the people of the country—the farmers, the laborers, the small businessmen, and the returned veterans—will take political possession of the country, as they should do; and in my judgment the sooner they do it the better it will be.

Mr. President, coming back to this informer's statute, I should like to point out the difference between the way a poor man is treated and the way a rich, profligate corporation is treated. In the July 27, 1943, issue of the Kansas City Star, the following item appeared:

Norman DeLos Zancker, of Topeka, 32-year-old employee of the Sunflower Ordnance Works, DeSoto, Kans., was fined $50 and probated for 3 years this morning—

Probated means that he received a jail sentence, but was placed on probation; so he was fined $50 and was sentenced to 3 years in the penitentiary, but was placed on probation—

was fined $50 and probated for 3 years this morning by Judge Richard J. Hopkins in the Kansas City, Kans., Federal district court on a charge of drawing 2 days' pay he did not earn.

Zancker had formerly pleaded not guilty before P. W. Croker, United States commissioner. He was indicted by a Federal grand jury June 4.

Zancker was accused of receiving $13.20 each day for January 6 and 7, days on which he allegedly did not work. The fine of $50 was set to cover the amounts paid him and court costs.

I now read an item from the Kansas City Star for June 11, 1943:

Charged with the theft of 19 mechanical pencils and one 50-foot steel tape from the quartermaster depot at Independence and Hardesty Avenues, Mrs. Opal Wilma Krebs, 26, was arrested yesterday at her home, 615 East Fifteenth Street, by F. B. I. agents. She has been employed in the packing department of the depot.

She was arraigned before Charles H. Thompson, United States commissioner, and pleaded guilty. Held for action of the Federal grand jury, she was committed to the Jackson County jail, when she failed to furnish bond of $1,000.

What happened in the case of a corporation? I hold in my hand an excerpt from an article appearing in the July 17, 1943, issue of the magazine Labor. I know that the two distinguished Senators who are engaged in confidential conversation would not want to miss this. I just spoke about a young man who was given a $50 fine and sentenced to 3 years in the penitentiary but was put on probation for illegally drawing 2 days' pay—$13.20 each day—and about a young woman who stole 19 pencils and a 50-foot steel tape, and was sent to jail because she could not furnish $1,000 bond.

Now I wish to show what happened to a great corporation, as appears from an article in the magazine Labor for July 17, 1943:

Another war contractor who defrauded Uncle Sam by delivering fake war material has been permitted to escape by paying a fine after pleading guilty.

Senators will remember the great speech made by the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] telling about the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co. Those fellows escaped. None of them went to jail. This appears to be a similar case:

In Federal court at Toledo, Ohio, this week, Federal Judge Frank L. Kloeb dismissed the Sandusky Foundry & Machine and seven of its officials, after assessing fines aggregating $80,000.

They were indicted for a conspiracy to cheat the Government through the delivery of defective propeller sleeves to the Navy, the crime being made possible by the use of fake tests. Evidence supporting the charges was obtained in a surprise raid by agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Despite the enormity of the offense, Judge Kloeb made an effort to minimize if not actually to defend it. "It is not difficult to understand," he said, "why a company, under pressure from the Government to increase production, may be tempted to violate some of the specifications." The fines, Judge Kloeb revealed, will be paid by the company, which means that they will probably be passed on to the Government under its cost-plus-fixed-fee contract with the Navy.

That is the situation. I have before me the records in other cases. I do not know just how much interest there is in them. To me they are very interesting and very revealing.

Mr. President, a moment ago I said that the poor man—and by that I mean the common man, the average farmer, the small merchant, and the laboring man—did not have much chance. That is true. During the short time I have been a Member of this body several instances have arisen to prove that statement.

I remember that one day when we were considering a tax bill to raise $160,000,000 of revenue, it was proposed that we place a use tax of $5 on every car. That measure was enacted into law. I voted against it, as did 31 other Senators. The distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] made a magnificent speech against it, but it passed.

What is the result? A rich man may have an automobile costing $20,000, and a poor sharecropper in the darkest part of North Dakota or Mississippi may buy an old "jitney" for $15 so that he can go to town on Sunday afternoon. Call him a hired man, a hobo, or an I. W. W., if

you will. Those poor people are called many names. All they are good for is to do the hard work, anyway. The use tax is the same on that $15 car as it is on the $20,000 car. This is in America, Mr. President.

I shall not go into all the tax matters today, because I expect to speak on the tax bill when it comes before the Senate. I see before me Senators who have been here a long time and who are eminently better qualified to speak on these matters than I am. I have not the slightest doubt that they would do so if they were not so busy in their committees.

In the tax bill which is now being considered by the Senate Finance Committee an effort is being made to tax cooperatives. I give notice now that when the measure comes before the Senate, if an attempt is made to tax cooperatives I shall offer an amendment to tax foundations such as the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation, and all the other 119 foundations which today are tax-exempt, organizations which, without one dollar's worth of buildings, have assets of more than $1,000,000,000. If a cooperative, composed of a few farmers who are trying to solve the problem of distribution, is to be taxed, then, by the eternal gods, the Rockefeller Foundation and all the other foundations, with $1,000,000,000 worth of tax-exempt property, should also be taxed. As I have said, I am not discussing the matter of taxes today.

If House bill 1203 becomes the law of the land, Mr. President, then our jury system will be gone. The method of administering the law will be gone, because in every single suit involving crooks and racketeers who have defrauded the Government the Attorney General will be the prosecutor, the judge, and the jury, all in one.

Mr. President, I cannot believe that the Senate will ever pass a measure so violative of all that we have been taught in this country as constituting justice.

There are a great many objections to the bill. Every reason which existed for the enactment of the informers' statute during the administration of Abraham Lincoln exists today; and every reason—if any—which exists today for the repeal of that law existed when it was signed by President Abraham Lincoln.

At the time of the passage of the informer bill it was the sentiment of the Congress and of President Abraham Lincoln that the Government of the United States of America was a people's government—a government truly, actually, and realistically "of the people, by the people and for the people." They believed that the citizens of the Nation should be given an opportunity to have an active part in our Government. If Government officials did not do their full duty promptly and effectively, then the people, through statutes such as the informer law, would have the opportunity of taking action into their own hands to prevent the theft or squandering of public funds.

Unfortunately for our Nation, during the past 10 years, the tendency has been in exactly the opposite direction, namely, to concentrate all power in the hands of a few governmental officials in Washington; to place all the power of government not in the hands of the people, not even in the hands of the servants of the people, but in governmental officials in Washington, most of whom today take the position that they are the rulers or masters of the people.

The purpose of the informer statute when enacted was twofold, as is the purpose of continuing its existence today and in the future. Its existence is a perpetual threat to wrongdoers. With this statute as a part of our law, those who would steal or wantonly waste public funds realize that if the Attorney General or his assistants are too busy, or for some other reason fail to prosecute and seek the recovery of the wasted funds, they still have to fear actions brought under the informer statute. The other purpose of the statute is to furnish a spur to Government law-enforcement officials who may be too busy, or for some other reason do not take vigorous action against those who defraud the Government.

While there is no greater moral reason for the Informer Statute today than when it was enacted, there is a greater pecuniary reason for its continuance. With this country soon to be in debt hundreds of billions of dollars, there is more need than ever before in the life of our Nation for every possible means for the preservation of public funds, or for the recovery of those wasted or stolen. Under those circumstances we should be strengthening the Informer Statute instead of emasculating it. We should be passing similar laws instead of repealing this one.

The only excuse advanced for the destruction of this safeguard of our people and of their money, is that a few suits have been brought in the country based on indictments by the Government without independent investigation and information on the part of the plaintiffs. Nobody condones actions of that sort. The Informer Statute can easily be amended to prevent repetition of that type of litigation without terminating the real virtues of the law as would be done by the passage of the bill now being considered.

This bill would make impossible honest, patriotic, worth while informer suits such as the one that has been brought by former Gov. Payne H. Ratner of Kansas and his associates against the contractors who built the Sunflower Ordnance Plant near DeSoto, Kansas. That suit was brought as the result of independent investigation, and information on the part of the plaintiff in the case, and on the part of Governor Ratner and his cocounsel. It was not brought until several months after public officials were notified of the graft and waste at this plant built with public funds. The suit was not filed until months after governmental officials had had an opportunity to do something on their account about the situation. After months had passed without any prosecution, or a suit for the recovery of money having been started by the Government, the action was filed for William V. Ryan by Governor Ratner, former Circuit Judge Marion D. Waltner of Kansas City, and their associate counsel.

Every Member of the Senate is familiar with what has taken place since that lawsuit was filed. I need not go into it further at this time. I can only say, Mr. President, that to me it seems that it will be going back far indeed in the jurisprudence of this country if somehow, in some way, whether by the bill now sought to be enacted into law or by some other law, the right of the average man, the right of the average citizen, shall be taken away from him so that he cannot prosecute war frauds, so that the lawyer he retains cannot prosecute them, and so that the United States district attorney cannot prosecute them, but under the statute only one man, namely, the Attorney General of the United States, will have that power.

Mr. President, I believe that in view of the nature of the measure under consideration, one which involves billions upon billions of dollars, as stated by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, there should be a quorum present. Inasmuch as I believe that there is not now a quorum present, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Gerry	Nye
Austin	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Green	Overton
Ball	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Gurney	Reed
Barkley	Hatch	Robertson
Brewster	Hawkes	Russell
Bridges	Hayden	Smith
Brooks	Hill	Stewart
Buck	Holman	Taft
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	La Follette	Truman
Capper	Langer	Tunnell
Caraway	Lodge	Tydings
Chandler	Lucas	Vandenberg
Chavez	McCarran	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	McClellan	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	McKellar	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Maloney	Wheeler
Downey	Maybank	Wherry
Eastland	Mead	White
Ellender	Millikin	Wiley
Ferguson	Moore	Willis
George	Murray	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business, holding hearings in the State of Mississippi.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is detained on public business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from

Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of public matters.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] are absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report on House bill 1203.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, just one more matter, and then I shall conclude.

Within the last few days we have had before us a subject involving States' rights. The question was as to the right of a State as against the Federal Government.

If the pending conference report bill shall become law, it will mean that a man residing in any State will have nothing at all to say about any action being brought against those who may be guilty of committing war frauds. It will mean that no State will have a right to bring suit, no individual will have a right to bring suit, the only man in all the world who can bring one of these actions will be, in the last analysis, the Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. President, in view of the grave importance of this measure, I believe the bill should be recommitted to the committee of conference with instructions to determine whether, after further conference, they cannot report a more satisfactory bill.

I therefore move that the bill be recommitted to the committee of conference, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be instructed to confer again with the House conferees and see whether a better bill cannot be produced.

Mr. WHITE. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHITE. What is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Dakota to recommit the conference report to the committee of conference, with instructions.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report on House bill 1203.

The report was agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. BARKLEY. By direction of the Committee on Banking and Currency I report favorably for the calendar an original joint resolution extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation for a period of 60 days. I ask that it go on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2207) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DICKSTEIN, Mr. LESINSKI, and Mr. MASON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2350) to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2350) to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

RECESS

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, December 17, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1943

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

In this silence, our Father, we gratefully pause; be pleased to hear our supplication. As Thou hast shared Thy divine nature with us, help us to approach the pattern and similitude of our Saviour's character. With Him there is no end and no faithful failure. The words of our Lord are enduring in their simplicity, in their reality, and goodness. In them we see the grandeur of a truly great life: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant. Thou hast been faithful over a few things; I will set thee over many things."

O God, we pray that the Members, officers, and employees of the Congress may be altogether worthy of life's "well done"; open the fountains of Thy love and wisdom; so much that concerns the welfare of our Nation depends on the mental, moral, and spiritual nature of the servants of state. Wherever there are men and women striving for the right way, consider them and give them a quenchless desire to serve. When mistakes are made, may we have the manly spirit to confess them; when we have expressed faults give us the courage to correct them. In the name of Him who prayed for His enemies, wept with His friends, and took little children to His holy breast. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 3611) entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States, to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KILGORE, Mr. MCCARRAN, and Mr. FERGUSON to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

Department of the Interior.
Department of the Navy.
Department of War.
Federal Security Agency.
National Housing Agency.
War Manpower Commission (National Youth Administration).

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

Department of the Navy.
Department of War.
Executive Office of the President (Office for Emergency Management).

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SULLIVAN]?

There was no objection.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY FOR MEMBERS OF OUR ARMED FORCES

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEARNS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, as a veteran of the last war, there is nothing that concerns me more than the welfare of the men and women who are serving their country in the armed forces today, both while they are on active duty, and as they return to civil life. I had hoped that we should profit by the mistakes that were made after the last war, and that with agencies already set up, official and unofficial, there would be a minimum of error and confusion in dealing with these problems. Already a substantial number of men are being discharged from the services. It is disturbing to find that in too many cases they are meeting with the same sort of delays and red tape that occurred last time. There should be the least possible delay in passing legislation providing fair and generous treatment in the way of mustering-out pay; but beyond this it is imperative that such a law, and other veterans' legislation already on the statute books, should be so administered as to cause a minimum of hardship and anxiety to our returning soldiers and sailors as they make this difficult transition.

Another matter that calls for immediate and intelligent attention is the matter of soldiers' voting in the coming election. Regardless of any possible effect on my own fortunes or those of anyone else, I believe that these 10,000,000 citizens have a right to exercise their constitutional privileges. The difficulties involved are admittedly great; but it ought not to be beyond the abilities of the Congress to provide legislation that will effectively meet those difficulties, and I hope that immediate action will be had. Neither the soldiers nor their relatives at home will easily forgive our failure to achieve this. The future of the Nation is in their hands.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial on Czechoslovakia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEFAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short newspaper release on disabled American veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]?

There was no objection.

TEHERAN CONFERENCE

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the recent conference at Teheran will be far-reaching in its consequences. Its effect upon the present war will soon be felt. Its possibiilities for the peace and for the future of the world are tremendous. The meeting of Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin, will go down in history as one of the most important steps in the long struggle of mankind for freedom from war and oppression. This Nation has just cause to be proud of its President and Commander in Chief for his part in making this meeting possible. The success of the conference, the very fact that these chosen leaders have met, is a tribute to the President's political courage, his vision, and his great love of freedom and humanity.

With the Teheran Conference we can be assured of a speedier victory, of continued and increasing coordination of military efforts. This alone is sufficient cause for rejoicing. However, the significance of this meeting as a beginning of the long road to world peace far outweighs its military importance.

For it is for this for which we fight—the end of tyranny, oppression and of war, for the opportunities of freedom and the ability to work and live without fear.

No words can better summarize the significance of this first conference as a beginning of world harmony than the words of the statement itself. I quote:

> From these friendly conferences we look with confidence to the day when all the peoples of the world may live free lives untouched by tyranny and according to their varying desires and their own consciences.

THE CLEVELAND PRESS CAMPAIGN ON BEHALF OF CRILE GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Press is conducting a campaign to raise $100,000 to equip the Army's new Crile General Hospital with a bedside radio system to furnish entertainment to wounded and disabled servicemen. The campaign has already gone over the top. The goal set was $100,000, but generous contributions have already exceeded that amount by $9,000. This is another example of the patriotism of the citizens of greater Cleveland who are 100 percent devoted to the war effort. The War Department has commended this spirit of loyalty to the men who fought heroically and valiantly for our cause.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include a telegram from the American Legion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LANE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial that recently appeared in the Boston Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3598) "making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June

30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 18, 36, 64, and 71.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, 19, 21, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 52, 53, 54, 56 58, 61, 65, 66, 68, 69, 72, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, and 93; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "not to exceed $300,000 of the unexpended balances of the appropriations made to the National Youth Administration for the purposes of liquidation in the War Manpower Commission Appropriation Act, 1944, and the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943, are hereby continued available until June 30, 1944, for payment of all such obligations incurred prior to January 1, 1944,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$112,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$175,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Economics of mineral industries: For an additional amount for economics of mineral industries, fiscal year 1944, including the objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1944, $16,000; and the limitation upon the amount that may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia is hereby increased to $347,500."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Construction of byproducts plant, Pribilof Islands, Alaska: For the enlargement of the byproduct plant, for the utilization of fur-seal carcasses, on Saint Paul Island, including the purchase and installation of machinery and other equipment, fiscal year 1944, to remain available until expended, $135,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: After the number "127" in such amendment, insert "(claim of Charles A. Buchanan, Port Huron, Michigan, $125.62)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$17,788.30"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Reimbursement for damages on the Illinois River, Illinois: Not to exceed $303,500 of any unobligated balances of existing appropriations heretofore made for the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works, for the prosecution of such projects theretofore authorized as may be most desirable in the interests of commerce and navigation, and for other purposes specified under the head "Rivers and harbors" in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1944, are hereby made available for the payments on account of damages arising as a result of projects on the Illinois River, Illinois, in accordance with the provisions of the act approved October 23, 1943 (Public Law 168)."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 8, 11, 12, 13, 20, 22, 23, 26, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 48, 49, 55, 63, 67, 70, 94, 95, and 96.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JED JOHNSON,
JOHN TABER,
J. EDGAR CHENOWETH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
D. LANE POWERS,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, relating to the Senate: Appropriates for salaries and expenses of the Senate in the amounts and in the manner proposed by the Senate amendments.

Nos. 6 and 7, relating to the House of Representatives: Appropriates $1,500 additional for mileage of Members of the House and $1,654.15 for payment of contested-election expenses, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 9 and 10, relating to the War Manpower Commission: Appropriates $6,233,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $5,900,000 as proposed by the House, for employment office facilities and services; and strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation of $2,125,000, inserted by the House, for migration of workers from foreign countries and from territories and possessions of the United States for employment in the continental United States.

Nos. 14 and 15, relating to the Employees' Compensation Commission: Appropriates $3,700,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,500,000, as proposed by the House. This action is in accordance with action of the conferees on Senate amendment 65 relating to payments to employees of naval contractors missing from Guam, Wake, and the Philippine Islands.

Nos. 16, 17, 18, and 19, relating to the liquidation of the National Youth Administration: Eliminates the direct appropriation of $300,000 proposed by the Senate and makes not to exceed $300,000 of previous unexpended balances available for such liquidation and makes technical changes and corrections in connection with the paragraph.

Nos. 21, 24, and 25, relating to the Federal Works Agency: Makes an additional $4,500 of funds appropriated to the Public Works Administration available for personal services in the Office of the Administrator; extends to June 30, 1944, the availability of administrative funds in connection with work relief in Puerto Rico; and appropriates $2,191.70 for payment of authorized claims under the Public Roads Administration; all as proposed by the Senate.

No. 27: Appropriates $112,500, instead of $75,000 as proposed by the House and $149,224 as proposed by the Senate, for salaries and expenses of the National Labor Relations Board in performing the duties imposed upon it by the War Labor Disputes Act.

No. 28: Appropriates $225,000, as proposed by the Senate, for printing and binding for the Veterans' Administration.

Nos. 29 to 34, inclusive, relating to the government of the District of Columbia: Appropriates, as proposed by the Senate amendments, the following amounts: Refund of erroneous collections, $125,000; personal services, Municipal Court, $5,961; refunding water rents and other water charges erroneously paid, $2,000; and audited claims, $4,808; a total of $137,769, payable from District revenues.

No. 36; relating to the Department of Agriculture: Strike out the appropriation of $4,100,000, proposed by the Senate, for the emergency rubber project (growing of guayule).

Nos. 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 50, 51, 52, 53, and 54, relating to the Department of the Interior: Appropriates $2,250,000, instead of $950,000 as proposed by the House and $3,550,000 as proposed by the Senate, for salaries and expenses of the Solid Fuels Administration for War; appropriates $175,000, instead of $150,000 as proposed by the House and $200,000 as proposed by the Senate, for the Office of Fishery Coordination; appropriates, as proposed by the Senate, sundry amounts from Indian tribal funds for tribal expenses; appropriates $16,000, instead of $18,500 as proposed by the Senate, for economics of mineral industries, Bureau of Mines, and adjusts the amount for personal services in the District of Columbia accordingly; appropriates $135,000 for enlargement of the byproducts plant on Saint Paul Island, Alaska, for the utilization of fur-seal carcasses but eliminates the Senate proposal of $140,000 for a similar new plant on Saint George Island; appropriates $18,000 for salaries and expenses of the government of the Virgin Islands and $4,675 for salaries and expenses of the agricultural experiment station and vocational school, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 56: Appropriates $30,000, as proposed by the Senate, for salaries for the Claims Division, Department of Justice.

Nos. 57 and 58: Appropriates an additional amount of $125.62, as proposed by the Senate, for payment of authorized damage claims under the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Nos. 59 and 60, relating to the Department of Labor: Appropriates $200,000, instead of $250,000 as proposed by the House and $125,000 as proposed by the Senate, for salaries and expenses of the Division of Labor Standards; and appropriates $50,000, instead of $125,000 as proposed by the Senate, for salaries and expenses of the Women's Bureau.

Nos. 61, 62, 64, 65, 66, 68, and 69, relating to the Navy Department: Appropriates $4,790.44 additional, as proposed by the Senate, for payment of claims for damages by collision with naval vessels certified to the Senate after the bill had passed the House; and makes $750,000,000 available for the naval stock fund as proposed by the House instead of $500,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The House bill contained provision for changing the method of payment to employees of naval contractors known to be enemy prisoners or hostages or missing from employment on Wake Island, from the provision made for such employees under the act of December 2, 1942 (Public Law 784), to rates to be fixed by the Secretary of the Navy not to exceed those for comparable positions to Navy employees in areas nearest to the last place of employment of such contractors employees; the Senate has stricken out the House provision and inserted a substitute, amending the act of December 2, 1942, to include employees on Guam and in the Philippines (not included in the House bill), placing the administration of the provision in the Employees Compensation Commission (instead of the Secretary of the Navy), providing that the benefits shall be 100 percent of the average weekly wages of the person but shall not exceed the average weekly wages paid to civilian employees of the United States in the same or most similar occupation in the areas nearest to the place of employment where such person was last employed and shall not exceed the average weekly wages of such absent person at the time the absence began; the substitute also provides that only 70 percent of the average weekly wage so determined shall be paid to dependents of the person and authorizes the Commission, in the distribution of the 70 percent, to vary the percentage among dependents, where necessary to do so, to avoid injustice or excess allowance; and the House accepts the Senate amendment. The conference agreement also strikes out the House provision with respect to the allowance for civilian clothing, Marine Corps (reinstated in amendment 70); and appropriates $84.48 additional for payment of authorized vessel damage claims under the Coast Guard.

No. 71, relating to military activities of the War Department: Strikes out the paragraph, inserted by the Senate, amending the provision in the Military Appropriation Act, 1944, with respect to the use of funds in connection with class IV–E, conscientious objectors.

Nos. 72, 73, and 74, relating to civil functions of the War Department: Makes a technical correction, as proposed by the Senate, in the appropriation for a turning basin at Lorain, Ohio; strikes out the direct appropriation of $303,500 inserted by the Senate, and substitutes a provision for the use of funds heretofore appropriated for reimbursement for damages arising as a result of river and harbor projects on the Illinois River, Ill., as authorized by the act of October 23, 1943 (Public Law 168), and appropriates $31,960.75 for payment of damage claims certified to Congress for appropriation under the Act of July 3, 1943.

Nos. 75 to 93, inclusive: Appropriates additional amounts for the payment of authorized damage claims certified to Congress as provided by law, judgments against the United States, and audited claims allowed by the Comptroller-General, all as proposed by the Senate, pursuant to certifications after the bill had passed the House.

AMENDMENTS REPORTED IN DISAGREEMENT

No. 8: Striking out the appropriation of $175,000 in the House bill for additional salaries and expenses of the Bureau of the Budget.

No. 11: Authorizing the expenditure of $2,350,000 additional for administrative expenses of the War Shipping Administration from the War Shipping Administration revolving fund.

Nos. 12 and 13: Striking out appropriations in the House bill, respectively, of $683,000 and $26,000, for the Civil Service Commission for the establishment and operation of a centralized Federal employment reporting and civil-service retirement record system.

No. 20: Appropriating $345,000 and providing authority for the Surgeon-General of the United States Public Health Service to enter into agreements with private practicing physicians and dentists to relocate in areas needing their services and to pay their travel and transportation of their families and household effects to such new location and to pay the practitioner a relocation allowance of not to exceed $250 per month for three months.

No. 22: Appropriating $50,000,000 additional for war public works (community facilities) under the Federal Works Agency.

No. 23: Appropriating $9,000,000 for work relief in Puerto Rico pursuant to Senate bill 981 and to become available if and when such bill is enacted into law.

No. 26: Increasing from $50,000,000 to $100,000,000 the amount in the House bill for war housing under the National Housing Agency.

No. 35: Heading in the bill contingent upon action on amendments Nos. 37 and 38.

No. 37: Appropriating $2,428,656 additional for operating and administrative expenses under the Federal Crop Insurance Act and repealing the proviso in the Agricultural Appropriation Act, 1944, prohibiting the use of funds in connection with the insurance of wheat and cotton crops planted subsequent to July 31, 1943.

No. 38: Appropriating $6,500,000 additional for administrative and operating expenses of the Farm Security Administration and increasing from $60,000,000 to $97,500,000 the amount which may be used in the fiscal year 1944 for the making of rehabilitation loans.

No. 39. Appropriating $650,000 to inaugurate the quinquennial census of agriculture required to be taken in the calendar year 1945.

No. 40: Appropriating $9,907,890 for the development of civil landing areas (airports).

No. 48: Authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase from the principal of the judgment fund of the Shoshone Tribe of Indians of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming, one United States Series E War bond of the denomination of $500 for each member of such tribe to be held in trust by the United States until the maturity date.

No. 49: Appropriating $2,800,000 for water conservation and utility projects under the Bureau of Reclamation.

No. 55: Increasing the amount for administrative expenses of the Puerto Rican hurricane relief from $20,000 to $25,350.

No. 63: Increasing from 45 to 60 the number of officers of the Navy above rank of captain who may receive flight pay during the fiscal year 1944.

No. 67: Making existing naval appropriations for "Construction and Machinery" and "Armor, Armament, and Ammunition," available to carry into effect the recent authorization, passed by both Houses, for additional auxiliary vessels, landing craft, and district craft, effective when such authorization shall become law.

No. 70: Extending the House provision for the Marine Corps under amendment No. 66, increasing to $30 the maximum cost of civilian clothing per person for enlisted personnel given discharges for bad conduct, undesirability, unsuitability, or inaptitude, to include the Navy and Coast Guard, and incorporate all three services in the new paragraph.

No. 94: Providing for the rescinding and cancelation of funds of the War and Navy Departments under certain conditions and determinations, the repeal of the transferability clause between appropriations for the War Department, and the prohibition of the placing, by administrative direction, of any funds for construction projects under any department or agency in a reserve status.

No. 95: Prohibiting the War Department from canceling existing authority with respect to the manufacture and distribution of Army insignia and making the section effective as of March 1, 1943.

No. 96: Changing a section number of the bill.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JED JOHNSON,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
D. LANE POWERS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as this bill passed the House it carried appropriations aggregating $166,000,000. When it came back from the other body it was almost double that amount. The Senate amendments carried an additional $141,000,000, involving a total of approximately $308,000,000. It must be taken into consideration, however, that $65,000,000 of this additional appropriation was submitted in estimates which came up after the bill had passed the House and which the House did not have an opportunity to consider.

By way of summary:

Amount of bill as passed by the Senate	$308,340,019.23
Amount of bill as passed by the House	166,754,124.32
Amount added by the Senate	141,585,894.91
Estimates presented to the Senate after the bill had passed the House	65,187,503.76

On the whole, the Senate added 96 amendments. We were able to agree in conference on most of those amendments, but we were compelled to bring back—in some instances on account of disagreement and in other instances because of the parliamentary situation—22 amendments. These 22 amendments are the amendments that are now before the House for final disposition. They embrace $130,000,000 of the $141,000,000 added by the Senate, including $50,000,000 for war housing; $50,000,000 for war public works—community facilities; $6,500,000 for Farm Security Administration—in addition authority for $37,500,000 of R. F. C. funds for loans; $10,000,000 for airports; $2,800,000 for water conservation and utility projects;

$2,428,000 for crop insurance; $9,000,000 for work relief in Puerto Rico.

In passing on these 22 amendments this afternoon the House will take its position on the expenditure of $130,000,000 more than was agreed to by the House when we first passed the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, as to the items that were in controversy, you never get what you would like, but the only differences I would have with this report would be so small that they would not justify me in objecting to it. I did not like some of the things to which we had to agree, but when an item is only $5,000 or $10,000 as compared with differences involved in the amendments in disagreement running into hundreds of millions of dollars, you have to take the little ones sometimes when you do not like them. So that is the situation as this conference report comes up. I shall favor it because generally we have done very well.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: On page 5, line 8, strike out all of lines 8 to 16.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment reducing the item to $100,000.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 8 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: "In lieu of the matter stricken out insert the following:

"'BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

"'For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Budget, fiscal year 1944, including the objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1944, and including $20,000 additional for the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, $100,000.'"

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this is the only item in the bill in which the other body has made any cut that amounts to anything. There is approximately $17,000 on the Federal Hospitalization Board that General Hines and the Surgeon General are interested in. There is about $33,000 on field offices, and maybe $50,000 more that might be justified.

In the general operation of the Budget, the more we seem to give them the more trouble they seem to get into and the more unjustifiable estimates for appropriations they seem to send up to us. If anyone will look at these things that have been sent over by the other body and that will be up for consideration today, he will realize the kind of a job the Budget has failed to do in keeping out estimates that ought not to be considered. I feel that if we reduce this item to $100,000 we shall have accomplished something along the line of saving money and still give the Budget enough money to meet its obligations on the hospitalization and those field offices that might be necessary, and we shall be very liberal.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of the Budget had before the committee a supplemental request for the remainder of the present fiscal year for $355,300 for additional personnel and expenses to enable it more adequately to carry out its responsibilities in connection with its budgetary duties. These funds were designed to give the Bureau more personnel to enable it better to discharge its duties in connection with the present requirements of law to survey the needs of agencies for personnel every 3 months and establish ceilings above which they cannot go, to increase its field force in order to coordinate the use of equipment and supplies to bring about economies of operation, to provide a force to study the post-war construction plans of the various construction agencies of the Government in order to have a well-coordinated construction program of public works when the war ends, and to provide a staff for the Federal Board of Hospitalization to insure the fullest coordination and utilization of all Government hospitals, particularly with reference to use during the war for members of the armed forces and after the war for the veterans that will need to be cared for in them. The House approved for this purpose $175,000, and the Senate has stricken out the item. In my judgment the $175,000 is too small. This is money that will save money, and I hope the House will oppose cutting this amount any further and insist that the Senate recede from its action in striking out the $175,000. Our annual expenditures are approximately $100,000,000,000 this year, and two or three million dollars for the Bureau of the Budget is insignificant compared to the problem involved. It is an economy amendment, and I trust it will be retained in the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri), there were—ayes 71, noes 24.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: On page 10, line 9, insert the following:

"WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

"The amount that may be used for administrative expenses in the fiscal year 1944 under the head 'War Shipping Administration, revolving fund,' is hereby increased from $9,650,000 to $12,000,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 11 and concur in the same.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 12: On page 10, line 16, strike out lines 16, 17, 18, and 19.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment 12 and agree to the same with an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by such amendment, insert:

"Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, fiscal year 1944, including the objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1944, $688,000: *Provided*, That the use of social-security numbers in connection with the centralization of Federal employment reporting and civil-service retirement records shall not be deemed in any manner as an indication of approval by Congress of any participation in whole or in part by the Social Security Board in the administration of the Federal retirement system or to the consolidation of the Federal retirement system with the social security system for non-Federal employees."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Should we not have both of those amendments together?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Unfortunately one carries an amendment and the other is to be agreed to without amendment.

Mr. TABER. That is all right.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 13: On page 10, line 20, strike out lines 20, 21, and 22.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 13.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 20: On page 16, line 8, strike out "$1,350,000" and insert "$1,695,000: *Provided*, That the Surgeon General is authorized, on application of a municipality, county, or other local subdivision of government duly approved by the State health department having jurisdiction over said municipality, county, or other local subdivision of government to enter into agreements with private practicing physicians and dentists under which, in consideration of the payment to them of a relocation allowance of not to

exceed $250 per month for 3 months and the actual cost of travel and transportation of the physician or dentist and his family and household effects to the new location, such physician or dentist will agree to move to and engage in the practice of his profession in such area for a period of not less than 1 year: *Provided, however,* That no such contract shall be made with any physician or dentist unless such physician or dentist shall be admitted to practice by the State authority having such jurisdiction of such new location: *Provided further,* That each such applicant subdivision shall contribute $100 to the total cost of such relocation allowance, travel, and transportation costs of each such physician or dentist and his family obtained by said applicant."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist in its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 20.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 22: On page 18, line 3, insert the following:

"War public works (community facilities): For an additional amount to enable the Federal Works Administrator to carry out the functions vested in him by titles II and III of the act of October 14, 1940, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1531–1534 and 1541), $50,000,000, to remain available during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, of which amount not to exceed $2,250,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, including the objects specified under the head 'Defense public works (community facilities)' in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, and the joint resolution approved December 23, 1941 (Public Law 371)."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 22.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri moves that the House insist in its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 22, and yields to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LANHAM moves that the House recede in its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out "$50,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$25,000,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, this amendment has to do with title 2 of the act with reference to defense public housing for the duration. That title has to do, not with housing itself, but with community facilities, which make the houses available for living purposes for those who work in these various production plants. The appropriation for the purpose of these community facilities in the early stages of this legislation was equal to one-half of the amount appropriated for the housing itself. In the later legislation $600,000,000 was authorized and appropriated for additional housing with no appropriation whatever for community facilities. Then there was an additional authorization of $300,000,000 for such housing and an authorization, with reference to the entire $900,000,000, of $200,000,000 for the community facilities. Now, of that $200,000,000 authorized, only $50,000,000 has heretofore been appropriated. In my judgment the entire amount specified in the Senate amendment is necessary. We have a message from the President in that regard. In accordance with the testimony which has been brought out before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds concerning the necessity for these funds, personally I believe that the entire $50,000,000 should be appropriated, and that would make the total amount appropriated only one-half of the authorization for such purposes. Rather than have the conferees go back and insist further on their disagreement to any amount for these community facilities, because I assume that to insist further means to strike out the item, I have offered this amendment which would appropriate $25,000,000, which is certainly as little as they can possibly get along on. These various plants of production cannot be carried on and the workers simply will not go to them for their labors unless they have some decent facilities available to them.

I hope that taking at least a part of a loaf rather than having further insistence upon striking out the whole item, thereby jeopardizing our war industries, we will agree to this amendment providing for the $25,000,000 for this purpose.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I come from a section of the United States where that condition which you have described is perhaps more acute than in any other section of the country. I know the necessity that is bound up in this particular item and in the amendment which you have offered. I hope the House will accept it.

Mr. LANHAM. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Michigan.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in the beginning of our involvment in this war we had to authorize and in some instances, actually appropriate colossal sums of money, oftentimes with very indefinite and vague estimates from the bureaus and departments as to what ultimately would be needed. That was true in the field of plant construction, cantonment construction, and it was true in the field of munitions and in all realms of activities where the Government had to go out and suddenly go into the market and build and construct and purchase for this colossal war. As the situation has rounded out, we have gotten our bearings and we are trying to pull in wherever we can and salvage funds where possible. As a result of that, the War Department upon careful analysis of their needs came to the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House and stated:

We find, due to favorable conditions in the war front, due to unforeseen contingencies, that we have 12 or 13 billion dollars that we are not going to have to use. We are going to hold it. We are not going to use it unless the Congress tells us in the future to use it for something else.

Now, in the field of community facilities, they were much needed and we had to authorize and we had to appropriate large sums of money. We have appropriated heretofore, I am told, $350,000,000 for community facilities. Some very fine work and some very needed work has been done along that line, but this agency has remaining, unallocated and unobligated, from 10 to 13 million dollars. Our committee feels that that fund will certainly carry them over the peak. We were not shown any situations of very acute need that could not be taken care of with this fund which they have.

In addition to that, we know that the war picture is changing, and we think it very advisable, and we think that sane and conservative fiscal policy for this Congress to pursue is to hold just a little bit, put the brakes on a little bit until we know where we stand. If future needs show dire and urgent need for additional funds for community facilities on war activities, that cannot reasonably be supplied by the communities and cannot be taken care of by this balance that is remaining, then the Congress will still be here.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that the hearings on which this was granted do not show a single individual instance of where there is pressing need?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. No hearings in detail at all.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. On the other hand, due to closing factories and the closing down and slowing down of the war-production effort, we are finding a great many places where we have not only put in housing but community facilities that are not needed at all.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. Such testimony as might have been adduced with reference to this was before the Senate committee and not before a House committee. May I say further to the gentleman that these facilities are needed for housing construction which has already been done.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. Did I understand the gentleman to say there were from 10 to 13 million dollars in unexpended balance?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Thirteen million dollars remaining on their hands, still unallocated.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and agree with the amendment.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question now recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri that the House insists upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 18, line 15, insert "Work relief in Puerto Rico: For all expenses necessary to enable the Federal Works Administrator to carry out the provisions of S. 981, Seventy-eighth Congress, entitled 'A bill to assist in relieving economic distress in Puerto Rico by providing work for unemployed persons and for other purposes', if and when enacted, fiscal year 1944, $9,000,000, of which not to exceed 5 percent shall be used for administrative purposes."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 23.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 21, line 6, amendment No. 26, strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$100,000,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 26.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the next amendment in disagreement is amendment No. 35. I ask unanimous consent that we pass over this amendment pending disposition of a subsequent amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman plans to pass it until at least amendment No. 38 is disposed of?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Amendments 37 and 38.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 35 be passed over until amendments Nos. 37 and 38 have been disposed of.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 37, page 24, line 1:

"FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

"Administrative and operating expenses: For an additional amount for operating and administrative expenses under the Federal Crop Insurance Act, approved February 16, 1938, as amended, fiscal year 1944, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944, $2,428,656: *Provided*, That the proviso contained in the paragraph headed 'Federal Crop Insurance Act' in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944, is hereby repealed: *Provided further*, That no part of the appropriation shall be used for or in connection with any contracts of insurance executed prior to July 12, 1943, except for the liquidation of insurance on crops for 1943 and prior years, or in connection with any new contracts of insurance for winter wheat of the 1944 crop except with the holders, on July 12, 1943, of 3-year contracts."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the committee I am instructed to move that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 37.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEMKE moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 37 and concur in the same.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota, the proponent of the motion.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I feel that this is a very important amendment. I feel that very many Members who voted to kill crop insurance believe it was a mistake. We can correct the mistake and we ought to at this earliest possible moment. This crop insurance has been virtually self-supporting in the last few years. It made its big mistake the first 2 years. That is the time the large deficit was created. It is only a toehold, and if you vote to discontinue it you will deny that toehold of protection to the farmers to carry on their farm operations. There is no insurance company that will undertake this risk; there is no private insurance of any kind that they can get. It is an experiment, but they are entitled to a sufficient length of time to give it a fair trial.

Let us not in this emergency, especially when we need crops for war purposes and to feed the starving of Europe, forget that we owe some responsibility to see that the farmer is protected in producing crops. Especially since if this item of appropriation is not adopted, the farmers who planted winter wheat will have no protection.

Let me remind you further that you, through the Government, have agreed to insure the crops for 3 years. We hear a lot of lip service about foreign nations breaking treaties; you are breaking the contracts you made with your own people, the wheat farmers. You are breaking your promise to one-third of the population of this Nation. I therefore beg you all to give this matter serious consideration and to concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. Is not every argument that is applicable to every other business applicable also to the farmer?

Mr. LEMKE. The gentleman is correct, and a whole lot more. While the risk is great the farmer will ultimately take care of that risk; the premiums will be adjusted so that they will cover the loss. The farmer can be protected and this insurance finally becomes self-sustaining. Again I suggest to you in all earnestness that we correct the mistake we made and let us give the farmers an opportunity at least for the 2-year additional period to test this experiment. You, through the Government, have made these agreements with them. I feel it is a disgrace and a blot upon the fair name of our Government to violate a contract it has made with its own people.

I thank you for your attention.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, this matter has been thoroughly ventilated in the course of the consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1944. There were at least three, and if my memory serves me correctly, four record votes in opposition to its continuation. The fact developed that on a single crop, wheat, over a period of 4 years it cost the Federal Treasury $41,000,000. On wheat alone our administrative expenses were $24,000,000. The excess of the indemnity over the premiums was $17,000,000; so that on wheat alone for 4 full years' insurance we expended $41,000,000. There has been no information to indicate that that is a defensible and justifiable expenditure. It would be far better to let this matter go over for the present and let the Committee on Agricultural Appropriations examine into it when they begin their hearings sometime in February or March. Certainly testimony will be adduced before the committee, and if the picture looks as black as it did when we first examined into it earlier this year then there would be no warrant for continuation, as here proposed.

As to the point made by the gentleman from North Dakota concerning the good faith of the Government on 3-year contracts, let me remind him that every one of those contracts carried a cancelation clause whereby they could be reduced from 3 years to 2, or from 2 years to 1, or they could be canceled entirely. There is no particular point in belaboring the argument that there is involved here a question of bad faith because there is none. The fact remains that we have lost $41,000,000, an average of $10,000,000 a year on a single farm commodity. Before we go into this matter again, having ordained to liquidate this Corporation, we ought to examine into all the facts with less haste, and with

more time than is available on the floor today. So I suggest that the motion of the gentleman from North Dakota be voted down.

It might be possible to so reconstruct the actuarial system under which the Crop Insurance Corporation has been functioning so that premiums collected will balance the indemnities paid out. Certainly this is the least that we should expect of such an operation and to bring this about, it would be necessary to amend existing law and confer additional powers upon the Corporation. This can be carefully examined when hearings begin on the agricultural appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1945 and I suggest that we therefore reject the motion of the gentleman from North Dakota and postpone action until such further investigation can be made.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I want to call your attention to the situation in North Dakota in case you decide to take the position you did some time ago. In North Dakota the Federal crop insurance was not only paid for by the farmers of North Dakota but they have a reserve fund of 1,600,000 bushels in that State, and if the House persists in taking away the Federal crop insurance this 1,600,000 bushels will disappear to the loss of those who created this reserve.

North Dakota, it will be remembered, is one of the most risky States in the Union so far as crops are concerned. We are subject to long droughts and sometimes to floods. You cannot build any organization as large and as extensive as the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation and measure it by the success of 1 year.

When the farmers of North Dakota entered into those contracts and signed up for 3 years, they understood that they were to be protected. They did not read the clause in that contract that the Government would not make good unless the Congress appropriated the money. They did not understand that at all. They went ahead with the understanding that it was a valid contract and they have made good. They are not asking alms from anyone. They have in that fund enough so that the cost of our insurance will be reduced next year.

This contract reminds me of Amos and Andy. Amos was the adviser to Andy. Andy was being sued on a contract. Amos asked, "Let me see that contract." He looked it over and he says, "You are stuck." He says, "Andy, always remember that the big letters in any contract give you something and the little letters take it away." The farmers did not read the small letters in that insurance contract but assumed that a contract made with the Government would be carried out by the Government. The issue here today is, Will Congress keep faith with those who till the soil?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the motion of the gentleman from North Dakota should be adopted. The argument of those who are endeavoring to suspend crop insurance is just like the old Negro woman who carried insurance on her husband's life for 20 years and then dropped it because he did not die. The farmers need this crop insurance, and you should vote for the continuance of crop insurance in the interest of food production.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, whenever the question of an appropriation for crop insurance has been under consideration in the House there has been a difference of opinion as to the attitude of the farmers of the country toward crop insurance as indicated by their utilization of the Federal facilities. In my own State the number of policyholders has increased from year to year in the river counties due to inundations by the Missouri River during the crop seasons. But in the remainder of the State, and in the Nation as a whole, applications for crop insurance have steadily declined, as shown by the acreage statistics reported by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. The last hearing before the subcommittee on the Agriculture Department appropriation bill for 1944, on page 895, shows that outside of the first year, when the program was getting under way—that was in 1939—the following acreage was insured. In 1940, 108,000,000 acres; in 1941, 104,000,000 acres, a decline of 4,000,000 acres; and in 1943 the last cline of 14,000,000 acres. There is the year available, 90,000,000, a further deevidence that the acreage under crop insurance has steadily decreased from 1941 down to the present year.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. I wonder whether or not the decrease in insurance, however, has kept pace with the total reduction in acreage of all crops. I assume the gentleman has that information.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We have under cultivation this year the largest acreage in history, but notwithstanding the increase in total acreage under cultivation there has been a decrease in acreage under insurance.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. Supplementing what our chairman has said, I call attention to the testimony given by J. Carl Wright, manager of this crop-insurance operation, before the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations a few days ago, which brings the monetary situation up to date. He says:

> Since the inception of the crop-insurance program, indemnities amounting to $73,000,000 have been paid to wheat and cotton farmers who lost their crops. Of this amount, $50,000,000 represented premiums which were contributed by growers, the remaining $23,000,000 representing a net loss on insurance operations. Due to heavy losses from floods in the spring of 1943, this loss may reach $30,000,000 by the time operations for the 1943 crop year are completed.

I thought that ought to be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the gentleman from Indiana has at this opportune time introduced these statistics, because that was what I was leading up to.

I am not opposed to crop insurance. I favor crop insurance, when properly administered. It was my privilege, as chairman of the subcommittee on the agricultural appropriation bill, to bring in the first appropriation for crop insurance ever passed by the Congress and to be a member of the subcommittee that has reported out each appropriation for that purpose.

I may say, parenthetically in passing, that in all these years no one in my State ever at any time, in letter or in conversation, mentioned the subject of crop insurance to me, either in approval or disapproval.

We expected losses in the beginning. At the end of the first year sufficient data were available to put crop insurance on a permanent and self-sustaining basis. But every succeeding year the loss has continued.

Millions of dollars were lost to the Government every crop season. Every year when the representatives of the Crop Insurance Administration came before the subcommittee we said, "Gentlemen, you will have to adjust your premiums to your losses."

The Federal Government is willing to pay the overhead, it is willing to contribute the administrative costs, which run six million, seven million, and eight million dollars a year. It is willing to give that to the farmers in crop insurance, but you ought to charge enough premium to take care of your losses. You cannot expect the Federal Government indefinitely not only to furnish the overhead but every year to take millions of dollars out of the Treasury to keep you gentlemen going and charge it up to the taxpayers.

Every year they assured us: "We will do that. We will increase the premium until it takes care of the losses." But they always came back with the usual losses and insufficient premiums.

The year before last we warned them, "Unless you raise your premiums enough to take care of your losses, there is danger that the Congress will discontinue the program. In time of war, when all these losses must be paid out of borrowed money, the country will expect those who insure their crops to pay enough to cover the losses as they do in fire insurance or any other form of insurance."

Again they disregarded their promise to make it self-sustaining, and the House is familiar with what happened. For the time being, at least, all insurance was discontinued.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, I favor crop insurance. I think it is a valuable if not indispensable adjunct to agriculture. But it should not ask more than administrative expenses out of the taxpayers. We have losses up to this time, as indicated by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW], of over $30,000,000, and this

does not include the $8,000,000 donated annually by the Government for administrative expenses.

It is not crop insurance that is bad, Mr. Speaker, it is the administration of the system. And in order to remedy the one defect and restore insurance under proper safeguards, it is my intention to offer an amendment which would remove the objection. With the consent of the House, I will submit here an amendment which I propose to offer when the parliamentary situation permits. Unfortunately, under the rules of the House, it is not in order to offer the amendment at this point. Later, if it is in order, I propose to offer this amendment providing that after the Government has paid the overhead and without charging any of that expense to the farmer, the premiums shall be sufficient to meet the bare losses, just as they do in the case of fire insurance, automobile insurance, life insurance, or any other form of insurance.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. May I ask the gentleman if the original plan for crop insurance did not contemplate a possible loss of $100,000,000, and if that is not the amount that was authorized to be appropriated?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Certainly not. It was anticipated that rates might need readjustment in the light of the experience of the first year. It was thought they might be too high or too low, but there was no thought of making the farmer a mendicant and a burden on the United States Treasury indefinitely. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that any man who advocates indefinitely taking money out of the Federal Treasury and giving it to the farmer as a gift, without compensation whatever, is not a friend of the farmer. He is rendering the farmer a disservice. Because eventually the taxpayers of the country will be so turned against such a system as to make reasonable payments from the Treasury for administrative purposes impossible. It is inconceivable that $100,000,000, or any other such amount, can be taken out of the Federal Treasury indefinitely, and given to any class. The entire country will eventually rise against any such proposition as that.

Mr. LEMKE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. I have great respect for the chairman's opinions, but I want to ask him, in all fairness, whether we did not go through a stage of spending rather than conserving, and whether any other Department of Government spent any less than this Department has. After all, we are just asking you to give us an opportunity to find out what the final premium shall be, and then it will be self-sustaining.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is no difference of opinion between the gentleman from North Dakota and myself. The farmers are willing to pay for what they get. They are willing to pay an adequate premium on crop insurance, just as they are willing to pay adequate premiums on every other type of insurance they enjoy.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas, a member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. In fairness to my chairman, I want to ask him if he is not against the Lemke amendment and for sustaining the Senate amendment, and it is possible for him to bring in his suggestion here at all?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is correct. The amendment is not in order at this time. It may be later on. If the question should be divided and the House should recede, concurrence with an amendment would be in order. But it is not in order to offer it now. I welcome any proposition that is self-supporting.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I just wish to ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee this question in connection with the question submitted by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], assuming now that the original intent was that we did desire for the Government to absorb some expense or losses, we will call them, would it not be fair to say to the extent we did assume that in the original intent, it was to be limited by an experimental trial. The experiment has occurred. The losses have proved disastrous and too burdensome on the Treasury and we are now doing away with it. Is that not about the situation?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; we gave them 5 years. In the 5 years they refused to adjust it. And because they refused to adjust it the House last spring, when the question came up, discontinued the appropriation. Many of us are willing to resume it if it is brought in on a self-sustaining basis.

Mr. HOBBS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, do I understand that the gentleman intends to offer an amendment at the appropriate time in this consideration of this bill similar to his bill, H. R. 3785?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. When it is in order.

Mr. HOBBS. Now? Today?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in order that the proposition can be understood I ask unanimous consent that the proposed amendment be read at this time for information.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the amendment will be read by the Clerk for the information of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the last amendment insert a new proviso, as follows: "*Provided further*, That the total payments hereunder for losses on any one of the crops insured hereunder shall not exceed the total of premiums charged and collected for insurance on such crop and no part of this appropriation shall be used (1) to pay the salary or expenses of any person who acting singly or in collaboration with others in determining the terms and conditions upon which any crop is insured hereunder shall prescribe any such terms and conditions as will not save the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation or the Government from liability for an amount in excess of the total of the collected premiums, or (2) to pay the salary of any person who, acting singly or in collaboration with others, authorizes or directs any person or group of persons or the Board of Directors of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to proceed in violation of (1) herein."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under this amendment the Federal Government would continue, as in the past, to pay all costs of administration, an expense which last year approximated $8,000,000, and there would be no charge against the farmer for any of that expense. But it would require premiums sufficiently high to pay the losses. In any private company the insured pays a premium that not only pays all losses but also pays cost of overhead and a profit besides.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. But you do plan and mean to offer that amendment as soon as you can?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If it is in order.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. If the motion to recede and concur offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] prevails, then the gentleman's motion would be in order; would it not?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; it would be in order under these circumstances: If there was a division of the question and the House should first vote to recede, then on a motion to concur, this amendment would be in order.

Mr. COOLEY. Would the gentleman from Missouri ask for a division so that the gentleman's amendment might be in order?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman to ask for it. Unfortunately I am in charge of the bill and am precluded by the rules from making the request for that purpose.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the question and for a vote on the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion. The motion is for the House to recede from its disagreement.

The noes appear to have it.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

Whereupon, upon division, there were—ayes 53, noes 96, and the motion was not agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mis-

souri, that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 38: On page 24, beginning in line 18, insert:

"LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

"For an amount in addition to the $20,000,000 appropriated under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944, and for the same objects and subject to the same conditions, $6,500,000; and the limitation of $60,000,000 in the authorization and direction to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make advances, contained under this head in said act, is hereby increased to $97,500,000."

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PACE moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 38 and concur therein with the following amendment: In line 22, after the figure "$6,500,000", strike out the remainder of the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I hope that I may have the close attention of the membership because I think I am right on this.

When the regular Agricultural Department appropriation bill was passed in July, the appropriation for administrative expenses for Farm Security was reduced from about $40,000,000 to $20,000,000. It was recognized that not too much was known about what the effect would be, and this language was put into the bill and is the law now:

During the first 4 months of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, the Administrator of the War Food Administration may, in his discretion, authorize expenditures from this appropriation at a rate in excess of one-twelfth of the total appropriation during each of such months.

Mr. Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, accepted that as authority from the Congress and he has operated the Farm Security Administration on the basis of $26,500,000; that is, he has expended at that rate under our direction and authority.

As you know, you have a special committee of this House which has been investigating Farm Security for several months. We have gone into this matter very carefully. We have decided that not only should we grant this $6,500,000 but that we are rather obligated to grant the $6,500,000. On the other hand, the committee is not in agreement that you should approve the next provision in the bill, which is to increase the loan money from $60,000,000 to $97,000,000. That was the reason we endeavored to divide the question and that is the reason I offered this amendment to increase the administrative expense from $20,000,000 to $26,500,000, when it was about $40,000,000 last year, and then to strike out the increase in loans.

Most of you know we have a new Administrator of Farm Security. This gentleman is Mr. Frank Hancock, a former able Member of this House, a man who believes in sound business principles and economy. As a member of this special subcommittee I have learned a great deal about the past operation of Farm Security and can assure you it is going to be an entirely different administration under Mr. Hancock; it is going to be operated on sound business principles; it is going to be operated in an economical way. I think it would be most unfair to Mr. Hancock to let him go into office—he has been there only 2 weeks—with his hands tied, for the former Administrator, under the authority of Congress, expended administrative funds at the rate of $26,500,000. We should not let Mr. Hancock take over the office without adequate funds to at least hope to do a reasonable job. We have spent months investigating this program. We are very anxious to economize and put the Farm Security Administration on a business basis. I hope my amendment will be adopted. It means an increase in administrative expenses from $20,000,000 to $26,500,000, and it means you refuse to grant the additional $37,000,000 for loans. We feel that because of better conditions on the farms it should not be necessary to make so many loans; that there will not be as much need for rehabilitation loans. We have stopped the expenditure of money for these resettlement projects. A great part of the loan money in the past was used for resettlement projects. I feel that if we grant the $6,500,000 increase for administrative expenses and decline to increase the loan an additional $37,000,000, we will have set up a sound business program.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On what grounds does the new Administrator, whom I understand has been in office only 2 weeks, justify an increase in administrative expense of $6,500,000?

Mr. PACE. It is justified on this simple statement, that since the 1st of July they have operated on a basis in excess of $20,000,000; in fact they have spent at the rate of $26,500,000. If Mr. Hancock gets no additional funds he will have to operate without an adequate administrative organization; he cannot possibly function efficiently and we cannot expect him to do a good job.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is not the scope of his operations being materially reduced?

Mr. PACE. They will be, but it will take time to do that. The personnel has already been reduced, we are told, from 20,000 to 10,000. We think he is going to do a good job.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield that I may ask a question?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will not the gentleman from Missouri yield him 1 additional minute that I may ask him a question?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Georgia 1 additional minute.

Mr. TABER. It seems to me, and I want to ask the gentleman how he feels about it, that if they have reduced their personnel from 20,000 to 10,000 they should be able to get along on the amount that is carried for this current year, because they have been doing a lot of foolish things even this year, things that I know of, things that waste money. I am wondering if we really would not be better off and if they would not be better off if we left them without the money and let them get their padding trimmed down where it ought to be.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman from New York, Mr. Hancock, has advised our committee that he will not be able to do a good job, such as we expect of him, unless we do give him the additional $6,500,000. We should give some thought to the investment which the Government now has outstanding, which must be protected and collected. As of June 30, 1943, Farm Security had outstanding $401,000,000 in rural rehabilitation loans and $161,000,000 in tenant-purchase loans. In addition we have ordered the prompt liquidation of these resettlement and cooperative projects, in which over $71,000,000 has been invested.

So the new Administrator must not only press for increased food production, but he must also supervise, liquidate, and collect these outstanding obligations and investments, which total nearly $650,000,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON], a member of the committee.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, it was the intention of the subcommittee when we permitted the Administrator to have a little more than the monthly ratio for the first 3 or 4 months that the year's total should be the amount we submitted.

After they spent this allowable amount to which the gentleman from Georgia refers, they thought they had a mandatory provision as they interpreted it before our committee, that they should keep up that ratio throughout the year. It was our distinct understanding in the subcommittee we were giving them out of the total for the year an extra amount for the first 4 months to help curtail and liquidate. It was not our intention at all to increase the amount for the year as a whole.

That makes me think of the Fair Labor Standards Act when time and a half was to be a penalty on the employer, then later it was decided that was a social gain for labor. They knew that we intended to let them have that extra money only for 4 months. Now, after they have spent it, they say they thought that was the ratio for the year. That was not the intention of the subcommittee, and I think the gentleman's motion should be voted down.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I believe that all the Members know that I have not in the past favored the land policies of the Farm Security Administration. Unfortunately, money which we had formerly appropriated for rural rehabilitation purposes has been used for the purpose of purchasing large tracts of land throughout the length and breadth of the country. I have not approved of the

unauthorized, the unwise, and the illegal use of Federal funds by this agency, I have not approved of their 99-year lease policy, neither have I approved of their cooperative farming efforts and the many other experiments they have undertaken; but that is all a thing of the past.

As the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] said, we now have a new Administrator, not a screwball nor a crackpot, nor an unknown person, but a man who served here in this House with great distinction and ability, a true American who believes in the ancient traditions of our great Government, a man who does not believe in these experiments which the F. S. A. has conducted. At the head of F. S. A. is Mr. Marvin Jones and under him as Administrator is Mr. Frank Hancock. You and I know that neither of these men will tolerate the things that have been tolerated in Farm Security.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to second what the gentleman has said about our confidence in Marvin Jones especially, although I am not so well acquainted with the other gentleman. We may depend upon them to carry out the right policy of the vital Farm Security Administration business.

I want to save and salvage everything possible which is worth while in F. S. A. For that purpose I also request the gentleman to throw his influence, now that some of these great projects are to be liquidated, although mistakes they may have been, in favor of a process so that these projects shall be liquidated in such a way the Government will not be the loser thereby. Let us furnish the present level-headed managers enough to safeguard the public interest.

Mr. COOLEY. We have more than a billion dollars of Government money invested in this agency and if it is held down to $20,000,000 a year that is only a 2-percent margin upon which to operate, supervise these loans, and to care for and supervise the property. It seems to me that in good faith and in good morals we should provide Mr. Jones and Mr. Hancock with this $6,500,000 because if it is not provided you will completely wreck and ruin the agency.

Mr. HOBBS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. May I ask the gentleman if this is not a synopsis of the situation: Mr. Hancock and his Administration is now faced with the problem of financing the F. S. A. for the remaining 6 months of this fiscal year with $6,750,000 because money has been siphoned off at the rate of $26,500,000 for the operation and expenses of the first 6 months?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HOBBS. Therefore, instead of having $10,000,000, he will have only $6,750,000 and it is an utter impossibility to continue operating F. S. A. on any such reduced budget.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. KERR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. I understand the $6,500,000 is for continuation of the administrative expenses?

Mr. COOLEY. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. And that there is available the sum of about $60,000,000 for crop loans to certain classes of farmers?

Mr. COOLEY. For rural rehabilitation loans $60,000,000, and for tenant purchase loans $30,000,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is the policy of the present Administrator with respect to disposing of these properties?

Mr. COOLEY. I am glad to have the opportunity to answer the gentleman. Congress has time and again expressed its desire to have all these projects liquidated, but unfortunately the Farm Security Administration has been advised by its legal adviser that the property which it is now in possession of can only be disposed of in two ways. One is in furtherance of rural rehabilitation, for which it was originally purchased, and the other is to have the property declared surplus property and disposed of by another agency of the Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the legislation which our committee will report, we will provide other ways for the disposal of this property. Some of it will not lend itself to subdivision. For instance, in Arizona they have the Casa Grande project in which there are five or six thousand acres of land which can be operated only by heavy and expensive machinery. All of the buildings are located close together and it will have to be sold as a unit. We will have to authorize that sale.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Part of this administrative expense then will be used for the purpose of liquidating these properties?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right, and I hope our committee can early in the next session of Congress provide some legislative machinery for an expeditious liquidation of all these properties.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the Treasury Department, under present law, dispose of that property not used by the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. COOLEY. If it is declared surplus property, that is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is disposed of by the Treasury Department?

Mr. COOLEY. I think that is the department.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. In view of the fact that the appropriation carries $60,000,000 for rehabilitation loans, since this is a smaller amount this additional money for administrative expenses will not be required.

I should like the chairman of the subcommittee to explain to the House what work must be done in connection with carrying on this program; that is, supervision of crops and loans, and the amount of money that is involved in this other than the $60,000,000 that is going to be put out.

Mr. COOLEY. My friend knows that I cannot possibly do that unless the chairman gives me additional time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman.

In answer to my friend from Missouri, I will say that they now have on the books of the agency millions upon millions of dollars worth of outstanding loans which must be serviced and collected. Those loans have accumulated. I do not know the total, but I would guess a half a billion dollars, perhaps.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I would ask the gentleman if it is not something near a billion dollars.

Mr. COOLEY. I say, in loans probably half a billion, and in property to be supervised probably another half a billion. We were amazed to find that this agency had taken money which we had appropriated for rural rehabilitation purposes, which we thought was being used for operating loans, and had acquired and is now in possession of more than 2,000,000 acres of farm land in America. The F. S. A. is the greatest landlord this country has even known. It is operating large tracts of land through corporations. But that is neither here nor there. We are faced with actualities. I know that Members of this House want to preserve this property and want to preserve and perpetuate the things that are good about the F. S. A.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. If we do not give them the money for administrative expenses, the Farm Security Administration will not be in position to take care of the loans that are now outstanding and also the thousands of acres of real estate which must be looked after by the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I supported what might be called the liberal view in reference to farm security, but did not the gentleman vote against it when we had it up before?

Mr. COOLEY. No, I never have. The gentleman has misunderstood my position. I have always favored the objectives, the worth-while objectives, of the Farm Security Administration. I sought an investigation more than 2 years ago

in an honest effort to save the Administration from itself.

I knew it was engaging in practices which were unauthorized by Congress, and had the investigation been conducted when I first requested it we could now have adopted basic legislation. Our committee is now investigating it. We have found the situation to be just about as bad, if not even worse, than it has been pictured to Congress in the past, but we hope it is going to be better. We believe it is going to be better. We have every reason to believe Frank Hancock and Marvin Jones will make something good out of this agency and will save the Government's investment.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. If we do not appropriate this additional $6,500,000, is there not danger that we may lose very many millions more in deterioration of this property, loss of collections, and so forth?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct. That is borne out by the evidence of Mr. Hancock and by the request of Mr. Jones. I think that in good faith Republicans and Democrats alike should give these two former colleagues of ours an opportunity to straighten out this agency.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I have been detained and have not heard the debate. As I understand, the matter presently before the Congress has nothing to do with the Production Credit Association?

Mr. COOLEY. No, it has nothing whatever to do with the Production Credit Association.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this organization could very easily get along and get along satisfactorily with the funds that have already been appropriated. I call your attention to page 370 of the hearings in the Senate. It appears that over the last 2 years the Farm Security Administration have cut down their force from 17,000 to less than 10,000 at the present time. They say right on that page that there are 50,000 farm families to whom they intend to make loans. With 10,000 employees, that means 5 loans for each employee to look after. With the other things that they have outstanding, 450,000 families are involved in one way or another, as they claim right there on that page, that means only 45 people for each individual to deal with.

Why is it that a fellow who works for the Government cannot do that much? It is kind of hard work for me to see. While I want to see these people have money enough to liquidate properly those things that are being liquidated and to look after them properly, I really believe this House ought to insist on the employees of the Government doing something. I do not see any reason why we should need so many.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman's arithmetic indicates that 1 employee would be charged with the responsibility of looking after 45 borrowers. Is that right?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. Would the gentleman want to undertake the responsibility of supervising 45 farms? That is what is involved. Each one of those borrowers is engaged in farming.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman mean that these folks who borrow the money have to have a representative of the Farm Security Administration supervising their farms?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not mean to say that all of them do, but certainly some of them do.

Mr. TABER. If they do, there is no sense in our trying to make farmers out of them.

Mr. COOLEY. Many of them are in desperate need of supervision. They are in the low-income brackets in agriculture in America.

Mr. TABER. We have the Extension Service with a very large force in each county, and they ought to be able to get along on what we have provided.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. One of the expenses of the Farm Security Administration is that they had an organized socialized medicine program within the Farm Security Administration. They were in advance of the Senate bill. That is one of the things they had in their comprehension.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman will yield, may I ask my friend from Kansas if he believes that our former colleagues, Mr. Jones and Mr. Hancock, will go in for socialized medicine?

Mr. TABER. That shows there are places where they can economize.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. The men that are favoring this amendment are men that favored farm security in toto in other fights.

Mr. COOLEY. And I think the men that are opposed to it are the ones who are opposed to the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. TABER. I think that the House should turn down this motion and insist on its disagreement.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I hope very much that the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] will be adopted by the House. If it were possible in a parliamentary way to get consideration for the loan fund referred to in the conference report, I would be glad to offer such an amendment, but it is not. I am deeply interested, as many of you know, in this agency, because for a number of years I was connected with it, and yet, as a Member of Congress, I realize that some of the criticisms of the Farm Security Administration have been wholesome and in certain instances thoroughly constructive. I am sure every Member of Congress is watching with interest the work of Mr. COOLEY's committee, and we appreciate the hard work they are doing. It is now apparent that we cannot legislate constructively without a permanent policy on this subject, without legislation that gives us the basis for planning for the future of this agency. But here we have the question of what we are going to do about the tremendous assets that are in the hands of the agency, almost a billion dollars, and I submit it is not good business for us to reduce their appropriation to the point where they will have to close one-half of all the county offices now serving 2,900 agricultural counties in the United States. There are about 2,100 county offices in the Farm Security Administration serving the farmers who borrow from them in all of the agricultural counties.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Does not the gentleman feel that 5,000 employees or 10,000 employees are enough to service 2,100 offices?

Mr. HAYS. I cannot agree with the gentleman from New York on that point for this reason. They have already reduced the organization from about 15,000 employees to less than 10,000. Now, any further reductions will have to be at the county level. I think the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] was correct in what he said in answer to the gentleman from New York regarding the supervision that is necessary if we do this thing in a businesslike way. But we simply cannot afford to reduce any further the number of men who are dealing at the grass roots with this work and with this important food-production program. If we do, we are going to lose money and we are going to lose food production.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he can advise the House whether or not the Farm Security Administration has readjusted its program to stay within the limit of $20,000,000 for the annual operation.

Mr. HAYS. They have not been able to so far. They were not told to do so by the Congress. I think that has been alluded to. As a matter of fact, in the agricultural appropriation act it was specifically authorized that they continue as they were at the rate of $26,500,000 for administrative expenses.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I would just like to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that with

the money they now have on hand, without this $6,500,000, they will have to close about half of the county offices?

Mr. HAYS. That is my main point in this argument. If the House wants 50 percent of the Farm Security Administration offices closed in the counties, then they should vote down the motion and support the motion of the gentleman from Missouri. But I cannot believe you are going to do that. There has been no serious criticism of the work of the home demonstration agents or the home management supervisors, as they are called, in the F. S. A. There has been no substantial criticism of the work of the county supervisors. These are unsung heroes in the agricultural program. They have helped thousands of farmers to step up their production and they have done a grand job. If you look at the record of the increase in the amount of milk, eggs, and meat all over the United States you will see that these men and women have worked quietly but effectively through rehabilitation loans giving credit and supervision where needed, and it has been a tremendous achievement.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. Last spring, when they filed their estimates before the Committee on Appropriations, they estimated they would need this $6,500,000 in order to administer a program that carries with it an additional $37,500,000 in loans. Now, the thing I am puzzled about is this: I think that some of this loan money should be allowed if we allow all of the administrative expenses. Now we did not authorize the Farm Security Administration to spend this extra money during the first quarter. It was simply permissible; so do you not think if we allowed part of the expenses, a part of the loans should be allowed at the same time?

Mr. HAYS. I am sorry time does not permit me to go into that. I cannot agree that the elimination of additional loans means that we can further reduce this administrative expense.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON].

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to serve on this special committee of seven investigating Farm Security, under the very able leadership of our colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. He has done a remarkable job. He has been fair. This committee, on all essentials, has seen practically eye to eye.

I am in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]. Actually there is a division of 2 parts of this amendment in disagreement. The one part I am sure we would make a mistake if we denied that $6,500,000 for administration, when you realize that so much of this is in many of the projects that do require supervision. Someone asked a question a little while ago "Does it take 1 man to supervise 45 farms?" I say "Yes." If you would visit some of these projects and see some of these poor people, you would see that they need not only supervision now but many of them will always need supervision if they are to be farmers.

Now, we have heavy loans there and it is going to take a lot of supervision to try to liquidate. We are going to liquidate a lot of these projects. It is going to take a lot of money for proper supervision, to recover many times this $6,500,000 we are asking for.

Do you know, they have even gone out to some of the plantations of the country and have taken over sharecroppers and made a lot of heavy loans to the sharecroppers which should have been done by the plantation owner? You will find that in the hearings before our Special Committee Investigating Farm Security. We have to do a lot of supervision to recover many of our loans.

I know that Farm Security has been in bad repute and much of that bad repute has been justified. We should not allow any more money for loans at this time. I think we are already allowing too much. Some of it has gone into good places, but much of it has been absolutely wasted, year after year increasing loans to some farmers who have practically repaid nothing. I say to you that Farm Security Administration has put more pseudo farmers into debt than it has taken out of debt. They have taken them from the mountains and solicited them to come down and take a farm. They have taken them away from their environments and put them on farms to make a living when they did not know anything about farming. It has taken a lot of supervision. They have done a lot of injustice to many farmers on many of these projects. They have taken farmers who were struggling along and yet were solvent and had equities in their places. They were put onto some of these projects that were not ready for them and have gone deeply into debt.

I can see one of those farmers now, when he said, "I have been here 4 or 5 years." He said, "I now owe the Farm Security $7,500 on this place, and I see no hope of ever making it."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman feel that this request for $6,500,000 is in all respects reasonable, when we realize the enormity of the task to be done?

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Absolutely. Do not forget we have a new Administrator, Mr. Hancock. He has impressed me greatly. I think he is a high-type man. He came forth with a clean-cut statement. He said he was not afraid of any questions, and we asked him some pretty blunt questions as to his policies on a lot of these collectivism farms, and he said, "We are going to liquidate them if I have anything to do with it."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I think this subject has been pretty well covered. I am a member of the Cooley committee which is now investigating the Farm Security Administration. That investigation is almost concluded now, and the committee will be making a report, possibly within the next few weeks. I would not presume to say anything on this matter, except that our investigation, I think, has given the members of the committee a very good idea of just what problems are facing the Farm Security Administration at this time.

As has already been said, the committee does not favor an increase in loans of $37,000,000 but after talking with Mr. Hancock, the new Administrator, and with Marvin Jones, the War Food Administrator, we do feel that an additional amount of $6,500,000 is justified for administrative expenses.

This agency has property which must be liquidated, to the value of more than a billion dollars. Much of it is in pretty bad shape. It is going to take a great deal of work to untangle some of the difficulties that have arisen in connection with the maladministration of this program.

In addition I think that at this particular time there is greater need for supervision by the Farm Security Administration than would ordinarily be the case. We have a war food program; we are trying to get every farmer to produce the maximum amount of food; and these farmers under the Farm Security program, with proper supervision, will produce more than would otherwise be the case. I think for this reason we can better justify expenditure at this time for that supervision than would ordinarily be the case. That does not enter into the question as to whether or not we should continue the Farm Security Administration or whether we ought to have a supervised program after this time. I think we ought to have it at this time in order to produce the maximum amount of food in this country and for that reason I feel it would be a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy for us to refuse this additional appropriation. I think we would lose far more than the amount involved if we do not appropriate the money and make it possible to get adequate administration and supervision at this time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the amendment might better have recognized the reduction in the loan authority that is proposed by the dropping of the second half of the Senate amendment. Obviously, there will be $37,000,000 that will not be lent but which was proposed to be lent when this $6,-

500,000 was set up as an addition to the administrative fund. We have a very practical problem, however, and that is that we are appropriating money to take care of money that the Government has already lent. I have a copy of the hearings which were held by the deficiency committee on this item when it was before the House. At page 691 I find that in 1938 there was a total outstanding loan obligation of $128,000,000, that the administrative expenses allowed for servicing and collecting loans was $12,070,000; in other words, approximately one-tenth of the outstanding loan obligation. That has varied down through the years, but generally it has held fairly close to the 10-percent figure. At the first of the year 1943 the outstanding balance of loan obligations was $418,000,000. If you add to the $418,000,000 the $60,000,000 that is proposed to be lent and then subtract the estimate of collections based on the history of collections the last few years you will find the load of the Farm Security Administration for this year. They should collect about $120,000,000 in principal and $15,000,000 in interest, and at the end of the year be servicing a total of $358,000,000 in loans. Considering that they have used administrative funds at the rate of $26,000,000 during the first part of the year, they have spent a little over $2,000,000 per month. They should have approximately $8,000,000 or $9,000,000 to operate with in the balance of the fiscal year, as near as I estimate, which would be about one million per month, about half of what has been used thus far this year. Does the gentleman from Georgia have any more accurate figures?

Mr. PACE. I should think the gentleman would want to add to those figures as of June 30 $161,000,000 of T. P. A. loans and also include in his figure an amount of approximately $100,000,000 in projects to be managed and liquidated.

Mr. CASE. Projects to be managed and liquidated are of course in addition to rehabilitation loans.

Mr. PACE. So also the T. P. A.

Mr. CASE. So the question resolves itself into whether or not it is good business to give the Farm Security Administration $8,000,000 or $9,000,000 additional for collecting $135,000,000 in principal and interest, and for supervising $358,000,000 of rehabilitation loans plus these items mentioned by the gentleman from Georgia. Personally, I would have reduced the $6,500,000 somewhat in recognition of the fact that we were striking out the proposed addition of $37,000,000 loan capital; but, after all, if we are going to collect this $135,000,000 and service the remaining $388,000,000 we ought to give the agency enough money to do the job.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, a dime's worth of common sense! Nothing else! Dollar-for-dollar value, and then some is what the Pace amendment means.

Here is the situation. Do not blink it! Do not kid yourselves!

For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1943, and ending June 30, 1944, under the leadership of our great Appropriations Committee, there was appropriated $20,000,000 for the administrative expenses of F. S. A. This was a teriffic cut, forcing a reduction of the administrative force by more than 33⅓ percent. We realized that this cut posed a problem that might prove impossible of solution. So, in the same law, and under the same leadership, we authorized Judge Marvin Jones, our National Food Administrator, if he found the cut to be too great, to run F. S. A. as if its appropriation for administrative expenses were $26,500,000. The administrative force of F. S. A. was reduced from 15,000 to less than 10,000 but Judge Jones found that even after this and other savings had been effectuated, it was necessary to spend at the rate of $26,500,000 for the year in order for F. S. A. to continue to function in any worth-while way. Therefore, to carry on during the first 6 months of the present fiscal year there has been already expended $13,250,000 out of the total appropriation of $20,000,000 for the whole year, leaving a balance of only $6,750,000 available for administrative expenses for the remaining 6 months. The administrative functioning of F. S. A. having been already reduced to the irreducible minimum, we must either increase the appropriation or quit. To quit means the loss of many times the cost of increasing the appropriation. Judge Jones was, and is right, it is "penny wise and pound foolish" to try to run a $100,000,000 business with less than a skeleton staff. So he retained a skeleton staff. Now, instead of retaining it, some advocate cutting the skeleton in half.

F. S. A. has loaned a lot of money that must be collected. Everybody who is familiar with farming knows that the best investment any farmer can make is in his riders to supervise the crop-making and the collections. Private business all over the United States in the Farm Belt knows that the financier needs at least one supervisor or rider to every 30 one-mule farms. Properly supervised farms produce at least twice as much and pay more than twice as much. F. S. A. supervisors, because of false economy, are each given 45 farms to supervise: 50 percent more than experienced, successful farmers have found wise and profitable. Is it any wonder that F. S. A. is not making the collections it should? But, unless the Pace amendment prevails each F. S. A. supervisor must be given 90 farms to supervise! It is physically impossible for them to do their job on 45 farms. It is also financially foolish. But if you wish to see the cash returns from F. S. A. farms dwindle toward the vanishing point, force F. S. A. to make the vain gesture of requiring each supervisor to supervise 90 farms!

Frank Hancock is good but neither he, nor any other man can do the same essential job which, with strict economy, has cost $13,250,000 to do, for $6,750,000!

The way to enable F. S. A. to get back the money it loaned is to provide more supervisors, not fewer. We had just as well write off as lost every outstanding loan, as to make supervision a joke by doubling the work-load of every supervisor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me this appropriation is amply justified on two grounds: First, in order to recapture the amount of money owed the Federal Government. If we do not give Mr. Hancock the staff he needs we are going to lose many, many times the amount involved. These loans must be serviced and it is good economy to appropriate the amount needed for that purpose.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman permit me to put in the RECORD the correct figures on that? I have received these figures from the Farm Security less than 10 minutes ago.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. PACE. As of June 30 the outstanding rural-rehabilitation loans were $401,000,000 and tenant purchase loans $161,000,000, making a total of outstanding loans of $562,000,000, outside the value of the numerous resettlement projects.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The figures the gentleman gives are conclusive evidence this appropriation is needed and is necessary.

The other point I want to make is that we need production of food now like we have never needed it before. About the only way we can get additional production is from the small farms. Those of us who have visited the Farm Security farmers know that in order to get greatly increased production they must have supervision. In my district the Farm Security Administration has gone into a section that was formerly operated as a coal-mine district. The coal-mining company moved its equipment. The Farm Security Administration got these people located on small farms and, as has been stated, taught them how to become good farmers. They have done an unusually good job. If you take supervision away from those farmers who have not had experience in farming until recently, they will not produce to their maximum capacity. So, in the name of getting increased production I think we ought to give this appropriation to the Farm Security Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN].

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, this House created a special committee in the Committee on Agriculture to look into the problems of farm security. Most of the

membership of that committee has spoken here today and they have told this House why they think this six and a half million dollars in administrative cost should be carried in this bill.

As has been stated here, Farm Security was in a bad way under the administration that formerly obtained. Marvin Jones took over the operation of Farm Security. Mr. Baldwin has ceased to have any connection with Farm Security, and his notions of carrying on that organization are out. We now have an ex-Member of this House, an able man, in charge of that organization, liquidating some of the things which this Congress said should be liquidated, and trying to bring order out of chaos.

This special committee has gone into the subject, and after careful study, as has been told you by the other members of the special committee, has decided that Mr. Hancock and Mr. Jones should have this six and one-half million dollars to carry on this work in a businesslike manner. I know the membership of the House wants this organization carried on in a systematic, businesslike way. If we do not do that, we are not living up to what we should stand for in this House. I appeal to all the Members to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, from the very beginning I have favored continuation of the Farm Security Administration because of its interest to the farmers of my State which I thought was typical of the farmers in all States of the Union. I do not undertake to justify that part of its activities which gave rise to the investigation of the subcommittee, which has done a fine work in that respect. From every one of the members of that subcommittee you have heard their recommendations.

Mr. Hancock comes from my State. He preceded my brother in Congress and is a resident of my district now. I do not have to say to those who really know him what his qualities are, but I do say that there is not a bit of danger in Frank Hancock wasting $1 of the people's money in the position he now occupies as an Administrator of the Farm Security Administration, or elsewhere. That is supplemented by the fine man we have as head of the War Food Administration, Hon. Marvin Jones. I do not think we are risking one thing in the world by adopting this amendment and granting the additional appropriation of $6,500,000 to carry on this work.

You have heard the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], as supplemented by information furnished by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], give you figures. We know that this amount is necessary. I trust that the House will adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I should like to correct the record. It was stated here this morning that the special committee investigating the F. S. A. had agreed to support the $6,500,000 appropriation for administrative costs. That is entirely correct. It was further stated that the committee had decided to oppose the appropriation of $37,000,000 for rural rehabilitation loans. The majority of the committee felt that the $37,000,000 was not needed, but there were some of us, and I was one of them, who were perfectly willing to follow the recommendation of Judge Jones and Mr. Hancock in their request for the additional amount.

Mr. FOLGER. As I understand, we now have only the other matter before us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have been keenly interested in this agency for a long time. As a member of the Committee on Expenditures I have watched it rather closely. Those "lemons" that accumulated in the Tugwellian era seem to be with us still. We are told that they are in process of liquidation. I am wondering about the method of the liquidators, and whether they take expenses from the main fund. Why can not one man service many more than 45 loans, even though of a different type? One man ought to call on at least five or ten a day. If those farmers need such constant and continuous supervision, they are not the kind of farmers you told us you would select for rehabilitations.

A point I want to make is that although we have Marvin Jones, Fred Vinson, and Frank Hancock, for each of whom we have high regard, how can we expect them to endorse our viewpoint? After being made judges and then assigned to some other job, they can pay but little attention to us as they must reflect the will of the President who appointed them. I am having my own experience these last few days. No, the czar and the O. P. A., they have been told to hold the line. They must do it, no matter what inequities exist. We appeal to them but they can only sympathize with you. They must be the servant only of the one who appointed them. We can expect but little help from them.

Do not say to me that I do not trust Frank Hancock. Of course, I do, but he will have to take the path pointed by his superior. If we could quickly get rid of these Tugwell "lemons" I might be willing to vote money for such liquidation, but we have been a long time liquidating.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. No; the gentleman has whitewashed them sufficiently. We whitewashed mud on yesterday and are still whitewashing today. I am tired of painting ugly things with cheap, white coloring.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. GIFFORD. On whitewashing?

Mr. COOLEY. No. Does not the gentleman believe that Mr. Hancock should be given an opportunity at least to go ahead and know his own personnel?

Mr. GIFFORD. Should I believe Vinson? Should I believe Marvin Jones? Sure, but if they do not do exactly as they are told, they walk the plank, exactly as Chester Davis did.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not think either one of them thinks that much of his job. I do not believe either one of them will bow to the whip of the White House.

Mr. GIFFORD. They do the will of the one who appointed them; the gentleman knows that.

Mr. COOLEY. I am sorry the gentleman does not have much confidence in them.

Mr. GIFFORD. I have full and complete confidence if they could only act their own way, but they must carry on in the manner expected by those who appointed them. Recall the helplessness of Marvin Jones before our committee in the matter of subsidies, and I consider the helplessness of Vinson, forced to hold the line, even though our entire transportation is tied up. He must hold it until ordered otherwise.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia to recede and concur with an amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 103, noes 56.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 39: Page 25, line 23, insert the following:

"Census of agriculture: For all necessary expenses incident to preparation for the quinquennial census of agriculture of the United States, to be taken during the fiscal year 1945, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere without regard to the civil-service and classification laws; construction or rental of tabulating machines; travel expenses; and printing and binding, fiscal year 1944, $650,000, to remain available until December 31, 1946."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 39 and concur therein.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri will not prevail. This calls for $650,000 for a census of agriculture which is required in 1945.

There is no requirement that it be instituted in 1944. There was no testimony that I can find before the Senate Committee on Deficiencies; there is not one iota of information I could raise on this question. The amendment was written in on the floor of the Senate, as far as I can determine from the bill, without any hearings, without any information, and undertakes to jump the gun by a full year by providing $650,000 in 1944 when, under the statute, this census is not required until 1945. In my judgment, this would constitute a wholly indefensible action. I trust, therefore, that this motion will be voted down.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. What does the gentleman think a farmer would do if a census taker came out to take a census during these busy times?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think it is an additional burden. It is in the nature of so many questionnaires with which businessmen in the country are afflicted today. It will impede and impair agricultural production. There is no warrant for it without any testimony to support this kind of an appropriation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is this not an attempt to keep the number of Federal jobs up at a time when we ought to be conserving?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It would appear so, particularly since it comes a year before the statute requires it.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman from New York brought out the point I was going to make of this providing for some more political plums. There is an election on next year. They want to keep them on the pay roll and sweeten the kitty.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I trust that under those circumstances the motion of the chairman of the committee will not prevail.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the situation we find ourselves in is this: The census of agriculture is required by law. If this appropriation is not made, it will not save one single dime. The census of agriculture has to be taken in 1945 because the law says it has to be taken, and the purpose of allowing this appropriation now is simply to give the Census Bureau a good running start and a better opportunity to prepare for the census. It is a matter, I think, of common prudence to allow this to be done, since there will be no saving whatever if this appropriation is denied, and since the law requires the census to be taken. By allowing this appropriation now we will give the Census Bureau a better opportunity to organize its work and to discharge efficiently and economically the task that is imposed upon it by law. I appeal to the House to follow this sensible course and approve the Senate's action.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion offered by the chairman of the committee and I would like to have the attention of my good and capable friend from Illinois. He makes the statement that this census would not be necessary before 1945. The agricultural census now contemplated is one provided for by law and is a census that has been taken for three quarters of a century or more. It differs from the decennial census in that the decennial census is generally taken in the spring of the year, say about April 1, whereas the 5-year census usually begins on or about the 1st of December. Therefore, this $650,000 will be needed primarily for use in preparing schedules and determining the processes and manner in which the census will be taken in order to have it ready to begin on the 1st of December 1944, and if it is to be taken the Director advises it will be necessary to make this appropriation now.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. If it is not necessary to start taking the census before December 1, 1944, why should not the matter be considered by the regular committee and brought in with the appropriation for the new fiscal year, which would be available on the 1st of July?

Mr. HARE. I do not know as I would be able to answer that except the Director of the Bureau of the Census has asked the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate for it in this particular bill. I assume he does so with the hope this bill will be passed in latter part of this year, thinking possibly the regular appropriation may not be passed before next July 1.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When the first agricultural census was ordained for 1939, it was taken in the spring of 1940?

Mr. HARE. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Normally the 1944 census should be taken in the spring of 1945 if there are going to be comparable statistics that have any authentic value to the Department of Agriculture and yet it is proposed, from what they stated in the hearings before the House deficiency committee, that they expect to get on the land in the fall of 1944. I submit to the gentleman, if there were no other reason for voting this motion down it would be the fact that you do not get good comparable statistics as between the fall in one case and the spring in the other, when there is a tremendous shift in the livestock population of the country.

Mr. HARE. I can appreciate the gentleman's viewpoint but the Director of the Census Bureau reasons otherwise. He says there was a time when they took the 5-year census in the spring of the year, but they found that on account of the movement of farmers, particularly tenant farmers, who frequently change their location on the first of January or latter part of December, it was difficult to locate them and get an accurate account of their farming operations the year previous. That is, they would not be able to give accurate information as to the average yield, production, and so forth. But he has found that by taking the census beginning with December 1, before they left the farm, when the acreage to various crops was still fresh on their minds, they would be able to furnish more accurate and detailed information, both as to crop yields, total production, the number of livestock and poultry on the farm.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. No doubt the gentleman has made very careful study of this. I wonder if this is possible, each State, through the State department of agriculture, conducts a census similar to this each year for tax purposes in the various States. I am wondering if, in view of the critical manpower situation, the figures compiled by the State departments of agriculture could be used and thus abandon entirely the need for this appropriation.

Mr. HARE. I could not argue that point. The suggestion sounds reasonable and may have merit, but that would require legislation providing for the change. The appropriation could not handle that. The question is whether or not we will make the necessary appropriation now to carry out the law as it was enacted years ago, providing for an agricultural census every 5 years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri, that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment, and concur in the same.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 42, noes 91.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. It is my impression that amendments Nos. 35 and 36 were both passed over by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. I am very much interested in No. 36 because it provides for an additional amount for the rubber emergency project. He said he would refer back to amendment No. 36, after other amendments had been considered. Has such been brought about, as yet?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Senate amendment No. 36 is incorporated in the conference report and does not come

before us here. May I now ask, Mr. Speaker, that we return to Senate amendment No. 35, in view of the fact that we have now disposed of Senate amendment No. 38. I ask that the Clerk read Senate amendment No. 35.

Mr. TABER. Should we not dispose of this amendment first?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Allow the Chair to remind the gentleman from Missouri that the House voted against the motion to recede and concur in amendment No. 39.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Which is equivalent to insistence. It is not necessary to take a further vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is not necessary, but it is probably customary to make such a motion.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 39.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I now ask that the Clerk read amendment No. 35.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report amendment No. 35.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 35, page 23, line 19: "Department of Agriculture."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we have included an appropriation for the Farm Security Administration, I now move that the House recede from its disagreement with Senate amendment No. 35, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 28, line 2, insert "Development of civil landing areas: For the construction, building, completion, and development of landing areas and public airports, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission as to the availability of manpower and subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Production Board as to the availability of critical materials, including construction previously undertaken by the Work Projects Administration and for all necessary engineering and administrative expenses in the field, $9,907,890, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be construed as precluding the use of other appropriations available for any of the purposes for which this appropriation is made: *Provided further*, That any or all of the foregoing appropriation of $9,907,890 may be transferred to any other Federal agency organized to undertake the work herein provided for either by contract or by force account, and such agency is authorized to proceed with such work."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 40.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion, which I have sent to the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 40.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that has been before this House. It has been pointed out before and probably will be pointed out again that the House has voted upon this matter. But I call your attention to the fact that the last time it was before the Committee of the Whole House, it lost by a margin of 1 vote, and in that particular instance, I think a great many Members of this House were somewhat frightened by the statement that was made on the floor, in which it was said that it was utterly inconceivable that we should again at this time resume operation of W. P. A. I suggest that such statements have no part in this debate. This is an appropriation to the Department of Commerce for the Civil Aeronautics Administration. It is not tied in in any way to the W. P. A. This will be administered by the C. A. A., and when someone takes the floor and says this is an attempt to revive W. P. A., that statement is not and cannot be correct.

I suggest that this is a matter of simple justice, and I hope to point out why it is. Civic officials have, in the common phrase, stuck their necks out on this matter. The Government of the United States has come into communities and suggested that additional facilities should be developed. They have asked those communities to vote bonds and to provide funds so that they might cooperate with C. A. A.

When those local officials have done that then the Federal Government comes along and stops the program and makes it impossible for these fields to be completed. All we want is justice in this matter and nothing else. We have asked only that these communities may be allowed to complete the projects started at Government insistence. May I give you one simple sample and ask you to bear that sample in mind.

Let me cite the case of the city of Beatrice, Nebr. The city of Beatrice, Nebr., had an airport of 160 acres. It was satisfied with that airport. Government officials came along, however, and asked the people of that community to expand their airport for a civilian training program, to get additional land, pay for it, make it available to the Government on a patriotic basis. This they did. They voted bonds for that purpose and increased the size of that airport to 640 acres A contract was awarded. The contractor came in and he plowed up the airport of Beatrice, Nebr. The contract was then stopped and the airport which the city once had is in such shape that a mountain goat could not walk across it at this time. I ask the gentleman from Nebraska if I have overstated the facts?

Mr. CURTIS. What the gentleman has stated is true. The Government stopped the project at a point where the airfield was left utterly useless and at a point where the people's money was all gone. Their airport has been ruined and the Federal Government walked away after ruining it.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. That is a story that goes all through this country. It is true wherever these ports are located. And yet the cry of pork barrel is raised whenever we ask the Government to keep its word to its citizens in such cases and carry out the promises made by responsible Government officials to these communities.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Certainly.

Mr. STEFAN. Is not really this a matter of economy? These airports, many of them, are 90 percent completed. The appropriation of this money, about $10,000,000, will complete them.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes; I believe that is true.

Mr. STEFAN. And make them useful and available not only in the war period but in the post-war period as well.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The gentleman is correct. Let me point out, also, the report of the Merritt committee on conditions in South America showed that four or five hundred millions of dollars had been spent for airports in various parts of the world because of military necessity, yet you cannot appropriate $9,000,000 to complete these airports in this country that were expanded and begun on the basis of military necessity and so designated by Army officials. A special Army officer, Colonel Harloe, was designated to do that work while acting in a liaison capacity between W. P. A. and C. A. A.

Let me point out also that there has been allocated over $40,000,000 for the construction of Pan American air lines to develop airports all over Latin America, yet we hear no cry of pork barrel about that.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Is not the situation the gentleman refers to identical with that of streets, sewers, and other public utilities projects for which bonds have been floated by communities?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Not at all; because the airport projects were all special projects officially designated through specific officers of the War Department designated to pass upon the question of military necessity. Not a single one of these airport projects was started before the military necessity of it had been certified by the War Department. Some of the plans are new, I admit. The bill contemplates enlarged airport facilities in the city of Boston. It is new to the bill, but it is a very large and important airport, essential to the country's welfare.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I do not like the ugly term "pork barrel" and I would not apply it to any of my colleagues, because it carries a certain amount of odium but I do not think we need apologize particularly for a Member of Congress who has a special interest in something that is to be placed in his own district. I think that is understandable. I have no quarrel with that. I am not going to try to make any emotional appeal to Congress to delete this item from the bill because it is "pork barrel." We had this matter up in the House and considered it thoroughly. A list of airports was included in the record. After that consideration the House by a majority of 50 on a roll-call vote refused to include it. In the other body 7 airports were added to that list.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at this point I may include in my own remarks this list of these seven additional airports with a brief description of each, because there is nothing in the hearings or nothing anywhere to give us information about them and we had to go to the departments outside of the legislative branch to find information about them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Boston, Mass.: This is believed to be the East Boston municipal airport site which is now the property of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. A harbor improvement project in the form of a seaplane channel, which was to provide dirt for a fill to enlarge the airport, has been held up by Presidential direction. It is understood that Assistant Secretary of War McCloy made a personal investigation of this site and reached the conclusion the work required to make it useful in the war could not be completed in time to justify the project on military grounds.

The C. A. A. has developed two alternate sites, Bedford and Norwood, each within 15 miles of Boston. The Army Air Forces are using Bedford and the Navy is using Norwood.

There is no mention of Boston in the hearings as being under consideration.

It is believed by well-informed people that the East Boston site lacks the all-around possibilities for development into a major airport. The two new locations offer greater advantages.

Cumberland, Md.: This airport is sometimes known as Wylie Forge, W. Va., which is the actual location of the Cumberland municipal airport. It is strictly a Cumberland project. This project is in the current development-of-landing-areas program of the C. A. A., at the request of the Army Air Forces. Two runways will be provided, the longer of which is to be 5,600 feet. An allotment of $150,000 was approved April 23, 1943.

It is hard to understand why Cumberland wa placed in this report by the Senate committee, as the present development-of-landing-areas project will provide full utilization of the present site.

Battle Mountain, Nev.: Since last spring the Public Roads Administration has built a hard-surfaced flight strip at this point. Battle Mountain is a community of a few more than 1,000 population. The Army Air Forces have never shown great interest in this location, and are believed to have no interest in further development at this point. The new flight strip is not located at the site of the small existing airport and it is possible that the effort begun last spring to provide a large airport here is still being pushed. The present airport is listed as class 1 with lighting. It is a C. A. A. intermediate field and is located on the San Francisco-Salt Lake airway. There were 7 aircraft landings in fiscal year 1943.

No evidence was submitted at this hearing, or the previous one, which established any civil justification for an airport at this location. It is believed that even the proponents of the 6,000 airport program would not advocate any further improvement at this point now the flight strip has been completed.

Winder, Ga., is a city of 3,974 population, located about 40 miles northeast of Atlanta, Ga., within 50 miles of Army or C. A. A. improved airfields at Gainesville or Athens. At Winder there is an intermediate landing field maintained by the C. A. A. on which field there were 103 aircraft landings in fiscal year 1943.

There has been very little activity regarding this site. The Army Air Forces have no interest whatsoever, so any justification would have to be strictly civil. Mr. Stanton advised interested persons May 12, 1943, that there was no military need for a field at this locality and further that all funds available to the C. A. A. for airport development were obligated or encumbered.

A W. P. A. project proposed in 1937 seems to have fallen through due to the inability of the community to obtain title to the lands.

No mention was made in the hearings of Winder, Ga.

Opelousas, La., is a city of 8,980 population, which is located 50 miles west-northwest of Baton Rouge. It is in the low-lying country of central Louisiana and has an elevation of 79 to 80 feet above sea level. There is no airport at present, but a site has been selected and a bond issue for its purchase passed. The money is reported to be in escrow.

In 1939 the C. A. A. district airport engineer approved the location. However, such approval would be of little weight at this date.

Negotiations were at one time opened with the W. P. A. for assistance in the development of the airport. Mr. H. D. Larcade, Jr., testified that these negotiations were dropped because Major General Frank (at that time in command of the Third Air Force) indicated he considered a military airport desirable in this general locality and that Opelousas would be satisfactory. Attempts were therefore made to have Opelousas included in the development of landing areas program. It is believed the C. A. A. did have this site in a tentative listing for the E program which was provided for in the 1943 appropriation. It was never passed by the approval board. Currently it is believed that the Army Air Forces are not now interested in an airport in this location and further, that they do not consider the site suitable for military operations. The estimated cost was testified to as being $885,972.

Holdenville, Okla., is a city of 6,632, according to the last census, which is located 75 miles east-southeast of Oklahoma City. The present airport, which is in class 1, is limited in its possible development because of the proximity of a railroad, a ridge of hills, and the city itself. The maximum expansion possible is to class 3. It is not located on any Federal airway. Except in special cases, all airports being improved for military purposes are at least class 4 with 5,000-foot runways. There is no indication of any military requirement for an airport at this point.

The city was advised by Mr. Stanton, August 9, 1943, that all funds appropriated for development of airports for national defense had been allocated or encumbered. The agitation for use of Federal funds at this point seems to have started in August of 1943. The city has $100,000 available for improvement of the airport.

It is believed the only justification for an airport at this city would be strictly for civil aviation. Any justification is limited, among other things, by the fact the city is not on a Federal airway.

Sheridan, Wyo., already has a class 3 airport which is on the Cheyenne-Billings airway. A project to improve the airport at this city has been included in the current development of landing areas program of the C. A. A. at the request of the Army Air Forces. An allotment of $100,000 was made on September 15, 1943. There is no apparent reason why Sheridan should have been included in the Senate committee's report, as the approved project will take care of any military or civil use.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Not one of these projects is the so-called W. P. A. airports. Two of them are airports upon which work had been performed and two of them are included in the present airport construction program of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The other five are new projects that are supposed to breathe perhaps new life into this proposition. Let us consider just a moment what this is. There is no Budget estimate for it.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Can the gentleman advise the House whether or not because of administrative activity that these cities or towns involved here did vote bond issues for the construction of these airports?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. One of them had a bond issue. Some of them are airports on which Federal funds through W. P. A. had been used and construction has been temporarily laid aside.

Let us look at that a minute. When we got into this war that you heard mentioned several times, we had of necessity to change our national policy on some matters. For this reason there are a great many worth-while public projects that are temporarily laid aside. These airports are not the only ones. There are Federal buildings, there are reclamation projects, our public-roads program has practically been discontinued except insofar as there may be emergency construction for the war effort. Unless they have the O. K. of the War Department or the Navy Department and the War Production Board the road program has been stopped. Why? For three reasons: First, the money involved; second, the manpower involved, and, third, the critical material involved.

So what do we say? We say that on these worth-while projects until we can get this war out of the way we are going to lay these things aside and come back to them later in the post-war period. That will be a splendid starting point for the employment of labor and for the use

of material. That is what these airports will do.

There are only a few airports involved here, but all over the United States they want airports and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I would be the first one to take the Well of this House whenever the opportunity is propitious to proceed with the construction of airports because I want to see our country lined with airports, including small airports in communities where private flyers will have an opportunity to get in their planes and use them. One of these airports put in here by the other body is in a little town over in the State of Nevada that has a population of 1,000. They have already built a landing strip there. They already have a small airport. On that airport last year there were 103 landings during the 12-month period; 103 ships landed on the ground of that airport, yet we are asked here to take labor and critical material and divert it to a program that does not have the sanction of the administration, the Budget, the Army, the Navy, or the War Production Board. They have told us they do not need it and it ought not to be done.

Every one of these projects has been submitted to the Army and Navy and they say they do not need them. They did not request them. If they do need them they can get the funds or they have the funds with which to go ahead.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, now what is the situation? This is the acid test. I repeat, this is the acid test. Are we for conserving nonessential expenditures in wartime except when it involves a project for our own district or our own State, or do we really mean what many of us have been hollering about in the Well of this House, that we want to win this war, we want to conserve manpower, we want to conserve critical materials, we want to conserve funds until we win the war? Are we not on high ground when we go back to our local communities and say to the mayor or city council: "Mr. Mayor, we must have this little airport here and we are going to get it, but we have sent the boys of this community to war, we have sent the dollars of this community to war; we need the labor, we need the material, and you and I, Mr. Mayor, are going to wait until this war is over and in the post-war period when there is more labor, when there is more material and more dollars and we want to give employment, we will come back and give attention to the development of civil aviation and see that our communities have the facilities that they need, but for the present we are only going to build highways, we are only going to build public buildings, we are only going to build schools, we are only going to build community facilities where they are needed for the war.

What did this House do a few minutes ago? By an overwhelming vote it threw an appropriation of $50,000,000 out of this bill for community facilities. What are community facilities? Schools, nurseries, streets, feeder streets, all those things that go around the war plants. What did we do, and very properly so? We said, we are going to hold back a little on those unless the War Department, the Navy Department, or the War Production Board says they are presently needed in the war effort. We are going to wait on those things.

Here we are asked to build airports at places where there is not one scintilla of evidence in this record to show either what they will cost or that they are needed for any purpose. There is no civilian flying to amount to anything. You cannot buy a civilian airplane and you cannot get instruction to fly planes. The only aviation that amounts to anything now is aviation in connection with the war effort. So there is plenty of time to do this.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SNYDER. Has the Air Corps asked for any of these airports?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It specifically said they were not needed for the present war effort.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Does not the amendment provide that these will not be started except by approval of the Manpower Commission?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. But the gentleman knows when you give the authority of Congress and appropriate the money how the powers that be will go to the other end of the Avenue and say: "Here, Mr. Bureaucrat, who are you to put your judgment up against the Congress? The money has been appropriated, the Congress has appropriated the money for this airport. Now, you just dare not build my airport when the Congress has already appropriated the money."

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman I know wants to be fair. He said there were no plans and specifications on these things. The C. A. A. has approved these airports and requested a budget for them. There are plans and specifications. Many of them are 90 percent completed. I know the gentleman wants to be fair about this.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman is quite right. In connection with most of the airports, practically all of them, that we had in the first House amendment that is true. So far as the seven additional ones are concerned we know nothing about them except on two. We never heard of them before except two.

Mr. STEFAN. The plans and specifications and their cost have been reviewed by the C. A. A.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. On some of them, but on many of them not. Let the gentleman take the Senate hearings. There is not even a thing in the Senate hearings about some of these airports.

Mr. STEFAN. Just be fair about the statement.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I want to be fair about it, but why vote for an airport when you never heard anything about it except when the amendment is struck in there by another body? That is the thing that makes some gentleman get up and say that it smells a little bit like that time of the year when you butcher hogs.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Virginia missed a point. This is a safety measure. This is a measure to protect the boys of the United States who go out in training in these Army airplanes. Every day we hear and read in the papers of some disastrous wreck. We are losing men by the thousands who are flying defective airplanes and cannot find landing airfields. This is a safety-first measure.

I wish you had sat with me with General Olds when we were discussing airplanes flying in the mountains of the West, where there are cross-currents of air, where the fliers need a haven, a place of safety to get in when something goes wrong, when an air current strikes a plane and carries it to destruction. The gentleman says we are looking for airports. I will tell you who is looking for landing fields. It is the boys in planes in distress who cannot make a landing in bad weather, in storms and cross winds and snow. They are the men who are looking for airports.

The gentleman talks about an airfield in Nevada, in Nevada where all the mountains are, where a man needs a haven. There is the place we need landing fields.

This is no pork barrel. There is no airport in this bill for my district, but I know the need for these landing fields.

This is a measure to protect the boys who are taken from the farms and cities for training, and put into these planes, boys who do not know how to operate them properly. General Olds said they are not dry behind the ears. When something goes wrong and they must land, what a godsend to see the lights of a good landing field. If you do not believe that that this country needs more airports, read the newspapers. Vote for this appropriation and give these boys safety.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. ROHRBOUGH].

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my approval of this amendment to appropriate funds for the completion of certain airports throughout the United States. It has been pointed out that this appropriation will

serve to complete work on which there has been expended already more than $10,000,000. That sum was not expended by the Federal Government alone. Approximately one-third of it was provided by the several communities represented.

In the case of the airport in my own district, the Harrison County Airport, situated at Clarksburg, W. Va., while the Federal Government has expended a total of $591,975, the sponsors—which means the citizens and taxpayers of that vicinity—have expended as of November 1, 1943, a total of $244,437, or 29 percent of the total sum spent. That large sum has been raised by taxation or donation, and has been paid out in cash. The obligation of the airport was incurred by the good people of that community, and that amount of money was expended by them, under the inducement that the Federal Government would see to it that the project was completed. The citizens of that community were told, in effect, that it was their patriotic duty to promote such an undertaking. They were persuaded that such was of extreme importance in building national defense, in promoting the growth of air commerce, and in defeating unemployment, as well as in the proper development of the community. True, the agreements entered into contained saving clauses for the protection of the Federal Government, but it was very generally implied that such clauses would never be invoked. Consequently, a large sacrifice was made by that community for the purpose of securing something which has not been secured—a completed airport. The adoption of this amendment will aid materially in such completion.

Notwithstanding its noncompletion, the airport of which I speak has been of valuable service already. On it a number of pilots have received preliminary training. It has sufficed repeatedly as an emergency landing field. It serves to bring one air-line service to that community. However, until it is completed to the extent that it can accommodate large planes, it cannot be utilized to its fullest extent for commercial or military aviation. When so enlarged and completed, it will provide a valuable link in commercial aviation, serve as an emergency field for military aviation, and provide facilities for more advanced training of pilots. Being located as it is in the foothills of the Appalachian Mountains, which are regarded as hazardous for flying operations, its position makes it extremely valuable for emergency purposes.

While it is true that this and the other airfields affected by this amendment are not deemed by the War Department as directly necessary to the war effort, yet it cannot be denied that they are of much importance indirectly to that effort. All were designed to fit in with national defense and the development of civil aviation. As has been stated, many are approximately 90 percent completed. While our first job is to win the war, and while at all times I favor sensible economy, yet we must not lose sight of the fact that aviation has developed in an undreamed-of way during these war years, and that we must be taking steps now to meet the situation we shall face when hostilities have ceased. The ending of the war will release thousands of transport planes which will be available immediately for civil aviation. We shall see stupendous expansion in air commerce almost overnight. We shall see shortly congested air traffic unless we build fields in advance to take care of it. Completion of these airports will be a step in that direction.

I do not believe that partially completed projects dealing with streets, roads, highways, sewers, water systems, public buildings, housing, hospitals, or schools, as formerly mentioned on the floor of this House by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], present questions exactly comparable with this one, unless it be as to hospitals—hospitals to care for those who come back sick and hurt. Completion of those I also advocate. But as to streets, roads, and highways, they face no expanded use immediately following the war, and the repair of those already built will be our first problem. As to sewers, water systems, public buildings, housing, and schools, certainly no action is imperative at present, except in certain congested areas. As to all of those problems—whether partially completed or not commenced—how can we build with wisdom until we perceive the spread or centralization of population under the economic conditions which prevail following the war. As to aviation, the expansion is here now, and we know that it will continue. This war has made America and Americans air-minded. We must have ports and facilities adequate for the situation. If we are to keep pace, we must begin now.

If we can spend hundreds of millions for airports in other countries—all of which are not strictly for war purposes, if I am correctly advised, and a great number of which will be given away when this war ends; if we can spend untold millions for our neighbors; then, certainly, we should be able to spend a few millions to promote civil aviation in this country and to promote the interests of those who help pay the taxes to provide for all this spending.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER].

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I usually heartily agree with every position taken by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], who is usually right, but he is all wrong on this aviation question. I hope the preferential motion of the gentleman from New Mexico prevails.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard part of the arguments this afternoon advanced against the completion of these airports which were commenced with W. P. A. funds. Other arguments will be advanced. All of them will be a repetition of the debate which took place last summer when this Senate amendment was before the House for consideration.

I do not think it necessary to spend a lot of time in refuting the various objections which have been raised to this Senate amendment. All of those objections were answered fully in the debates last summer. It appears, however, that certain of our Members are going to oppose this matter anyhow, and I feel that those Members who were not here to listen to the debates at that time ought to know that this matter of completing these uncompleted airports is just a matter of good, common sense.

The Government has already invested money in these airports, and when W. P. A. folded up, some provision should have been made to finish those jobs. Three of those projects are in my district. I have visited all three localities during the past summer. In all three places I know that it is necessary that this airport development be carried out. Unless this is done, money that the Federal Government has already expended will have been wasted.

Eventually, it is my opinion, the Government will spend funds for airport expansion, not only in these three localities—Hibbing, International Falls, and Eveleth, Minn.—but in many other localities. It strikes me as ridiculous to appropriate money to build airports in South America and to deny funds for that purpose in our own country. Such a procedure does not make sense.

It is time that we became air-minded in that we awake to the fact that aviation and airports are the great possibilities of the future. Without airports you cannot have progress in the aviation industry.

Personally, I think aviation is in its infancy, and its future development furnishes unlimited possibilities along lines that will benefit all of the American people. It is not a sectional matter. It is a matter that requires a national viewpoint. The responsibility rests on Congress. I feel certain that our Members here today will recognize that responsibility.

There should be a network of airfields all over this country from East to West and North to South. There is no finer post-war planning program. It will furnish employment for thousands of men, and so will the aviation industry furnish such employment in the building of airplanes.

When the young men now in the armed forces return from World War No. 2 the development of aviation will make possible jobs for them in commercial aviation.

I am supporting this motion to concur in the Senate amendment, and I hope that it is adopted.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, in my service in the House I have greatly admired the gentleman from Virginia. In most instances involving appropriations he has manifested the position I have tried to assume ever since I have been a Member of Congress. I have consistently voted against spending the public's

money unless it is necessary. I am simply amazed, however, at the character of the statement the gentleman made here this afternoon and the loose manner in which he handled the facts of the situation.

First of all, let it be understood once and for all that the amendment which the Senate put in this bill specifically provides and makes a part of the law, that these projects are subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission as to the availability of manpower and subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Production Board as to the availability of critical materials.

This Congress is saying to the Civil Aeronautics Authority, that is charged with the responsibility for completing these airports, "We tell you now and we tell these people who are interested in these ports that there is a war on and that these ports shall be completed and the money expended only when there is manpower and critical materials available."

The gentleman from Virginia completely missed the point when he attempted to compare the completion of these airports with the discontinuance of the public building and road programs. This is not discontinuing a building program, this appropriation is for the purpose of completing airports upon which $10,000,000 has already been expended. Some of these airports are from 60 to 90 percent completed and are lying in a state of incompletion and going to pieces, because the funds are not available to complete the projects.

Take the situation involved in the Winnebago County airport. The United States Government came into that county after this war started. The project was approved by the President in 1942. The people of my county were told that it was necessary for national defense to build a class 3 airport in order to provide landing facilities for bombers that might have to be used for the protection of the Soo locks.

We went ahead in response to that appeal and used the public money to buy the land to build a class 3 airport. We have spent about one hundred and fifty thousand-odd dollars upon that airport. The Government came through and spent a large sum. The airport is about 60 percent complete, and there it sits. We still do not have a class 3 airport. It will go to pieces, and we will still have no landing field despite the expenditure of this large sum. Although the Government is now using that part which is completed in the daily training of 400 civil air cadets, the port is far from complete and does not meet the specifications of a class 3 airport. Is it not fair to assume that as a matter of simple justice the Government will keep its promise to those people? The same thing applies to these other airports. We are not asking for the construction of a new airport. We are asking that you protect the investment that you have already made in these airports and see that they are completed. We are asking that the Government keep faith and carry out its agreement.

I have not heard anybody say "pork" when you spend from $400,000,000 to $500,000,000 building airports in Central and South America, but you yell "pork" when the people you have induced to start these airports come in and ask you to complete them. I do not think the gentleman from Virginia meant that at all. This matter was thoroughly presented to the deficiency committee, was it not? This matter was thoroughly presented to your deficiency committee and the figures given, were they not?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The matter was thoroughly presented to the deficiency committee and debated on the floor, and Congress defeated it by 50 votes.

Mr. KEEFE. Was it not presented to your deficiency committee in connection with this very bill?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There is the roll call. It was defeated by 50 votes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. May I have 3 additional minutes?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Is it not really the fact that after it was presented just 3 weeks ago it came in here and we had a teller vote on it and it was lost by 1 vote—3 weeks ago?

Mr. KEEFE. That is correct. The figure the gentleman from Virginia has referred to is the vote when it came up first last summer. The gentleman from Virginia knows that.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That was July 7.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; that was July 7. May I say that because the House took the wrong action there is no reason why it should persist in maintaining that position?

Members of the House, this is simply a question of justice. That is all that is involved in this situation. We are going to build these airports sometime. It is part of the aviation program; there is no question about that. If you will look at the hearings before this deficiency committee, you will see that many of these airports were approved under Presidential approval after this war started. Just bear that in mind. Every single one of them had the approval of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and officials of the Army or they would not have been started at all.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. It should also be borne in mind for the most part this is not a new appropriation. The money was already appropriated through the W. P. A. and reverted to the Treasury. It has been earmarked once and delivered to these communities and then withdrawn.

Mr. KEEFE. I just wanted to say this to my colleagues, there are a lot of Members of Congress who are interested in this matter, not because they want to see public funds thrown away or misspent. My record in Congress will not indicate that. The votes which I cast will not indicate that I am a reckless spender of public funds. But here is a case where the Government must keep faith with these people. That is all there is to it. They must keep faith with the communities. They have been led into a situation where they have issued bonds and where they have raised their money and spent their money and then they are left out there "holding the bag," as it might be said on the street, with these airports partially completed and with their investment gone and the investment that the Government itself made in these airports threatened with dismemberment because of the failure to hard surface the runways.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. When a man is up in an airplane and is in trouble, does he not have a priority in looking for landing lights at night when he cannot find a place to land?

Mr. KEEFE. Just recently in Danbury, Conn., a bomber in distress landed in one of these incomplete airports, and saved the bomber and the lives of the people on that bomber. That is happening all over this country, gentlemen.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Does the gentleman know that the very night that our late, esteemed colleague, Bill Ditter, met with his death, 18 airplanes went down in that same squall between here and Pittsburgh because they could not find a place to get on the ground?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. And the airport at Danbury, Conn., is on this very list?

Mr. KEEFE. Certainly, it is on this very list.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, first the gentleman from New Mexico and then the gentleman from Wisconsin stood before the House and protested against the use of that word "pork barrel." The gentleman from Virginia did not mention pork barrel. Not a member of the committee even suggested it. Where did you gentlemen conceive the idea that anyone thought there was pork barrel in this?

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I will say the gentleman from Virginia did not, perhaps, use the words "pork barrel" before the gentleman from New Mexico spoke, but I happen to have talked to the gentleman from

Virginia in a conversation in which that term was used, and it has been used by other members of your committee, and it has been designated as pork-barrel legislation. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman flees where nobody pursues. I do not know why the gentleman is so interested in the phrase "pork barrel." Incidentally, I would love to hear him sing "Roll out the barrel," with that beautiful basso voice of his. But nobody has charged him and the others with anything. Let us see, gentlemen, what this whole thing is about. The committee naturally would like to go along with their friends in the House who have these airports to be built in their districts, but it cannot.

Every one of us would like to be generous. There are many other things we would like to go along with in order to assist our friends on both sides of the aisle.

Now, let us look at this thing in just a common-sense business way. Away back, when we had a tremendous amount of unemployment in this country, the W. P. A. started in various communities to give helpful work. Although there were many advantages to come from it, the only purpose of going into these communities on the part of the Federal Government was to provide employment. They went into communities and built all kinds of facilities. They were criticized for it; criticized by the people from these very districts that were benefited by these projects. They wanted to help build airfields, roads, and many different types of projects to relieve unemployment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. In just a moment, please. In those communities they built these airports and employed thousands and thousands of people. Then this House decided that W. P. A. was not needed longer, and they stopped W. P. A. That not only stopped the airports but that stopped roads and that stopped a thousand different types of W. P. A. projects all over the country. There are many projects today that have as much right to be asked for as these airport projects. You Members in your districts, just as in mine, have uncompleted W. P. A. projects that have as much claim on the Federal Government as these airports. But you are not here asking for them. Still, these airport communities are requesting additional funds. It is perfectly possible that many of these can be built by the communities themselves. Those of you who are always crying about the intervention of the Federal Government should try to get your communities to show some enterprise and finish the job.

These projects are no different from other projects that the W. P. A. was forced to abandon as far as necessity is concerned. Those that were different, those that had military necessity were taken over from the W. P. A. and the Army has completed them. They went through the list of W. P. A. projects and selected those that needed to be finished for the purposes of this war, and they are completing and have completed them. But there were 24 of them that had no military necessity. There is no occasion for anybody to go ahead with them from the standpoint of the war. Those are the ones that are before you today—the ones that were marked off the list by the war authorities.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. That is an incorrect statement.

Mr. O'NEAL. Well, a number of them are. Part of them are not; and later I will tell about them. In addition to that there are all over this country today places where airfields would have some military use, in your community and mine. They would serve a better purpose, perhaps, than some of those in this bill. There are many places, from the standpoint of airports for the purposes of this war—I have heard it stated 600 of them, which from a military standpoint are probably more important than those mentioned here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I will try to conclude in about 3 minutes and leave the balance of the time for questions.

Now, with reference to these airports, let us understand this situation. I hold in my hand a sheet. You will see some red marks on it. The ones without red marks, for the most part are the ones that we debated about in July, and which this House defeated by 50 votes. The amount then asked was something over $8,000,000. This went to the Senate in the first deficiency bill, and the Senate raised it to $9,900,000. The list now includes the places marked in red, which have never been so far as we know, presented to this House or to any committee of it, or for which there was any justification. They are merely put in there, I presume, because some Senator has some district which would like to have another airport.

They are asking you and this committee today not only to vote for the ones we rejected before but to swallow these additional airports requested by some Senators without known justification, without explanation, without saying one word about it. That is what you are asked to do today, take them all. I assure you, however, there are hundreds of places in the United States that would like to have an airport even though W. P. A. did nothing for them before. They have as much claim to it today as any of these as far as the Government is concerned. Let me call attention to one thing more and then I shall be glad to yield for questions.

The point came up before the Senate specifically as to whether or not the military or naval authorities passed on these as airports required by the war effort. That matter was debated before the Senate committee and the Senate hearings at page 603 disclose this fact—which has not been quoted before:

Colonel FISHER. Speaking for the War Department, Senator, this morning I took the 24 cases up with our Deputy Chief of Staff after making a screening study of them and it was determined that of these particular 24 we have no military necessity.

Senator THOMAS. Not for any of them?

Colonel FISHER. Not the 24 on this list, sir.

Senator THOMAS. Then how did they get before this committee? Who is sponsoring them?

Colonel FISHER. I really do not know, sir.

Senator THOMAS. Who is back of this list?

Mr. DONALDSON. I can give you the history of this list of projects.

Senator MCKELLAR. I just want to say that when a Congressman wants to come before this committee he has the right to come over.

So all on the list at the time were turned down by the Army. The Army went over them and insisted to the Senate that there was no military necessity for them; yet in addition to that there were seven more added by the Senators themselves running into hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars. They are asking the Government to give this to them simply because it is a good time to get it.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman raised the question as to who asked for these airports.

Mr. O'NEAL. I did not raise the question; the Senate committee raised it.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman knows that the Civil Aeronautics Authority appeared before the Budget requesting the completion of these airports.

Mr. O'NEAL. I read just what Colonel Fisher said about it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman spoke twice about prewar projects to take care of the unemployed. An examination of the hearings before the House committee discloses that 10 of these were authorized by the President in 1942.

Mr. O'NEAL. I will ask the gentleman what W. P. A.'s function was. Was it not entirely to give employment to the unemployed?

Mr. CURTIS. This has nothing to do with W. P. A.

Mr. O'NEAL. All of these I mentioned here were worked on by W. P. A., and the only function of W. P. A. was to give employment.

Mr. CURTIS. This has nothing to do with W. P. A.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I may inform the gentleman that I am familiar with the airports built in the Hawaiian Islands, by W. P. A., for I was connected with it at that time. If that was made work I do not so understand it.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Was it not understood in connection with these W. P. A. projects that they should be completed under contract with the municipalities?

Mr. O'NEAL. I think the municipalities had great benefit given to them and should assume some of the liability.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That was the contract they entered into, to complete them themselves.

Mr. O'NEAL. I hope they may be able to.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I remind the gentleman that the local communities have very large investments in these airports just as has the Federal Government.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-quarter of a minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico. I hope it will be adopted by the House, so that the funds for the completion of these airports may be made available.

One of these airports is located in my district at Pueblo, Colo. This is the Pueblo Municipal Airport and is now in use. However, certain work remains to be completed. Contact lights must be installed, and taxiways and apron constructed. Most of the electrical equipment is now on hand for this lighting. Some of the material for paving the taxiways is available. It is estimated that $70,000 will be required for this work, and this is the amount provided in this bill.

This is an important airport and should be completed as quickly as possible. The city of Pueblo has spent the sum of $125,745.49 on this airport. Federal funds in the amount of $598,398 have been provided, making a total expenditure of $724,143.49.

This airport is now being used for an instrument-training program for pilots under the supervision of the Pueblo Junior College. Pueblo is a regular stop on both the Continental Air Lines and the Braniff Airways. Traffic at this airport is increasing constantly.

In my opinion, the appropriation of money for the construction of airports is one of the most valuable contributions this Congress can now make to the war effort. This is particularly true where airports have been started and are now uncompleted.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-quarter of a minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, in cooperation with my colleagues, I am taking the liberty to respectfully request that you include in the proposed item for completion of airports in the third deficiency appropriation bill, the sum of $885,972, for development of an airport at Opelousas, La., in the Seventh Congressional District of Louisiana, located in the south-central part of the State, about 50 miles by air from the Gulf of Mexico.

It is in order to give you a brief statement as to the reason this airport was not completed. Immediately after the Civil Aeronautics Administration was created and an appropriation of $68,000,000 was approved, the city of Opelousas, La., through the Opelousas Chamber of Commerce, made application for the allocation of funds for the construction of this airport, which application was duly acknowledged and a site was selected and tendered to the Civil Aeronautics Administration, which was inspected and approved by the engineers of the Civil Aeronautics Association on June 15, 1939. Opelousas was included in the development program of the Civil Aeronautics Administration when $100,000,000 and $203,000,000 was subsequently authorized, and to comply with the requirements of the Civil Aeronautics Administration a bond issue of $100,000 was voted by the taxpayers of St. Landry Parish, of which Opelousas is the county seat, which bond issue was for the purpose of acquiring the land. When the Civil Aeronautics Administration did not actually begin construction of this airport, arrangements were being made with the State officials of the Works Progress Administration to build the airport, and all details, plans, and so forth, had been agreed upon, when the commanding general of the Third Air Force at Tampa, Fla., advised the committee of the airport that he would recommend to the War Department that the Army establish a bombing base at Opelousas, La., and as a result the negotiations with the Works Progress Administration were suspended. The commanding general of the Third Air Force was transferred to the European theater, and nothing was done. In the meantime, the Works Progress Administration folded up, and the airport is still uncompleted, notwithstanding that I am informed that 540 airports in the United States have actually been completed.

Opelousas is the second oldest city in Louisiana and is situated in the center of one of the greatest agricultural, oil, lumber, livestock, and manufacturing areas of Louisiana, as a result of being the financial and distributing hub for all of that area, necessarily having a network of paved highways and three trunk railway lines for transportation, with all modern conveniences. It is located in the center of the war industries, training camps, refineries, and enjoys a strategic position in regard to location for the defense of these industries and the Gulf coast. The elevation of Opelousas is 76.9 above sea level, with ideal soil, atmospheric, and climatic conditions for air operations.

Opelousas is designated by the Post Office Department on the air-mail route from New Orleans, Baton Rouge, Opelousas, and west to Beaumont, and other Texas points.

In proof of the fact that Opelousas is strategically located for defense and military purposes, I am attaching two copies of letters from the headquarters of the Third Air Force, at Tampa, Fla., in which Opelousas is located, from which it will be noted that it is stated that the location of an airport at Opelousas, La., would be of military value.

The matter referred to is as follows:

HEADQUARTERS THIRD AIR FORCE,
Tampa, Fla., April 6, 1942.

OPELOUSAS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Office of the Secretary, Opelousas, La.

GENTLEMEN: Your letter dated March 26, 1942, was received and your inquiry and interest in the Air Corps activities are appreciated.

This headquarters has requested the C. A. A. to consider the location of an airport in the vicinity of your city for inclusion in their 1942–43 program. It is suggested that you communicate with Mr. S. E. Travis, Jr., Supervisor of Surveys, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Fort Worth, Tex., as that office may be able to give some additional information.

Sincerely yours,

H. M. JONES,
Lieutenant Colonel,
Adjutant General's Department,
Adjutant General.

HEADQUARTERS THIRD AIR FORCE,
OFFICE OF THE COMMANDING GENERAL,
Tampa, Fla., February 12, 1942.

Hon. SAM JONES,
Governor of Louisiana,
Baton Rouge, La.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: In reply to your telegram of February 11, Mr. Wier and Mr. LARCADE were in my office this afternoon for about an hour and we discussed at some length the question of an airport at Opelousas, La.

These gentlemen were not quite sure relative the necessary procedure for obtaining the airport that they wanted. I gave them the benefit of my limited experience along that line, and they left feeling that the long trip over here was worth while.

This office had already told the C. A. A. that an airport in the vicinity of Crowley and Jennings would have military value and that likewise an airport at Opelousas would be of military advantage to us, in fact more so than at the former place.

Very truly yours,

WALTER H. FRANK,
Major General, United States Army,
Commanding.

I exhibit to you, Mr. Speaker, a copy of the call for the election to authorize a $100,000 bond issue, being a newspaper advertisement signed by the outstanding citizens of our community, from which I would like to quote, wherein the people were told that—

Under the proposed plan, the parish will purchase the land, 800 to 1,000 acres, preferably 1,000 acres, and the Government will build the airport without further cost to the parish. The airport will be turned over to the Government during the war for use as an Army base for training airplane pilots.

And, further:

The United States Army officials have already approved the project and the Civil Aeronautics Administration of the Government has been requested by the Army to build same.

EXCERPT FROM RECENT LETTER FROM C. A. A. ON PROJECT

Of course, I have continued to make efforts to get these airport facilities for my constituents, as the gentleman from the C. A. A. will recall, all during the last 2 or 3 years, but without success up to this time. The last letter I have from

the department—from the C. A. A.—signed by Mr. Stanton, under date of June 28, 1943, says that—

All of the funds which have been appropriated to this Administration for airport development are either allocated or encumbered and no new projects can be undertaken, even though their necessity to meet military requirements has been established, until additional funds are forthcoming from Congress.

That is an excerpt from Mr. Stanton's letter of June 28, 1943.

Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that I have justified the necessity of this airport as being of military necessity, and I am of the opinion that all of the other airports provided for in this appropriation have likewise proven their case, and in view of the fact that lengthy hearings were held by both the House and Senate committees, I feel that this matter has been sufficiently discussed, and that all of the Members of the House are acquainted with the importance and necessity of approving this amendment, and, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I respectfully ask that you give us your best consideration and support of this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SULLIVAN].

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I come from the State of Nevada. The gentleman from Virginia this afternoon specifically referred to the airport at Battle Mountain, Nev. Mention was made of the fact that this airport was located in a town of only a thousand people. In reply I ask what the population of a town has to do with the desirability of an airport. In some places in Nevada the Army has established airports where there are not a dozen people within a hundred miles. The Army is using that place for bombers in order that the flyers may have experience in dropping bombs.

On the airport at Battle Mountain there has been a total of $425,000 expended. The county bonded itself in order to purchase the land. W. P. A. spent a lot of money on it and the Army has built a running strip on this airport and recently the Transport Service of the Air Corps has moved from another airport and is now using the Battle Mountain Airport.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Do I understand that any war use is being made of this airport?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Absolutely. At the present time the Transport Service of the Air Corps is using it.

Mr. Speaker, Nevada is particularly desirable for this class of work by the Army. It is a State of magnificent distances. It is larger in area than the combined area of Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Delaware, New Hampshire, New Jersey, and New York, and, although we have the smallest population in the Union, we are the richest per capita in the United States.

I know that the Members of this House are going to show good sense and make the appropriation called for in the Senate amendment. We are building airports all over the world. Why do we not finish some that have been started in this country that we will own outright?

Mr. PLUMLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I do not like to be picked on, because outside of Maine we are the biggest State geographically and always the best in New England.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Is Battle Mountain on the main air-line route going from San Francisco to Chicago?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes; it is on that main air-line route. I ask my colleague, Mr. Speaker, to support this appropriation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, there is no question of pork-barrel legislation involved in this amendment. It is merely a question of completing vital airport construction which if left unfinished will result in deterioration, waste, and deprivation of the use of these airports by the communities concerned and in emergency cases by our own airmen of the Army and Navy. No manpower problem is involved despite what has been said here by my learned friend the gentleman from Virginia, and no problem of the use of critical materials is involved. The measure specifically reserves the control of war agencies over these matters.

If we can appropriate almost untold millions of dollars for the airport development of foreign nations, we ought to be willing to allocate this relatively modest sum to complete important airports throughout our own country. I hope that the House will agree to this most constructive and desirable appropriation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, an amendment was offered in the House after hearings had been had to insert an item involving $6,756,918 in the bill to cover certain airports on which it was alleged the W. P. A. had entered into contracts with the communities. We are faced with a different proposition now.

Today we are faced with a proposition involving seven more airports, none of which has had any work done on them, none of which has been through the mill and none of which is in a position where there is any obligation on the part of the United States to go along with them. There are a lot of these airports about which there might be question. For instance, the airport at Des Moines is better than two-thirds completed, and planes are landing on it all the time. The airport proposed at Menominee, Mich., is only 25 miles, I understand, from Eau Claire. The one at Eveleth, Minn., is 50 to 60 miles away from Hibbing, Minn.

The airports I am going to refer to now have no claim under this W. P. A. business at all: Winder, Ga., $565,000; Opelousas, La., $885,000; Cumberland, Md., $150,000; Boston, Mass., $500,000; Battle Mountain, Nev., $450,000; Holdenville, Okla., $350,000; and Sheridan, Wyo., $250,000.

As to those, the W. P. A. has had nothing to do with them. There has never been any approval whatever, still they have been put in this bill by the Senate. One-third of the whole amount is for this group of seven. In other words, these are averaging a great deal more than the others because they are brand new propositions and cost a lot of money.

It is difficult to see how we can consider this bill and these things on their merit and have the bill loaded down with an amendment which has no justification along the line of the argument that has most generally been presented here.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman mentioned Boston with a request of $500,000. May I ask the gentleman if any request has ever been made to the Appropriations Committee for that sum of money?

Mr. TABER. Not to our committee, and, as I understand it, not to the Senate. There was nothing in the hearings whatever with reference to it and it has been impossible to find out exactly where that airport is.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is that typical of all the other air stations that the gentleman has mentioned?

Mr. TABER. No, not entirely. Here is one at Cumberland, Md., $150,000, if I remember rightly, where an allotment was approved on April 23, 1943, out of another appropriation and it will be built anyway.

Mr. PITTENGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. Is the gentleman talking about the airport at Cumberland, Md.?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. PITTENGER. I have been up there; I have looked over that uncompleted airport and the Government is letting its property deteriorate because we have not finished it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman should listen to this because it is a fact: An allotment has already been made for the Cumberland airport out of another appropriation to complete it and there is no sense in our doing it twice. Why should we double up on something? Do you wish us to double up?

Mr. PITTENGER. No, and we are not doubling up. The fact that they have made an allotment indicates the correctness of the position of us Members who fought for this appropriation before, and it should stand.

Mr. TABER. An allotment has been made out of another appropriation. Now we appropriate again. Is that not doubling up? Do you want to do business that way? I do not want to go ahead with that kind of a program and for that reason I am going to oppose this motion to recede and concur. It means $9,907,000. Why should we spend that when the whole thing is mixed up. Why should we carry an item in here for it, at a time when the approval of the War Production Board as to the availability of critical materials is required before the money can be spent? We will never get anywhere if we try to manage the finances of the Government that way.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will reject this amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 3598, is the bill the House approved with a cut of 82 percent.

Now there is a proposal to finish 24 airports that have not been certified by either the Army or the Navy. Any one of these airports the Army and the Navy could have immediately upon asking for its completion. They will cost $6,756,000 and there is no Budget approval for them.

Moreover, the joker in this proposed airport program is that seven airports have been added, estimated to cost $3,150,000. How do you know that the amount proposed is correct? Nobody knows. It is just a proposal. So you have that additional sum in here. The camel is getting its nose under the tent for $3,150,000.

If you will read the RECORD of July 7, you will find therein the exact language applicable to the contracts that were entered into between the various municipalities and the Federal Government as to the erection of these airports. Because of the very nature of the W. P. A., going along on an annual basis, it was impossible for the Government to contract for any period of time more than a year. I quote:

> It is agreed that the Work Projects Administration is under no obligation to initiate operations under the project authorization, if approved, not to complete the project, or any portion thereof, if placed in operation.
>
> Further, in consideration of the expenditure of Federal funds on the project, it is agreed if the proposed work is undertaken and operations are discontinued by the Work Projects Administration, the sponsors will take such steps as may be necessary to complete a useful economic unit of the work.

Those are the words in the contract which all sponsors agreed to. This chamber today has echoed from the shout of pork and pork barrel. Since we are talking about dirty linen, let us wash it here. The Members of this House are the very ones who discontinued W. P. A., not the mayor of the city, not the civic-minded committee back home interested in your airport, nor other groups that you seek to console today. No; it was the Members of this House, the Representatives of the people who voted disapproval and who maintained there was not one good thing that came out of the W. P. A. But today they are asking, "Can we have a private W. P. A. for our individual districts?"

My friends, the arguments are against you, the contract is against you, the amount of money unsupported by the Budget is against you. You are very inconsistent in your action. You have cut this bill 82 percent, and now you walk in with a new unapproved item for $9,906,000. Yet we talk about economy. It depends on whose ox is being gored.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the question. I think the motion now is to recede and concur, and I ask that the motion be divided.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that this comes too late, since the Chair had already announced that the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the point of order is well taken.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the House divided, and there were—ayes 131, noes 63.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present and object to the vote on that ground.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. On the announcement of the vote, it appeared that only 194 had voted—22 less than a quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri must understand that some Members in the House may not have voted. The Chair thinks he must count. [After counting.] Two hundred and fifteen Members are present, lacking one of being a quorum.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I came in while the Chair was announcing the result of the count.

The SPEAKER. The Chair had announced that a quorum was not present. Gentlemen coming in after the announcement was made cannot be counted.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How many Members constitute a quorum at the present time?

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and sixteen, and the Chair counted 215.

The roll call is automatic.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As I understand, Mr. Speaker, this vote is on the motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment providing for these airports.

The SPEAKER. The Chair so announced.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 192, nays, 129, answered "present" 1, not voting 107, as follows:

[Roll No. 170]

YEAS—192

Allen, La.	Grant, Ind.	Murdock
Andersen, H. Carl	Green	Murphy
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gregory	Murray, Tenn.
Andresen, August H.	Griffiths	Murray, Wis.
Barrett	Hagen	Newsome
Bates, Ky.	Hale	Norman
Beall	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Norton
Beckworth	Hare	O'Brien, Mich.
Bennett, Mo.	Harless, Ariz.	O'Connor
Blackney	Harris, Ark.	O'Hara
Bloom	Hays	O'Konski
Bonner	Heffernan	Outland
Boren	Hendricks	Pace
Bradley, Mich.	Herter	Patman
Brooks	Hinshaw	Patton
Brown, Ga.	Hoch	Peterson, Fla.
Bryson	Hoeven	Peterson, Ga.
Burchill, N. Y.	Holifield	Philbin
Burdick	Holmes, Wash.	Pittenger
Burgin	Hope	Ploeser
Camp	Horan	Poage
Canfield	Howell	Price
Capozzoli	Hull	Priest
Carlson, Kans.	Izac	Ramey
Carson, Ohio	Jarman	Ramspeck
Chenoweth	Jensen	Rankin
Church	Johnson, Luther A.	Rees, Kans.
Cochran	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Richards
Coffee	Keefe	Rivers
Cole, Mo.	Keogh	Robinson, Utah
Compton	Kerr	Robsion, Ky.
Cooley	King	Rockwell
Courtney	Kirwan	Rogers, Mass.
Crosser	LaFollette	Rohrbough
Cunningham	Lambertson	Rolph
Curley	Landis	Rowe
Curtis	Lane	Sabath
Davis	Larcade	Sadowski
Day	Lea	Sauthoff
Domengeaux	LeCompte	Schuetz
Drewry	Lemke	Scrivner
Durham	Lesinski	Short
Dworshak	Lewis	Sikes
Elliott	Luce	Smith, Maine
Ellis	Lynch	Smith, Wis.
Fay	McGregor	Stearns, N. H.
Feighan	McKenzie	Stefan
Fellows	McMillan	Stewart
Fenton	McMurray	Stockman
Fernandez	McWilliams	Sullivan
Fisher	Maas	Talle
Fogarty	Madden	Thomas, Tex.
Gale	Magnuson	Thomason
Gathings	Manasco	Tolan
Gavagan	Mansfield, Mont.	Vincent, Ky.
Gearhart	Marcantonio	Weaver
Gerlach	Merritt	Welchel, Ohio
Gibson	Merrow	Weiss
Gilchrist	Miller, Mo.	Welch
Goodwin	Miller, Nebr.	Wheat
Gordon	Miller, Pa.	Wickersham
Gorski	Monkiewicz	Winter
Gossett	Mott	Wolcott
Granger		Wolverton, N. J.
		Worley

NAYS—129

Abernethy	Gallagher	Mundt
Allen, Ill.	Gifford	Norrell
Andrews	Gillette	O'Brien, Ill.
Angell	Gillie	O'Brien, N. Y.
Arends	Graham	O'Neal
Auchincloss	Gross	Plumley
Bates, Mass.	Gwynne	Poulson
Bender	Hall,	Powers
Bishop	Leonard W.	Pracht
Bolton	Halleck	Rabaut
Brehm	Harness, Ind.	Reed, N. Y.
Brown, Ohio	Heidinger	Rodgers, Pa.
Brumbaugh	Hess	Sasscer
Buffett	Hobbs	Satterfield
Burch, Va.	Hoffman	Scanlon
Busbey	Jeffrey	Scott
Butler	Jenkins	Sheppard
Cannon, Mo.	Johnson,	Simpson, Ill.
Carrier	Anton J.	Simpson, Pa.
Carter	Johnson,	Smith, Ohio
Case	Calvin D.	Snyder
Chiperfield	Johnson, Ind.	Somers, N. Y.
Clark	Johnson, Okla.	Spence
Clevenger	Jones	Springer
Cole, N. Y.	Jonkman	Stanley
Colmer	Judd	Starnes, Ala.
Cooper	Kean	Sumners, Tex.
Costello	Kearney	Sundstrom
Crawford	Kennedy	Taber
Dickstein	Kilburn	Thomas, N. J.
Dirksen	Kinzer	Tibbott
Dondero	Kleberg	Troutman
Doughton	Kunkel	Vorys, Ohio
Eaton	Lanham	Vursell
Eberharter	LeFevre	Wadsworth
Ellison, Md.	Ludlow	Ward
Elston, Ohio	McCowen	Whitten
Engel, Mich.	McGehee	Whittington
Engle, Calif.	McLean	Wigglesworth
Fish	Mahon	Willey
Folger	Martin, Mass.	Wilson
Forand	Michener	Winstead
Fuller	Monroney	Woodrum, Va.
Furlong	Mruk	Zimmerman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Cox

NOT VOTING—107

Anderson, Calif.	Gamble	Pfeifer
Arnold	Gavin	Phillips
Baldwin, Md.	Gore	Randolph
Baldwin, N. Y.	Grant, Ala.	Reece, Tenn.
Barden	Hancock	Reed, Ill.
Barry	Harris, Va.	Rizley
Bell	Hart	Robertson
Bennett, Mich.	Hartley	Rogers, Calif.
Bland	Hébert	Rowan
Boykin	Hill	Russell
Bradley, Pa.	Holmes, Mass.	Schiffler
Buckley	Jackson	Schwabe
Bulwinkle	Jennings	Shafer
Byrne	Johnson,	Sheridan
Cannon, Fla.	J. Leroy	Slaughter
Celler	Johnson, Ward	Smith, Va.
Chapman	Kee	Smith, W. Va.
Clason	Kefauver	Sparkman
Cravens	Kelley	Stevenson
Cullen	Kilday	Sumner, Ill.
D'Alesandro	Klein	Talbot
Dawson	Knutson	Tarver
Delaney	McCord	Taylor
Dewey	McCormack	Towe
Dies	Maloney	Treadway
Dilweg	Mansfield, Tex.	Vinson, Ga.
Dingell	Martin, Iowa	Voorhis, Calif.
Disney	Mason	Walter
Douglas	May	Wasielewski
Ellsworth	Miller, Conn.	Wene
Elmer	Mills	West
Fitzpatrick	Morrison, La.	Whelchel, Ga.
Flannagan	Morrison, N. C.	White
Ford	Myers	Wolfenden, Pa.
Fulbright	O'Leary	Woodruff, Mich.
Fulmer	O'Toole	Wright

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Schiffler for, with Mr. Mills against.

Mr. Randolph for, with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Schwabe for, with Mr. Cravens against.

Mr. Voorhis of California for, with Mr. Kelley against.

Mr. Flannagan for, with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Elmer for, with Mr. Robertson against.

Until further notice:

General pairs:

Mr. Cullen with Mr. Knutson.

Mr. Jackson with Mr. Shafer.

Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Reed of Illinois.

Mr. Morrison of Louisiana with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Klein with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Dilweg with Mr. Hartley.

Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Dewey.

Mr. Maloney with Mr. Jennings.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Chapman with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Hill.

Mr. Bland with Mr. Arnold.

Mr. Byrne with Mr. Ward Johnson.

Mr. McCormack with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Hart with Mr. Miller of Connecticut.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Clason.

Mr. D'Alesandro with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Gavin.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. Sparkman with Mr. Mason.

Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Towe.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.

Mr. Tarver with Mr. Talbot.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Martin of Iowa.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Rizley.

Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. Fulbright with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Hancock.

Mr. Disney with Mr. Phillips.

Mr. TIBBOTT changed his vote from yea to nay.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 48: On page 32, line 15, insert the following:

"That the section of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1944, approved July 12, 1943 (Public Law 133, 78th Cong., p. 22), which authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to purchase United States Treasury War bonds for the membership of the Shoshone Tribe of Indians is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed, with the consent of the business committee of the Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming, to purchase one United States Treasury Series E War bond of the denomination of $500 for each member of said Shoshone Tribe according to a roll of said tribe prepared as of July 12, 1943, and approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and to pay the total cost of the bonds so purchased out of the principal of the judgment fund of said tribe in the Treasury. Each bond shall be registered by the Treasury Department in the name of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in trust for the enrolled member of the Shoshone Tribe for whom purchased and shall be held by the United States until the date of maturity, whereupon said bond shall be redeemed and the proceeds thereof paid to the Indian owner free of any trust or restriction. In the event of the death of the Shoshone owner the proceeds of said bond at maturity shall be distributed to his devisees or heirs or next of kin as provided by existing law. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to grant permission to the county chairman of the War bond purchase program of Fremont County, Wyo., in which county the Shoshone Tribe resides, to include the total amount of bonds purchased for the members of said tribe in his quota of War bond sales.' "

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 48 and concur therein.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 49: On page 33, line 22, insert the following:

"BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

"Water conservation and utility projects: For an additional amount for water conservation and utility projects, fiscal year 1944, including a total limitation of $800,000 for surveys, investigations, plans, and specifications, and administrative expenses in connection therewith (of which not to exceed $30,000 shall be available for departmental personal services), as authorized by the act of August 11, 1939 (16 U. S. C. 590y and 590z), as amended by the act of July 16, 1943 (Public Law 152), to remain available until expended, $2,800,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 49 and concur in the same with an amendment which I have sent to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 49 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

"In lieu of the sum of '$2,800,000' named in such amendment, insert '$700,000'; and in lieu of the sum of '$800,000' named in such amendment, insert '$200,000.' "

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I make a preferential motion, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: On page 34, line 8, strike out the figure "$2,800,000" and insert the figure "$1,400,000."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has not made a preferential motion. He has made a motion to recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur in the same, and a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment is already pending.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I make a preferential motion, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITE moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 49 and concur in the same.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] to make a unanimous-consent request.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr.

Towe] be granted indefinite leave of absence because of illness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is one of the most important appropriations, as I see it, carried in this bill. What the Government must have at this time is food, and this deals directly with the production of food. This amendment in the bill is to finance the construction and completion of small irrigation projects by the cooperative operations of both the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of the Interior. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who spoke this afternoon, said among other things: We must have food and the best way we can get it is from the small farmers. This amendment of the Senate that I am supporting goes directly to that situation, to finance the small projects that are already surveyed. There is $800,000 carried in this bill for surveys and investigations in order that we may proceed with the program that has been worked out by the Department of the Interior.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Is it not true that this fund of $2,800,000 which was incorporated in the deficiency appropriation by the Senate will carry out further investigations in line with the request made by the War Food Administration for such action?

Mr. WHITE. That is correct. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. And is not an appropriation of this sort really a saving of money, because it will pay for itself many times over in the years to come?

Mr. WHITE. This thing will pay for itself in two ways. It will pay for itself by being reimbursable and it will add new wealth and new tax income to the Government. It will establish new communities and do all the things for the development of this country that has been done by the Bureau of Reclamation in the past.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not also true that many of these small irrigation projects have already been begun? That is to say, they have been in the course of progress for a long time and it is going to require very little more money and very little more labor to complete them so they will reach the stage of production?

Mr. WHITE. That is the situation in the Western States. We have an organization set up in the Department of Agriculture to handle one of the most important activities of the Government—the War Food Administration—and that is the production and distribution of food. They have taken this into consideration, and provided a program which I am going to read to the House:

It is apparent that every effort must be made to increase agricultural production this year and for 1944 and 1945, since the need for food is inevitably going to exceed our ability to produce it and supplies available for civilians will continue to decline.

Finally it should be noted that food is in a category by itself insofar as the war and post-war situation is concerned. The minute the war has been won, production of direct military items—ships, tanks, guns, airplanes, etc., can be suspended. No such action can be taken with food. The demand for it will continue at even higher levels for at least 2 years after the war is won. Consequently, in appraising the timing of projects for expanding food production, at least 2 years should be added as compared with projects for the expansion of direct military production. In other words, if projects for expansion of production of direct military items are ruled out, if such production will not come into being until after 1945, projects of the expansion of food should not be ruled out unless they will not come into production until after 1947. The importance of the continuing post-war demand for food should not be minimized because our ability to supply food to freed countries and even to the civilian populations of enemy countries in the immediate post-war period will have a vital bearing upon the chances for a lasting peace. Moreover, because of the time lag in agricultural production we cannot afford to wait until the war is over to develop post-war food production programs.

It is evident, therefore, that it is essential to press into production every possible acre of land in the Nation. Our present food production resources in established areas already are operating at capacity and the only other means of increasing output are through development which will permit more intensive cultivation, such as irrigation projects.

The 18 Western States afford many excellent opportunities for expanding production of the foods in greatest need, such as dry beans and peas, potatoes, and dairy products. Through irrigation project development, production of these items can be increased in certain and stable amounts without sacrificing output or other essential crops and livestock products.

II. THE FACTS CONCERNING THE $800,000 FOR INVESTIGATION

Principally because stop-orders had been issued against most reclamation and water conservation projects a year ago, Congress appropriated only $964,000 for Bureau of Reclamation investigations, in spite of the fact that the Bureau had sought $2,220,000 for this purpose, and the Bureau of the Budget had recommended $1,200,000.

Now under the impetus of the War Food Administration demand for irrigation war food projects, the Bureau of Reclamation is confronted with the greatest demand in history to expedite the investigation and processing of water conservation and irrigation projects. For this purpose it has the smallest appropriation in years. The result is that unless additional investigation money is made available the irrigation war food program will suffer greatly. Scores of worthwhile irrigation war food projects throughout the West cannot be brought to the attention of the War Production Board, and therefore cannot be approved, constructed, and put to growing war food crops.

Already the Bureau has suspended or deferred surveys and investigations on 103 river basins and projects, on which work had been scheduled for the fiscal year. Also, there were 28 other projects which the Bureau was unable to schedule for lack of funds. Every Western State was affected. Not only is the war food program being injured, but unless additional funds are made available many trained survey and investigation crews will have to be released during the remainder of the fiscal year 1944 and their particular skills lost to the Bureau.

III. FINAL DECISION WILL BE UP TO THE HOUSE CONFEREES

The House conferees on H. R. 3598 (the deficiency bill) should be urged to recede and concur with the Senate committee on these 2 items. This course will be necessary if we want to keep faith with those with whom we have promised to share our food supply until the ravaged and starving countries of the world have been able to rehabilitate their agricultural production and can again become self-supporting insofar as food is concerned. The facts are that the 11 Western States today lack 40,000 carloads of food annually of being self-supporting in foodstuffs. The Pacific war demand will make the situation much worse before it gets better.

I wish some of the Members could go with me into some of these big irrigation districts in the West and see what they are contributing to the Nation's war-food supply.

You will see trucks rolling in from these irrigated lands with great loads, cans of cream, trucks loaded with butter rolling to the cars from the creameries; meat being loaded into refrigerator cars from the packing plants; you will see the wonderful production of food that is coming out of these irrigation districts that have already been established.

The appropriation for reclamation in the bill is right in line with the program of irrigation and reclamation that has done so much and is doing so much in this war emergency to furnish food that is needed in the war effort. Pork, beef, butter, eggs, and every kind of food is to be produced by this program; and I ask your support of this motion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the question, and I ask that we vote immediately on the question of receding.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House recede from its disagreement with the Senate amendment?

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the motion was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on the question of receding I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may ask for a division.

The question is, Will the House recede from its disagreement?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were ayes 40 and noes 48.

So the motion to recede was rejected.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The SPEAKER. The House has refused to recede.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to further insist.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE. The first question for division was a division on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]. The House has refused to recede on the division of that motion. Then it seems to me that the question recurs on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to recede and concur with an amendment. On that motion I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks for a division of the question. The House has already refused to recede. Therefore, it would be rather anomalous if we had a division of the motion of the gentleman from Missouri, and voted again on the question of receding.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I insist on my motion that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE. Since the motion which was offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] was a preferential motion as against the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], I question whether or not the gentleman can then move to insist. The vote, it seems to me, must recur on the motion previously pending, which was the motion of the gentleman from Missouri to recede and concur with an amendment. A division of the question is entirely different when two different propositions are before the House. The House has refused to recede on the dividing of the question offered by the gentleman from Idaho, but has not refused to recede on dividing the question offered by the gentleman from Missouri in his original motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has moved to insist on disagreement to the Senate amendment. The Chair believes there is nothing to do at this time but to put the gentleman's motion.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri, that the House insist on its disagreement.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, may I say with regard to that, there appears to have been a misunderstanding on the part of certain Members. I think we should take this back to conference.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri, to insist on the disagreement of the House to the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico), there were—ayes 70, and noes 39.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am confused as to what the question is. Will the Chair restate it?

The SPEAKER. The motion to recede was voted down. The only motion the gentleman from Missouri had left, therefore, was to further insist on the disagreement to the Senate amendment. That is what we are voting on now.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Did the gentleman from Missouri withdraw his motion to recede and concur with an amendment?

The SPEAKER. He did not; it was not necessary. Because of the fact that a motion to recede had been voted down, a second motion to recede was not in order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. The motion to recede and concur with an amendment having been displaced by a motion to recede and concur, and this motion having been divided so that we voted on the motion to recede alone, the only motion that could possibly be made would be the one the gentleman from Missouri did make, that the House further insist; is that correct?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has so stated.

Mr. TABER. Then if we do not vote to further insist, the House will not be in a position to act on this amendment.

The SPEAKER. That is a matter about to be decided by those who vote on this roll call.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. It is too late; the Chair has already announced that a quorum was not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 223, nays 75, not voting 131, as follows:

[Roll No. 171]

YEAS—223

Abernethy	Brehm	Clevenger
Allen, Ill.	Brooks	Cochran
Allen, La.	Brown, Ga.	Cole, Mo.
Andersen, H. Carl	Brown, Ohio	Cole, N. Y.
Andresen, August H.	Brumbaugh	Colmer
Andrews	Bryson	Compton
Arends	Buffett	Cooley
Auchincloss	Bulwinkle	Cooper
Bates, Ky.	Burch, Va.	Courtney
Bates, Mass.	Burgin	Crawford
Beall	Busbey	Crosser
Bell	Butler	Cunningham
Bender	Camp	Davis
Bennett, Mo.	Canfield	Day
Bishop	Cannon, Mo.	Dirksen
Blackney	Carrier	Dondero
Bloom	Carson, Ohio	Drewry
Bolton	Carter	Eberharter
Bradley, Pa.	Chiperfield	Ellis
	Church	Ellison, Md.
	Clark	Elston, Ohio
Engel, Mich.	Kearney	Ramey
Feighan	Kefauver	Ramspeck
Fenton	Kennedy	Reed, N. Y.
Fish	Keogh	Rees, Kans.
Fisher	Kerr	Richards
Folger	Kilburn	Rivers
Furlong	Kinzer	Robsion, Ky.
Gallagher	Kirwan	Rodgers, Pa.
Gathings	Kleberg	Rogers, Mass.
Gavin	Kunkel	Rohrbough
Gerlach	Lambertson	Rowe
Gibson	Lane	Sabath
Gifford	Lanham	Sasscer
Gilchrist	Larcade	Satterfield
Gillette	Lea	Sauthoff
Gillie	LeCompte	Scanlon
Goodwin	LeFevre	Schuetz
Graham	Lesinski	Scott
Grant, Ind.	Luce	Short
Green	Ludlow	Simpson, Ill.
Gross	McCormack	Smith, Maine
Gwynne	McCowen	Smith, Ohio
Hall, Edwin Arthur	McGehee	Smith, Wis.
Hall, Leonard W.	McGregor	Snyder
Halleck	McLean	Somers, N. Y.
Hancock	McMillan	Spence
Harness, Ind.	McWilliams	Springer
Harris, Ark.	Martin, Mass.	Stanley
Hart	Merritt	Starnes, Ala.
Hays	Merrow	Stearns, N. H.
Hébert	Michener	Sumners, Tex.
Heidinger	Miller, Mo.	Sundstrom
Hendricks	Miller, Pa.	Taber
Herter	Monkiewicz	Talle
Hess	Mruk	Thomas, N. J.
Hobbs	Murray, Tenn.	Thomas, Tex.
Hoch	Newsome	Tibbott
Hoeven	Norrell	Tolan
Howell	O'Brien, Ill.	Troutman
Jarman	O'Brien, N. Y.	Vincent, Ky.
Jenkins	O'Hara	Vorys, Ohio
Jensen	O'Konski	Vursell
Johnson, Anton J.	O'Neal	Wadsworth
Johnson, Calvin D.	Pace	Ward
Johnson, Ind.	Patman	Weaver
Johnson, Luther A.	Patton	Weichel, Ohio
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Peterson, Ga.	Weiss
Jonkman	Philbin	Wheat
Judd	Pittenger	Whitten
Kean	Ploeser	Whittington
	Plumley	Wigglesworth
	Powers	Willey
	Pracht	Wilson
	Price	Wolcott
	Priest	Wolverton, N. J.
	Rabaut	Zimmerman

NAYS—75

Anderson, N. Mex.	Hale	Murphy
Angell	Harless, Ariz.	Murray, Wis.
Barrett	Hinshaw	Norman
Burchill, N. Y.	Holifield	O'Brien, Mich.
Burdick	Holmes, Wash.	O'Connor
Capozzoli	Hope	Outland
Carlson, Kans.	Horan	Peterson, Fla.
Case	Hull	Poage
Chenoweth	Izac	Poulson
Coffee	Johnson, J. Leroy	Rankin
Curtis	Keefe	Robinson, Utah
Domengeaux	LaFollette	Rockwell
Dworshak	Landis	Rolph
Elliott	Lemke	Rowan
Engle, Calif.	McMurray	Russell
Fay	Madden	Sadowski
Fernandez	Magnuson	Scrivner
Fogarty	Mahon	Stefan
Forand	Mansfield, Mont.	Stockman
Gearhart	Marcantonio	Sullivan
Gordon	Miller, Nebr.	Thomason
Gorski	Mott	Welch
Gossett	Mundt	White
Granger	Murdock	Wickersham
Hagen		Winter
		Worley

NOT VOTING—131

Anderson, Calif.	Chapman	Douglas
Arnold	Clason	Durham
Baldwin, Md.	Costello	Eaton
Baldwin, N. Y.	Cox	Ellsworth
Barden	Cravens	Elmer
Barry	Cullen	Fellows
Beckworth	Curley	Fitzpatrick
Bennett, Mich.	D'Alesandro	Flannagan
Bland	Dawson	Ford
Bonner	Delaney	Fulbright
Boren	Dewey	Fuller
Boykin	Dickstein	Fulmer
Bradley, Mich.	Dies	Gale
Buckley	Dilweg	Gamble
Byrne	Dingell	Gavagan
Cannon, Fla.	Disney	Gore
Celler	Doughton	Grant, Ala.

Gregory	Manasco	Sikes
Griffiths	Mansfield, Tex.	Simpson, Pa.
Hare	Martin, Iowa	Slaughter
Harris, Va.	Mason	Smith, Va.
Hartley	May	Smith, W. Va.
Heffernan	Miller, Conn.	Sparkman
Hill	Mills	Stevenson
Hoffman	Monroney	Stewart
Holmes, Mass.	Morrison, La.	Sumner, Ill.
Jackson	Morrison, N. C.	Talbot
Jeffrey	Myers	Tarver
Jennings	Norton	Taylor
Johnson, Okla.	O'Leary	Towe
Johnson, Ward	O'Toole	Treadway
Jones	Pfeifer	Vinson, Ga.
Kee	Phillips	Voorhis, Calif.
Kelley	Randolph	Walter
Kilday	Reece, Tenn.	Wasielewski
King	Reed, Ill.	Wene
Klein	Rizley	West
Knutson	Robertson	Whelchel, Ga.
Lewis	Rogers, Calif.	Winstead
Lynch	Schiffler	Wolfenden, Pa.
McCord	Schwabe	Woodruff, Mich.
McKenzie	Shafer	Woodrum, Va.
Maas	Sheppard	Wright
Maloney	Sheridan	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Mills with Mr. Schiffler.

Mr. Randolph with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Cravens with Mr. Schwabe.

Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.

Mr. Robertson with Mr. Elmer.

Mr. Voorhis of California with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Cullen with Mr. Knutson.

Mr. Kelley with Mr. Fuller.

Mr. Jackson with Mr. Shafer.

Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Reed of Illinois.

Mr. Morrison of Louisiana with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Klein with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Dilweg with Mr. Hartley.

Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Dewey.

Mr. Bland with Mr. Arnold.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Hill.

Mr. D'Alesandro with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Byrne with Mr. Ward Johnson.

Mr. Sparkman with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Burchill of New York with Mr. Miller of Connecticut.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Clason.

Mr. Tarver with Mr. Talbot.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Towe.

Mr. Wright with Mr. Rizley.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Martin of Iowa.

Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Fulbright with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Disney with Mr. Phillips.

Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Jones.

Mr. Maloney with Mr. Jennings.

Mr. Lynch with Mr. Lewis.

Mr. Chapman with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Baldwin of Maryland with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Fellows.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Griffiths.

Mr. Walter with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Harris of Virginia with Mr. Jeffrey.

Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Doughton with Mr. Maas.

Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. ENGEL of Michigan changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 55: On page 38, line 13 insert:

"PUERTO RICO HURRICANE RELIEF

"The limitation of $20,000 upon the amount that may be expended for administrative expenses, Puerto Rico hurricane relief, contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1944, is hereby increased to $25,350."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55 and concur in the same.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman explain briefly just how much Puerto Rico will receive?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Five thousand dollars.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri to recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 63: On page 40, line 20 insert: "Pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel: The number of officers above the rank of captain, who may receive flight pay during the fiscal year 1944, is increased from 45 to 60."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 63 and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 67: On page 44, line 24, insert:

INCREASE AND REPLACEMENT OF NAVAL VESSELS

Subject to authorization by other law, the appropriations "Construction and machinery" and "Armor, armament, and ammunition," shall be available for the acquisition and conversion or construction of additional auxiliaries, when such acquisition and conversion or construction has been directed by the President, and for the acquisition and conversion or construction of additional landing craft and district craft as the Secretary may determine to be necessary for the conduct of the war.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 67 and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 70: On page 46, line 3, insert:

"On and after July 1, 1943, the limitation on the cost of civilian clothing per person, including an overcoat when necessary, for enlisted personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard given discharges for bad conduct, undesirability, unsuitability, or inaptitude is hereby increased to $30."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 70 and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 94: On page 85, line 1, insert:

"SEC. 305. No part of any funds appropriated for the War or Navy Department, when it is found by the head of such Department that any part of such funds is not necessary for the completion of the purpose for which appropriated, shall be used for any other purpose without the specific approval of law by the Congress; and, notwithstanding any other provision of law providing for transfer of any part of such funds, when it is found by the head of such department that such funds are not to be used for the purposes for which appropriated, such appropriations to that extent shall be rescinded and canceled and the Secretary of such Department shall certify the amount so reduced, rescinded, and canceled to the Treasury Department, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the President of the Senate: *Provided*, That no appropriation or part of any appropriation heretofore, herein, or hereafter made available for any executive department or independent establishment to construct any particular project shall be impounded, or held as a reserve, or used for any other purpose, except by direction of the Congress, and any part of such appropriation not needed to complete such project, or the part thereof for which appropriation has been made, shall be retained by the Treasury: *Provided further*, That section 3 of the Military Appropriation Act, 1944, approved July 1, 1943, is hereby repealed."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 94.

Mr. Speaker, Senate amendment No. 94, which is known as the McKellar amendment, has precipitated considerable controversy. Clearly it is not an economy amendment, and it has provisions in it which, in the judgment of those who have studied it carefully, would lead to extravagance. It would also make it most difficult for the War and Navy Departments to discharge their responsibilities in connection with the expeditious prosecution of the war because it takes away the flexibility now existing in their appropriations to meet unforeseen emergencies which are constantly arising all the time due to the shifting character of the military and naval needs on the various battle fronts and theaters of action. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy have each pointed out the difficulties which would confront their respective Departments in the event the amendment should be adopted. Study of current appropriations of the War and Navy Departments and their balances have been made by the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations having jurisdiction of those appropriations and they have recently reviewed those balances and are cognizant of the changes in needs and

the changes in the requirements under the various appropriations. The committee feels that the amendment is not a desirable one either from the standpoint of economy or the prosecution of the war.

Another feature of the amendment, which is apart from the portion affecting the War and Navy funds, is the proviso which prohibits any appropriation made to any department or agency for a particular construction project from being impounded or placed in reserve. The undoubted result of the proviso, if enacted, would be to require the expenditure of funds for construction projects even though that action might not be wise or economical. The placing of funds in reserve has been an established practice of the Government ever since the passage of the Budget and Accounting Act in 1921. It has been carried on in the interest of economy. These are days when we should be tightening, wherever we can, the expenditure of funds for things that we can get along without while the war is on. We should not be relaxing the restraints and controls which are in the interest of economy and the conservation of funds unless that course is clearly in the interest of facilitating the prosecution of the war.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, we are now about to vote upon the so-called McKellar amendment. It has been much misunderstood in the press and the country.

The facts are that the first part of the amendment simply provides for the rescinding and cancelation of appropriations where the Secretary of either War or Navy, as the case may be, certifies that the funds are not needed for the purpose for which appropriated. Such a provision would never result in a saving, because a certificate would not be made. In other words, the Secretary of War would never certify that an appropriation was not needed but would permit the appropriation to continue until it expired on the 30th of June at the end of the fiscal year. It is perfectly clear that the first part of the language would not save a cent.

The proviso beginning on line 15, however, would prevent the Budget from impounding any funds appropriated for the construction of a particular project. This would result in the waste of millions and millions of dollars and is inserted in the bill for the purpose of preventing the Bureau of the Budget from impounding funds at the time when we need the exercise of that power more than any other in the history of our country. The sands are shifting very rapidly and as we approach nearer and nearer to the end of the war it is going to be absolutely necessary for the Budget to impound funds on all sorts of projects, or we are going to face financial bankruptcy.

The second part of the proviso of this amendment would prevent the Budget from impounding the funds that need to be impounded.

The third part of this amendment would repeal section 3 of the Military Appropriation Act of 1944 which permits the transfer of funds by the Secretary of War of not to exceed 10 percent of any particular appropriation to another appropriation, provided that appropriation is not thereby increased by more than 10 percent.

Facing an all-out attack on Japan and facing an attack of western Europe, I would not dare to be a party to the repeal of that provision. It may be necessary any day to use this power and to increase some particular appropriation. In any event, no such transfers are made according to the understanding we have with the War Department without the approval of the members of the War Department Appropriation Subcommittee.

With this situation, I can see nothing to do except to reject this amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 283, nays 18, not voting 128, as follows:

[Roll No. 172]

YEAS—283

Abernethy	Davis	Holmes, Wash.
Allen, Ill.	Day	Hope
Allen, La.	Dewey	Horan
Andersen, H. Carl	Dirksen	Howell
	Domengeaux	Hull
Andresen, August H.	Dondero	Izac
	Drewry	Jarman
Andrews	Dworshak	Jenkins
Angell	Eberharter	Jensen
Arends	Elliott	Johnson, Anton J.
Auchincloss	Ellis	
Barrett	Ellison, Md.	Johnson, Ind.
Bates, Ky.	Elston, Ohio	Johnson, Lyndon B.
Beall	Engel, Mich.	
Beckworth	Engle, Calif.	Johnson, Okla.
Bell	Fay	Jonkman
Bender	Feighan	Judd
Bennett, Mich.	Fellows	Kean
Bennett, Mo.	Fenton	Kearney
Bishop	Fernandez	Keefe
Blackney	Fish	Kefauver
Bloom	Fisher	Kennedy
Bolton	Fogarty	Keogh
Bradley, Mich.	Folger	Kerr
Bradley, Pa.	Forand	Kilburn
Brehm	Ford	Kinzer
Brooks	Furlong	Kirwan
Brown, Ga.	Gallagher	Kleberg
Brown, Ohio	Gavin	Kunkel
Brumbaugh	Gerlach	LaFollette
Bryson	Gibson	Lambertson
Buffett	Gifford	Landis
Bulwinkle	Gilchrist	Lane
Burch, Va.	Gillette	Lanham
Burchill, N. Y.	Gillie	Larcade
Burgin	Goodwin	Lea
Busbey	Gordon	LeCompte
Butler	Gorski	LeFevre
Camp	Graham	Lesinski
Canfield	Granger	Lewis
Cannon, Mo.	Grant, Ind.	Luce
Capozzoli	Green	Ludlow
Carlson, Kans.	Gross	McCormack
Carson, Ohio	Gwynne	McCowen
Case	Hagen	McGregor
Chenoweth	Hall, Edwin Arthur	McLean
Chiperfield		McMillan
Church	Hall, Leonard W.	McMurray
Clark		McWilliams
Clevenger	Halleck	Maas
Cochran	Hancock	Madden
Coffee	Hare	Magnuson
Cole, Mo.	Harless, Ariz.	Mahon
Cole, N. Y.	Harness, Ind.	Marcantonio
Compton	Hart	Martin, Mass.
Cooley	Hays	Merritt
Cooper	Heidinger	Michener
Costello	Hess	Miller, Conn.
Courtney	Hinshaw	Miller, Mo.
Crawford	Hobbs	Miller, Pa.
Crosser	Hoch	Monkiewicz
Cunningham	Hoeven	Monroney
Curtis	Holifield	Mott
Mruk	Rees, Kans.	Stefan
Mundt	Richards	Stockman
Murdock	Rivers	Sullivan
Murphy	Robinson, Utah	Sumners, Tex.
Murray, Wis.	Robsion, Ky.	Sundstrom
Newsome	Rockwell	Taber
Norman	Rodgers, Pa.	Talle
Norton	Rogers, Mass.	Thomas, N. J.
O'Brien, Ill.	Rohrbough	Thomas, Tex.
O'Brien, Mich.	Rolph	Thomason
O'Brien, N. Y.	Rowan	Tibbott
O'Connor	Rowe	Troutman
O'Hara	Sasscer	Vincent, Ky.
O'Konski	Satterfield	Vorys, Ohio
O'Neal	Sauthoff	Vursell
Outland	Scanlon	Wadsworth
Pace	Schuetz	Ward
Patman	Scott	Weaver
Patton	Scrivner	Welchel, Ohio
Peterson, Fla.	Sheppard	Welch
Peterson, Ga.	Short	Wheat
Philbin	Simpson, Ill.	Whittington
Pittenger	Slaughter	Wickersham
Ploeser	Smith, Maine	Wigglesworth
Plumley	Smith, Ohio	Willey
Poulson	Smith, Va.	Wilson
Powers	Smith, Wis.	Winter
Pracht	Snyder	Wolcott
Priest	Somers, N. Y.	Wolverton, N. J.
Rabaut	Spence	Woodrum, Va.
Ramey	Springer	Worley
Ramspeck	Stanley	Zimmerman
Rankin	Starnes, Ala.	
Reed, N. Y.	Stearns, N. H.	

NAYS—18

Burdick	Johnson, Luther A.	Norrell
Colmer	Lemke	Peage
Gathings	McGehee	Russell
Gossett	Mansfield, Mont.	Sikes
Harris, Ark.	Murray, Tenn.	White
Johnson, Calvin D.		Whitten
		Winstead

NOT VOTING—128

Anderson, Calif.	Gale	Morrison, N. C.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gamble	Myers
	Gavagan	O'Leary
Arnold	Gearhart	O'Toole
Baldwin, Md.	Gore	Pfeifer
Baldwin, N. Y.	Grant, Ala.	Phillips
Barden	Gregory	Price
Barry	Griffiths	Randolph
Bates, Mass.	Hale	Reece, Tenn.
Bland	Harris, Va.	Reed, Ill.
Bonner	Hartley	Rizley
Boren	Hébert	Robertson
Boykin	Heffernan	Rogers, Calif.
Buckley	Hendricks	Sabath
Byrne	Herter	Sadowski
Cannon, Fla.	Hill	Schiffler
Carrier	Hoffman	Schwabe
Carter	Holmes, Mass.	Shafer
Celler	Jackson	Sheridan
Chapman	Jeffrey	Simpson, Pa.
Clason	Jennings	Smith, W. Va.
Cox	Johnson, J. Leroy	Sparkman
Cravens		Stevenson
Cullen	Johnson, Ward	Stewart
Curley	Jones	Sumner, Ill.
D'Alesandro	Kee	Talbot
Dawson	Kelley	Tarver
Delaney	Kilday	Taylor
Dickstein	King	Tolan
Dies	Klein	Towe
Dilweg	Knutson	Treadway
Dingell	Lynch	Vinson, Ga.
Disney	McCord	Voorhis, Calif.
Doughton	McKenzie	Walter
Douglas	Maloney	Wasielewski
Durham	Manasco	Weiss
Eaton	Mansfield, Tex.	Wene
Ellsworth	Martin, Iowa	West
Elmer	Mason	Whelchel, Ga.
Fitzpatrick	May	Wolfenden, Pa.
Flannagan	Merrow	Woodruff, Mich.
Fulbright	Miller, Nebr.	Wright
Fuller	Mills	
Fulmer	Morrison, La.	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Manasco with Mr. Miller of Nebraska.
Mr. May with Mr. Bates, of Massachusetts.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Carrier.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Cox with Miss Sumner of Illinois.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Kee.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Griffiths.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Gale.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Gearhart.
Mr. Doughton with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Hale.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. J. Leroy Johnson.
Mr. Kilday with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Lynch with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. GOSSETT and RUSSELL changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 95: On page 86, line 1, insert:

"SEC. 306. No funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for the War Department shall be used directly or indirectly for or devoted to the purpose of the cancelation of existing certificates of authority with respect to the manufacture and distribution of Army insignia and no such funds shall be used directly or indirectly either to enforce or announce the provisions of order AR 600–90, as amended, or any amended or similar or comparable order or regulation restricting the manufacture and distribution of Army insignia: *Provided*, That this section shall be effective as of date March 1, 1943."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the McKellar bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 96: On page 86, line 12, strike out "305" and insert in lieu thereof "307."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 96.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. CANNON of Missouri, a motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the conference report just agreed to may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF COURT REPORTERS IN THE DISTRICT COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3611), to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts in the United States, to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK]?

There was no objection.

THE LATE KATHLEEN SEXTON HOLMES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked yesterday to learn of the sudden passing of Mrs. Kathleen Sexton Holmes, who was so well and favorably known by everyone here in the Capitol. She was a true gentlewoman. She had many fine characteristics, a handsome woman, intelligent, and a very able news reporter. She was a very honest and a very fair one. She made a real contribution to journalism. I felt proud to count her my friend.

Coming from the conservative South she had much conservatism and also indicated a very great interest in women going forward and accomplishing things. She was very helpful in connection with the passage of the bill covering the Women's Auxiliary Army Corps.

Those whose districts she covered knew her especially well. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] paid her a beautiful tribute yesterday. I hate to think that we have lost her physical presence, but we shall cherish always the memory of her gracious, helpful spirit.

SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its disagreements to amendments pending between the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 3598), making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

The Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. CANNON of Missouri, WOODRUM of Virginia, LUDLOW, SNYDER, O'NEAL, RABAUT, JOHNSON of Oklahoma, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, LAMBERTSON, and POWERS.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Washington Post of this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial and in the other a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from today's Washington Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO A HERO

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, this tragic war has produced many heroes whose names have been flashed across the continent because of outstanding achievements accomplished under circumstances and conditions that made such feats appear impossible. One of these heroes whose name is known throughout the width and breadth of the land is Capt. Walker Mahurin, of Fort Wayne, Ind., America's leading fighter ace in the European theater of war.

Captain Mahurin, a gallant Thunderbolt pilot attached to the Eighth Air Force in England, has 13 enemy planes to his credit—half as many as Eddie Rickenbacker's last war record of 26 victories. He has made this miraculous record in a period of less than 4 months, his first victory having been scored on August 18, when he shot down two Focke-Wulfs over Germany.

Captain Mahurin has taken his place in the hall of fame alongside two other Fort Wayne flying heroes—Captain "Bud" Miller, veteran of the Doolittle raid on Tokyo, who was killed in action over north Africa; and Lt. Louis Curdes, ace

of the north African and Sicilian campaigns, reported missing in action over Italy.

I am delighted to say that I have known this gallant young officer since he was a small boy. His father, Guy Marshall Mahurin, a well-known architect who died 2 years ago, was a close friend and fellow Kiwanian. His devoted mother is a very charming and gracious lady, who is following his exploits from her home in Fort Wayne. I had the pleasure of visiting Mrs. Mahurin recently and it is needless to add that she is justly proud of her famous flying son who is one of America's outstanding war heroes. On his last visit home, she reported, he told her, worriedly and boyishly: "Mom, I don't think I could ever really shoot anyone." Her reply was that he should not worry about it, but should do whatever it was necessary for him to do.

America may well be proud of such mothers and such sons. They are our strength in this battle for the survival of America. Because of them, victory is within our grasp.

Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me I am including as part of my remarks an Associated Press dispatch from London, dated December 5, 1943:

AMERICAN ACE BOOSTS SCORE—HOOSIER STATE FLIER CHALKS UP 13 VICTORIES

LONDON, December 5.—America's leading fighter ace in the European theater, Capt. Walker M. Mahurin, of Fort Wayne, Ind., is half way toward Eddie Rickenbacker's last war record of 26 victories after a slow start.

The 25-year-old Thunderbolt pilot flew 28 missions over Nazi Europe before he bagged his first enemy plane.

Since that time he has shot down 12 more Jerries—half of them in 2 days' hunting.

The slow start wasn't really Mahurin's fault. Most of his early sorties were fighter sweeps productive of little combat. Morale ebbed because "we felt we were contributing so little to the war," he told a press conference.

The former Purdue University student who flies *The Spirit of Atlantic City*, and his group finally were assigned to escort heavy bombers, and they have had plenty of action since.

Mahurin twice has scored triples, and his bag includes seven twin-engined fighters and six single-engined aircraft.

His Thunderbolt has been hit only once by German fighter bullets in 60 sorties. His squadron has accounted for 50 German planes shot down against the loss of 10 planes.

Holder of the Air Medal with three Oak Leaf Clusters, the Distinguished Flying Cross, and the Silver Star, Mahurin is "anxious to get this war over, over here" to get a crack at the Japanese.

CREATION OF COMMISSION TO SAVE THE JEWS OF EUROPE

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, the establishment of an American commission for the protection and salvage of artistic and historic monuments in Europe, under the chairmanship of Justice Owen J. Roberts, was announced today by the State Department. Recovery of art objects from Axis leaders who have appropriated them also is among the functions of the Commission.

On November 9 House Resolution 352 was presented to the Committee on Foreign Affairs by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN] and the worthy gentleman from California [Mr. ROGERS], calling for the creation of a commission to save the Jews of Europe. That is 6 weeks ago, but as yet this resolution is not before the House. Now, I speak of the action of August 20 by the State Department in this connection only because I am confused and disturbed. It takes us no time at all to offer protection to art, and yet we deliberate for weeks in offering protection to human beings.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs lists among its members some of the ablest men with whom I have had the pleasure of serving. I know that their sympathy responds to the appeal of this pleading call for human justice. Yet why the delay? The chairman of the committee has publicly stated that he is in favor of this resolution. The President of the United States has said, "Our hearts are in the right place." This House, I am confident, would pass this resolution with few, if any, dissenting votes, and I would like to call to the attention of the chairman of the committee the statement of the Archbishop of Canterbury that 10,000 Jews are being murdered daily. In the light of this tragic situation I know the committee feels the immensity of its responsibility. The chairman should, and therefore his action in causing this unnecessary delay is perplexing to me beyond all belief.

We are approaching the Christmas season. I believe it would be a gesture in keeping with our most beautiful traditions were we at this time to give the Jews of the world an assurance of our sympathy and our willingness to act in their behalf.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a report of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is recognized for 1 hour.

PACIFIC OUTLINE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, some of the remarks I shall make here this afternoon, while critical, are not intended as personal criticism of anyone or any group, nor of any political party or administration. They are intended in the nature of a critique or objective criticism rather than subjective.

I hope that my remarks will be accepted in that spirit. In fact, I have subjected some of my own beliefs and actions to criticism and admit my own errors. If others will join me in that perhaps we may get somewhere.

Our country has important decisions to make in, I trust, the not distant future. It has seemed to me that if "what is past is prologue," it might indeed prove profitable to "study the past." The quotation you have observed graven in the granite of the Federal Archives Building.

Therefore, within the limits of time available to me I have been studying the past in order to find out, if possible, just how we arrived at the position in which we find ourselves today, and to expose the facts to searching light so that perhaps we may be able to profit in the future by our mistakes of the past and do a better job for our country and for its future generations.

WAR IN THE PACIFIC

It is their purpose that Japan shall be stripped of all the islands in the Pacific which she has seized or occupied since the beginning of the First World War in 1914 and that all the territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China. Japan will also be expelled from all other territories which she has taken by violence and greed.

Mr. Speaker, someone should have told Commodore Perry the old fable of Pandora's box before he sailed to Dai Nihon that first time in 1853 and surely before his second visit in the next year. For on that fatal second trip when he pressed the Tokugawa Shogun to open Japan's lid, there was loosed upon the world a new set of evil spirits that will be hard to herd back inside. They were 27,000,000 then—now they are 100,000,000.

The little people who theretofore had heard no evil, seen no evil, and spoken no evil outside their own little island proceeded to learn a great deal of western evil and apparently thought it was smart and amusing; and they found it quite practical to adopt for their own unmoral purposes.

We have admired the Japanese for their politeness but failed to wonder at it long enough to reason how they may have gotten that way. It comes to my mind now from memories of youthful, strictly unpleasant contacts with an infamous Chicago Stockyards neighborhood gang called Ragan's Colts that the members of that gang were exceedingly polite to each other and to the face of any other with whom they thought it unwise to tangle. It was so because any slightest breach was expected to result in quick and brutal retaliation. Insults between them, however slight, meant bare knuckles in the gym forthwith; and the others whom they respected to their faces were the Stockyards police, the goal of their manhood aspirations.

The Japanese, according to their own history, were something like that before Perry pressed the Shogun—an island full of cutthroats who delicately preserved life by being very polite. They got ingrained into them the habit of being polite to all whom they feared or respected and remorselessly brutal to any they

might consider inferior. The carelessly impolite got weeded out by a vicious process of selection. Apparently they are as lacking in the spiritual quality of remorse as any case of dementia praecox. If there be a saving grace in other mortals may it not be the ability to be truly and deep-seatedly sorry.

Upon dropping hands from ears, eyes, and mouth, the outside world was amazing to these long self-isolated islanders. They saw their mother Asia just across the sea, sprawling with teeming, unorganized hundreds of millions, and as they gazed they watched the occidental nations on empire bent take deep slices of China's riches. They saw deals made with intent to defraud China and they heard the guns of men-of-war back up the trumped up demands of the great powers of the Occident. To them it was a nice game—and right down their alley—so why wait? They commenced at once.

Forty years after the Perry-Tokugawa shogun incident, Japan sank her samurai sword into China. That was 1894. The Great Powers told Japan to get out—and she did, but the sword had gone in rather easily and come out with the island of Formosa and the Pescadores, and right then Japan started doing an inside job on Korea.

In 1898 the battle of Manila Bay settled the question of Spanish domination over uncounted thousands of islands of the Pacific. In the Treaty of Paris we took the 3,100 Philippine Islands and Guam, paying Spain a $20,000,000 indemnity. Spain then offered to relinquish the Carolines, the Marianas, and the Palau Islands and all the rest she claimed for $5,000,000 to Germany who claimed prior rights. Spain sold the lot to Germany. Our statesmen have needed a crystal ball on many an occasion, but that was one time when they needed it and there was no vision. Think how different things could have been had our statesmen either not taken the Philippines at all, or been endowed with only a little foresight at that moment and had insisted on acquiring all the islands lying between the United States and the Philippines. How insignificant a part of the cost to regain those other islands is $5,000,000, to say nothing of the priceless sweat, blood, and tears. But Germany got those islands, bought them from Spain for a song, a song now so painful to our ears. They nicely rounded out her holdings of the Marshalls, the Solomons, and the Bismarck Archipelago.

In the era of wild scramble for chunks of anything loose in Asia or the Pacific, Germany took the killing of a pair of missionaries in Shantung as a pretext for moving in and extorting from China a 99-year lease on Kiaochow Bay and exclusive rights to build railways and develop mines in Shantung Province.

Russia had grabbed Port Arthur and the right to build what is now known as the Chinese Eastern Railway, from Harbin in Siberia to Port Arthur. France was "granted" a 99-year lease on Kwangchow Bay and railroad rights.

Britain got the right to collect the customs on the Yangtze Valley trade and had long held Hong Kong and rights in other so-called treaty ports.

The United States asked for nothing but the open door, and got it slightly ajar going and coming.

But about that time the Chinese got very tired of it all and the result was the Boxer's Uprising. Their sole and peculiar idea seemed to be to expel all foreigners from China. The foreigners resented the idea of being run out, and as the combined foreigners had better weapons and plenty of battleships, China was forced into abject submission and to agree to the infamous Boxer Protocol with its indemnities. The date was September 7, 1901.

On February 8, 1904, Japanese assassin gunboats sneaked into Port Arthur and torpedoed the Russian Fleet in the night and ran out again. Had she guessed how thoroughly the job was to be accomplished, Japan could have overwhelmed the entire besotted fleet and garrison in a few days, but the Russo-Japanese War dragged on until Teddy Roosevelt arranged the Treaty of Portsmouth, signed September 5, 1905. Japan claimed everything in sight, but came out with a well-defined right to the "paramount interest" in Korea, the Russian leases, and most of the Chinese Eastern Railway, and the southern half—the good half—of Sakhalin Island.

In 1905 Britain was busy elsewhere and entered into a secret treaty of mutual assistance with Japan to look after her—Britain's—interests in Asia. Britain figured that Russia was done for 10 years at least, and Germany was a rising menace. Her fleet was needed in the North Sea and the Atlantic; Japan had been cooperative so why not ally herself with Japan to guard their several interests in Asia.

From then on Japan was free to work methodically and undisturbed in Korea and Manchuria and to gnaw at the vitals of China. In 1910 she had gotten such a thorough strangle hold on Korea that she simply annexed Korea and called it Chosen. Nobody seemed to care—that is, nobody but the Koreans and Chinese. In 1911, the Anglo-Japanese Alliance became a matter of formality.

Then, lo and behold, the opportunity of a lifetime dropped into Japan's lap. The European nations sprang at each other's throats on July 31, 1914. That left Japan free, calmly and without much fuss, to gobble up all the German possessions in the Orient. They included not only Kiaochow Bay and the interests in Shantung Province of China but all of those German-held islands in the Pacific between the Philippines and Hawaii and Australia. Japan thought over the situation very carefully before deciding which side of that war to take but finally she declared war on Germany August 23, 1914. She was soon in possession of the Marianas, the Palaus, the Marshalls, the Solomons, and the Bismarck Archipelago. The British annexed the Gilberts in 1915 as they had proclaimed a protectorate over them in 1892, and the Japs were very busy in the neighborhood.

In 1915, while other great powers were fighting each other Japan perpetrated the infamous 21 demands upon a helpless China, and got away with some of them.

Listen to Secretary Lansing's report of his conference with the Japanese Ambassador on special mission, Viscount Ishii, held September 6, 1917, in Washington. This matter appeared as a part of the remarks made by me December 2, 1943, as contained on page 10236 of the RECORD.

The following are the words of our then Secretary of State, Robert Lansing:

> I asked the Ambassador whether he desired to discuss other questions than those immediately pertaining to the war, because if he so desired I was willing to do so—but I thought the supreme object of both Governments at the present moment should be the winning of the war and an understanding as to how we could cooperate to that end.
>
> He said that in view of the fact that he had come here and been so handsomely received by the American people, he thought it would be unfortunate not to consider some of the other questions, as we had to look forward to a time when the war would be over. He said in the first place he ought to inform me that when he returned to Japan from France, where he was Ambassador in 1915, he stopped in London and saw Sir Edward Grey. Japan at that time had taken Kiaochow and the German islands in the south Pacific. He said he told Sir Edward Grey it was the intention of his Government to return Kiaochow to China, but that no government in Japan could stand if they did not retain some of the south sea islands as "souvenirs" of the war; that it had been a sacrifice for his Government to enter the war, which they were not compelled to do under their treaty of alliance—that is according to the letter of the treaty—but he thought they were according to the spirit. He then went on to say that Sir Edward Grey had practically consented in the readjustment of territory after the war; that the German islands north of the Equator should be retained by Japan, while those south of the Equator should go to Great Britain.

May I, at this point, suggest the reading of my entire address of December 2 to those who were not on the floor? It contains much information in the nature of a preface to remarks which will follow here.

The Treaty of Versailles was signed. Peace came again to the warring nations of Europe, but those ex-German islands of the broad Pacific—what disposition was made of them? Those islands lying north of the equator went to Japan and those lying south of the equator went to Britain as spoils of war, "souvenirs," as Viscount Ishii playfully called them. The Japanese got a "mandate." Where was the United States? Looking out the window, saying that we sought no territorial expansion and were not interested in any mandates—and we never once gave a thought to all those little potential island fortresses out in the Pacific between Hawaii and the Philippines. Did I say we did not give them a thought? That is not wholly true as our Navy was thinking about them ruefully and insisted at least that Japan agree not to fortify any of them. In 1919 Japan had already been in possession of those islands for 5 years and she had very slowly, quietly, but firmly closed the door. It

stayed closed, for never since has anyone visited them, on record. They are islands of mystery among which wayward vessels disappeared, vanished from the sea.

In 1919 our Navy Department, realizing the tactical problem of defending the Philippines, drew up a set of plans for fortifying them and also building fortified or defended naval bases on Midway, Wake, and particularly the Island of Guam. At this point I desire to present certain testimony of Admiral Leahy before the House Committee on Naval Affairs when that committee was considering the naval authorization bill of 1939:

Mr. DREWRY. In 1919, was there not some provision made for the development of a base at Guam?

Admiral LEAHY. The Navy Department at that time contemplated providing an efficient advance base at Guam and the plans were made to accomplish that. At the time of the so-called Washington Naval Treaty, when our naval superiority was given up for what appeared to this Government to be a good reason, the United States agreed in the treaty with the other signatory nations that islands in a certain area, which included the island of Guam, would not be fortified. Therefore, the plan to fortify Guam was given up. That treaty has now expired and is no longer in force, and we now have the right to make such improvements in our island possessions as we may consider necessary.

Mr. DREWRY. Other nations who were signatory to that treaty also agreed that they would not fortify their island possessions.

Admiral LEAHY. That is correct.

Mr. DREWRY. Have their possessions been fortified by the other nations?

Admiral LEAHY. My information is not sufficiently accurate to make reply to that question.

Mr. DREWRY. Is it possible for us to get that information?

Admiral LEAHY. It is not possible for us to get any information that we have not already received.

Mr. DREWRY. That is what I want to bring out, that we could now fortify if we wished to do so. We are not going to let other nations tell us what to do because other nations, we may think, have fortified, but we cannot get the information. If we are willing to give information from our standpoint, why cannot we get information from the standpoint of the other nation? Foreign nations are thoroughly informed in regard to our activities in the matter of defensive preparation, but we are not informed as to theirs.

Admiral LEAHY. We are not.

Mr. DREWRY. Is it because other nations do not let an American go on their islands to see how they are fortified?

Admiral LEAHY. It is a fact that access to certain islands in the Pacific is denied to all foreign citizens by the nation which holds those islands.

I shall refer to that hearing again, but in order that matters may be presented consecutively, I shall proceed in orderly sequence of events.

World War No. 1 had stimulated not only the building and equipping of huge armies over the world, but great navies as well. At the close of the war the American naval construction program begun in 1916 called for the construction of nearly 800,000 tons of ships, and the Naval Appropriation bill for the year 1921 totaled $500,000,000—about 2 days' war expenditure by today's standards, but a seemingly staggering sum in that day of new, freshly signed peace with a League in process of formation. The United States and Britain and Japan seemed to be involved in a race for supremacy in naval armament, just why no one seems to know, except that we wanted to finish what we had started and Britain was afraid to be outdone.

So President Harding called the great powers of the world to Washington to talk things over. The five great powers, including, with ourselves, Britain, France, Italy, and Japan; and four lesser powers, including China, having interests in the Orient appeared. That conference, under the chairmanship of Charles Evans Hughes, resulted in 5 treaties and 12 resolutions.

One was the 10-year Four-Power Pacific Treaty between the United States, Great Britain, France, and Japan, in which the signatories conveniently guaranteed each other's rights in their respective Pacific insular possessions. This treaty likewise assisted in breaking the old alliance of 1905 and 1911 between Britain and Japan, of which I have already spoken.

Another, known as the Shantung Treaty, provided for the return to China of Japan's ill-gotten rights in Shantung Province that had been taken from Germany in 1914 and officially given to Japan in the Versailles Treaty, in exchange for Japan's signature to the Covenant of the League of Nations—see my address of September 27, 1943, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 7830.

Two other treaties known as the Nine-Power Pacts guaranteed the territorial integrity and administrative independence of China and reiterated the principle of the never-too-open door in China.

The principal treaty was the 15-year Naval Arms Limitation treaty of 1922, establishing the infamous 5:5:3 ratio between the capital fleets of the United States, Britain, and Japan. Britain saw that soon the battle fleet of the United States would outweigh the combined British and Japanese Fleets, and felt that her interests might be menaced thereby. But the spirit of the United States was for disarmament. Had not "the war to end all wars" been fought and won? Back to peace and normalcy was in the hearts of all Americans.

In 1916 the United States had embarked upon a large fleet program so that by 1921 our capital-ship fleet—old, new, and building totaled more than 1,385,000 tons. Of this amount 618,000 tons were still on the ways, many nearing completion by December 1921.

Great Britain had spent money on plans for 4 battleships of the *Hood* class, 49,000 tons each, and had in service about 1,000,000 tons of ships, many of which were approaching the over-age point.

Japan had a projected program she had not yet commenced, and 289,100 tons on the ways in various stages up to completion, plus about 460,000 tons in service.

Pursuant to the 15-year naval limitation treaty of 1922, the United States sank or otherwise destroyed 30, or 825,000 tons of its ships, 600,000 tons of which was in new ships; Britain didn't build her 4 heavy battleships of the *Hood* class and destroyed 400,000 tons of ships, a number of which she was about to destroy, anyway, because of age; Japan didn't start her projected program, destroyed 6 ships in various stages of incompletion, including 2 for which keels were not yet laid, and scrapped 160,000 tons of old ships.

As a result of this process we ended up with a fairly modern fleet, the British weeded out a lot of old ships from her fleet, and the Japanese had a small but new fleet, the oldest of which had been built in 1914. The ratio to start with, including ships in service and building, had been about 13:11:7. It ended up at 5:5:3, with no limitations on cruisers or pocket battleships of under 10,000 tons.

Japan held out for a higher ratio for herself for awhile, but finally offered to sign if we and Britain would agree not to fortify our insular possessions in the Pacific. Hence, the following was agreed to as article 19 of the treaty:

ARTICLE XIX

The United States, the British Empire, and Japan agree that the status quo at the time of the signing of the present treaty, with regard to fortifications and naval bases, shall be maintained in their respective territories and possessions specified hereunder:

(1) The insular possessions which the United States now holds or may hereafter acquire in the Pacific Ocean, except (a) those adjacent to the coast of the United States, Alaska, and the Panama Canal Zone, not including the Aleutian Islands, and (b) the Hawaiian Islands;

(2) Hong Kong and the insular possessions which the British Empire now holds or may hereafter acquire in the Pacific Ocean, east of the meridian of 110° east longitude, except (a) those adjacent to the coast of Canada, (b) the Commonwealth of Australia and its territories, and (c) New Zealand;

(3) The following insular territories and possessions of Japan in the Pacific Ocean, to wit: the Kurile Islands, the Bonin Islands, Amami-Oshima, the Loochoo Islands, Formosa and the Pescadores, and any insular territories or possessions in the Pacific Ocean which Japan may hereafter acquire.

The maintenance of the status quo under the foregoing provisions implies that no new fortifications or naval bases shall be established in the territories and possessions specified that no measures shall be taken to increase the existing naval facilities for the repair and maintenance of naval forces, and that no increase shall be made in the coast defenses of the territories and possessions above specified. This restriction, however, does not preclude such repair and replacement of worn-out weapons and equipment as is customary in naval and military establishments in time of peace.

Remember the Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1905 providing for mutual assistance in the Pacific? Britain felt, of course, that if the United States would be willing to limit her fleet to equal size with the British Fleet and permit the strengthening of the Japanese Fleet, any menace from the colossus of the Western Hemisphere would be neutralized. The Japanese, after putting in their demand for a 10:10:7 ratio, just sat back and chuckled inwardly at the scene before her—the two great western powers vying to limit each other's fleet and sinking their own battleships. What

could be sweeter? Japan played dead while Britain and the United States sparred. Would Japan trade the cancelation of her treaty of 1905 for the uncontested right to double the relative power of her own fleet? Oh, too happy, please; and that was the deal. We sank 30 capital ships, including 15 beautiful new ships. Britain scrapped blueprints for battleships and Japan proceeded gleefully to double her strength. The Orient was handed over to the Japs in that deal without a shot being fired and the credulous Anglo-American world sat back satisfied and applauded their own thoughts. Only the officers of the United States Navy wept, for they, upon whose valiant lives would rest the defense of our country from the windward side, saw the truth. The Philippines were lost at that conference table and the Japanese position was advanced to our back door in Hawaii.

All that those words in article 19 did was to cause our Navy sadly to pigeonhole their 1919 plans to fortify the Philippines, Guam, Wake, and Midway, while the Japanese, smilingly agreeing likewise not to fortify her island possessions, most of which she had already agreed not to fortify in her mandate, calmly proceeded to close the door to them tighter and tighter until no ray of light was visible to the outside world—and those who entered did not return.

Did I say that only our Navy wept? Alone? That is not wholly true either, for the British Dominions that fronted on the Pacific saw it too, and shuddered.

From 1920 to 1926 the young Republic of China was in the throes of violent revolution, a struggle for power between the war lords of the north and south, while both sides were being goaded into anti-white, anti-foreign demonstrations by the insidious Bolsheviks. As had been customary in the past, each new outrage against the handful of Marine Corps protected missionaries and international businessmen brought new demands for punitive expeditions, indemnities, and satisfaction while the great powers hung on, leechlike, to their holdings. Japan sat back and watched and waited, meantime further debauching Chinese officialdom and inching in with tourists, salesmen, and settlers. Chiang Kai-shek came to the top—China's man of destiny.

The United States found its own stock market a pleasurable fountainhead of fabulous paper riches in those days and was too engrossed in this new toy balloon to look beyond its shores. In 1929 the new toy blew up in our faces.

Then 1931 came along—9 years had elapsed since the Washington Conference. Japanese tourists and settlers had prepared the way in Manchuria just as they had done in Korea 25 years earlier. It was now time for the Japanese military to do its stuff. They moved in to pacify Manchuria. Our Secretary of State, Henry L. Stimson, formally protested and desired to call together the signatories to that Nine Power Pact of 1922 who had so solemnly guaranteed the integrity of China, but the British were coy and urged that the matter be referred to the League of Nations for investigation. The Japanese withdrew then from the League, we lost much face, and the report of the Lyton commission was just another report. Japan got coal and iron and slave labor in Manchuria.

In 1932 the 10-year naval building ban expired. The London Conference met to discuss its renewal but it was not renewed by the Japanese because Japan, having built her treaty-doubled fleet did not need to worry any more about the United States Fleet, as it had aged and deteriorated badly for lack of popular support. Britain's Fleet was up to strength and astride the world's western sea lanes. Commerce would go on. But she did decide it might be wise to do a little fortifying at Singapore.

When that treaty expired, our agreement not to fortify our own islands also expired. The Japanese, having walked out of the League of Nations, felt that her agreement not to fortify her Pacific islands under the terms of the mandate of the League was no longer binding, and the ultimate expiration of the naval limitation treaty which would occur in 1936 was final. From then on it was a race against time for the Japanese; a race against the time when we might awaken to what was going on. We did not awaken, however, until that morning that will live in infamy, December 7, 1941. And I am not so sure that we have wiped the smoke from our eyes yet.

1931–41: THE FATEFUL DECADE

"The Fateful Decade" is the title to chapter I on page 1 of that fulsome volume of comment and documents published recently by our Department of State, entitled "Peace and War." From this point on in my address each quotation I shall use is taken verbatim from its pages, unless otherwise specifically noted. I only wish that I might include the entire 874 pages of that book as a part of my remarks for every page is pertinent.

Eight years of pedagogy on a high moral plane succeeded by 12 years of normalcy and business as usual was in turn succeeded by an interminable era of social planning and professional proselyting commencing in 1933. We have experienced 30 years of unreality, wafted back and forth from extreme to extreme. When will we become mature as a nation?

The keynote of our voice in the fateful decade was struck in Washington, December 28, 1933, when the President said in the course of his address:

> In the wider world field a chain of events has led, of late, away from rather than toward the ultimate objectives of Woodrow Wilson.
>
> The superficial observer charges this failure to the growth of the spirit of nationalism. But in so doing he suggests a nationalism of that kind supported by the overwhelming masses of the people themselves in each nation.
>
> I challenge that description of the world population today.
>
> The blame for the danger to world peace lies not in the world population but in the political leaders of that population.
>
> The imagination of the masses of world population was stirred, as never before, by President Wilson's gallant appeal to them—to those masses—to banish future war. His appeal meant little to the imagination or the hearts of a large number of the so-called statesmen who gathered in Paris to assemble a treaty of so-called peace in 1919. I saw that with my own eyes and heard that with my own ears. Political profit, personal prestige, national aggrandizement attended the birth of the League of Nations, and handicapped it from its infancy by seeking their own profit and their own safety first.
>
> Nevertheless, through the League directly, or through its guiding motives indirectly, the states of the world have groped forward to find something better than the old way of composing their differences.
>
> The League has provided a common meeting place; it has provided machinery which serves for international discussion; and in very many practical instances it has helped labor and health and commerce and education and, last, but not least, the actual settlement of many disputes great and small among nations great and small.
>
> Today the United States is cooperating openly in the fuller utilization of the League of Nations machinery than ever before.
>
> I believe that I express the views of my countrymen when I state that the old policies, alliances, combinations, and balances of power have proved themselves inadequate for the preservation of world peace. The League of Nations, encouraging as it does the extension of nonaggression pacts, of reduction of armament agreements, is a prop in the world peace structure .
>
> We are not members and we do not contemplate membership.
>
> * * * * *
>
> It is but an extension of the challenge of Woodrow Wilson for us to propose in this newer generation that from now on war by government shall be changed to peace by peoples.

Unfortunately not many Japanese speak English and very few Americans speak Japanese, or any other language than English. To proselytize, one must have the intelligent and not unwilling ear of the neophyte peoples. Those words fell on politely deaf ears.

In 1934 the Philippine Independence Act was passed and signed by President Roosevelt, giving the Filipinos their full independence as of July 4, 1946. The Philippine Legislature accepted with misgivings.

In 1934 our observers reported the probable existence of a secret alliance between Japan and Germany. The State Department editorializes as follows:

REPORTED GERMAN-JAPANESE ENTENTE

> Throughout this period indications were received by this Government from various sources that Germany and Japan were drawing together in closer relations. The two countries were in similar situations in that each had left the League of Nations and each was already engaged in preparing militarily and otherwise a program of national expansion. In May 1934 the United State Military Attaché in Berlin, Lieutenant Colonel Wuest, reported that evidence was accumulating which tended "to show the existence of unusually close and friendly relations between Germany and Japan even to the extent of a possible secret alliance." This report stated further that these friendly relations between the two countries were dependent entirely upon self-interest; that the Germans usually expressed themselves to the effect that "we are encouraging close and friendly relations

with Japan because it is to our advantage to do so but we must never forget that we are white people and they are not."

Shortly thereafter, United States Consul Geist at Berlin reported to the Department of State that the German Government was bent on recovering Germany's military prestige and then seeing what could be obtained from the rest of the world. He said that German rearmament was concentrated upon power in the air and motorization of attacking forces; that the young Nazis were enthusiastic with regard to military prospects; that they spoke of gas war, bacteriological war, and the use of death-dealing rays; that they boasted that airplanes would not pass the German frontiers; and that they had fantastic ideas about Germany's invincibility in "the next war."

Mr. Geist emphasized that the youth of Germany were being inculcated with an unprecedented, conscious, and deliberate love of militarism; that one of the amazing things of modern history was that the government of a great power should definitely teach children to cherish ideas of valor, heroism, and self-sacrifice, "unrelieved by any of the virtues which modern civilization has come to place above brute force." The Consul said that war might not be imminent but it was difficult to foresee "how the bellicose spirit here can be restrained and directed into permanent channels of peace toward the end of this present decade."

That report was from Europe. Now, let us see what came from the Orient. Ambassador Grew is no neophyte in our Diplomatic Service. He was first secretary to Ambassador "Jimmy" Gerard at Berlin in 1914. As a 20-year-old college sophomore on vacation, I worked as a volunteer clerk under him at the Embassy in Berlin when war broke loose that summer. I quote further editorialized comment:

A comprehensive appraisal of the situation in Japan was sent to the Secretary of State by Ambassador Grew in a despatch of December 27, 1934. The Ambassador reported that things were being constantly said and written in Japan to the effect that Japan's destiny was to subjugate and rule the world. He said that the aim of certain elements in the Army and Navy, the patriotic societies, and the intense nationalists throughout the country was "to obtain trade control and eventually predominate political influence in China, the Philippines, the Straits Settlements, Siam and the Dutch East Indies, the Maritime Provinces and Vladivostok, one step at a time, as in Korea and Manchuria, pausing intermittently to consolidate and then continuing as soon as the intervening obstacles can be overcome by diplomacy or force." With such dreams of empire cherished in Japan, and with a Japanese Army and Navy capable of "taking the bit in their own teeth and running away with it," we would be "reprehensibly somnolent," Ambassador Grew warned, if we were to trust to the security of treaty restraints or international comity to safeguard our own interests.

Continuing, the Ambassador said that there was a "swashbuckling temper" in the country, largely developed by military propaganda, which could lead Japan during the next few years to any extreme unless the saner minds in the Government were able to cope with it and to restrain the country from national suicide. He referred to the extreme sensitiveness of the Japanese people which, he said, arose out of a marked inferiority complex manifested "in the garb of an equally marked superiority complex, with all its attendant bluster, chauvinism, xenophobia, and organized national propaganda." He characterized as "thoroughly mistaken" the idea that a great body of liberal thought lying just beneath the surface since 1931 would be sufficiently strong to emerge and, with a little foreign encouragement, assume control. The liberal thought was there, he stated, but it was inarticulate and largely impotent and probably would remain so for some time to come.

The Ambassador said that unless we were prepared to subscribe to the "Pax Japonica" in the Far East, we should rapidly build up our Navy to treaty strength, and when the Washington Naval Treaty expired we should continue "regardless of cost" to maintain the existing naval ratios with Japan; that Japan's naval policy had been formulated on a premise that the United States would never build up to treaty strength. He reported that almost half of the Japanese national budget for 1935–36 was for the Army and Navy.

Finally, the Ambassador declared, it would be "criminally short-sighted" to discard from calculations the possibility of eventual war with Japan; the best possible way to avoid it would be adequate preparation, as "preparedness is a cold fact which even the chauvinists, the military, the patriots, and the ultranationalists in Japan, for all their bluster concerning 'provocative measures' in the United States, can grasp and understand."

On December 29, 1934, upon the failure of the London Conference, Japan gave official notice of intention to terminate the Washington Naval Treaty of 1922. In commenting on that event our Secretary of State Cordell Hull said in conclusion:

The question presented when the Washington treaties were negotiated, and which prompted each delegation to the signing and each country to the ratifying of those treaties, was that of promoting peace through disarmament and cooperative effort along certain defined lines. The objectives then and there envisaged are still fundamental among the objectives of the foreign policy of the United States. To this high purpose the people of this country, in a spirit of sincere friendship toward all other peoples, will continue unswervingly to devote their own efforts, and earnestly invoke like efforts on the part of others.

He thereby accepted as the policy for this administration the policy of the Harding administration concerning disarmament and cooperation for world peace. As quoted previously in my remarks, President Roosevelt had sideswiped the League of Nations by saying that we were not members and did not contemplate membership. At this point, Secretary Hull adopted the Harding-Hughes principle of disarmament. What was past was indeed prologue.

It is important to present at this point the full text of a thoroughly statesmanlike letter from Ambassador Grew to Secretary Hull written 2 days before the Secretary announced Japan's notice of intention to terminate the Washington Naval Treaty. The document is as follows:

The Ambassador in Japan (Grew) to the Secretary of State

No. 1102 TOKYO, December 27, 1934.
[Received January 16, 1935.]

SIR: Now that the London Naval Conversations have terminated, I should like to convey to the Department various thoughts in this general connection to which the Department may desire to give consideration if and when the conversations are renewed or a naval conference convoked. I shall be contributing little that is new, for most of the facts and opinions set forth herein have already been brought to the Department's attention in previous reports. Furthermore, the attitude, policy and action of our delegation in London, as directed by the Government and as revealed in the various summaries of developments telegraphed to this Embassy on October 25 and 31, November 22 and December 10, and in certain press reports, have indicated a sound comprehension of the situation in the Far East as it exists today. The firm stand of our Government and delegation to maintain the present naval ratios intact in the face of Japanese intransigeance, as well as their decision that the action of the Japanese Government in denouncing the Washington Naval Treaty automatically created a new situation in which the conversations must be suspended *sine die*, leaving the Japanese to return home empty handed, were especially gratifying to those of us who have watched the developments in London from this angle. The purpose of this despatch is therefore mainly to summarize and to place my views in concise form on record for the future.

The thought which is uppermost in my mind is that the United States is faced, and will be faced in future, with two main alternatives. One is to be prepared to withdraw from the Far East, gracefully and gradually perhaps, but not the less effectively in the long run, permitting our treaty rights to be nullified, the Open Door to be closed, our vested economic interests to be dissolved and our commerce to operate unprotected. There are those who advocate this course, and who have advocated it to me personally, on the ground that any other policy will entail the risk of eventual war with Japan. * * * In their opinion, "the game is not worth the candle" because the United States can continue to subsist comfortably even after relinquishing its varied interests in the Far East, thereby eliminating the risk of future war.

The other main alternative is to insist, and to continue to insist, not aggressively yet not the less firmly, on the maintenance of our legitimate rights and interests in this part of the world and, so far as practicable, to support the normal development of those interests constructively and progressively.

There has already been abundant indication that the present Administration in Washington proposes to follow the second of these alternatives. For purposes of discussion we may therefore, I assume, discard the hypothesis of withdrawal and examine the future outlook with the assurance that our Government has not the slightest intention of relinquishing the legitimate rights, vested interests, non-discriminatory privileges for equal opportunity and healthful commercial development of the United States in the Far East.

In following this second and logical course, there should be and need be nothing inconsistent, so far as our own attitude is concerned, with the policy of the good neighbor. The determination to support and protect our legitimate interests in the Far East can and should be carried out in a way which, while sacrificing no point of principle, will aim to restrict to a minimum the friction between the United States and Japan inevitably arising from time to time as a result of that determination.

The administration of that policy from day to day becomes a matter of diplomacy, sometimes delicate, always important, for much depends on the method and manner of approach to the various problems with which we have been, are, and will continue to be faced. With the ultra-sensitiveness of the Japanese, arising out of a marked inferiority complex which manifests itself in the garb of an equally marked superiority complex,

with all its attendant bluster, chauvinism, xenophobia and organized national propaganda, the method and maanner of dealing with current controversies assume a significance and importance often out of all proportion to the nature of the controversy. That the Department fully appreciates this fact has been amply demonstrated by the instructions issued to this Embassy since the present Administration took office, and it has been our endeavor to carry out those instructions, or to act on our own initiative when such action was called for, with the foregoing considerations constantly in view.

But behind our day to day diplomacy lies a factor of prime importance, namely national support, demonstrated and reinforced by national preparedness. I believe that a fundamental element of that preparedness should be the maintenance of the present naval ratios in principle and the eventual achievement and maintenance of those ratios, so far as they apply to Japan, in fact. With such a background, and only with such a background, can we pursue our dimplomacy with any cofidence that our representations will be listened to or that they will lead to favorable results. Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, was recently reported in the press as saying: "Armies and navies, in being efficient, give weight to the peaceful words of statesmen, but a feverish effort to create them when once a crisis is imminent simply provokes attack." We need thorough preparedness not in the interests of war but of peace.

It is difficult for those who do not live in Japan to appraise the present temper of the country. An American Senator, according to reports, has recently recommended that we should accord parity to Japan in order to avoid future war. Whatever the Senator's views may be concerning the general policy that we should follow in the Far East, he probably does not realize what harm that sort of public statement does in strengthening the Japanese stand and in reinforcing the aggressive ambitions of the expansionists. The Japanese press of course picks out such statements by prominent Americans and publishes them far and wide, thus confirming the general belief in Japan that the pacifist element in the United States is preponderantly strong and in the last analysis will control the policy and action of our Government. Under such circumstances there is a general tendency to characterize our diplomatic representations as bluff and to believe that they can safely be disregarded without fear of implementation. It would be helpful if those who share the Senator's views could hear and read some of the things that are constantly being said and written in Japan, to the effect that Japan's destiny is to subjugate and rule the world (sic), and could realize the expansionist ambitions which lie not far from the surface in the minds of certain elements in the Army and Navy, the patriotic societies and the intense nationalists throughout the country. Their aim is to obtain trade control and eventually predominant political influence in China, the Philippines, the Straits Settlements, Siam, and the Dutch East Indies, the Maritime Provinces, and Vladivostok, one step at a time, as in Korea and Manchuria, pausing intermittently to consolidate and then continuing as soon as the intervening obstacles can be overcome by diplomacy or force. With such dreams of empire cherished by many, and with an army and navy capable of taking the bit in their own teeth and running away with it regardless of the restraining influence of the saner heads of the Government in Tokyo (a risk which unquestionably exists and of which we have already had ample evidence in the Manchurian affair), we would be reprehensibly somnolent if we were to trust to the security of treaty restraints or international comity to safeguard our own interests or, indeed, our own property.

I may refer here to my despatch No. 608 of December 12, 1933, a re-reading of which is respectfully invited because it applies directly to the present situation. That despatch reported a confidential conversation with the Netherlands Minister, General Pabst, a shrewd and rational colleague with long experience in Japan, in which the Minister said that in his opinion the Japanese Navy, imbued as it is with patriotic and chauvinistic fervor and with a desire to emulate the deeds of the army in order not to lose caste with the public, would be perfectly capable of descending upon and occupying Guam at a moment of crisis or, indeed, at any other moment, regardless of the ulterior consequences. I do not think that such an insane step is likely, yet the action of the army in Manchuria, judged from the point of view of treaty rights and international comity, might also have been judged as insensate. The important fact is that under present circumstances, and indeed under circumstances which may continue in future (although the pendulum of chauvinism throughout Japanese history has swung to and fro in periodic cycles of intensity and temporary relaxation) the armed forces of the country are perfectly capable of over-riding the restraining control of the Government and of committing what might well amount to national "harakiri" in a mistaken conception of patriotism.

When Japanese speak of Japan's being the "stabilizing factor" and the "guardian of peace" of East Asia, what they have in mind is a Pax Japonica with eventual complete commercial control, and, in the minds of some, eventual complete political control of East Asia. While Ambassador Saito may have been misquoted in a recent issue of the Philadelphia Bulletin as saying that Japan will be prepared to fight to maintain that conception of peace, nevertheless that is precisely what is in the minds of many Japanese today. There is a swashbuckling temper in the country, largely developed by military propaganda, which can lead Japan during the next few years, or in the next few generations, to any extremes unless the saner minds in the Government prove able to cope with it and to restrain the country from national suicide.

The efficacy of such restraint is always problematical. Plots against the Government are constantly being hatched. We hear, for instance, that a number of young officers of the Third Infantry Regiment and students from the Military Academy in Tokyo were found on November 22 to have planned to assassinate various high members of the Government, including Count Makino, and that students of the Military Academy were confined to the school area for a few days after the discovery of that plot, which had for its object the placing in effect at once of the provisions of the now celebrated "army pamphlet" (see despatch No. 1031 of November 1, 1934). A similar alleged plot to attack the politicians at the opening of the extraordinary session of the Diet—another May 15 incident—is also said to have been discovered and nipped in the bud. Such plots aim to form a military dictatorship. It is of course impossible to substantiate these rumors, but they are much talked about and it is unlikely that so much smoke would materialize without some fire. I wish that more Americans could come out here and live here and gradually come to sense the real potential risks and dangers of the situation instead of speaking and writing academically on a subject which they know nothing whatever about, thereby contributing ammunition to the Japanese military and extremists who are stronger than they have been for many a day. The idea that a great body of liberal thought lying just beneath the surface since 1931 would be sufficiently strong to emerge and assume control with a little foreign encouragement is thoroughly mistaken. The liberal thought is there, but it is inarticulate and largely impotent, and in all probability will remain so for some time to come.

At this point I should like to make the following observation. From reading this despatch, and perhaps from other reports periodically submitted by the Embassy, one might readily get the impression that we are developing something of an "anti-Japanese" complex. This is not the case. One can dislike and disagree with certain members of a family without necessarily feeling hostility to the family itself. For me there are no finer people in the world than the type of Japanese exemplified by such men as * * * and a host of others. I am rather inclined to place * * * in the same general category; if he could have his way unhampered by the military I believe that he would steer the country into safer and saner channels. One of these friends once sadly remarked to us: "We Japanese are always putting our worst foot foremost, and we are too proud to explain ourselves." This is profoundly true. Theirs has been and is a "bungling diplomacy". They habitually play their cards badly. Amau's statement of April 17 was a case in point. The declaration of the oil monopoly in Manchuria at this particular juncture, thereby tending to drive Great Britain into the other camp at a moment when closer Anglo-Japanese cooperation was very much in view, was another. While it is true that the military and the extremists are primarily responsible for the "bungling diplomacy" of Japan, the Japanese as a race tend to be inarticulate, more at home in action than with words. The recent negotiations in Batavia amply illustrated the fact that Japanese diplomats, well removed from home influences and at liberty to choose their own method and manner of approach, are peculiarly insensitive to the unhappy effects of arbitrary pronouncements. They have learned little from the sad experience of Hanihara. But the military and the extremists know little and care little about Japan's relations with other countries, and it is the desire of people like Shiratori, Amau and other Government officials to enhance their own prestige at home and to safeguard their future careers by standing in well with the military that brings about much of the trouble. Perhaps we should be grateful that they so often give their hand away in advance.

But all this does not make us less sympathetic to the better elements in Japanese life or in any sense "anti-Japanese." Japan is a country of paradoxes and extremes, of great wisdom and of great stupidity, an apt illustration of which may be found in connection with the naval conversations; while the naval authorities and the press have been stoutly maintaining that Japan cannot adequately defend her shores with less than parity, the press and the public, in articles, speeches and interviews, have at the same time been valiantly boasting that the Japanese Navy is today stronger than the American Navy and could easily defeat us in case of war. In such an atmosphere it is difficult, very difficult, for a foreigner to keep a detached and balanced point of view. We in the Embassy are making that effort, I hope with success, and in the meantime about all we can do is to keep the boat from rocking dangerously. Constructive work is at present impossible. Our efforts are concentrated on the thwarting of destructive influences.

Having placed the foregoing considerations on record, I have less hesitation in reiterating and emphasizing with all con-

viction the potential dangers of the situation and the prime importance of American national preparedness to meet it. As a nation we have taken the lead in international efforts towards the restriction and reduction of armaments. We have had hopes that the movement would be progressive, but the condition of world affairs as they have developed during the past twelve years since the Washington Conference has not afforded fruitful ground for such progress. Unless we are prepared to subscribe to a "Pax Japonica" in the Far East, with all that this movement, as conceived and interpreted by Japan, is bound to entail, we should rapidly build up our Navy to treaty strength, and if and when the Washington Naval Treaty expires we should continue to maintain the present ratio with Japan regardless of cost, a peace-time insurance both to cover and to reduce the risk of war. In the meantime every proper step should be taken to avoid or to offset the belligerent utterances of jingoes no less than the defeatist statements of pacifists in the United States, many of which find their way into the Japanese press, because the utterances of the former tend to enflame public sentiment against our country, while the statements of the latter convey an impression of American weakness, irresolution and bluff.

My own opinion, although it can be but guesswork, is that Japan will under no circumstances invite a race in naval armaments, and that having found our position on the ratios to be adamant, further propositions will be forthcoming within the next two years before the Washington Treaty expires, or before our present building program is fully completed. When the United States has actually completed its naval building program to treaty limits, then, it is believed, and probably not before then, Japan will realize that we are in earnest and will seek a compromise. We believe that Japan's naval policy has been formulated on the premise that the United States would never build up to treaty strength, a premise which has been strengthened in the past by the naval policy of the past two Administrations, by the apparent strength of the pacifist element in the United States, and more recently by the effects of the depression.

While it is true that Japan, by sedulously forming and stimulating public opinion to demand parity with the United States in principle if not in fact, has burned her bridges behind her, nevertheless the Japanese leaders are past-masters at remoulding public opinion in the country by skillful propaganda to suit new conditions. Once convinced that parity is impossible, it is difficult to believe that she will allow matters to come to a point where competitive building becomes unavoidable. With a national budget for 1935–1936 totalling 2,193,414,289 yen, of which about 47% is for the Army and Navy, and with an estimated national debt in 1936 of 9,880,000,000 yen, nearly equal to the Cabinet Bureau of Statistics estimate of the national income for 1930, namely 10,635,000,000 yen; with her vast outlay in Manchuria, her already heavily taxed population and the crying need of large sections of her people for relief funds, it is difficult to see how Japan could afford to embark upon a program of maintaining naval parity with the United States and Great Britain.

Having registered our position firmly and unequivocally, we can now afford to await the next move on the part of Japan. I believe that it will come.

So far as we can evaluate here the proceedings of the recent preliminary naval conversations in London, I am of the opinion that the most important and the most valuable result issuing therefrom has been the apparent tendency towards closer Anglo-American cooperation in the Far East. If we can count in future—again as a direct result of Japan's "bungling diplomacy"—on a solid and united front between the United States and Great Britain in meeting Japan's flaunting of treaty rights and her unrestrained ambitions to control East Asia, the future may well assume a brighter aspect for all of us.

Theodore Roosevelt enunciated the policy "Speak softly but carry a big stick". If our diplomacy in the Far East is to achieve favorable results, and if we are to reduce the risk of an eventual war with Japan to a minimum, that is the only way to proceed. Such a war may be unthinkable, and so it is, but the spectre of it is always present and will be present for some time to come. It would be criminally short-sighted to discard it from our calculation, and the best possible way to avoid it is to be adequately prepared, for preparedness is a cold fact which even the chauvinists, the military, the patriots and the ultra-nationalists in Japan, for all their bluster concerning "provocative measures" in the United States, can grasp and understand. The Soviet Ambassador recently told me that a prominent Japanese had said to him that the most important factor in avoiding a Japanese attack on the Maritime Provinces was the intensive Soviet military preparations in Siberia and Vladivostok. I believe this to be true, and again, and yet again, I urge that our own country be adequately prepared to meet all eventualities in the Far East.

The Counselor, the Naval Attaché and the Military Attaché of this Embassy, having separately read this despatch, have expressed to me their full concurrence with its contents both in essence and detail.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH C. GREW.

Did our Government follow Ambassador Grew's advice or even give it more than a passing pained glance? No; it was almost completely ignored. We continued raking leaves instead of building fortifications, paying farmers to destroy their pigs and cattle, paying people not to work instead of paying the unemployed to make guns and ammunition. Pacifism and world peace without work was the watchword. Meanwhile the whirlwind gathered and the saber-toothed tiger crouched to spring from the heart of the storm.

There is one bright spot in this dismal picture, and that spot shines upon a Member of this House and upon the committee of which he is still chairman. I refer to none other than our distinguished colleague, the Honorable CARL VINSON of Georgia, Chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. During 1934, under his able personal sponsorship and leadership there was passed the Vinson Naval Authorization Act, which authorized the construction of ships up to the limits of the Washington and London naval treaties. If any man in our country is deserving of the high tributes paid to a patriot, it is CARL VINSON. His comprehension in these matters has been so far ahead of not only the administration, but, at times, of the Navy itself, that he deserves every honor a grateful country can bestow upon him.

But it was not until 1937 that the keels were laid for two new battleships—the first laid since 1920. Much credit has been taken by this administration for foresight in this matter, but most of the credit is due to CARL VINSON and his colleagues on the committee.

It would be repetitious to recount the many messages of warning from our diplomatic and military observers in all parts of the globe—telling of impending war. They are amply spread in that volume, Peace and War, from which I have been quoting. What did our Government do about it? Almost nothing—sometimes, worse than nothing.

In 1933 Secretary Hull requested the Congress to enact legislation authorizing the application of arms embargoes under certain conditions and "to the sole end of maintaining the peace of the world." The legislation was not enacted.

By 1935 public support had been built up for the arms-embargo principle and neutrality legislation, so the Neutrality Act of 1935 was passed by Congress and signed by the President August 31, 1935:

Because—

Said Mr. Roosevelt—

it was intended as an expression of the fixed desire of the Government and the people of the United States to avoid any action which might involve us in war.

But the President hedged by admitting that the inflexible embargo provision "might drag us into war instead of keeping us out." If he understood the danger, why did he not veto it then? He controlled that Congress absolutely.

Two months later, on October 3, 1935, Italian forces invaded Ethiopia. The Neutrality Act with embargoes were invoked 2 days afterward. In his accompanying statement the President said that:

The major policy of the United States was to keep from becoming involved in war.

Addis Ababa fell on May 5, 1936, and on June 12, 1936, the United States terminated its application of the Neutrality Act to that act of rape.

That precedent served as a notice and guaranty to Hitler and Tojo that they could proceed about their bloody business at will without risk of our entering the field to stop them. We were no longer a force, a world power for good. We had turned our face away while murder and rape were committed and only turned to look back sadly upon the fait accompli.

In 1936 President Roosevelt, campaigning for reelection, pointed with pride to the neutrality legislation. At this point it is well that we recall to mind some of the words of Candidate Roosevelt and particularly those delivered at Chautauqua, N. Y., on August 14, 1936:

We shun political commitments which might entangle us in foreign wars; we avoid connection with the political activities of the League of Nations; but I am glad to say that we have cooperated wholeheartedly in the social and humanitarian work at Geneva. Thus we are a part of the world effort to control traffic in narcotics, to improve international health, to help child welfare, to eliminate double taxation, and to better working conditions and laboring hours throughout the world.

We are not isolationists except insofar as we seek to isolate ourselves completely from war. Yet we must remember that so long as war exists on earth there will be some danger

that even the nation which most ardently desires peace may be drawn into war.

I have seen war. I have seen war on land and sea. I have seen blood running from the wounded. I have seen men coughing out their gassed lungs. I have seen the dead in the mud. I have seen cities destroyed. I have seen 200 limping, exhausted men come out of line—the survivors of a regiment of 1,000 that went forward 48 hours before. I have seen children starving. I have seen the agony of mothers and wives. I hate war.

Yes, my friends; we all hate war. Nobody but the Nazis and Japs seem to like it very much, and we hope that they, too, will be thoroughly and permanently sick of it when we get through with them. But the point of this discussion is not to criticize nor say "I told you so," for none of us may cast the first stone. The point is that the people of this country, bombarded on every side with words like the President's, came to believe that hating war and passing Neutrality Acts would, in fact, keep us out of war—a totally unrealistic attitude on everyone's part—in fact, an exceedingly dangerous attitude—dangerous to the peace of our country and the world.

Realism had been spoken in the words of Gen. Douglas MacArthur when, as Chief of Staff in 1934, he advocated an immediate expansion of our armed forces. That expansion, he said, would at least offer the United States "a justified assurance of freedom from attack, or, at the worst, from extreme consequences"—to put it mildly—"in the event of attack."

On November 25, 1936, Japan joined Germany in the anti-Comintern pact. Both feared Russia and both saw their chance.

On January 8, 1937, the President finally directed the Navy Department to proceed with the construction of two of the replacement battleships that had been authorized by the Vinson Naval Act of 1934. The Army had been increased in strength from the low point of 118,000 in 1935 to 158,000 at that time.

Six months later, on July 7, 1937, Japanese troops burst into North China over the Marco Polo Bridge. Secretary Hull at once urged, though gently, that the Japanese Government exercise a policy of self-restraint. He might as well have urged a tiger to exercise self-restraint when its kill was bleating.

On July 16, 1937, 9 days later, Secretary Hull felt called upon to issue a statement of our principles. These are editorially described as follows:

He said that the following principles were advocated by the United States: Maintenance of peace; national and international self-restraint; abstinence from use of force in pursuit of policy; abstinence from interference in the internal affairs of other nations; adjustment of problems in international relations by processes of peaceful negotiation and agreement; faithful observance of international agreements; modification of provisions of treaties, when need therefor arises, by orderly processes carried out in a spirit of mutual helpfulness and accommodation; respect by all nations for the rights of others and performance by all nations of established obligations; revitalization and strengthening of international law; promotion of economic security and stability the world over; lowering or removing of excessive barriers of international trade; effective equality of commercial opportunity and application of the principle of equality of treatment; and limitation and reduction of armament. The Secretary stated that the United States avoided entering into alliances or entangling commitments but believed in cooperative effort by peaceful and practical means in support of the above-stated principles.

And then on August 10 Mr. Hull offered Japan the good offices of our Government in settling the dispute. How unrealistic. There was no dispute. Japan was on her way to devour China—that is all. So Japan did not bother to respond to our Secretary's kind offer.

On September 14, 1937, the President could not make up his mind whether or not to apply the vaunted Neutrality Act embargoes. They would not have helped China, but rather Japan. So instead of issuing a proclamation, he issued a statement.

On October 5, 1937, he delivered the famous "quarantine aggressor nations" speech at Chicago. And the next day the League of Nations proclaimed that Japan's attack on China was a violation of the Nine-Power Pact of 1922. So what? So that was that, and that was all.

From then on until December 7, 1941, the President and the Secretary cautiously sought peaceful means to check the Japanese conquest. About all they succeeded in doing was to enrage the tiger and bring despair to its victim.

In January 1938, the President asked Congress for, and was promptly given, authority and funds to strengthen our national defense by two more battleships and two cruisers. The Secretary of War reported then that our Army ranked eighteenth among the armies of the world.

On March 17, 1938, Secretary Hull at long last woke up. He declared that "isolation is not a means to security, it is a fruitful source of insecurity." But by that time the people were so imbued with the neutrality, embargo, disarmament, and nonintervention theme that they only shuddered to think of what was going on elsewhere in the world, as they went on being relief clients and taxpayers.

Then alert Chairman CARL VINSON'S Committee on Naval Affairs directed that the Navy investigate the question of shore and outlying naval establishments. The Hepburn board did a quick and excellent job and filed its report with the Speaker of the House on January 3, 1939. Among other recommendations, the Hepburn board's report recommended the immediate fortification of Guam. I quote from that report, House Document No. 65, Seventy-sixth Congress, as follows:

GUAM

112. Guam is at present practically defenseless against determined attack by any first-class power based in the western Pacific. With adequate air and submarine protection securely based on Guam, the island could be made secure against anything short of a major effort on the part of any probable enemy, an effort that is to say on the same order of magnitude that would be required to establish a footing in the Philippines. Supported by a garrison of only moderate strength in comparison to the important military issues involved, with appropriate antiaircraft and coast-defense equipment, it seems that such a defense force should be able to hold out to the limit of time that its supplies lasted, a period long enough in ordinary probability for adequate support to arrive. The salient military features of the situation above envisaged are as follows:

(a) The island is well adapted to the maintenance of an air force equal or superior to any similar hostile force that could be assembled within a radius of 1,200 miles.

(b) Its natural facilities for development of a submarine base are excellent.

(c) Even without command of the sea extending westward of Midway, the air and submarine strength of the island could be reinforced.

(d) The island could only be reduced or occupied by an enemy through landing operations supported by naval surface operations on a large scale. Hostile air attack alone could produce no decisive effect, and against defenses of the character mentioned would be likely to incur heavy and unrequited losses.

(e) So long as Guam existed as a strong air and submarine base hostile operations against the Philippines would be a precarious undertaking. To an even greater extent Guam would greatly impede, if not actually deny, extensive hostile naval operations to the southward, thus greatly simplifying our naval problem should the fleet ever be called upon for operations in the Far East.

113. The foregoing considerations are of sufficient weight to warrant the recommendation that Guam should be developed as a major air and submarine base, with a garrison sufficient in strength to make its reduction or occupation a major effort on the part of any probable enemy. There are, however, other considerations and possibilities of a far greater significance which it is pertinent to take account of in this connection. Although these considerations may be regarded as beyond the precept of this Board they are of such far-reaching importance that the Board feels impelled to include them in its report.

114. Guam is adapted naturally to development as a major advanced fleet base. Detailed studies to this end have been made in the past, and plans adequate to the situation are in hand. Technical development in aircraft and submarines during recent years have greatly increased the possibilities of such a base.

115. On December 18, 1919, the Joint Army and Navy Board recommended that "Guam be fortified and garrisoned adequate to its defense against any force that could be brought against it," and that a first-class naval base be prepared in Apra Harbor. The Washington Treaty of 1922 put an end to those plans, but that treaty has now expired.

116. The establishment of a fully equipped fleet base at Guam, capable of maintaining at least the major part of the fleet in all types, would in itself practically assure the impregnability of the island. This by virtue of two facts, viz, the natural adaptability of the island to defense by inferior force; and, second, the availability of a fleet base at this point would practically assure, if not unquestioned command of the sea between the island and Hawaii, at least the possibility of maintaining our communications over this area upon no less than equal terms with any force that might attack them.

117. An important though not governing consideration is the obvious fact that a fleet base in Guam would provide for the security of our Asiatic Fleet in time of sudden emer-

gency, and for the maintenance of its peacetime mission with no great loss in efficiency or convenience as compared to the present situation.

118. Confining itself to the purely military aspect of this question, the Board is of the opinion, in which it believes itself supported by the most authoritative sources that have given study to the matter, that a strong advanced fleet base at Guam, developed to the practical limits which the natural resources invite, would assure—

1. Practical immunity of the Philippines against hostile attack in force.

2. The most favorable conditions that could be brought about for the prosecution of naval operations in the western Pacific, arising from whatever necessity. It would reduce to its simplest possible terms the defense of Hawaii and the continental coast of the United States.

3. The ability of the fleet to operate with greater freedom in meeting emergency conditions that might arise in the Atlantic.

Within a few days the Naval Affairs Committee received from the Secretary of the Navy a draft of a proposed bill to carry out the recommendations of the Hepburn board. But no mention was made in the bill of fortifications for Guam, although all of the other recommendations were carried forward in the bill. The wording in the bill in reference to Guam was as follows:

H. R. 2880

A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed to establish, develop, or increase naval aviation facilities, with which shall be included the authority to purchase or otherwise acquire land and to construct buildings and accessories at or in the vicinity of Kaneohe Bay, Midway Island, Wake Island, Johnston Island, Palmyra Island; Kodiak, Alaska; Sitka, Alaska; San Juan, P. R.; Pensacola, Fla.; Jacksonville, Fla.; Pearl Harbor, T. H.; and Guam, at a cost not to exceed $65,000,000, except as may be otherwise authorized by law, toward accomplishing the recommendations made by the board appointed pursuant to section 10 (a) of the act approved May 17, 1938 (52 Stat. 403; 34 U. S. C. 4981), as contained in House of Representatives Document No. 65, Seventy-sixth Congress.

Testimony from the Navy as contained in the hearings was voluminous, and much reference was made to Guam. Following are a few pertinent quotations:

Admiral LEAHY. Without giving any consideration to the establishment of such a base, the improvements in facilities for handling airplanes at Guam proposed in this bill will be of much value to existing American commercial air transportation, and to the facility of operation of any naval airplanes that may at any time be in that area.

* * * * *

Our fleet base at Pearl Harbor is an incalculable asset to fleet operations in the Pacific in defense of our coast or of our interests in the Pacific Ocean. The aircraft operating bases proposed for Midway, Wake, Johnston, and Palmyra Islands screen Oahu from the south and west and will support fleet operations in the mid-Pacific.

The island of Guam is not only an island located among foreign-owned islands but it is a vital link in the American airways route to the Orient. Its location close to the Philippines and its natural adaptability to development as an efficient port for seaplane operations render its development extremely important.

The $5,000,000 authorization for Guam requested in this bill is for the purpose of dredging, building a breakwater to improve the seaplane take-off area, and for the construction of initial shore facilities; all of which items are almost essential to the commercial use of the island by American air lines, whether or not the full recommendation of the Board with regard to the ultimate development of Guam should eventually be carried out.

* * * * *

GUAM

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. VINSON). The newspapers of the country are much interested in the fact that Guam, as you say, is in the neighborhood of foreign countries. The country wants to know something about Guam and the reason why it is included in the bill. You have briefly stated that you propose to spend $5,000,000 at Guam. Please state exactly how the proposed $5,000,000 of the $65,000,000 is to be spent at Guam.

Admiral LEAHY. The $5,000,000 authorization for Guam, requested in this bill, is for the purpose of dredging, building a breakwater, improving the seaplane take-off area, and for the construction of initial shore facilities designed to facilitate the operations of airplanes from Apro Harbor at Guam.

The CHAIRMAN. Both military and commercial.

Admiral LEAHY. Both military and commercial, and for the assistance of the commercial lines which are already established and operating with Guam as a stopping point.

* * * * *

Mr. BATES. If foreign nationals are prevented from landing on the mandated islands, as I understand you to say is true, and because of that you are unable to get information of what is going on in regard to the fortification of those islands, why do we permit foreign nationals to land in our island possessions?

Admiral LEAHY. That is outside of my cognizance. I do not know.

Mr. BATES. You do know that foreign nationals are prohibited from landing on the mandated islands?

Admiral LEAHY. I do know that permission has been refused to foreigners to land on the mandated islands. I know also that foreigners have free access to islands under the sovereignty of the United States.

Mr. BATES. How far are the Mariana Islands from Japan?

Admiral LEAHY. The Mariana Islands form a long chain. The nearest large island, Saipan, is about 120 miles north of Guam, although there is a small island only 30 miles from Guam.

Mr. BATES. You know nothing about any possible fortifications on those islands by Japan at the present time?

Admiral LEAHY. No.

Mr. HAVENNER. If the future military policy of the United States should involve a withdrawal of the fleet from the western Pacific, would you express an opinion whether this proposed fortification of Guam would still be highly important for the protection of the Western Hemisphere and the possessions of the United States east of that point?

Admiral LEAHY. There is no proposition in the bill now before the committee to fortify Guam.

* * * * *

Mr. SUTPHIN. Under the Independence Act, when are we supposed to withdraw entirely from the islands?

Admiral LEAHY. 1946.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Could the islands be defended, in the event of a national emergency today; the Philippine Islands, I am talking about?

Admiral LEAHY. May I ask if your question is: Can the United States defend the Philippine Islands in case they are attacked?

Mr. SUTPHIN. That is right.

Admiral LEAHY. In my opinion the United States can defend the Philippine Islands with the facilities now available. It would, however, be a long, costly war.

Mr. SUTPHIN. From the Hawaiian Island base, which is the base we have at the present time?

Admiral LEAHY. The Hawaiian Island base is the most westerly one we have at the present time.

* * * * *

Mr. DARDEN. In your opinion, would it not require a huge outlay of money to put it in such condition as to be able to hold out, say, for a month, against a naval attack by Japan?

Admiral LEAHY. It depends on what you call a large amount of money for that purpose, Mr. Darden. It could be made into a reasonably well-defended aviation and submarine base with the expenditure of, roughly, $80,000,000.

* * * * *

Mr. CHURCH. I think Hugh Johnson has commented on building a base. Is it your opinion that it would take $200,000,000 to build the Guam base to its final needs?

Admiral HEPBURN. You mean the advance fleet base?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes.

Admiral HEPBURN. I have not done any figuring. It would cost about as much as Singapore.

Mr. CHURCH. How much would it cost to make this finally a so-called advance fleet base?

Admiral HEPBURN. I can only give you a rough estimate, I think about $150,000,000.

The following is taken from the committee report on the naval authorization bill, Committee Report No. 76:

GUAM

Under the terms of the bill the Navy will be authorized (1) to build a breakwater at a cost not to exceed $2,200,000; (2) to dredge the harbor to remove coral heads, to provide channels for ships and for seaplane operations at a cost not to exceed $1,900,000; and (3) to build seaplane ramps and parking space, small power plant, and necessary accessories, at a cost not to exceed $900,000.

From the above it can be seen that there is no provision to fortify Guam, as has been widely and incorrectly understood to be the case. The improvements contemplated are no more than is done year after year by this country in improving our harbors so as to make them safe and tenable under all conditions for surface vessels as well as for aircraft.

In speaking for the Navy Department, Hon. Charles Edison, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, assured the committee that it was not the policy of the Department to fortify Guam nor did the Department now contemplate doing any more than is provided for in this bill. In referring to Guam the Assistant Secretary stated:

"It is the present policy of the Navy Department now to ask for development only to the extent stated in the bill before this committee.

"If unforeseen changes in the international situation should indicate a necessity for further development of an airplane base, then Congress will be so informed.

"We hope that there will be no necessity for further development; none is contemplated at the present time."

Meantime, while the Japanese Government made no official protests concerning Guam and its fortification, there was nevertheless a continuous barrage of warning comments by unofficial and often unnamed official spokesmen of Japan. These indicated that Guam's fortification would be deemed an unfriendly act, even though no provision for its fortification was contained in the bill. Hence there grew up in the minds of the public an erroneous idea that the bill actually provided for the fortification of Guam.

When that bill came to the floor of the House the timorous provision authorizing $5,000,000 for deepening the harbor of Apra was stricken from the bill. Many Members—I was then a new Member—voted to strike it on the ground that it was foolish to dredge a harbor that was undefended and that could be taken without much trouble in the event of hostilities. It was stricken from the bill by an overwhelming nonpartisan majority. However, as the public continued to be misled as to the facts, $3,000,000 was quietly granted for the purpose of deepening the harbor in a later bill, and the harbor of Apra was being prepared for the craft of the Japs when they struck in early December 1941.

Who prevented the Navy from asking Congress for the necessary $230,000,000 with which to fortify Guam? The people will know only when the confidential files of the Navy, the State Department, and the President are one day opened. I do not believe the Navy will be found guilty. Moreover, as things have turned out, the Navy would not have had time to fortify Guam in any event, and had they started in to do it war might have come much sooner, and we were very ill-prepared.

I quote now from Peace and War, page 88, as follows:

> It was the opinion of the responsible officials of the Government, including the highest military and naval authorities, that adoption and application of a policy of imposing embargoes upon strategic exports to Japan would be attended with serious risk of retaliatory action of a character likely to lead to this country's becoming involved in war.

And on page 89:

> They were in agreement that prevailing public opinion in this country and, with the imminence of and finally the outbreak of war in Europe, the comparative military unpreparedness of this country were such as to render it inadvisable to risk, by resort to drastic economic measures against Japan, involvement in war.

That situation was the key to events that followed. The ultimate realization by our Government that Ambassador Grew had been right in the beginning—right all the way through and right to the end—finally dawned upon unwilling minds and hearts attuned to the siren song of peace or pacifism, both in the Congress, of which I was a Member, and in America.

In the spring of 1939, the President did not seem to dare to ask for outright repeal of the Neutrality Act, which was the right course to have taken. He simply asked for its revision, and repeal of the arms embargo. But the people thought they knew better by then. Had they not had it dinned into their ears, lo, these many years that the way to avoid war was to avoid any and every act that might involve us in war? The Representatives of the people in Congress assembled, refused to repeal the arms embargo, and as the President said we might as well go home, we adjourned. On August 23, the Russians signed up with the Nazis. The way for the Axis was clear. The United States was no longer a force to be reckoned with.

On September 1, Germany invaded Poland and Britain declared war. The President hastily reconvened the Congress in special session on September 21. In due course the revised Neutrality Act was passed and the arms embargo was repealed, but by a fairly narrow margin. Only the personal prestige and appeal of Secretary Hull to his southern Democrats turned the trick.

Came 1940, and the President's request of $1,800,000,000 for national defense was quickly granted by Congress, as was another billion in May and $5,000,000,000 in July. The National Guard was called into Federal service in May, and realization came, even though belated, of the might and power of aviation. At that late date our Army had 1,900 obsolete planes, and all of 52 planes suited for combat duty. Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and then France fell to the Nazi invader.

On August 6, 1940, the Secretary of State—Hull—said in a prepared statement:

> The one and only sure way for our Nation to avoid being drawn into serious trouble or actual war by the wild and destructive forces now abroad elsewhere in the world and to command respect for its rights and interests abroad is for our people to become thoroughly conscious of the possibilities of danger, to make up their minds that we must continue to arm, and to arm to such an extent that the forces of conquest and ruin will not dare make an attack on us or on any part of this hemisphere. To this end, each citizen must be ready and willing for real sacrifice of time and of substance and for hard personal service. In the face of terrific problems and conditions, and until the present serious threats and dangers have disappeared, we cannot pursue complacently the course of our customary normal life.
>
> I feel constrained thus to offer my views in the light of what is already a dangerously widespread movement for world conquest and for the destruction of most of the worthwhile things which civilization has given the human race.

A political campaign was on again in 1940, and the question of conscription was before the Congress. The President did not sponsor the Burke-Wadsworth bill, but held aloof as it was a hot subject to handle in a campaign. The War Department had long since prepared a proper conscription bill for official introduction, but with a political campaign on, the administration thought it best to let nature take its course, and the Burke-Wadsworth bill was handed the President and signed on September 16, 1940. By its own terms, the act was to expire 1 year later.

Shortly thereafter, on October 30, 1940, Candidate Roosevelt said in the course of a campaign inspection tour of defense plants:

> And while I am talking to you mothers and fathers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before but I shall say it again and again. Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars. They are going into training to form a force so strong that, by its very existence, it will keep the threat of war away from our shores. The purpose of our defense is defense.

On September 4, 1940, Statesman-Ambassador Grew cabled Secretary Hull in part as follows:

> I have expressed the opinion in previous communications that American-Japanese relations would be set on a downward curve if sanctions were applied by the United States. It is true that measures are now justified by our new program of national preparedness which need not fall within the category of outright sanctions. On the other hand, the probability must be contemplated that drastic embargoes on such important products as oil, of which a superabundance is known to be possessed by the United States, would be interpreted by the people and the Government of Japan as actual sanctions and some form of retaliation might and probably would follow. The risks would depend not so much upon the careful calculations of the Japanese Government as upon the uncalculating do or die temper of the Army and Navy should they impute to the United States the responsibility for the failure of their plans for expansion. It may be that such retaliation would take the form of countermeasures by the Government but it would be more likely that it would be some sudden stroke by the Navy or Army without the prior authorization or knowledge of the Government. These dangers constitute an imponderable element which cannot be weighed with assurance at any given moment. However, it would be shortsighted to deny their existence or to formulate policy and adopt measures without fully considering these potential risks and determining the wisdom of facing them squarely.
>
> * * * * *
>
> (b) Admittedly America's security has depended in a measure upon the British fleet, which has been in turn and could only have been supported by the British Empire. (c) If the support of the British Empire in this her hour of travail is conceived to be in our interest, and most emphatically do I so conceive it, we must strive by every means to preserve the status quo in the Pacific, at least until the war in Europe has been won or lost. This cannot be done, in my opinion, nor can we further protect our interests properly and adequately merely by the expression of disapproval and carefully keeping a record thereof.

On September 23, 1940, the Department of State issued a press release, as follows:

> In response to inquiries at the press conference today, the Secretary of State said:
>
> "Events are transpiring so rapidly in the Indochina situation that it is impossible to get a clear picture of the minute-to-minute developments. It seems obvious, however, that the status quo is being upset and that this is being achieved under duress. The position of the United States in disapproval and in depreciation of such procedures has repeatedly been stated."
>
> This Government has not at any time or in any way approved the French concessions to Japan. The attitude of this Government

toward developments in French Indochina is as expressed by the Secretary of State this morning and in previous public statements.

For many years Japan had been a heavy importer of scrap iron and steel to fill the maw of her shrieking war machines. Aviation gasoline and fuel oil from California were no less important to her in the conquest of Asia. The Export Control Act of July 2, 1940, had provided a means for virtually embargoing these and other articles from export, and regulations had been promulgated that in effect singled out Japan, while favoring Britain. Japan protested by note and declared it discriminatory action as "an unfriendly act," stating in an annex to her note that "if it leads to the imposition of further measures of curtailment, future relations between Japan and the United States will be unpredictable." How precise the Japanese.

That was a solemn warning to us, then and there. That note was delivered to Secretary Hull October 7, 1940, 14 months to the day before Pearl Harbor.

On December 29, 1940, the President delivered a fireside chat to the Nation in which he proclaimed us the "arsenal of democracy." In that now famous speech he made only incidental mention of the menace in the Pacific.

On January 6, 1941, in his message to the new Seventy-seventh Congress, he expounded the "four freedoms."

On January 27, 1941, Ambassador Grew cabled the Secretary of State as follows:

[Telegram: Paraphrase]

TOKYO, January 27, 1941—6 p. m.

[Received January 27—6:38 a. m.]

125. A member of the Embassy was told by my ——— colleague that from many quarters, including a Japanese one, he had heard that a surprise mass attack on Pearl Harbor was planned by the Japanese military forces, in case of "trouble" between Japan and the United States; that the attack would involve the use of all the Japanese military facilities. My colleague said that he was prompted to pass this on because it had come to him from many sources, although the plan seemed fantastic.

GREW.

From a memorandum dated March 8, 1941, recording a conversation with the Japanese Ambassador Nomura held by Mr. Hull secretly at his apartment in the Carlton Hotel, I quote the following—Peace and War, page 623, document 199.

I inquired further what countries like mine would have to gain by remaining complacent in the face of a movement to substitute force and conquest for law and justice and order and fair dealing and equality. The Ambassador sought to play down the view that such military conquest was really in the mind of his Government and he then said that embargoes by this country were, of course, of increasing concern, and that he did not believe there would be any further military movements unless the policy of increasing embargoes by this country should force his Government, in the minds of those in control, to take further military steps. To this I replied that this is a matter entirely in the hands of his Government. * * *

* * * * *

I referred on one or two occasions to the statement reported to have been made to Mr. Churchill by the Japanese Ambassador in London some days ago to the effect that his Government would not attack Singapore or the Netherlands East Indies, and inquired point-blank what the Ambassador's idea as to this was. In reply to the first inquiry, he was not exceedingly strong in his statement but he did make it fairly definite that he did not believe there would be an attack but added, as heretofore indicated, that if our American embargoes continued to press his Government and the military group in control, they may feel forced to proceed further in a naval or military way.

* * * * *

In the course of the conversation I had occasion to remind the Ambassador that few nations were ever on more mutually profitable and genuine friendly relations than our two countries for two generations lasting until about the time of the Coolidge and Hoover administrations. I said that, speaking in great confidence, when I came to the State Department, one of my greatest ambitions was to work out a mutually satisfactory arrangement with respect to the Quota Limitation Act of 1924, enacted by our Congress, so as to place the whole matter of immigration on an equal or reciprocal basis, which, of course, would have meant that the number of immigrants both ways would be limited, but this basis of equality would settle the feeling that has existed since 1924. He expressed his gratification at this.

Then came the Lend-Lease Act, the act of March 11, 1941, containing the following subsection—section 3:

(b) The terms and conditions upon which any such foreign government receives any aid authorized under subsection (a) shall be those which the President deems satisfactory, and the benefit to the United States may be payment or repayment in kind or property, or any other direct or indirect benefit which the President deems satisfactory.

On May 27, 1941, the President declared an unlimited emergency. His radio message is summed up in a paragraph from page 107 of Peace and War as follows:

The President summed up our national policy as follows: We would actively resist wherever necessary and with all our resources every attempt by Hitler to extend his domination to the Western Hemisphere; we would actively resist his every attempt to gain control of the seas; we would insist upon the vital importance of keeping Hitlerism away from any point in the world which could be used and would be used as a base of attack against the Americas; we would give every possible assistance to Great Britain and all countries which, like Great Britain, were resisting Hitlerism or its equivalent with force of arms; our patrols were helping to insure delivery of the needed supplies to Great Britain, and all additional measures necessary to deliver the goods would be taken.

Commencing on May 11, 1941, there was an interchange of views between Ambassador Nomura and Secretary Hull concerning a new trade treaty and amity in general. This exchange was in process until on July 23, 1941, when the Japanese Ambassador called on Acting Secretary of State Sumner Welles and presented notice of the Japanese agreement with the Vichy French Government for Japanese occupation of French Indochina. In his memorandum of the interview, Mr. Welles reports in part as follows—Peace and War, page 696, Document 218:

I said I thought the time had now come to speak with the complete frankness which the Ambassador would expect from a member of his own naval profession and I would consequently take the liberty of doing so. I said that the movement now undertaken by Japan could only be regarded by the United States as having two probable purposes, neither of which purpose this Government could ignore.

First, the United States could only assume that the occupation of Indochina by Japan constituted notice to the United States that the Japanese Government intended to pursue a policy of force and of conquest, and, second, that in the light of these acts on the part of Japan, the United States, with regard to its own safety in the light of its own preparations for self-defense, must assume that the Japanese Government was taking the last step before proceeding upon a policy of totalitarian expansion in the South Seas and of conquest in the South Seas through the seizure of additional territories in that region.

This Government could not see that there was any fact or factual theory upon which Japan could possibly fill Indochina with Japanese military and other forces for purposes of defending Japan. The only consequent alternative was to regard the occupation of Indochina by Japan as being undertaken because of the Japanese realization of its value to Japan for purposes of offense against the South Sea area.

I said that in view of all of these considerations, which I believed I had set forth very clearly to the Ambassador, I was now in a position where I must tell him, at the request of Secretary Hull, that the latter could not see that there was any basis now offered for the pursuit of the conversations in which he and the Ambassador had been engaged.

As the Japanese had watched the export license restrictions tighten, they had sent a very military looking commercial expedition to Java to negotiate with the Dutch for oil and gasoline. The Dutch stood firm, and their position was sustained by Secretary Hull. Mr. Hull had said on April 7, 1940, that:

Intervention in the domestic affairs of the Netherlands Indies or any alteration of their status quo by other than peaceful processes would be prejudicial to the cause of stability, peace, and security not only in the region of the Netherlands Indies, but in the entire Pacific area.

Following the Export Control Act of July 2, 1940, official restrictions upon exports to Japan commenced. A total embargo on the export of iron and steel scrap to destinations other than countries of the Western Hemisphere and Great Britain went into effect on October 16, 1940. At last the squeeze was on Japan. By spring of 1941, aviation gasoline was off the list, and oil was being pinched down. Japan needed these things to conduct her conquest of China. We placed her in the position of either stopping her conquest of China, or attacking the Netherlands East Indies, for only there were quantities of oil to be had.

Her first move southward was into Indochina as a jumping-off place. Her second move would include Thailand. But matters were hastened by the President issuing an Executive order on July 26, 1941, freezing all Japanese assets in the United States, and on July 30, 1941,

he issued an Executive order that shut off the last drop of oil to Japan.

From that day on it was merely a matter of Japanese stalling for time and position. As we had warned Japan not to upset the status quo in the Netherlands East Indies, it was plain to her that we would fight if she did it. She nevertheless decided to take Java and Sumatra for their oil—her position screened from us by her thousands of islands of Micronesia, some of them fortified, was safe. She calculated, cooly and carefully—she sparred for time—she watched our fleet like a crouched tiger, and on December 7, 1941, struck a paralyzing blow at Pearl Harbor with one sharp clawed paw, as Ambassador Grew had forewarned she might do, while she sprang on southward after oil in Java. Before we could recover she had taken the foredoomed Philippines in stride, the Malay Peninsula, Singapore, the Netherlands East Indies, and was on the way to Australia.

Had Japan been able to envision that she might disable two-thirds of our Pacific Fleet in an hour, she could have planned to go on to the Pacific coast of the United States, which she could have taken then without serious opposition. Such was the destructive power of that one lightning stroke. Shades of Port Arthur.

From what has gone before in this address it is easy to see that we had ample warning of Japan's intentions, and her probable course of action, at least 4 months in advance of the fatal event. But to complete the record, let us examine a few more documents and memoranda. The stalling negotiations that took place, leading up to the arrival of Ambassador Extraordinary Kurusu, are relatively unimportant. The stage was already set on August 1 of 1941.

It appears from the record that President Roosevelt was deeply preoccupied with Herr Hitler, while Secretary Hull was similarly engrossed, though to a lesser extent, with the Japanese.

The President had caused the fleet to be split. It had been concentrated in the Pacific, but by July 1941 a large part of it had been moved through the Canal into the Atlantic to protect lend-lease shipments. That insured victory to the Japs in their initial effort. In fact, it was almost an invitation to strike. One can imagine their satisfaction on witnessing the reduction of our Pacific Fleet at the very moment we were freezing her assets and taking the final step of shutting off her oil supply. Way back in 1906, Gen. Homer Lea had declared that "When Japan declares war either the American Navy will be divided between the Pacific and Atlantic, or the whole of it will be in the Atlantic."

The following excerpt is editorial comment on the memorandum relating to the course of a visit at the White House of Ambassador Nomura on the afternoon of July 24, 1941:

The President then said that it was believed in the United States that such policies as Japan was pursuing were due to German pressure upon Japan; that the Japanese Government did not understand as clearly as we that Hitler was bent upon world domination; that if Germany succeeded in defeating Russia and dominating Europe and Africa, Germany thereafter would turn her attention to the Far East and to the Western Hemisphere; and that it was entirely possible that after some years the Navies of Japan and of the United States would be cooperating against Hitler as a common enemy.

In the course of this conversation the President reminded the Japanese Ambassador that the United States had been permitting oil to be exported from the United States to Japan; that this had been done because we realized that if these oil supplies had been shut off or restricted the Japanese Government and people would have used this as an incentive or pretext for moving down upon the Netherlands Indies in order to assure themselves of a greater oil supply; that the United States had been pursuing this policy primarily for the purpose of doing its utmost to preserve peace in the Pacific region; that our citizens were unable to understand why, at a time when they were asked to curtail their use of gasoline, the United States should be permitting oil supplies to go to Japan when Japan had given every indication of pursuing a policy of force and conquest in conjunction with the policy of world conquest and domination being carried on by Hitler. The President said that if Japan attempted to seize oil supplies by force in the Netherlands Indies, the latter would undoubtedly resist, the British would immediately come to their assistance, and war would then result. In view of our own policy of assisting Great Britain, "an exceedingly serious situation would immediately result." The President stated that with these facts in mind oil had up to this time been permitted to be shipped from the United States to Japan, notwithstanding the bitter criticism leveled against the administration.

President Roosevelt discussed this question in an informal talk at the White House on July 24. He explained the essential necessity, from the standpoint of our own defense and of that of Great Britain, of preventing war from breaking out in the South Pacific. He said that if oil supplies from the United States had been cut off, Japan probably would have attacked the Netherlands Indies to obtain oil and war would have resulted; that the policy of the United States in allowing oil to go to Japan had succeeded in keeping war out of the South Pacific, "for our own good, for the good of the defense of Great Britain, and the freedom of the seas."

Two days later Japan's assets in the United States were frozen by Executive order, and a week later oil was shut off.

Then followed a period of sparring and stalling until arrangements had been made for the visit of Ambassador Kurusu.

At this point permit me to insert the editorial comment contained on pages 136 and 137 of Peace and War, subtitled "Ambassador Grew's Report That War Might Be Inevitable":

In a telegram of November 3, 1941, Ambassador Grew reported to the Department of State on the current situation in Japan. He warned against acceptance of any theory that the weakening and final exhaustion of Japanese financial and economic resources would result shortly in Japan's collapse as a militarist nation. He pointed out that despite severe cuts in industrial output, the loss of most of Japan's commerce, and the depletion of national resources, such a collapse had not occurred; but instead there was being drastically prosecuted the integration of Japanese national economy. Events so far, he said, had given no support for the view that war in the Far East could best be averted by imposition of commercial embargoes. He said that considering the temper of the people of Japan it was dangerously uncertain to base United States policy on a view that the imposition of progressive and rigorous economic measures would probably avert war; that it was the view of the Embassy that war would not be averted by such a course.

The Ambassador said it was his purpose to insure against the United States becoming involved in war with Japan through any misconception of Japanese capacity to plunge into a "suicidal struggle" with us. Although reason, he said, would dictate against such a happening, our own standards of logic could not be used to measure Japanese rationality. While we need not be overly concerned by the "bellicose" utterances of the Japanese press, it would be short-sighted to underestimate the obvious preparations of Japan; it would be short-sighted also if our policy were based on a belief that these preparations amounted merely to saber rattling. Finally, he warned of the possibility of Japan's adopting measures with dramatic and dangerous suddenness which might make inevitable a war with the United States.

Four days later, on November 7, Secretary Hull stated at a Cabinet meeting that relations between Japan and the United States were extremely critical and that there was "imminent possibility" that Japan might at any time start a new military movement of conquest by force. It thereupon became the consensus of the Cabinet that the critical situation might well be emphasized in speeches in order that the country would, if possible, be better prepared for such a development. Accordingly, Secretary of the Navy Knox delivered an address on November 11, 1941, in which he stated that we were not only confronted with the necesity of extreme measures of self-defense in the Atlantic, but we were "likewise faced with grim possibilities on the other side of the world—on the far side of the Pacific"; that the Pacific no less than the Atlantic called for instant readiness for defense. On the same day Under Secretary of State Welles, carrying out the Cabinet suggestion in an address, stated that beyond the Atlantic a sinister and pitiless conqueror had reduced more than half of Europe to abject serfdom and that in the Far East the same forces of conquest were menacing the safety of all nations bordering on the Pacific. The waves of world conquest were "breaking high both in the East and in the West," he said, and were threatening, more and more with each passing day, "to engulf our own shores." He warned that the United States was in far greater peril than in 1917; that "at any moment war may be forced upon us."

On November 17 Ambassador Grew cabled from Tokyo that in calling attention to the necessity for vigilance against sudden Japanese naval or military attack in regions not then involved in the Chinese-Japanese conflict, he considered it probable that the Japanese would make use of every possible tactical advantage, including surprise and initiative. The Ambassador said that in Japan there was an extremely effective control over military information and that as a consequence it was unlikely that the Embassy would be able to give substantial warning.

I then submit the concluding comment on Ambassador Kurusu's conference with Secretary Hull on November 18, 1941, as follows:

Mr. Kurusu said that Japan would not be a "cat's-paw" for Germany; that Japan had entered into the Tripartite Pact in order to use the pact for its own purposes and because it felt isolated; that the situation in Japan

was very pressing and that it was important to arrest a further deterioration of relations between the two countries; that our freezing regulations had caused impatience in Japan and a feeling that Japan had to fight while still in a position to fight.

On November 26, 1941, Kurusu ceased stalling with Secretary Hull, and asked to see the President, which he did on November 27.

Now let me quote a paragraph or two from page 144, as follows:

JAPAN MAY MOVE SUDDENLY

On November 25 and on November 28, at meetings of high officials of this Government, Secretary Hull emphasized the critical nature of the relations of this country with Japan. He stated that there was practically no possibility of an agreement being achieved with Japan; that in his opinion the Japanese were likely to break out at any time with new acts of conquest by force; and that the matter of safeguarding our national security was in the hands of the Army and the Navy. The Secretary expressed his judgment that any plans for our military defense should include an assumption that the Japanese might make the element of surprise a central point in their strategy and also might attack at various points simultaneously with a view to demoralizing efforts of defense and of coordination for purposes thereof.

On November 29, 1941, Secretary Hull conferred with the British Ambassador. The Secretary said that "the diplomatic part of our relations with Japan was virtually over and that the matter will now go to the officials of the Army and Navy." He said further that it would be "a serious mistake for our country and other countries interested in the Pacific situation to make plans of resistance without including the possibility that Japan may move suddenly and with every possible element of surprise and spread out over considerable areas and capture certain positions and posts before the peaceful countries interested in the Pacific would have time to confer and formulate plans to meet these new conditions; that this would be on the theory that the Japanese recognize that their course of unlimited conquest now renewed all along the line probably is a desperate gamble and requires the utmost boldness and risk."

REPORTED JAPANESE TROOP MOVEMENTS

Secretary Hull conferred with the Japanese Ambassador and Mr. Kurusu on December 1. The Secretary said that in the current discussions we had to take into account the bellicose utterances emanating from Tokyo. He emphasized that we did not propose to go into partnership with Japan's military leaders; that he had not heard one whisper of peace from them, "only bluster and blood-curdling threats." The Japanese representatives said that statements of Japanese officials were taken more seriously in the United States than was warranted; that these statements were misquoted in the press.

The Secretary said that this Government had no idea of trying to bluff Japan and that he saw no occasion for Japan's trying to bluff us; he emphasized that "there is a limit beyond which we cannot go."

And so it went, until abandoning all hope of getting anywhere with Kurusu, the President went over the heads of the diplomats. On December 6, 1941, he telegraphed a personal message to the Son of Heaven, reciting conditions as they seemed to be, and stating that both he and the Emperor had "a sacred duty to restore traditional amity and prevent further death and destruction in the world."

R. S. V. P.

At 1:20 p. m. Washington, 7:50 a. m. Honolulu time, December 7, 1941, the Emperor replied with bombs and bullets on Pearl Harbor.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot for the life of me see anything very surprising in that attack, except the fact that we were taken by surprise. Japan's record since long before Commodore Perry pressed the shogun is rich with such episodes. Every attack she has made, and she has made many, has been the type of attack that is to be expected of an assassin. She never learned the rules expounded by the Marquis of Queensbury. Her rules are the rules of her favorite sport—ju jitsu. What kind of a game did our Government think we were playing with Japan, or Japan with us?

Effective ultimatums had been given by both sides. Negotiations had broken off. What were we waiting for? Why were our naval and military commanders not ordered into position with orders to strike and strike hard at the zero hour? Why was a carrier sent to Midway a week before with orders to sink anything it saw, and yet why did Pearl Harbor sleep? Did our Government think that Pearl Harbor was another *Panay* incident, or was it simply that confusion in Washington was more confounded than at Pearl Harbor?

And finally, Mr. Speaker, why were Admiral Kimmel and General Short permitted to waive the statute of limitations on their trial, when everyone knows that they cannot waive it? Does the Government fear to try them? Even now it is highly doubtful that the eleventh-hour concurrence of both Houses in a resolution extending the statute of limitations in that case is legal, and particularly since it did not receive the signature of the President on December 7. I am sure that they both want to be tried.

Mr. Speaker, this has been prepared as an historical outline, but it ends with unanswered questions. If I am not here to fill in the answers when they appear, I hope another will write them in, and I trust that the succeeding chapters will be happier, than this long, and unhappy record I have compiled of a Government which failed to lead its people in seeing the grave danger that faced them in the East.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that that special order be transferred to tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MAGNUSON, for an indefinite period, beginning January 4, 1944, on account of official business for the Naval Affairs Committee.

To Mr. WRIGHT, for 1 week, on account of illness.

To Mr. TAYLOR (at the request of Mr. KEARNEY), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. DILWEG (at the request of Mr. GIBSON), for the remainder of the week, on account of illness.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution establishing the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission, defining its powers and duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, December 17, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Friday, December 17, 1943, at 10 a. m., to consider H. R. 2241, a bill to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument, Wyo.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

970. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Corporation Counsel, District of Columbia, transmitting request that the draft of a proposed bill, submitted October 29, 1943, be amended by inserting at the end of the first paragraph on page 7, the following: "Sec. 4. Strike out the clause 'when filled to the bottom of the capseat, stopple, or other designating mark' in section 14 of said act," and change the present section 4 to section 5, and section 5 to section 6, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. S. 250. An act to promote sustained-yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment, and taxable forest wealth;

(b) to assure a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and (c) to secure the benefits of forests in regulation of water supply and stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife; with amendment (Rept. No. 960). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WEAVER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3847. A bill to exempt certain officers and employees of the Office of Price Administration from certain provisions of the Criminal Code and Revised Statutes; without amendment (Rept. No. 961). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 3854. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act for the purpose of authorizing participation by the United States in the establishment of a United Nations Bank for Reconstruction and Development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SAUTHOFF:

H. R. 3855. A bill relative to granting and giving instructions in civil and criminal cases in the district courts of continental United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARNESS of Indiana:

H. R. 3856. A bill to provide for the disposition of surplus inventories of strategic materials owned by the United States and Government-owned plants and factories; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FAY:

H. R. 3857. A bill requesting that the President of the United States of America proclaim Armed Services Honor Day and urging that it be properly observed throughout the Nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 3858. A bill to provide unemployment compensation for veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEWEY:

H. J. Res. 207. Joint resolution to provide for a central reconstruction fund to be used in joint account with foreign governments for rehabilitation, stabilization of currencies, and reconstruction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 208. Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1944; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 383. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor to investigate the effectiveness of the War Labor Disputes Act; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 384. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings on the bill (H. R. 2857) to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 3859. A bill for the relief of E. Bird Giles and Sherman Beck; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FAY:

H. R. 3860. A bill for the relief of Emil Chalupa; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3861. A bill to authorize the presentation to Capt. Walter Thomas Collins, United States Marine Corps, of a Distinguished Service Cross; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4088. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of the pastor and 31 members of the Fruita Baptist Church, Fruita, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4089. Also, petition of 40 citizens of the State of New Jersey, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4090. Also, petition of 19 citizens of Fruita, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4091. Also, petition of 61 members of the Congregational Church, the Advent Church, and the Methodist Church, Hampton, N. H., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4092. Also, petition of 64 members and adherents of United Presbyterian Church of Greeley, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4093. Also, petition of the pastor and 29 members of the Emmanuel Christian Church of Foxboro, Mass., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4094. Also, petition of 151 citizens of the State of Rhode Island, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4095. Also, petition of 70 members of the St. John's Methodist Church of Dover, N. H., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4096. Also, petition of 20 citizens of the State of Colorado, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4097. Also, petition of 14 members of the Congregational Church of Foxboro, Mass., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4098. Also, petition of 82 members of the Baptist Church, Methodist Church, and First Unitarian Congregational Society of Lebanon, N. H., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4099. Also, petition of 60 citizens of the State of Rhode Island, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4100. Also, petition of 118 citizens of the State of Connecticut, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4101. Also, petition of 19 members of the First Parish Church, Congregational Christian, of Dover, N. H., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4102. Also, petition of 85 citizens of the State of Colorado, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4103. Also, petition of 80 citizens of the State of New Jersey, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the

United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4104. Also, petition of 49 members of the Foxboro Baptist Church, Foxboro, Mass., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4105. Also, petition of 126 citizens of the State of New Hampshire, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4106. Also, petition of 76 citizens of Dover, N. H., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4107. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of Ethel Ingraham and 27 other citizens of Walnut Creek, Calif., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4108. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Herman E. Herberer and 30 other St. Louis citizens protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4109. Also, petition of Paul F. Regnier and 30 other St. Louis citizens protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4110. Also, petition of P. Donatti and 30 other St. Louis citizens protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4111. Also, petition of Lawrence Gottschamer and 30 other St. Louis citizens protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4112. Also, petition of Herman E. Herberer and 30 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4113. By Mr. ELSTON of Ohio: Petition of Gus Pfeiffer and 62 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4114. Also, petition of John J. Staft and 21 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the duration of the war, and any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4115. Also, petition of William J. DeBoeck and 19 other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the duration of the war, and any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4116. Also, petition of Julius Murray and 19 other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the duration of the war, and any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4117. Also, petition of B. Heffron and 20 other citizens of Cincinnati, Sharonville, and Reading, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the duration of the war, and any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4118. Also, petition of Myers Tavern and signed by 20 citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the duration of the war, and any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4119. Also, petition of Jacob Ziegler, Jr., and 20 other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the duration of the war, and any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4120. Also, petition of Woodmont Grill and signed by 20 citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the duration of the war, and any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4121. Also, petition of Lantern Cafe and signed by 20 citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the duration of the war, and any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4122. Also, petition of Mrs. Hobart McKee and 20 other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the duration of the war, and any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4123. Also, petition of Charles Lawkon and 21 other citizens of Elmwood, Norwood, and Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the duration of the war, and any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4124. Also, petition of the Snack Bar and signed by 50 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the duration of the war and any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4125. Also, petition of Charles Abraham and 21 other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the duration of the war and any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4126. Also, petition of the New Forest Cafe and signed by 20 other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the duration of the war and any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4127. Also, 13 petitions of F. V. Igler and 245 other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the duration of the war and any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4128. Also, 15 petitions of the Meier's Wine Cellars and signed by 352 other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the duration of the war and any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4129. Also, petition of Sam Massis Grocery, of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the duration of the war, and any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4130. Also, petitions of Lido Garden and signed by 80 citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the duration of the war and any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4131. Also, petition of Gorman's Cafe and signed by 50 citizens of Cincinnati, Wyoming, Lockland, Sharonville, Blue Ash, and Norwood, Ohio, and Newport, Ky., protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the duration of the war and any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4132. Also, petition of Roscoe Peterson and 20 other citizens of Madeira, Indian Hill, and Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the duration of the war, and any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4133. Also, petition of Charles Berkman and 20 other citizens of North College Hill, Greenhills, Cheviot, and Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the duration of the war and any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4134. Also, petition of Jo's Tap Room and signed by 20 other citizens of Cincinnati, Norwood, and Harrison, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the duration of the war and any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4135. Also, petition of Dan Delany and 19 other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the duration of the war and any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4136. Also, petition of Edwin Kampel and 25 other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the duration of the war and any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4137. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of sundry citizens of Morgan County, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4138. By Mr. RABAUT: Petition of 1,500 citizens of the State of Michigan protesting against the consideration of House bill 2082 or any other prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4139. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Petition of S. A. Hall and 30 other citizens of Lewis County, W. Va., requesting passage of House Resolution 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4140. By Mr. ROLPH: Petition of the California State Chamber of Commerce, San Francisco, endorsing House bills 3269 and 3270, and Senate bill 1362; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4141. Also, petition of the California State Chamber of Commerce, San Francisco, opposing Senate bill 1122; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4142. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of the United Labor Legislative Council of Marion County, V. Wa., Mathew Matison, George S. Fletcher, Ernie Tennant, E. C. Toothman, Lloyd Rowe, and others, opposing any form of sales tax or of increasing the tax burden on lower-income groups; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4143. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary of the State Aeronautical Commission of Colorado, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 3420; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, December 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Desire of Nations, as again our hearts are drawn by the lure of a manger, enable our spirits to kindle with the joy of simple shepherds long ago. As every hearth is aflame with the Christmas candles of faith and hope and love we think tenderly and with pride of the flower of our Nation's youth, upon whose loneliness the silent stars look down from alien skies. Our wistful prayers for them wing their way to Thee and bind them to us with a nearness which mocks the separating miles. In distant corners of the earth they keep their constant vigil for freedom's sake.

On land and sea, through the trackless air, on palm-fringed islands of the south, on bleak and rugged shores of the north, on desert sands, or surrounded by the crumbling glories of the past, their hearts are home as they sing even in fox holes the loved and familiar carols which celebrate the coming of the Newborn King and proclaim the prophecy of a Christmas yet to be:

"When peace shall over all the earth
Its ancient splendors fling,
And the whole world send back the song
Which now the angels sing."

Our advent petition for all the warriors of the truth of Christmas is that Thou wilt make strong their arm, courageous their hearts, and pure their spirits. Hasten the day when the mighty melody above the Little Eastern Town of peace to men of good will shall be the divine harmony of all earth's myriad tongues. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, December 16, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

PROTEST AGAINST THE ARTICLE "A SUMMONS AGAINST THE 'KISS OF DEATH'"

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I note with some regret that yesterday while I was engaged in the Finance Committee, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Summons Against the 'Kiss of Death,'" written by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and published in the New York Times magazine for December 12, 1943. I would not have objected to its inclusion in the RECORD if I had been here, because that is a futile process, as any Senator can then read the whole matter into the RECORD. I do, however, want to have the RECORD show my protest against an article which throws very unfair aspersions on my grandfather, the late Senator Lodge, and which by the use of one quotation which I believe to be utterly spurious, by others which are unfairly drawn from their context, and by the skillful use of half truths conveys an utterly false impression of his service here and smears an honorable and patriotic public servant.

Leaving my personal interest out of account, I think it is a pity that an article on a subject of such importance as the League of Nations debate should utterly miss the great lessons which can be drawn from that debate. All in all, the article is a callow oversimplification which serves no good purpose, tends to confuse the public thought, and misses a great opportunity to contribute to public education.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. TUNNELL presented petitions signed by 298 citizens of the State of Delaware, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs; and one of the petitions was ordered to be printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached thereto, as follows:

To the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States:

We, the undersigned citizens of the State of Delaware do respectfully petition you to defend the United States of America by defending the health and morale of the youth called out by your action under the Selective Service Act, from what Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, referred to as "a sordid business for the accumulation of money" the trade in alcoholic beverages including beer; and from the danger of venereal disease incident to prostitution, by passing S. 860.

IMPORTATION OF LIVESTOCK FEED—SOCIAL-SECURITY PAY-ROLL TAX—REPORT OF FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance I report back favorably with amendments House Joint Resolution 171, to permit the importation from foreign countries free of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed, and I submit a report (No. 607) thereon. One of the amendments of the Committee on Finance undertakes to treat the social-security pay-roll tax problem for the next 60 days by precisely the same sort of a formula which it is proposed to use in connection with the Commodity Credit Corporation problem.

I am instructed by the committee, and I have the consent of the majority leader, to say that after the pending business is concluded I shall ask unanimous consent for the consideration of this matter later in the day.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say in that connection that the Senator from Michigan has correctly stated the situation. The action recommended by the committee is necessary to be taken on the House joint resolution dealing with the temporary suspension of import duties on certain feeds for the relief of dairies and cattle and other stock feeders in the United States, which is a tax measure.

The main tax bill cannot be enacted into law before Christmas. That being true, the pay-roll tax automatically would be stepped up on the 1st day of January, and the only way that can be avoided under the action of the Finance Committee, which has adopted the same proposal as an amendment to the tax bill, is to add it as an amendment to the joint resolution to which the Senator from Michigan has called attention. It is agreeable that as soon as the Senate shall have disposed of Senate Joint Resolution 103 that the joint resolution be taken up because it is necessary to obtain action in the House in order that the purposes to be carried out may be effected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 3261. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 608); and

S. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities; with amendments (Rept. No. 609).

By Mr. BURTON, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1028. A bill to amend the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 610); and

S. 1029. A bill to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 611).

By Mr. BAILEY (for Mr. SMITH), from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 2562. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey to the State Hospital at Goldsboro, Goldsboro, N. C., a certain tract of land, situated in Wayne County, N. C.; without amendment (Rept. No. 612).

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1428. A bill to amend the provision of the act authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of officers, enlisted men, or nurses of the Navy or Marine Corps, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 613);

S. 1517. A bill for the relief of Staff Sgt. Marion Johnson, United States Marine Corps, and Sgt. George B. Kress, United States Marine Corps Reserve; without amendment (Rept. No. 614);

S. 1542. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building B. O. Q. O–3 at the United States naval construction training center, Davisville, R. I., on March 27, 1943; without amendment (Rept. No. 615);

S. 1589. A bill for the relief of C. Guy Evans, Garland Mineral Springs, Index, Wash.; without amendment (Rept. No. 616);

H. R. 2976. A bill to grant military rank to certain members of the Navy Nurse Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 617);

H. R. 3605. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in tents used as quarters by members of the Twelfth Naval Construction Battalion, Long Island, Alaska, on December 26, 1942, and May 26, 1943, respectively; without amendment (Rept. No. 618);

H. R. 3606. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire at the outlying degaussing branch of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., on December 4, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 619);

H. R. 3607. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in tent L–76 at the Amphibious Training Base, Camp Bradford, Norfolk, Va., on March 15, 1943; without amendment (Rept. No. 620);

H. R. 3741. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 621); and

H. R. 3760. A bill authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Lt. Gen. Thomas Holcomb, United States Marine Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 622).

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 220, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 220), submitted by Mr. WHEELER on December 15, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures authorized by Senate Resolution 46, agreed to January 14, 1943, authorizing the Committee on Interstate Commerce to hold hearings during the Seventy-eighth Congress, is hereby increased by $5,000.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Sundry officers for appointment and/or promotion in the United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Finance:

George Hofferbert, of Baltimore, Md., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Maryland, in place of M. Hampton Magruder, resigned.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Lt. Gen. (temporary) Alexander A. Vandegrift to be the Commandant of the Marine Corps with the rank of lieutenant general, for a period of 4 years, from the 1st day of January 1944; and

Col. Merritt A. Edson to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 1st day of December 1943.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 1601. A bill to amend the act making it a misdemeanor to stow away on vessels; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1602. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Winnie Left Her Behind, a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

(Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. STEWART) introduced Senate bill 1603, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1604. A bill to provide certain benefits for members of the armed forces upon their discharge or release from active duty to provide for the use and disposition of surplus war property in the interests of small business enterprises of veterans and others, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

EXPATRIATION OF CERTAIN CITIZENS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to introduce a bill on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], to provide for the expatriation of citizens of the United States who indicate allegiance and fidelity to a foreign country, and for other purposes.

As will be noted, this bill amends section 401 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (act of October 14, 1940; 54 Stat. 1168; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 801), which provides:

A person who is a national of the United States, whether by birth or naturalization, shall lose his nationality by—

I shall not read the entire act, but paragraphs (a) to (h), inclusive, enumerate the conditions. Our bill adds two additional paragraphs, (i) and (j), and I wish to have incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the bill which we have just introduced.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1603) to provide for the expatriation of citizens of the United States who indicate allegiance and fidelity to a foreign country, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 401 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (act of October 14, 1940; 54 Stat. 1168; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 801) is hereby amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"(i) Making any written statement to the United States or any agency or officer or agent thereof to the effect that he considers himself to be a citizen or subject of a foreign country, or that he adheres to or bears allegiance and fidelity to a foreign country, or that he denies that he bears allegiance and fidelity to the United States; or in response to an inquiry or request lawfully made by an agency or officer of the United States, expressing a refusal to swear unqualified allegiance to the United States of America or to forswear any form of allegiance or obedience to any foreign government.

"(j) Indicating by his course of conduct and utterances that he adheres to or bears allegiance and fidelity to a foreign country. It shall be the duty of the United States attorneys for the respective districts, upon affidavit showing good cause therefor, to institute proceedings in accordance with section 338 of this act (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 738) to cancel the United States nationality of any person on the ground that he has lost his nationality under the provisions of this paragraph.

"Any person who has lost his nationality under the provisions of paragraph (i) hereof, or whose nationality has been canceled by a judgment rendered in an action brought under the provisions of paragraph (j) hereof shall be subject to deportation under the immigration laws, and in the event such person was a national of the United States by birth, the deportation shall be to any country of which any ancestor from whom he inherits or derives United States nationality was a citizen or subject."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it will be noted that under paragraph "i," one of the conditions enumerated is "expressing a refusal to swear unqualified allegiance to the United States of America or to forswear any form of allegiance or obedience to any foreign country." This provision is particularly aimed at the American-born Japanese who gave negative answers to question 28 in a questionnaire submitted to them by the War Relocation Authority. The question was:

Will you swear unqualified allegiance to the United States of America and forswear any form of allegiance or obedience to the Japanese Emperor or any other foreign government, power, or organization?

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that this question was submitted to 19,979 male Japanese of 17 years of age or older, and of this number 4,850 gave a nonaffirmative answer; in other words, 25.4 percent of the Japanese males born in this country admit that they owe allegiance to Japan. This same question

was submitted to 18,486 female Japanese born in the United States who were 17 years of age or older, and 1,487 gave "no" for an answer.

Mr. President, I say that any men or women born in the United States who have enjoyed our Nation of liberty and justice and who, in this crisis, thus admit that they owe allegiance to the Japanese Government, are no longer entitled to call themselves citizens of our country and should be deported immediately after the war.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I am very much interested in the Senator's bill, in the introduction of which I agreed to join with him, of course, and at a later date I hope to have something to say on the subject. Does the Senator have any figures, other than those he has quoted, that indicate how many of the native-born Japanese gave negative answers to the question which would indicate or was a test of their loyalty to the United States?

Mr. McFARLAND. I have only the figures I have just quoted. There may be other figures now available.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, does the Senator know how many American-born Japanese there are in the United States who are claiming citizenship by reason of birth?

Mr. McFARLAND. I cannot answer the Senator's question. I do not see how any native-born Japanese or any other person could claim American citizenship who admits that he owes allegiance to another country.

Mr. STEWART. I agree with the Senator. I think he is exactly right.

Mr. McFARLAND. Twenty-five percent, if you please, of the male Japanese born in this country admit that they owe allegiance to another nation—namely, Japan.

Mr. STEWART. I believe the Senator stated the number of questionnaires submitted was approximately 19,000.

Mr. McFARLAND. Questionnaires were submitted to 19,979 male Japanese, and of that number 4,850 gave nonaffirmative answers to the questions. Some of them did not answer the questions.

Mr. STEWART. How many questionnaires were submitted to females?

Mr. McFARLAND. Questions were submitted to 18,486 females.

Mr. STEWART. That would make a total of about 37,000. If my memory is correct, that is not more than half of the native-born Japanese of the United States. I wonder why the questionnaire was not submitted to them all.

Mr. McFARLAND. I cannot answer the Senator's question, but I think that question should be answered. I think we should find out.

Mr. STEWART. I simply wish to say to the Senator that I am very much interested in his bill, and, as I said, I am glad to be coauthor of the bill and will watch its progress with interest, and shall be glad to help it along. I hope it will be passed. I have heretofore introduced so-called anti-Japanese legislation myself.

Mr. McFARLAND. I was about to say that I did not call this proposal anti-Japanese, but it is, because the persons involved are 100 percent Japanese. Only those who refuse to swear allegiance to our country are involved.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that section (g) of our bill makes it mandatory upon the Attorney General to bring action to cancel the citizenship of those who have by their course of conduct or utterance indicated that they adhere to or bear allegiance and fidelity to a foreign country. The second paragraph makes those who have lost their citizenship under the provisions of paragraph (i) or (j) subject to deportation under the immigration laws of the United States.

Mr. President, we could have made our bill broader, but we have confined it to those who, without question, are not citizens of the United States at heart, and who have admitted by writing or utterance that they owe allegiance to a foreign country. The figures which I have just given are taken from the report of a subcommittee on Japanese war relocation centers, of which the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] was chairman, and are found on pages 48 and 49 of the report.

Mr. President, we cannot afford to allow these people to continue to enjoy the blessings of our great Nation. It is time that we see to it that the United States is 100 percent American. Let us send these people to the country of their love. We have no place for them here.

AMENDMENT TO THE REVENUE BILL

Mr. ANDREWS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3687) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

INVESTIGATION OF CONDITIONS IN PUERTO RICO—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. CHAVEZ submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 222), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures authorized by Senate Resolution 26, agreed to January 28, 1943, authorizing the subcommittee of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs to hold hearings during the Seventy-eighth Congress, is hereby increased by $15,000.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE ASSOCIATION OF FINANCE COMPANIES, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Association of Finance Companies, Milwaukee, Wis., December 11, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENTS BY SENATOR HILL AND REPRESENTATIVES EATON, MAY, AND BLOOM ON ANNOUNCEMENT OF TEHERAN CONFERENCE

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD radio statements made by him and by Representatives EATON, MAY, and BLOOM at the time of the announcement of the Teheran Conference, December 6, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

A 1944 PROGRAM FOR THE REPUBLICANS—ARTICLE BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A 1944 Program for the Republicans," written by Senator TAFT and published in the Saturday Evening Post of December 11, which appears in the Appendix.]

ANGELS AT MEAUX, FRANCE—A CHRISTMAS STORY BY JOE MITCHELL PILCHER

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Christmas story entitled "Angels at Meaux, France," written by Joe Mitchell Pilcher, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 103 which extends until the 29th day of February the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States.

The joint resolution was read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the first sentence of section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "December 31, 1943" and inserting in lieu thereof "February 29, 1944."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] advised me yesterday that he wanted, not to oppose the joint resolution, but to make some remarks in connection with it. He is not at the moment in the Chamber, but I understand is on his way. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Caraway	Hawkes
Andrews	Chavez	Hayden
Austin	Clark, Idaho	Hill
Bailey	Clark, Mo.	Holman
Ball	Connally	Johnson, Calif.
Bankhead	Davis	Johnson, Colo.
Barkley	Downey	Kilgore
Bone	Eastland	La Follette
Brewster	Ellender	Langer
Brooks	Ferguson	Lodge
Buck	George	Lucas
Burton	Gerry	McCarran
Bushfield	Gillette	McClellan
Butler	Green	McFarland
Byrd	Gurney	McKellar
Capper	Hatch	Maloney

Maybank	Russell	Vandenberg
Mead	Smith	Van Nuys
Millikin	Stewart	Wallgren
Moore	Taft	Walsh, Mass.
Murray	Thomas, Idaho	Walsh, N. J.
Nye	Thomas, Okla.	Wheeler
Overton	Thomas, Utah	Wherry
Radcliffe	Truman	White
Reed	Tunnell	Wiley
Robertson	Tydings	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on official business, holding hearings in the State of Mississippi.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is detained on public business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public business.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement in regard to Senate Joint Resolution 103, which is now before the Senate.

As we all know, the Commodity Credit Corporation was created long before the war, and long before anyone thought about war, and has served a very useful purpose to the farmers of the United States. Last July we extended its life until the 31st day of December of this year. In the meantime the House of Representatives has passed a bill extending its life with certain prohibitions in regard to subsidies. That bill was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, and exhaustive hearings were had upon it, lasting 2 weeks or more, and the committee has been considering the House bill. In the meantime, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] introduced a bill in the Senate embodying the provisions of the House bill, with some slight modifications.

The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency has been in session attempting to frame a bill which would be reasonably satisfactory to the Congress and to the country, but it has been unable to do so. Yesterday it declined to report the House bill, or the Bankhead bill, or any amendments thereto. It is obvious that we cannot legislate on the subsidy question between now and Christmas, or between now and the reassembling of the Congress on the 3d day of January, or on whatever day Congress may agree to reassemble. So that the Commodity Credit Corporation would automatically expire on the 31st day of December.

No one would like to see that occur. It is generally agreed, without regard to whether men are for or against the program of subsidies now in force, that the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation should be extended because of the useful work it does in other fields.

The committee authorized me yesterday to submit a resolution extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation for practically 60 days, or until the 29th day of February, the next year being a leap year, and there being 29 days in the month of February. Practically, it extends its life for 58 days.

In view of the fact that the Finance Committee will not be able to report the tax bill until next week, we will not be able to dispose of that measure until after the reassembling of Congress in January, and if the proposed extension until the end of February is agreed to, it is my hope and belief that we can work out a bill before another expiration of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation legislation, and it will be, I think I may say, the obligation and the effort of the Committee on Banking and Currency, without regard to the length of any recess or the date on which Congress may reassemble, to try to have a bill for presentation to the Senate as soon as possible after the reconvening of the Seventy-eighth Congress in its second session.

Therefore the committee felt that the resolution of extension, simply changing the date of the expiration of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation from December 31, 1943, to February 29, 1944, was justified.

There was some fear expressed in some quarters that the proposed extension would result in the War Food Administration, or the Commodity Credit Corporation, or the O. P. A., or the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or some other agency that has been dealing with or has the power to deal with subsidies, broadening the program to include other commodities than those already included in it.

I wish to say that I have consulted on that subject Justice Byrnes, who is the Director of War Mobilization; I have conferred with Mr. Jesse Jones, who has charge of the operations of the R. F. C.; I have conferred with Judge Marvin Jones, who is the War Food Administrator; and with the heads of all the agencies that have anything to do with the inauguration of subsidies, and I am authorized to say on their behalf on the floor of the Senate that if the joint resolution is passed no additional commodity will be taken into the subsidy program during the period of the extension.

The subsidy program is now running at the rate of $1,100,000,000 a year; it runs somewhere between $90,000,000 and $100,000,000 a month. That would mean that during the 2 months, that proportion of the $1,100,000,000 would be all that those in charge of the program would feel like expending, because they recognize the situation which exists here, and they have very frankly said to me that they would not feel at liberty to go beyond what they are doing in the way of commodities or in the proportional amount expended during this period of extension.

I am glad to make that statement to my friends in the Senate and to the country, so that there will be no doubt at all about the effect of the joint resolution extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Kentucky for the assurance he has given to the Senate, and particularly those of us who are primarily concerned with the subsidy program, that it will not be enlarged during the period in question. I wish to say to the Senator from Kentucky, as I told him yesterday in conversation when we discussed the matters which he has now mentioned, and which I propose to discuss, that so far as I am concerned, I am not opposed to the joint resolution; in fact, I think perhaps it is necessary, at least highly desirable, to pass it.

Mr. President, I realize that we are at the end of a long session, and there are a number of important matters which must be disposed of today. There is nothing, however, that is of more importance to the country than the subject I shall proceed to discuss. I had expected to discuss it in support of the bill of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], if it had come out of the committee. However, the subject should be discussed, anyway. I shall be as brief as possible considering the need for a full discussion of the matter involved.

What the country needs is more information and less propaganda about the so-called inflation situation. Administration spokesmen have screamed exaggeration and distortion at the top of their voices to a point where the country is bewildered and alarmed. It seems harsh to say that this bewilderment and alarm was deliberately caused, but surely administration spokesmen cannot be so dumb or ignorant of the facts as their public utterances would indicate.

Administration spokesmen, and this does not exclude the President, Justice Byrnes, Judge Vinson, O. P. A. Bowles, or most of the others, have constantly confused subsidies with price ceilings in the public mind. Conversations I have had with, and letters I have received from, my constituents and others, show a widespread belief, based upon what these men have said, that the discontinuance of the subsidy policy being followed would mean the end of all control over prices. This simply is not so. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Much as I dislike to make the charge, I cannot escape

the feeling that administration spokesmen are deliberately trying to plant this fear in the public mind.

As a matter of fact, the use of subsidies is a minor factor in the control of prices. It touches only a limited number of items and then only to a limited extent. If this subsidy policy were dropped and prices permitted to adjust themselves under O. P. A. rules and limitations, and no public mention made of the change, it is doubtful if it would be greatly noticed by consumers in general. Jim Byrnes, Fred Vinson, and Chester Bowles shriek at the top of their voices that subsidies are necessary to prevent ruinous inflation, that if a stubborn and obstinate Congress refuses to supply money and authority for that policy, the United States of America is threatened with immediate financial destruction. The spokesmen of an honest administration would not follow such a false and disturbing course. This administration is not honest either with the people or the Congress. The fact that the administration has not kept faith with the Congress, that it has constantly disregarded legislative enactment and usurped powers far beyond the authority of any statute, is one of the main reasons why Congress is disinclined to trust it further. The attitude of the Congress cannot be fully understood without consideration of this fact. The people are entitled to more truth and candor, and less "bunk."

So much misinformation has been handed out by administration spokesmen about high food prices and the cost of living that the public naturally assumes that prices, including prices of food, are higher than ever before—so high, in fact, as to constitute a threat to the average consumer of the country.

Nothing could be farther from the truth. Through the 1920's we had what was and is regarded as a reasonably normal period of business prosperity. The sum total of prices of all articles going into the cost of living is less now than it was in the period from 1923 to 1929. The year 1926 has been used by dependable statistical agencies as a base year for comparison of prices and living costs. On November 15, 1943, the cost of food was 99.9 percent of the average cost of food in 1926. Similarly, clothing on November 15, 1943, was 110.3 percent, house furnishings 106.5 percent, miscellaneous items 114.7 percent of the 1926 prices. Food has increased in price less than any of the other major factors mentioned. All items going into the cost of living, taken together, on November 15, 1943, were 98.2 percent of the 1926 average.

In order to support their distortion of the actual situation, all of the spokesmen for the administration, including the President, Justice Byrnes, Judge Vinson, and Mr. Bowles, use 1935–39 prices as a basis from which to calculate. These prices are not representative. They are subnormal. The depth of the depression in the thirties was reached in 1932 and 1933, and had not recovered to anything like an average normal basis in 1939. In fact, cost-of-living prices from 1935–39 were lower than in any year or sequence of years since 1918, save alone the depth of the depression years in 1932 and 1933. This is especially true of food prices.

To make its point and support its distortion of the facts, the administration's spokesmen are using depressed or subnormal prices with which to compare the current price level, both of food and other articles that go into the cost of living.

Whence comes this desperate cry from Byrnes, Jones, Bowles, not to omit the President, that we are threatened with inflation because prices are running away with us? They lay special emphasis upon food prices. This is not the first time this administration, led by President Roosevelt, has unfairly and unnecessarily alarmed the country. The President followed that course in his message to Congress on Labor Day in 1942. In that message, he charged the farmer with being a profiteer, and held food prices to be responsible for the high cost of living and demanded that they be stabilized. In most of his public utterances he has taken the same attitude toward the farmer, the stockman, and the food producers of the country. It is an outrage upon fairness to so continuously misrepresent an important segment of the population of the United States engaged in the all-important task of producing food and more food for the Nation, for our armed forces, and for Lend-Lease. Surely, common decency should demand that the Chief Executive of the United States should speak the truth and tell the people honestly what the facts are, and deal fairly with the farmer and food producers of the Nation. This he has not done.

I challenge the candor, the integrity, and the honesty of this administration. It has been, and is now, misleading the people of the country. It is causing undue alarm and great concern for alleged causes which, when examined, have no foundation in truth or in fact.

Food prices have not gone up since 1926, but incomes have. The average income per person not on farms in the United States in 1926 was $856. In July 1943 the average income per person in the United States was $1,052—an increase of 23 percent over 1926. The industrial worker has done even better than that. In 1926, the wage income per industrial worker was $1,318. In July 1943 the wage income per industrial worker was at the rate of $2,138 per annum. For the industrial worker, the 1943 income is 162 percent of his 1926 income—an increase of 62 percent over these years.

But the industrial worker, as well as the average citizen, is paying less for his food in 1943 than in 1926. This is the outstanding and important circumstance when we come to consider this problem. No spokesman for the administration has ever remotely referred to this all-important fact. Constantly they have increased the fears of the people of the country by ignoring the correct comparison, and using only a comparison with depressed prices at subnormal levels.

GOVERNMENT BY DIRECTIVE

What the country needs is more government by law, and less by decree. When, as an average citizen, I would read about government by decree in various countries—for example, in France and Germany in the pre-war period—I used to wonder just what it meant. Out of experience in our own country, I have come to know. Practically all effective government in the United States of America is now by decree, only we call it directive. Laws passed by Congress are either ignored or deliberately flouted by administrative agencies, taking their cue from the Chief Executive and Commander in Chief. This Commander in Chief stuff is a favorite phrase of those who choose to ignore constitutional limitations and legislative enactments.

There is no authority for the use of subsidies as they are now being used, except Presidential directive. The only authority of Congress for the use of subsidies is in the Emergency Price Control Act of January 30, 1942.

Paragraph (e), section 2, of that act reads in part as follows:

> The Administrator * * * may * * * make subsidy payments to domestic producers * * * in such amounts * * * as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production.

There is other language in the same section and paragraph, all along the same line. Subsidies were to be used only to increase production. That was the central idea of the Congress, and the Price Administrator was given authority to use subsidies only to increase production. The indiscriminate use of subsidies as a rebate on grocery bills, at the expense of taxpayers, was never contemplated in any of the acts through which the Congress has given authority to the Commander in Chief. In fact, the application of the term Commander in Chief is greatly abused. George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Woodrow Wilson never dreamed of claiming more civil authority as President of the United States by virtue of their constitutional position of Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States. The usurpation of authority by the present President of the United States, under the pretext of being Commander in Chief, exceeds anything in our history.

No wonder that every election in which the people have an opportunity to express their views of this administration shows a steadily increasing resentment against usurpation of authority through bureaucratic control. In this particular situation we are seeing bureaucratic dictatorship at its worst.

INFLATION

In the last few years we have emerged from a period of depression during which prices of all commodities, and especially foods, were subnormal. The American

farmer, the American businessman, and the American manufacturer—in fact, the whole country—would become bankrupt if it had to continue business on the basis of the price levels and the volume of business obtaining from 1932 to 1939. Only 1 year in this period, 1937, showed an approach to normal business. All the other years were plainly years of depressed prices and subnormal business.

Beginning about January 1, 1940, we came into a period of increasing prices on all commodities. In the past 4 years prices have substantially increased. Food prices started at a lower level than commodity prices generally and had a steeper climb to make before they approached a normal level.

But this increase in prices does not by any means spell inflation—at least, true inflation. As I have pointed out elsewhere, the present price level is not above, and in many respects is definitely below, that of the last period of normally prosperous business in the country—namely, the years from 1922 to 1930. Again using 1926 as a basis of comparison, let me call attention to the following essential factors which must be given complete consideration in any adequate determination of our present situation:

In 1926 the United States Government collected $4,100,000,000 in taxes.

In 1942 the United States Government collected $16,400,000,000 in taxes.

In 1943 the United States Government collected $34,500,000,000 in taxes.

On November 30, 1926, the national debt was $19,400,000,000.

On November 30, 1942, the national debt was $100,400,000,000.

On November 30, 1943, the national debt was $170,300,000,000.

In 1926 the national income was $77,000,000,000.

In 1942 the national income was $120,000,000,000.

The national income is estimated to be $148,000,000,000 for 1943.

November 30, 1926, the amount of money in circulation was $4,800,000,000.

November 30, 1942, the amount of money in circulation was $4,800,000,000.

November 30, 1943, the amount of money in circulation was $19,900,000,000.

From 1926 to 1943 taxes increased 800 percent; the national debt increased 900 percent; the national income approximately doubled; the amount of money in circulation—that is, in the hands of the people—available for purchases increased 400 percent.

In the name of God Almighty, the Constitution, and everything else that is holy, how can anybody, even a dumb and dishonest administration, expect prices to remain static, or even be held to some recent level in the face of these factors? It is just one of the impossible things, so impossible that no honest man clothed with authority and any sense of responsibility to the people should hold out for a moment that anything of the kind could be done.

An increase in the present price level over former price levels is only to be expected. We have exceeded the depressed levels of the years 1935 to 1939, but we have only now approached the average price level of a reasonably normal prosperous business period from 1923 to 1930.

Where is the inflation? Where is the threat to the country? Where is there any basis for the wild notes of alarm that administration spokesmen have sounded and are sounding? It is their distortion, misrepresentation, and exaggeration that has alarmed unnecessarily the people of the country.

I stand here on the floor of the Senate today and challenge the intelligence or the integrity of the men who have done this thing. I have supported what I have said today by the best authority in the United States—namely, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, of the Department of Labor, and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, of the Department of Agriculture. These two statistical agencies are recognized on every hand as being able and honest. No one questions their ability or their integrity. They have furnished me with the facts. Every single statement I have made today rests upon a foundation provided for me for this purpose. I asked them for the facts. They gave me the facts. I have laid the facts before the Senate and the country.

These facts indict an administration that has shown indecision, vacillation, and a lack of either integrity or intelligence in dealing with these all-important factors which concern the welfare of our country.

THE BUTTER SUBSIDY

The economic unsoundness of the administration's subsidy program is clearly illustrated in the butter subsidy. In June, butter prices were rolled back 5 cents a pound. At the same time, a payment to the butter processors of 5 cents per pound was made out of the Treasury.

For every dollar of reduction in butter prices to the consumer, $1 of the taxpayers' money is taken from the Treasury to pay a subsidy to the processor. This is not quite all. There is the administrative expense of handling the subsidy which must be added to the burden placed upon the taxpayer. This expense probably runs between 3 and 5 percent of the sums paid.

In other words, the taxpayer pays from $1.03 to $1.05 as an offset to every dollar of rebate upon the consumer purchases of butter.

I do not mean to say that this can be applied to all of the various forms of subsidies. In some cases, undoubtedly, the reduction in the consumer's grocery bill is larger than the assessment against the taxpayer. Butter, however, is the clearest illustration of the extreme economic folly of the roll-back subsidy.

THE FIXED-INCOME CLASS

There is a segment of our population whose income is rigid, or so nearly rigid as to be called the fixed-income class. I have endeavored to obtain the precise extent of this class of our people. I have been unable to get anything like exact figures. The Bureau of Labor Statistics tells me that out of thirty to forty million families in the country, perhaps 5,000,000, or about one-eighth, fall into this class.

There is no doubt about the hardship which a rise in prices inflicts upon this class of people. It is true, of course, that this same class profited through the depression period. With fixed incomes, their purchasing power was greatest when prices were the lowest. The higher prices go the greater the difficulties in which they find themselves.

I wish there were some way whereby relief could be given this class of people. We cannot base our whole economy, or a sound economic policy, upon what is perhaps one-eighth of our people. One of the methods suggested to give this class relief has been the application of a food-stamp plan something like that used for persons on relief through the blue stamps issued through some of the depression years.

One trouble with that plan is that many, perhaps most, of this class of our citizens would refuse to accept any aid of that kind. I have discussed this matter with numerous of my colleagues, but so far no one has been able to suggest any other plan of help for these people, who are among the most responsible and worthy of our entire citizenship.

THE EFFECT OF DISCONTINUING SUBSIDIES ON THE COST OF LIVING

There has been, I fear, much misinformation, possibly misrepresentation, as to the effect that the discontinuance of the subsidy program would have upon the cost of living.

Witless Bill Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, has stated that the discontinuance of subsidies would cause food prices to be doubled in 3 months, and perhaps tripled in 6 months. This is so silly as to be unworthy of any serious attention.

Stabilization Czar Byrnes has stated that the discontinuance of subsidies of all kinds would increase the food level about 7 percent and the entire cost of living about 4 percent. I think Mr. Byrnes has statistical authority for this statement, but I question the correctness of his information.

My own investigation with the statistical bureaus has led me to believe that the entire discontinuance of the subsidy program would increase food costs about 3 or 4 percent, and would increase the entire cost of living about 1 percent. I realize that the estimate I am making, as well as the estimate made by Mr. Byrnes, is subject to review. I think, however, that my estimate is more nearly correct than that made by Mr. Byrnes.

Mr. President, I have had distributed to Members of the Senate nine tables which were prepared for me by the statistical agencies to which I have referred. I now wish to describe and discuss the tables as briefly as I can.

The tables which Senators have before them, identified by the letters A and B, were prepared for me by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor. The remaining tables, which are numbered from 1 to 7, inclusive, were prepared for me for use in this connection by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Both Bureaus have brought the facts as nearly up to date as it is possible to bring them.

Table A shows the cost of living from 1926 down to October 1943. In October 1943, the cost of living was 98.4 percent of what it was in 1926.

Table B breaks the cost of living down into the trend of prices on a number of important commodities. I especially invite attention, Mr. President, to the fact that when the average cost of living on November 15, 1943, was 98.2 percent of what it was in 1926, food was 99.9 percent—still less than 100 percent. But the price of clothing on November 15 had gone up to 110.3 percent. Household furnishings had gone to 106.5 percent.

I wish to add to table B further information which I obtained from the Bureau of Labor Statistics—namely, that the index price of bituminous coal on November 15 was 105.5 percent of the 1926 price. I make that statement because when the Bureau sent me the figures on fuel they combined coal, gas, and electricity. I asked the Bureau to separate the figures, which they did, but the figures came to me too late to be included among those shown in the table.

I should be glad if Senators would refer to table 1, because on that table there appears a tabulation of 16 articles of food on which the average retail prices from 1925 to 1929 are compared with those of October 1943. Mr. President, the table shows that in October 1943 the average prices of 8 of those articles were above the 1926 prices, and that as to the remaining 8, the average prices were below the 1926 prices. I did not select those articles. I telephoned the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and asked them to select 16 important food articles in order to show how the prices on the last available date compared with the prices for the same articles in 1926. This is the result of their work.

I believe the information shown in table 2 is self-explanatory. I invite attention to the fact that it shows food costs and consumer income. I invite attention to the fact that in column 4, where there is shown the amount of income remaining after purchasing food, the income is not only higher now than it was in 1926, but during the period about which so much disturbance has been raised, the period from 1940 to the present time, the consumer net income after his grocery bill was paid increased every month. In other words, net income has increased more than the cost of food. That statement applies not to industrial workers alone, but to the average citizen of the United States as a whole.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish the Senator would explain table 1.

Mr. REED. The figure 111.0 is shown at the bottom of column 5. That figure should not be there. The figures in column 6 on table 1, showing the prices of food, represent the proportion of the total food costs of that particular food item.

If the Senator will examine line 4, he will find that milk represented 8.6 percent of the total food costs of the average consumer of the United States. In line 9, he will find that white bread is 5.7 percent. Does that explanation make it clear?

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. REED. I invite attention of Senators to the fact that these tables are quite important. So far as I know, they have been prepared somewhat differently than similar tables have heretofore been prepared. They have been prepared by the two most prominent statistical bureaus in the United States, which were told exactly the purpose for which I wished to use them. They were prepared so that if I had spoken yesterday the release date on one of the statements would have prevented me from using it. The information is that recent.

I wish to refer now to table 3. I am trying to hurry along, Mr. President. I do not wish to detain the Senate unnecessarily. On page 3 is shown the increase in weekly earnings per worker in various classes of employment. I call special attention to line 20 of that table. The country now is confronted with the question of increasing the wages of railroad workers. Last week there was a resolution before the Senate dealing with that subject. Yesterday we had a threat of a railroad strike based on wages. I am expressing no opinion about the adequacy or inadequacy of railroad wages, but this table shows that from January 1, 1941, to July 1943, the wages of all employees of class 1 steam railroads increased 29.9 percent.

I invite special attention to the last 5 lines, namely, lines 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29. Mr. President, like other Senators, I occasionally read articles written by columnists, and sometimes I become a little irritated, though not so much so as do some of my senatorial friends. I realize that we have columnists with us. All I want them to do is to be as fair as possible, as reasonable as they can be, and also be accurate in their statements. Recently I read an article by Mr. Lippmann, in which he stated that the Government workers had received no increase in wages and that they were badly cramped by the rise in prices.

Of course, I read Mr. Lippmann occasionally. Sometimes I am impressed by his pontifical and ponderous style and sometimes I have difficulty in telling whether it is the voice of Lippmann or the voice of God. Anyway, God is usually more correct than is Mr. Lippmann.

On line 27 these figures show that 3,107,000 Government workers in the executive service received an increase of wages of 19.8 percent since January 1, 1941.

While I am dealing with the columnist question, Mr. President, I do not think we ought to take the columnists too seriously. The Senate will remember what David Harum said about fleas and a dog, that he thought reasonable amounts of fleas were good for a dog; they kept him from brooding over the fact that he was a dog. So I think the nagging and irritation we get from some of the columnists is probably good for us, and maybe keep us from brooding over more important things. So we ought not to take them too seriously. There is the sensational and sometimes inaccurate Drew Pearson and then my good friend Ernest Lindley, voice of the White Father, whose father was chancellor of Kansas University. I could go further through the list, but I do not want to take the time away from the Senator from Michigan who has a measure which he thinks is much more important, I suppose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator says we should not take these figures too seriously.

Mr. REED. No; I did not say the figures; I want them to be taken seriously. I said not to take the columnists too seriously.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. If we are going to take them that way, the Senator's table B, if I caught it correctly, representing the index of the cost of 16 items of food is only 98.2 percent at this time, taking 1926 as a basis.

Mr. REED. In the case of food, it is 99.9, including all items.

Mr. WHERRY. Food, of course, is produced by farmers and other producers.

Mr. REED. And by stockmen.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. That figure I think is outstanding, and I want to compliment the Senator in calling that table to the attention of the Senate, because now we have some idea of what the food cost rise has been.

Mr. REED. And some idea of the extent of the exaggeration, distortion, and misrepresentations that have been made to this country by this administration. That is what I am trying to put before the Senate and the country today. It is a disgraceful chapter in the governmental history of the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to thank the Senator for the table and for his remarks, but I also want to call attention to the fact that in table No. 3 there is one item the Senator apparently did not mention, although he mentioned others. That table shows that farm labor has increased 110 percent. That goes into the cost of production of food, and the cost of food has increased only 99 percent. Certainly, the farmer's cost has gone up tremendously above any other prices. Is that correct?

Mr. REED. The Senator is correct. I may say to the Senator from Nebraska that I did not take more time on these tables because, although they are important, I did not want the Senator from Michigan to have nervous prostration.

Mr. WHERRY. We will take care of the Senator from Michigan if the Senator will continue to bring to our attention tables such as these, which are so informative.

Mr. REED. I think table 3 is important. There has been much said about the white-collar workers, and

there is much to be said for the white-collar workers. However, I think white-collar workers have not been entirely neglected inasmuch as they have had an increase in pay almost equivalent to the increase in the cost of living.

Table 4 is merely a reduction of industrial wages paid to their real worth, compared, for example, with 1924 to 1929, which is taken as 100. The wages of industrial workers, according to the last figure we have, is 163 percent of the average from 1924 to 1929. The cost of living is 99 percent of that average. The real worth of these wages is 165 percent of the wages paid in 1926; so the increase in real worth, in purchasing power, is 65 percent.

Table 5 is a compilation such as I have used in nearly similar form several times previously on this floor. It shows the relation between factory wages, the average hourly earnings, and the urban cost of living, and the real wages of workers. It shows about the same result as the other table, except that the period 1935 to 1939 is used as a basis. Using that as the basis, since the 1st day of January 1939, in the period about which the present administration broadcasts so much as to the increase in the cost of living, because of which it threatens to surrender to minorities that insist upon more concessions, the real earnings per worker have increased to 159.7 percent of the base period—an increase in purchasing power of 59.7 per cent.

Taking the hourly wage, which has not increased as much as the actual wage, because of longer hours and overtime payments, but taking the hourly wage as the basis the increase in the real purchasing power of the wage is 29.3 percent. The last figure shows 129.3 percent as compared with the 1st of January 1939.

Table 6 compares the income of the farmer, the person engaged in agriculture, with the income of the industrial worker. That is the best comparison we can make. Back in 1910 to 1914, the period which we used so long as the basis of parity, the farmer got 62 percent, as much of an income as the industrial worker. The best years the farmer ever had was 1917, when he got 84 percent as much as the industrial worker; 1918, when he got 82.9 percent as much; and 1919 when he got 81.6 percent as much. In 1932, at the depth of the depression, the farmer's income had decreased so far and the prices of the farmers' products had gone so low that in that year the farmer got 23.5 percent as much of an income as the average industrial worker. In 1943 the farmer had 65 percent as much income as the industrial worker.

I go now, Mr. President, to page 7, and then I shall conclude.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. Do the tables furnish information as to the increase in wages and cost of living since September 1942, the date of the hold-the-line order?

Mr. REED. I am sorry I have not that figure in exactly that shape. There had been some increase in wages and some increase in the cost of living up to the early summer or late spring months of this year, since which time there has been some decrease in the cost of living; but I do not have those figures.

Mr. President, I wish to make an important observation, based on table 7, which was prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. I shall make this as brief as I can, but it is important.

This administration is greatly worried about subsidies, and is insisting upon the payment of subsidies so as to reduce food costs to the consumer. From 1921 to 1940 the food producers of this country, the farmers and the stockmen, subsidized food consumers to the extent of $17,767,000,000. Senators will find that on line 26 of table 7.

In the last 3 years, beginning in 1941 and running through 1942 and 1943, the farmer has improved his position both actually, and relatively as to the other population. The farmer has pulled himself up in this period to the extent of $7,106,000,000. That will be found in line 37.

From 1924 to 1940 the farmer's property decreased in value, because he was producing at a loss, and his capital actually shrank in those years over $11,000,000,000. So that the total shrinkage in value of the farmer's property, plus his deficiency in income, amounted to $31,454,000,000.

The fact is that in those years the farmer was subsidizing the food consumer. He was selling his products at less than they cost him to produce, and his income, taking into account the shrinkage in capital values, was $31,000,000,000 short in that period.

Nineteen hundred and forty-three has been the best year, perhaps, agriculture ever had, save possibly the First World War years of 1917, 1918, and 1919. I think 1943 was the best year agriculture ever will have. I should like to talk about that at some length, but I think I shall be able to restrain myself, and save that for a later date.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Before the Senator from Kansas takes his seat I should like to ask him one question. Has he found any way of reconciling the two statements coming from the administration, first, that workers and most other citizens of the United States are earning so much money that some way must be found to siphon it off in order to stop inflation; and second, that we must have the subsidies now requested in order that the people may eat?

Both the Senator and I have very deep sympathy with those who have fixed incomes; we have very deep sympathy and full understanding of their problems. I refer to those who have had no advances in income, or little advances, the so-called white-collar workers, stenographers, teachers, and various other classes, who, according to what I understood the Senator to say, he estimates comprise about 18 or 20 percent of our population.

Mr. REED. No; about one-eighth.

Mr. HAWKES. I cannot bring together the two thoughts emanating from the administration, one that there is so much money in the pockets of the people that it must be taken away in order to stop inflation, and, second, that we must continue a program of Government subsidization, when all of us know that one subsidy leads to another, and the last one to another, and that the entire system of subsidy is destructive of the American system of free enterprise and the American way of life. Can the Senator throw any light on that subject?

Mr. REED. Not very much. As a matter of fact, anyone with a fixed income is better off when prices are low, and as prices rise, if his income is still fixed, the fixed-income citizen is in greater difficulty. I agree with the Senator from New Jersey, the use of subsidies, in the way that subsidies have been used, is as uneconomical a practice as can possibly be followed. At the present time our citizens are receiving the highest average incomes ever received in the history of the United States. The industrial workers, who are putting most of the pressure behind the increase-in-wage cry, and threatening now to "break the line," are receiving the highest wages paid in the history of the world. Yet, with the present subsidies paid, they buy their groceries at lower prices and have more money left with which to break the line, than if they had to pay what their food is reasonably and fairly worth in the market at this time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have the tables to which I have referred, and which I have described, inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE A.—*Comparison of changes in wholesale prices and in wage earners' cost of living*

[Indexes 1926=100]

Date	Wholesale prices (in primary markets)	Cost of living
Average:		
1926	100.0	100.0
1927	95.4	98.1
1928	96.7	97.0
1929	95.3	96.9
1930	86.4	94.5
1931	73.0	86.0
1932	64.8	77.2
1933	65.9	73.1
1934	74.9	75.7
1935	80.0	77.6
1936	80.8	78.4
1937	86.3	81.2
1938	78.6	79.7
1939	77.1	78.6
1940	78.6	79.3
1941	87.3	83.2
1942	98.8	92.2

TABLE A.—*Comparison of changes in wholesale prices and in wage earners' cost of living*—Continued

[Indexes 1926=100]

Date	Wholesale prices (in primary markets)	Cost of living
1942—January	96.0	88.6
February	96.7	89.3
March	97.6	90.4
April	98.7	91.1
May	98.8	91.8
June	98.6	92.1
July	98.7	92.6
August	99.2	93.0
September	99.6	93.2
October	100.0	94.1
November	100.3	94.8
December	101.0	95.3
1943—January	101.9	95.5
February	102.5	95.7
March	103.4	97.2
April	103.7	98.2
May	104.1	99.0
June	103.8	98.7
July	103.2	98.0
August	103.1	97.6
September	103.1	98.0
October	103.0	98.4

Source: U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The cost-of-living index measures changes in the cost of goods purchased by wage earners and lower-salaried workers due to changes in retail prices; that is, it is a price barometer, not a measure of total family expenditures, since total family expenditures also are affected by changes in income.

TABLE B.—*Indexes of the cost of living to moderate-income families in the large cities combined*

[Average 1926=100]

Date	All items	Food	Clothing	Rent	Housefurnishings	Miscellaneous
Average:						
1926	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1927	98.1	96.3	98.1	98.4	97.6	100.6
1928	97.0	95.2	96.6	96.1	95.2	101.2
1929	96.9	96.4	95.6	93.8	94.0	101.9
1930	94.5	91.7	93.4	91.2	91.7	102.4
1931	86.0	75.6	85.1	86.5	82.5	101.5
1932	77.2	63.0	75.3	77.6	71.9	99.1
1933	73.1	61.2	72.9	66.8	70.9	95.9
1934	75.7	68.2	79.7	62.6	78.1	95.4
1935	77.6	73.1	80.3	62.5	79.8	95.6
1936	78.4	73.7	80.9	64.0	81.1	96.2
1937	81.2	76.6	85.2	67.0	87.8	98.4
1938	79.7	71.2	84.7	69.1	87.0	98.9
1939	78.6	69.3	83.3	69.2	85.3	98.1
1940	79.3	70.3	84.3	69.4	84.6	98.5
1941	83.2	76.8	88.1	70.5	90.3	101.4
1942	92.2	90.2	103.0	72.0	102.9	108.1
1943: Nov. 15	98.2	99.9	110.3	[1] 71.7	106.5	114.7

[1] Rent figures collected quarterly only. This index as of Sept. 15, 1943.

Source: U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

TABLE 1.—*Retail prices of 16 major foods in leading cities of the United States, average 1925–29 and October 1943*

(1) Commodity	(2) Unit	Retail price (3) 1925–29, Octobers	Retail price (4) October 1943	(5) October 1943 as percent of Octobers 1925–29	(6) Percent of total food, October 1943 [1]
		Cts.	*Cts.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*
1. Potatoes, white	15 lbs.	50.4	61.0	121.0	4.1
2. Flour, wheat	10 lbs.	54.8	62.6	114.2	1.8
3. Chickens, roasting	Lb.	38.7	44.1	114.0	5.5
4. Milk, delivered [2]	Qt.	14.2	15.5	109.2	8.6
5. Eggs	Doz.	61.9	67.2	108.6	8.1
6. Cabbage	Lb.	4.3	4.6	107.0	.5
7. Tomatoes, canned [2]	No. 2 can	12.1	12.4	102.5	1.1
8. Round steak [2]	Lb.	41.4	41.9	101.2	2.6

TABLE 1.—*Retail prices of 16 major foods in leading cities of the United States, average 1925–29 and October 1943*—Continued

(1) Commodity	(2) Unit	Retail price (3) 1925–29, Octobers	Retail price (4) October 1943	(5) October 1943 as percent of Octobers 1925–29	(6) Percent of total food, October 1943 [1]
		Cts.	*Cts.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*
9. Bread, white	Lb.	9.1	8.9	97.8	5.7
10. Rolled oats	Lb.	9.0	8.7	96.7	.5
11. Pork chops [2]	Lb.	40.6	37.7	92.9	3.0
12. Navy beans, dried [2]	Lb.	11.1	10.3	92.8	.4
13. Lard [2]	Lb.	20.5	18.9	92.2	1.3
14. Butter [2]	Lb.	57.2	50.5	88.3	4.2
15. Oranges	Doz.	59.0	51.8	87.8	5.9
16. Corn flakes	8 ozs.	9.8	6.6	67.3	1.1
17. Total or average				111.0	54.4

[1] Based on aggregate consumer expenditures.

[2] Subsidy payments are being made to processors or producers.

Source: Division of Statistical and Historical Research, Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Compiled from publications of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

TABLE 2.—*Per capita food costs, consumer income, and expenditures, United States, 1929 to July 1943* [1]

(1) Year and month	(2) Total income payments per capita [2]	(3) Expenditures for food [2]	(4) "Take home" income after paying grocery bill [2]	Food expenditures as percentage of income: (5) Actual	Food expenditures as percentage of income: (6) Cost of quantities of foods representing average annual consumption 1935–39 [3]
				Pct.	*Pct.*
1. 1929	$679	$156	$523	23	22
2. 1930	595	143	452	24	23
3. 1931	500	120	380	24	22
4. 1932	380	94	286	25	24
5. 1933	368	91	277	25	25
6. 1934	418	100	318	24	25
7. 1935	460	105	355	23	25
8. 1936	531	113	418	21	22
9. 1937	561	119	442	21	21
10. 1938	509	113	396	22	21
11. 1939	541	114	427	21	20
12. 1940	579	121	458	21	18
13. 1941	692	140	552	20	17
14. 1942	857	176	681	21	17
15. January	777	168	609	22	17
16. February	786	160	626	20	17
17. March	796	162	634	20	17
18. April	817	165	652	20	17
19. May	826	171	655	21	17
20. June	846	169	677	20	17
21. July	861	179	682	21	17
22. August	877	182	695	21	17
23. September	887	178	709	20	16
24. October	909	196	713	22	16
25. November	939	184	755	20	16
26. December	959	193	766	20	16
1943:					
27. January	973	194	779	20	16
28. February	991	198	793	20	16
29. March	1,009	207	802	21	16
30. April	1,023	194	829	19	16
31. May	1,028	201	827	20	16
32. June	1,040	200	840	19	16
33. July	1,052	212	840	20	16

[1] Averages apply to the average civilian consumer, including both farm and nonfarm population.

[2] Income and expenditure data are based upon compilations of the U. S. Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

[3] Percentage of income required to purchase the same quantities of the same foods as the pre-war (1935–39) average consumption. Differences between this column and actual expenditures are due to changes in the nature and level of consumption, i. e., quality of food purchased, amount of services included, percentage of meals eaten out, etc.

Source: Division of Statistical and Historical Research, Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

TABLE 3.—*Increase in weekly earnings per worker in selected industries compared with increase in cost of living, United States, January 1941 to July 1943*

(1) Industry	(2) Wage earners employed July 1943	Weekly earnings (3) January 1941	Weekly earnings (4) July 1943	(5) Percentage increase
	Thousands	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Percent*
1. Water transportation	80	[1] 40.76	[1] 77.76	90.8
2. Shipbuilding	(2)	37.69	60.62	60.8
3. Anthracite mining	71	25.13	39.69	57.9
4. Automobiles	694	37.69	57.18	51.7
5. Iron and steel	1,711	31.07	47.27	52.1
6. Bituminous mining	379	26.00	42.76	64.5
7. Rubber products	192	30.38	45.00	48.1
8. Quarrying and nonmetallic mining	63	22.06	35.72	61.9
9. Chemicals and allied products	742	27.53	42.04	52.7
10. Metalliferous mining	95	30.31	43.30	42.9
11. Crude petroleum and natural gas	93	33.99	49.51	45.7
12. Stone, clay, and glass products	358	25.02	35.40	41.5
13. Textile mill products	1,219	18.01	27.16	50.8
14. Street railways and busses	229	33.63	44.30	31.7
15. Food and kindred products	1,016	24.69	35.52	43.9
16. Leather and leather products	330	20.66	29.13	41.0
17. Dyeing and cleaning	85	19.92	27.55	38.3
18. Apparel and other finished textile products	833	18.76	26.05	38.9
19. Farm labor (hired) [3]	2,896	9.54	20.04	110.1
20. Class I steam railways [4]	1,539	[5] 32.93	[5] 42.79	29.9
21. Tobacco manufactures	89	17.89	27.37	53.0
22. Electric light and power	209	35.49	44.86	26.4
23. Power laundries	268	18.37	23.47	27.8
24. Year-round hotels [7]	346	15.65	20.18	28.9
25. Wholesale trade	1,499	30.59	39.44	28.9
26. Retail trade	3,627	21.53	25.48	18.3
27. U. S. Government executive service [8]	3,107	35.54	42.58	19.8
28. Printing and publishing	339	33.49	40.02	19.5
29. Telephone and telegraph	490	31.69	35.94	13.4
30. Cost of living				22.8

[1] Based on pay rolls and employment indexes as reported by Bureau of Labor Statistics Monthly Pay Rolls (including bonuses for entering war zones) divided by employment and then divided by 4.33 to arrive at a weekly wage figure.

[2] Restricted.

[3] Wage rate per day without board multiplied by 6 to obtain weekly figures.

[4] Based on data reported by Interstate Commerce Commission.

[5] Estimate made by Bureau of Agricultural Economics by dividing pay rolls of class I steam railway employees who received pay during the month (excluding salaried employees and switching and terminal companies) by employment of class I steam railways and then dividing by 4.33 to arrive at a weekly wage. All data employed in making this estimate were reported by Interstate Commerce Commission.

[6] Estimated by Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Data of employment and pay rolls as reported by the Interstate Commerce Commission not yet available.

[7] Board, room, and tips are not included in the wages of hotel employees.

[8] Based on employment and pay-roll data furnished by Bureau of Labor Statistics. Monthly pay rolls divided by 4.33 to convert to a weekly basis.

Source: Division of Statistical and Historical Research, Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

TABLE 4.—*Income of industrial workers adjusted for living costs, United States, 1941–43*

[1924–29=100]

(1) Year	(2) Income per industrial worker	(3) Cost of living [1]	(4) Income per industrial worker adjusted for cost of living
1. 1935–39	88	81	109
2. 1940	97	81	120
3. 1941	114	85	134
4. 1942	141	94	150
5. 1943	163	99	165

[1] Bureau of Labor Statistics data converted to 1924–29 base.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

TABLE 5.—*Percentage index of average earnings per employed worker and per hour in manufacturing and urban living costs, United States, 1939–43*

(1935–39=100)

Year and month	Factory pay roll per employed worker [1]	Average hourly earnings of factory workers [2]	Urban cost of living [3]	Real earnings	
				Per worker	Per hour
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1939:					
1. January	101.5	104.3	99.7	101.8	104.6
2. February	102.7	104.2	99.3	103.4	104.9
3. March	103.7	104.3	99.1	104.6	105.2
4. April	101.3	104.0	99.0	102.3	105.1
5. May	101.8	104.3	98.9	102.9	105.5
6. June	103.4	104.2	98.6	104.9	105.7
7. July	100.7	103.3	99.1	101.6	104.2
8. August	103.8	103.0	98.7	105.2	104.4
9. September	103.7	103.7	100.6	103.2	103.1
10. October	108.8	104.8	100.4	108.4	104.4
11. November	108.5	106.0	100.2	108.3	105.8
12. December	110.6	107.6	99.6	111.0	108.0
1940:					
13. January	107.7	108.1	99.7	108.0	108.4
14. February	107.3	108.0	100.2	107.1	107.8
15. March	108.5	108.5	99.8	108.7	108.7
16. April	107.5	108.3	100.0	107.5	108.3
17. May	108.2	108.9	100.2	108.0	108.7
18. June	109.5	109.3	100.5	109.0	108.8
19. July	107.9	108.6	100.3	107.6	108.3
20. August	111.4	108.9	100.0	111.4	108.9
21. September	113.6	109.4	100.4	113.1	109.0
22. October	115.4	109.8	100.2	115.2	109.6
23. November	114.7	110.8	100.1	114.6	110.7
24. December	119.2	111.6	100.7	118.4	110.8
1941:					
25. January	118.4	112.7	100.8	117.5	111.8
26. February	122.0	113.1	100.8	121.0	112.2
27. March	124.0	113.7	101.2	122.5	112.4
28. April	124.6	115.9	102.2	121.9	113.4
29. May	130.9	119.0	102.9	127.2	115.6
30. June	134.8	120.8	104.6	128.9	115.5
31. July	132.5	121.3	105.3	125.8	115.2
32. August	134.8	121.5	106.2	126.9	114.4
33. September	136.6	123.5	108.1	126.4	114.2
34. October	140.0	125.6	109.4	128.0	114.8
35. November	139.3	127.6	110.2	126.4	115.8
36. December	144.3	129.2	110.5	130.6	116.9
1942:					
37. January	149.8	132.2	112.0	133.8	118.0
38. February	152.7	132.6	112.9	135.2	117.4
39. March	155.6	133.9	114.3	136.1	117.1
40. April	158.0	135.7	115.1	137.3	117.9
41. May	161.2	137.8	116.0	139.0	118.8
42. June	163.2	139.5	116.4	140.2	119.8
43. July	165.0	141.3	117.0	141.0	120.8
44. August	169.3	143.6	117.5	144.1	122.2
45. September	171.2	147.2	117.8	145.3	125.0
46. October	176.0	147.4	119.6	147.9	123.9

TABLE 5.—*Percentage index of average earnings per employed worker and per hour in manufacturing and urban living costs, United States, 1939–43*—Continued

Year and month	Factory pay roll per employed worker	Average hourly earnings of factory workers	Urban cost of living	Real earnings	
				Per worker	Per hour
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1942—Con.					
47. November	180.8	149.4	119.8	150.9	124.7
48. December	182.6	149.7	120.4	151.7	124.3
1943:					
49. January	184.0	151.7	120.7	152.4	125.7
50. February	186.7	152.5	121.0	154.3	126.0
51. March	189.9	154.2	122.8	154.6	125.6
52. April	192.7	155.8	124.1	155.3	125.5
53. May	195.7	157.5	125.1	156.4	125.9
54. June	196.1	158.3	124.8	157.1	126.8
55. July	193.9	159.0	123.8	156.6	128.4
56. August	196.8	159.3	123.2	159.7	129.3

[1] The index of factory pay rolls divided by that of factory employment.

[2] Based on cents-per-hour data reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

[3] Bureau of Labor Statistics data.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

TABLE 6.—*Average hourly earnings and annual wage income of factory and industrial workers compared to average net farm income of persons engaged in agriculture, 1910–43*

Year	Hourly earnings of factory workers		Wage income per industrial worker		Average net farm income per person engaged in agriculture [2]	Column 6 as percent of column 4
	Per hour [1]	1910–14=100	Per year	1910–14=100		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	Cents	Percent		Percent		Percent
1. 1910	20.0	94.4	$573	98.4	$371	64.7
2. 1911	20.4	96.4	562	96.5	348	61.9
3. 1912	21.2	100.1	575	98.7	371	64.5
4. 1913	22.0	103.8	600	103.0	382	63.7
5. 1914	22.3	105.3	603	103.5	360	59.7
6. 1915	22.9	108.1	622	106.8	381	61.3
7. 1916	26.1	123.3	694	119.1	465	67.0
8. 1917	31.1	146.7	818	140.4	690	84.4
9. 1918	40.8	192.5	1,064	182.6	882	82.9
10. 1919	47.7	225.1	1,188	203.9	969	81.6
11. 1920	57.8	272.2	1,411	242.2	753	53.4
12. 1921	50.6	238.8	1,234	211.8	417	33.8
13. 1922	46.4	219.1	1,182	202.9	453	38.3
14. 1923	52.0	245.4	1,274	218.7	532	41.8
15. 1924	54.5	257.4	1,273	218.5	559	43.9
16. 1925	54.4	256.9	1,293	221.9	642	49.7
17. 1926	54.8	258.9	1,318	226.2	609	46.2
18. 1927	55.2	260.6	1,311	225.0	621	47.4
19. 1928	56.0	264.3	1,323	227.1	616	46.6
20. 1929	56.6	267.2	1,334	229.0	649	48.7
21. 1930	55.2	260.6	1,249	214.4	489	39.2
22. 1931	51.7	244.0	1,130	194.0	322	28.5
23. 1932	45.8	216.2	929	159.5	218	23.5
24. 1933	45.5	214.8	900	154.5	289	32.1
25. 1934	54.1	255.4	983	168.7	400	40.7
26. 1935	55.9	264.0	1,058	181.6	468	44.2
27. 1936	56.4	266.3	1,130	194.0	536	47.4
28. 1937	63.4	299.5	1,219	209.2	565	46.3
29. 1938	63.9	301.8	1,134	194.6	489	43.1
30. 1939	63.3	298.9	1,205	206.8	504	41.8
31. 1940	66.1	312.1	1,273	218.5	526	41.3
32. 1941	72.9	344.1	1,495	256.6	726	48.6
33. 1942	85.3	402.7	1,847	317.0	1,062	57.5
34. 1943 [3]	------	------	2,138	367.0	1,392	65.1
Averages:						
35. 1910–14	21.2	100.0	583	100.0	366	62.8
36. 1935–39	60.6	286.1	1,149	197.2	512	44.6

TABLE 6.—*Average hourly earnings and annual wage income of factory and industrial workers compared to average net farm income of persons engaged in agriculture, 1910–43*—Continued

[1] 1939 to date, not comparable to earlier date.

[2] Aggregate net income of farm operators (excluding value of inventory changes) plus wages of hired laborers divided by average farm employment. Including Government payments.

[3] Preliminary estimate.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

TABLE 7.—*Operating deficit under "parity income," 1921–40, and decrease in farmer's equity, 1924–40*

[In millions of dollars]

Year	Parity income and actual income from agriculture to persons on farms, United States 1921–40		Value of farm property, Jan. 1			Total farm debt	Farmers' equity
	Parity income	Actual income	Real estate	Other	Total		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1. 1921	6,289	3,795	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
2. 1922	6,255	4,850	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
3. 1923	6,973	5,608	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
4. 1924	6,687	5,560	50,468	8,857	59,325	13,506	45,819
5. 1925	6,875	6,266	49,493	8,841	58,309	12,677	45,632
6. 1926	7,226	6,617	49,052	9,296	58,348	12,440	45,908
7. 1927	6,788	6,314	47,634	9,338	56,972	12,269	44,703
8. 1928	6,883	6,687	47,495	9,912	57,407	12,363	45,044
9. 1929	7,253	6,741	47,880	10,588	58,468	12,363	46,105
10. 1930	6,335	5,114	47,880	10,498	58,378	12,019	46,359
11. Total for period	67,564	58,152					
12. Deficit in farm income under parity income for period 1921–30		9,412					
13. 1931	5,093	3,482	43,993	8,382	52,375	11,500	40,875
14. 1932	3,778	2,285	37,236	6,647	43,883	10,842	33,041
15. 1933	3,645	2,982	30,724	5,554	36,278	9,963	26,315
16. 1934	4,257	3,515	31,933	5,685	37,618	9,154	28,464
17. 1935	4,738	5,037	32,859	5,879	38,738	8,935	29,803
18. 1936	5,393	5,340	33,910	7,782	41,692	8,771	32,921
19. 1937	5,707	6,074	34,757	7,951	42,708	8,628	34,080
20. 1938	5,216	4,996	34,747	8,328	43,075	8,741	34,334

[1] 1921–23 not included because of the inflated land values in that period which distort the picture.

TABLE 7.—*Operating deficit under "parity income," 1921–40, and decrease in farmer's equity, 1924–40*—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

Year	Parity income and actual income from agriculture to persons on farms, United States 1921–40		Value of farm property, Jan. 1			Total farm debt	Farmers' equity
	Parity income	Actual income	Real estate	Other	Total		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
21. 1939	4,485	5,174	33,931	8,407	42,338	9,025	23,313
22. 1940	5,956	5,386	33,642	8,504	42,146	8,929	33,217
23. Total for period	49,268	44,271					
24. Income less Government payments		40,913					
25. Deficit in farm income under parity income for period 1931–40		8,355					
26. Total deficit in farm income under parity income 1921–40		17,767					[2] 12,606

[2] Net decrease in farmers' equity 1924–40.

IMPROVEMENT IN FARMERS' SITUATION SINCE 1940

27. 1941	6,808	7,591	34,026	8,903	42,929	9,073	33,856
28. 1942	8,192	11,288	36,611	11,464	48,075	9,150	38,925
29. 1943	9,348	14,200	39,905	14,696	[1] 54,601	8,837	45,764
30. Total for period	24,348	33,079					
31. Income less Government payments		31,454					
32. Increase farm income over parity income, 1941–43		7,106					[3] 11,908

	Million dollars
[3] 3. Total income deficit, 1921–40	17,767
34. Net increase in farmers' equity in farm property, 1924–40	12,606
35. Total accrued farm deficit, 1921–40	30,373
36. Improvement since 1940:	
37. Increase farm income over parity income, 1941–43	7,106
38. Net increase in farm property equity, 1941–43	11,908
39. Total improvement since 1940	19,014
40. Net deficiency in farm income plus net decrease in farmers' equity, 1921–43	11,359

[1] Includes $852,000,000 of loans by Commodity Credit Corporation on commodities under loan. Amount of loans by Commodity Credit Corporation in other years not available.

[3] Net increase in farm property equity, 1941–43.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I started about a week ago to dictate what I have said today. In the last 2 days, yesterday and the day before, the New York Times, in two very lucid editorials, has expressed precisely the same views regarding the subject that I have just expressed. The Washington Post of yesterday morning expressed much the same view. I ask unanimous consent that the editorials from the New York Times of November 15 and 16 and the editorial from the Washington Post of November 16 be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of December 15, 1943]

SUBSIDIES AND INFLATION

The subsidy debate has reached the point where extremists on both sides are engaging in a fear campaign. The opponents of subsidies hold that such payments will be highly inflationary; the proponents argue that the elimination of subsidies will mean a doubling of prices within a year. Regardless of which side is successful, therefore, a large group of people will believe that a drastic price inflation is imminent. It is necessary, therefore, to examine the inflation arguments dispassionately and to obtain a sense of perspective as to what is involved if either of the alternatives is adopted. Such an examination reveals that some of the claims of both groups have been grossly exaggerated. Let us examine each in turn.

It is argued that if we pay $1,500,000,000 for subsidies that this will be highly inflationary. If the amount could be held down to this, however, there would be little justification for this charge. Subsidy payments must be viewed as part of the broad problem of war finance. During the current fiscal year the Federal deficit will be about $57,000,000,000. If the above amount were added for subsidies, the total deficit would become $58,500,000,000. It is not realistic to assume that fifty-seven is not inflationary and that fifty-eight and one-half is inflationary, or to assume that the extra $1,500,000,000 would be the straw to break the camel's back.

If this is true, wherein lies the danger that subsidies may be inflationary? The danger lies in the abuse of subsidies rather than in their use. Unless they were paid under carefully specified conditions it could easily develop that the path of least resistance would be to accede to demands for high wages and high prices, and then to try to offset these increases by subsequent subsidy payments. That this is not a theoretical danger is clearly indicated by the following passage from the President's recent food message:

"On the farm as in industry the war has pushed costs above the levels that prevailed before the outbreak of war. * * * These are costs of war, and it is entirely appropriate that they should be met out of the Public Treasury, just as are the costs of producing tanks and planes and ships and guns."

Many of the increases in costs, however, were not directly attributable to the war. They could have been avoided. Subsidies must clearly be limited, therefore, to unavoidable increases in costs due to the war.

Subsidies are most dangerous when they are not accompanied, as the President has admitted, by "wise" fiscal policies and "firm" wage and price policies. In Great Britain and Canada, where subsidies have been used with substantial effect, it has been these fiscal, price, and wage policies which have made the major contribution to stability. Subsidies were only used to supplement them.

Let us turn now to the other argument. Would the elimination of subsidies result in a doubling of prices in 3 months and a trebling in 6 months, as recently stated by William Green, head of the A. F. of L.? The answer is an emphatic "No." According to the O. P. A., food costs would rise by 7 percent if all food subsidies were eliminated. This would be equivalent to about 2.8 percent in the cost-of-living index. But even this figure overstates the rise somewhat. Thus, the O. P. A. food price chief has testified that the withdrawal of all food subsidies would mean an addition of a $1,890,000,000 to the food bill of civilians. This figure may be compared with total estimated consumers' expenditures of $90,000,000,000 in 1943, or an increase of only 2 percent.

If the roll-back subsidies on meat, butter, and peanut butter were eliminated, and other food-subsidy programs continued, the cost-of-living index would increase only slightly more than 1 percent. It is argued, however, that labor would insist upon further wage increases should this increase in living costs be permitted on top of that which has previously taken place. But a resolute policy by the administration could insure that except in the case of substandard wages no further wage increases would be permitted. Certainly, the data on wage rates and weekly earnings do not indicate that organized labor in manufacture, which has been most vociferous in this subsidy battle, has suffered a deterioration of living standards during this war.

What, then, is the explanation for the recent fantastic forecasts of price rises? It seems clear that the proponents of the sub-

sidy program have been confusing subsidy payments and price ceilings. They have assumed that the elimination or modification of subsidies means the end of price ceilings. This is simply not so. Moreover, it cannot be emphasized too strongly that maximum price regulations have been the major factor keeping prices down. If there were no subsidies we would still continue price ceilings. While some advances in prices might be necessary, they would undoubtedly be moderate as compared with those that might take place in the absence of price control.

In sum, certain subsidies can be useful in the battle against inflationary price increases and as a device to stimulate essential production. But a well-considered subsidy program has only a subordinate role to play at best. It should be possible to work out an effective compromise which will permit the use of helpful subsidies and prohibit the use of dangerous ones.

[From the New York Times of December 16, 1943]

A SUBSIDY COMPROMISE

The battle against inflation will not necessarily succeed or fail because of the action now taken concerning subsidies. But a reasonable compromise retaining those subsidies which can aid in the battle and discarding those which have the opposite tendency will indicate that a sense of balance is being achieved. A workable compromise at the present juncture might include these points:

1. A prohibition of roll-back subsidies. It is these payments that have precipitated the bitter opposition to subsidies. Because of failure to distinguish clearly between different types of subsidies, these payments are threatening to destroy what is useful in the subsidy program. To prohibit them would merely restore the prices of meat, butter, and peanut butter to the levels prevailing prior to the introduction of roll-back subsidies. Their elimination would result in an increase in the cost of living index of only slightly more than 1 percent. This would be a small price to pay for stopping a very dangerous type of payment.

2. O. P. A. should be provided with a designated sum for a year's subsidies, perhaps with the proviso that no more than one-third or so of this amount may be spent in any 3-month period. Such a proviso could help to remove congressional fears that the O. P. A. might once more evade a congressional mandate.

3. Periodic reports might be required, possibly every 3 months, on subsidy payments. Such reports should include a detailed description of the mechanics and operation of each program, estimates of the savings effected, evidence of continuing need, and administrative costs. Such information, if filed promptly, would make it possible for Congress to check any abuses that might develop.

4. The conditions under which subsidies may be used should be clearly stated in the legislation. Experience in this country, as well as in other countries, has indicated that certain safeguards are necessary. In the recent hearings on the subsidy bill the O. P. A. submitted a memorandum showing the standards which should be used in paying subsidies (House hearings on H. R. 3477, pp. 336-338). The more important included: "(a) Subsidies should be granted only for commodities important to war production or the cost of living; (b) subsidy must be required to obtain necessary production and distribution at prices consistent with stabilization program; (c) all feasible steps to reduce costs shall have been taken before a subsidy program is put into operation; (d) price adjustments at earlier or later stages of production or distribution must be explored before subsidies are used; (e) subsidies should not be used unless there is a direct net saving from their use." Safeguards similar to these could conveniently be included in the legislation itself. Since they have been proposed by O. P. A., subsidy supporters could not object to their adoption.

A limited use of subsidies under these conditions could prove helpful in stabilizing prices. But the useful role of subsidies at best can be only a subordinate one. The main elements in any program to limit inflation still remain price and wage stabilization and a fiscal policy designed to siphon off additional amounts of excess purchasing power. Unless these primary measures are taken, subsidies, so far from helping to control inflation, could only increase the danger.

[From the Washington Post of December 16, 1943]

COMPROMISE!

Congress has a duty to the American people to settle the subsidy issue before adjournment. The likelihood seems to be that the Senate will put off the vote and extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the interim. But any such postponement till after the New Year would seriously hamper farmers and price-control agencies that should be laying plans for next year. In these circumstances we would most strongly urge a compromise.

The bill passed by the House and now before the Senate prohibits only roll-back consumer subsidies and subsidies imposed to avoid increasing price ceilings. These are now in force. Food subsidies provided by means of support prices and loans for the purpose of stimulating production are not prohibited by the pending bill. In our opinion, the so-called roll-back subsidies employed to reduce prices charged consumers at retail are economically undesirable. We wish they had never been utilized. We also believe that the economic effects of suddenly sweeping away all such subsidies have been grossly exaggerated. According to O. P. A. estimates, the sweeping away of the roll-back subsidies now in force would raise the food index slightly over 7 percent and add about 3 percent to the general cost-of-living index. Certainly an increase of 3 percent in living costs would not be a valid excuse for the exorbitant wage demands that, according to William H. Davis, Chairman of the W. L. B., and other administration spokesmen, would follow the dropping of subsidy roll-backs.

A great deal of mischief has been done by official promises to labor that living costs would be rolled back and by ill-advised official warnings that disaster impends if the roll-back subsidies are dropped. Indeed, labor leaders have virtually been advised that if the administration loses out in the current subsidy fight, the last obstacle to uncontrolled wage increases and uncontrollable inflation will be removed. In view, therefore, of the explosive conditions fostered by official prophets of doom, it would be politically foolhardy to throw the roll-back subsidies overboard at this juncture. Certainly a subsidy outlay of between one and two billion dollars would be a bagatelle compared with the cost to the Government and to the people of this country of a collapse of the price- and wage-control program.

Congress could—and should—set a maximum limit to the amount that can be used for roll-back subsidies—possibly a sum roughly equivalent to the amount needed to finance the existing program. It might also forbid extension of the roll-back program without specific congressional authorization and place a time limit on use of subsidies, as suggested by the minority members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. Since the subsidy bill, in extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, makes that agency accountable to Congress rather than the President for its acts and policies, legislative control over the food-subsidy program would be assured in any event. That makes the case for a reasonable compromise all the stronger.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Senator from Kansas for presenting to the Senate a most illuminating set of facts and figures, the preparation of which must have required a tremendous amount of work on his part. I think his presentation has been splendid.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there is no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) was passed.

Mr. BANKHEAD subsequently said:

Mr. President, in view of the fact that consideration of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill has been put over until after the 1st of January, I thought it appropriate to issue a short statement dealing with the subject. I had rather hoped to address the Senate on the subject today, but I doubt the wisdom of undertaking to do so at this time. However, I have issued a short statement which I wish to read and have carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

I regret very deeply the delay in considering the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, which has been occasioned by those who oppose the passage of the House or Senate bill restricting the payment of consumer food subsidies.

I have done all I could to get action on this measure at the earliest possible date, and the War Food Administration and the bulk of the farm organizations have also urged that there be no delay.

We suffered a temporary setback when the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, by a margin of one vote, rejected my bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation so as to provide support prices necessary to get abundant farm production and to eliminate the payment of food subsidies.

We will not relax our efforts in the least to prevent a broad program of food subsidies being forced on the American people at a time when consumer incomes are the highest in history.

I am confident that the sentiment against consumer subsidies will be stronger than ever when consumers get the true facts and when Senators and Congressmen return here after talking to their constituents.

The public has been misled by an organized scare campaign designed to make consumers believe that the only alternative to food subsidies is run-away prices and wild inflation. Many absurd and fantastic statements to that effect have been made by leaders of the prosubsidy forces.

The proposed system of consumer subsidies is highly inflationary, and the ultimate costs to the public will be more than will be the case if such subsidies are avoided.

I am confident that once the consuming public learns the truth about the situation it will overwhelmingly reject the present subsidy program. I firmly believe that the average consumer prefers to pay his own grocery bill in its entirety, rather than to pass part of it on to present and future taxpayers, a larger percentage of whom will be

the members of our armed forces who are fighting on our world-wide battle fronts today.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 11, 35, 40, 48, 55, 63, 67, 70, and 95 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 12, and 38, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 13, 20, 22, 23, 26, 37, 39, 49, 94, and 96 of the bill, asked a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. POWERS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2207) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MALONEY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MALONEY, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. BALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

IMPORTATION OF LIVESTOCK FEED—SOCIAL SECURITY PAY-ROLL TAX

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, pursuant to the program announced earlier in the day by the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 171.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 171) to permit the importation from foreign countries free of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I understand it is the purpose of the Senator from Michigan to propose an amendment to House Joint Resolution 171, affecting the Social Security Act. Is that true?

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me I shall make a very brief statement to indicate what is contemplated, and the necessity for it.

Mr. President, the Senate Finance Committee has voted by a very large majority in favor of maintaining the 1-percent pay-roll tax under social security, a tax which under the existing statute otherwise would automatically increase to 2 percent on New Year's Day. That action of the Senate Finance Committee is in connection with the pending tax bill. Unfortunately the tax bill cannot reach the Senate for final action before the new year. Therefore, beginning on New Year's Day, except as we deal with the situation today, there will be a state of confusion and chaos in respect to the pay-roll taxes, because, while there will be pending a provision for the freezing of the pay-roll tax, yet the action achieving that result will not occur until later in January.

Therefore the Senate Finance Committee yesterday unanimously recommended that House Joint Resolution 171, the only available House bill before the Senate, be used as a vehicle to give this problem precisely the same kind of treatment which has been given to the Commodity Credit Corporation problem. In other words, as reported, the joint resolution carries an amendment which has the unanimous approval of the Senate Finance Committee and simply freezes the situation for 60 days until Congress has a chance to deal finally and definitely with the question of what the pay-roll tax shall be in 1944. Unless this is done, Mr. President, every employer in this country and every employee on social security, 40,000,000 of them, will be in a state of confusion during the first 2 or 3 weeks in January. Employers will have temporarily to change their withholding bases, employees will temporarily have to increase their contributions, yet the whole thing may retroactively be changed when the tax bill is passed.

The sole purpose of the amendment, I will say to my able friend the junior Senator from Montana, is not at all to settle the question of what shall be the pay-roll tax when it is standardized for next year. I may say to the Senator that in the committee those members who oppose the "freezing" of the pay-roll tax next year agreed that this device is necessary in order to prevent during the first few weeks in January a state of utter confusion which would involve every employer in the country and every employee on social security.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to inquire from the able senior Senator from Michigan if it is not a fact that the representatives of the labor unions appeared at the hearings and objected to the action proposed by the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is not discussing the pending question; the Senator is asking me whether the labor unions do not oppose the "freeze" for 1944.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is entirely correct; but I suggest to him that that question is not involved today. We are not at all prejudging the issue for 1944. We are simply endeavoring to create a situation whereby Congress can deal with the issue after January without an interim of utter chaos and confusion when employers and employees will not know what the withholding tax is ultimately to be.

Mr. MURRAY. It would seem to me that this matter is one of such vital importance and serious consequence that it should not be disposed of in this manner, as a rider to a measure which is utterly unrelated to the subject.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me, let me say that I am afraid I have not made it plain that we are not proposing to dispose of anything. We are simply endeavoring to create a 60-day period during which the Senate and the House will have time to act.

Mr. MURRAY. Of course. However, that would lay the basis for the taking of action within that period for the purpose of preventing the rise in the pay-roll tax, a rise which is necessary in order to carry out the purposes of the Social Security Act.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I would not so construe the proposed action of the Senate, I will say to the Senator; and I certainly would not undertake to use the action today as any precedent or as any prejudice in connection with the fundamental question. I agree with the Senator that the fundamental question should have full and complete consideration by the Senate and by the House. The only thing in the world we are proposing to do is to create such a situation that the Senate and the House can give the subject the full consideration which I agree with the Senator it requires.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to state for the benefit of my friend the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] that I was one of those on the Committee on Finance who voted against the freezing of the social-security tax at its present rate. I was in the minority on the committee; and the committee adopted as a part of the tax bill the amendment freezing the tax—that is to say, prohibiting the automatic increase on January 1. That amendment is incorporated in the tax bill as reported from the committee and will be threshed out on the floor of the Senate when the tax bill is taken up. Even though the 60-day pe-

riod of suspension is granted, if the Senate rejects the amendment, then the increase will automatically go into effect; because provision for the freezing is not contained in the House bill, as I recall, and that matter would have to go to conference. Even if the Senate adopted the amendment freezing the tax at its present rate, it would still have to go to conference, to be threshed out there. If in the consideration of the tax bill the Senate rejected the amendment, then the increased tax would automatically go into effect.

The amendment is offered to this bill, because the tax bill cannot be passed before the 1st of January. What the amendment now before the Senate would do would be simply to hold the matter in abeyance until the Senate can thresh out the matter on the floor, in connection with consideration of the tax bill.

In my judgment, no rights will be lost by anyone interested in the matter, because, after all, it must be threshed out and determined by the Senate as a part of the tax bill.

I desired to make that explanation as one of those who in committee voted against the proposed amendment to freeze the tax as it is now, commencing January 1.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should like to add to what was said by the Senator from Kentucky in his remarks to the Senator from Montana that, while I do not agree with the labor unions on this subject, and while I completely agree with those who would "freeze" the tax as it is for the next calendar year, yet I entirely agree with the wisdom of the 60-day device for preventing total disruption of the pay-roll system during the first 1, 2, or 3 weeks in January, until the Congress has a chance to consider the matter further.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit, I should like to say further that if what is proposed by the amendment is not done, and if on the 1st of January the increased tax automatically goes into effect, then it must be withheld and collected by the employers. If subsequently the Congress should adopt the proposal freezing the tax, then the employers would be required to repay the amounts collected, or make adjustments for them, and would immediately be required to repay the money to those from whom they might have collected it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. From approximately 40,000,000 persons.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; from approximately 40,000,000 persons, which undoubtedly would create a very confusing situation.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I was merely going to say that I was unfamiliar with the purpose of the Senator from Michigan in proposing the amendment to House Joint Resolution 171, but it occurred to me that, if it would have the effect of "freezing" the rise of the tax, it would be a matter for which full opportunity for discussion on the floor of the Senate should be provided.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I totally agree with the Senator that the issue is of that magnitude, and I can assure him that the proposed device is only one to bridge a gap during the first 1, 2, or 3 weeks in January, pending the time when we shall have a chance to give the subject the precise consideration which the Senator requests in behalf of it.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator for the explanation. My understanding was that the proposed freezing of the tax at its present rate would be opposed not only by the labor unions but also by many other persons who are interested in the successful administration of the Social Security Act.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That may well be, on the main issue. I am not arguing that with the Senator today.

Mr. MURRAY. I have before me an extract from an editorial, published in the Wall Street Journal, which discusses this matter and points out the objections to the course proposed by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Now the Senator is discussing the main question; he is not discussing the matter pending here today.

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY. But I merely desire to call attention to the fact that there is widespread and vigorous opposition to the purpose.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have not had occasion to read the amendment upon which the Senator from Michigan has requested action by the Senate; but, as I understand, it proposes that for the first 60 days of 1944 the tax shall be frozen at its present rate. Is that correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct. It is simply to prevent the automatic operation of the existing statute during those 60 days, while the Senate and the House will have an opportunity to decide the basic question. No other purpose is involved.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may say a few words?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to say that it is obvious, I think, that the House will not have a quorum present next week. After consultation with the majority leader, who talked with several members of the Finance Committee, it was deemed proper and advisable to have the committe act on the bill and report it to the Senate, with no expectation that it could be taken up and disposed of at this season of the year, prior to January 1. If the Congress should take a recess until January 3 or 5 or 10, the bill would then be ready to be taken up immediately after the expiration of the recess; and, after the passage of the bill by the Senate, it would immediately go to conference. If in the tax bill there should be no provision for freezing the social security tax at its present rate, the new rates or the stepped-up rates would immediately become operative. I should think the conferees would be through with the tax bill by the 15th or 20th of January, at least.

Mr. GREEN rose.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, unfortunately I was not in the Chamber when the amendment was being discussed. May I have the clerk read it?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The language is rather technical. I think perhaps I can explain it to the Senator.

Mr. GREEN. I should like to have the amendment stated, as well as to hear the explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, after line 11, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 3. (a) Clauses (1) and (2) of section 1400 of the Federal Insurance Contributions Act (Internal Revenue Code, sec. 1400) are amended to read as follows:

"(1) With respect to wages received during the calendar years 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, and the first 2 calendar months of the calendar year 1944, the rate shall be 1 percent.

"(2) With respect to wages received during the last 10 calendar months of the calendar year 1944 and during the calendar year 1945, the rate shall be 2 percent."

(b) Clauses (1) and (2) of section 1410 of such act (Internal Revenue Code, sec. 1410) are amended to read as follows:

"(1) With respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, and the first 2 calendar months of the calendar year 1944, the rate shall be 1 percent.

"(2) With respect to wages paid during the last 10 calendar months of the calendar year 1944 and during the calendar year 1945, the rate shall be 2 percent."

Mr. VANDENBERG. When all that language is boiled down the net result is simply to move forward from January 1 to February 28, the date when the statutory increase in pay-roll taxes becomes effective. If the Senate and House act on the question prior thereto the effective date will be whatever date the House and Senate decide upon. The sole purpose is to avoid the hiatus in January, when employers would be at a loss to know whether they should take 1 percent or 2 percent from the pay rolls.

Mr. GREEN. What would be the result if the Congress should not act during the 60 days?

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Congress should not act during the 60-day period, the automatic increase would go into effect on March 1.

Mr. GREEN. The 2 percent?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct. The sole purpose of the amendment, to which the Senate Finance Committee has given its unanimous approval, is to bridge the gap due to the fact that we are unable to report the tax bill before the first of the year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have an explanation of the joint resolution to which this amendment is being attached, so that I may properly understand what the joint resolution provides. I am not sure that this is the time to ask for an explanation; but as a result of the information we received in the testimony before the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary in the investigation of the liquor business, I am wondering whether we ought to open up this provision of the tariff and permit the importation of grain to be withdrawn from warehouses for consumption during the next 90 days. If we do, according to my information, it will mean a loss to the Government of four or five million dollars.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest to the able Senator that his question does not go to the pending amendment. I suggest that he allow the amendment to be adopted, and then I shall be very glad to answer his question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, House Joint Resolution 171 is the only House revenue measure pending in the Senate. That is the reason it was chosen as the vehicle for this action.

The joint resolution was passed in the House on a yea-and-nay vote, by about 5 to 1. Its sole purpose is to permit, for 90 days, the importation, free of duty, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed. Therefore, I am unable to see how it could possibly fall within the scope of the question submitted by the able Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to assure the distinguished Senator from Michigan that I am in favor of the amendment just adopted. However, I wish to point out that according to the information which we received, the sole purpose of House Joint Resolution 171 is to permit 9,000,000 bushels of wheat now in storage on boats on some of the Great Lakes to be sold at a price which will increase by 45 cents the price per bushel which the Government pays. Does the Senator know anything about that?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am unable to answer the Senator's question. All I can do is to call his attention to the yea-and-nay vote in the House on the joint resolution. On the one hand, I find some of the most rabid Republican tariff protectionists in the history of the country supporting the joint resolution providing for the 90-day lapse. I also find some of the ablest farm proponents, such as Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, of Minnesota, equally insistent that the 90-day experiment is worth while from an agricultural point of view. I am sorry that I cannot give the Senator a categorical reply to the question which he submits; but from the debates and from the long consideration of this question, which is apparent from the hearings in the House, I am unable to believe that there is any menace involved. On the contrary, I am forced to believe it is a worth-while adventure.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the Senate should know that this morning Mr. Upson, of the Food Administration, stated before the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary that 9,000,000 bushels of wheat have been shipped to this country from Canada. That wheat is now held in storage in American boats, in American waters. The pricing depends upon the outcome of House Joint Resolution 171. If it should pass, that wheat would net Canada 45 cents a bushel more, or in excess of $4,000,000. The price has not been put on it, because of the pendency of this joint resolution, which would permit the increased price. I think the Senate should know that. That is the fact, as given to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, all I know is that on April 29 the President, by proclamation, provided that wheat for feed could be imported duty-free into this country. Therefore, I am unable to understand how this particular measure could have the slightest effect on the situation involved in the discussion.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It was my understanding that the primary purpose of the joint resolution was to increase the supply of feed available to livestock and poultry producers, in the hope that they might to some extent thereby check the flood of animals which are going to the slaughter houses and packing plants in such volume that they can hardly be handled. If there is any private interest concerned in this measure, this is the first time I have heard of it. I know that the Representative from Wisconsin who sponsored the measure, although he is not a member of the party to which I belong, would not under any circumstances be interested in any private effect which the joint resolution might have. He is concerned only with the benefit which might accrue to the producers of livestock and poultry. I believe that the measure is meritorious, and that it ought to pass speedily.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the joint resolution by its terms restricts the purposes of imports to livestock and poultry feed. It forbids the use of any of the grain for milling, or anything of that kind. It is as restrictive as a measure of this kind could well be made. My understanding is that it has been strongly urged by the agencies which are charged with the responsibility of providing a greater quantity of cattle and poultry feed than is now available in the market. So far as I know that is the sole purpose of the joint resolution, and it is, of course, limited to 90 days.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator's final statement is correct. The War Food Administration has very earnestly requested the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to make the further statement that I am not only in hearty accord with providing sufficient feed for livestock purposes in this country, but will go along with the Senate in any program of that kind. However, the joint resolution does not involve that question alone. I am not saying the object proposed to be accomplished can be accomplished in any other way, and possibly this is the only way to do it, but it developed in the committee this morning that this measure was being urged for the purpose of enabling wheat to be imported duty-free so that the Canadian Government may obtain an increased price for wheat which has been loaded on boats more than 4 weeks ago, and which will be held until March 15 next year, unless the joint resolution is passed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. My understanding of the situation is that months ago, under the President's order, what we call second- or third-grade wheat was permitted to come into this country free of duty. From what the junior Senator from Michigan has said it seems to me the situation is this: If we pass the joint resolution the first-grade wheat, which is probably in boats and probably in our harbors, and on which duty would have to be paid, would not be subject to the duty.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, that statement is in accordance with the testimony which was given this morning before the committee.

Mr. WILEY. Yes; of course, then the situation is very plain. We are simply saying that because of our policy in relation to livestock feed, we think it is advisable that for 90 days all wheat, including the wheat which is now in our ports, shall be allowed to come in duty-free.

That is all there is to it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, the joint resolution expressly provides that it shall not be construed to authorize the importation of wheat for milling purposes.

Mr. WILEY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. TAFT. So unless there can be obtained for feed wheat the top price which is paid for milling wheat, the increase in price would not be received, and I do not think the top price can be obtained for feed wheat.

Mr. WILEY. After listening to the colloquy today, it seems to me the rational explanation is that Canada has wheat in our ports on which she would otherwise have to pay duty, and that if the joint resolution is passed, she will not have to pay duty. That is all there is to the question, as I see it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Question!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the joint resolution.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Michigan still has the floor, there is another question which I should like to ask him.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. The question relates to the freezing of the tax, about which the Senator has spoken, for 2 months more.

I did not hear all the discussion on the subject. Perhaps the Senator from Michigan has already discussed the financial consequences of the proposed extension for 2 months. As I understand the Senator's argument—and I am not quite sure that I understand it correctly—the result will be that even if the Congress should decide against changing the existing statutory law, it could not then recover the difference between the 1 percent and 2 percent which the present law exacts. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think it is correct; but, if I may interrupt the Senator, I have no idea that the period will be 2 months; I have no idea that it will be longer than 3 weeks, because I believe the tax bill will be enacted by the middle of January.

Mr. GREEN. Then, as provided in the amendment, the extended time would be not to exceed 2 months, during which the Government would lose the revenue.

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; the Government would not lose the revenue. It would not be revenue to the Government. It would be revenue which inures to the reserve fund of the old-age and survivors' benefit fund account.

Mr. GREEN. It should be called an insurance premium, perhaps, but it is called a fund. If it is not a tax, then it has no business in the pending joint resolution. We are considering an amendment to continue a tax, are we not?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. If it is a tax, the Government loses the tax, does it not?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; because the tax does not inure to the Government. It inures to the reserve fund of the old-age and survivors' benefit account.

Mr. GREEN. Yes; but it amounts to the same thing in the long run.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is the trouble. That is why I disagree on the merits of it, but I do not see why we should argue the merits today.

Mr. GREEN. In order to avoid question, let us state the situation in this way: If we provide for extension of the present tax for 2 months will not $200,000,000 less come to the Government?

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the period extends for as long as 2 months there will be $200,000,000 less in the reserve fund of the old-age and survivors' benefit account provided employers immediately accept the statutory obligation on January 1. There seems to be a great deal of doubt as to whether many of them will do so because of the very reasonable expectation that the Congress will freeze the tax when it comes to the ultimate decision. That is the source of the doubt. A great many employers wonder whether they should not take a chance on waiting for 3 weeks, because there would be a tremendous obligation upon them in connection with large pay rolls to change over their entire pay-roll withholding system. They would hesitate to do so if it were to apply only to a week or two. I do not know what they would do.

Mr. GREEN. How could they justify refusal to obey the law?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not think they could.

Mr. GREEN. Does the Senator think they would not obey the law?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have given the Senator the best information I can give him.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from Rhode Island that in no event would any of the increased pay-roll tax, assuming it were collected, reach the Treasury until the end of the first quarter; that is, April 1. The proposal temporarily to freeze the tax is solely in the interest of the employer and the employee until we later pass upon the question of whether it should be frozen. No money is due to go into the Treasury until April 1, regardless of when we commence to collect the pay-roll tax.

Mr. GREEN. But even then there will be more than $200,000,000 less in the fund.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, if it should take 60 days after January 1 definitely to settle the question, but I do not think it will. I think this question will be settled in January.

Mr. GREEN. If the period were only 30 days there would be more than $100,000,000 less in the Treasury, would there not?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is correct, and I will say that so far as I am concerned—and I am the chief proponent of this so-called freeze—that if Congress decides in January or February that the pay-roll tax should not be frozen, I should be perfectly willing to make the decision retroactive to January 1.

Mr. GREEN. That would satisfy my objection. Will the language of the Senator's amendment be changed to comply with his suggestion?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I cannot do that in the pending amendment. It can be done in an amendment to the tax bill, and I will join the Senator in doing that precise thing when the time comes.

Mr. GREEN. I shall be satisfied with the Senator's assurance to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read the third time.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 171) was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to permit the importation from foreign countries free of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed, and suspending for 2 months the increase in the tax rates under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act."

Mr. VANDENBERG. I move that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. GEORGE, Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, and Mr. VANDENBERG conferees on the part of the Senate.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit the conference report on the first supplemental national defense appropriation bill, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3598) "making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 18, 36, 64, and 71.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, 19, 21, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 52, 53, 54, 56, 58, 61, 65, 66, 68, 69, 72, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, and 93; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "not to exceed $300,000 of the unexpended balances of the appropriations made to the National Youth Administration for the purposes of liquidation in the War Manpower Commission Appropriation Act, 1944, and the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943, are hereby continued available until June 30, 1944, for payment of all such obligations incurred prior to January 1, 1944,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$112,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$175,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Economics of mineral industries: For an additional amount for economics of mineral industries, fiscal year 1944, including the objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1944, $16,000;

and the limitation upon the amount that may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia is hereby increased to $347,500."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Construction of byproducts plant, Pribilof Islands, Alaska: For the enlargement of the byproduct plant, for the utilization of furseal carcasses, on Saint Paul Island, including the purchase and installation of machinery and other equipment, fiscal year 1944, to remain available until expended, $135,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: After the number "127" in such amendment, insert "(claim of Charles A. Buchanan, Port Huron, Michigan, $125.62)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$17,788.30"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Reimbursement for damages on the Illinois River, Illinois: Not to exceed $303,500 of any unobligated balances of existing appropriations heretofore made for the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works, for the prosecution of such projects theretofore authorized as may be most desirable in the interests of commerce and navigation, and for other purposes specified under the head "Rivers and Harbors" in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1944, are hereby made available for the payments on account of damages arising as a result of projects on the Illinois River, Illinois, in accordance with the provisions of the act approved October 23, 1943 (Public Law 168)."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 8, 11, 12, 13, 20, 22, 23, 26, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 48, 49, 55, 63, 67, 70, 94, 95, and 96.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JED JOHNSON,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
D. LANE POWERS,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I ask that the conference report be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report is agreed to.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I now ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on certain amendments of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 3598, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
December 16, 1943.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 11, 35, 40, 48, 55, 63, 67, 70, and 95 to the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 8 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert:

"BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

"For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Budget, fiscal year 1944, including the objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1944, and including $20,000 additional for the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, $100,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 12 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by such amendment insert:

"Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, fiscal year 1944, including the objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1944, $688,000: *Provided,* That the use of social security numbers in connection with the centralization of Federal employment reporting and civil service retirement records shall not be deemed in any manner as an indication of approval by Congress of any participation in whole or in part by the Social Security Board in the administration of the Federal retirement system or to the consolidation of the Federal retirement system with the social security system for non-Federal employees."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 38 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

For an amount in addition to the $20,000,000 appropriated under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944, and for the same objects and subject to the same conditions, $6,500,000.

That the House insist upon its amendments to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 8, 12, and 38; and insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 13, 20, 22, 23, 26, 37, 39, 49, 94, and 96 to said bill and ask a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Ordered, That Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. POWERS be the managers of the conference on the part of the House.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 12, and 38.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I now move that the Senate further insist on its amendments numbered 8, 12, 13, 20, 22, 23, 26, 37, 38, 39, 49, 94, and 96; agree to the further conference asked by the House thereon and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN conferees on the part of the Senate, at the further conference.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 610, being Senate bill 1543, to provide for payment of mustering-out pay to members of the armed forces, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1543) to provide for payment of mustering-out pay to members of the armed forces, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] was chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs which considered this bill, but, inasmuch as I introduced the original bill, if it is agreeable to the Senator, I shall make a very brief explanation.

The Senate will recall that on the 23d of November the President sent a message to the Congress recommending certain benefits for members of the armed services of the United States, including mustering-out pay at the time of discharge and providing for its payment, including also certain benefits under the Social Security Act, and other benefits. That portion of the President's message which dealt with mustering-out pay was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. A day or two later I introduced Senate bill 1543 carrying out the recommendations of the President in regard to the payment of mustering-out pay for all those in the armed services, which includes, of course, all branches of the

Army and Navy and the WAVES, WAC's, and all others who are now an integral part of our armed forces.

The bill which I introduced provided for a straight payment of $300 regardless of the length of time anyone had been in the service. It provided for a part of it to be paid immediately upon discharge and the balance within 2 months of mustering out. The bill which I introduced also provided no payment for those above the rank of captain. The subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee reported the bill back to the full committee with the recommendation that it pass. The full committee revised the schedule of payment and raised the rank to include those as high as colonel instead of captain, which was the rank carried in my bill. They provided a sliding scale of payments, providing $500 mustering-out pay for those who served overseas for 18 months or longer; $400 for those serving overseas between 12 and 18 months; and $300 for those who served overseas for less than 12 months, one-third of it to be paid at the time of discharge, the balance to be paid in two equal monthly installments thereafter. The bill as reported also provides that $300 shall be paid to those who serve for a year or more in continental United States—excluding Alaska, as service there is regarded as overseas duty—one-third of it to be paid at the time of discharge and the balance in two equal monthly installments; and, further, that $200 mustering-out pay shall be paid to those who serve in the United States less than 12 months——

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall yield in a moment—and providing in the same way that one-third of it shall be paid at the time of discharge and the other in two equal monthly payments.

I wish to say in this connection that the Senator from Nevada has suggested to me the propriety of providing that those who are to receive the $200 discharge pay shall be paid one-half of it at the time of discharge and the other half within a month. I think that is a very good suggestion, and, after consulting with the Senator from Colorado, I will propose such an amendment. It will prevent the necessity of paying those who receive $200, $66⅔ at the time of discharge and $66⅔ each month thereafter until the balance is paid. I think that is a very valuable and wise suggestion.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I want to have the RECORD show that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and myself appreciate the promptness and the vigor with which the distinguished Senator from Kentucky presented his bill and the manner in which he has followed it up.

The Senator from New Hampshire is necessarily absent today. I have not interposed objection of any kind to the progress of the bill because I know that the Senator from New Hampshire realizes the necessity of speed in the dispatch of this business. I feel justified in saying that I think the Senator from New Hampshire would agree with me that the Senator from Nevada is correct in his proposal of having the $200 payment divided into two and not into three payments, and, so far as I have any authority to speak, I am glad to join the distinguished leader in accepting an amendment of that character.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont, and I want to say to him that I appreciate the contribution made to this subject by him and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] who introduced jointly a bill practically the same as the one which I introduced, except for a difference in the schedule of payments. The full committee revised the whole subject and has recommended the payments I have indicated.

I wish to say—and after this I shall yield to the Senator from Arizona—that it is important that this proposed legislation be enacted now. It provides mustering-out payments not only to those who are to be mustered out hereafter, but for payment to all those who have been mustered out since the date fixed in the act, December 7, 1941. Many of those have already gone out of the service. Some of them have been discharged because of physical disability. They may later be entitled to compensation, and no doubt many of them will be, but until they have filed and proved their claims they receive nothing at the hands of the Government. Many of them have been required, of course, to seek jobs and all of them are undertaking to find them. This mustering-out pay is intended to pay for the interim between their discharge and the time when they can reintegrate themselves into industry, into employment. According to the testimony of General Marshall and other officers of the War Department and the Navy Department, of the total number of men now in the Army it is estimated that some 75,000 are being discharged a month because of physical disability or for one reason or another, and many of them are being discharged because of injuries. It may be months, certainly weeks, before those who are injured or whose physical condition has been damaged by their service in the Army can make out their claims and prove them before the Veterans' Administration.

In the meantime they are receiving nothing from the Government, and it is extremely important that we enact the proposed legislation at once. I am anxious to see it enacted before Christmas, so that the payments may be presented to the men and women entitled to them as a Christmas gift, if possible, although I admit that is more or less sentimental.

I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Kentucky tell me whether he has considered this bill as in any way providing for adjusted pay.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; it does not. As the President has recommended, and as the committee has recommended, it provides merely a sort of stopgap pay between the discharge of the soldier and his reintegration into industry, or into his profession, or whatever it is he is going to do when he returns home. It has nothing whatever to do with the final adjustment of compensation or benefits to which our soldiers and sailors will be entitled.

Mr. McFARLAND. A little while before the Senator from Kentucky introduced his bill the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and I introduced a bill providing for adjusted pay. The Finance Committee has been very busy with other matters and has not had time to consider our bill. It had in it section 9 (a), a provision very similar to the original mustering-out bill introduced by the Senator from Kentucky.

I would say that if the pending bill provides solely for mustering-out pay, then it is all right, but if it is to be in any way treated as providing adjusted pay, it would not be.

Mr. BARKLEY. The payments were not regarded as adjusted compensation in the President's message; they were not regarded so by me in introducing the bill; they were not so regarded by the Committee on Military Affairs in reporting the bill, and the bill to which the Senator refers, now before the Committee on Finance, which deals with the adjusted compensation as we have dealt with it heretofore in regard to veterans of World War No. 1, will still be a matter for legislation on the part of Congress. The pay provided in the pending bill has no relationship to that; it is wholly independent, and is intended merely to bridge the beneficiaries over for the brief period after they get out of the Army or Navy until they are able to secure employment. Their final rights will be adjusted and legislated upon wholly independent of the pending measure.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from Arizona has no objection to the matter being considered separately, providing it is distinctly understood that the payments are not to be considered as adjusted pay. I did not want the bill to be passed without that understanding, because someone might rise on the floor of the Senate and say, "We have already adjusted the pay of the veterans."

Mr. BARKLEY. No; no advantage will be taken of our soldiers and sailors in any branch of the service in the final adjustment of their compensation because of the fact that they get this interim pay, merely as mustering-out pay, and that alone. I am a member of the Committee on Finance, which will consider the whole subject, but it is impossible for us to wait until the matter before that committee has been disposed of in order to pay the men who are now coming out of the service, and those who will be coming out until the war is over, and immediately after it is over. This pay will enable them to "get by." I might say, between the time when they are discharged and the time when they obtain employment.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am in accord with the bill, or I would not have included

a similar provision in the bill the Senator from South Carolina and I have introduced. I am glad, even though we have been unable to have our bill considered, to see this phase of the matter considered and passed at this time, because I appreciate that it means a great deal to the boys at the front to know what they can count on when they return to their homes.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is important to those who are still fighting, and will continue to fight, to know that when they return home they will receive the pay we are now proposing, in addition to what we have already provided for them in the way of compensation. It certainly is very sorely needed by the boys who have already been discharged.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for stating that he is willing to give our bill early consideration. I feel it should be considered at an early date, for the same reason the pending bill needs to be considered today. I think it is important that this matter be considered as a whole, and as soon as possible.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the Senator about that.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I had thought of introducing, or furthering, a substitute for the pending measure, but after studying the bill, I am convinced that the committee has worked out the problem much better than my proposed substitute would, and especially now, when the able Senator from Kentucky is content to take the suggestion I gave him, to divide the $200 payment into two payments. I think that improves the situation considerably, as affecting those who will receive the smaller payments.

I wish to say that there are now in this country, of those who are being mustered out and who have been mustered out, who find themselves without work, or are unable to accommodate themselves to the new conditions they confront, many boys to whom this will be a great boon. In my judgment these payments will, when they come to them, be a great blessing, and save many of them from the discontent and unhappiness which otherwise would naturally follow.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is undoubtedly true, and I thank the Senator from Nevada for that constructive contribution.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Will the Senator make a statement a little more in detail along the line of that made by the Senator from Nevada? What will be received by the boys who are mustered out, under the terms of the bill? Somewhat in excess of half a million of them have already been discharged.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the bill those who have served overseas for 18 months or more will receive $500, one-third of which will be paid when they are mustered out, and the balance in two monthly payments.

Those who have served between 12 months and 18 months overseas will receive $400, to be paid in the same way.

Those who have served less than 12 months overseas will receive $300, to be paid in the same way.

Those who have served in the United States 12 months or more will receive $300 at the time of their mustering out, to be paid in the same way.

Those who have served in this country less than 12 months will draw $200.

Mr. McCARRAN. How about the man who has already been mustered out?

Mr. BARKLEY. He will draw the pay just the same. The bill provides that it shall apply to all those who have been discharged since the 7th of December 1941.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. In order to make that clear at this time, it will be necessary for the bill to pass as an authorizing measure, then it will be necessary for Congress to pass an appropriation bill, so that the money may be available.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is correct. We have included in the bill an authorization for an appropriation, and the money cannot be paid until the authorization is made, and then the Committees on Appropriations of the two Houses provide the money.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. On the question raised by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], let me call attention to the new language. The bill provides mustering-out payments, not mustering-out pay.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. It is erroneous to assume that money authorized is for pay in any sense. It provides payments for mustering out, and the payments represent a benevolence on the part of the people for the soldiers, to take care of a special circumstance and need, and have no reference whatever to pay. That is an important change in the text of the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; and that was made in order that there might not be any confusion as to the object of the bill and its relationship to any future legislation dealing with compensation.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for the explanation. I wanted that matter made plain.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I rose to ask the very question propounded by the Senator from Vermont. Let me take this opportunity to commend the distinguished Senator from Kentucky and the distinguished Senator from Vermont for bringing this bill to the floor at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's remarks, as I am sure the Senator from Vermont does. I do not want the Senate to fail to recognize the obligation which we and the country at large and the armed services owe to the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], who was chairman of the subcommittee which handled the bill. He has worked indefatigably to have the bill reported. I make the same statement regarding all the members of the Committee on Military Affairs, including the subcommittee which was originally appointed.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Kentucky. I did not have any intention of leaving anyone out.

Mr. BARKLEY. No. I think the Senator from South Carolina is a member of that committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. Not only the members of the committee but the entire membership of the Senate should be thanked for having given thought to this matter at this time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Was the action of the committee unanimous?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] can answer that question. I am not a member of the committee. I think the committee was unanimous in reporting the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The committee was unanimous in reporting the bill. However, there are some differences of opinion as to some points in the bill, I may say, but the vote was unanimous.

Mr. LANGER. May I inquire what has been done toward helping the young men who are mustered out who are insane? Has anything been done to take care of them?

Mr. BARKLEY. They will all receive the same pay as if they had been mustered out under normal circumstances. What will be done later by way of veterans' compensation to them obviously could not be taken care of in this measure, because we could not separate one class of servicemen from others. We had to arrange the matter according to the time of service to include all men and women, regardless of the cause for their being mustered out, whether the war was on or whether the war was over. But the cases to which the Senator from North Dakota referred will come later in legislation giving them compensation because of their physical or mental condition.

Mr. LANGER. Is any bill pending now which would provide for the rehabilitation of such persons?

Mr. BARKLEY. Proposed legislation is now pending providing for their rehabilitation. A very comprehensive program is being worked out which I hope to see enacted in the very near future, as soon as possible in the coming session.

Mr. LANGER. I join with the Senator from Kentucky in that hope.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. As I understand the distinguished leader, this measure is in addition to legislation which has already been passed or proposed for rehabilitation, education, and so forth, and so on?

Mr. BARKLEY. Absolutely.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. So that we may see clearly the amount of the obligation which has really accrued against the United States, and with which we are trying to catch up at this time, I read a statement from the Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson, on page 10 of the report, and I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky if that represents his estimate of the obligation we now have to the men already discharged:

> With respect, however, to the persons who have already been discharged or relieved from active duty up to the present time, it is estimated that the cost would be roughly a quarter of a billion dollars.

That would be the amount, I take it, involved as of this time with respect to the men already discharged?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will ask the Senator from Colorado, who is chairman of the subcommittee, to reply to that question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, it would be considerably more than the estimate made by the Secretary. I think he was referring only to the men in his particular department, and not to all the enlisted men in the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and other services. Under the provisions of the pending bill the amount that we probably already owe, the amount which has accrued, would be about $350,000,000, instead of $250,000,000. I think the Secretary is $100,000,000 low in his estimate.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that the Secretary's letter was based on the original bill which I introduced, which was referred to him, providing for a straigh $300 payment without regard to length of service. His estimate was based upon that proposal. Under the new schedule which the committee has worked out, running from $200 to $500, it would probably be necessary to revise the Secretary's figures based on the number of servicemen who have already been discharged, but I think the estimate of the Senator from Colorado of $350,000,000 would be reasonably accurate. I may say that under the original bill calling for a $300 mustering-out payment to all those in the service, based upon a total of approximately 10,000,000 in the service, the total obligation would amount to about $3,000,000,000.

Mr. BURTON. It may well be, then, at the present time that this measure will call for an appropriation or payment of between $350,000,000 and $500,000,000 to meet the obligation at the time appropriation bills will be coming up?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; it will require an appropriation of about $350,000,000, and in addition to that a current annual appropriation of $250,000,000, because there are about 75,000 individuals going out of the service every month, and the amount payable to them would be upward of $250,000,000 in addition. So we would have a current expense or requirement for appropriations of $250,000,000 plus, and appropriations requiring about $350,000,000 for back pay.

Mr. BURTON. Does the Senator care to hazard a guess as to what the ultimate cost will be?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course it is a little difficult to figure, because we do not know how long the war is going to last. The committee upped the figure considerably. Under the pending bill the total cost could not possibly be less than $4,000,000,000.

Mr. BURTON. The seriousness of the immediate situation is illustrated by the fact that we recognize an obligation which should be met, of approximately $350,000,000 to men who are in need, who have rendered service to their country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. It is back pay.

Mr. BURTON. The urgency for immediate passage of the measure is due to the recognition of a debt to the men in that amount, at the time they need it, and when they have rendered the service.

Mr. BARKLEY. The situation has created an immediate urgency for the passage of the measure. These men have all been discharged. They are on their own. Many of them have no jobs. They have become a burden on their families. This is a debt which I feel, and the Senate feels, and the country feels, we owe to those men. Individuals will be paid mustering-out payments as they come from the service in the future.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. There is no question that this amount will be in excess of any payment due now to a disabled veteran who has been discharged, or to one who will be discharged, if there is any such payment due.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator says "excess." It will be independent of that.

Mr. FERGUSON. Over and above.

Mr. BARKLEY. Over and above, that is true. Of course he receives compensation because of injury, or because of any impairment of his health or physical condition due to the service. That is a matter of right to which he is entitled. This is a payment in recognition of his need immediately when he gets out of the service.

Mr. FERGUSON. It has nothing to do with his injuries?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; absolutely nothing.

Mr. FERGUSON. Or his physical incapacity or health?

Mr. BARKLEY. No. The payment will be received by all men and women in the service whether injured or not. And their rights to compensation, if they are injured, or if their health is in any way impaired, will be entirely different from this and independent of it.

Mr. FERGUSON. We call this mustering-out pay, but we differentiate between those who have served in foreign lands and those who have been in camp or served in this country.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. So in effect this is what might be called compensation for their service.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; it is not compensation. We do not regard it as compensation, although of course it is in their pockets. They are able to spend it. They can look upon it in any way they see fit to look upon it, but it is not regarded as compensation in the ordinary sense in which we have used that term in all our legislation heretofore.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not like to have the men who have served feel that Congress is now thinking it is making a gift, as a Senator remarked, a Christmas present.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a figure of speech.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the men have earned this payment and much more.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I agree with the Senator. That is the reason why no one thought of discriminating between those who have already served and been discharged, and those who are now serving and will be discharged in the future. It would be a very rank discrimination to say to those who are now being ordered to serve, when they come back, "We will not pay you anything because you have been mustered out," when they may be wandering around looking for a job.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree that we should pay all alike.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. The basis of the difference in the amount is the difference in the need. This is a benevolence based on need. It is not pay, and the committee was very careful to make it clear by changing the language, even the language of the title of the bill, from "mustering-out pay" to "mustering-out payment." The evidence shows beyond any dispute at all that the men who have been discharged or relieved from service, who have served 18 months overseas in the theater of operations, are for many different reasons in need of greater assistance than men who have parted from their occupations for, say, only 45 days, who have never left the country, and never have suffered those things which result in need of a mustering-out payment of money.

So it seems to me that in consideration of the bill all should recognize that it does not enter the field of payment for services or the field of compensation for what the members of the armed forces have done, but that it is strictly and purely a matter of honorably caring for the need of these men at the time when they are mustered out.

Mr. BARKLEY. I may say in that connection that the committee has proceeded on the theory that the longer a man is in the service, whether at home or abroad, the more completely disconnected he becomes from his former job.

Mr. AUSTIN. And the more dislocated are his affairs at home.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; the more dislocated they become. In other words, if

a man has been out of touch for 12 months or 18 months with the job he had before he entered the Navy, he is more completely dissociated from that job than he would have been if he had been in the Navy, and away from home, only 6 months.

Mr. AUSTIN. And it must not be forgotten that during a long time more changes can occur than during a short time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course.

Mr. AUSTIN. And that the changes in conditions which existed when the man left home might, by virtue of the passage of 18 months, be quite different from the changes which would occur after the passage of only 6 months.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. While some of those who return may find jobs in the same institutions in which they worked before they left, it may well be true that after the war many veterans will find that the institutions with which they were associated before the war have completely gone out of existence during the 18 months or 2 years, or whatever the period may be, during which they were away.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is quite possible.

Mr. BARKLEY. So they will not be able to go back to the jobs they had before they entered the service, but will have to cruise around the field in order to determine where they may find employment elsewhere. In such cases I think the proposed difference in pay is justified.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I was glad to hear the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Kentucky state that the proposed mustering-out pay would not be payment for services rendered, but would be a mustering-out payment. As a member of the committee, I wish to say that the mustering-out payment would in no way supersede or take the place of payments under laws already passed, such as the one providing for the payment of $500 a year, as I remember it, to aviators.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course not.

Mr. GURNEY. Nor would the mustering-out pay take the place of the payment, provided for in a law already enacted, of additional compensation for men in the submarine service of the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. GURNEY. I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky if that is his belief and judgment regarding the bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, yes. The provision for payment under the bill would in no way supersede any of the provisions we have formerly enacted for extra compensation or pay, or whatever it may be called, under previous laws of Congress. The proposed payment would be wholly independent of any payment made under any previously enacted law dealing with the question of compensation, either for injury or for service.

Mr. GURNEY. That is in accordance with my understanding of what the committee intended.

I should like to suggest to the Senator from Kentucky that on page 4, in line 11 of the bill, I do not believe the wording is in accordance with his desire or in accordance with the understanding of the committee. It was our intention not to make the mustering-out payments available to those serving inside the continental United States, providing they might ask on their own initiative for a discharge from the service; but certainly it was not the committee's intention to have the payment withheld from a man who had seen service in Alaska or in the Aleutian Islands—Kiska, Attu, or some of the other of those dreadful places. I am informed by the legislative counsel that, through inadvertence, the words "or in Alaska" got in the bill, that they got there by error. I would suggest to the Senator from Kentucky that the three words at the end of line 11, page 4, be deleted from the bill before it is passed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I would defer to the Senator from Colorado on that point first.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, those words were put in by mistake and should come out.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, Mr. President; it seems to me that they should come out, and it is entirely agreeable that those words be eliminated.

Mr. GURNEY. If this is the time and place to make the motion, I now move that the words "or in Alaska" be deleted from the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I accept that suggestion.

Mr. GURNEY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCKELLAR in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky a question. Inasmuch as he mentioned the matter of returning veterans securing jobs, let me inquire whether the civil-service laws of the country today give veterans a preference.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, undoubtedly; veterans are given preference in grade over anyone else.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, the veterans of the last war received certain preference.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. And, as I understand the matter, the veterans returning from the present war will receive certain preference.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; as I understand the law, it is a continuing one applying to veterans.

Mr. MAYBANK. My reason for asking the question is that I should like to see the veterans receive even greater preference. I now have before the Civil Service Committee a bill making such provision.

Mr. BARKLEY. We can deal with that matter in dealing with the civil-service laws. We cannot very well deal with it in connection with the consideration of the pending bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is quite true. I merely desire to say that I believe the returning veterans deserve every possible preference, in order to enable them to adjust themselves.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. In reference to the very timely suggestion made by the Senator from South Carolina, I may say that not only will the veterans enjoy the preferences provided for under the Civil Service Act; but, as the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Kentucky undoubtedly now recall, into the Civil Service Act we wrote, insofar as we could do so, provision to assure that a returning veteran would get back the job he had before he entered the service, thus endeavoring to assure him employment in his former occupation.

I rose to ask the Senator from Kentucky a question. The Senator knows, of course, that under section 5 of the bill it is provided that the mustering-out payments shall not be subject to deduction in the settlement of debts or other obligations. Not only is it provided that they shall not be subject to deductions in the settlement of debts or other obligations which might be due to the United States or to some instrumentality thereof, but also that they shall not be subject to deduction in the settlement of the claims of creditors. The Senate Committee on Military Affairs, of course, could not propose as an amendment to the bill a provision that the payments should not be subject to deduction in the settlement of taxes. I would say that I understand the Senator from Kentucky plans to have such a provision embodied in the tax bill. Is that correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yesterday the Finance Committee voted in favor of an amendment, which I offered, exempting these payments from taxation. Of course, we all appreciate the fact that in a bill which is not a tax bill we cannot provide for a tax exemption; because at the other end of the Capitol there is the feeling that all tax bills should originate there. But yesterday the Senate Finance Committee unanimously agreed to that amendment; and when the tax bill comes before the Senate, it will carry an amendment exempting these payments from taxation.

Mr. HILL. Just as section 5 of the bill exempts the payments from other liability?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; just as section 5 exempts the payments from liability in connection with any other payments with which the Committee on Military Affairs has any authority to deal.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. It is necessary for me to leave the Chamber. Before I do so, and because I may not see the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky tomorrow, when I understand the Senate will adjourn.

Mr. BARKLEY. No, Mr. President; it is not contemplated the Senate will adjourn tomorrow, but early next week.

Mr. LANGER. In case I do not see the Senator again, before the adjournment is taken, I desire to thank him for the many, many courtesies he has shown me this year, and to wish him a very merry Christmas and a happy New Year. I understand that a short time ago he was not well; and he was absent from the Chamber for some time. I hope that when the Senate meets again he will return, as a result of a vacation, feeling in his usual good health.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from North Dakota, and I wish for him, also, a very happy Christmas holiday.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Kentucky for yielding to me for a few moments on the subject which we are discussing.

I have no objection—in fact, I am in favor of the central idea of the pending bill, to provide mustering-out payments. However, I wish to say that I am increasingly appalled by the indifference with which we approach legislation on matters having to do with our war veterans.

Today I had as my guests in the Senate dining room Captain Bong, a young man 23 years of age, and a young man by the name of Hendricks, who had been with the Commandos in Africa.

It is all very well to talk about providing mustering-out payments; but we are missing the boat. We do not realize that what these boys want is, first, the assurance of a job. How are we to assure them of a job? Are we to give them the wherewithal to go out and have the time of their lives, and then be worthless for a job? The President has suggested that we make mustering-out payments. It has been suggested that 500,000 of these boys have come out of the service. Many of them have not the physical scars that the young sergeant with whom I had lunch this noon has, but many of them have mental scars. They have gone into the hell of war.

I heard the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] say that consideration had been given to these matters. I trust that he is listening to me now. I have a bill pending which has the approval of the Veterans' Administration, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Legion. That is the kind of bill which should be brought before the Senate for consideration without further delay, because the very heart of it is that it would be administered by the Veterans' Administration.

We took those boys off the farms, from the villages, and off the streets. A third of them never had a job. They were only kids, 16, 17, 18, and 19 years of age. They have been in the service for 1 or 2 years, and have gone through the hell of war. We took them from peaceful occupations and put them into hell. Then all at once they are returned to this country, after their souls have been singed and their mentalities burned—and we talk about mustering-out pay.

It will be fine for those who have jobs, if they are in condition to return to their jobs. But, Mr. President, I have talked to youngsters on the streets of the Middle West, the streets of New York City, and the streets of Washington, who are wandering around in a daze, as you and I would be doing if we had come out of a hell such as war. Then we say, "Give them two or three or four hundred dollars to have the time of their lives and burn themselves out again, in their own country."

I am speaking for the United States of America, and not alone for those 10,000,000 boys. I am speaking for 135,000,000 of us who want to do our full job to see that those boys, when they come back, are given the kind of a square deal which will make them men, qualified to take over the affairs of the country.

We talk about giving them mustering-out pay, despite the fact that again and again we have been told that the problem is becoming more serious day by day as the men are discharged by the thousands. We continue to wrangle on the floor of the Senate. We have before us today a bill providing mustering-out pay. Meanwhile, tens of thousands of our young men who have given up their civilian rights and privileges to serve their country under arms are wandering the streets. We think we are solving the problem by giving them a little more money so that they may wander the streets a little while longer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WILEY. I shall be through in a moment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is the Senator from Wisconsin still addressing his remarks to me? A moment ago he said that he wished to call my attention to his speech.

Mr. WILEY. I am addressing my remarks to the Senator; but I have the floor, and I exact my right——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin does not happen to have the floor. I have the floor.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILEY. Have I the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor.

Mr. WILEY. Did not the Senator from Kentucky yield the floor to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not yield the floor. I yielded to the Senator for what I supposed was a question.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Kentucky did not so limit it. I make the point of order——

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator takes the technical view that I have yielded the floor by yielding to him because of the courtesy I extended toward him, I will retain the floor and not yield further. I am willing to have the Senator finish his speech.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. This is the first time that I have ever heard of a Senator losing the floor by yielding to another Senator.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I shall not argue the point of order. The Chair has stated that the point of order was not well taken. I am willing to abide by the decision of the Chair. I asked the Senator to yield to me. He yielded to me for a few remarks. I ask him if I may continue?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator asked me to yield to him. He did not say for what purpose.

Mr. WILEY. No; and the Senator did not limit the purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator will not continue to occupy the floor until we miss the boat which is now in the harbor.

Mr. WILEY. I did not expect the Senator to explode and blow up the boat.

Mr. BARKLEY. No. I leave that to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I thought perhaps the kind words of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to the Senator from Kentucky had helped him to get over the recent election results in Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not yield to the Senator further if he proposes to deal in all sorts of silly remarks such as that. I thought the Senator had something in good faith to contribute.

Mr. WILEY. I thought I was making a contribution in good faith.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am willing to yield to the Senator if he will resume the contribution and not talk about some previous election when he has his mind on the next one.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, have I the floor?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I have the floor. I am yielding to the Senator.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator is most gracious. I wish to pay my respects to the distinguished majority leader in this Christmas season. He is very kind and generous.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to continue for just a moment.

Thousands of our boys are walking the streets of our cities, and it is proposed that we give them two or three or four hundred dollars mustering-out pay. I am in favor of that, but I again say to the Senate that we are missing the boat. The boat is not in the harbor, as the distinguished majority leader has said. The boat will soon be bringing back to this country millions of our boys, injured and wounded, and needing the right kind of direction and guidance from America, which will be found in the Veterans' Administration.

The Veterans' Administration, within the Federal Government, can best do the job of rehabilitating our returning servicemen. Prior to this time it has done a fine job, but it does not now have the authority to obtain a questionnaire from each soldier as he returns to these shores, to find out, first, whether or not he has a job; second, whether or not he wishes to return to his job; third, what his desire is in the matter; and fourth, whether he is capable of being left alone to wander the streets of America with two or three or four hundred dollars in his pocket. That is the decision which must be made. After the last war we turned loose a group of which cost this country billions of dollars.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I have not the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope that the Senator will allow the Senator from Wisconsin to conclude.

Mr. McFARLAND. I merely wished to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should also like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. WILEY. I shall be very happy to yield in a moment.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator does not have the power to yield. I still retain that power, and will exercise it in the spirit of Christmas, under the leadership of the amiable Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator is most kind.

After this war, unless we immediately take steps to give the Veterans' Administration authority to deal with the situation, there will be a real tragedy, perhaps double, treble, or quadruple what we had after the last World War. Consider our last post-war period. It was 12 years before anything was done in certain directions. That is a long trail, and I may add that it is one upon which this Congress has already started. The Veterans' Administration has available the records of each man's service. It has available the man's health record during his service, and at the time of his induction. If he is suffering any disability, his condition from week to week is known, as medical check-ups are made. No organization can more efficiently administer the affairs of veterans, whether it be in hospitalization, reemployment, or any other phase of reestablishing our boys and girls in civilian life. That is the crux of the whole problem—to see that the boys and girls who come out of the service are reestablished in civilian life.

This organization, the Veterans' Administration, given adequate power, with a Nation-wide set-up, will save us much grief in the days prior to and subsequent to the armistice. It will ferret out the problems, and find a solution to them. Upon its recommendation we can act to give it greater powers, if necessary.

Mr. President, three times I have spoken on this subject, and I shall continue to speak on it on the floor of the Senate until I can obtain action specifically on the matter of rehabilitation of the soldier and the sailor. I have pointed out that veterans' relief is not a problem for you and me, but that it is a problem for the whole Nation. We have an organization—the Veterans' Administration—already established by law to take up the problems as they should be taken up; namely, individually. Why do we not give that agency authority to proceed? Why do we not allow it, an experienced, legally authorized body, to take the problem in hand and tell us what additional legislation is needed to empower it to the fullest extent to deal adequately with the problem?

Let us make up our minds immediately what mustering-out pay is to be given our servicemen, and go ahead and give it to them. We who are returning to our homes for Christmas have money in our pockets and presents for our families and friends. I wonder how many thousands of veterans are worrying about where they will eat and find shelter on Christmas Day. They are worried about it; but are we? Will this bill be passed in time to meet the emergency? I hope so, but, Mr. President, after it is passed we should see to it that the ex-servicemen are given the opportunity which they will all require, and to which they are entitled; namely, that of securing a job.

I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, by implication the Senator criticizes the Congress and the committees which have been considering veterans' legislation because this is the only bill thus far reported. The Senator knows that in several messages to Congress the President has urged legislation for physical and mental rehabilitation, for vocational training, and for the broadening of the social security laws to benefit the ex-servicemen and women. Bills are pending before the Committee on Education and Labor dealing with the question of vocational rehabilitation, before the Committee on Military Affairs dealing with other phases of the subject, and before the Committee on Finance dealing with the broadening of the social security law, which came from that committee.

The Senator seems to be complaining because the Military Affairs Committee has reported this bill, and because this is a particular boat in the harbor which I spoke of a few minutes ago. There may be other boats which will come into the harbor, and if so we shall try to catch them when they dock. But this is the only one now before us. We hope that we will not allow it to pass out of the harbor before we board it.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. I think the Senator misspoke himself. Last year Congress passed a bill providing for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, and the bill now pending in the Committee on Education and Labor would give discharged veterans a chance to continue their high school and college education.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I appreciate the Senator's correction. Last year we did pass a vocational rehabilitation bill for ex-servicemen. We caught that boat and sailed off on it a year ago. Now we are about to catch another, and I hope without unnecessary delay. I hope that from time to time other craft will come into port so that we can board them as the needs of the veterans arise.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to inquire about the men who are more than 38 years of age. Are they to be included, or do they come under the language in lines 12 and 13 on page 4 reading, "or relieved from active service solely on their own initiative for occupational reasons."

Mr. BARKLEY. All men more than 38 years old who were discharged because of their age—and there were thousands of them—will be entitled to this pay.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator know how many of them there are?

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot give the Senator the figures. I cannot give the Senator the number of those who were discharged by reason of the policy of the War Department of discharging men between 38 and 45 years of age.

Mr. GURNEY. Will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I call the attention of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to the words in line 13 on page 4 reading, "who are discharged * * * on their own initiative."

Mr. FERGUSON. Does that include men over 38 years of age?

Mr. GURNEY. That specifically provides that men who are discharged on the initiative of the Army or Navy will be permitted to receive the payments.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is correct about that.

Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment on page 5, at the end of line 11, to add the following proviso:

Provided, That persons receiving pay under subsection (e) of this section shall receive one-half thereof on the date of discharge, and shall receive the balance at the end of 1 month therefrom.

That would mean that those receiving $200 would receive half of it when they were mustered out, and the other half within a month.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I was going to suggest that there are two classes involved in the $200 payment.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not think so.

Mr. AUSTIN. There are those who have heretofore been discharged or relieved from duty, and those who hereafter may be discharged or relieved from duty. There is a distinction in those two classes with respect to the time of payment. In the one case $100, or one-half of the $200, would be paid forthwith on discharge. That would be the case in respect to future discharges. In the other case, those who have heretofore been discharged, the payment would be due 1 month after the requisition for it had been made to the proper department by the person entitled thereto.

Mr. BARKLEY. That provision is to be found on another page in the bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; but this language must recognize the two classes with respect to the time when payment is due.

Mr. BARKLEY. I might change the amendment to read in this way:

All persons receiving $200 as mustering-out pay under this act shall receive one-half thereof at the time of discharge, and the other half within 1 month therefrom.

Would that cover it?

Mr. AUSTIN. That would not cover it. The language must be adapted to the difference between the soldier who was mustered out heretofore and the soldier who will be mustered out hereafter.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the language I have just suggested, any soldier who has been mustered out heretofore and is entitled to receive $200, would receive half of it at the time of his discharge,

and the other half within a month thereafter.

Mr. AUSTIN. Suppose a man were discharged a year ago after having served only a short period of time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I catch the Senator's point. It is provided in the bill that those who have been heretofore discharged must ask for the money.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Thirty days after the Government has received the request therefor, the man is entitled to the money. That must be the situation; otherwise the bill would be unworkable.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would still be necessary to amend the paragraph on page 5 applicable to subsection (e). We can adopt language to take care of that situation. I would ask that the amendment be adopted to subsection (e).

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I merely want to clarify one point. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] rose a moment ago and in an angry tone commenced shouting about this bill. I thought he was in opposition to it. He pointed to the Senator from Colorado and said he hoped the Senator was listening to him. I was listening to him. I was listening to him trying to find out what he was talking about and what his position on the pending measure was. So I was listening very intently to him. As I understood from his remarks, he was concerned about a bill which he has offered, Senate bill 1566 by number, which has been referred to the Finance Committee and upon which there is no report at the present time. The measure he referred to is not before the Military Affairs Committee and not before the subcommittee of which I am a member and chairman. The number of the bill (S. 1566) would indicate in itself that his measure was introduced some time after the pending bill, Senate bill 1543, was introduced, and, since his bill is before the Finance Committee, I call his attention to the fact that the Finance Committee has been working for the last 30 days on the new tax bill; it has been working long hours and constantly on that measure, and will be for another week, and if there has been any delay in the consideration of his bill it undoubtedly is caused by the very heavy amount of work which has been imposed on the Finance Committee.

I want to assure the Senator from Wisconsin, however, that I am very much interested, perhaps almost as much interested in this measure as he himself is. I am anxious to work out the problems which face the returning veterans, and I assure the Senator that I am going to do everything I can in the Finance Committee and elsewhere to expedite the consideration of the measure which he has introduced, and which I wish to thank him for introducing.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not have the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to add to what the Senator from Colorado said that Senate bill 1495 is also pending before the Finance Committee, and that bill takes in all these matters, including education. It would also permit the purchase of a farm or a business. I suggest that the able Senator from Wisconsin read it, and I hope we will have his support for that bill.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. WILEY. For a comment?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator can ask me about his comment, and make it a question.

Mr. WILEY. I am afraid the Senator did not listen to the colloquy which has just taken place.

I merely wanted to state that I am very happy to hear that the distinguished Senator from Colorado has given consideration or will give consideration to the idea embodied in my bill, Senate bill 1566.

I am sorry if he got the impression that when I rose I was angry. I rather think it must be that some of us have been working so hard and diligently that——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. When I hear a man shouting and pointing his finger and acting as though he were going to crack down on somebody I naturally think he is angry. I am sorry if I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. WILEY. I am sure I could not be angry with the distinguished Senator from Colorado, but I want to repeat that recently some Senators have been working so late that apparently their nerves are a little off edge. I saw the Senator was engrossed in other matters, and I wanted to have his attention. I believe I did reach over and point my finger at him, but I did not mean in anywise to upset his mental equilibrium or give him the impression that I could be angry with him. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think I can clear the atmosphere by observing that the Senator from Wisconsin was pointing at the Senator from Colorado but was shouting at me. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILEY. Perhaps the Senator from Kentucky had it coming to him.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, through collaboration with the Senator from Vermont, and I think with the approval of the Senator from New Hampshire, I now offer an amendment which I think will meet the situation. At the end of line 11, page 5, add this language:

Provided, That benefits under subsection (e) of this section shall be payable in two instead of three equal installments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 5, line 11, after the word "payment", it is proposed to strike out the period and insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That benefits under subsection (e) of this section shall be payable in two instead of three equal installments."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to, and without objection, the amendment as amended is agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I desire to say that I shall support the amendment wholeheartedly and support the bill to provide mustering-out payments to members of the armed forces, but, since in a few days the Senate will recess for the holiday season and Senators will return home to discuss many important public problems with their constituents, I should like to remind them that probably the most outstanding issue of the times is the question of world peace—a peace which men have always sought but never attained. I know that the mothers and fathers and the wives and sisters of American men who are now fighting the battles of the world are hopeful that this time mankind will find the answer to the eternal quest for peace.

I sincerely trust that the philosophy and spirit of Him whose birth and life we commemorate at this season will abide with us and lead us into the paths of human righteousness and world peace. For with His help we can truly establish a world community which can be described in these words:

Nation with nation and land with land,
Unite to make men free;
And every peaceful heart and mind
Proclaims our liberty.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I think the Senate was entirely justified in its action in accepting the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kentucky and the committee amendment as amended by that amendment.

Before the bill passes I desire to say in behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] who, unfortunately, is necessarily absent, that he took into consideration in preparing this proposal of amendment, which was offered in the form of a bill, facts which are of record here, such as appear on page 19 of the hearings. I have no intention of reading what appears there, but only of calling attention to this striking condition, which calls for prompt action of the kind the Senate is apparently about to take.

Here are listed typical cases of discharged soldiers or soldiers who have been retired from active service and who are entitled to benefits under existing law, to be awarded by the Veterans' Administration. I shall summarize the cases in order to make perfectly clear that there is a hiatus between the discharge and the time of payments or benefits under the existing law when a soldier is discharged for injury, and in all instances the soldier is left to rely upon such resources as he may otherwise have or upon the resources of someone else who may be regarded as doing a charity to him. His position, therefore, is a humiliating one.

In case No. 1 the discharge occurred in April 1943, and the procedure for getting the soldier the benefits has not yet been finished, and he has not yet received a cent.

In case No. 2 the discharge was in April, and the soldier has not yet been

examined, and therefore has not received any benefits.

In the third case there was a hiatus from July to November, during which time the discharged soldier had to be dependent upon friends or somebody else to take care of him.

In the next case the hiatus between discharge and benefits was from July to October.

In the next case it was from August to November.

In the next case the discharge occurred in February and there have been no benefits yet.

In the next case the discharge was in July and there have been no benefits yet.

In the next case the hiatus was from July to October.

In the next case the hiatus was from June to the present time, during which time the soldier has not received any benefits.

In the next case the hiatus was from June to the present time, during which time nothing has been paid.

The next is a striking case. The discharge was in December 1942, and the poor soldier has not yet had his case decided, and has not as yet received any payments.

In the next case, which is the twelfth, the veteran was discharged in June 1943, and has not yet been paid anything.

In the next two cases the discharges were both in March, and no payment has as yet been received by either veteran.

In case No. 15, a recent survey of State hospitals for the insane in northern California alone showed 100 discharged veterans of World War No. 2 being confined there because of lack of beds in Veterans' Administration facilities.

Mr. President, this statement does not comprehend the whole field; it is a mere sample of cases which characterize the conditions of a very large number of veterans of this world war.

The evidence before us tended to show that since Pearl Harbor more than 1,000,000 such men have been relieved from service. Others have been discharged for one reason or another, and the present rate of discharge, as nearly as we can estimate it, is 70,000 a month. I notice that the distinguished leader referred to 75,000. Perhaps his view of that matter is more sound than ours.

Mr. BARKLEY. The number I gave was the number estimated by the Army officers who appeared before the Committee on Military Affairs on the fathers' draft bill, as of the end of this year, when they expected to have an army of 7,700,000. Of course, they stated that the number of discharges thereafter would increase as we became more active in actual battle.

Mr. AUSTIN. I understand the difference now. It is because those figures were figures covering replacements, and they necessarily included the replacements of men who died in battle. Therefore, it is quite likely that those replacements, which are of men discharged or relieved from active service, would number about 70,000 a month.

In any event, the problem is a serious one; it is a pressing one. There is every reason to justify the distinguished Senator from Kentucky in having brought his bill forward 3 days after the President had sent his message to the Senate upon the subject.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Is the term "mustering out" equivalent to "discharge"?

Mr. AUSTIN. No.

Mr. WILEY. What is the difference?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mustering out can occur without a discharge.

Mr. WILEY. I think that should be made clear.

Mr. AUSTIN. We discussed that matter, and adapted the language to the possibility of a man leaving the service under honorable conditions which did not amount to an honorable discharge. There are various ways in which that can come about, and it was because of that possibility that we changed the language from the double negative. In the original bill the words "who shall have been discharged or relieved from active duty under other than dishonorable conditions." We changed that to the affirmative allegation, "who shall have been discharged or relieved from active duty under honorable conditions on or after December 7." That could include men who have been relieved from active duty but who do not have an honorable discharge. There was a debate in the committee as to whether we should include among the conditions upon which eligibility for these benefits depended the presentation of an honorable discharge, limiting the benefits to those only who could present honorable discharges. We found, on investigation, that that would result in great injustice to a class of men who have left the service for the benefit of the service, and yet who have not been entitled to honorable discharges.

We start off with this broad field of men who have been discharged or relieved under honorable conditions, and then we narrow that in some particulars. One is that such payments shall not be made to members of the armed forces who have had no service outside the continental limits of the United States, and who are discharged or relieved from active service solely on their own initiative for occupational reasons. That reflects the philosophy of the bill. If a man who has never left this continent steps out of the armed forces at his own request, to enter upon an occupation which without doubt will compensate him more than his pay as a soldier, then he does not need the benefits. In other words, the theory of the bill, as the committee conceived it, is that it is founded upon need, and should provide a mustering-out payment founded upon need, not intended in any way as a substitute for any other compensation. While I use the term "other compensation," it really is not compensation, and it is not intended to be such.

One point which I wish to make clear now is that there can be only one benefit to one person, under the proposal. There are conditions under which men are mustered out, yet they reenlist, and although the committee would have been glad to introduce into the bill the element of encouragement for reenlistment, the members of the committee thought it wise not to confuse the basis for this payment by having any other consideration for the payments than need.

Mr. BURTON. Simply to clarify that point, will the Senator assume the case of a man who has served for 12 months outside the continental limits of the United States, and also has served 12 months inside the continental limits of the United States, one period following the other, and is then discharged. What would he receive?

Mr. AUSTIN. He would receive the maximum rate according to his service. We can ignore his service on the continent in ascertaining the rate at which he receives benefits in the class in which he falls.

Mr. BURTON. His service in the United States does not place him in the $200 class; and then he receives an additional mustering-out pay for serving outside the United States?

Mr. AUSTIN. That cannot be done. The bill forbids it. The proposal says:

> That no person entitled to benefit under this act shall receive mustering-out payment more than once, and such payment shall accrue and the amount thereof shall be computed as of the time of discharge—

That is, discharge—

> for the purpose of effecting a permanent separation from the service or of ultimate relief from active service.

Mr. BURTON. That clause happens to appear in the paragraph which deals particularly with those who have already received their discharges. I desire to have this made clear. If a man is sent out of the country, serves overseas, and then receives his mustering-out pay on the basis of overseas service, it is not necessary to consider his prior service in the United States?

Mr. AUSTIN. It is not necessary to consider it. He can receive but one payment, and, of course, that would be based on the category which would pay him the most money.

Mr. President, I think there is nothing further I particularly care to call attention to. I regret that we have had to proceed in the absence of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], but I feel perfectly sure that he would have wished us to do as we have done if we could have conferred with him in respect to the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and read the third time.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, as I read the bill I would be eligible for a benefit under its terms, and for that reason I feel that propriety dictates that I be excused from voting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator is excused.

The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 1543) was passed, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That each member of the armed forces of the United States, who shall have been engaged in active service in the present war, discharged or relieved from active service under honorable conditions, on

or after December 7, 1941, shall be eligible to receive mustering-out payment: *Provided*, That mustering-out payment shall not be made to any person who, at the time of discharge or relief from active service, holds a commission, either permanent, temporary, or in any reserve capacity, of any rank above that of colonel in the Army, or of any equivalent rank in any of the other branches of the armed service of the United States: *Provided further*, That such payment shall not be made to members of the armed forces who, at the time of discharge or relief from active service, are transferred or returned to the retired list with retirement pay or to a status in which they receive retirement pay: *Provided further*, That such payment shall not be made to members of the armed forces who have had no service outside of the continental limits of the United States and who are discharged or relieved from active service solely on their own initiative for occupational reasons.

SEC. 2. Mustering-out payment for persons eligible under section 1 shall be in sums as follows:

(a) $500 for persons who have served outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska for 18 months or more after December 6, 1941.

(b) $400 for persons who have served outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska for 12 to 18 months after December 6, 1941.

(c) $300 for persons who have served outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska for less than 12 months after December 6, 1941.

(d) $300 for persons who have served within the continental limits of the United States (excluding Alaska) for 12 months or more after December 6, 1941.

(e) $200 for persons who have served within the continental limits of the United States (excluding Alaska) for less than 12 months after December 6, 1941.

Each individual eligible to receive mustering-out payment shall receive one-third of the stipulated amount at the time of discharge or relief from active duty. The remaining amount of mustering-out payment shall be made in two equal installments—1 month and 2 months, respectively, from the date of the original payment: *Provided*, That benefits under subsection (e) of this section shall be payable in two instead of three installments.

SEC. 3. Any member of the armed forces entitled to mustering-out payment but who shall have been discharged or relieved from active service under honorable conditions before the effective date of this act shall receive the benefits thereof, beginning within 1 month after application has been made by such person and received by the appropriate department: *Provided*, That no person entitled to benefit under this act shall receive mustering-out payment more than once, and such payment shall accrue and the amount thereof shall be computed as of the time of discharge for the purpose of effecting a permanent separation from the service or of ultimate relief from active service.

SEC. 4. If any member of the armed forces, after his discharge or relief from active service, shall die before receiving any portion of or the full amount of his mustering-out payment, the balance of the amount due him shall be payable, on appropriate application therefor, to his surviving spouse, if any; and if he shall leave no surviving spouse, then in equal shares to his child or children, if any; and if he shall leave no surviving spouse or child or children, then in equal shares to his surviving parents, if any: *Provided*, That no payments under this act shall be made to any other person.

SEC. 5. No part of the mustering-out payment authorized by this act shall be subject to deduction in settlement of debts due the United States or instrumentalities thereof, nor shall such payment be assignable or subject to the claims of creditors of any person to whom or on behalf of whom it is paid; and shall not be liable to attachment, levy, or seizure by or under any legal or equitable process whatever.

SEC. 6. As used in this act—

(a) The term "member of the armed forces of the United States" means any member of the Army or Navy of the United States, the United States Marine Corps, the United States Coast Guard, or any of their respective components.

(b) The term "spouse" means a lawful wife or husband.

(c) The term "child" includes (1) a legitimate child; (2) a child legally adopted; and (3) a stepchild, if, at the time of death of the member of the armed forces, such stepchild was a member of the deceased's household.

(d) The term "parent" includes father and mother, stepfather and stepmother, and father and mother through adoption.

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall administer this act within their respective services.

SEC. 8. This act may be cited as "Mustering-out Payment Act of 1943."

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for mustering-out payments to members of the armed forces, and for other purposes."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say to Senators that because of the situation with respect to the deficiency appropriation bill it is necessary for the Senate to hold a session tomorrow; otherwise, I should have moved that the Senate go over until Monday. It is necessary, however, to meet tomorrow, and I hope Senators will arrange their plans accordingly.

SWITZERLAND'S HELP AS A NEUTRAL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a few days ago the ship *Gripsholm* arrived in New York City, bringing to our shores approximately 1,500 Americans who had come from Japanese prison camps. The return of these Americans was made possible by the exchange of Japanese prisoners for them, through the good offices of the Government of Switzerland and the International Red Cross Committee of Geneva.

As we know, matters, many of which involve the welfare and at times even the lives of citizens of nations at war, cannot be handled through negotiations between the warring nations. It is only through the good offices of neutral nations that such matters can be handled.

We have long known that the United States had a good friend in the Government and people of Switzerland, but the rescue of our fellow Americans from the Japanese prison camps challenged my attention and prompted me to make inquiries as to the services of the Government of Switzerland and the International Red Cross Committee of Geneva. I find an impressive list of these services, and I wish to pay my tribute to the Government of Switzerland and the International Red Cross Committee of Geneva. I wish to pay my special tribute to the Minister from Switzerland, the Honorable Charles Bruggmann, for his splendid leadership and his fine and devoted work in the rendering of these services. I ask, Mr. President, that a list of these services may follow my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The chief humanitarian activities of Switzerland performed in its capacity as a neutral by its diplomatic representatives and through the intermediary of the International Red Cross Committee of Geneva are briefly summarized below.

The International Red Cross Committee of Geneva has been founded in Switzerland and is composed entirely of Swiss members. Two-thirds of the funds necessary for the work of the International Red Cross are furnished by the Swiss government and the Swiss people. The offices of the International Red Cross Committee cover a space of 1,650,000 square feet. Of the 3,500 employees in Geneva, two-thirds are voluntary workers without salary.

The Swiss diplomatic service represents the interests of 27 belligerent nations. It may also be stated that Switzerland represents the United States in all and Great Britain in most countries with which they are at war.

1. Switzerland handles the lists of prisoners of war and civilian internees in order to identify each individual. In numerous cases Switzerland handles the exchange of civilian internees and of the wounded or sick prisoners of war.

Fifteen million cards are filed at the International Red Cross Committee in Geneva. Each card bears the names and the particulars of a prisoner of war or a civilian internee.

Seven thousand to 15,000 letters and telegrams concerning prisoners of war and civilian internees are handled every day by the International Red Cross Committee at Geneva.

2. Switzerland transmits news, messages, and inquiries about all the prisoners of war and civilian internees the world over.

More than 10,000,000 messages to prisoners of war have been sent by their families through the intermediary of the International Red Cross Committee of Geneva.

Since the start of the war, 55,000,000 pieces of mail have been received or sent through the International Red Cross at Geneva.

3. Switzerland transmits food parcels to prisoners of war at an average of 450,000 parcels per month. Due to recent increase in shipments the average must approach approximately 700,000 to 800,000 parcels monthly. The parcels are shipped on Swiss boats under the supervision of Swiss delegates in belligerent countries. On a recent trip from Philadelphia to France the Swiss boat S. S. *Lugano* carried 1,000,000 food parcels for American and Allied prisoners of war. Another Swiss boat due to leave in December will also carry over 1,250,000 food parcels for the prisoners of war in Europe.

4. Through its diplomatic representatives and 97 International Red Cross representatives in 47 countries, Switzerland visits camps of prisoners of war and civilian internees and sends detailed reports to the belligerents. Through these activities Switzerland is checking in every camp, where she represents foreign interests, whether prisoners of war are treated in conformity with the Convention of Geneva of 1929.

5. As a neutral country surrounded by nations at war, Switzerland has received thousands of refugees, and sends to the populations of France, Holland, Greece, Belgium, and other countries food and medical supplies.

During recent events more than 30,000 Italian soldiers and more than 5,000 Italian Jews passed the Swiss border and took refuge in Switzerland. The thousands of refugees in Switzerland, a country which is slightly over 4,000,000 inhabitants, present a serious problem.

6. Switzerland extends relief to civilians who are not interned but reside in enemy territories. This in the case of thousands of American and British nationals who reside in Shanghai, Hongkong, Manila, etc.

It should be remembered that all the humanitarian activities of Switzerland, including the work of the International Red Cross Committee, are made possible only by the traditionally recognized neutrality of the Government of Switzerland.

POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS CONFIRMED

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there are only two nominations on the Executive Calendar, the nominations of two postmasters in the State of Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the nominations be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified forthwith.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed, en bloc, and the President will be immediately notified.

AUTHORIZATIONS TO SIGN BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess of the Senate the Vice President be authorized to sign bills and resolutions ready for his signature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND—NOMINATION CONFIRMED

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, earlier in the day the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] reported from the Finance Committee the nomination of George Hofferbert, of Baltimore, Md., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Maryland, in place of M. Hampton Magruder, resigned. The report from the Finance Committee was unanimous. In view of the importance of the nomination, I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration, as in executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that I believe the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] spoke to me about the nomination, and seemed to feel there was very great public need for its immediate consideration. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, December 18, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 17 (legislative day of December 15), 1943:

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

George Hofferbert to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Maryland.

POSTMASTERS

LOUISIANA

Martha C. Wimberly, Castor.
Muse W. Keller, Palmetto.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Robert O. McClure, D. D., president, Ohio Northern University, Ada, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou who art the hope of all the ends of the earth, and who in former times didst lead our fathers, guide us, we pray Thee, by Thine infinite wisdom. We beseech Thee to bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure religion. Defend our liberties and preserve our unity. Save us as a nation from fear and confusion, from pride and arrogance, and from every evil way.

Bless, we pray Thee, those in authority over us. Imbue them with the spirit of wisdom, goodness, and truth; so rule their hearts that law and order, justice and peace, may everywhere prevail. Grant us peace, Thy most precious gift, and not to us only, but to all the nations and peoples of the earth. In the midst of our suffering we turn to Thee. We seek the light that shineth into the darkness and pray that the light that appeared over Bethlehem in yonder day may shine into all our hearts this day. In His blessed name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1203) entitled "An act to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States."

VACANCY ON SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation, which was read by the Clerk:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 17, 1943.*

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities, the same to take effect immediately.

Respectfully submitted.

M. M. MASON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 65, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities, to fill the existing vacancy thereon, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a resolution recently adopted by the Rotary Club of Union City, Tenn., and an article attached thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 385

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 385) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 1, 1944, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation at the rate of $2,000 per annum each, payable monthly, for the employment of six expert transcribers who shall be appointed by and be under the direction and control of the committee stenographers in reporting and transcribing committee hearings.

SEC. 2. That effective January 1, 1944, there shall also be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation at the rate of $1,260 per annum each, payable monthly, for the employment of three additional laborers to be appointed by the Doorkeeper of the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was given permission to extend my remarks and to insert an address by Admiral Vickery, of the merchant marine. The address went over the required amount. I have an estimate from the Printing Office of $112.50, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed, notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include an address by Wesley R. Nelson, of New Mexico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include therein certain editorials of Massachusetts papers alluding to the benefits of lend-lease.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD,

and to include therein a letter from one of my young friends in north Africa?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, at his request I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] may extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] be excused on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a letter from Leonard W. Esper, department commander of the American Legion, Department of Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include a speech by my colleague the gentleman from New Hampshire, Hon. FOSTER STEARNS, before the Veterans of Foreign Wars of New Hampshire, on June 15, 1940.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix on two subjects and to include an article in connection with each subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial by A. H. Stone, of Mississippi, on post-war plans and planning. The Public Printer advises that the cost is $112.50 or $22.50 in excess of the usually allowed 4,000 words. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the cost the article be included in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and place in the RECORD a statement by Hon. Sumner Welles, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the development of hydroelectric power in South America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FARM LABOR

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of business on the Speaker's table today, it be in order to consider House Joint Resolution 208, the farm labor bill, under the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FISH. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. SABATH. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the purpose of the request is that you want to waive a rule and bring it up by unanimous consent?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is important that the bill be considered before the holidays, as all appropriations expire with the calendar year on December 31. I took up the matter yesterday with my good friend the chairman of the Committee on Rules and must have misunderstood him as I had the impression he told me the representatives of the Committee on Appropriations could appear before the Committee on Rules at 11:30 this morning. Of course, we could not have taken it up sooner as the bill was not ordered reported and application for a rule authorized until noon yesterday.

I had consulted also with the Speaker and the majority leader, and it was our expectation to call the bill up for consideration this afternoon if a rule was granted for that purpose. However, when we appeared before the Committee on Rules this morning in accordance with our understanding, the Committee on Rules was not in session and the chairman could not be reached. On that account it is necessary to ask unanimous consent for consideration as this is not a general appropriation bill and not privileged for immediate consideration under the rules.

Mr. FISH. As far as I am concerned, I am glad to waive the rule, as an individual.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will object until I know what it is all about.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman withhold that for a minute?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Let the Chair state the request. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] asked unanimous consent to take up House Joint Resolution 208 and consider it under the general rules of the House.

Is there objection?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if I am not mistaken this is the resolution about which the gentleman from Missouri appeared this morning about 11 o'clock before the Rules Committee. Unfortunately, I had an appointment with Judge Marvin Jones, a former Member of this House, who now has something to do with agriculture. While I was in conference with Judge Jones on some matters with reference to agriculture and the high prices that are being charged to the consumer, I was informed that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and several other outstanding members of that committee appeared and urged a rule. Unfortunately, we are not always in session. We like to please the gentleman from Missouri, and the Appropriations Committee, but we naturally must know something about legislation that is proposed to be considered in order to grant a rule. This is an important bill. It calls for about $31,000,000 for the purpose of providing automobiles for transporting laborers and I do not think there is immediate need for this legislation. I feel that due consideration should be given this legislation and I think it might better be held until we get back.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I would like to say to the gentleman from Illinois that it is very important at this time that we do consider this legislation. The means of providing money for the importation of Mexican labor to the State of California at the present time is imperative. We are using 12,000 of those workers. About 6,000 will be brought to the State of California the 1st day of January. Additional thousands of those workers will be needed in the month of January and February. Unless this legislation is passed before the Congress recesses, or before the first of the year, we will have to send back the present labor that is now in the State of California before the 31st day of December 1943. It is imperative that we do have this legislation passed as soon as possible. The people of the State of California are putting their seed in the ground now for 1944. They want to have some assurance that this labor will be available, before placing their seed in the ground to produce these foodstuffs.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, answering the gentleman, I want to say that I am familiar with the labor conditions, and particularly with farm labor in California, and have been for many years. I know that some labor has been imported into California, into the sugar-beet sections, and also into the southern cotton-picking sections. I do not object to bringing in labor to produce food, but I do object to expending $31,000,000 to provide for 37,000 men who are already here. It should not require that amount of money. Further, if a lot of the farm boys would remain on the farms instead of leaving to work in the plants in the cities we would not need to import Mexican, or any other, labor. Even before the war there was always a demand on the part of the cotton growers and sugar-beet growers for Mexican laborers. I am satisfied that the small farmers and growers are not demanding this legislation. It is the great big ranchers, grove and farm owners with extensive holdings running into thousands of acres, who seek this legislation. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how many of the laborers who will be available under the provisions of this bill will be employed by former President Hoover on his thousand-or-more-acre farm in San Joaquin Valley and on the farms of other extensive landowners in California. However, in view of the fact that the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] says that the food supply

depends on this legislation, I am not going to object.

I hope that if we have to pay transportation for farm labor that the farmers will not come in again and demand a still further increase in the price of their products, which are already extremely high.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We saw the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] yesterday maneuver around in a parliamentary procedure which defeated the $2,000,000 item for reclamation purposes. If we had gotten that through, the results which would be accomplished would have made it unnecessary to have all of this foreign labor. Many of the projects have already been begun and are partly finished, but the gentleman knocked them out. While I have the floor for a minute I want to say that I do not like the odor of the way this bill has been brought in here. For instance, right on the top of the report we have in big red letters "For Release When Bill Is Reported." How can 435 Members know anything about what is before them when they do not get the report until the morning of the day that the bill is brought to the floor? This is an unfair practice.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, as I stated, having explained my viewpoint, I will not insist upon my objection if the membership is satisfied that it should be taken up today, in view of the fact that they desire to go home and show the farmers what good has been done and what additional money has been appropriated for their welfare. I have no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I certainly do not want the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] to the effect that the farmers are being overpaid for their products to go into the RECORD unchallenged for the intelligent American people to read with disgust.

Mr. SABATH. If I felt this would only go to the intelligent and fair-minded people, I would not have said it. I know that the farmers have more money today than they know what to do with. They never have been so prosperous as they are now. Even the dairy farmers in the gentleman's district in Mississippi and the people of his State are more prosperous today than ever before. In fact, that is true of every State in the Union. I have not heard a single farmer complain that he has not obtained a greater price for everything he has produced. Consequently I do not like to have the gentleman make a statement that the intelligent people would not understand. I know the intelligent people understand. It is the uninformed who do not know that the farmers are getting more. I know they do not get all the money and that the profiteers are getting a great deal of it. I know the wholesalers and commissionmen are just as guilty as the farmers, but the poor unfortunate consumer is obligated to pay the bills, and unfortunately he does not receive sufficient compensation for his work to make both ends meet.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if that is the opinion that prevails in Chicago, God save the farmers from such influences. The consumer is paying less per dollar for his food and clothing today to the farmers who produce it than ever before in the history of the country. The farmers of this Nation are working harder, struggling more, and furnishing more of their sons to the service in proportion, and getting less for their labor than any other people under the American flag. I am not going to sit here and permit these statements to go into the RECORD unchallenged. When the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] says that the farmers of the South are more prosperous than they have ever been before, he certainly either does not know, or he does not care, about the enormous burdens the farmers of the South and West are now carrying.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard enough. I am going to demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order has been demanded. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will now recognize Members to extend their remarks and to proceed for 1 minute.

THE RETURN OF PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT TO THE WHITE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I know that the people of the country are greatly pleased with the return of our brave President to the United States and to the White House. We are all proud of the great leadership that he has displayed during this war.

We all take great pride in the outstanding courage that he has evidenced as shown by the historic trip that he has just completed, and the historic results that have and will flow from the two conferences that took place at Cairo and Tehran. The conference at Cairo was for the purpose of the United Nations agreeing to smash the Japs. The conference at Tehran was for the purpose of the United Nations agreeing on action to smash Nazi Germany. Those conferences were not only for the purpose of the successful conduct of the war, but after the war is over to try to establish conditions based upon the self-interest of nations and our own self-interest, that will assure permanent peace in the future.

In connection with that I was particularly impressed with an informal remark made by President Roosevelt in an informal but important speech to the Nation's soldiers in Iran, when he said:

> That the purpose of the conference was twofold. The first was to lay military plans for cooperation between the three nations looking toward the winning of the war just as fast as we possibly can, and I think we have made progress toward that end.

He later said:

> The other purpose was to talk over world conditions after the war, to try to plan for a world for us and for our children when war would cease to be a necessity.

And then he said:

> We have made great progress in that also.

To me that is the most significant statement, practical statement—the determination to win the war, and thereafter, in a practical manner, to win the peace.

Without regard to political party, as Americans, we are all proud of our President's trip and its results, of his brilliant and courageous leadership, and we are all glad to see him back in the White House again.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

OUR MEN AND WOMEN IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, as the days of what we have called the holiday season draw near it comes to us all that the word rings rather hollow as we speak it. Out there in the far reaches of the battle fronts our men and our women anticipate no holiday. Grimly they face the task of winning the war—lonesome and nostalgic, their hearts ache for their homes, for their loved ones—for the America whose flag of freedom and opportunity their young hands hold so high.

Fellow Members of the House of Representatives of this America they serve so completely, are they less Americans because they are in uniform? Are they less citizens because they are outside the boundaries of these United States? Have they not the right to expect of us who represent them here some action that will make possible a mechanism whereby they will be able to exercise their inalienable right to vote in the coming election?

It is inconceivable to me that we should permit selfish interest to prevent the passage of some form of legislation that will secure to them their right of franchise unbiased and free.

Tragically true it is that there are those who would so forget the high privilege of their public service as to be attempting to devise ways to vote the soldier rather than to make possible the soldier vote.

How dare we fail these men of ours out there in the jungles, in the foxholes, in the bleak frozen north, in the rain-drenched south. Have we not enough courage to dare to do right? Are we so unworthy of the freedom that has been ours that we cannot, for this moment at least, forget all our differences, remembering only our common aims, our common dreams? Stripped of our varied formulas, cannot we upon whom rests an

almost intolerable burden of responsibility, cannot we find at least the shadow of their courage and their selflessness?

I would be unworthy not only of my privileged opportunity for service in this House but also of my womanhood did I not rise to speak for all these millions whom we have called to the colors for the duration of the most terrible war of all time or until the moment when their unready souls are hurled back into the vast unknown.

If we go home to our constituencies in these next days let us do so in great humility of spirit and let us return filled with fresh courage and new determination to give our men and women in and with the armed forces a clear method by which they may vote in the coming elections—so assuring them that the freedom talked about over so many radio bands is not a joke, but a glorious reality.

RAILROAD WAGES

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the Congress has any right to adjourn today over the New Year without taking definite action on a bill that was passed by a vote of 74 to 4 in the Senate to approve the contract made between the nonoperating employees and the railroads which provides for an 8-cent hourly increase.

The Nation is threatened with a railroad strike, called for December 30, which, if carried out, will jeopardize the entire railroad system and seriously impair and handicap our war efforts. I also believe the railroad operating employees are justified in their demands for an increase to meet the higher costs of living.

Congress has no right to shut its eyes and try to evade any responsibility for the impending railroad strike. It should not adjourn until Monday, and by that time the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce would have an opportunity to report a bill and the Rules Committee to grant a rule for consideration in the House on Monday.

I know of nothing that could be more disastrous to our economic system and to the conduct of the war than permitting the railroad strike to go into effect on December 30, when it could be prevented by a simple act of justice by granting all railroad employees the increase they are entitled to and the amount awarded to nonoperating railway employees by an impartial tribunal acting within the limits of existing laws.

THE BASIS OF PROSPERITY

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that I am now apparently in order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is always glad to hold the gentleman in order when he is.

Mr. GIFFORD. I had hoped the gentleman from Mississippi had succeeded in placing me in order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. GIFFORD. Just a minute; I do not yield.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot let the opportunity pass without challenging the statements of the gentleman from Illinois, who crowed so loudly about the marvelous prosperity at the present time. This marvelous prosperity is founded wholly upon Government debt, and when that debt is handed down to posterity it will be the end of ancestor worship, and he will be one of the most prominent of the ancestors. He has been here for so many years. This prosperity should be compared with the halcyon days of 1929, when prosperity was founded on private debt. There is a wide difference. As trustees we are responsible for public debt that has brought about this false prosperity. I advise that we may well feel most uncomfortable rather than boastful and gladsome.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

THE FLAG CODE

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, several Members have asked me lately about the amendment of the flag code relating to Thanksgiving Day.

From the early days of our Nation a day for thanksgiving was fixed by Executive proclamation annually. The first proclamation having designated the last Thursday in November, subsequent proclamations did likewise until President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in the great depression, seeking to promote better business earlier in the harvest season, designated an earlier date. This change was not as satisfactory as it was hoped it might be, so the President returned to the former custom of designating the last Thursday of November as Thanksgiving Day and Congress passed Public Law 379 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, approved by the President on December 26, 1941, making the fourth Thursday of November in each succeeding year Thanksgiving Day, and a legal public holiday.

In codifying the existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag, the major attention was focused upon those rules and customs, rather than upon the sixteenth holiday named in one of the rules which was copied into the flag code just as it had read for 20 years. So, the fact that the then recently passed law of the same Congress, had fixed the fourth Thursday of November as Thanksgiving Day, instead of the last Thursday, was overlooked. When the mistake was discovered it was corrected by amending the flag code to bring it into conformity with Public Law 379, Seventy-seventh Congress.

The original flag code is Public Law 623, Seventy-seventh Congress. The amended flag code is Public Law 829, Seventy-seventh Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit two requests: One, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper clipping on pork rationing; and two, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include some communications on the silver dollar in Montana.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman's requests are granted.

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT'S SAFE RETURN

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, following what the distinguished majority leader said, if I may I shall temporarily usurp a function traditionally performed by the President of the United States.

In the exercise of that function I want to proclaim this a day of thanksgiving. I hope this may not sound presumptuous. I do it humbly and solemnly, devoutly to give thanks to the Providence that has returned our President safely, and in good health, to his country and his people.

The mere fact of the safe return of the Commander in Chief is reason enough for the giving of thanks. But there is additional reason for our gratitude in the tremendous accomplishment of his hazardous and historic journey. Because of it the Allied Nations and peoples of the world now fighting for freedom and decency are closer together than great nations have ever been before. Because of it the certainty of victory is clear, and its day is nearer. Because of it the future is golden with hope—hope that men finally may have learned how they might live together in peace, hope that this will be the last war that we, or our children, or their children will know. Surely these are things all of us, regardless of our divergent views on other matters, sincerely desire. We may well look upon this the 17th day of December 1943 as a day of thanksgiving.

THE SOLDIERS' VOTE

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] for the position she has taken and for the challenge she has extended to the Members of the Congress of the United States to bring in and perfect a bill that will give the soldiers who are fighting on the battle fronts of the world and those in the cantonment camps in this country an opportunity to vote. I should like to say to the Members

of the House, because I know many of you will be asked about the soldiers' voting when you get home, that the House Committee on Elections has perfected a bill that we hope to persuade the chairman to hold hearings on, so we may bring it to the floor of the House. This bill will be designed to give the soldiers a chance to vote rather than to set up restrictions that are more designed to vote the soldiers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article by David Lawrence on the renegotiation statute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Christmas comes next week and brings again to our minds the thought of "Peace on earth and good will toward men." There is tragic evidence that there is not peace on earth today. But to the veteran servicemen in our armed forces who have been so gallantly protecting us, this House can show good will by passing the mustering-out pay bill before Christmas to take care of men as they are discharged. There can be no happy Christmas for them away from their families, but our own Christmas will be pleasanter if we pass the bill. There is no possible excuse to my mind for our not passing it, perhaps not a perfect one but one at least to give these veterans mustering-out pay before Christmas. I believe there is not a Member here who will not feel very deeply a sense of omission if the bill is not passed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

THE SAFE RETURN OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the Commander in Chief of our military forces, the President of this great Nation, Franklin D. Roosevelt, has just returned from several of the most important conferences of all time, among them the meeting with Stalin and Churchill.

The President's courage, military sagacity, far-sightedness, and resolute faith in the desire of the majority of the world's peoples to work together for peace have been vindicated by the results of these conferences. Regardless of party or of group interest, every individual in this Nation owes Franklin D. Roosevelt a vote of thanks and confidence for this contribution to world freedom.

While the results of this first meeting between Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin were primarily military, this meeting will go down in history as far more than a gathering of Allied military leaders. It was that, and the military conclusions reached will hasten the war's conclusion. But the meeting was far more than a military conference. It is the start of a world partnership designed to prevent future wars, to prevent the festering of sores and of aggressive acts which breed wars. The opportunity is herewith presented for future meetings of the various nations' leaders, not alone by diplomats and officials in intermediate levels of government but by the chosen leaders themselves.

For this opportunity this Nation should be grateful. The fact that it has come about is due almost entirely to the personality, the courage, and the belief in humanity of our President and Commander in Chief, Franklin D. Roosevelt. That the chosen leaders of the Allied Nations should meet was his belief. The meeting was of his design.

The results, if this Nation avails itself of the opportunity, will mark the beginning of world humanity.

IRRIGATION PROJECTS AND INCREASED FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, does this country need to produce food? Is it really necessary as a part of our war effort to increase food production? If that is true—and I have been assuming that it is true—it occurs to me that we are overlooking some remarkable opportunities to accomplish it. In the RECORD for December 15, I indicated that about a quarter of a million acres of land under irrigation in the Valley of the Sun, where I live, last year produced about $30,000,000 worth of agricultural products. I will yield a part of my very limited time right now if any Member will rise in his place and point out to me any place in the country or in the world a block of a quarter million acres which did produce or can produce $30,000,000 worth of food and fiber in 12 months. This irrigated land averaged a hundred and twenty-eight dollars worth of production annually.

I am not boasting, but merely pointing out that the best way to get maximum increased food production is to finish the almost completed irrigation projects certified by the proper agencies, and thus make barren acres equally productive. One way to do this would be for the House to recede and concur in the Senate amendment No. 49 in the bill before us yesterday. If we need food, it is very unfortunate that the parliamentary complication resulted as it did in the vote on that amendment yesterday.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein an item from the Hammond Times.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE SAFE RETURN OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FURLONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FURLONG. Mr. Speaker, the President has just been close to several of the fighting fronts. There is no doubt about it that on every front we have been fighting this war under the handicap of one terrible weakness, always our greatest weakness. It has been the weakness that both Nazis and Japs spotted and banked on from the first, in order to get as far as they got—the weakness of our being easily divided from those who should be our allies. Discouragingly and disgracefully this weakness has been exploited at home as well as in Berlin and Tokyo. We all know that Hitler, Goebbels, and Tojo have found useful echoes in this country. And always the greatest single objective, the most consistently and vigorously pursued theme of all Axis propaganda has been to divide us from our allies, to make us distrust them, fear them, hate them, act without them. The President flew to Cairo and Teheran realizing this. In Cairo and Teheran our great weakness was healed. In Cairo and Teheran the fuse was pulled from our enemies' most dangerous and most successful weapon. From Cairo and Teheran we welcome the man who accomplished these things—and shortened the road to victory.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] may be allowed to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include two editorials from a New England newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent also that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by Governor Wills of Vermont on the Bill of Rights.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include comments by Mr. Harry Fiterman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALE]?

There was no objection.

POSITION OF AMERICAN LEGION ON ADJUSTED COMPENSATION BILL

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received a letter from the national legislative committee of the American Legion, which reads as follows:

DECEMBER 16, 1943.

Hon. WALTER G. PLOESER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PLOESER: Attached is copy of the statement released today and we will appreciate it if you will read it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD upon receipt.

Thanking you, I am,

F. M. SULLIVAN,
Executive Director,
National Legislative Committee.

The enclosure is as follows:

The American Legion is not a party to any "groups representing the veterans" whose insistence on further hearings on an adjusted compensation bill is blamed by Chairman ANDREW J. MAY, of the House Military Affairs Committee, as the reason for delay in immediate House consideration of the urgently needed veterans' mustering-out pay legislation.

Mr. MAY erroneously named the American Legion as one of the veterans' groups to whose request for additional hearings he had deferred immediate action on mustering-out pay in an explanation on the floor of the House December 15.

The American Legion has supported the principles of mustering-out pay, particularly as incorporated in the original May bill, H. R. 3742, and, since conclusion of hearings by both Houses of Congress, urges passage of this legislation before Christmas.

EXTENSION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, it is expected that within a reasonably short time the other body will send us a resolution to continue in existence the Commodity Credit Corporation for a period of 60 days from the first of the year. I recognize that if the other body does not choose to make a decision on the matter of general consumer subsidies, it is not our responsibility, although action should have already been taken so that the farmers of the Nation might know what they may plant the coming season. If we are to expect our farmers to produce, we should let them know what our farm program is to be, but Marvin Jones and his associates cannot announce a farm program until this Congress takes final action on the question of subsidies. We must let the Department of Agriculture know whether we want the farmer to get a fair price in the market place or whether we want him to depend on a dole from the Public Treasury. I think he should have a fair price in the market place, but, regardless of that, he must know what he can expect.

Mr. Speaker, within less than 60 days we will be planting corn in Texas and the farmers ought to know what the program is going to be, whether it be subsidies or no subsidies. We should not extend this time as long as 60 days. This whole issue was discussed in June. On July 2, 1943, the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation was extended for 6 months with the understanding that within that time definite action would be taken on the question of consumer subsidies. The committee in the House reported a bill approximately 6 weeks or 2 months ago. I believe it took 3 weeks before the bill was considered by the House, but, even so, it was sent to the other body several weeks ago. Why should it be necessary for that body to delay action? I know of no reason why they should not act before Christmas. I am ready to stay here just as long as it takes to dispose of this measure, but I realize that the other body is not going to act until next year. We must, as a practical matter, agree to a continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation past the first of the year, but why should we delay so long? There is no necessity for allowing a continuation of more than a reasonable time after the other body reconvenes next month, and I hope that the House of Representatives will not be a party to extending the time to an unreasonable limit.

THE RANKIN BILL

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to learn from the well of the House this morning that the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress has been working very hard to report out a bill which will be satisfactory insofar as giving a vote to the soldiers is concerned. I sincerely hope, however, that that committee will not conclude to report out the so-called Rankin bill.

Mr. Speaker, proponents of the so-called Rankin bill contend that it would be helpful toward giving the soldiers and sailors the right to vote. A close reading of the Rankin bill shows there is no clause in it which directly affects soldiers and sailors. The bill merely makes recommendations to the States which, if not followed by the States, nullifies every provision of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask whether the Legislature of Mississippi will follow the recommendation of Congress on this subject, or will it treat our recommendation with the same respect that we would accord a resolution of that State's legislature on the same subject.

The answer to that question I leave to those who are following the leadership of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

THE RETURN OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, our President has just returned from a 20,000 mile journey, a journey whose principal effect has been to secure complete and explicit unity with our allies in the prosecution of the war. This unity will undoubtedly strike despair and confusion into the already wavering Berlin-Tokyo Axis and will for this reason alone materially hasten the day of victory. Time alone will testify to the epochal importance of this historic journey of our President, but the decisions reached and the concord achieved will, we know now, initiate the final blow which will surely result in the confusion, humiliation, and unconditional surrender of our enemies. And greater harmony at home, so greatly needed, will be effected too, since the irresponsible hints of the New York-Chicago-San Simeon propaganda axis at a separate Russo-German peace have been revealed as malicious misrepresentations.

A greater and more perfect unity here at home is bound to result with the effective removal of every possible ground for suspicion and mistrust. Our President, safely returned, richly deserves an affectionate welcome and a hearty vote of thanks for these two benefits, if for nothing more.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. GOSSETT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE SITUATION OF THE FARMERS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let go unchallenged the statement of the gentleman from Illinois a while ago when he said that the guilty farmers have more money now than they have ever had before and more than they know what to do with. I want to tell him and his kind that the farmers in this country are not guilty and they do not feel guilty.

During years and years we have farmed through a down market and kept them supplied with their victuals. Now when the market has increased a little we are the victims of such malicious attacks as made by him.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the farmers of this country are going farther than any other group in the country to bring this war to a definite conclusion by keeping the home front and the men on the front fed and we are going to continue to do that. Such slanderous attacks as made here today will not help the situation.

The gentleman from Chicago would do well to explain to the House and the farmers of the country as to why he and the administration continue to fight to maintain lending agencies for the farmers when, as he says, the farmers have more money than they know what to do with. He might explain why they have set up numerous agencies for this purpose and made it possible to borrow from one lending agency to pay off their obligation to another, thus getting the former deeper and deeper in debt.

THE SITUATION OF THE FARMERS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] brusquely sought to deny the prosperity of the farmers. He was followed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD], who states that the present prosperity is due to our increased indebtedness and to the money that we are borrowing.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CROSS] also attempted to deny the prosperity of the farmers and sought to imply that I made unjust charges and that I envied their prosperity.

First, to the gentleman from Iowa I will say that far from envying the prosperity of the farmers, most emphatically it gratifies me that they are prosperous. But I do resent the effort of those who speak in their behalf in attempting to deny the truth of their genuine prosperity. The truth hurts. I am attempting only to give facts and stick to the truth in every instance. There is no justification for denying that the farmers are prosperous and I do not approve of the apparent attempt to conceal that fact. The farmers in the last few years have paid up practically all of their mortgages and now have more money in banks than ever before. This is borne out by statistics and reports from the banks in every section of the country. Of course some people are never satisfied, but surely the farmers, particularly, should at this time be not only satisfied but grateful and thankful for the prosperity they are now having abundantly under the Democratic administration of President Roosevelt.

The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD], who generally is most fair and highly intelligent, resents my calling attention from time to time to the general prosperity of the country, and asserts this prosperity is due to the fact that the country has borrowed and owes huge sums. It is indeed for every intelligent businessman to acknowledge that generally the most prosperous business organizations have been successful in their financing by wisely utilizing their borrowing capacity. Frequently the more money they borrow the greater the increase in size of their plants and the volume of their business and profits.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] resents, as usual, the disclosure of the real facts with regard to the farmers of his State. To him I say that the people and farmers of his district and of the whole State of Mississippi are enjoying greater prosperity than ever before. The reports show that there is more money in the banks there than ever before in the history of that State. And I think he should be willing to acknowledge this condition. Of course, I know that he has been peeved because the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], who is unafraid at all times to call a spade a spade, has got under his hide in charging that he was trying to deprive the soldiers of their right to vote. I am well aware of his contention in opposing the bill reported by the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress in asserting that it would affect the rights of the States and he also harps on the Constitution.

He cannot deny and he should know that the Constitution gives every citizen in the United States the right to vote. While he professes friendship for the soldiers, yet in the last Congress he sought to bring about the defeat of the bill giving them the right to vote, and again at this session is repeating his performance and would deny the voting privilege to our brave soldiers. Oh, I hear him and others say, just wait until the boys come home—yes, just wait until the boys come home, but I charge that while they are away fighting it is grossly unfair to deprive them of their great privilege and right to cast their votes and to register their approval or disapproval as to general conditions at home. The Lucas-Green-Worley bill definitely provides the machinery for the members of our armed forces to exercise their right to vote and any attempt to amend it can only be construed as an effort to sabotage the right of the soldiers to vote.

THE FIRST AIRPLANE FLIGHT BY THE WRIGHT BROTHERS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, if the tides which flow in from the seas and the winds which sweep down from the dunes are in a historical mood this morning, they will pause briefly to pay tribute to the memory of Wilbur and Orville Wright.

It was 40 years ago at 11 a. m. that these young men from the State of Ohio took that frail craft and kept it in the air for 59 seconds over the sands of Kitty Hawk, N. C. They gave not only the theory but the practicability of flying to the world. Madmen and maniacs have distorted the instrument which they meant to give mankind for good.

Today as final victory is being approached by the power of Allied air might, we can look forward to the dream of the Wright brothers and know that this instrument of flying will be not only the winner of the war but the keeper forever of the peace.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Silver Spring (Md.) News on the soldier vote.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LEWIS]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LEWIS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE RETURN OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the minority can join with the majority this morning in expressing their thankfulness and their pleasure in the fact that the President of the United States has returned safely and in good health. We are not only glad because he is back, because he is in good health, but we are glad that he brought with him Harry Hopkins, who perhaps can explain why it is if—the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]—we have this great prosperity that he talks about, it is necessary to ask for subsidies to drive down the cost of living. The gentleman intimated that everyone had

plenty of money, and yet he advocates subsidies. That is something that seems inconsistent to me, and I would like to have it explained.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and insert an address by the Honorable Nelson A. Rockefeller, at the American Legion dinner in Washington recently.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in revising and extending my remarks I may insert a radio address on the subject of the soldiers' vote bill which I am going to make over radio station WRC tonight at 7:30 p. m.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FARM LABOR SUPPLY BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 208, the farm labor supply bill; and pending that motion I would like to get some understanding from the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] as to the time they would need for general debate.

Mr. TABER. I think an hour, equally divided, ought to take care of it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Pending the previous motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 1 hour, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and one-half by myself.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 208, with Mr. THOMASON in the chair.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is a war bill. It is a bill to provide an adequate supply of the most essential munition of war. It is a bill to provide sufficient food to feed our armies, our workmen in war industries, our civilian population, and our allies in Axis-free countries. Military authorities have testified before our committees that food is as necessary to the war program as gunpowder, and that in the coming year we will need more food than has been heretofore produced.

The Food Administrator tells us that although we produced in this country last year the largest amount of food ever produced in the history of the country, it will be necessary to exceed that production in the coming year; and that whereas last year we cultivated an estimated 364,000,000 acres, the goal for the coming year is an estimated 380,000,000 acres.

Of course, one of the prime factors in the production of food is labor, and with the increasing burden of production upon American agriculture, there is a dwindling supply of that constituent factor in production. Whereas in 1943 the Army and the war industries took from the farms a little over 4,100,000 workers formerly available for farm labor, in 1944 the same sources are taking from the American farms over 5,200,000 workers.

Complicating the increased burden of production and dwindling supply of labor is a growing shortage of machinery. Of course, labor and machinery on the farm are supplementary and interchangeable. If you have machinery you require less labor. If you have less machinery you require more manpower. Now, the supply of both is shrinking steadily. Not only is the available manpower on the farm decreasing but the machinery on the farm is wearing out and there are few replacements. The result is that although the farmers are utilizing the services of every member of the family, including the mother of the family and the children, in arduous labor from dawn until dusk; although they have called in inexperienced city labor, men, women, and children, and have taken advantage of the opportunity to employ prisoners of war and in certain centers of the country, evacuees, there is still a growing and alarming shortage of labor on the farm.

This bill is a proposal to remedy that situation, first, by recruitment and replacement of labor within the State; second, by the recruitment and transportation of foreign labor into the country and from State to State. Although the program was not initiated until later in 1942, and it has only been in effect in 1942 and 1943, already notable results have been secured. For this last year this service was able to supply 1,600,000 individual workers in 2,400,000 replacements on 1,000,000 farms. Now, with the increased goal set by the Food Administration, with the increased calls upon the American farmer for additional food, they have set the goal at 5,000,000 replacements. They want to raise the replacements from 4,300,000 to 5,000,000, and they want to raise the number of workers available from 1,600,000 to 2,200,000 workers.

In order to meet this situation the Budget estimate asked for $35,000,000 in addition to the unexpended balances. The committee believes that under this bill a maximum of service can be secured by a direct appropriation of $27,000,000, which, with $6,750,000 unexpended funds available from other sources, will provide a total of $33,750,000 for this purpose in the coming year. That is an excess of about $7,000,000 over the amount supplied for the current year, but even at that, a decrease of $6,000,000 in the Budget estimate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I listened with much interest to four Democratic Members of the House, including Mr. MCCORMACK, the majority leader, read prepared eulogies and tributes about the President's trip over to Egypt and Iran, and in regard to the Cairo and Teheran conferences. I believe all Americans are united in support of any action taken at either one of those conferences that would expedite the winning of the war and the crushing of the German and Japanese armies and navies. I believe most Americans are in favor of any reasonable plan to set up machinery to provide for world peace. They are not, however, in favor of surrendering their sovereignty as a nation entering into a super state or financing a glorified world-wide W. P. A. after the war.

I can recollect that similar eulogies were proclaimed upon the floor of the House over the Atlantic Charter. And where is the Atlantic Charter now? It has been torpedoed and sunk by its own creators, and in the house of its friends. It is utterly forgotten and hushed up. It is now almost seditious or treasonable to refer to the Atlantic Charter, which was even more eulogized and praised than the Cairo and Teheran conference. In the Atlantic Charter, at least, we were told that our war aims guaranteed that small, independent and sovereign nations would have the right of self-determination, and of choosing their own form of government. Was that included in either the Teheran or Cairo conferences? Will the small nations, such as Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, be permitted to choose their own forms of government after this war? Is there any provision in the Cairo or Teheran agreements that provides that there will be no fifth partition of Poland? Of course, we do not know what was in these conference agreements except the general principles with which we are all in accord, that will expedite the winning of the war or preserve world peace after the war. But we in Congress do not propose nor are the American people prepared to accept any commitments, secret or otherwise, that might mean the destruction of small, independent and sovereign nations, including the Balkan nations. Before asking us to commit ourselves, we want to know all the facts and the Congress of the United States, Democrats and Republicans alike, are entitled to know, what commitments have been made. I hope the President of the United States will come before the Congress and report to both the House and the Senate and tell them about every single commitment that was entered into. Then we can determine what our policies should be and whether we should approve all

of them. Until we know the commitments that have been entered into in these conferences we have no right to specifically praise or eulogize or commend something we know nothing about. If any Member of the Congress has been taken into these secrets and knows all about what actions were taken at those conferences and what was agreed to, then it is his duty to tell us, both on the majority and the minority side, so that we can intelligently consider what action to take in the interests of all the American people. Let us take the veil off both these conferences and agreements by permitting the American people to enter by the front door and having complete confidence in their final judgments. The Congress, composed of the elected Representatives of the people, should decide what the future policy of the Nation is to be. I can remember listening to eulogies of a whole series of conferences, many of which have been forgotten or repudiated already. I believe in the general terms of the Cairo and Teheran conferences as published in the newspapers, and so do the American people. But we have a right to know about any and all commitments, and until we do, I hope Members of Congress and the American people will reserve their judgment until all the facts have been made public.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] says this is a war measure. It is approved by the Food Administrator.

I am going to support this bill, because the Food Administrator says it is necessary. It does not make any difference to me whether it is a farm-labor subsidy. When it is presented as a war measure, and the Food Administrator states that it is necessary, I am going to support his recommendation the same as I would if the Army or the Navy said they had to have more money for ships, planes, tanks, and so forth.

Just a short while ago we had another war measure here. That, too, was labeled a subsidy measure. That provided for food subsidies, and the same War Food Administrator told the House, through the committees, how necessary that was as a war measure. On that occasion, the great farm organizations of the country put the finger down and said, "No. We are against food subsidies." The result was, so much pressure having been brought to bear, the bill was defeated.

Now these same organizations, those farm organizations that opposed food subsidies, come to you and say, "We are supporting the farm-labor subsidy."

I confess I do not like the way this money is going to be handled. Nevertheless, if the committee says it is the proper way, I will vote for the bill. Seventeen million dollars of this money is going to be handled by men who are not really Federal employees. A part of their salaries are paid by subsidies, if you please, that we grant to the extension services of the various States. We have been paying those subsidies all the years I have been here. On one occasion, where there was an effort to reduce that expenditure, there was such a howl from the four corners of the country that there was no opportunity whatsoever to do so.

What I want to bring out now is that when the War Food Administrator tells you he needs something as a war measure, no matter whether it is a food subsidy or whether it is for a farm-labor subsidy, I think the same principle exists, and that the farm organizations of this country and the labor organizations of this country and the masses of the people of this country should get behind them, because they are war measures. Do not defeat one and pass the other. When you have the testimony of a man in whom we all have confidence, who served in this House for over 20 years and was the chairman of your great Committee on Agriculture, Judge Marvin Jones, tells you it is necessary, take his word when he says it is a war measure and it is needed.

As I say, I am going to support this bill. Not a penny of it will ever enter my congressional district. That matters not to me. I try to legislate from a national standpoint and not from a local standpoint.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, the district which I have the honor to represent in Michigan is not in a true sense, an agricultural district. It is very largely a consumer district. Be that as it may, the resolution before us this afternoon is designed to increase production of food in this country and it shall have my wholehearted support. Inflation is caused by scarcity of consumer goods on the one hand and a surplus of money—cheap money—on the other hand. Provide the farmers with labor as proposed in the measure before us and sufficient farm machinery and they will produce food in abundance. Under the fundamental law of supply and demand with an abundance of food, living costs will be less and not more.

I disagree thoroughly with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] in the conclusions he reached on the subsidy bill, and its relationship to this joint resolution. Very few people have stopped to even ask themselves the question why it was that such an overwhelming majority on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, voted to discontinue the food or consumer subsidies after January 1, 1944. Certainly there must have been good and sufficient reasons, or that conclusion would not have been reached.

Regardless of the attitude of the press or the radio commentators, reasons did exist why the House took that position. One of the reasons is, that it would not produce 1 more pound of food. Another reason is that those engaged in agriculture do not want subsidies. All they ask for is a fair and reasonable price for what they produce in the market places, and no one has furnished a good and sufficient reason why they should not have it. Even now they are not asking for higher prices generally.

Subsidies do not produce food. They do furnish a reason for increasing the national debt and increasing centralized Government here in Washington when it is not needed.

The farm population of the United States represents about 32 percent of our people. If the estimates made by the Department of Commerce are correct, those figures show that the 32 percent who till the soil and produce the food will receive out of the national income this year $12,500,000,000, or 8.8 percent of the national income. The national income is estimated at $142,000,000,000. It is absolutely absurd for anybody to claim on this floor, or anywhere else, that a segment of our population who will receive less than 9 cents out of every income dollar, can or will produce inflation in the United States. I am reliably informed that the average farm wage earning is 33.9 cents per hour for this year.

I voted against continuing subsidies because in my judgment, it presented the greatest threat toward inflation. Many voted for a continuance of subsidies, undoubtedly honestly, for the same reason. But this afternoon we have a joint resolution to provide sufficient labor to our farmers in order to assist them in the production of food. No one in this Chamber is opposed to that. I am gratified to notice that in the report it is estimated 1944 will bring 4 percent more in the volume of food produced over 1943. I am satisfied that the farm organizations of this land are asking that this bill be passed in order that they may have the manpower to produce food, and they will produce it for a fair and reasonable price without having a subsidy attached to it.

I hope the bill will be passed. I believe it will. We lend our support wholeheartedly to the measure.

As to the question of controlling prices, this Congress by an overwhelming vote passed a price control act. If there is anybody in or out of Government who says there is not sufficient law on the books to empower the President and the O. P. A., the agency dealing with this subject, to control prices, then let such request or recommendation be made to Congress and I am satisfied that Congress will respond, and respond immediately, and grant the power and authority to do so. However, it has not been requested.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat surprised when my good friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] made some of the statements he

did regarding the provision of this bill, and its relationship to subsidies.

I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri that the people of the State of California this year used about 42,000 Mexican workers. There was no subsidy attached, because the people of my State made it possible for each of those Mexicans to average from $11 to $17 a day for their wage scale.

The Federal Government did pay the transportation costs of the Mexicans from the border to the various areas in the State of California.

The State of California is in a little different position than any other State regarding labor at the present time. You must realize that about 85,000 Japanese, who I am happy to know are penned up at the present time, were permitted to run loose and work upon the farms in the State of California. In addition to that, the tremendous shipbuilding program and airplane manufacturing on the west coast in California today, together with Oregon and Washington, causes a great shifting of labor and has taken thousands of our farm laborers away from us.

If food is the No. 1 item, as we have been told by practically every Government agency, then it is very important that we produce an abundance of foodstuffs as fast as we can. The State of California farms not 6 or 7 months of the year but 12 months in the year. In our State at the present time we are placing the seed in the ground to make it possible to have foodstuffs in the months of January and February. Continued operation makes it necessary that we must have farm labor each and every month to assist the farmers in producing foodstuffs.

In 1942 we lost 70,000,000 pounds of foodstuffs while thousands of people throughout the world starved, all because there was no labor available to harvest the crops after the farmers had produced them.

In 1942 I saw grapes hang on the vines and rot because the farmers could not get labor to harvest them, yet thousands of people in the Eastern States would have liked those same grapes on their tables.

This bill does just one thing: It makes labor available not only to people in the State of California, but to the other States of the Nation where a labor shortage exists. As I said before, food is No. 1 item on the list. Even though war should cease on the 1st of January, the 15th of June, or any other date in the immediate future, for the ensuing 18 months, or 2 years, we would be called upon to produce more foodstuffs than we are producing at the present time. We must keep our word to our allies and assist them in providing food for their people. We must know in advance as many of the factors affecting food production as possible, and labor is one of the most important. As I stated earlier in this discussion, we must know now whether labor is going to be available to harvest the crops before we put the seed in the ground. Otherwise at harvest time with no labor available the foodstuff itself will not be utilized.

This is not a subsidy bill; it has nothing to do with subsidy. The farmer is paying this labor such a wage, as I said before, as perhaps they never enjoyed in their lives. On a piece-work basis some of these Mexicans made as high as $14 to $17 a day. When it came to the harvesting of cotton on the basis of $2.25 per hundredweight they could not make such high wages, and we had to return those Mexicans to Mexico and bring in new workers who had not enjoyed such high earnings, so that we could get the cotton harvested. I am giving you conditions as they actually exist and have existed. These are conditions we have passed.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. ROLPH. My colleague from the central section of California represents one of the great agricultural districts of our State. I represent one of the great metropolitan districts. I want to tell my distinguished colleague that the people in the cities are just as much interested in seeing that this labor comes in as are those in the farm districts.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman for his interest. I would say further, since he knows the value of agriculture, that in my congressional district last year we produced over $200,000,000 worth of food and fiber. My colleague who stood in front of me, the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART], and I have 4 out of 5 ranking counties in agriculture that produce more agricultural foodstuffs than any other counties in the world. We must have this labor if we are to continue these tremendous harvests.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I should like to say that those four counties have two of the best Representatives in the United States.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. GEARHART. I join my colleague in thanking the gentleman from Michigan for his kind words, but I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to compliment the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT], for he has been constantly on this particular job. It has been my privilege to work with him closely. I think the results we have achieved speak for themselves. At this time therefore it would be very appropriate for us to express our gratitude to the Congress and to the executive departments for the fine way they have responded to the calls we have made down through the years.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The gentleman has made a very fine presentation. As I understand the proposal is primarily to bring in Mexicans over the border to help the people in California. The proposal was advanced recently by one of these New Deal agencies in Cleveland, I think it was, that we take some Jap prisoners from the west coast that I understand formerly were active in agriculture in the gentleman's area, and bring them into Michigan. I personally do not approve of that idea at all. I want to ask the gentleman why it is that we cannot work out some arrangement whereby we could keep those Japs out there in his country where his people know how to take care of them and handle them, and keep the Mexicans out of Michigan as well. I do not want Mexicans up there. They gave us some trouble up in my country once.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to ask my friend from Michigan if there is not a remote possibility of sanitation being spread by teaching?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I am not answering; but I will say that our people in Michigan have learned how to take baths. They learned that many years ago.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to dim any of the glory of California; they do have a pretty nice State out there; but when any of you want to find the richest soil on earth you must come to Carroll and Saline Counties in Missouri.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I want to say further, to give the membership something of an idea of the way this program was handled this year, that the State of California after having lost $70,000,000 in foodstuffs in 1942, the State legislature appropriated $1,800,000 to be expended in cooperation with the Federal Government in bringing in these laborers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from California 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, the State of California has spent $1,800,000 in 7 months' operation. In Tulare County alone the farmers spent $56,000 additional—that one county. Like sums were spent in neighboring counties, such as Kings, Kern, Fresno, Madera, and Stanislaus.

I should like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] if the bill is so designed that the Federal Government will enter into agreements with Mexico with regard to bringing in and returning the Mexican laborers that it may be desired to bring in?

Mr. TABER. That is correct, and the authority is specifically given in the bill.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The War Food Administrator will have charge of this program, will he not?

Mr. TABER. Yes; but the provisions with reference to the agreements with

Mexico or other foreign countries are on page 7, paragraph 3, line 7:

To cooperate with the Secretary of State in the negotiation or renegotiation of agreements with foreign countries relating to the importation of workers into the United States.

That is the paragraph that relates to that particular item. This bill deals not only with the importation of workers into the United States frim Mexico but it also relates to other countries. We expect them to come in from Bahama and Jamaica also.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. HARE. As I understand it, this is merely the carrying out of a policy that has been followed for many years. While it is true that California is a great agricultural State and produces wonderful crops, this is not the first time California has been called upon to import labor in harvest time.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is correct.

Mr. HARE. Such labor has always been imported under a policy established by the State Department and in agreement with the foreign government. This also will not deviate from the policy to any great extent. About the only difference lies in the fact that you will get the labor when you want it, when you need it, and, further, that the travel expense of the laborers will be paid by the Federal Government.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Formerly the expense of coming to the place of work and returning to Mexico was borne by the Mexicans themselves. We now really need this labor. The Mexicans were not very happy about letting them come in in the first place, so we had to set up some kind of governmental policy. The only agency that could be responsible for them was the Federal Government, not the State governments. So this agreement, I understand, was entered into through the State Department, with the Mexican Government, whereby our Government became responsible to pay for their transportation to and from their place of employment.

Mr. HARE. As I understand, this bill is designed for the purposes of increasing production. Assuming for the sake of argument that the bill should not be passed, are not the chances good that you would be able to secure sufficient labor, anyway?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No; we would not.

Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] would help me straighten out one matter in my own mind. Is this resolution drafted in such way that we are going to be guaranteed this Mexican labor?

Mr. TABER. I do not think there is anything in the nature of a guaranty. I think that everything possible will be done by the United States authorities to see that it is available, and it is with that in mind that we are trying to get the bill through here today so it will become a law before the 1st of January, and we can hang onto the Mexicans who are already in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, as I listened to these exchanges of the genial gentleman from California I thought the next claim that was going to be made for California was that they produced the greatest crop of honey in the world. I was amused by the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri that he was for this bill although there would be no benefit in his district, that there was not a penny of the funds coming into his district. Well, bless you, if this particular bill were to be voted on on the basis of whether or not any money was coming into districts I do not know whether the bill would carry or not. I happen to represent a district which probably is regarded as an agricultural district—the production of livestock is the principal industry. I do not know that any particular amount of this money is coming into my district. It may mean that a little will be used in connection with some labor for a small sugar-beet area.

The benefits of this bill, such benefits as there are, will be primarily for organizing the reserve agricultural labor of the various communities and aid in the distribution of special laborers where you have seasonal crops. It may be that in dollars some of these funds will not go to the city districts, but if the gentleman from Missouri who represents a city district might also ask what would happen to the people in his district if these seasonal perishable crops are not harvested in proper time. So I believe the benefit of this bill hits one district as much as another district.

The question of subsidies is only remotely connected with this particular bill. It is enlightening to remember that most of the agitation for subsidy legislation proceeds from consumer districts. Certainly if the fate of subsidy legislation were to rest upon getting an affirmative vote from strictly agricultural districts in the country subsidies such as are proposed under current discussion would never be adopted. The reason for that is that subsidies are essentially consumer subsidies. The farmers are not asking for subsidies and yet the representatives of the consumer districts who plead for subsidies plead for them in the name of the farmers. The representatives from the agricultural districts are not crying for subsidies; the farmers are not asking for subsidies.

The demand for increased subsidies comes from consumers who do not want to pay the price or the cost of production. I had a petition the other day coming from a little town in my district, signed by 17 women, many of whom I know personally. They were petitioning that the Price Administrator permit the milk dealer of that small community to increase the price of milk by 1 cent a quart. The producer did not ask for it. He simply faced the fact that he could not continue in the milk business; feed and labor costs were too high. His only chance was to either sell his herd or to separate the cream and sell the cream. The families who wanted milk for their babies naturally desired him to continue to serve them with milk. The producer did not ask for an increase in price and he did not ask for a subsidy.

We have gotten to a strange position in connection with this subsidy question, partly because the administration has not followed the plain directive in the Price Control Act that any prices affecting agricultural commodities should be made effective only by the joint action of the Price Administrator and the Secretary of Agriculture. The Price Control Act specifically provided that the responsibilities and duties placed upon the Secretary of Agriculture should not be transferred to the Price Administrator and that functions relating to agricultural commodities should not be transferred to the Price Administrator by any other agency. Some smart person figured out a way to get around that by creating a War Food Administrator and transferring the functions of the Secretary of Agriculture to the War Food Administrator, thus evading the plain directive of the Congress. That is the root of the whole trouble.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, from the farmers of my district—and I have many of them very capable, who produce many tons of food of various varieties—I am told that they have had satisfactory experience with Mexican workers, with the good people we have brought up here from Jamaica, as well as from some of the interstate transferees who have been brought into that general area. Other farmers tell me that some of their experiences have not been too satisfactory. So that perhaps is the natural development because of the contradiction of personalities which sometimes occur in such relationships.

There is one phase of this I am very much interested in, and I should like to ask the chairman in charge of the bill if there is anything in the hearings, which I have not had time to digest thoroughly, with respect to citizens of the United States located in Puerto Rico being brought into this country.

On page 11 of the hearings I find this interesting comment:

To date, we have brought in about 70,000 foreign farm workers. We have transported these and approximately 30,000 interstate workers to meet the needs that could not be met through local mobilization. Foreign laborers included Mexicans, Bahamans, and Jamaicans. The Mexicans have been used primarily on the west coast and States west of the Mississippi. The Bahamans and Jamaicans have been used primarily on the east coast and in the North Central States.

Mr. Chairman, I raise this question because, as I view the picture ahead of us in the next 10 to 50 years, we will undoubtedly familiarize ourselves and accommodate ourselves to living with

other people than those born and reared here in the United States; and, to save my life, Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why this Congress, year in and year out, appropriates and makes available to the people of Puerto Rico anywhere from twenty-five to fifty million dollars for relief purposes incident to unemployment in Puerto Rico, and at the same time will carry on a program of this type, and fail to bring into this country adult single Puerto Ricans so that they will become better citizens of the United States, and so that their labor can be used in solving some of our shortage in this type of labor. If the chairman of the committee can give me any light on that, I shall be delighted to have him do so.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Speaking off the record, one of the principal considerations in bringing in foreign labor is that we be in a position to send them back as soon as they are through with the job. Always these people from foreign countries coming into America are so pleased with our wages and our standard of living and the conditions under which we live that they want to stay here, and we have to have a strict understanding with the immigration authorities that when they have finished the job and are through with their work they will be returned to the country from which they came. In order to assure that, we have to take every precaution. They are fingerprinted, and so forth. If they are citizens of this country, we cannot send them back, but if they are not citizens of this country we can send them back.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the point I am going to raise.

It appears, Mr. Chairman, that we are here financing approximately $23,000,000 out of a total of $35,000,000 for transportation, subsistence, and housing of the 70,000 or more farm workers which we bring in, including those who are transferred in interstate operations. We should understand, then, that in giving consideration to the protest that might exist in this country against our retaining in the United States Puerto Ricans, citizens of the United States, we are putting up perhaps $2 to only $1 that would be necessary in order to otherwise carry on such a program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 4 additional minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman brings up a question in which I am very much interested, having served on the Insular Affairs Committee for some time. My understanding was that there was an unemployment problem also in the British Bahamas. I was very much concerned with the unemployment and the conditions that exist in Puerto Rico, where we are spending a tremendous amount of money for relief. I, too, asked the question the gentleman from Michigan asked: Why import unemployed people from British Bahama when we have so many of our own people unemployed in Puerto Rico?

Mr. CRAWFORD. And to whom we are sending relief dollars every day.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes. We are spending a tremendous amount of money down there to relieve the unemployment situation. The answer I was given to my question was that these British Jamaicans understood English and speak English while many Puerto Ricans do not understand English. There perhaps would be some danger that the Puerto Ricans may stay around here after they had arrived and we cannot send them back.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am accepting the answer of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations at face value.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I was going to ask the gentleman a question somewhat along the line of the question propounded by the gentleman from Nebraska. That is probably the same answer that most of us get, that is, the Mexicans will have to leave because they are not citizens and the Puerto Ricans may not. That is a sort of tragic answer. Does the gentleman have any facts to present us in reference to what the results of Puerto Rican labor have been from the standpoint of agricultural production and its stability, if brought here?

Mr. CRAWFORD. We have had such little experience in that connection that any observation I may make in answer to that question I would not consider adequate, because of the limited number who have come here and gone into agriculture. Our Government has within the last few months been inducing Puerto Ricans to come to the Atlantic seaboard, New York City, for instance, throwing them off there, and leaving them stranded without any funds with which to make a living or with which to pay their expenses. Still we have this labor shortage situation in connection with our farm people. It runs so contrary in my mind to the philosophy that we have been following here with respect to many other international relations that I just have not any patience with it.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the language on page 8, line 23, stating:

> The term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico—

Indicating that it is a matter of administration. The Food Administrator or the Extension Service, if funds are allotted, may bring in Puerto Ricans with funds provided in this bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think that gives the proper answer to the whole question, because if it is up to the Food Administrator I am just one of those who will ask him why he does not give our citizens, native Puerto Ricans, a chance to participate in the flow of the war billions and help meet the labor shortage in the continental United States, the same as they have given the opportunity to the Bahamans and Jamaicans.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman knows that we have Puerto Rican farmers and Puerto Rican natives who are very good farmers, who know something about agriculture, and who are just as good farmers and laborers as those of Jamaica.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is an agricultural country down there, as I understand it, and these people know how to work.

Mr. STEFAN. They are mighty good workers, too.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not very disturbing to have it publicly announced, for the first time in my hearing at least, that it is a liability to be a citizen of the United States?

Mr. CRAWFORD. It does disturb me, too.

Mr. JUDD. And to be discriminated against if you happen to be one of our citizens?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I call specific attention of my colleagues over on the left from the great State of Missouri who entered into a colloquy when we were first discussing the program that is before us in the pending legislation. I want to pay my respects to the great State of Missouri, not only for having a most fertile ground, but also for producing some very fertile and very efficient and lovable, as well as splendid, Congressmen who represent their districts in a most able manner, even though they are conspicuous by their absence in so doing.

Mr. Chairman, I really took the floor only to pay a compliment to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], for whom I have a great admiration.

Frequently in handling legislation by the departments after it has been passed by the Congress, we find that they have their own interpretations of procedure which sometimes are not always in accord with what the Congress intended. So at this time I ask the chairman who is handling this bill if there is any reason conveyed in the bill or if there is anything to his knowledge that it is not the intent of the Congress to have any imported labor that is designated within the bill imported not for agricultural purposes? It is the intent and purpose of the Congress at this time as conveyed in this bill to have that privilege exercised; is that right?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The one and only purpose of the bill is to provide sufficient farm labor to produce the necessary food required in this national emergency.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I want to thank the chairman, and I will address myself now to the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations and repeat the same

question to him: Was that the intent of the Congress?

Mr. TABER. The intent of the committee was that there should be more money spent for bringing laborers in from the outside and less money spent on the flunkies who have been monkeying around with ball games and entertainments. What we want is laborers brought in here and that is what we have tried to provide, and get rid of the flunkies.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman from California and all members of the California delegation are very proud of their State. The gentleman has made a few references to his own State and to the State of Missouri. I would like to make an observation in order to make a correction for fear perhaps that people who are listening to the gentleman from California may be mistaken as to where the best agricultural country in the United States is located. May I tell my friend that the richest 100 square miles in the world, agriculturally speaking, is located in the State of Nebraska and in the Third Congressional District of that great State, which I have the honor to represent in Congress, and if the gentleman from California will look up the record he will find that Nebraska is the white spot of the United States. We have no bonded indebtedness; we pay as we go.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I want to say to the gentleman from Nebraska that I want to pay my compliments for being able to learn from him of the prolific type of soil and also for the splendid manner in which he produces the sunflower.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to say a few words on the subject of farm labor. I wish to read into the RECORD part of a letter that I received from the Shade Tobacco Growers Agricultural Association of the State of Connecticut, referring to the way this program worked out in the State of Connecticut and what a tremendous help it was this past summer. This letter refers to the Jamaican labor brought in under this program. We had 781 Jamaicans in Hartford County working mostly on tobacco and the potato crop, although some worked on poultry and some on beef raising and on dairy farms. I quote from the letter as follows:

> These men started their working season at 45 cents an hour for regular farm labor and 50 cents an hour for farm specialty work. They ended the season getting 55 cents an hour for regular farm labor and 60 cents for farm specialty work. The leaders were paid on the basis of 55 cents per hour plus $2 a week leader fee. The raise in pay was not due to the men's request, but was due to a voluntary increase on the part of the farmers employing them.

When the farmers voluntarily, in the middle of the season, decide to increase their pay, we have ample evidence that their labor was satisfactory.

I quote further, as follows:

> We found these men to be good, average farm labor, performing their tasks to the best of their ability and doing their work cheerfully. The men in general were polite, obedient, and were willing to work from dawn to dark if necessary. Their willingness to do overtime work was one of their outstanding qualifications. These men participated in and actually furnished the base labor for the production of approximately 4,220 acres of shade tobacco, worth $5,908,000, and approximately 1,000 acres of potatoes, worth $437,500. They also furnished miscellaneous labor for dairy, poultry, and beef raising.
>
> Four hundred of the Jamaicans went to work on the potato harvest, successfully harvesting 3,800 acres of potatoes.
>
> Every Jamaican, excluding illness, was employed better than 95 percent of the working days from the time they arrived in Connecticut until October 15, which we considered the end of the season.
>
> I think that I can safely state that Connecticut's crop of shade tobacco and potatoes would not have been harvested if it were not for the Jamaicans.
>
> We sincerely hope that this labor will be imported by the War Food Administration another year and the Shade Tobacco Growers Agricultural Association will wish to employ approximately 2,000 of these men.

This letter is signed by Ralph Lasbury, Jr., secretary of the association.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, the gentleman has pointed out very correctly that people who have been trained to work as they are trained in the West Indies, not only Jamaicans and Bahamans and Cubans and Puerto Ricans and San Domingans and people from Martinique and other places, when they come to the United States they still know how to work, they are willing to work, they are trained agriculturalists from sunup until sundown. That is a natural thing to occur, as the gentleman has just pointed out. I think it can be truthfully said of all the agricultural workers in that general area.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I visited all the camps we had in Connecticut during the summer recess. I was impressed by the steady way in which they kept to their task. I would like to ask one question of the chairman the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. On page 8, section 5, subsection (b) which reads—

> Any payment made by the United States or other public or private agencies or employers to aliens brought into the United States under this act shall not be subject to deductions or withholdings under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Does that mean these men pay no income tax on the pay that they receive?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We had an understanding with this labor when it was brought in that they should receive a certain approximate wage. Then when they found they were to be subject to tax which had not been anticipated and which thereby reduced their pay, and, of course, their stay in the country was very short and there would be no opportunity for reimbursement, it was found necessary to incorporate a provision of this sort in order to be able to carry out meticulously with them the agreement that we made with them and with their government.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I want to say I am not opposed to the provision, but I just wanted to be sure that that was the real intent.

I do not want to close without saying a word about the men with whom I have dealt who were handling this program last year.

In the early part of the season they felt their way along. I had numerous conferences with them and I found these men particularly cooperative and particularly anxious to do a good job, and I think they succeeded. For that reason I feel it is a mistake to now put this program under the Extension Service. I realize that an amendment to leave this program where it is now would be defeated and I will not offer such an amendment. If the Extension Service can do a good job any place they will do it in Connecticut. We have a very excellent Extension Service staff in Connecticut and I am confident that they will cooperate with our farmers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, the first bill introduced by me on coming to Congress was one seeking to compel freight-rate equalization and the removal of discriminatory freight-rate differentials long existing throughout the country. Such a bill has been introduced by me during each session I have been in the Congress. For this purpose on December 3 I introduced H. R. 3775, a bill which seeks to compel within a stated time the establishment of uniform class rates. I was assisted in the drawing of this bill by the Board of Investigation and Research created by the Congress some 2 years ago for the study of the transportation problems of the country.

This nonpartisan board of experts created by the Congress, as well as all other nonpartisan experts who have studied this question, agree that there is no reasonable basis for the discriminatory freight-rate differentials now existing between the different freight zones into which the country has been arbitrarily divided. There is no reason why freight rates on one side of an imaginary line should be from 25 to 75 percent higher than they are on the other side of such line. These artificial traffic barriers have long retarded and handicapped the industrial development of all sections of the country except the eastern or official zone.

The five freight-rate zones into which the country is divided and the rates within those zones are roughly as follows:

First. The eastern or official zone is the States east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio River; this being the official zone we start here with 100 in this zone as the base rate or yardstick.

Second. We have the southern zone, which is the States east of the Mississippi and south of the Ohio Rivers, rate 139.

Third. The western trunk-line zone, which includes States north of Oklahoma and Arkansas, west of the Mississippi River, and east of Montana and the middle of Wyoming and Colorado, rate 147.

Fourth. We have the southwestern zone composed of Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, and a portion of New Mexico, rate 175.

Fifth, and last, we have the mountain-Pacific zone, including those States west of the last two zones mentioned above, rate 171. Thus you see the rates are highest in the southwestern States. In these States the rates average 75 percent higher than in the northeastern States of the official zone.

Now let us consider some specific rate cases to show how this affects Texas. To ship cotton clothing from New York to Peoria, Ill., a distance of 988 miles, the cost is $1.25 per 100 pounds, while to ship the same goods from Wichita Falls, Tex., to Peoria, a distance of 980 miles, the cost is $2.11 per 100 pounds. To ship refrigerators in carload lots from Pittsburgh, Pa., to Cairo, Ill., a distance of 640 miles, the cost is $140.40, while to ship the same refrigerators from Fort Worth, Tex., to Cairo, Ill., a distance of 630 miles, the cost is $176.40. To ship a carload of cotton piece goods from Boston, Mass., to St. Louis, Mo., a distance of 1,074 miles, the cost is $254.40, while to ship the same goods from Dallas, Tex., to Columbus, Ohio, a distance of 1,039 miles, the cost is $351.60.

In 1895 the House of Representatives passed a resolution demanding freight rate equalization. Some years later the Senate passed a bill demanding freight rate equalization. In 1919 the Director General of the Railroads appointed a board for this purpose. In almost every session of Congress since the creation of the I. C. C. numerous bills and resolutions have been introduced demanding freight-rate equalization. Each time some definite action is about to take place the railroads have begged off or promised correction, but nothing has been done.

Mr. Chairman, this situation has grown worse. In 1935 motor carriers were placed under the I. C. C. In 1940 water carriers were placed under the I. C. C. Whatever benefit the public might have expected to get from competition as between these modes of transportation now appears to be lost. The railroads are now trying to eliminate water competition. Furthermore, they have been upheld in their power to do this, first by the I. C. C. and then by a decision of the Supreme Court rendered on this June 14 in the case of the I. C. C., B. & O. Ry. Co. et al., appellants, against Inland Waterways Corporation et al. Not only do the railroads now dominate motor traffic and water traffic but they are reaching out for control of air traffic from which we are expecting so much after the war.

Mr. Chairman, the gross freight rate discriminations existing in this country cannot be justified by the cost of freight movement, or by the volume of freight movement, or by the density of traffic, or by vested interests, or upon any other basis. All the old arguments heretofore used by those resisting freight-rate adjustment have been exploded by scientific study and research. It is now admitted that road maintenance and the cost of moving traffic are, in fact, less in some of the higher-cost zones.

Those insisting on freight rate equalization are not necessarily asking that rates be lowered. They are insisting the rates be equalized, which can be done by raising freight rates in the lower zones as well as by reducing them in the higher zones.

Under existing freight rate discriminations it is easy to understand why the Northeastern States have continued to enjoy vastly superior industrial development. Such industrial development as my section of the country may have enjoyed has been in spite of these freight rate inequalities. Such inequalities are doubtless to some extent responsible for the location of more than 80 percent of all war industry within the so-called official zone, that small group of States lying east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio Rivers.

Mr. Chairman, the railroads are not to be as severely condemned for this situation as are the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Congress of the United States. The Interstate Commerce Commission contends it lacks authority to equalize these discriminatory freight rate differentials. When an agency of the Government fails, refuses, or is unable to remove abuses of the public interest within its field of operations, it is then obligatory upon the Congress to act. Such appears to be the case in this matter of interterritorial freight-rate differentials. The Congress should enact legislation charging the Interstate Commerce Commission with the specific duty of equalizing interterritorial freight class rates.

The industrial Northeast, which has long benefited from this unfair rate advantage, is, of course, fighting any and all proposals to equalize freight rates. For some strange reason they have been joined in this fight by the United States Chamber of Commerce. They have also been joined by a great many industries in our section of the country who are wrongly told they will lose their commodity rate advantages if freight rate equalization is effected. H. R. 3775 and most of the bills pending before this Congress do not propose any disturbance in commodity rates, but are simply asking for equalization in class rates as between existing zones.

H. R. 3775 does not purport to cure all transportation evils. It does not touch the exceedingly bad formula used by the I. C. C. to increase freight rates. When the I. C. C. increases all rates by a fixed percent, as it is now threatening to do, it increases rather than decreases freight-rate inequality. Again H. R. 3775 does not disturb export rates wherein, generally speaking, industrial commodities are given an unfair advantage over agricultural commodities.

Mr. Chairman, the people of the Southwest have suffered too long and too much from these unfair, unequal transportation rates. There is no reason why one section of this country should be permitted to legally steal from another section. It has always been the function and duty of Government to write the rules of fair play. An outraged sense of justice now demands that action be taken by this Congress to remove old wrongs and to prevent new ones. In this, as well as in some other matters, we need a good neighbor policy here at home.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] such time as he may require.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, in the first place I want to say that I would not do anything in the world that could be construed in the remotest way as a repudiation of Judge Marvin Jones. I esteem him too highly for that. He is doing a splendid job in a most difficult position. The Members of this House know him and have unlimited confidence in him. We know that under any conceivable set-up he is going to administer this service efficiently and successfully.

But after all it is for the Congress to lay down the law and there is certainly no intended reflection on Judge Jones when the Congress decides that it wishes to give over-all authority in the matter of farm labor recruitment to the Extension Service, especially when it is stated in the specific language of the bill before us that the complete and supreme authority in the matter of farm labor recruitment is vested in the War Food Administrator.

It is true that Judge Jones in the hearings before our subcommittee expressed a preference that the existing two-headed system should be maintained, but with equal alacrity he stated that it was a problem for Congress and that he would cheerfully administer any system that Congress might devise, which we know he will. To use his own language I quote from his testimony on page 276 of the hearings:

Of course—

He said—

we are going to use whatever instruments are furnished to us by Congress and you gentlemen have the determination of that.

Two arguments may be made for the plan of farm labor recruitment provided in this bill:

First. It will make for efficiency.

Second. It will make for economy.

Under the new and simplified plan, one agency—the Farm Extension Service—will take over all responsibility for farm-labor recruitment. The recruitment within States will be through the

existing State extension services. The recruitment of labor in foreign countries and the transportation and assignment of foreign laborers to jobs in this country will be under the direct charge of the National Director of the Extension Service. It will all be under the Extension Service. Thus will be eliminated the overlapping, waste, red tape, and extravagances inherent in two separate organizations occupying the same field.

The reorganization that will be required within the Extension Service will be very slight, involving the establishment of one small unit in the Washington bureau. On this point, M. C. Wilson, the Deputy Director of Extension, gave our subcommittee some definite information which is found on page 288 of the hearings, as follows:

It would be preferable, under normal circumstances, that foreign labor be handled by some agency other than Extension. However, these are not normal times. The Nation is at war.

If the Congress wants the Extension Service to handle foreign labor as well as domestic agricultural labor, the Extension Service will accept willingly the added assignment and do the best job it possibly can.

To handle foreign labor will involve the establishment of a special unit in the Federal Extension Service to handle the relationships with foreign governments and manage the transportation of foreign workers.

If a special unit is set up in the Federal Extension Service, better coordination of the interstate and foreign program with the intrastate program would probably result. Since the State extension services are part of the State agricultural colleges or universities, as the case may be, it will, of course, be necessary for the State extension directors to clear the matter of added responsibilities for foreign labor with their respective boards of regents or trustees.

An impressive presentation of the need of bringing all farm labor recruitment activities under one head was given to our subcommittee by Mr. P. O. Davis, director of the extension service in Alabama. I quote his views, found on page 268 of the hearings, as follows:

Our experience in Alabama—and I'm speaking only for my own State—is that one agency should handle the entire farm labor program.

We have had good cooperation all the way through, but there is too much procedure—too many steps to go through. In an application for soldiers to help harvest peanuts we had to go through the county office, then through my office, then an office in Montgomery, and two offices in Atlanta before it was finally ready for Washington, where three offices had to act. In other words, a total of eight offices, which, I believe, is too much for a job of that kind—certainly under war conditions.

I want to emphasize, therefore, that one agency should handle this. I do this based upon experience we have had during the last half of 1943.

Estimates of the savings that will be accomplished by this reorganization vary from a low of $2,000,000 to a high of ten million. Mr. Wilson, the deputy director of extension, expressed the conservative view that "there would be perhaps between two and three million dollars' savings." W. R. Ogg, representing the American Farm Bureau Federation, told our subcommittee, at page 274 of the hearings:

I believe that in a reasonable time we could show you there would be a very substantial saving, possibly in an amount somewhere in between $5,000,000 and $10,000,000.

From the standpoint, therefore, of both increased efficiency and economy, I believe this is a wise measure, especially advisable at this time when economy in government is so imperative, and I hope the bill will pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, because of the position I took in the subcommittee opposing the changes made in the farm-labor program, House Joint Resolution 208, now being considered by the House, I desire to quote the following language from the report:

Food requirements for the calendar year 1944 for the prosecution of the war by the United Nations and for the temporary relief of liberated people of occupied countries are estimated to be in excess of the needs of the calendar year of 1943, the peak year of all time for production in the United States.

On page 2, it says:

In response to an inquiry as to needs at home and abroad in 1944, both as to character and amount of food, the War Food Administrator responded, "The needs will be tremendous—for the year as a whole we may reasonably expect that more food will be needed for our armed forces."

Then again on page 4:

The committee was advised during the course of the hearings that no substantial losses of food crops during 1943 have been directly attributed to lack of harvest labor.

That last statement is a compliment to the system now in vogue and certainly calls for no change in the program.

On page 278 of the hearings, Judge Jones, our own Marvin Jones, said:

The other witnesses who are familiar with the budgetary details will furnish you information regarding the reduction in expenses which it is claimed would result from the change. In any event, I believe it would be unwise to place obligations on the extension services. The proposal represents a radical departure from the type of work which they have successfully carried on, and which I would like to see preserved through the years.

I have already pointed out some of the difficulties and complications that are involved. County agents are overworked at the present time, and I do not see the wisdom of adding new duties, which are outside their usual line of work, especially when the present plan is working fairly well.

That is a strong statement. Now, however, ladies and gentlemen, we are changing it, remember that.

Judge Jones continued:

The county agents have been doing a fine job in recruiting and placing labor in local areas with which they are familiar and, of course, we want them to continue that work.

Mr. WOODRUM. That is about your answer to all these inquiries, is it not, Judge Jones?

Mr. JONES. In this particular thing?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. JONES. Yes. I would not undertake to change this whole thing. I think a fine job is being done, generally speaking. Some mistakes have been made.

Again he said in answer to an inquiry by Mr. O'NEAL:

Yes; I would prefer to continue as at present. I would not say it is necessarily a better method but it has proven to be successful and I would not take a chance on a change. I still think the Extension Service can do nearly anything they undertake, but I think it would be unfortunate if they had to go out and build the organization to do it at this time.

I hoped all along that we would have followed the advice of Judge Jones, that former colleague of ours in the House, familiar to the last detail with agricultural matters. I know that our distinguished chairman, with whom it is very difficult for me to differ, has his views on this matter. But we are talking about food in wartime. The lack of it could be disastrous and chaos result if we bungle the program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST].

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, as I read and study this bill, I think it will not do much good to my own particular State.

For example, on page 55 of the report, it is found that there were introduced into my State from the outside a grand total of 28 workers for the year ending October 31, 1943. Twenty-eight workers. It will cost my State probably $600,000.

In addition to that, however, there are some recompenses, as shown by the preliminary estimate, whereby we will get perhaps 250,000 next year, and as shown on page 38, and again on page 68, we are destined to get a little more money.

If the farmers of this country want this bill, I am not going to vote against it. I have always voted for everything that the farmers want. I understand that most of them do want it. But I wish to say that the discrimination made against my State is important to me, especially in view of the fact that within a half hour or an hour, we are going to get the tariff bill, which puts corn on the free list. That is what is going to happen. Heretofore, you voted for that bill. That bill has passed because the time has come when Republicans and Democrats would like to have some cheap grain.

Now, this is not going to do much good, but I am not going to seriously object to it. I think it will pass, anyway, and I might as well accept it along with free trade, which I hope the Republicans and Democrats will support for ever and ever and ever, world without end. Amen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me there is a great deal of misapprehension about this bill. I think it can

be clarified without a lot of involved discussion.

The legislative history is rather fortuitous and I think rather interesting. When this bill came from the deficiency subcommittee and was considered by the full committee, I offered an amendment to put this particular function of recruiting foreign labor in the Federal Office of Extension. After 2 roll calls in committee, it finally carried by a vote of 16 to 15. Thereafter a motion was made to recommit the bill to committee. When it was re-reported it came in this form, and carried out the idea that I had in mind.

Now, it seems to me there is a great deal of misinformation as to what this will do. In the first place, this does not take jurisdiction away from Marvin Jones. You need only read the first section, and you will find that the $27,000,000 is appropriated to the War Food Administrator. In both versions of the bill, as first reported and as reported the second time, $17,500,000 was mandated for distribution among the States. So, resolutions 205 and 208 do not differ in that respect at all.

The original bill then said that the rest of the money could be apportioned by the Administrator. The pending bill says that the money shall be apportioned to the Federal Office of Extension for the purpose of handling the recruitment of foreign labor. It is substituting one office for another, but it does this: It certainly puts the entire function in a single Federal agency, namely, Extension. They will handle the intrastate recruitment of workers, through the State and local offices. They will also handle the foreign recruitment of workers, whether all year round or seasonal or for any other purpose, through the office in Washington.

Mr. Wilson on page 288 of the hearings had this to say:

> If a special unit is set up in the Federal Extension Service, better coordination of the interstate and foreign program with the intrastate program would probably result.

Moreover, in my judgment it will be a great deal cheaper. Consequently the original amount was reduced from $31,100,000 plus unexpended balances to $27,000,000, plus unexpended balances.

Mr. Jones still has authority to make foreign agreements. He still has authority to make a deal with the States with reference to labor-camp facilities. He still has authority to utilize the services of different agencies of the Government. Would it not be rather interesting, would it not be rather intriguing now, after we mandated him to handle the intrastate labor aspect of this bill, that the Congress should not say to him that the foreign recruitment of labor should also be handled by the same agency of Government for the purpose of getting better recruitment?

So much point is made about the fact that Mr. Jones may have one idea or another as to how it should be done. He has testified that what he wants is a practical solution, and this is a practical solution. But when all is said and done it remains for the Congress to determine and to mandate an agency, rather than for the agency to mandate the peoples' representatives as to the type of policy that shall be carried out.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRIKSEN. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I am curious to know why a portion of this program should be assigned to the Office of Education.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not the Office of Education; the Office of Extension.

Mr. DONDERO. Then the gentleman misspoke himself.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I meant the Office of Extension in Washington, D. C.

Consequenty we are going to get a coordinated program. But let me say this: I think we overemphasize the importance of this program, because the great bulk of the labor is, after all, handled privately and independently. The record will show it, as a matter of fact. In the State of California if you depend entirely upon this, you would still be shy a great many farm workers to carry on the crop function of the State of California. The work herein contemplated will be supplemented by a larger effort on the part of private functioning agencies in finding the labor.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Then you feel that the way this bill is drafted at the present time there will be practically no lost motion in handling foreign labor that may be brought in?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There will be none whatsoever. In addition, this will be more efficient and a more economical way of handling it.

So I want to emphasize that this is, in my judgment, the very best and most efficient and economical approach to this problem that we can take.

One other thing. If you will look at the figures you will find there were about 2,500,000 placements by the State extension service of 1,200,000 different workers. If you will multiply that into the expenditure you will find it costs about $4.50 per capita to take care of those who were recruited within the State.

Then look at the figures for the 100,000-plus who were recruited by the labor office in the War Food Administration, including 70,000 foreign workers, and you will find that, including subsistence and transportation, it cost more than $220 a head. If my figures are correct, it cost slightly over $22,000,000 to perform this recruitment service for 100,154 workers of which more than $14,000,000 was expended for transportation and subsistence. That means that the over-all cost was about $220 per person and comparatively that is rather high. The Federal Office of Extension can do a better job than that at far less cost to the taxpayer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the Clerk may read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of assisting in providing an adequate supply of workers for the production and harvesting of agricultural commodities within the several States, the Administrator shall apportion among the several States, on the basis of need, not more than $17,500,000 of the sum appropriated by section 1 (including apportionments heretofore made) and the sums so apportioned shall be available for payment to such States for expenditure by the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges in such States in accordance with such agreements as may be entered into by the Administrator and such extension services and subject to the supervision of the Administrator. The purposes for which such funds may be expended by such extension services shall include, among other things, (1) the recruiting (including recruitment within the State of recruitment for employment elsewhere), placement (including the placement of workers as tenants or sharecroppers), and training of such workers; (2) transportation (including transportation from State to State and within the State of recruitment for employment elsewhere), supervision, subsistence, protection, health, and medical and burial services, and shelter for such workers and their families and necessary personal property; (3) lease, repair, alteration, and operation of labor supply centers and other necessary facilities and services, including former Civilian Conservation Corps camps, and not to exceed $200,000 for the construction of labor supply centers and other necessary facilities and services (not to exceed $40,000 for any one center); (4) advancing to workers of sums due from employers within the United States who are under contractual obligation to reimburse such extension services for such advances, the repayments from employers for such advances to be credited to the respective funds apportioned to the States; (5) employment of personnel and other administrative expenses; (6) payment to or reimbursement of other public or private agencies or individuals for furnishing services or facilities for such purposes; and (7) rendering assistance with respect to the deferment of agricultural labor, including among other things of information on the contribution that individuals subject to selective service are making to agricultural production. Such extension services may enter into agreements with other public and private agencies and individuals and utilize the facilities and services of such agencies and individuals in carrying out the purposes of this section.

(b) The Administrator shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury, from time to time, the amounts to be paid to each State under this section and the time or times such amounts are to be paid; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the State, at the time or times fixed by the Administrator, the amounts so certified.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see a bill under consideration that at least attempts to solve the farm-labor situation. I am not entirely satisfied with this measure but it is at least an effort or an attempt on the part of the House to see what can be done to meet the terrible dearth of farm labor which is prevalent throughout the entire Nation.

When I say that 1 dairy farmer in up-State New York can do more work in 1 day than 10 Mexicans can in a month that statement is not made disparagingly of the Mexicans' efforts; it describes the industry, the experience, and the ability of the dairy farmers in up-State New York to surmount the tremendous difficulties which have been placed in their way. They have been deprived of farm labor, of the natural law of supply and demand, due to bureaucratic regulation, and of everything else which, as Americans, they have been accustomed to work with. As a result the number of auction sales in my district alone attest that they have done everything within their power as they go along trying to keep their heads above water and to maintain private enterprise and individual initiative qualities so sorely missed at this time.

In discussing this important subject of farm labor I wonder if I might probe a bit into the future to examine what is going to happen to the 12,000,000 servicemen who will be mustered out at the close of this war. I assume that about two and a half million men will be kept in the standing Army as far as we know at the present time. That will leave nine and one-half million who will come back to take their places again in their communities where they lived before the war. That means nine and one-half million patriotic Americans feeling they deserve a place in the sun in the post-war pursuits which are bound to expand and to open up to every citizen of the United States if an intelligent approach is made to this colossal problem. It is the duty of Congress to provide ways and means by which the soldier can return to the farm and give him an opportunity of acquiring his rood of ground and maintaining that individual initiative which has contributed to the greatness of American agriculture ever since this country began. I believe that we owe it to the returning soldiers to formulate a plan in agriculture whereby they may be able to own and maintain their little farms. I sincerely hope they will not be faced with the danger of being swallowed up either by a government which—God forbid that it ever happen in this country—seeks to place them on the land as a serf, or by some large entrepreneur who keeps buying up land to the extent that he reduces the owners of small farms to the same status they would be reduced to if the Government took over all the farms. I maintain it is necessary to consider this problem and I hope the House will do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

By unanimous consent the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXPENDITURE OF OTHER FUNDS

SEC. 3. (a) The funds appropriated by section 1 and not apportioned by the Administrator among the several States pursuant to section 2 shall be allotted by the Administrator to the Office of Extension, War Food Administration, for expenditures, of which not to exceed $200,000 shall be available for administrative expenses in the District of Columbia. The purposes for which such funds may be expended shall include, among other things, (1) the recruiting and transportation of foreign workers and their families and necessary personal property, within the United States and elsewhere; (2) furnishing, by loans or otherwise, of health and medical and burial services, training, subsistence, allowances, protection, and shelter for such workers and their families, while en route, including the furnishing of health and medical services to agricultural workers and their families housed in any labor supply center operated as a part of this program; (3) advancing to workers of sums due from employers within the United States who are under contractual obligation to reimburse the United States for such advances, the repayments from employers for such advances to be credited to the funds available to the Administrator; (4) payments in lieu of taxes on labor supply centers in accordance with the procedure set forth in the act of June 29, 1936 (40 U. S. C. 432); (5) determination and payment of claims (not exceeding $50 in any one case) of workers recruited in foreign countries (a) who, in prepartion for transportation to or from the United States and subsequent failure of such transportation, have suffered losses, or (b) who have been transported to the United States and during said transportation, including embarkation and debarkation, have suffered the loss of or damage to personal effects; and (6) operating personnel and expenses to carry out the above purposes.

(b) The Administrator may allocate to any State, in the manner provided in section 2, from the amount made available by this section, such funds for labor supply centers and other necessary services and facilities and for the feeding of workers in such centers, as in his judgment may be more advantageously applied by such State for the Federal Government than by direct expenditure by the War Food Administration. He is also authorized, in connection with the purposes of this subsection, to loan to any State any labor supply center and the facilities and equipment thereof, owned by the United States, under such terms and conditions as he may specify.

(c) Not more than $200,000 of the combined sum of the appropriation in Public Law 45, Seventy-eighth Congress, and the direct appropriation in section 1 hereof shall be available for obligation during the calendar year 1944 for administrative expenses of the Administrator under such Public Law 45 and this act, including (1) the employment of persons and organizations, by contract or otherwise, at the seat of government and elsewhere; (2) purchase, exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles; (3) printing and binding; (4) travel expenses of persons employed in administrative, supervisory, or facilitating capacities within a foreign country or from a foreign country to the United States and return, including such expenses to first-duty stations; and (5) payment to or reimbursement of other agencies or individuals for administrative expenses incurred by them.

(d) For the purpose of this act, the Administrator is authorized—

(1) to utilize the facilities, services, and personnel of units and agencies within the Department of Agriculture; to enter into agreements with other public or private agencies or individuals; to utilize (pursuant to such agreements) the facilities and services of such agencies and individuals and to delegate to them functions under this joint resolution; and to allocate or transfer funds to (in addition to the transfers authorized by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Acts for the fiscal years 1944 and 1945), or otherwise to pay or reimburse such units, agencies, and individuals for expenses in connection therewith;

(2) to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services; and

(3) to cooperate with the Secretary of State in the negotiation or renegotiation of agreements with foreign governments relating to the importation of workers into the United States.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that on page 4, in lines 9 and 10, the word "expenditures" may be corrected to read "expenditure."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

LIMITATIONS

SEC. 4. (a) No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside of such county without the prior consent in writing of the county extension agent of such county, if such worker has resided in such county for a period of 1 year or more immediately prior thereto and has been engaged in agricultural labor as his principal occupation during such period.

(b) No part of the funds herein appropriated, or heretofore appropriated or made available to any department or agency of the Government for the recruiting, transportation, or placement of agricultural workers, shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership, with respect to any agricultural labor, except with respect to workers imported into the United States from a foreign country and then only to the extent required to comply with agreements with the government of such foreign country: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent the expenditure of such funds in connection with the negotiation of agreements with employers of agricultural workers which may provide that prevailing wage rates shall be paid for particular crops and areas involved and that shelter shall be provided for such workers.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of interrogating the chairman of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, does the language on page 8 and following mean that if Puerto Rican laborers are brought in here from Puerto Rico, where they do have organized union workers in agriculture, that after arriving here these funds could be used by those in charge of the administration of this act for the purpose of organizing the farm workers?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is no possibility of using any part of the funds for any purpose other than those designated in the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. There is an absolute prohibition against the use of the funds

in the bill for anything of that character. The Puerto Ricans would not be brought in or imported from a foreign country if they were brought in; they are defined specifically by the language at the bottom of that page as a State.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That refers to workers from a foreign country. Puerto Rico, of course, is not a foreign country.

Mr. TABER. In other words, Puerto Rico would not be within the exception; and I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that other foreign countries with which we have an agreement for the importation of these laborers have specifically required our State Department to agree that these people shall join no organizations. That has been done by the foreign countries, and we have no control over them.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There are no funds in the bill that can be used for any purpose except that of recruitment and placement of labor.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, those are the answers to the questions I desired to have answered.

By unanimous consent the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 5. (a) Funds appropriated by this act may be expended without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

(b) Any payments made by the United States or other public or private agencies or employers to aliens brought into the United States under this act shall not be subject to deduction or withholding under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

(c) For the purpose of this act—

(1) the term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico;

(2) the term "worker" includes nationals of the United States and aliens;

(3) the term "agricultural labor" includes any services or activities included within the provisions of section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 or section 1426 (h) of the Internal Revenue Code.

(d) Effective July 1, 1943, notwithstanding section 3 of the act of June 29, 1936 (U. S. C., title 40, sec. 433), receipts derived for the account of the United States from the use and occupancy of agricultural labor supply centers, including camps and facilities heretofore used by or under the control of the Farm Security Administration, shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided*, That all receipts derived from the furnishing of subsistence to workers shall be credited to the appropriation in section 1 and be available for expenditure by the Administrator for the replenishment of subsistence supplies and for expenses incident to the furnishing of such subsistence.

(e) The former Civilian Conservation Corps camps shall be transferred without charge to the Administrator, to the extent that he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That no such camp which is being utilized by any other agency of the Government, or which has been transferred to any State, county, municipality, or nonprofit organization, shall be transferred to the Administrator under this subsection without the consent of such agency, State, county, municipality, or organization.

(f) Notwithstanding provisions of title I of the Social Security Act, as amended (relating to grants to States for old-age assistance), and of appropriations for payments thereunder, in any case in which any State pays old-age assistance to any individual at a rate not in excess of the rate of old-age assistance paid to such individual during the month of July 1943, any failure to take into consideration any income and resources of such individual arising from agricultural labor performed by him as an employee, or from labor otherwise performed by him in connection with the raising or harvesting of agricultural commodities, after the date of enactment of this act and prior to the seventh calendar month occurring after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President shall not be a basis of excluding payments made to such individual in computing payments made to States under section 3 of such title, of refusing to approve a State plan under section 2 of such title, or of withholding certification pursuant to section 4 of such title.

(g) In order to facilitate the employment by agricultural employers in the United States of native-born residents of North America, South America, and Central America, and the islands adjacent thereto, desiring to perform agricultural labor in the United States, during continuation of hostilities in the present war, any such resident desiring to enter the United States for that purpose shall be exempt from the payment of head tax required by section 2 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, and from other admission charges, and shall be exempt from those excluding provisions of section 3 of such act which relate to contract laborers, the requirements of literacy, and the payment of passage by corporations, foreign government, or others; and any such resident shall be admitted to perform agricultural labor in the United States for such time and under such conditions (but not including the exaction of bond to insure ultimate departure from the United States) as may be required by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with the approval of the Attorney General; and in the event such regulations require documentary evidence of the country of birth of any such resident which he is unable to furnish, such requirement may be waived by the admitting officer of the United States at the point where such resident seeks entry into the United States if such official has other proof satisfactory to him that such resident is a native of the country claimed as his birthplace. Each such resident shall be provided with an identification card (with his photograph and fingerprints) to be prescribed under such regulations which shall be in lieu of all other documentary requirements, including the registration at time of entry or after entry required by the Alien Registration Act of 1940. Any such resident admitted under the foregoing provisions who fails to maintain the status for which he was admitted or to depart from the United States in accordance with the terms of his admission shall be taken into custody under a warrant issued by the Attorney General at any time after entry and deported in accordance with section 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917. Sections 5 and 6 of such act shall not apply to the importation of aliens under this act. No provision of this act shall authorize the admission into the United States of any enemy alien.

(h) When authorized by the Administrator, workers under the program may be used in the packing, canning, freezing, drying, or other processing of perishable or seasonal fruits and vegetables.

(i) This act shall take effect upon the date of its enactment into law and shall thereupon supersede the act of April 29, 1943 (Public Law 45), to the extent that such act is inconsistent with this act.

(j) This act may be cited as the "Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 12, after line 17, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"*Provided further*, That notwithstanding any provisions to the contrary in the act approved July 12, 1943 (Public Law 132), funds available to the War Manpower Commission for the current migration of Mexican or Canadian nationals under the auspices of the War Manpower Commission for industrial and railroad purposes essential to the war effort, may continue to be expended during the fiscal year 1944."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, so that the House may understand this amendment, there is $140,000 that has been allocated out of the President's funds to the War Manpower Commission to permit them to promote the migration of Canadian and Mexican workers into the United States temporarily in a similar manner to the manner in which they are being brought in here for work upon the railroads in this country. It has been used quite successfully and we would like to have it continued, especially in view of the fact that the paragraph relating to the importation of Puerto Rican laborers was cut out of the deficiency bill that was up here yesterday.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York and I have conferred on this amendment, and it is entirely acceptable to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the subsection numbers on page 12 (i) and (j) be changed to (j) and (k), respectively.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMASON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 208) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1944, had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the bill and also to extend my own remarks that I made today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 171. Joint resolution to permit the importation from foreign countries free of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GEORGE, Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, and Mr. VANDENBERG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3598) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 12, and 38 to the foregoing bill; further insists upon its amendments numbered 8, 12, 13, 20, 22, 23, 26, 37, 38, 39, 49, 94, and 96 to said bill disagreed to by the House, agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 103. Joint resolution continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 2207) entitled "An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MALONEY, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. BALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONTINUING THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION AS AN AGENCY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 103 under the general rules of the House, and that there may be 30 minutes' general debate, to be divided equally between the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] and myself.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 103, extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 103, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is recognized for 15 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, due to the fact that printed copies are not available, would it be in order to ask unanimous consent to read the entire resolution for the information of the House?

The CHAIRMAN. It would. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103), as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the first sentence of section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "December 31, 1943" and inserting in lieu thereof "February 29, 1944."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution merely continues the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation from January 1 until February 29, 1944. It makes no change in the existing law. If this resolution is not passed by the end of this year, the Commodity Credit Corporation dies by expiration of the time for which it was created.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has been a useful agency. I think every Member of this House who represents an agricultural district knows of the services it has rendered to the people. It has not resorted to artificial devices, but has gone into the market and operated under the fundamental and economic law of supply and demand. It has given to the farmer a price and a market place for his product that he otherwise would not have had and certainly no one here wants to see that useful organization die.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand that the gentleman is agreeable to accepting an amendment which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] is to offer which would limit the extension to February 5. Is that true?

Mr. SPENCE. I have not really considered that. May I say that the Senate has had charge of this bill. The Senate says it will take 60 days to perfect the legislation. It seems to me the Senate is the judge as to what time it will take to consider legislation that has been heretofore passed by the House. I do know what effect the continuation of 30 days would have. It will mean a shortening of the vacation.

The time the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation is continued is up to the House. The Senate has said it needs 60 days. My great interest is in seeing that the Commodity Credit Corporation is kept alive.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman. The reason I am interrupting him is I thought, if he would agree to the amendment, perhaps we would not need to have so much discussion as if there were a conquest.

Mr. SPENCE. I have not had a chance to discuss this matter with the committee and I do not feel I have the right to agree to it; however, I am not opposing the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

It is up to the House. I am not going to resist it. If the House feels it should be 30 days, it is satisfactory to me. I think it is a question for them to decide.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do I understand now that the time has been limited to 15 minutes on each side?

Mr. SPENCE. That is the agreement.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. LUDLOW. During this period of extension the function of the Corporation will continue as it is going on now?

Mr. SPENCE. There is no change in the existing law at all. It merely continues the Commodity Credit Corporation until February 29, 1944. I may say this resolution, I understand, was passed by the Senate without debate. That certainly would indicate there is nothing controversial in it.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. We might shorten this matter if the gentleman from Kentucky would yield to the gentleman from Texas to offer his amendment unless somebody else wants to take time in the general debate.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has not yet expired.

Mr. GIFFORD. We are entitled to half of the time. I do not want to speak, but I want to make a brief comment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 15 minutes. The gentleman from Kentucky has 15 minutes and he yielded himself 5 minutes which has not yet expired.

Mr. GIFFORD. That is perfectly all right with me.

Mr. KLEBERG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. KLEBERG. The amendment which I have to offer is an amendment changing the date from February 29 to February 5, 1944. In view of the very fair statement the gentleman from Kentucky has made, I have no desire to prolong the debate. The matter has been amply discussed here and over on the other side and so far as I am concerned I will have nothing to say on the amendment whatsoever. The amendment speaks for itself. The time should be ample for the Senate to draft any bill other than a tax bill, as fully informed as they are on it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] this question: The gentleman does, however, propose to submit his amendment changing the date from February 29 to February 5, 1944?

Mr. KLEBERG. I do, as soon as we read the resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD. So that the Committee will have a chance to have debate on it.

Mr. KLEBERG. As soon as the general debate is over.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. It is very necessary that something be done as soon as possible to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation in view of the fact that Mr. Marvin Jones wants to make an announcement of the program to farmers who are producing the war crops and he is very anxious to announce that program as early as possible.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. If the extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation is agreed upon for 60 days, that will not prevent the same argument being made as was made by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], that the legislation should be expedited. But I think it is very necessary we extend the Commodity Credit Corporation for a sufficient lengh of time so as not to jeopardize the life of that Corporation. It must be remembered that there are millions of bales of cotton, which is just one commodity involved in this, and if the support price is taken out from under the Commodity Credit Corporation cotton that is now selling at 20 cents a pound, it probably would not be selling at 10 cents a pound very soon, because there is an enormous surplus of cotton. Foreign countries cannot buy that cotton because there is a lack of ocean transportation and there are many things about it unlike the other war that would cause the price of cotton immediately to slump and probably go down one-half.

Mr. SPENCE. I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky has consumed 6 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to make a brief observation.

We are all agreed on the extension of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I do not expect anyone to vote against it. The question at issue is how long a time we are to allow administration leaders to browbeat us into obedience. Think of the great majority in both branches of this Congress desiring this legislation. But, it is to be a question as to how much time shall be granted to allow those in the extreme minority to urge others to change their votes so that we may lack the two-thirds to finally save the measure? Some of us feel that February 5 is long enough to subject Members to that sort of treatment. You can see what has happened in the last few days in the other body. Great pressure has been brought to bear to postpone to gain time. It is most annoying. If you harp on a thing long enough you will get believers.

In my own district you now have a few converts, because certain commentators favorable to the administration are making some of my people believe in the consumer subsidies. They are trying to frighten our people by misrepresenting the effect of this antisubsidy program. These few are loyally expressing the views of a stubborn administration. We certainly have the arguments against consumer subsidies. We have had the courage to put the bill over. The minority feel that all they need now is time. They desire to annoy us as long as possible, hoping to force enough of us to change our votes. That is the only issue today. We understand it. We desire to be reasonable. We have gone a long way when we agree to extend the time to February 5. We do not think we should allow 60 days for the administrative whiplash to be wielded. I long for the day when sometime again we will have leaders here who will lead us where we decide to go, instead of managers for the administration to drive us. I have said this before. I resent it.

Although the great majority are for this legislation, it will be postponed and the whip used until we lack the two-thirds vote probably necessary. It tempts me to believe that the two-thirds vote should be repealed; that no man should have two votes to my one. In such a matter as this the majority should prevail. But I do not want to scrap the Constitution of the United States. I love it and I like to hold to the old tried methods as long as we can. Wisely used they would still be the best. Again I want to make it emphatic that we are fair on this side, when we compromise on February 5. It is simply a grasp for time and I stigmatize it as such that we may fully understand the situation. Do not drag any red herring across the issue, none of us are opposed to the extension of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Do not take the time now to argue the merits of subsidies. Do not waste further time today in arguing that policy. We have watched some of you "rub the itch of your poor opinion on subsidies until you should have scabs already." We have been highly educated to your point of view and wholly unconvinced. The great majority of both branches of the Congress have spoken and spoken emphatically on this matter. This is simply a dilatory method to gain time for the administration. How long shall we endure these methods: "Quousque tandem abutere, O Imperator, patentia nostra."

Let us speak our own minds by at least February 5. Longer postponement is not justified and the reason it is desired is too transparent. But we will compromise on February 5. I trust I have not injured anybody's feelings by talking plainly, but I think it necessary that the real question here shall not become beclouded.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to say in response to the observation made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], if I understood him correctly, if I understand the position of the War Food Administrator, Mr. Marvin Jones, the announcement of the 1944 food-producing program has been withheld pending action on this subsidy question. And starting in the grand State of California where planting has already begun and moving eastward, it seems to me if we extend this time beyond February 5, we are doing a great injustice to our people whom we expect to get this food production from in 1944. I am not going to take any additional time of the House except to say that so far as I am concerned I am opposed to the February 29

date, and I shall be glad to support the February 5 date.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no further debate the Clerk will read.

The Clerk again read the resolution.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KLEBERG: On page 1, line 6, strike out "February 29, 1944" and insert "February 5, 1944."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. KLEBERG. I yield my time back. The amendment speaks for itself, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and upon a division (demanded by Mr. SPENCE) there were—ayes 103, noes 27.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the resolution back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and the resolution, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker, having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103), directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole House, with the recommendation that the amendment agreed to and the resolution as amended do pass.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

The resolution was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIMINATING PRIVATE SUITS FOR PENALTIES AND DAMAGES ARISING OUT OF FRAUDS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1203) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1203) entitled "An act to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with the following amendments: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment numbered 1, insert "'(A)'" after "SEC. 3491" on page 1, line 6 of the House engrossed bill, and on page 2, line 2, after "'suit.'" strike out the quotation mark and insert the following:

"'(B) Except as hereinafter provided, such suit may be brought and carried on by any person, as well for himself as for the United States; the same shall be at the sole cost and charge of such person, and shall be in the name of the United States, but shall not be withdrawn or discontinued without the consent, in writing, of the judge of the court and the district attorney, first filed in the case, setting forth their reasons for such consent.

"'(C) Whenever any such suit shall be brought by any person under clause (B) notice of the pendency of such suit shall be given to the United States by serving upon the United States attorney for the district in which such suit shall have been brought a copy of the bill of complaint and by sending, by registered mail, to the Attorney General of the United States at Washington, District of Columbia, a copy of such bill together with a disclosure in writing of substantially all evidence and information in his possession material to the effective prosecution of such suit. The United States shall have 60 days, after service as above provided, within which to enter appearance in such suit. If the United States shall fail, or decline in writing to the court, during said period of 60 days to enter any such suit, such person may carry on such suit. If the United States within said period shall enter appearance in such suit the same shall be carried on solely by the United States. In carrying on such suit the United States shall not be bound by any action taken by the person who brought it, and may proceed in all respects as if it were instituting the suit: *Provided*, That if the United States shall fail to carry on such suit with due diligence within a period of six months from the date of its appearance therein, or within such additional time as the court after notice may allow, such suit may be carried on by the person bringing the same in accordance with clause (B) above. The court shall have no jurisdiction to proceed with any such suit brought under clause (B) or pending suit brought under section 3491 of the Revised Statutes whenever it shall be made to appear that such suit was based upon evidence or information in the possession of the United States, or any agency, officer or employee thereof, at the time such suit was brought: *Provided, however*, That no abatement shall be had as to a suit pending at the effective date of this Act if before such suit was filed such person had in his possession and voluntarily disclosed to the Attorney General substantial evidence and information which was not theretofore in the possession of the Department of Justice.

"'(D) In any suit whether or not on appeal pending at the effective date of this Act brought under Revised Statutes, section 3491, the court in which such suit is pending shall stay all further proceedings, and shall forthwith cause written notice, by registered mail, to be given the Attorney General that such suit is pending, and the Attorney General shall have sixty days from the date of such notice to appear and carry on such suit in accordance with clause (C).

"'(E) (1) In any such suit, if carried on by the United States as herein provided, the court may award to the person who brought such suit, out of the proceeds of such suit or any settlement of any claim involved therein, which shall be collected, an amount which in the judgment of the court is fair and reasonable compensation to such person for disclosure of the information or evidence not in the possession of the United States when such suit was brought. Any such award shall in no event exceed one-tenth of the proceeds of such suit or any settlement thereof.

"'(2) In any such suit when not carried on by the United States as herein provided, whether heretofore or hereafter brought, the court may award to the person who brought such suit and prosecuted it to final judgment, or to settlement, as provided in clause (B), out of the proceeds of such suit or any settlement of any claim involved therein, which shall be collected, an amount, not in excess of one-fourth of the proceeds of such suit or any settlement thereof, which in the judgment of the court is fair and reasonable compensation to such person for the collection of any forfeiture and damages; and such person shall be entitled to receive to his own use such reasonable expenses as the court shall find to have been necessarily incurred and all costs the court may award against the defendant, to be allowed and taxed according to any provision of law or rule of court in force, or that shall be in force in suits between private parties in said court: *Provided*, That such person shall be liable for all costs incurred by himself in such case and shall have no claim therefor on the United States.'

"SEC. 2. Section 3493 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 234) is hereby repealed."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same.

Amendments numbered 3 and 4: That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3 and 4.

Amendment to the title: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
CLARENCE E. HANCOCK,
Managers on the part of the House.
FREDERICK VAN NUYS,
PAT MCCARRAN,
JOHN A. DANAHER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1203) entitled "An act to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: The House bill proposed to amend section 3491 of the Revised Statutes to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States. Senate amendment No. 1 would have restored that provision of the law permitting private suits, and together with the other Senate amendments would have limited such suits and

specified the conditions under which they could be maintained.

The conferees have agreed that private suits should be permitted and have followed to some extent the pattern of the Senate amendments. The conferees, however, propose and recommend new provisions in lieu of the Senate amendments. The House recedes from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 1 and agrees to the same with amendments which substitute the new provisions.

PROVISIONS OF SENATE AMENDMENTS

The first Senate amendment would permit private suits to be brought but would require that such suits be based upon information, evidence, or sources not then in the possession of the United States, unless obtained from such person (bringing the suit) by the United States in the course of any investigation by a grand jury, congressional committee, or other public body or before a United States commission, or other proceeding instituted or conducted by it. Also, under amendment No. 1 it would have been necessary prior to commencement of the suit that (1) such person had made full disclosure in writing to the Attorney General of the grounds thereof, and had requested the Attorney General to bring suit, and (2) the Attorney General had thereafter declined in writing to comply with such request, or had allowed 6 months to elapse "without causing a suit to be brought for part or all the relief requested." Also under the amendment provision was made that in the event the Attorney General "takes action," the court could award the person who made the disclosure and request, fair and reasonable compensation for original information, evidence, and sources so disclosed, which was not in the possession of or obtained by the United States in the course of any investigation or proceeding instituted or conducted by it. The amount of the award was to be limited to not exceed one-tenth of the proceeds of suit or any settlement thereof and the award was to be final.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment would have stricken section 2 from the House bill. Section 2 of the House bill proposed to repeal section 3493 of the Revised Statutes (authorizing recovery of one-half the proceeds by the person bringing the suit, and recovery of costs), and proposed to repeal section 3494 of the Revised Statutes (providing that such suits should be commenced within 6 years from the commission of the act). Since the House bill proposed to eliminate private suits the two sections referred to were to have been repealed. However, the Senate amendments, limiting but not eliminating private suits, proposed to leave those sections of the law intact. The House recedes from its disagreement to this Senate amendment. Under the conference agreement, later discussed, it will appear that necessary parts of section 3493 have been incorporated in clause (E) (2).

Amendment No. 3: This amendment of the Senate related to pending suits and would deny jurisdiction to the court of any pending suit which the court would not have jurisdiction of if it were a new suit. It would require the court to stay all further proceedings until the Attorney General shall have had 30 days' opportunity to move to dismiss the case. Jurisdiction would not be denied where the Attorney General should not move to dismiss a pending case. A suit so dismissed could be again filed, upon compliance with the procedure set out in the first Senate amendment, "based on the same act, acts, and transactions involved in the suit previously brought if prior to the previous commencement thereof, the information, evidence, and sources upon which such suit was based were not in the possession of or obtained by the United States in the course of any investigation or proceeding instituted or conducted by it." An extension period of 8 months was provided in the amendment to permit the refiling of a suit previously filed within the limitation period. This amendment of the Senate also provided that the Attorney General might "cause a suit to be brought based in whole or in part upon the act, acts, or transactions involved in such pending suit previously brought by such person either after receipt of such disclosure and request or otherwise; and, if such suit brought by the Attorney General is based in whole or in part upon original information, evidence, or sources furnished or obtained through such pending suit or by the plaintiff in such pending suit, the court may, upon application made by such plaintiff, award to him, out of the proceeds of the suit brought by the Attorney General or any settlement of any claim involved therein, an amount, not in excess of one-tenth of the proceeds or settlement, which in the judgment of the court is fair and reasonable compensation to such plaintiff." The Senate recedes. The matter is covered by the conference proposal.

Amendment No. 4: This amendment of the Senate would make the act inapplicable to any suit filed prior to June 15, 1942, or in which a final judgment had been entered, whether or not the case was on appeal. The Senate recedes. This matter is also covered by the conference proposal.

Amendment to the title: The amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill is appropriate to the matter agreed upon in conference. The House recedes.

PROVISIONS OF THE CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

The matter recommended by the conference as a substitute for Senate amendment No. 1, and which in fact disposes of the subject matter of Senate amendments 2, 3, and 4, provides the following:

(A) redeclares jurisdiction in the courts specified to entertain such suits brought by the United States. This much was in the House bill and was not changed by the Senate amendments; therefore, it is not disturbed by the conference agreement.

(B) redeclares jurisdiction in such courts to entertain such suits brought by private parties. A separation is made between suits by the United States and those by private parties in order to facilitate the treatment of the procedures to be followed.

(C) requires any person filing suit under (B) to serve a copy of the complaint upon the United States attorney for the district where suit is brought and to send to the Attorney General by registered mail a copy of the complaint and a disclosure in writing of substantially all evidence and information in his possession material to the effective prosecution of such suit. The United States is afforded 60 days' time after completion of the service above mentioned within which to enter appearance in the suit. If it declines in writing to the court or fails within such period to enter the suit such person may carry on the suit. If the United States enters appearance in the suit it shall carry on the action alone. In such event, the United States would not be bound by any action taken by the person who brought the suit and could proceed in all respects as if it were instituting the suit. Should the United States fail to carry on the suit with due diligence within a period of 6 months from the date of its appearance, or within such additional time allowed by the court, such suit could be carried on by the person bringing the same in accordance with clause (B).

Jurisdiction is denied to the court to proceed with any suit brought under clause (B) or pending suit brought under section 3491 of the Revised Statutes (private suits) whenever it shall be made to appear that such suit was based upon evidence or information in the possession of the United States, or any agency, officer or employee thereof, at the time such suit was brought.

It will not be possible to abate a pending suit if before such suit was filed such person had in his possession and voluntarily disclosed to the Attorney General substantial evidence and information which was not theretofore in the possession of the Department of Justice.

(D) applies to pending suits, whether or not on appeal, and provides for a stay of all further proceedings, for written notice by registered mail to be given the Attorney General, and that the Attorney General shall have 60 days from the date of such notice to appear and carry on the suit in accordance with clause (C).

(E) (1) provides that in any such suit if carried on by the United States the court may award to the person who brought such suit, from the proceeds collected, fair and reasonable compensation to such person for disclosure of the information or evidence not in the possession of the United States when the suit was brought. The amount of the award is limited to one-tenth of the proceeds.

(E) (2) affects a suit not carried on by the United States, whether heretofore or hereafter brought. It provides that the court may award to the person who brought the suit and prosecuted it to final judgment, or to settlement, as provided in (B), out of the proceeds collected, fair and reasonable compensation to such person not in excess of one-fourth of the proceeds of such suit or any settlement thereof, for the collection of any forfeiture and damages. It also authorizes recovery of such reasonable expenses as the court shall find to have been necessarily incurred and of costs and insures that there shall be no claim for costs against the United States.

Section 2 of the conference agreement provides for the repeal of section 3493 of the Revised Statutes. Relevant parts from that statute are included in (E) (2). The amount authorized to be recovered under that statute, of one-half, has been reduced to "fair and reasonable compensation" with a maximum allowance of one-fourth of the proceeds and reasonable expenses necessarily incurred.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
CLARENCE E. HANCOCK,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, at the time the House, by unanimous consent, repealed entirely the so-called informer's bill, the attention of the committee was not called to the fact that conceivably the chief law enforcement officer of the United States would not proceed against an individual in an appropriate action. When the bill reached the Senate, the Senate provided for that situation, and wrote, not satisfactorily, a bill that would make it possible for the United States to proceed, and at the same time permit individuals, as was the case under the old Informer's Act, to proceed.

The original law was passed back in 1863, at a time when we did not have the F. B. I. and all of the many Government investigating agencies. It was passed for the purpose of making it possible for the United States, in an appropriate action to recover against people who had perpetrated frauds against the United States. Since the enactment of the original legislation, but few actions have been brought until during this war period. Now, the country is literally covered with racketeering suits. As a matter of fact, the latest count that I

had showed 250 cases, in none of which has any service been rendered to the United States.

There has been a contention that there were four actions in which informers brought suits in good faith, and that information was not available to the Department of Justice. As to those, there is some dispute. But if there are any actions brought in good faith by informers, then, under this compromise measure, those informers will have the right to proceed with their actions and recover.

The only effect this legislation would have under the laws under which the action was brought would be that the amount that could be recovered is reduced from 50 percent to 25 percent. In view of the fact that these actions are for huge sums of money, I do not know that that makes much difference.

I will call attention to a few of the 250 or more cases that have been brought and the amounts involved. One $6,000,000; in two, $2,000,000; in three, $2,000,000; in four, $40,000,000; in five, $40,000,000; in six, $100,000 plus $400,000 in penalties; in seven, $2,000,000, and so on.

So we do not think that cutting the amount of the award from 50 to 25 percent is going to work a very great hardship on any one in the event there is a bona fide action.

Now, as to the cases where the United States feels there is no ground for recovery, in those cases the United States may become a party by merely intervening. Then if the United States decides that there is no case and gets out of it the individual may proceed on his own. However, if the United States decides to proceed in any of these cases, then the person who assisted in the recovery may be allowed up to 10 percent of the amount recovered.

In every case that will be brought in the future it will be necessary for the suitor to notify the United States attorney in the district in which the action is to be brought, and the Attorney General, in writing of the material facts which in his judgment form the basis of the suit. If the Attorney General fails to proceed, then the citizen may proceed on his own. It is then his case. He may proceed and recover if he can, and can be compensated for his work.

We feel that by enacting this compromise legislation the United States will be amply protected and at the same time there will not be this ever-present invitation to racketeers to examine indictments, to examine reports of the Truman committee, or if you please, for dishonest and unscrupulous investigators to turn over information to their friends or coconspirators for the purpose of bringing suit against our citizens on information that either comes to them by reading an indictment or a bill of complaint or through testimony before some committee or which comes to them in their official capacity as a representative of the United States.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. What will happen to the suits already filed?

Mr. WALTER. In the suits already filed the United States has a right to intervene. If the United States does not choose to intervene, then the citizen who started the suit may proceed to prosecute the case to a conclusion.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Then as a practical matter, the passing of this bill will interfere with those who have originally filed suit? In other words, it does exactly what some people are attempting to say H. R. 3269 and H. R. 3270 accomplishes, which I deny. But, in these cases the Congress is interfering with the final conclusion of those suits.

Mr. WALTER. I do not know that you call it interfering to break up a racket. It seems to me it is most desirable that the United States step in and protect citizens who are being harassed and annoyed by this scheme that is nothing more nor less than glorified blackmail.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. By the same token I contend that Congress should step in and protect the interests of the citizen on the bill in which the gentleman is so interested.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I might also add that in these cases the informer bringing the suit has not been put to any expense, because they are usually brought on a contingent fee basis. Is not that correct?

Mr. WALTER. I think that is correct. Those people who have been interested in informer suits who appeared before the subcommittee and the conferees, have objected to the 25-percent provision. When we pinned them down to the reason for their objection it was that they felt they ought to get more money for rendering a very doubtful service.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. In many of these informer suits which have been brought is it not a fact, I will ask the gentleman, that some of the men who brought these actions merely went to the court and practically copied the indictment which was then pending and made that the basis of a complaint upon which they based their informer suits to collect a large sum of money?

Mr. WALTER. That is not only the fact, but our attention was called to one case in New Orleans where a lawyer flew from California to New Orleans, got hold of an indictment within hours after it had been returned by the grand jury, used that as the basis for his bill of complaint, and made the mistakes, grammatical and otherwise, that appeared in the indictment that had just been returned.

Mr. SPRINGER. And this particular bill is intended to correct that sort of procedure and stop that sort of racketeering?

Mr. WALTER. Exactly. We have no desire to interfere with suits which are brought honestly and legitimately by informers which the United States were not party to.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS. I should like to call the gentleman's attention also to the case against the Curtiss-Wright Co. filed in the United States District Court of Cincinnati for the Southern District of Ohio where a lawyer flew in from a far-distant place. He had heard about some complaint against that company. He filed a suit for $100,000,000 against the Curtiss-Wright Co. and did it without any information except that which he obtained from Government files, and he rendered no service.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

I should like to add to what the gentleman from Ohio said in that particular case that, as I understand it, the so-called informer secured every bit of information in his bill of complaint from the indictment and thereafter endeavored to subpena the Department of Justice files in order to make out a case on the allegations that he had set forth in his bill of complaint.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. The Judiciary Committee gave a lot of attention to this matter. As one member I am thoroughly convinced that the statute has served a good purpose. It was set up at a time when it was serviceable. But by the same token, the same study, the same information, I am well satisfied that the statute has encouraged and made possible a system of racketeering which should be prevented. I know nothing about the changes made by the conferees, but on the whole I think the statute, if it should not be repealed entirely for the good of the people and the honesty of our people, should at least be amended to prevent a lot of this racketeering.

Mr. WALTER. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that we would not be here today but for the fact that the Supreme Court held it was not necessary to have information in order to bring an informer suit; and the case in which this very tortuous decision, if I may be so presumptuous as to criticize the Supreme Court of the United States, was handed down, was brought in an action where every bit of information in the bill of complaint was adduced at a public hearing and the informer knew absolutely nothing about the facts in the case until after the Government had adduced them.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. There is one element, however, that has not been brought out: That in order for the informer to recover, he must prove that a fraud had been committed by the accused against the Government.

Mr. WALTER. That is correct.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In wartime, when the Government is subjected to all kinds of frauds, I think it is extremely dangerous to weaken those provisions which make possible recovery against fraudulent contracts.

Mr. WALTER. Of course the gentleman from New York must realize that nothing in this bill affects the right of the United States to proceed in respect to fraud under existing law, which permits the United States to proceed not only under the section that is being amended but under other law, is not affected by this report. I agree entirely with what the gentleman says that during wartime there is, of course, fraud that we do not come in contact with ordinarily, but at the same time, and by the same token, there are more people engaged in business who could be subjected to the sort of racketeering that is going on now. For that reason I feel that this bill should be enacted.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. I just want to point out to the gentleman that since the decision he referred to was rendered informer suits have multiplied very rapidly and are continuing to multiply.

The Department of Justice feels that the work of this office is being impaired and interfered with. In this connection I might say that the Attorney General feels that this bill, if passed, will kill about 200 cases pending under the informer statute. At the same time he is opposed to a certain bill in which the gentleman and I are interested, H. R. 3270. I agree that it would interfere with the prosecution of insurance companies. He favors killing suits he does not like, but he likes to preserve those on which he has a different view.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I think the conferees are to be commended for the industry they have shown in attempting to remedy a very lamentable condition that has prevailed respecting so-called informer suits. In their zeal to remedy this condition they have overlooked, in my judgment, and perhaps unwittingly placed limitations upon the prosecution of true informer actions which defeat the very purpose and in practical effect nullify true informer suits. For more than 80 years this country has followed the Lincoln statute on informer actions. In this connection, in 1863, Lincoln uttered these words:

> Worse than traitors in arms are the men who pretend loyalty to the flag, feast and fatten on the misfortunes of the Nation while patriotic blood is crimsoning the plains of the South and their countrymen are mouldering in the dust.

Now as never before is there a necessity for adequate precautions to protect against attempts of public plunderers. With billions and billions of dollars in war contracts that should at least come under the careful scrutiny of the Attorney General and the impartial scrutiny of some informer, if you please, we should have at least the added incentive of bringing to light those frauds perpetrated upon the Government. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, this bill deters the honest informer. I read from the language on page 2 of the report the following:

> The Court shall have no jurisdiction—

Mind you—

> shall have no jurisdiction to proceed with any such suit brought under clause (B) or pending suit brought under section 3491 of the Revised Statutes whenever it shall be made to appear that such suit was based upon evidence or information in the possession of the United States, or any agency, officer, or employee thereof, at the time such suit was brought—

Mark those words—

> at the time such suit was brought.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. In just 1 minute.

Mr. WALTER. I know the gentleman wants to be fair. Will he not read the rest of it?

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. I shall be pleased to at the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I read:

> *Provided, however,* That no abatement shall be had as to a suit pending at the effective date of this act if before such suit was filed such person had in his possession and voluntarily disclosed to the Attorney General substantial evidence and information which was not theretofore in the possession of the Department of Justice.

In order to be protected on that score it is absolutely necessary that the informer shall have already instituted his suit because the measure of his right to proceed is whether or not that information was in the possession of the Attorney General at the time the suit was brought. Let us suppose this situation: That two Members of this House possess information regarding a fraud perpetrated against the Government. They had intended next week to institute an action in the nature of an informer suit but in the interim received subpenas to appear before a committee of this House to investigate that fraud and to give whatever information they had upon the subject. They appear in response to the subpena and give their testimony under oath. Next week they decide to institute their suit, but can they do so? Absolutely not, for the language reads:

> The court shall have no jurisdiction—

No jurisdiction—

> to proceed with any suit if the information was in the possession of the Attorney General at the time the suit was brought.

There is the vice of this report, or of this bill. Instead of encouraging the disclosure of frauds perpetrated against the Government, it places a premium upon secrecy, because what potential informer would dare disclose the information he had when he had not filed a suit if by disclosing it he is forever precluded from the prosecution of the action?

Let me say in this connection that it is utterly possible, in fact it is probable, in every conceivable situation that a true informer's suit may be further thwarted by the action of some inert Attorney General. We have not always had the official initiative to see that frauds were ferreted out; no, we cannot rely upon that alone. Under the provisions of this bill it is possible for the Attorney General in every case to enter his appearance and take over the prosecution of the action and even abate the action if necessary, because he has the same power when he takes it over as the power of the one who originally instituted it. If that be so, conceive of a situation in which the Attorney General has figured he cannot win the case, or for some reason best known to himself, he does not desire to prosecute it either vigorously or otherwise, and he drops out of the case. Suppose, then, the original informer has been lulled into a sense of security, and not knowing of the action of the Attorney General, the case is dismissed. We will say he sued three contractors who were residents of three different States. It will then be necessary after the completion of this war work to hunt down those three contractors, if you please, try to get service upon them successfully, and maintain an action in their jurisdiction at considerable expense to the informer. All that the informer can receive, as the maximum in any case where the Attorney General takes over, is 10 percent, but he may receive much less than that because he may receive whatever in the judgment of the trial judge is deemed an adequate compensation for the information which the informer possessed.

What incentive would there be to employ lawyers upon a contingent basis if the maximum amount, covering all of your expenses, would only be 10 percent of the total amount recovered? On the contrary, the tendency would be to discourage, as I see it, the disclosure of frauds perpetrated against the Government. Who would want to voluntarily submit information that might in the end preclude him from the prosecution of these acts?

In addition to that, this proposed legislation places an undue burden upon the original informer. It places the burden of two suits upon him. He must prove to the satisfaction of the court, when the question of his original knowledge is raised, whether or not he possessed the original information on the subject. When he has met and successfully surmounted that issue he may proceed. But suppose, instead, the Attorney General steps in, then steps out, and then the issue or a plea in abatement is raised on the ground of lack of original information of the informer? The informer then is put at a considerable handicap to try to meet those issues, because the Attorney General is out of the case.

That duty should not be placed upon the informer, but under the language of this legislation it should be placed upon the Attorney General to show what, if any, information was contributed by the original informer, because, after all, the Attorney General has the information and the facilities for producing it. Let me suggest something here, and I am mindful at the same time of the very commendatory work done by the conferees on this bill. They have eliminated some nine-tenths of the vices that were contained and left in it following

the emasculating amendment that was inserted by the Senate. If you follow the history of this legislation, on April Fool's Day of last year this House, when only 23 Members were present on the floor, sought to abolish the original Informers Act. The Senate then took that up and in its amendment even sought to limit informers' suits to those frauds that had been discovered up to June 15, 1942.

What was the purpose of that? What was the motivating purpose of the Attorney General in asking for the outright abolition of this beneficial legislation in the face of untold billions of dollars that have been spent and the untold fraud that will yet be uncovered? What chance has one in foreign service, what chance have those who have discovered defective materials, to institute action to bring to light some nefarious practices in the way of fraud against this Government? Right at this time when the interests and efforts of the Nation are devoted to the prosecution of the war, when our attentions are focused upon the foreign fronts, is it reasonable to assume that this is the most propitious time in which to discover, then to proceed to prosecute these frauds? I think not. There is something wrong with this proposed legislation. There is something subtle, Mr. Speaker, exceedingly subtle, when you consider the fact that one of the persons who appeared, a man from my district, and contributed greatly to pointing out the inequity of this situation finds himself harassed, yes, by some New Deal Gestapo, that has trapped him and hounded him simply because he had the temerity for 9 long months to knock at the door of the Attorney General's office and to lay on his desk the infamous frauds that have been perpetrated in the construction of the small arms plant in St. Louis.

Let us follow his course.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Does not the gentleman concede this legislation in nowise affects the case of fraud in his own district except as to the amount that may be recovered?

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. That is a comparative question. It depends to what extent certain individuals are involved in the suit. I have just instanced the fact that that suit is directed, for example, against the Massman Construction Co., of Kansas City, 50 percent of the stock of which is owned by Tom Prendergast. That suit is also directed against a former Government official who came in and got away with a contract after it had been awarded to Mr. Coates as the low bidder, and was later given to former Governor Stelle and his crowd at an expense of more than $100,000 additional to the taxpayers of this Nation. It has no relation to this case? I know of none more in point than that.

But let me tell you something which came to me in the form of a letter from this fine young man to whom I talked last Saturday. His voice quivered with indignation when he told me these words and I asked him to commit them to writing. This is as follows:

DECEMBER 10, 1943.

Representative LOUIS E. MILLER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: One of the most shocking things that ever happened to me occurred this week. Representative ———, member of the House Military Affairs Committee, wrote Col. C. C. Earp, head of the Selective Service Board of Missouri, requesting a review of my draft classification. My board of Webster Groves, Mo., complied with Colonel Earp's request, and my file was sent to him and he in turn sent it to the appeal board and they placed me in 1–A. I was never given a voice in this matter, and I never requested that my draft status be appealed. Over this action my local board has felt that they were entirely bypassed and that this matter was never duly taken up with them.

Now I have fought diligently for what I believed was right in regards to some legislation in Washington and I have spent considerable money to fight for these rights. I certainly have no objections to serving in the armed forces, but when gestapo methods are used and the Army is used as a disciplinary barracks, I am greatly incensed that this country has reached such a state of affairs.

I have no objections to having this letter read in the House, and I will continue to fight to keep the repeal of the Lincoln Statute from throwing my case out of the St. Louis courts, regardless of what political group is resorting to these methods. It is high time that a thorough investigation be made as to the motive of such action on the part of some men.

Very truly yours,

GORDON R. COATES.

I tried to lead a clean fight, and I hope that I did, but this is such a low blow. I can hardly express my feelings.

G. R. C.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I sometimes wish that I had the power to weave sentences as sharp as the sting of the scorpion's leash or to coin words red hot from the bottom of hell, if so I would picture to you in all of its hideousness * * * this infamous conspiracy, this subtle scheme to set aside the only guaranty that has lasted for 80 years against unmitigated frauds perpetrated upon the Government and to substitute in its stead a feeble statute that does nothing but paralyze the efforts of an honest informer.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article about Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK].

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset this is not the proper tribunal in which to try the case brought by the gentleman from St. Louis who has been mentioned, Mr. Coates. I may say that he tried to induce the Attorney General to bring an action upon what he claims to be a fraudulent transaction. The Attorney General's office made an investigation and came to the conclusion there was no fraud and no case. We inserted language in this revised version of H. R. 1203 expressly protecting the rights of that young man. He may proceed with his suit. The only thing he complains about is that the bill reduces the reward from 50 to 25 percent of the proceeds. That action of his is being brought for $200,000. If he succeeds, he will be allowed to pocket $50,000 under the bill before us, in addition to his expenses. He does not think that is enough, but we do. Under the law as it now stands he could profit to the extent of $100,000.

As to the alleged conspiracy to railroad this man into the Army because of his interest in H. R. 1203, that is pure bunk.

As you gentlemen know, the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO], in whom we all have complete and unbounded confidence, is chairman of an investigating committee of the Military Affairs Committee. He looks into deferments from the draft given to employees of the Government and of industry. In that position the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] receives a great volume of mail from all over the United States. I suppose one wife wants to know why the next door neighbor's husband stays at home while hers goes to war, or one mother wants to know why some other mother's son is not sent when hers has to go. In that way the chairman of this subcommittee has received a tremendous volume of mail. Evidently, there came a complaint regarding Mr. Coates.

What does the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] do when he gets these complaints? He turns them over to investigators for his committee. If the investigators find facts which ought to be brought to the attention of the proper officials of the Selective Service they report those facts. That is doubtless what happened in this case. The investigators turned over the result of their examination to officials of the Selective Service board in Missouri and now Mr. Coates finds himself in the service, or soon to be there. If he ought to be in the Army, I am glad he will have an opportunity to serve. But I am sure his interest in this pending legislation has nothing whatever to do with the action of the Selective Service board in Mis-

souri. I asked the gentleman from California if he had ever heard of Coates. He said, "Of course not. He is a total stranger to me. I receive thousands of letters of that kind." That disposes of Mr. Coates.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is aimed at a great and growing evil. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania has pointed out, there is a multiplicity of suits brought under the ancient informers statute which permits any man to bring an action in the name of the Government to recover double damages against any contractor engaged in a fraudulent transaction with the United States. The informer is permitted to retain half for his own services and the Federal Government gets the other half of any recovery that may be had.

Under the decision of the Supreme Court, which was referred to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, an informer need not have any information of his own whatever. The result is that a certain type of lawyer, usually known as shysters, follow the Truman committee around the country, follow the proceedings of grand juries, and bring suits before the Department of Justice has even completed investigations. In that way millions of dollars are being diverted from the Federal Treasury into the pockets of the so-called informers, who contribute no public service whatever.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Is it not a fact that the 50 percent the Government gets makes it whole on the amount that it has been defrauded of, while the other 50 percent goes to the informer?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes; and it often results in unjust enrichment of a shyster, who contributes no service whatever. The Government ought to receive all of the double damages the law authorizes in such cases.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think the real point which the gentleman misses is that, shysters or no shysters, we should make it most conducive, even by the use of shysters, to catch the big shysters who are defrauding the Government.

Mr. HANCOCK. It is the duty of the Attorney General to bring suits for the recovery of fraudulent profits and penalties for the benefit of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. If the Attorney General does not act, it is perfectly proper, and should be, for any citizen to get after these big shysters who are defrauding the Government in time of war.

Mr. HANCOCK. I am not going to be guided in my action on legislation by the implied charge that the Attorney General and his entire staff are dishonest. If we are to proceed on that theory, then we have a poor system of government, and we better call it quits and get some other kind.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WALTER. I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK].

Mr. HANCOCK. Before I conclude—and this is new to most of you—I do not want to leave a wrong impression. The temptation and the opportunity is tremendous under the present law for renegotiators, contracting officers of the various purchasing agencies of the Government, and agents for collectors of internal revenue to take advantage of the information they discover in the course of the business to enrich themselves by instigating informer's suits. That is a temptation we wish to remove.

Let me say also there was no objection to this bill when it was before the House. There was none when it was before the Committee on the Judiciary, and there was very little objection in the Senate, although it was long-winded. Your conferees had four full sessions on this. When I say full, I mean each session lasted 2 or 3 hours. We have written it and rewritten it, and we have made every effort to protect the interests of the Government and take care of the deserving informers, if any.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Boiling the thing down as much as we can, is this not about the situation? In the first place, the average, good American citizen should not have to have a pecuniary reward in order to give information about somebody defrauding the Government?

Mr. HANCOCK. The gentleman is entirely correct. It is the duty of every good citizen to protect his Government.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In the second place, if he has information and he gives it to the Government, and the Government does not proceed in due course, provision is made here where that suit can be brought and where he can get some compensation?

Mr. HANCOCK. That is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. So this bill, then, protects the Government and it protects the corporation or the contractor from being defrauded and harassed by shysters or people who might bring suit without any information or with little information; and yet if the Government does not act, there is still a protection or a means whereby they can proceed.

Mr. HANCOCK. The gentleman has correctly stated the question better than I have been able to do.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1543. An act to provide for mustering-out payments to members of the armed forces, and for other purposes.

IMPORTATION OF GRAIN FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 171, to permit the importation from foreign countries free of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

On page 2, after line 11, insert:

"SEC. 3. (a) Clauses (1) and (2) of section 1400 of the Federal Insurance Contributions Act (Internal Revenue Code, sec. 1400) are amended to read as follows:

"'(1) With respect to wages received during the calendar years 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, and the first 2 calendar months of the calendar year 1944, the rate shall be 1 percent.

"'(2) With respect to wages received during the last 10 calendar months of the calendar year 1944 and during the calendar year 1945, the rate shall be 2 percent.'

"(b) Clauses (1) and (2) of section 1410 of such act (Internal Revenue Code, sec. 1410) are amended to read as follows:

"'(1) With respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, and the first 2 calendar months of the calendar year 1944, the rate shall be 1 percent.

"'(2) With respect to wages paid during the last 10 calendar months of the calendar year 1944 and during the calendar year 1945, the rate shall be 2 percent.'"

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to permit the importation from foreign countries free of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed, and suspending for 2 months the increase in the tax rates under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I voted for the resolution when it was before the House. This resolution simply provided for the importation of feed, notwithstanding the tariff. When this resolution went to the Senate an extraneous amendment was added thereto, an amendment which freezes the payment of social-security tax for a period of 2 months. This amendment has been opposed by all branches of labor. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to object to the adoption of the Senate amendment. Therefore, I object.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 171 and consider the Senate amendments in the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not expect to object, I trust the gentleman will give some of us on this side of the aisle who opposed the House joint resolution a little time in the consideration of it.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Of course, if this request is granted, it will mean, after the request to consider the Senate amendment in the House, that then the chairman of the committee will move to concur in the Senate amendments. Then he will have 1 hour and can yield as he sees proper to any Members of the House. And any time up to the end of the hour he can move the previous question.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to object, but I did want to be assured by the gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, that he would give some time to us on this side of the aisle if this was granted.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The Members will be given time if they desire.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendment to House Joint Resolution 171.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, under the present law social-security taxes increase on January 1, 1944, from 1 percent for employee and employer, to 2 percent for the employer and employee. This amendment to House Joint Resolution 171, adopted by the Senate, postponed the date of increase of the social-security tax from 1 to 2 percent on employer and employee from January 1 to March 1, 1944. In other words, for the first 2 calendar months of 1944, the present tax rate would be frozen. The reason for this is obvious in my opinion owing to the situation with respect to the tax bill that is now being considered by the Senate. We are informed reliably that the Senate Finance Committee has frozen this tax for 1 year, for the calendar year 1944, that is, for the entire year. And if the action of the Senate Finance Committee should be approved by the Congress, then, of course, much confusion would result, because under the present law if this amendment is not adopted, on January 1, 1944, employers would begin to withhold the 1 percent, which is proposed to be postponed. Then if the Congress should approve the action or ratify the action of the Senate Finance Committee—and I understand that was adopted by a large majority—then the collection of this money from the employee by the employer would have to be refunded and there would be untold confusion. Until we can ascertain what the action of Congress is with respect to the amendments for changes made in our tax bill which we sent over to the Senate, until we know what that action will be, I do not see how we can intelligently and safely permit this increase in the social-security tax to become effective, because, if it is, certainly much trouble will result. This only proposes to postpone or advance the effective date for 60 days. Under the present law it is 1 percent for 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, and 1943, and then it increases beginning with January 1, 1944, to 2 percent. The Senate amendment just proposes to advance that increase in the tax for 60 days, for the 2 calendar months of January and February, in order for us to determine what the action of Congress is. If the action of the Congress should not ratify the action of the Senate Finance Committee, of course, beginning with March 1, 1944, the increase would go on. In other words, I think it would be a great mistake until we see what action Congress takes with respect to this increase, not to adopt this amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I want to ask the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of our Committee on Ways and Means, if we may have it definitely understood that in the event this Senate amendment is concurred in and freezes this social-security tax for 60 days, as provided in this amendment, if the tax bill when it comes over from the Senate includes a provision freezing this social-security tax, the Ways and Means Committee will hold adequate hearings and go into the matter carefully to determine whether or not, from an actuarial standpoint, the fund accumulated under the tax without the increase going into effect, will be adequate to safeguard and protect this fund.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I will state to the distinguished statesman from Tennessee that, so far as my influence can go, I will not only do that, but I would favor just such a course as he has suggested. I would not want to be in a position myself, and I am sure the other conferees would not want to be in a position, of adopting this without having held hearings on it, until all the facts were brought out and we were satisfied ourselves. At least I would want to satisfy myself and every other member of the conference would have an opportunity to satisfy himself as to the soundness of the proposal made by the Senate amendment.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. I think this is a matter of sufficient importance for the chairman, the distinguished Member from North Carolina, to be justified in asking the Ways and Means Committee to hold a hearing, instead of arbitrarily fixing the time. At least 1 day should be set aside to hear both sides of this so we might have the facts ourselves.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means will pursue his usual consistent course. He is the servant of the committee. What the committee desires in that respect is what the chairman of the committee will favor. The chairman favors the action suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am frank to tell the gentleman I do not think this tax ought to be frozen. Am I correct that this bill is brought in here because of the fact that we do not know what action is going to be taken on the tax bill, and that you do not want to let the tax automatically increase and then have to cut back again?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is the sole purpose.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I can understand that, but I do not want this record to go by without expressing my opposition to freezing that tax.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I welcome any questions and will be glad to express my views about them, and will say that the matter will be thoroughly considered by the committee, and the House will have the benefit of everything we find out on the subject.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There are many of us who would like to be heard on this matter when it comes back, and I am sure the gentleman will accord us an opportunity.

Mr. DOUGHTON. As far as I am concerned, we want to get all the facts and we will certainly give opportunity to Members to be heard. Our committee tries to be fair, and tries to get all the light we can on any subject.

Mr. MAGNUSON. My colleague from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] and myself want to be heard on the freezing of this tax.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] raised a question, which if I understand it correctly, confuses me. Did I understand you to say there would be hearings before the committee, before the tax bill comes to the House for consideration of this subject?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Not before we find out what action the Senate takes.

It may not ratify the action of the Senate Finance Committee. After that is done I will call the committee together and we will decide what course we will pursue in order that our committee may get all the facts and have full information with respect to everything pertaining to this amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The proper procedure to follow, if I understand what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] intended, certainly what I intended, is that when the tax bill comes back from the Senate, if it includes this provision freezing the social security tax, the Ways and Means Committee will at least take it up

for thorough consideration in the committee, and will hold adequate hearings on that provision to get full information and all the facts we can on that subject.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And before the House is required to act?

Mr. COOPER. That will be before the House conferees meet the Senate conferees in conference.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I am sure that will be the course that our committee will pursue in the event the amendment as adopted by the Senate Finance Committee is ratified by the Senate. Otherwise, it is out, and there will be nothing to go into conference about on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] 5 minutes.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise in opposition to this amendment that has been added to the bill that passed the House last week. I did want a few minutes to discuss that amendment briefly, because I do not think we ought to legislate that way. In view of the statement that the chairman of the committee has made, that we will hold hearings on the amendment, I have nothing further to offer, and nothing to add.

I am somewhat concerned here about freezing this social security tax at the present figure. In view of the statements that have been made from time to time that we are building up an accrued liability that some day must be met by this Congress, that will either require increased pay-roll taxes or a subsidy from the Federal Treasurer, I think the time has arrived when we should give it consideration. That was my only point in asking for time today, and in view of the fact that the chairman has so agreed, I will yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time, for the purpose of getting into the record, a statement to clarify what was said in the debate on this bill when it was before the House originally. At that time you will recall that I offered an amendment which would have provided that the bill would not go into effect if the country in which the imports originated should put into effect as to any of the commodities in question, an equalization fee or other device to raise the price of the commodity to purchasers in this country. It was stated during the course of that debate that the reciprocal trade agreement with Canada would prevent any action of that kind being taken as far as that country was concerned. I did not know of any such provision then. I have made inquiry of the Department of State since as to whether there was such a provision in any of the reciprocal trade agreements with Canada. I have been informed that there is no such provision.

The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] also made inquiry concerning the same matter, and I have here a part of a letter which was written to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], by Mr. Southworth, of the Division of Commercial Policy and Agreement of the Department of State, on this very question. I want to read from that letter at this time:

> Canada has lower prices owing to more effective price control, so equalization fee takes account of that difference and prevents Canadian supply from being raided by the United States.
>
> There is no specific provision in the Canadian agreement which would prevent Canada from establishing equalization fee to offset reductions here.
>
> Under Canadian wartime measures to protect war economy of which this is one, there can be no reduction in price to the American consumer as a result of this bill as far as oats and barley are concerned.
>
> Any action Canada may take is in no way aimed at nullifying our duty removal. It is a part of the Canadian wartime economic measures, and was established before our proposed duty removal was ever thought of.
>
> There exists the wartime escape clause under which Canada in wartime may take action which in peacetime might be contrary to agreements.
>
> But as pointed out above Canada does not need to resort to wartime escape clause in this matter since there is no specific provision in the Canadian agreement forbidding the establishment of equalization fee of its increase to offset the duty reduction by the United States.

I simply bring that matter to your attention to keep the record straight and to point out that there will be no benefits received by citizens of the United States by reason of the passage of this resolution. It will bring no new feed supplies into the country and the only result of its passage will be to divert the tariff duties which formerly went into our Treasury to the pockets of Canadian producers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I am the one who raised the point, and I assumed that provision was in the Canadian Trade Agreement. If I am in error, of course, I wish to make amends for it. I had understood there was such a provision in the Canadian Trade Agreement. I know the gentleman would not make this statement unless he had thoroughly investigated the subject. Did the gentleman ascertain whether there was such a provision in any subsequent agreements?

Mr. HOPE. Yes. I am informed that there is no such provision in any Canadian agreement. There is such a provision in some agreements with other governments, but not with Canada.

Mr. REED of New York. I knew there were these other agreements and I thought I was correct when I stated it was in the Canadian agreement. I am glad the gentleman has pointed out the real situation.

Mr. HOPE. I am sure the gentleman would not have made the statement unless he thoroughly believed that to be the case.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. PACE. I understood the gentleman to say that the temporary suspension of these duties will not be of any financial benefit to the American farmer. It will automatically raise their price an equal amount?

Mr. HOPE. Yes. The benefits which accrue will go to the Canadian producers and not to American consumers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST].

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, everyone knows my belief on this question. It will do the American purchaser of wheat, oats, corn, and grain no particular good.

For 100 years, the farming communities have been voting for tariff schedules. Ever since I can remember, I have heard that it was right, out in Iowa, to protect the manufacturers of the East. We did it every election. Now the time has come when there are some benefits to be derived by the farmers from a tariff. The tariff bill of 1930 helped in many particulars, although the tariff rate on wheat was passed along in the twenties sometime. But the minute that the tariff helps the farmer some, although it does not make the grain cheaper, as pointed out by the gentleman from Kansas, that minute the Republicans, the apostles of protective tariff, desert the farmers. It is not right.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that this is a very unsatisfactory way to legislate. The House of Representatives passed a simple resolution providing for feed for livestock and poultry to be brought in for a period of 90 days, without the payment of a tariff duty. When the resolution providing for that one simple thing goes to another body, then an amendment that has no relation to the tariff law, not in any way connected with it, but an amendment to the Social Security Act, is placed on this tariff bill and it comes back here. They are two entirely different subjects.

Now, we meet that situation from time to time, and I think it is a very unsatisfactory way to legislate. I voted for this House Joint Resolution No. 171 to permit this feed for livestock and poultry to be brought in for a period of 90 days to help our people who, we are told, are in great need of this feed. Now, we have another matter, an entirely different subject, added by way of an amendment in the other body.

Now with respect to this amendment freezing the social-security tax, let us bear in mind that the matter was not even considered by the Ways and Means Committee. No hearings were held, and yet it involves one of the most important questions connected with the social-security program. Under title II of the Social Security Act the people of this country who are now in the working period of their lives are building up certain rights to which they are entitled as

matter of law when they reach the age of retirement. Unless you build up a fund sufficient to provide for the payment of those benefits when they reach retirement age, then one of two things will have to happen. They will be disappointed, and, in all practical effect, their own Government will not deal squarely with them, because they have been promised under the law all these years that those benefits would be available for them when they reached retirement age, or, on the other hand, if the retirement fund is not sufficient, the Federal Government will have to appropriate money out of the general fund and pay a subsidy.

These people, now in the working period of their lives, are paying in their taxes. They are paying the 1 percent. They appeared before the Senate Finance Committee, representatives of the workers, and asked that the increase to 2 percent be allowed to take place on the 1st of January, as the law now provides. The opposition to that came from the employers. The employers get a credit on their income tax for the taxes paid for social security. The workers, the people who would be entitled to these benefits, are asking that the increase go into effect, that this fund be made safe and kept safe from an actuarial standpoint. The employers are the ones who are asking that this be frozen.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. Just let me proceed for one moment, if I may, please.

This is a matter of such great importance that we ought to have sufficient time to go into it carefully and be certain from an actuarial standpoint that the funds are kept sufficient and adequate, that sufficient money will be there so people reaching retirement age may receive the benefits this law has provided for them.

I yield with pleasure to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if this action be taken affirmatively today if it would irrevocably amend the 2 percent requirement. Could it not be taken up again at some later time?

Mr. COOPER. As the situation stands now this Senate amendment provides that the tax for 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, and the first two calendar months of 1944 shall be 1 percent. That is what it is now.

Mr. COMPTON. And no harm is done by passing this resolution today.

Mr. COOPER. We are passing it before we know whether it is right; we are passing it before we know whether it is actuarially sound for our social security program.

Mr. COMPTON. No harm could be done after 2 months; is not that true?

Mr. COOPER. That may be. The gentleman does not know, nor do I know; and I served on every subcommittee that has worked on this thing. I have lived with it for years. It is something we ought to go into carefully and be certain that we are safe.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to take the floor, but some things have been said in regard to feed that I should like to discuss.

In the first place, remember that in the Northeast where we have thousands of fine dairy cattle and thousands of poultry farms, the entire strength, the sovereign power, of the State of New York and of the New England States has been exerted in an effort to get feed to keep these dairy herds from starving and to keep the poultry from being diminished so that we can produce food to help win this war. The feed was not available in this country. We tried the West, the Northwest, and everywhere.

It is not a question of whether the Canadians are going to get something more than we planned; that is not the question. The farmers in New York State and in New England, looking to the support of the people in the cities, the milk supply, the butter supply, and our soldiers, and the people abroad we are trying to support under lend-lease, are willing to pay, no matter where they get the feed, in order to save this country from the devastating results of a shortage of feed for poultry and for cows. That is the answer to that.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. No; I have only 5 minutes.

In regard to social security, I do not approve this method of legislation, but the fact remains we face a condition here, not a theory. Something ought to be done because we know that in a tax bill now, as has been pointed out, these taxes have been frozen at 1 percent for a year. That bill is coming back here. In the meantime something ought to be done to avoid the confusion of millions of blanks being prepared and sent out, these payroll taxes being collected that might have to be refunded. So something has to be done in the way of freezing these taxes at this time.

As to the question of protecting the reserve fund, Mr. Speaker, anybody with the mind of a 4-year-old knows that those funds are being spent all the time and the more that are collected the more will be spent. The result will be a paper instead of a reserve fund, a huge reserve fund on paper on which the people will have to pay taxes in order to make that paper good.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. As a matter of fact, these reserves now amount to five times as much as any actuary, auditor, or accountant ever thought would be necessary; and they always figure that five times was the limit. They have reached that limit now.

Mr. REED of New York. Yes; this reserve fund has been collected but, of course, the money has been spent.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If I understood the gentleman from Ohio correctly, the adoption of the Senate amendment will result in making the rate 1 percent for January and February irrespective of what happens to the tax bill when it comes back to this body.

Mr. REED of New York. That is true. We can modify the tax bill after we have had a hearing, but all of this simply advances the time just 2 months.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that statement is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; because some people will wonder if they will have to go back to January 1 and pay 1 or 2 percent when the new tax bill is passed.

Mr. COOPER. If the gentleman will yield further, if this provision becomes law it will mean that the present 1 percent from employers and 1 percent from employees will continue for the first 2 calendar months, that is, January and February 1944.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to read section 4 (a) of the act entitled "An act to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes."

By inserting after the words "so as to support" a comma and the following—

I want every Member of Congress who is interested in having his Government live up to its obligations to the people of this country to note this language:

"during the continuance of the present war and until the expiration of the two-year period beginning with the first day of January immediately following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by a concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated."

No. 2: By striking out "85 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "90 percent."

No. 3: By inserting after the word "tobacco" a comma, and the word "peanuts."

(B) The amendments made by this section shall, irrespective of whether or not there is any further public pronouncement under subsection (4a) be applicable with respect to any commodity to which a public announcement has heretofore been made under this subsection.

Mr. Speaker, I read that in the RECORD for this purpose: Request was made on a nonbasic commodity on which the Secretary of Agriculture had the authority, and on which, in my judgment, he used the right procedure, made definite promises to the people of this country as far as hogs are concerned—and I will stick to that one animal. Mr. Wickard, as you know, went out and put a floor under hogs that was between 110 and 115 percent of parity the day he put the floor there. He did it to increase the pork products in this country.

Whether these farmers should have raised so many hogs is beside the question so far as what I am trying to point

out is concerned. The fact is they did so. I do not like to have to stand here and admit that the hog producer has not had the protection the law provides. It clearly shows that some agency does not take its promises too seriously. These same hogs, however, are selling at 66 percent of parity on the farms of the country right today. That applies to certain classes of the hogs, and I will explain why that is so. The support price set by the Secretary of Agriculture applied to hogs weighing between 240 and 270 pounds and changed to 200 to 270 pounds. At the present time hogs below 200 pounds are selling as low as 8 cents on some of the markets. While the support price applies to the 200-270-pound hogs, the parity price applies to the farm price and is not based on the weight of the animal. The situation gives the packer what is known as a buyer's market. Since 100-pound hogs are selling for only 8 cents in the market, this pork from these lightweight hogs should show an ample margin when the meat is sold on O. P. A. ceiling prices based on $13.75 per hundredweight. This same situation exists for the hogs weighing over 270 pounds as well as it applies to the ones marketed below 200 pounds each. This reflects a price of about two-thirds of parity to the growers of the hogs. Is there any reason in the world why our Government should not live up to the obligations and promises it has made to our own people? Yes; even though it is necessary for us to change our opinions on the tariff or anything else that is necessary to do that is in keeping with fairness and justice to help them do it.

I do not think anyone has a very good case against lifting these duties for 90 days.

As to the advantage to Canada, remember that Canada is only one country from which this feed can be imported.

I noted the import figures as were given over the radio the other night although I did not suppose it was permissible to give figures as to imports and exports at this time; but if you did hear that you know that there is plenty of opportunity to get the needed feed in connection with the poultry industry, and the egg end of the poultry industry, also in connection with feed for the dairy industry from other places than Canada.

I want to make one statement at this time. I want to keep within the rules of the House, Mr. Speaker, and I will not say where I heard it, but there is just one little insinuation I want to answer here as far as I am concerned. No one ever asked me to introduce this resolution, no group or individual. I did it on my own responsibility. Whether it is right or wrong, I am willing to answer for the outcome.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I wanted to raise this point: If this Senate amendment is adopted on this resolution and the 2 percent is remitted to 1 percent, and the tax bill eventually contains the 2 percent, we are bound not to have any retroactive provision in there. That should take care of the months of January and February and that will be lost.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the Senate amendment will be adopted. Time is a very important element in this matter. Doubtless the Senate had hearings and received information with respect to the merits of this amendment. This is evidenced by the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] that the employers are the ones urging a postponement of the increase to 2 percent; that the employees themselves are against postponement; that they want the 2-percent rate to go into effect. So evidently hearings were held and full information obtained by the Committee on Finance.

I do not believe the Senate can be charged with undue delay in their consideration of the tax bill the House sent to them recently; I do not think they have been unusually long in considering that bill, bearing in mind the controversial nature of its subject matter.

The greatest possible loss cannot be more than 2 months on this 1-percent employer-employee contribution. I am just as anxious as anybody to keep this fund sound and to protect the beneficiaries under the Social Security Act, but the people of the United States are not so anxious to pay these taxes unless they are necessary.

Unless the Senate is convinced that this fund is adequate and interest of the employees will not be jeopardized, of course we will not be bothered with it. But why take the risk when I understand that the vote of the Senate Finance Committee was overwhelming? They are just as anxious to protect the employers and this fund as we are. We are not going to take what they say about it. After it comes over here, we will go into it. We will get full information and if the action of the conferees should not be satisfactory to the House, when the conference report is brought in, the House will have the opportunity to express its opposition.

I think it would be most unfortunate now, inasmuch as we cannot pass on this tax bill for perhaps 30 days, to have the tax go into effect, and then by action of the Congress freeze the tax from January 1, 1944. There would be confusion, and I do not think we can afford to be responsible for that.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REED of New York. There is only one question involved here?

The SPEAKER. That is all, whether or not the House will concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT AS REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 20, section 43, United States Code, the Chair appoints as regents of the Smithsonian Institution the following Members of the House: Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. COX, and Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter to the Boston Club regarding the price of milk and the shortage of milk in New England.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] may extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD twice, to include in one an editorial and in the other a speech by Dr. Frank Prescott.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PACE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS INVENTORIES OF STRATEGIC MATERIALS OWNED BY THE UNITED STATES AND GOVERNMENT-OWNED PLANTS AND FACTORIES IN THE INTEREST OF THE NATIONAL ECONOMY AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a measure, H. R. 3856, which I hope will receive the most careful thought and attention of every Member of this House, for I believe that in it will be found at least the outline for the solution of some of the most critical problems of our national demobilization and return to peaceful pursuits.

This measure suggests in a general way the mechanics to be applied in the disposition of the tremendous quantities of materials and supplies of every conceivable sort which our Federal procurement agencies will inevitably find on hand when this war ends. It deals, also, with the closely related problem of the tremendous additional industrial production facilities which the Federal Government has created to meet special and particular military requirements; and which we must retire on a stand-by basis, convert to peace-time uses, or destroy at the end of the war.

Let me repeat with all possible emphasis what is being said again and again every day: That upon the solution of this and the numerous related problems of post-war demobilization depend the very

existence of American business and industry, and the peace-time jobs of millions of Americans in practically every community in the Nation. If we fail to plan intelligently now against such a possibility, we are inviting the risk that the flood of surplus materials and supplies of every conceivable kind will be dumped into our domestic markets at the end of hostilities.

And make no mistake about it, the flood can be so great that it would simply engulf and destroy these markets right at a time when our industries are struggling with the problems of winding up production for war and getting back into normal peacetime production. The danger is by no means confined to the factories and mines, and their millions of employees who might be injured. It extends into every commercial field as a threat to every business enterprise in the channels of distribution which carry goods and services from the source of production to the consumer. This problem literally hangs over your neighborhood merchants, the corner drug and grocery stores, just as surely as it threatens our industrial system; and it may endanger the jobs of every man and woman employed in trade and commerce.

Like practically every foresighted person both in and out of the Government, I have been giving this over-all problem of post-war conversion a great deal of thought in recent months. And like every other person who has studied the problem, I am quick to admit at the outset that I do not have any complete and simple solution. Gearing America up for this war was a terrific problem; but I want to say to you here that taking America out of this war and back to normal, everyday living is even a greater problem which will require infinitely more skill, planning, and foresight. I urge you to believe that it is not a minute too early to attack that staggering problem now.

Do you realize, for instance, that our war procurement agencies have already canceled war-production contracts totaling upward of $8,000,000,000? That, of course, is a relatively small figure in comparison with the total volume of war contracts, and the total production job still remaining to be done before the war is won; but it is sufficient to remind us that in certain important fields we have whipped the war-production problems and are actually running ahead of the requirements, which just a few short months ago seemed unimaginably large.

Well, do you realize, also, that our fighting services—even now as they are fighting to keep up production in many important lines, are actually beginning to find themselves loaded up with surpluses of many things which they are trying to dispose of on the open market? Just mull that thought over in your mind for a minute. If you think it is too early to attack the problem of surpluses, just ask the services for a listing of announcements of sales of supplies and equipment which have already been offered for sale in civilian markets. Examine the elaborate catalog of supplies recently offered for sale through the Memphis depot of the Air Forces. That catalog, incidentally, deserves commendation as a fine piece of sales literature, but it should interest us primarily as proof that the problem of surplus war materials is already with us.

This leads me to a number of interesting and, I believe, important observations. To begin with, I have mentioned the fact that the services, particularly the Army are already disposing of considerable quantities of supplies and material. Needless to say this fact is already causing considerable concern among civilian producers and marketers. Of course, the total volume of materials now being offered for sale can be and doubtless will be promptly absorbed by a civilian America which is starved for practically every kind of usable commodity. The fact remains, however, that it is bitter medicine to manufacturers and distributors to see the Federal Government operating in markets from which they have for many months been precluded. You can understand, therefore, why American businessmen are worrying about this problem and wondering if Congress will have the foresight to protect them from some wholesale dumping of surpluses. Secondly, I have already in my study of this problem detected very little, if any, real cooperation among the various Federal agencies involved in this problem.

As you probably know the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department is now charged by Executive order with responsibility of disposing of all Federal surplus materials. There is clear evidence, however, that certain other Federal agencies are violating or evading this Executive order. That leads to the appearance that there is actually selling competition between Federal agencies.

The Procurement Division has done a great deal of work in planning on this problem, and I understand that it has actually formulated quite comprehensive plans to handle supplies and materials in a way to ease our reconversion program. For the time being and so long as the volume of disposable surpluses remains relatively small, I assume that the Procurement Division might satisfactorily administer sales with its existing organization. It should be perfectly apparent, however, that the volume of disposable surpluses may be so tremendous at the end of hostilities that only a special agency operating under specific authorization by Congress and working along clear-cut lines of policy will be adequate to handle the tremendous job satisfactorily, which brings me to the further observations that there is, so far, no clear-cut policy regarding the disposition of these vast surpluses. That is true despite the fact that at least a dozen Federal agencies and congressional committees, as well as numerous private organizations, such as the Committee on Economic Development, the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and many labor unions, have done intensive work on the problem. I am sure that all of these different agencies and organizations have excellent ideas to contribute toward the solution of the problem. What we need to do immediately, therefore, is to coordinate the thinking on this problem and to shape it up into a real and effective problem.

Many times and in many places during my studies to date, I have encountered a marked reluctance to move on from academic thinking to the establishment of a concrete program. Somehow the idea seems to prevail that if we talk too specifically about the problems of getting back to peace, while we are still fighting the war, the American people will get the false notion that the end of the war is in sight. I understand that this fear of overoptimism is actually blanketing some of the official work that is being done on the problem here in Washington right now. Frankly, I think such fear is totally unfounded. It takes for granted that the average American is a mentally low sort of individual who will lose track of today's job if someone mentions a plan for tomorrow.

Frequently to date, I have found in my inquiries among the procurement agencies a marked tendency to avoid specific questions about our actual material inventories. That, of course, is entirely understandable, for certainly no procurement officer can be expected to guess just how or when the war will end, or just what kind of an inventory we will find ourselves with when the war is over.

I think that much of the reluctance to discuss this problem in specific terms arises also from the fact that our procurement agencies will show up time and again with simply overwhelming surpluses of supplies and materials. The procurement agencies seem to assume in advance that the people will not accept reasonable explanations. Any sensible person knows, however, that our responsible military leaders must plan to share the maximum requirements to meet any conceivable condition which the war might develop. It would not merely be imprudent, it would be disastrous, if these leaders undertook to wage the war on a pinchpenny basis.

We can very well, as a Nation, be grateful, therefore, if the war proves less costly than we thought it might, and if we consequently are left with large quantities of materials unconsumed. I have approached this problem from several angles, wondering if it might be possible to arrive at some reasonably accurate estimate of the total size of our surplus stocks at the end of the war. I frankly doubt that there is any way to arrive at any reasonably accurate estimate, but in any event we know that the volume will necessarily be tremendous.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. The gentleman from Indiana is to be commended for introducing what I believe will be recognized as one of the most constructive pieces of legislation on one of the most important problems before the country today. This problem will become increasingly serious with the termination of the war. The gentleman has stated a

number of reasons why his bill should receive the support of Congress, and they are all sound. It occurs to me that this proposed legislation should particularly be considered as a national-defense measure, in that it would require the conservation of strategic materials. It would require the preservation of property which this Nation has found to be vital in the prosecution of the war. I am sure the gentleman recalls that the Military Affairs Committee, of which he is a member, as far back as 1940 reported out a bill which later became a law, authorizing the purchase of strategic materials. Most of the materials that could have been purchased under that act were not acquired by the time war came upon us. As a matter of fact, although we authorized the spending of $100,000,000 for such strategic materials as rubber, tin, and manganese, only $10,000,000 was appropriated by the time war began, and less than that sum had actually been expended. The President, you will recall, indicated that no more than ten million was necessary. Pearl Harbor showed how erroneous that was, and the months that followed proved the necessity of maintaining in this country at all times a sufficient stock pile of strategic materials to meet any emergency. If vital war materials are now to be disposed of without some thought being given to future emergencies, we might again find ourselves in the same unfortunate position we occupied when war was declared.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. My bill considers that very thing. It serves a twofold purpose. First, it provides for an orderly, regular disposition of the surplus inventories, and it serves the national defense in holding many of these strategic materials in the war-producing plant as stand-bys for a period of years, which I propose to discuss a little later on.

Statistics, therefore, should be unnecessary except for the very few people who cannot believe that this problem will be one of the biggest we ever faced as a nation. For them, we might use the estimate frequently suggested, that the problem will be 10 times as big as that one which followed World War No. 1 in dollar volume of surplus materials that would perhaps give us upward of $6,000,000,000 worth of disposable surpluses. Closely related to this problem, of course, is that of the disposition of Government-owned or sponsored industrial plants designed and built specifically for war production. It will help somewhat to comprehend the immensity of the over-all problem, if we are reminded that the Government actually owns some 2,500 such plants with an over-all investment of nearly $16,000,000,000. To the people who cannot comprehend the immensity of the problem, we should also point out that we have such special agencies as the Metals Reserve Company and the Rubber Reserve Company functioning under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which in its various activities has become by far the largest business organization in the world. If these people have not already seen the plain implication, it should be pointed out with all possible emphasis that we have a number of hopelessly interrelated factors of Federal industrial operation, influence, and control, which in the hands of an administration inclined toward state socialism, could kill, overnight, the American system of free enterprise. I repeat, therefore, that it is not a minute too early to draft specific legislation to cover this over-all problem and to deal in all possible detail with all phases of it.

This measure which I am today proposing is one of several important steps we must undertake at once.

I know that individual Members and committees in both Houses have been working on this problem. This proposal at first glance, therefore, may seem to be a mere duplication of work already done or now in progress. I urge, however, that this proposal be given immediate consideration, because it deals with an immediate and specific problem. I believe also that it will, at least, be a beginning toward the coordination which is so imperatively necessary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks a copy of that bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

H. R. 3856

A bill to provide for the disposition of surplus inventories of strategic materials owned by the United States and Government-owned plants and factories.

Be it enacted, etc. That as used in this act the term—

(a) "Agency" means any executive department, independent commission, board, bureau, office, agency, or other establishment of the Government, including any independent regulatory commission or board and any corporation owned or controlled by the United States, but does not include the legislative branch of the Government, the Supreme Court of the United States, or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

(b) "Strategic materials" means such storable materials and equipment as may be specified by the National Reconversion Board, including, but not limited to, the following: steel, copper, rope, alcohol, aviation gasoline, sugar, chrome, manganese, magnesium, tungsten, vanadium, antimony, wool, drugs, mercury, diamonds, silk, aluminum, rubber, shellac, zinc, tin, lead, radio and electrical equipment, turbines, motor vehicles, and aircraft.

NATIONAL RECONVERSION BOARD

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby created the National Reconversion Board (referred to in this act as the "Board"), which shall consist of eight members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as follows: (1) one representative from each of the following departments: the Department of War, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Treasury; (2) one representative from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; and (3) four representatives from industry. A vacancy in the membership of the Board shall be filled in the same manner as an original appointment. A majority of the Board shall constitute a quorum. The Board shall select a chairman from among its members.

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS INVENTORIES OF STRATEGIC MATERIALS

SEC. 3. No agency shall sell or otherwise dispose of any inventory of strategic materials owned by the United States or any agency, except to another agency, unless with the consent or at the direction of the Board.

SEC. 4. In determining the advisability of the sale or disposition of such strategic materials, the Board shall be guided by the following principles:

(a) No sale or disposition of any strategic materials shall be made to any purchaser for use, sale, or other disposition, within the United States at any time during the period beginning with the date of enactment of this act and ending 3 years from the date of termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, unless there is a shortage of such materials for industrial demands or unless such materials would otherwise be subject to spoilage.

(b) No sale or disposition in excess of 10 percent of the total Government-owned stocks of strategic materials on the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, shall be made to any purchasers for use, sale, or other disposition, within the United States during any one year after the end of the period prescribed in subsection (a), unless there is a shortage of such materials for industrial demands or unless such materials would otherwise be subject to spoilage.

(c) All sales and dispositions of strategic materials shall be at the current market price and shall, so far as practicable, be equitably distributed among the applicants desiring to purchase such materials.

(d) No sale or disposition of strategic materials shall be made to any foreign purchaser if after suitable investigation there are reasonable grounds for belief that any of such materials would be reshipped into the United States.

SEC. 5. The Board shall take appropriate action to accumulate complete data as to the amount of inventories of strategic materials which are owned by the United States and by all agencies.

SEC. 6. The Procurement Division of the Treasury Department is authorized, with the consent or at the direction of the Board, to purchase surplus stocks of strategic materials in the hands of manufacturers. The sale or disposition of strategic materials by the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department shall be subject to the consent or direction of the Board.

DISPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED PLANTS AND FACTORIES

SEC. 7. Except in compliance with an agreement or option which is now in force, no agency shall sell or dispose of any plant or factory owned by the United States or any agency unless with the consent or at the direction of the Board.

SEC. 8. In determining the advisability of the sale or disposition of any such plants or factories the Board shall be guided by the following principles:

(a) Such plants or factories shall be held as stand-by facilities for a period of at least 5 years after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, unless there is a shortage of production in the products for which such plants or factories are designed, or unless the operation of such facilities would result in a lessening of the dependence of the United States upon outside sources for critical materials. If offered for sale, the company which supervised the construction and operation of any such plant or factory during the present war shall have the first right to purchase the facilities, at the highest bona fide offer, at any time within 60 days after such offer or offers are submitted.

(b) After 5 years from the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed

by the President, such plants and factories will continue to be held as stand-by facilities if the Board considers such action to be in the national interest. Otherwise, they shall be offered for sale, or, if such sale would in the opinion of the Board result in surplus productive capacity which would disrupt the national economy, they shall be completely dismantled and sold for scrap. If offered for sale, the company which supervised the construction and operation of any such plant or factory during the present war shall have the first right to purchase the facilities, at the highest bona fide offer, at any time within 60 days after such offer or offers are submitted.

(c) In order to preserve American industry the Board shall not consent to or direct the sale or other disposition of the facilities of any such plant or factory for shipment to any foreign country except with the consent of Congress.

SEC. 9. No agency shall, after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, operate any such plant or factory in the production of materials not intended for use by the armed forces of the United States except with the consent of Congress.

SEC. 10. The Board shall take appropriate action to accumulate complete data on all plants or factories which are owned by the United States and all agencies.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a statement recently made by Hon. Frank Hancock, Administrator of the Farm Security Administration, before the special House committee which is now investigating the activities of the Farm Security Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a speech recently made by William J. Neal, Deputy Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, in Sheffield, Ala.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE SOLDIERS' VOTE BILL

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may include in my speech a statement with regard to soldiers' voting and a list of regulations as to soldiers' voting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, whether or not 9,000,000 American soldiers shall have and shall be permitted to effectively exercise the right to vote in the most crucial elections in the history of our Nation since 1864 is the most important issue before the Congress of the United States. The determination of this issue is just as important as was our declaration of war against the Axis Powers. It involves the very democracy of our Nation. It involves the democratic rights of our people. It involves the dignity and integrity of the Republic. To deny the effective democratic right of the ballot to those who are fighting and dying for the establishment of a democratic world subverts the democratic character of this democratic war.

Despite the vital nature of this issue Congress is about to recess for the balance of the year without having made provisions which will guarantee this sacred right to America's fighting forces. The fact that such legislative action does not even appear on the horizon of early 1944 is tragic. It is a travesty on the workings of the legislative process. This miserable failure has aroused the indignation of the American people. It has caused wonder and pain to every American soldier and chagrin and disgust to his relatives and friends at home.

Mr. Speaker, no matter how much puny men may conspire and contrive to evade this issue, it must and will be rightly resolved, for no power, clique, or cabal will withstand the ever-mighty, righteous will of the overwhelming majority of the American people. Those of us who have an abiding faith in the American people are, therefore, confident that this Congress will be compelled to provide national, effective, and simple machinery which will enable the American soldier to vote and to have his vote counted.

Because of the deplorable stage which this issue has reached in Congress, straight and forthright talk is required. Because of the importance of the issue the time has come when each and every one of us must talk and state his or her stand. It is not my purpose to make a partisan speech. As the House knows, I am a member of neither of the two major parties. I am simply performing what I deem to be an inescapable duty; that is, to define the issue and place the responsibility wherever it belongs.

Let me get down to specifics. The confusion created by the opponents of a national soldier voting apparatus makes it necessary to define and restate the issue. It is the contention of the opponents of a national, simple, and effective plan to provide for the soldier vote that their alternative proposal will guarantee the rights of members of the armed forces to cast their ballots and have their ballots counted.

I challenge that contention.

Their alternative is the so-called States'-rights bill, which would leave responsibility for providing soldier voting up to the 48 States. This alternative was adopted in the other body, where it was known as the Eastland-McClellan-McKellar substitute, and similar legislation pending in the House is known as the Rankin bill.

Mr. Speaker, the Rankin bill is no alternative at all. It is not even a substitute. It is the surest and most ruthless machinery for disenfranchisement of America's armed forces. It is the subterfuge by which those who do not want the soldiers to vote in the elections in 1944 render lip service to the right of soldiers to vote. It is an escape for those who are against giving the right to vote to the American soldiers.

The Rankin bill will be used by the flannel-mouths to lure the American people into believing that the enemies of the soldier ballot are its friends. The Rankin bill is a denial of the Bill of Rights to the armed forces of the United States. The Rankin bill will make certain that the vote of the American soldier will be of no consequence in 1944. The charges I have made are supported by the facts. Let us look at the concrete experiences of the elections of 1942. In the elections of 1942 soldier voting was left to the States, as the Rankin bill would do. Public Law 712, the Ramsay Act, under which soldier voting took place in 1942 elections, was well-meaning. It provided for the waiving of poll tax and registration requirements. However, it left again, for all practical purposes as the Rankin bill would do, the management and regulation of soldier voting to the States. Just how did this work? The record shows that although our armed forces numbered more than 5,000,000, a vast majority of them still in camps and training stations in continental United States, the plain fact is that only 28,051 effective ballots were cast by members of the armed forces in those elections. In fact only 136,686 applications were made by members of the armed forces for war ballots. Only 28,000 effective soldiers' ballots were cast in an election in which 29,000,000 participated. And this took place under the States'-rights system, a system which would be made worse by the Rankin bill, for the Rankin bill would supersede Public Law 712 and thereby eliminate its wise provisions that void registration and poll-tax requirements as prerequisites for soldier voting.

Let us look further into the experience of 1942. There were 64 soldier votes counted in Arizona. In Connecticut there were 378. In West Virginia there were 290. In Michigan there were 643. In South Carolina there were 87. In Kentucky there were 326. And in the State of Mississippi—Mr. RANKIN's own State—the grand sum of 89 ballots were considered valid and counted out of the enormous sum of 411 applications for ballots from soldiers. This is what happened under a law which although it had set aside registration and poll tax requirements, left the direction of the soldiers voting up to the States. With the registration requirements waived under a system typical of State absentee balloting a soldier had to write for a ballot, the ballot had to be mailed to him by the Secretary of State and then the soldier had to mail the ballot back. When we consider the war conditions under which this mailing had to take place, such as changes in troop locations, consequent changes of address, ensuing difficulties in communications, we can readily see how well nigh impossible it was for a soldier to effectively register his vote. It has been stated that the estimated time for a serviceman in Australia to have effectively balloted would have taken between

4 and 5 months—page 2 of report accompanying S. 1285.

Again I say this is what took place under State systems of soldier balloting pursuant to the Ramsay Act, Public Law 712, a State control system which did away with registration and poll tax requirements. Let us see what would happen under the Rankin bill, also a State control system which does not remove poll tax and registration requirements as prerequisites for soldier voting.

This bill would place the responsibility on the States to provide for soldier voting. Just what do the States now provide for soldier voting? Eight States provide for the payment of a poll tax—Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia—which will mean in some cases a poll tax payment of $1 to $2 to be taken from the already over-burdened $50 per month soldiers' pay and will also mean from point of time—from two to four additional carriages of mail. The soldier in every instance would have to meet certain poll tax pay date lines, which are hardly known to the great number of soldiers from these poll-tax States. Let us examine further what the States provide for soldiers voting. For instance, Texas specifically provides that no member of the armed forces shall be permitted to vote, pursuant to its absentee voting laws. Kentucky and New Mexico have no absentee voting laws. Kentucky would require a constitutional amendment to set up an absentee voting law.

Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent heretofore granted to me I insert at this point a statement showing the legal requirements of States which will preclude soldier voting in 1944 by the States'-rights method; and a table describing soldier voting under existing Federal and States law:

LEGAL REQUIREMENTS OF STATES WHICH WILL PRECLUDE SOLDIER VOTING IN 1944 BY STATES METHOD

(Study prepared by Legislative Reference Service, State Law Index, Soldier Voting—Federal and State Laws, Samuel H. Still, October 27, 1943)

1. Registration:

a. Thirty-nine States require registration of soldiers.

b. Exceptions are: Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas (registration is required in certain parts of the State), Minnesota (same as Kansas), Nevada, Oklahoma, Oregon, Texas.

c. Thirty-four States have permanent registration; however, men and women in armed forces just reaching 21 will not have registered, and the age groups from 21–30 are the lowest percentage of voters in the United States. Failure to vote in California, Connecticut, and Montana does not carry continuance of registration on notice of service in armed forces. Registration is not permanent in Louisiana (re-registration every 4 years unless service in armed forces is known), Missouri, Nebraska (not permanent in certain localities), New York (execution of war voter's oath in signing absentee ballot constitutes registration), Rhode Island (unless a property voter), South Dakota.

d. Absentee registration of soldiers is not allowed in these States: Nebraska (except in certain localities), New Hampshire, New Jersey, South Dakota, Utah, Virginia, Wyoming.

NOTE.—In most cases registration requirements are written in State constitutions. Only eight States have regular sessions of legislatures meeting in 1944, New Jersey being the only one of the above. Thus six States would perforce have to call special sessions of legislatures. However, to change a State constitution requires years in most States and could not be accomplished in time to register soldiers for primaries in 1944. Primaries for the seven States given above are Nebraska, April 11; New Hampshire, September 12; New Jersey, May 16; South Dakota, May 2; Utah, September 5; Virginia, August 1; Wyoming, August 22.

NOTE.—The Green-Lucas amendment, substituting for Public Law 712, waived registration requirements. The Rankin-Eastland amendment makes registration mandatory unless States can change their constitutions.

2. The poll tax:

a. Eight States require the payment of poll taxes, which will mean in point of time from two to four additional carriages of mail. In addition, there are certain date deadlines to be met which are not generally known to the average citizen. A private in the Army can scarcely afford to pay this head tax from his $50 per month.

State	Annual poll-tax payment	Maximum poll-tax payment
Alabama	$1.50	[1] $36.00
Arkansas	1.00	2.00
Georgia	1.00	[2] 47.47
Mississippi [3]	2.00	6.00
South Carolina	1.00	1.05
Tennessee	1.00	2.58
Texas	1.00	1.75
Virginia	1.50	[4] 5.01

[1] Cumulative from age 21 to 45.
[2] Cumulative from age 21 to 60 plus interest.
[3] Waived by Laws 1942, S. B. No. 74, for absentee soldier-voting.
[4] Cumulative 3 years.

NOTE.—Poll-tax requirements are waived by the Green-Lucas amendment. The Rankin-Eastland amendment would require payment, unless States enact special legislation to the contrary.

Legislative Reference Service State law index

SOLDIER VOTING—FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS

(Members of the armed forces may vote in accordance with either Federal or State law. The war ballot issued in accordance with Federal law provides for voting for national officers only, unless otherwise authorized by State law)

	Special procedure for soldier voting	Absent voting outside of State including soldiers	Absent voting inside of State including soldiers	Voting before election at place of residence	Registration of soldiers required	Absentee registration of soldiers	Registration is permanent
Federal	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	None required.	None required.
Alabama	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes.
Arizona	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Do.[1]
Arkansas	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None required.	None required.
California	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.[1]
Colorado	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None required.	None required.
Connecticut	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes.[1]
Delaware	No [2]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	do	Do.
Florida	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	do	Do.
Georgia	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	do	Do.
Idaho	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Do.[1]
Illinois	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None required.	None required.
Indiana	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.[1]
Iowa	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	do	Do.[1]
Kansas	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No [3]	None required [3]	None required.[3]
Kentucky	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes.[1]
Louisiana	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No.[4]
Maine	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes.
Maryland	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	do	Do.[5]
Massachusetts	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Do.
Michigan	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	do	Do.
Minnesota	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No [3]	do	Do.[5]
Mississippi	Yes [6]	Yes [6]	Yes [6]	No	Yes	do	Do.
Missouri	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes [7]	do	Do.[1 7]
Montana	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	do	Do.[1]
Nebraska	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Do.[1 7]
Nevada	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None required.	None required.
New Hampshire	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes.
New Jersey	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	do	Do.
New Mexico	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Do.[1]
New York	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes [7]	do.[8]	Do.[1 8]
North Carolina	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes [9]	do.[9]	Do.
North Dakota	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	do	Do.
Ohio	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes [7]	do	Do.[1]
Oklahoma	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	None required.	None required.
Oregon	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	do	Do.
Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Do.[1]
Rhode Island	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes [10]	do	No.[10]
South Carolina	No	Yes [6]	Yes [6]	Yes	Yes	do	Yes.
South Dakota	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No.
Tennessee	No	Yes [5]	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes.[1]
Texas	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None required.	None required.
Utah	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes.[1]
Vermont	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes [11]	Yes	Do.
Virginia	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Do.
Washington	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Do.
West Virginia	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	do	Do.[1]
Wisconsin	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	do.[12]	Do.[1]
Wyoming	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Do.

[1] Except for failure to vote in California, Connecticut, and Montana notice of service in armed forces carried continuance of registration.
[2] Soldier Voting Act was declared unconstitutional by *State ex rel. Walker* v. *Harrington* (30A2d688) but constitution has since been amended by Del. H. 5 adding sec. 4A to art. V.
[3] For voting for all except municipal officers, in accordance with Federal law. Registration is required in certain parts of the State for voting under the general-election law.
[4] Reregistration every 4 years unless service in armed forces is known.
[5] For voting for Federal and State officers in accordance with Federal law. Registration is required in certain parts of the State for voting under the general-election law.
[6] In primaries only.
[7] Except in certain localities.
[8] Execution of war voter's oath in signing absentee ballot constitutes registration.
[9] Application for an absent voter's ballot constitutes registration.
[10] Unless a "property voter."
[11] This State uses a check list prepared by selectmen of each town.
[12] Except in Milwaukee County.

Complete sets of the 1943 session laws for Alabama, Florida, Missouri, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Vermont are not available in the Library of Congress.

An analysis of these insertions will show that 39 States require registration of soldiers; that 8 States—Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, South Dakota, Utah, Virginia, and Wyoming—do not allow absentee registration of soldiers; and, that in the 34 States that have permanent registration the men and women in the armed forces just reaching 21 will not have registered.

We must bear in mind that time is the most important element in soldier voting. And this is the factor which will negate any legislation which a State could devise because of the number of mailings required. In many States the absentee voting laws fail to provide sufficient time for soldiers stationed even within the United States to obtain ballots and return them in time to be counted. Not only would wholesale disenfranchisement result for the soldiers within our borders, but well-nigh complete disenfranchisement would take place for those stationed overseas.

As I have stated, time is of the essence. Time is what makes the difference between a national soldiers' voting bill and the Rankin bill, a States' rights voting bill. A national soldier voting bill would require only one round trip bulk mail carriage. Under the Rankin bill, which leaves the responsibility to the States, let us see what would happen with regard to mailing and time under State soldier voting.

The Army, acting through Col. Robert Cutler, filed this statement before a meeting of the House Committee on Election of the President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, November 16, 1943:

> Such a special short-time carriage could not practicably be repeated at frequent intervals:
>
> | | *Days* |
> |---|---|
> | From an overseas point in the North American area to Springfield, Ill | 6 |
> | From an overseas point in the European theater to Springfield, Ill | 11 |
> | From an overseas point in the Pacific theater to Springfield, Ill | 13 |
> | From an overseas point in the Far East area (longest carriage) to Springfield, Ill | 16 |

Then when we consider that 39 States require registration and that 8 States require poll tax, the following steps would have to be taken:

First. A soldier writes for the registration forms. Dates are strictly defined in many States.

Second. The secretary of state returns the forms to the soldier.

Third. The soldier returns registration forms to the secretary of state.

Fourth. The soldier applies for a ballot from the secretary of state.

Fifth. The secretary of state sends ballot to soldier.

Sixth. The soldier sends ballot to the secretary of state.

Seventh. If there is a poll tax or other special qualifications, two additional carriages must be added.

Multiply the 6 days required to send a letter from an overseas point in the American area by even 5 carriages—thus allowing no time between transits of mail—and 30 days are required. In 27 States a voter can apply for a ballot only 30 days before the election. In addition, many States cut down this time by extenuating legal requirements. In Wisconsin, for example, a ballot can be mailed only 12 days before the election. In Oklahoma, a ballot cannot be mailed more than 10 days before any primary or general election, and then must be delivered to the ballot box by an agent in the State acting for the voter. South Dakota absentee voters may not mark their ballots earlier than the fifteenth day before election. In Vermont an absentee voter can apply for a ballot only 12 days before the election. In Missouri an absentee soldier can apply for a ballot not more than 15 days before the election. Arkansas provides that soldiers can vote at an election to be held with each regiment, separate battalion, troop, or battery. Three men to conduct the election are appointed by each commander of a regiment, battalion, company, troop, or battery. Ballots are sent on request, but no date is set. Kentucky and New Mexico have no absentee voting laws. Each of these States declared them unconstitutional in years gone by. In West Virginia ballots are mailed by circuit-court clerks on the tenth day prior to the election, but not sooner. In Texas an absentee voter must apply for a ballot not more than 20 days before the election. Written application must include 15 cents to cover postage, and poll-tax receipt or certificate of exemption. In 1942, under the Ramsay law, the Attorney General ruled that ballots had to be distributed, but it was not mandatory to count them. In almost every State there is some extenuating requirement or legal provision that would not allow even a third of the time required for the transit of mail involved in absentee balloting for members of the armed forces even within the continental limits of the United States.

Since Mississippi enacted in 1942 special legislation for wartime voting by members of the armed forces, I submit that we should examine its statute, particularly as it must be considered a model for State soldier voting, as it is a product of the State of the authors of the State soldier voting plan in Congress. An examination of chapter 202, section 3, of the laws of 1942 of the State of Mississippi will show that a soldier from Mississippi who is out of the State must rely on the efficiency and integrity of four disinterested persons in order to cast a valid ballot.

Absent voting is allowed for primaries only. The soldier must know that the primary is August 8—congressional primary August 22—and apply to the registrar of his county or municipality for a ballot. The registrar is required to send a ballot, upon this request, 29 days before a primary election, and thereafter when requested until election day.

Registration is required for voting at any election. Absentee registration under oath is allowed in the case of members of the armed forces for voting in primary elections. The voter must present the ballot to a commissioned officer, and then vote, taking the voter's oath before that officer, who is required to certify it. The commissioned officer must send it to an agent designated by the elector in his home municipality. The agent is designated in an affidavit by the voter.

The agent—a citizen in Mississippi—upon receiving the ballot from the commissioned officer, must deliver it to one of the managers of the election.

A manager of the election must deposit the ballot in the ballot box on election day.

Is it any wonder, therefore, that in the 1942 elections, only 411 soldiers asked for ballots and that only 89 soldiers' ballots were counted in Mississippi?

It will be argued by the advocates of this system that States will change their laws so as to allow sufficient time for soldiers casting their ballots. To this may I say that there are only eight States that will hold regular sessions of their legislatures in 1944. Assuming that special sessions will be called, and assuming that constitutions can be amended in time, we must bear in mind the great difference between this multiple mail carriage system and the one round-trip bulk mail carriage required under the Green-Lucas-Worley proposal. As Colonel Cutler pointed out, speaking for the Army:

> The burden on air-mail facilities under this latter procedure—
>
> Meaning the States' rights method—
>
> would not only be three times as heavy, but it would be diffused in an infinity of individual carriages spread over a long period of months. Such a burden could not be sustained by air-mail facilities (p. 10087, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, November 29, 1943).

Hence, no matter what system the States may devise, if it is possible for the States to devise it, it will never make possible effective soldier voting. Consequently, any proposal leaving the responsibility for setting up soldier-voting machinery with the States is an evasion of the responsibility we Members of Congress owe to our people in the armed forces to guarantee to them an effective system of soldier voting.

There is only one system that will effectively do the job and that is a system similar to the Green-Lucas-Worley proposal. It establishes a Federal war ballot commission, nonpartisan in character, which has responsibility for printing a simple war ballot on which are listed the names of candidates for Federal offices. On a balloting day, within dates set by the commission, and designated by the commanding officer of each unit so as not to interfere with military operations, the soldier will mark his ballot in secret, place it in a sealed official envelope, fill out the oath printed on that envelope, and finally enclose the ballot and the oath in another envelope for transmission. The commission on receipt of these ballots will send them still sealed and secret to proper secretaries of state who in turn will send them to proper election officials for opening of the sealed votes and for counting. This is the most effective solution and the only guaranty of a vote to the mem-

bers of the armed forces. It is uniform, nonpartisan, and sure.

The Rankin bill advocates raise the constitutional question. The Green-Lucas-Worley bill, they say, violates States' rights. Article I, section 4, of the Constitution is the complete answer. Last year when we had the Ramsay Act before us we heard the same objections and yet to this day none of them have challenged its constitutionality. Further, may I point out that Senator CARTER GLASS, who is by far a more outstanding defender of States' rights than the proponents of the Rankin bill, sent a stirring letter in support of the Green-Lucas-Worley measure.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I turn to the question of responsibility for the present disenfranchisement of the American soldiers. Let us look at the record. A minority of Democrats in another body, who according to the press are now threatening political insurrection and secession within the Democratic Party, emerged as a majority and adopted the Rankin plan in the Senate. The few became the majority only because 18 of the 30 Republicans present in another body voted for the Eastland-Rankin proposal, this despite the fact that Mr. Harrison Spangler, the national chairman of the Republican National Committee, had testified in favor of the Green-Lucas proposal.

Let us examine the situation in the House. Not a peep has come from the Republican leadership. Sphinx-like silence from Republican members of the Committee on Elections where the Green-Lucas-Worley bill is now reposing. No one is taken in by these tactics. The wives and relatives and friends of disenfranchised soldiers will vote for them in the next election: an election in which labor is girding itself and preparing itself for fullest participation; an election in which the vote of the Negro people will decide the fate of candidates in at least 14 key States, in at least 60 congressional districts, in at least 11 senatorial contests. The Negro people—one of whose finest sons, Dorie Miller—awarded the Navy Cross for heroism at Pearl Harbor, has just lost his life on the Liscome Bay—they know their stake in this war and their stake in this crucial issue of the soldier vote. Yes, it is my considered judgment that on this issue, Republican leadership has abdicated in favor of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. We have heard of Hoover Republicans, Willkie Republicans, Dewey Republicans, but on this issue it is my considered judgment again that the House Republicans, with a few notable exceptions, have earned the title of Rankin Republicans.

In 1864—the last time we had a Presidential election in time of war—Lincoln received the overwhelming majority of the soldier vote. Is it fear that history may repeat itself that has propelled the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] into a position of Republican leadership in the House on this issue? Is it blind partisanship and fear of democracy that gives poll-tax leadership to the Republican Party? It is my considered judgment this is an alliance of fear, it is an alliance between those who fear a free and untrammeled and unrestricted franchise, who fear to extend it to all irrespective of race, color and creed and those who fear the outcome of democratic process. These questions can be answered, and my judgment completely proven wrong, by the Republicans and the Republicans only. They can do so by abandoning Mr. RANKIN's leadership, by speaking out for the bill, by Republican members on the Committee of Elections voting to immediately report out favorably the Green-Lucas-Worley proposal, and by overwhelmingly voting in favor of this bill. Of course, I cannot expect every Republican to do this, for I admit that would be asking too much, for as you and I well know there is one who will always be a Rankin Republican, who will always be the natural and inseparable ally of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. CLARE HOFFMAN. When you gentlemen and only when you will give to this bill your conscientious support, then I will stand in this well and apologize and declare to the world that the Rankin Republicans are no longer Rankin Republicans, but just Republicans.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. HALE. The gentleman has made a most interesting speech and I for one should like to compliment him upon it. I think most of us will agree with a very large number of the things the gentleman has said, particularly as to the great cumbersomeness of any voting under State absentee voting laws; but I must say it seemed to me that the gentleman dismissed the constitutional question rather more lightly than I should have expected.

I ask the gentleman this specific question: The Constitution of Texas provides—a provision which seems a little odd—that soldiers and marines on duty shall not be eligible to vote. The gentleman from New York, of course, is familiar with the provisions of article II, section 1 of the United States Constitution. How under these circumstances can we enfranchise soldiers and marines from Texas on active duty?

Let me say also before the gentleman answers that question that I think a conscientious Member of this House, be he Republican or be he Democrat, who wants to get the answer to that constitutional question is entitled to the answer without having applied to him the epithet of being a Rankin Republican.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think with regard to the last sentence of the gentleman's remarks, that under the circumstances the Republicans, with a few notable exceptions, have generously earned the mantle of Rankin republicanism.

As to the constitutional phase of this issue, we had the same arguments against Public Law 712.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Members of this House rent the air and beat their breasts, said it was an unconstitutional measure, that it violated State rights. It became law, however, and nobody has ever challenged its constitutionality.

Sections 2 and 4 of article I, and the fifth section of the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States give Congress definite power to regulate the time, place, and manner of elections of Members of the House, the Senate, Presidential and Vice Presidential electors, as well as power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of the fourteenth amendment. Further than that, I believe the gentleman will concede that the elder statesman from Virginia, Senator CARTER GLASS, is a greater defender of State rights than the gentleman from Maine. When Senator CARTER GLASS sustains this proposal, then I am pretty safe in saying that the constitutional argument is being used, in my opinion, to evade the responsibility that we owe to the American soldier.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to agree with the gentleman so far as the constitutional question is involved. It has always seemed to me that the Federal Government under the Constitution has the authority to regulate the election of its own officials. If this be not so we can hardly claim to be a sovereign Government; but is not this true: That if the Federal Government alone acts in the matter then these soldiers would not have the right to vote for State and county officials?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The Green-Lucas bill, the gentleman will remember, under title 2, specifically makes provision for facilitating the transmission of State ballots for State offices on the part of the States.

Mr. GWYNNE. What I am getting at is that unless the States do act to change their laws the soldiers will not have the privilege of voting for State offices.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That may be, but unless we adopt the Green-Lucas-Worley proposal every soldier will be denied the right to vote for their Congressmen, their Senators, and their President. Certainly, the gentleman must agree that we must give them at least this right.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE INSURANCE BUSINESS

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, there is a school of thought in America that believes insurance should be controlled by the Federal Government. In fact, that very question will soon be before us for decision.

Of course, the proponents of Federal control will carefully camouflage it. They will tell us that they are seeking cheaper protection or that they are only fighting monopoly.

I have no brief for the insurance companies. If abuses exist in their management, they should be corrected. Neither monopoly nor overcharging should be allowed. But before we embark upon the course of Federal regulation we should carefully consider two questions. First, is it safe to add to our gigantic Federal bureaucracy at this time? Second, are the States able to furnish adequate regulation and control of insurance companies operating within their borders?

Hardly a day passes in the House that some Member does not point out the disadvantages and dangers of bureaucratic government. Within the last 25 years the building up of great bureaus in Washington has completely revolutionized our mode of living. Our representative type of government with its carefully coordinated three branches has almost ceased to exist. Of course, Congress still passes laws. But only in the technical sense can it be said that Congress governs the country. The real guiding, or rather misguiding, hand is to be found in the labyrinth of Federal bureaus which now reach into almost every activity of our daily lives. The passage of almost every law is followed by the issuance of volumes of complicated rules and regulations. These rules and regulations are made by persons who have never been elected by the people and are often in direct opposition to the intent of Congress as expressed in the law. Neither Congress nor the people have adequate control over these agencies. For the most part the courts are also powerless. In many instances the Congress very unwisely has taken away the right of the citizen to appeal to the courts established by the Constitution for his protection. Thus the plain intent of the Constitution and of the common law as developed after years of struggle are set at naught.

Not only has the power of legislation been turned over to the executive branch but also the power of judging as well. In recent years many quasi-judicial tribunals have been set up which have the powers of trial and decision, but apparently are not governed by constitutional and traditional safeguards which surround regularly established courts. Far more controversies are now being settled in these tribunals than in the courts.

I am sure it is not necessary to make an extended comment on this evil and dangerous situation. The growth of centralized and unregulated bureaus in the hands of the Federal Government is a real danger to human liberty. It must be fought just as vigorously as we are now fighting our enemies on foreign battlefields.

I do not blame any particular group nor any particular party for this condition. A combination of reasons has brought it upon us. I am, however, certain of one thing. The one body that can destroy bureaucracy and restore representative government is the Congress. Most of these bureaus exist because we created them or else appropriated funds for them after they had been created by Executive order. Certainly before we add another gigantic bureau we should make a careful survey to see if there is any real need for it.

Insurance is a far-flung business involving billions of dollars and millions of people. Should the Federal Government undertake to regulate it, think of the tremendous bureau that would be necessary. It will render insignificant all bureaucratic control as we now know it. The plain duty of this Congress is not to add more bureaus but to eliminate many we now have. No more centralization of power in Washington. Congress must hold that line.

Under existing decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, the legal right of the States to completely regulate insurance has long been settled. This was well expressed by Mr. Justice Frankfurter in *Osborn* v. *Ozlin* (310 U. S. 53 (1940)), as follows:

> The ways of safeguarding against the untoward manifestations of nature and other vicissitudes of life have long been withdrawn from the benefits and caprices of free competition. The State may fix insurance rates (*German Alliance Insurance Co.* v. *Lewis*, 233 U. S. 389); it may regulate the compensation of agents (*O'Gorman & Young* v. *Hartford Fire Insurance Co.*, 282 U. S. 251); it may curtail drastically the area of free contract (*National Insurance Co.* v. *Wanberg*, 260 U. S. 71).

In reviewing the history of State regulation in the case of *German Alliance Insurance Co.* v. *Kansas* (233 U. S. 389 (1914)) the Court has the following to say:

> We need only say that there was quite early State provisions for what is known as the unearned premium fund or reserve. Then came the limitation of dividends, the publishing of accounts, valued policies, standards of policies, prescribing investments, requiring deposits in money or bonds, confining the business to corporations, preventing discrimination in rates, limitation of risks, and other regulations equally restrictive.

The Court specifically held in this case that the business of insurance is so closely connected with the public interest as to justify legislative regulation of rates by the States.

The Attorney General of the United States apparently takes the view that the laws regulating insurance in many States are inadequate. After all, we wonder what business that is of the Attorney General. The people through their State legislatures have a right to say what regulation they wish for insurance in their particular jurisdiction. Before we jump to any hasty conclusion that State control has not been successful, it might be well to look to the record of insurance throughout the country.

The subject of insurance is one which touches the lives of practically every American family. It constitutes the principal estate of a great percentage of those who die. It is a valuable feature of any estate. Upon the death of the former owner many assets shrink drastically in value. A policy of life insurance is paid in full and without delay. Because of its protection to dependents and because of its encouragement to thrift and saving, the buying of insurance, particularly by young people, has been universally encouraged. I have known people to regret the buying of almost every kind of property except insurance. The usual regret of people approaching old age is that they did not buy more insurance when they were young. And yet strangely enough very few people hunt up an insurance agent and insist that he sell them a policy. Most of the insurance policies now in force and protecting the future widows and orphans owe their existence to the energy and salesmanship of a life-insurance agent. Many of the people who have insurance know very little about the higher officers of the company. They do, however, know their local agent. He is their friend. He advises them about their program. He helps them to get a loan to tide them over in bad times. In other words, a life insurance company is a service organization which through the local agent is able to keep in close contact with its many patrons.

A few statistics will illustrate the importance of insurance to the American people. In 1942, 303 life insurance companies collected in premiums $4,181,415,000, and their combined assets were $34,931,411,000. The amount of insurance in force was $130,332,848,000. If we include 54 life insurance associations and 205 life insurance fraternals, the final figures are: Total premiums collected, $4,317,102,000; total assets, $36,275,927,000; and insurance in force, $138,987,149,000. In 1941, 370 stock, fire, marine, and auto fire insurance companies collected in premiums $1,075,617,000, and held assets of $2,686,741,000. If we include mutual companies and various other organizations engaged in insurance we find 589 companies with combined assets of $3,131,557,000 and collecting annual premiums of $1,309,680,000. There are at least 64,000,000 life insurance policyholders in America, and the amount of insurance in effect is equal to $900 life-insurance protection per capita for the Nation's population. Sixty percent of the life insurance in the world is in America.

In view of the remarkable record made by insurance companies under State regulation, we should be very careful about scrapping the present system and substituting for it control by a great Federal bureaucracy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] may be permitted to extend the remarks he

made today and to include therein excerpts from hearings and a report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HESS, for 4 days, on account of illness.

To Mr. LARCADE, for 1 week, on account of official business in attending a flood-control meeting in New Orleans, La.

To Mr. WRIGHT (at the request of Mr. GIBSON), for all of the week beginning December 14, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, December 18, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

971. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the First Quarterly Report of the United States Commissioner of Education on the Education and Training of Defense Workers, covering the period beginning July 1, 1943, and ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on Appropriations.

972. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

973. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 214 of the act of February 28, 1925; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 385. Resolution providing for the employment of six expert transcribers for committee stenographers and three additional laborers by Doorkeeper of House; without amendment (Rept. No. 963). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 964. Report on the disposal of certain papers from several agencies of the Federal Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 208. Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 965). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 3848. A bill to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources; without amendment (Rept. No. 966). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 3862. A bill to amend section 8 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 3863. A bill to provide for the suspension of selective-service inductions for 6 months, to direct the classification of all men liable for training and service under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, between 18 and 38, as civilian selectees, and to provide for the basic military or naval training of such men in their home communities; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 3864. A bill to repeal section 2 of the act entitled "An act for the preservation of American antiquities"; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 3865. A bill to reserve certain public-domain lands in the State of Arizona for addition to the Havasupai Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 3866. A bill to reserve certain land on the public domain in Utah for addition to the Goshute Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 3867. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands heretofore acquired for the nonreservation Indian boarding school known as Sherman Institute, Riverdale, Calif.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 3868. A bill to provide for the disposition of tribal funds of the Blackfeet Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 3869. A bill to amend section 1, act of June 29, 1940 (54 Stat. 703), for the acquisition of Indian lands for the Grand Coulee Dam and Reservoir, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KERR:

H. Res. 386. Resolution authorizing the employment of counsel to represent Congress in certain litigation brought by Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd., Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett; to the Committee on Accounts.

H. Res. 387. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred in connection with House Resolution 386 and of further proceedings under House Resolution 105; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. CAPOZZOLI:

H. Res. 388. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate railroad crashes and other accidents in the United States in 1942 and 1943; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Chamber of Deputies of the Dominican Republic, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States on the first anniversary of the treacherous Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4144. By Mr. ELSTON of Ohio: Petitions of William Robison Cafe, Greenville; Smoler's Tavern, Columbus; Mahoning Wine Shoppe, Youngstown; Leo L. Mattingly, Zanesville; Ludlow Service Club, Springfield; Julius Jacolenne, Zanesville; J. A. Young, Middleport; Rathskeller, Bellefontaine; L. W. Heaton, Greenfield; Shamrock Grill, Sandusky; Julius Deski, Wilmington; Charlie's Rainbow Cafe, Marysville; Del Rio, Columbus; Terminal Lunch, Portsmouth; Wonder Bar, Zanesville; Order of Ahepa, Springfield; John J. Bartos, Dayton; William A. Korhis, Greenwich; James Carmody, Zanesville; James Hotel, Greenville; Henry DeMalade, Montgomery; Opal E. Meyer, Waldo; Pastime Bowling Alleys, Marietta; Mahoning Wine Shoppe, Youngstown; all of the State of Ohio, and signed by 20 or more other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the duration of the war, and any and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4145. By Mr. HALE: Petition of members and friends of the United Baptist Church of Topsham, Maine, favoring the enactment of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and transportation of all alcoholic beverages, including 3.2 beer, for the duration of the war and the period of demobilization following; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4146. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the general chairman, the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to General Patton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4147. Also, petition of the secretary, National Association of State Auditors, Comptrollers and Treasurers, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to governmental functions under the control and authority of the several States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, December 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, Thou who in times past across yearning centuries spoke to the fathers through the prophets hath in the Word made flesh spoken to us in that One whose name is the Prince of Peace and upon whose shoulders the government of men must ultimately rest, We thank Thee that not on one wondrous night alone did a star of hope light the heavens, but that straight down the crowding years the starlit pathway leads, reminding our earth-filled eyes that the highest truth is born in lowly places, clad in humble garb befitting the humility of God and of Godlike humanity.

As the Christmas star rains its fire on an earth plowed with spite and hate may we see in it a shining symbol that if we would find truth that is life indeed we must follow our starry ideals, no matter over what burning sands or to what lonely deserts they take our faltering feet. Save us from a festivity that knows nothing of receptivity and from decoration that forgets dedication. May the holly of this joyous season enshrine the

holy, and its crimson beads be but emblems of the myrrh of sacrifice—the gift of our contrite hearts. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, December 17, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on December 15, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1544. An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels, landing craft, and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; and

S. 1576. An act to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On December 5, 1943:

S. 763. An act amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

On December 17, 1943:

S. 861. An act to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States;

S. 990. An act for the relief of the Washington, Brandywine & Point Lookout Railroad Co.;

S. 1001. An act for the relief of the Meadow Brook Club;

S. 1038. An act for the relief of Verna Mae Rossell and Winifred Rossell Mooney;

S. 1049. An act to authorize the payment of additional compensation to special counsel in the case of United States against Standard Oil Co. of California;

S. 1282. An act for the relief of Eric W. Rodgers;

S. 1290. An act for the relief of William Carroll Knox;

S. 1315. An act providing for the transfer to the custody and control of the Secretary of the Navy of certain lands comprising a portion of Croatan National Forest in the State of North Carolina; and

S. 1544. An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels, landing craft, and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1203) to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 171) to permit the importation from foreign countries free of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 208) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1944, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate disagree to the House amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. THOMAS of Idaho conferees on the part of the Senate.

REPORT OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by the act of Congress to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States approved January 16, 1883, I transmit herewith the sixtieth annual report of the Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 18, 1943.*

[NOTE.—The report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.]

REQUISITION AND DISPOSAL OF PROPERTY REQUIRED FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying copy of a report, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am submitting herewith to the Congress a report of operations for the period April 16, 1943, through October 15, 1943 under the act of October 16, 1941, as amended, which authorized the President to requisition and dispose of property required for national defense.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 18, 1943.*

[NOTE.—The original of this report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.]

ERECTION OF MEMORIALS AND ENTOMBMENT OF BODIES IN ARLINGTON MEMORIAL AMPHITHEATER

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the requirements of the Public Act No. 397, Sixty-sixth Congress, I transmit herewith the annual report of the Commission on the Erection of Memorials and Entombment of Bodies in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 18, 1943.*

[NOTE.—The report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.]

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, submitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 76 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reasons for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 214 OF THE ACT OF FEBRUARY 28, 1925

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 214 of the act of February 28, 1925 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS, COMMITTEE FOR CONGESTED PRODUCTION AREAS

A letter from the Director of the Committee for Congested Production Areas (Executive Office of the President), submitting a revised estimate of personnel requirements (increase of positions) for that committee for the quarter ending December 31, 1943 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. VANDENBERG presented the following petitions, etc., which were referred, as indicated:

A resolution adopted by the Metropolitan Council of Exchange Clubs, at Detroit, Mich., favoring the adoption of measures by Congress to continue economic stabilization and retard any further inflationary trend; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A telegram in the nature of a petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Detroit, Mich., praying for the enactment of pending food subsidy legislation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Lincoln Park, Mich., favoring the enactment of pending food subsidy legislation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by a Commission meeting at Lansing, Mich., on the 18th day of November 1943, protesting against the diversion of water from Lake Michigan by the city of Chicago greater in amount than that allowed by the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution by the Board of Supervisors of Dickinson County, Mich., protesting against the adoption of a Federal sales tax; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by Menominee Post No. 1887, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, favoring the enactment of legislation granting to veterans of World Wars Nos. 1 and 2 a monthly compensation of $20 a month for veterans up to the age of 40 years; $40 a month for veterans between the ages of 40 and 50, $50 a month for veterans between the ages of 50 and 60, and $60 a month for veterans over 60 years of age; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by several Finnish organizations of Detroit, Mich., favoring a just and fair consideration of the cause of Finland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Jewish community of Bay City, Mich., favoring the opening of Palestine to unimpeded Jewish immigration in accordance with the Balfour Declaration; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Munising (Mich.) Rotary Club, favoring the unrestricted immigration of Jews into Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by a meeting of the Bethlehem Finnish Lutheran Congregation of Detroit, Mich., favoring a just and fair consideration of the cause of Finland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Allegan County, Mich., relating to the attitude toward the Government of John L. Lewis in connection with recent coal strikes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Memorials of sundry citizens of Detroit, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution by members of Local No. 600, Press Steel Executive Board, in the State of Michigan, favoring the enactment of pending anti-poll-tax legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution by the Wayne University Graduate School Committee on Research, of Detroit, Mich., protesting against the enactment of pending legislation to establish an office of Scientific and Technical Mobilization; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution by New York Central System Post, No. 134, American Legion, of Detroit, Mich., protesting against the use of prisoners of war in connection with work on the Nation's transportation systems; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of Hamtramck, Mich., favoring the enactment of legislation fixing a straight 1½-cent postage rate on newspapers mailed to members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

JEWISH NATIONAL HOME IN PALESTINE

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the body of the RECORD, and thereafter referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, a resolution adopted at a meeting of the New Britain Zionist District, held in New Britain, Conn., on November 16, 1943. This resolution favors the establishment of a Jewish National Home in Palestine.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922, adopted a resolution favoring the establishment of the Jewish National Home in Palestine; and

Whereas the interest of the Unitd States in the development of the Jewish homeland has been evidenced in statements issued by every President since the adoption of said resolution and by numerous other Government officials and Members of Congress, and

Whereas the Jewish community of the United States in consonance with the interest displayed by the Government of the United States has given heavily of its resources and energy toward the establishment of the Jewish home in Palestine, and

Whereas the British Government has by the issuance of the White Paper on Palestine checked and endangered the development of the Jewish National Home: Be it

Resolved, That we the New Britain Jewish Community represented in this gathering here tonight request the Representatives and Senators from the State of Connecticut that they bring to the attention of the President and the State Department the great wrong and injustice caused the Jewish people by the terms of the White Paper and that our Government strongly urge upon the British Government the abrogation of the said White Paper.

NEW BRITAIN ZIONIST DISTRICT,
GEORGE L. GANS, *President*.
SAMUEL S. GVOGEL, *Secretary*.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 149. A bill to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry-milk solids; without amendment (Rept. No. 623).

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], I submit his minority views on House bill 149, just reported by me, which I request may be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the minority views will be printed together with Report No. 623.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1605. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John Borrego and Mr. and Mrs. Joe Silva; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. GEORGE introduced Senate bill 1606, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MALONEY introduced Senate bill 1607, which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution to assist in making additional manpower available during the war emergency and for 6 months thereafter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. BARKLEY introduced Senate Joint Resolution 105, which was passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

VENUE OF SUITS BROUGHT UNDER PRICE CONTROL ACT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act and request that it be referred to the appropriate committee. I suppose it might be proper to have the bill referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, although it proposes to amend a law with reference to the jurisdiction of the courts. However, it relates to the Emergency Price Control Act.

Mr. President, I propose to offer an amendment to require all civil actions, including injunctions, to be brought in the district of the defendant against whom substantial relief is prayed, or in any district where the defendant maintains an agent or an office or a place of business.

The second section of the bill provides for the transfer of any pending cases to the proper jurisdiction, upon the application of the Administrator; or, if no application is made, the bill provides for the dismissal of the case within 30 days.

Mr. President, when we passed the Emergency Price Control Act, there was inserted, inadvertently, I hope—certainly without anyone's scrutinizing it very carefully—a sentence which permitted the bringing of suits for triple damages, injunction, and general civil relief against any defendant, in any section of the United States in which any part of a transaction occurred. The Office of Price Administration has repeatedly brought suit against citizens of one State, in jurisdictions thousands of miles removed from their place of residence, merely because they shipped, through the ordinary course, on an order, either telephonic or by telegraph or by letter, some goods or other merchandise on which a price was charged or paid which is alleged to have exceeded the ceiling price.

The bill seeks to go way back to the very fundamentals of English law, the very fundamentals of law in the United States, and to provide what should be the law in peacetime as well as in wartime that no suit shall be brought against any citizen except in the jurisdiction where he lives or where he has an office or an agent, or a place of business.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1606) to amend section 205 (c) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

DISPOSITION OF FEDERAL WAR HOUSING

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, in July of this year the National Committee on the Housing Emergency, Inc., which had long before been appointed by the President, issued a report entitled "Recommendations for the Disposition of Federal War Housing."

The chairman of this committee is Mrs. Samuel I. Rosenman, of New York,

and the officers of the committee are Joseph D. Leland, of Massachusetts, first vice chairman; Lisle Baker, Jr., of Kentucky, second vice chairman; Harold S. Buttenheim, of New York, third vice chairman; John E. Sloane, of New Jersey, secretary; Orie R. Kelly, of New York, treasurer; Gladys A. LaFetra, executive director.

Out of the National Committee on the Housing Emergency, Inc., there was named a committee on recommendations for the disposition of Federal war housing. This committee was composed of Joseph D. Leland, chairman; Henry R. Brigham; Henry I. Harriman; Henry V. Hubbard; Walter A. Neaves; Calvin H. Yuill.

As the result of the aforementioned report and the suggestions of the committee, I have had prepared a bill which would provide for the disposition of Federal war housing, and I ask unanimous consent to introduce the bill for appropriate reference.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1607) to provide for the disposition of Federal war housing was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 208) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1944, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CALIF. (S. DOC. NO. 138)

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, at the request of the Under Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, and at the suggestion of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], chairman of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with the accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Newport Bay Harbor, Calif., be printed as a Senate document, together with a letter referring thereto from Mr. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, and General Reybold, Major General, Chief of Engineers.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to know what the material is that is to be printed. I did not hear the Senator's entire statement.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am asking permission to have certain material printed as a Senate document, at the suggestion of the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, and at the request of the Under Secretary of War. The material relates to a report on the Newport Bay Harbor project in California. It is desired by the Army engineers and by the Under Secretary of War that the material be placed in the form of a Senate document for future use.

Mr. WHITE. I understand this is a matter which comes along in the usual course, and I have no objection.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEND-LEASE AND OTHER EXPENDITURES IN CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICAN COUNTRIES—LATIN-AMERICA TOUR BY SENATOR BUTLER (S. DOC. NO. 132)

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on the 20th of November the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] presented a statement to the Senate in regard to his trip through Latin America, and on that day asked that it be made a Senate document, which request was agreed to. On the 13th of December the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], as acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, made a statement in the Senate in reply to the statement of the Senator from Nebraska. I ask that both these statements be printed together as a Senate document. I may say that I understand, after conferring with the Senator from Nebraska, that he has no objection to the request.

I may add that, of course, this does not preclude either Senator, or any other Senator, making any speech hereafter he may desire to make on this subject, or any other.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

OUR OBLIGATION TO OUR VETERANS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Our Obligation to Our Veterans," delivered by him over radio stations in Wisconsin, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LAWYER'S PLACE IN AN UPSET WORLD — ADDRESS BY MALCOLM McDERMOTT

[Mr. BAILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Lawyer's Place in an Upset World," delivered by Mr. Malcolm McDermott before the North Carolina State Bar, Raleigh, N. C., on October 22, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WEEK'S NEWS—ADDRESS BY LEON HENDERSON

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the news of the week, delivered by Mr. Leon Henderson on December 11, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

MR. WILSON'S WARNING—EDITORIAL FROM THE PITTSBURGH PRESS

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Mr. Wilson's Warning," published in the Pittsburgh Press of December 10, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CURSE OF INFLATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE PITTSBURGH PRESS

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Curse of Inflation," published in the Pittsburgh Press of December 10, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADJUSTMENT OF VETERANS TO CIVILIAN LIFE—EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS STAR-TIMES

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Now Is the Time to Stop the Next Bonus March," published in the St. Louis Star-Times of December 3, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

A CHRISTMAS MESSAGE—TOLERANCE, THE KEYSTONE OF AMERICANISM

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I inquire of the majority leader if it would interfere with his program if I should make a brief statement of about 2½ or 3 minutes at this time?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, across the years of my public life, the idea has often occurred to me that the foundation stones of the Christmas spirit are to a very great extent made of the same elements as those upon which the founding fathers so solidly set the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. No American should ever forget the forces responsible for the coming of the Pilgrims to these shores, or of the social, political and economic injustices of the Old World from which issued every subsequent stream of immigration to our benevolent hills and valleys. The relative absence of opportunity to rise in the economic order, the lack of occasion to advance in public service, the nonexistence of a spiritual order allowing the worship of God in harmony with the individual conscience, racial antagonisms conceived in narrowness of mind and personal greed and satisfied in the hells of human tears, suffering, misery, and death—all these are the constituent features of those backgrounds intimately and directly responsible for the steady flow of men, women, and children to our shores, seeking in our America that peace and contentment symbolized by the immortal declaration that the Creator has endowed all men with the right of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

In line with the experience of every American, I have been a disturbed witness to all forms of human intolerance, to a form of conduct which has been so aptly described as "man's inhumanity to man." In my studied opinion, it is absolutely impossible to think of a condition more contrary, or more categorically opposed to the very essence, the veritable marrow, of our form of government, than intolerance, be it racial, religious, political, social, or economic. In other terms, I cannot reconcile myself to the possibility of a true American lifting a finger, raising a hand, penning a word, or voicing a thought in conscious support of the hideous forces of intolerance, the poisonous fangs of which our fathers came here to escape.

During this Christmas season, which beyond the semblance of a doubt is in the midst of the most critical period of the history of the Republic, it behooves every American to ponder the values of our form of government, and to make every effort to strengthen and perpetuate the principles of real Americanism, unsoiled by the dirt of narrowness, prejudice, and hypocrisy.

In our America, homes have been built, children reared, and life enjoyed by men of every nation, of every color, and of every religious and political inclination.

The sons and daughters of American colonials and European immigrants today grace every field of worthy endeavor, and all have contributed to the formation of that magnificent structure which we call America. From Maine to California, from the Dakotas to the Gulf, in the Pacific, European, and Asiatic theaters of war, the muster rolls of American armies and battle fleets are honored by the names of every breed of men, all serving their God and their country so that your children and mine may live to enjoy the blessings of a just and honorable world.

Colin Kelly reached the heights of heroism in the Philippines; James Patrick Devereux and his men fought to the death on Wake Island; Doug Munro led the Coast Guard boats sent to rescue marines from a beleaguered beach at Guadalcanal; Art Wermuth was a one-man army at Bataan; Dan Deleo led his squad for 3 weeks behind the German lines in Tunisia; Aram Parunack was the world's first pilot to land and take off from Greenland's treacherous ice cap; Joe Martinez died on Attu with his white-hot gun still at his blood-soaked shoulder; Myer Levin, William Chang, Alex Betlejewski, and George Lamptropoulos gave their lives on various battlefields. So reads an endless list of American boys sweating, fighting, and dying for America; boys whose people came from every nook of creation but a few years ago to seek a decent place in which to ply their honest labors. I am quite certain that in the fox holes of Guadalcanal, Tarawa, Tunisia, and Bataan, our boys did not stop to inquire into the name, complexion, racial origin, religious faith, or political or labor affiliations of their companions. These superficialities faded into insignificance in the face of that greater category to which they all belonged—Americans facing an enemy who would destroy their homes, their institutions, and their hallowed ideologies.

It is a comparatively simple task to determine whether a man is an American or whether he only pins this label on himself to be used as a megaphone for his personal aggrandizement. The tenets established by the founders of the Republic are as plain in the language in which they are expressed as they are high-principled and just in their conception. Either a man believes in them or he does not. Our Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, and our Bill of Rights were not formulated with the idea that each citizen could add to or detract from these documents as his individual whims and prejudices might suggest. The substance of these precious papers is the fruit of calm and placid intellects unruffled by the stresses and strains of small and degrading motives; and anyone who does not live up to their sum and substance is not worthy of the name American.

We are all familiar with the consistency with which racial, religious, and economic strife manifests itself in our country. It cannot be denied that all of this is the illegitimate offspring of the prejudice of one racial or economic group against another whose color, creed, or idea happens to differ from its own. It has been stated often that prejudice flows in the blood of humankind, and there are many so-called practical men who adhere to the argument that because we have never been free of it, we never will be. With every consideration for the difficulties involved in running contrary to human nature, I shall never become wedded to the notion that these conditions will ever prevail. To me this is a negative, a defeatist philosophy, which admits that we might as well continue, and thus nurture, our inborn evil traits and abandon all hope for a better human order. In the face of all obstacles, I shall persevere in pleading for tolerance; tolerance of one racial group for another; tolerance of organized labor with regard to the processes of organized business and industry; tolerance of one religious faith toward another which may be a system apart; tolerance of the so-called practical businessman for the ideas and efforts of the legislator; and tolerance of the legislator for the oft-labeled impracticality and idealism of the academician. We cannot avoid the circumstance that all the groups referred to, taken as a whole, constitute the life-giving elements of our American way of life. Remove any one, and America would be different. So long as the progress of our great country has brought about the existence of these political, social, and economic factors, it is nothing other than common sense that we should all plead for the maintenance of harmonious relations between them, if we are to witness the steady progression of our American institutions toward the sacred goals envisioned by the framers of our Constitution.

The greatness of your country and mine has stemmed from the infinite variety of its backgrounds. Its greatness in the future will depend upon our learning to live together in harmony and in peace. This is the synthesis of my position, and the foundation upon which I plead for a projection of the spirit of Christmas, the spirit of the Christian tradition, into the difficult years which lie ahead.

REMEMBER PEARL HARBOR, AND BE ALERT, AMERICA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on May 12, 1943, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 59, which would have authorized the President of the United States to proclaim June 20, 1943, as Armed Services Honor Day for the recognition and appreciation of the patriotic devotion to duty of all members of all branches of the armed military and naval forces of the United States of America.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate on June 22, 1943, and passed the Senate on July 5, 1943, but the date was changed from June 20 to August 1, 1943. Subsequently the joint resolution went to the House of Representatives where it was referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary, but was not acted on because of the summer recess. Representative TOLAN on October 21, 1943, introduced a similar joint resolution providing that the 7th day of December 1943 be set aside as a day of recognition and appreciation, and the House Judiciary Committee took action on the text of his joint resolution (H. J. Res. 177) instead of on Senate Joint Resolution 59, striking out everything after the resolving clause of my joint resolution and substituting the Tolan measure. That is how December 7 came to be designated. Senate Joint Resolution 59 was passed by the House on November 9, 1943, and the Senate agreed to the House amendments on November 15, 1943.

The President, on November 25, 1943, sent a veto message to the Senate. In this message he said that he—

> Considered the commemoration of the day fixed in the measure to be singularly inappropriate. December 7, 2 years ago, is a day that is remembered in this country as one of infamy on the part of a treacherous enemy. The day itself requires no reminder, and its anniversay should rather serve to cause all the people of the Nation to increase their efforts contributing to the successful prosecution of the war.

The President said further,

> It seems to me premature to establish at this time a day to be set aside to honor and commemorate all who have served in the armed forces of the United States during the course of the present war.

Mr. President, it will be noticed from the measure as the House passed it, that the 7th day of December 1943, was designated as a day of commemoration of all in the armed forces of the United States. The joint resolution as passed provided that the day was to be a day for prayer, for expressing our gratitude to Almighty God for His blessings thus far, and imploring His continued favor, protecting care, and aid; and for the complete victory of our armies and the restoration to health and strength of the wounded and ill, and a righteous, lasting peace. That is its language, Mr. President.

I think the individual who wrote the veto message for the President missed the point. It is true that December 7, 1941, was a day when a treacherous enemy, in violation of all international law, perpetrated a dastardly deed.

But it is also true, Mr. President, that 3,200 American lives were snuffed out because someone who should have been on guard was blind to the realities of world conditions.

If I had my way, I would have December 7 of every year designated as a day of perpetual observance and on the hour the Japs attacked, I would have every American, especially the children, stand in silence and repeat audibly or silently these words:

> I pledge Almighty God that as long as I live I shall stand on guard for my beloved country against the possibility of a treacherous attack by enemies, domestic or foreign. So help me God and keep me steadfast in the observance of this pledge throughout my mortal life.

Mr. President, if Pearl Harbor taught us anything it was that we were not alert, that we had been sabotaged into a false

sense of security. I might say parenthetically that apparently that was what happened at Bari, in Italy, earlier this month, where we lost a number of ships and a thousand lives. The Allied forces were not prepared with antiaircraft guns, and permitted the Nazi to sneak in with their bombers and destroy some 20 ships and snuff out lives of our boys again.

Mr. President, I repeat, if Pearl Harbor taught us anything it was that we were sabotaged into a false sense of security; that those of the armed forces whose duty it was to be alert were asleep. If on December 7, every year, we were to take the pledge which I suggest—and that is in line with the purpose of the joint resolution providing for a day of prayer and of dedication—if we were to take such a pledge there would be brought constantly to the minds of our youth and of every other citizen that we are living in a changing world, and that we pledge ourselves to see to it that there shall be no more Pearl Harbors throughout our entire future history. "Remember Pearl Harbor" written into the hearts of all Americans for generations to come is far more vital to the life of America than the slogan "Remember the Alamo" was to the brave men of Texas, or "Remember the Maine" was to the Americans of a former day.

Those slogans meant something, of course, to the men of those generations, but Pearl Harbor is more significant now because the world has been contacted.

Last night, Mr. President, we were privileged to be guests at a great banquet in this city celebrating the momentous occasion when 40 years ago the Wright brothers flew a plane for the first time in history. Last night we heard from distinguished speakers a little concerning the great advance which has been made in this science, which has made the world very small, so small that the best minds now have reached the conclusion that America must never permit any nation or group of nations hereafter to dominate the earth by means of the airplane.

Yes, Mr. President, "Remember Pearl Harbor" should be written into the hearts of Americans for generations to come. If we do not remember Pearl Harbor we may wake up some morning and find that conditions are very bad. By keeping in remembrance the lesson of Pearl Harbor—and that should be the duty of every citizen—we will see to it that we have competent men in position of authority and command, not mere theorists, synthetic thinkers, sleeping brass hats, and if we have such competent men in position of authority and command America will remain safe.

SALE OF TRACT OF LAND TO STATE HOSPITAL AT GOLDSBORO, N. C.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I rise to inquire of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] if he will object to consideration at the present time of a local bill which would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey to the State Hospital at Goldsboro, N. C., a tract of land in Wayne County, N. C., owned by the United States Government.

Mr. BARKLEY. No, Mr. President; I will not object. The Senator has explained the matter to me. I understand that the bill would authorize the State of North Carolina to purchase some land from the Government.

Mr. BAILEY. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 621, House bill 2562, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey to The State Hospital, at Goldsboro, N. C., a certain tract of land situated in Wayne County.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2562) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey to The State Hospital at Goldsboro, Goldsboro, N. C., a certain tract of land, situated in Wayne County, N. C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I will say for the information of the Senate that the bill has been approved by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and also has been approved by Mr. Chester Davis and the Department of Agriculture. The whole effect of the bill is to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture, upon payment by The State Hospital, at Goldsboro, N. C., of $4,180, to convey to the hospital all right, title, and interest of the United States to a tract of land consisting of approximately 88 acres.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I should like to inquire whether in the committee there was any objection to reporting the bill?

Mr. BAILEY. No, Mr. President; there was no objection. However, the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] had some question in his mind as to the disposition of the fund—whether it would go back into the Treasury or whether it would go back to the Farm Security Administration, the owner of the land. I told the Senator I thought it would go back into the Treasury. That is the only objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2562) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey to the State Hospital at Goldsboro, Goldsboro, N. C., a certain tract of land, situated in Wayne County, N. C., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the House must act first on the conferee report agreed to by the conferees on the deficiency appropriation bill. I am also advised that the House has agreed to the conference which the Senate requested a few minutes ago, on Senate Joint Resolution 103, extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It is desired that that conference meet at once in order to settle the debate as to the length of the extension. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that I understand that the House is now considering the conference report, and that the consideration will take only a short time. It will be entirely satisfactory to me to have a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, or a recess might be taken until half-past 1, which I imagine would give the House ample time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I imagine that would provide ample time. I shall amend my request by asking unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 1:30 p. m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate (at 12 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) took a recess until 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.

At the expiration of the recess the Senate reassembled.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, we have not yet received the conference report from the House of Representatives. The House has the papers and must act first.

Therefore, I shall have to request that the Senate wait until the report is received from the House of Representatives. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, to leave the matter in that way would create embarrassment for a great many Senators. They would not know whether the call of the Chair would come in 5 minutes or in an hour and 5 minutes. I think it would be a great deal better, if I may make the suggestion, to have recurring recesses, if necessary, but to have them taken to a time certain.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 2 o'clock p. m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate (at 1 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) took a recess until 2 o'clock p. m.

At the expiration of the recess the Senate reassembled.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SPENCE, Mr. FORD, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. GIFFORD, and Mr. CRAWFORD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ARTHUR C. NORCUTT—VETO MESSAGE
(S. DOC. NO. 139)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair) laid before the Senate the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 648, a bill "for the relief of Arthur C. Norcutt."

The bill proposes an award of compensation to Arthur C. Norcutt, Mason City, Nebr., in the sum of $1,000 in satisfaction of his claim against the United States for the death of his son, Roger Thaine Norcutt, who died while a member of the Civilian Conservaton Corps as the result, the bill recites, "of a disease contracted by him while an enrollee in the Civilian Conservation Corps."

The claimant's son enrolled in the Corps on April 20, 1937, and died approximately 3 months later, on July 17, 1937.

The law which governed the allowance of disability or death compensation in the case of enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps directed itself to traumatic injury only. This bill, in proposing to grant compensation for a death resulting from disease, rather than trauma, makes an exception of this case from the general law.

There is not sufficient justification for singling out this individual case for such preferential treatment, particularly since the record establishes that the enrollee died, not from disease contracted during his brief period of service, but as the result of a condition, or complication of a condition, that existed for several months prior to his enrollment in the Corps.

I am informed that there are other instances where the deaths of enrollees were attributable to diseases contracted as a result of exposure in the performance of their duties, where, pursuant to law, no compensation was provided for dependents.

While some question has been raised as to whether this enrollee was given proper medical attention and treatment, a board of inquiry appointed by the War Department to investigate this matter concluded that the enrollee had been given proper medical attention.

I regret, therefore, that I do not feel justified in approving the bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 18, 1943.*

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, this morning my attention was called to an article by Mr. Drew Pearson published in the Washington Post of today. It is not necessary for me to remind the distinguished Members of this body what President Franklin D. Roosevelt said about Mr. Drew Pearson, nor is it necessary for me to remind the distinguished Members of this body what one of the greatest Americans, our Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, has said about Mr. Drew Pearson. So, perhaps, anything I might say might be considered to be an after-thought in view of what the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, has uttered and in view of what a great southern leader, a former Member of this body, Secretary Hull, has said. But, Mr. President, in justice to myself and my colleagues I desire to read a paragraph from the latter part of the Pearson article and to comment upon it.

> Hence, shortly after MAYBANK'S vote against the soldier-vote bill, a member of Byrnes' staff gave MAYBANK some plain, unadulterated language. "The country would have been much better off," he said, "if we had left you in Charleston."

Mr. President, neither Mr. Byrnes nor any member of his staff has ever telephoned me, or ever talked to me, or ever written to me about the soldiers' vote bill or my vote thereon. So Mr. Pearson's statement is false and unfounded.

The people of South Carolina elected me United States Senator on the day the Senate passed the first soldier vote bill, August 25, 1942. At that time in my absence, the distinguished Senator from Georgia suggested that my colleague the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and I would have voted otherwise on certain questions if we had been present.

Mr. President, in 1941, before we had gone to war, when the National Guard had been called out, as Governor of South Carolina I was requested to appoint certain boards and to select certain men for selective-service positions. At that time I recommended to the people of South Carolina the enactment of a proper law so that South Carolinians in the armed services might vote, and afterward I conferred with my successor in the Governor's office about it.

Mr. President, I do not hesitate to say that an absolute falsehood has been printed in the Pearson article. I did not receive one letter from South Carolina or one telephone call in protest against my vote on the bill permitting absentee soldiers to cast their ballots; and, Mr. President, nobody from South Carolina or anywhere else ever called me in connection with the vote on that bill.

I wish to say in justice to myself and in justice to Mr. Byrnes, whom I have known for a long, long time, and whom I supported in 1930 when he was a candidate for a seat in this body, that when I had been elected in the largest ward in the city of Charleston to represent the people I counted the votes in the presence of all those there, as votes are ordinarily counted, and they were honorably and fairly counted.

But again my home town of Charleston has been the subject of some comment, perhaps, and the thought has been expressed that maybe they should have left me there. I am certain that no such thought came from Mr. Byrnes, whom I have always respected, and certainly no such thought came from any member of his staff, or, if so, it was never made known to me. Charleston is my home, and my friends and my people love everything about it.

I believe that it was my duty today as a Senator to condemn the statement I have quoted from the article by Drew Pearson and to let the people know that I do not think the distinguished Senator whom I succeeded would ever attempt to suggest to me or any other Member of this body how he should vote or how he should not vote. I represent the people of South Carolina, whom I respect and who have been good to me. I represent no cliques or groups.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I believe I know the soldiers and sailors from South Carolina as well as does any South Carolinian; many of them are my relatives; and I hope that by action of the State legislature, which will meet in January, they will be accorded the opportunity of voting. If there is anything I can do to help them, I shall do it.

Mr. President, last year, at a time when I was temporarily absent, I was summoned to return in order to help make a quorum to enable the Senate to act on an anti-poll-tax bill. In South Carolina payment of a poll tax is not a prerequisite to voting in the Democratic primaries, but one must pay a poll tax before he votes in a general election. Some two or three hundred thousand people pay poll taxes, some twenty or thirty thousand vote. The poll tax is a revenue measure.

Last year I made a speech in opposition to the anti-poll-tax bill, which I considered an unconstitutional measure. This year I was advised that the anti-poll-tax bill would again be brought before the Senate, and it is on the Calendar. I shall do everything I can to defeat it.

I believe in the Constitution of the United States, and in that provision having to do with State requirements for voting. I recognize that those who differ with me have the right to do so. However, Mr. President, I do not vote and speak against certain measures and then reverse myself and vote the other way. I am proud of the vote I cast on the soldiers' vote bill. I have no regrets, and I hope I have made plain to my fellow citizens and to my colleagues in the Senate that no one from Mr. Byrnes' office tried to influence me, or said anything to me. Again, let me repeat I represent the people of South Carolina, who elected me and no individuals or groups.

I hope that in the future, if Mr. Pearson desires to write such articles, he will not say "a member of Mr. Byrnes' staff," but will give the name of the person, and let me know and let the public know who would call me, as a United States Senator, and condemn me over the telephone.

Mr. President, no living man will do that so long as I am in the Senate, or elsewhere.

The various false statements which have appeared in the Merry Go Round, to which many other distinguished Americans have called attention, make me believe that anything appearing in this column is based upon half-truths and falsehood.

TRANSPORTATION—REPORT OF TRUMAN COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of my colleagues to the report filed on December 15 by the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. The subject of this report is transportation. It is part 13 of Senate Report No. 10 of this Congress. I wish to call it particularly to the attention of Senators because I believe it is one of the most important reports yet filed by the committee headed by the Senator from Missouri, which has filed so many excellent and important reports in the past.

I commend to the careful reading of every Senator all parts of this report, and particularly that portion of the report dealing with motor transport. This is a subject in which I am personally much interested because it affects my State, and I know that other Senators also are vitally interested in the subject because it affects their States.

When I asked the Senator from Missouri last March to undertake an investigation of conditions with respect to highway transportation, I did so in direct response to a petition approved by the Legislature of the State of Nevada. In my letter to the Senator from Missouri I stressed the vital importance of motor transport to all the Western States, as well as to the country as a whole. I also called attention to what I regarded as the most serious factor in the problem—namely, the necessity for providing adequate replacement and repair parts. I further emphasized the need for an investigation into the policies of the War Production Board in its handling of this problem. In subsequent communications to the committee headed by the Senator from Missouri, I furnished such additional information as I was able to secure and stressed certain additional matters which my own study of the problem indicated as meriting attention.

I am very happy that the report which has just been released by the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program supports the views which I expressed in March, and stresses the points which I stressed then and subsequently.

In this connection I should like to call particular attention to certain paragraphs in the committee's report.

At the outset of its discussion of motor transport, the committee states:

> The most serious situation with respect to transportation is the lack of adequate facilities for motor transport. Shortages in tires, repair parts, new equipment, and manpower, plus restrictions on road speed and other regulations, have imposed limits on the carrying capacity of trucks, busses, and automobiles which are far below the demands for the type of transportation service they render.
>
> The motor vehicle is woven into our national life to such a degree, and in such manner, that diminution in the service rendered by motor transport will necessarily have serious repercussions on our war effort.

I think it would be safe to go even further than the committee has gone, and to declare that any substantial diminution in the service rendered by motor transport will necessarily have not merely serious repercussions, but disastrous results on our war effort. Certainly the results of such a diminution in service would be disastrous to the economy and the war effort of the Western States.

The committee's report makes it very clear that the bottom of the barrel has been reached with regard to elimination of nonessential services performed by motortrucks. The committee states:

> Fundamentally, we must accept the principle that reductions in the volume of truck traffic will result in inability to handle essential traffic, which will have important and far-reaching results.

The language of that statement is very clear, but its implications are so broad that they may be missed if what the committee says is not most carefully considered. The clear implication of the committee's statement—with which I am most heartily in accord—is that the volume of truck traffic in this country is now at what amounts to an irreducible minimum if we are to avoid a transportation break-down which will cripple the war effort. In other words, we can no longer cut corners; we can no longer juggle the problem of keeping the trucks of the country running; the problem has been played with so long, without being directly and efficiently attacked, that it is now sitting astride our shoulders like the old man from the sea. The time for talking about it has passed and the time for taking immediate action has come.

As I indicated when I addressed the Senator from Missouri on this subject last March, suggesting that the policies of the War Production Board be investigated, and as I publicly stated several months ago, a major share of the blame for the fact that this problem has not been adequately solved rests squarely upon the War Production Board.

I am glad that the Special Committee to investigate the national-defense program concurs in this view, for the pronouncements of the committee are, as we all know, accorded the greatest respect not only throughout the country as a whole, in nongovernmental circles, but also by certain Government agencies who have with some consistency shown a lamentable inclination to accord very little respect to the views, recommendations, or requests of individual Members of the Senate.

Let me read to the Senate some of the things the committee says, in its report, about the War Production Board's handling of the problem of motor transport. The committee says:

> The shortage of replacement parts was further aggravated by a vigorous scrap drive instituted by the War Production Board in 1942 which resulted in approximately 4,000,000 motor vehicles in the Nation's junk yards being broken up and shipped to the which prohibited the scrapping of used, serviceable parts, which in normal times would have been fed back into the motor transport system, were destroyed and the civilian market was deprived of these reserves. Action to correct this situation was not taken until May 29, 1943, when the War Production Board issued Conservation Order M-311 which prohibited the scrapping of used serviceable automotive parts.

I doubt if action to correct this situation would ever have been taken if the need for such action had not been called forcefully to the attention of the War Production Board by the Truman committee and by individual Members of this body.

The committee report points out that since March of this year—and may I call the attention of Senators to the fact that it was in March of this year that I asked the Truman committee to investigate this problem—since March of this year, the War Production Board, and parts and vehicle manufacturers, have been attempting to assist truck operators in locating parts needed to maintain their vehicles where those particular parts could not be found locally. The committee then comments:

> The usefulness of this work is obvious, but indicates clearly the lack of an adequate inventory and emphasizes the need for producing more replacement parts.

The committee report goes on to recapitulate the control over replacement parts by limitation orders issued first by the Office of Production Management and then by its successor, the War Production Board, and points out that until very recently such orders restricted the manufacture and distribution of replacement parts to a specified percentage of previous production, and accorded parts for civilian use an inferior priority rating. No correction of this short-sighted policy was made until October 11 of this year, when a priority rating equal to military production priorities was assigned to parts for medium and heavy trucks, trailers, and busses. On November 13, an additional corrective was applied by removal of restrictions on the amount of inventory which could be carried by manufacturers.

The committee then states:

> The committee believes the War Production Board has delayed the parts-production program by not having made such a survey as soon as the problem became apparent. The regarding parts is now merely in the stage of getting the industry's approval of a form, which will later have to be approved by the War Production Board and the Budget Bureau under the Federal Reports Act of 1942 before it can be circulated and the collection of the information started. This information will then have to be compiled and studied before plans for scheduling production can be formulated. This point will probably not be reached before the 1944 new truck program is well under way. It is, therefore, quite likely that the portion of the replacement-parts program which exceeds the rough percentages already allocated will take an inferior position in the production schedules, so that a sufficient quantity of replacement parts may not be produced.

I submit that this situation is typical of the handling by the War Production Board of many matters under its jurisdiction. This is another case of "too little and too late," and it is only one of a number of instances of activities of the War Production Board to which that description may properly be applied.

Going on to the question of providing new trucks to replace those which of necessity are wearing out, and will wear out, under the tremendously increased load which has been placed upon highway transportation, the committee

points out that the War Production Board approved a program for production during the last half of 1943, of 7,500 heavy trucks, 5,610 commercial trailers and 1,600 attachment third axles, together with an appropriate number of bodies. The Board then states:

Some progress has been made in the production of third axles, bodies, and trailers, but virtually no progress has been made in the production of the 7,500 heavy trucks. Through the month of October no trucks had been completed. It is now estimated that only a total of 450 will be built this year. Manufacturers have indicated that the 7,500 trucks will not be completed before the end of June 1944, and then only if schedules for component parts such as engines, axles, and transmissions can be so revised as to provide parts for these trucks to be allocated to civilian uses.

The committee then states—and mark this:

The reason for the failure to produce these trucks was the assignment by the War Production Board of a priority rating inferior to that assigned to the production of vastly greater quantities of trucks for the armed services and the lack of adequate expediting.

Perhaps we should not quarrel with the assignment of priority ratings. Clearly the War Production Board was in error in the assignment of ratings which it made; the facts prove that; but perhaps the War Production Board was under such pressure from the War Department that it felt it could not do otherwise than it did. Let us be as charitable as possible. But even from the most charitable viewpoint there can be no excuse for the lack of adequate expediting, which the committee rightfully reports was one of the reasons for failure to produce these trucks, which are so essential to the war effort. One of the major jobs of the War Production Board is and has been to expedite the production of whatever items are needed for the war effort. In this instance the War Production Board failed to do that job. It is not the only instance, by any means, in which the War Production Board has so failed.

I do not wish to burden the Senate by drawing my remarks out at too great a length, but I should like to place in the RECORD at this time an excerpt from the report of the committee beginning on page 22 of the printed report and ending on page 25. I hope that Senators, if they do not have time to read the whole report—and I believe it should be read by every Member of this body—will at least take the time to read the section of the report which I have asked to be included as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, other sections of the report will equally repay reading. I sincerely hope that the Government agencies concerned with the various phases of the transportation problem with which this report deals will most earnestly consider the committee's recommendations, and will act upon them. This report is an outstanding example of the fine service which the committee headed by the Senator from Missouri has rendered and is rendering to the Senate and to the Nation. It is a thoughtful report, based upon a vast amount of careful research, and the committee's recommendations, if carried out, will go far toward alleviation of a situation which most gravely threatens our war effort. But no report, however fine, and no recommendations, however sound, can do any good unless those in whom administrative power is vested will read the report and act upon the recommendations. I hope that every Member of this body will do everything he can, in every way he can, to see that this report is read, and that the recommendations of the committee are acted upon, by those officials who have the power, and therefore the responsibility, to take such action.

EXHIBIT 1

NEW TRUCKS

Just as in the case of railroads, there has been a tendency to think that somehow our truck transportation industry will be able to get along with little or no new equipment, and that the facilities for making such new equipment can be diverted indefinitely to the manufacture of war equipment. In the case of trucks, this tendency has been even more pronounced than that in the case of railroads. At the same time, limited supplies of gasoline, particularly in the East, and the shortage of tires has led to the assumption that wherever possible transportation by truck should be eliminated in favor of transportation by rail.

As a result of this and the tremendous military demand for trucks during 1942 and 1943, the United States, the greatest user of motor vehicles in the world and the most dependent upon them, has had practically no trucks manufactured for civilian use.

Most of the new trucks on hand, at the time the manufacture of trucks was stopped early in 1942, were taken for war purposes. The Office of Defense Transportation requested that 261,500 of such trucks be made available for civilian use in 1942, but only 97,000 were assigned for that purpose. This should be contrasted with the 576,000 new trucks required for replacement needs alone in 1941, a year when more than 1,000,000 new trucks were manufactured. From March 9, 1942, when releases from the truck pool commenced, until November 1, 1943, approximately 91,000 trucks were issued for civilian use. This is the equivalent of 54,000 truck replacements annually, less than one-tenth of the new trucks supplied in 1941.

Even with drastic rationing, inventories of trucks available for the allocation to civilian use have now been almost completely exhausted. In October 1943, there were only 31,386 trucks left in the pool (11,256 light, 18,295 medium, and only 1,835 heavy). Many of these were special-type trucks, not suitable to general commercial haulage.

With the exception of a few thousand trailers, primarily tank trailers for petroleum transportation and pole trailers for logging operations, the only trucks authorized for production for civilian use up to July 1943 were 4,000 heavy trucks which were to be built to replace trucks allocated to civilian use but transferred to the military services. This figure was later reduced to 3,017, the number actually withdrawn for military use. Although the production of these trucks had been authorized in July 1942, only 2,252 of such units had been built by October 29, 1943.

A program was approved by the War Production Board for producing, during the last half of 1943, 7,500 heavy trucks, 5,610 commercial trailers, and 1,600 attachment third axles, together with an appropriate number of bodies. Some progress has been made in the production of third axles, bodies, and trailers, but virtually no progress has been made in the production of the 7,500 heavy trucks. Through the month of October, no trucks had been completed. It is now estimated that only a total of 450 will be built this year. Manufacturers have indicated that the 7,500 trucks will not be completed before the end of June 1944, and then only if schedules for component parts such as engines, axles, and transmissions can be so revised as to provide parts for these trucks to be allocated to civilian uses. The reason for the failure to produce these trucks was the assignment by the War Production Board of a priority rating inferior to that assigned to the production of vastly greater quantities of trucks for the armed services and the lack of adequate expediting.

Meanwhile, early in June 1943, the Automotive Division of the War Production Board requested all claimant agencies to submit their truck requirements for the last half of 1943 and the year 1944 by not later than June 14, 1943. Requests for trucks were submitted by the Maritime Commission, Office of Economic Warfare, Canada, War Production Board, Office of Defense Transportation, Army, Navy, and Lend-Lease. Some of these agencies failed to submit their final estimates until August or September.

The Office of Defense Transportation is the claimant agency for the civilian trucking industry of the United States. The total requirements for new trucks for which demands had been made upon the Office of Defense Transportation for the 18-month period ending December 1944, were 328,000. This figure was reduced by the Office of Defense Transportation to 79,625 for 1944 production on the ground that the materials and facilities for more than that number of trucks simply were not available if the amounts requested by the armed services and the other agencies were to be met. On August 28,1943, the War Production Board approved only 19,218 trucks for production in the first half of 1944. Even this figure was relatively meaningless because, as previously noted, inferior priority ratings had resulted in virtually no progress in providing for the manufacture of the 7,500 trucks scheduled for production in the last half of 1943. Under the circumstances, it was apparent that unless changes were made, there was little possibility of any substantial number of trucks being produced for civilian use before the end of 1944.

For the year 1943, the War Department requested the production of 671,107 trucks for its own use and that of the British and Russian forces. The present estimates are that 607,610 will be delivered. For 1944, for the same uses, the War Department requested a total of 742,433 trucks. This total of nearly a million and a half vehicles requested, when combined with the very substantial numbers in the possession of our armed forces and those of our allies from production prior to 1943, constitutes a tremendous number of trucks. The committee does not propose to substitute its judgment for that of the War Department as to the necessity for the building up of this vast mass of motortrucks nor does it propose to take the position that the 1944 military truck-production program is less essential to the war effort than the proportionate civilian production which it displaces. The War Department has indicated its willingness to make available to the committee privately a detailed justification of this program.

The committee does believe, however, that the possession of such a vast number of trucks makes it imperative that the War Department maintain an accurate and up-to-date inventory of its vehicles, not only in actual military use but those devoted to construction projects and other installations. The

War Department has informed the committee that it is now engaged in such a program.

The committee also believes that the War Department should institute procedures to ascertain how many ton-miles of use are being obtained for those trucks stationed within the continental United States because the War Department should not acquire trucks for nonmilitary purposes unless it is able to operate them with an efficiency comparable to that prevailing in civilian uses.

By the institution of these procedures the War Department should be able to reduce the number of trucks allocated to it for production, thus freeing manufacturing facilities for the manufacture of trucks sorely needed by the domestic transport industry.

The committee will follow this matter in order to ascertain the progress being made by the War Department in improving the efficiency of utilization of its present inventory of trucks in noncombat areas.

Because the committee does not want to take even the slightest risk of impeding the progress of the war by insisting upon the reduction of what might prove to be too large requests by the War Department for trucks, the committee at this stage can only recommend to the War Department that it, itself, subject its estimates to the most rigorous scrutiny to make certain that they are not excessive. The responsibility for making these requests rests squarely upon the War Department. It is aware of the need of these trucks for civilian transportation essential to the war program.

In addition to War Department requests for trucks for 1944, which include some hundreds of thousands of trucks for Russia and England, 96,721 trucks were requested by other claimant agencies for uses other than the United States civilian trucking industry. Such agencies include the Navy, Maritime Commission, Office of Lend-Lease, Office of Economic Warfare, Canada, and the War Production Board. The aggregate number of trucks so requested exceeded the number requested to be built for our civilian use. The same obligation will rest on these agencies as rests on the War Department—to account to the public, at a later date, for their requests by showing the necessity for the use of such trucks.

The committee called these facts sharply to the attention of the various agencies involved because the committee desired assurance that proper and sound plans were being made and that proper balance would be maintained by the War Production Board. The committee took the view that it was unsound to believe that because our civilian transportation had gotten along somehow up to the present time it could continue indefinitely without adequate replenishments.

On November 2, 1943, a final decision as to 1944 truck production was made by the War Production Board in which there was reflected a more realistic appreciation of the needs of the civilian trucking industry. For example, the War Production Board has designated 1944 truck production of both civilian and military trucks a "must" program and declared manpower for its production "essential." It has established an equal priority rating for all of the segments of the program, both military and civilian. It has provided for unified expediting. Furthermore it recognized to a greater degree the essentiality of filling civilian truck needs. While military requests were cut only approximately 3 percent, civilian domestic requests, although cut by nearly 15 percent, were much more adequately recognized than seemed probable last August.

A further encouraging feature of this decision is the fact that it was based upon a survey of the production facilities in the country as to components considered most scarce, i. e., rear axles, transmissions, and engines.

This survey, however, was deficient in that it did not attempt to take into account such underlying facility bottlenecks as foundry and bearing manufacturing facilities. The committee has been assured that such surveys are, however, being conducted and that steps will be taken to prevent such facility shortages from impeding the production schedule agreed upon. The survey was deficient in failing to take into account completely and accurately the demands on the same facilities for the production of replacement parts. As previously noted, this survey is in the process of formulation.

It should also be noted that the program for civilian truck production has not been stepped up appreciably for the first half of 1944 over that approved last August and that meeting civilian production schedules for the second half of 1944 will, to a large degree, depend upon the construction of new facilities. A further factor delaying the actual delivery of civilian trucks is the fact that military production has already been scheduled far ahead, and although civilian production has been accorded equal priority, it cannot apply to facilities already absorbed by military production.

The committee recommends that all possible speed be achieved in the production of trucks and that existing schedules be reexamined by the War Department in order to ascertain whether or not some part of present military production may not be deferred without impeding the war effort.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Nevada—I sincerely hope that every Member of the Senate will carefully study the report, which is founded on facts and sworn testimony.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am grateful to the Senator from Missouri. This is a matter which has been the subject of communication between us during the past several months, and I am happy that the Senator's committee took hold of the matter promptly and efficiently and, I hope, effectively.

The effect of the Senator's report will be manifested in the future, but I think the Senator and I could well afford to watch the progress of the recommendations, to see to it that the essence of the report is carried out by those who have the authority to execute it.

Mr. TRUMAN. I thank the Senator most sincerely.

RECESS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am informed the House has agreed to the conference report on the deficiency bill, but the message has not as yet reached the Senate, so if there is no other business to be transacted, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate take a further recess until 2:30 o'clock p. m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate (at 2 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) took a recess until 2:30 o'clock p. m.

At the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall have to ask that the Senate take a recess for 15 minutes longer. The House of Representatives has agreed to the conference report, but it has not as yet reached the Senate. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until a quarter to 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate (at 2 o'clock and 31 minutes) took a recess until 2 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.

At the expiration of the recess the Senate reassembled.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1169) for the relief of Samuel Margolin.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3598) "making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes." having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 22, 23, 26, 37, and 94.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 13 and 39; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum "$100,000", proposed in the House amendment insert: "$75,000, of which $20,000 shall be allocated to the Federal Board of Hospitalization"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House amendment insert the following:

"The Comptroller General of the United States shall make a study of the proposed centralization of retirement fund records in the Civil Service Commission, both from the standpoint of statutory requirements and the sufficiency thereof for accounting purposes, and shall submit a report thereon to the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives within ninety days from the date of approval of this act."

And the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum "$1,695,000" proposed in such amendment insert: "$1,550,-

000"; and in lieu of the sum "$100" proposed in such amendment insert "twenty-five per centum"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

"For an amount in addition to the $20,000,000 appropriated under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944, and for the same objects and subject to the same conditions, $6,500,000; and the limitation of $60,000,000 in the authorization and direction to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make advances, contained under this head in said Act, is hereby increased to $67,500,000."

And the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbred 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum $2,800,000" proposed in such amendment insert: "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert: "306"; and renumber the preceding section by striking out the number "306" and insert in lieu thereof: "305"; and the Senate agree to the same.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. W. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Tennessee make a brief explanation of the report?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I shall be glad to do so.

The items in controversy were 13 in number. The first was the Bureau of the Budget item of $175,000. The House agreed to that, with an amendment making the amount $75,000.

The next two items were in connection with the Civil Service Commission. The Senate struck out an item of $688,000, and the House agreed, with an amendment limiting the appropriation to some extent. The other item involved $26,000 for printing and binding. In conference this morning, the House conferees agreed that those two items might go out of the bill. In lieu thereof there was inserted a recommendation for the Comptroller General's Office to make a report in 90 days as to the proposed use of the money.

The next item relates to the Public Health Service. The Senate adopted an amendment providing $345,000 to be used for the purpose of furnishing doctors in distant communities where they were needed, with the provision that only $100 should be required of the counties or local communities. This morning the conferees agreed to reduce the amount of $345,000 proposed to be appropriated for that purpose to $200,000, and to require the local communities or authorities to contribute 25 percent of the amount.

The next item was a housing item of $50,000,000, which the Senate had inserted. The House conferees disagreed to it in the first conference, and they very strenuously disagreed to it again. The result was that the Senate conferees receded on that item.

The next item was $9,000,000 for relief in Puerto Rico. It was found that there was quite a sum of relief money which had been appropriated in the past, and which had not been used. It was believed that that item should go out of the bill, and the Senate conferees receded.

The next item had to do with the Farm Security Administration. The Senate had inserted an amendment providing $6,500,000 for administration and $37,500,000 for future loans. The House at first struck it all out, but yesterday it agreed to an amendment providing $6,500,000 for administration, but nothing for loans. The conferees agreed to an amount of $7,500,000 for loans, instead of $37,500,000.

The next item is Census of Agriculture, $650,000. It was put in by the Senate, but the House refused to agree to it. It came before the conferees in disagreement. On that item the House conferees receded, and it remains in the bill.

The next item is Water Conservation and Utility Projects, which has to do with reclamation projects. The Senate had allowed $2,800,000 for that item. It went to the House. The House struck it all out. It went to conference, and today an agreement was reached by the conferees reducing the sum to $1,000,000.

The next amendment is one which I am very unhappy to say was left out of the bill. The Senate had put in a provision placing restrictions on the Budget estimate, creating reserves, and impounding funds. For example, several times in the past we have appropriated considerable sums for roads, and the funds were impounded. Our road program has been virtually blocked because of the impounding of road funds. As Senators may remember, I offered an amendment which was agreed to in committee. The amendment would have prevented impounding and reservation of funds by the Budget Director. That amendment went out. The House took a yea-and-nay vote on it and, of course, that ended it so far as this bill is concerned. However, I wish to say to the Senate that I am very hopeful that the Senate will agree to it in the next appropriation bill which we shall consider.

I think I have made a full statement of everything which occurred in the conference this morning. If I have made any inaccurate statements I shall be glad to have members of the conference committee correct me. I do not think I have made a mistake.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator to state again the situation in relation to the Farm Security Administration. I did not quite understand his statement with respect to it.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I shall be glad to make a statement with regard to it.

The Senate agreed to an amendment appropriating $6,500,000 for administration, and $37,500,000 for the purpose of making small loans to farmers. Testimony was given before the committee to the effect that the loans made last year were well paid, and that the Government lost practically nothing by them. They were in excellent condition. So the Senate agreed to the amendment in that form. It went to the House. The House struck it out, but in the second conference the House conferees agreed to $6,500,000 for administration, but provided no money whatever for loans. The F. S. A. has some money to lend now, but not a great deal. After a very vigorous and active contest it was finally agreed as a compromise that there should be an allowance of $6,500,000 for administration and $7,500,000 for small loans.

Have I answered the question of the Senator?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to propound an additional question. Does the situation described by the Senator in any way affect the Production Credit Association?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I do not know of any way in which that activity would be affected.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Did the Senator say that the amount agreed to for loans was $7,500,000 or $37,500,000?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Seven million five hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. WILEY. That is for loans.

Mr. MCKELLAR. For loans only.

Mr. WILEY. And $6,500,000 for administration?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

COURT REPORTERS IN DISTRICT COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KILGORE submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3611) entitled "An Act to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States, to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That the Judicial Code (Act of March 3, 1911, 36 Stat. 1088, as amended) is hereby amended by inserting after section 5 thereof a new section 5a, entitled 'Court Reporters', as follows:

"'SEC. 5a. Court Reporters.—

"'(a) Appointment: Each district court of the United States, including the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia and the district courts in the Territories and insular possessions, shall appoint one or more court reporters for the district court in the manner provided for the appointment of the clerks of said courts. The number of reporters to be so appointed shall be determined by the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges (hereinafter referred to as the Judicial Conference). The persons to be so appointed shall possess the qualifications necessary for the satisfactory performance of the duties specified in subdivision (b) of this section, to be determined by standards which shall be formulated from time to time by the Judicial Conference, and shall take an oath to perform faithfully such duties. The court, with the approval of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts (hereinafter referred to as the Director) may appoint additional reporters for temporary service not exceeding three months, when there is more reporting work in the district than can be promptly performed by the authorized number of reporters and the urgency is so great as to render it impracticable to obtain the approval of the Judicial Conference. If the court and the Judicial Conference are of the opinion that in any district it is in the public interest that the duties of reporter should be combined with those of any other employee of the court, the Judicial Conference may authorize such a combination of positions and fix the salary therefor, as provided by subsection (c) hereof, any provision of law to the contrary notwithstanding.

"'(b) Duties: One of the reporters so appointed for each district court shall attend at each session of the court and at every other proceeding that may be designated by rule of procedure or order of court or by one of the judges of the court, and shall record verbatim by shorthand or by mechanical means (1) all proceedings in criminal cases had in open court, whether in connection with plea, trial, or sentence; (2) all proceedings in all other cases had in open court unless the parties with the approval of the sitting judge shall specifically agree to the contrary; and (3) such other proceedings as a judge of the court may direct or as may be required by rule of procedure or order of the court or as may be requested by any party to the proceeding. The reporter shall attach his official certificate to the original shorthand notes or other original records so taken and promptly file them with the clerk of the court, who shall preserve them in the public records of the court for not less than ten years. Upon the request of any party to any proceeding which has been so recorded and who has agreed to pay the fee therefor or of a judge of the court, the reporter shall promptly transcribe the original records of the requested parts of the proceedings and attach thereto his official certificate, and shall then deliver the transcript to the party or judge making the request. He shall also transcribe and certify all pleas and proceedings in connection with the imposition of sentence in criminal cases and such other parts of the record of proceedings as may be required by rule of procedure or order of court. The reporter shall promptly deliver to the clerk for the records of the court a certified copy of any transcript that he may make of any part of the record of any proceeding. The transcript of the testimony and proceedings in any case when duly certified by such reporter shall be deemed prima facie a correct statement of such testimony and proceedings. No transcripts of the proceedings of the court shall be considered as official except those made from the records taken by the reporter so appointed. The said original notes or other original records and the said copy of transcript shall be open to inspection in the office of the clerk as provided by law with respect to books containing the docket or minute of judgments, or decrees thereof.

"'(c) Compensation: Each reporter so appointed shall receive an annual salary, to be fixed from time to time by the Judicial Conference and to be paid in the same manner and at the same time that the salary of the clerk of the court is paid. In fixing such salary the Judicial Conference shall take into account in each instance the amount of time the reporter is required to be in attendance upon the court engaged in the performance of his duties. Such salary shall be not less than $3,000 nor more than $6,000 per annum. The reporter shall also receive his traveling expenses and expenses incurred for subsistence within the limitations prescribed by law for clerks of district courts while necessarily absent on official business from the place of his regular employment. All supplies shall be furnished by the reporter at his own expense. The reporter may charge and collect from parties, including the United States, who request transcripts, such fees therefor and no other, as may be prescribed from time to time by the court subject to the approval of the Judicial Conference. No fee shall be charged or taxed for any copy of a transcript delivered to the clerk for the records of court as required by subdivision (b) of this section. Fees for transcripts furnished in criminal or habeas corpus proceedings to persons allowed to sue, defend, or appeal in forma pauperis shall be paid by the United States out of money appropriated for that purpose; and the fees for transcripts furnished in other than criminal or habeas corpus proceedings to persons permitted to appeal in forma pauperis shall also be paid by the United States if the trial judge or a circuit judge shall certify that the appeal is not frivolous but presents a substantial question. Except as to transcripts that are to be paid for by the United States, the reporter may require any party requesting a transcript to prepay the estimated fee therefor in advance of delivery of the transcript.

"'(d) Administration: The Judicial Conference shall supervise and direct the administration of this section. Subject to this section and pertinent laws, it shall be the duty of the court to supervise and direct the reporter in the performance of his duties, including dealings with parties requesting transcripts. The Judicial Conference shall prescribe records which shall be maintained and reports which shall be filed by the reporter. Such records shall be inspected and audited in the same manner as the records and accounts of the clerk and may include records showing (1) the quantity of transcripts prepared, (2) the fees charged and the fees collected for transcripts, (3) any expenses incurred by the reporter in connection with transcripts, (4) the amount of time the reporter is in attendance upon the court for the purpose of recording proceedings, and (5) such other information as the Judicial Conference may determine.

"'(e) Taxation of fees as costs: In the discretion of the court any part or all of the fees for transcripts may be taxed as costs in the case. Fees paid by the United States for transcripts furnished to persons allowed to appeal in civil cases in forma pauperis shall be taxed in favor of the United States as costs in the case.'

"SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry the provisions of this Act into effect.

"SEC. 3. Upon request of the appellant, the record on appeal, under rules 75 and 76 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, shall be printed by a printer designated by the appellant."

And the Senate agree to the same.

PAT MCCARRAN,
HARLEY M. KILGORE,
HOMER FERGUSON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,
SAM HOBBS,
C. E. HANCOCK,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senate conferees I have submitted the conference report on House bill 3611 commonly called the Federal court reporters' bill. The conference has agreed to certain amendments of the House and certain amendments of the Senate. If any Senator wishes me to do so, I shall be glad to explain the conference report. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask if the report has been signed by all conferees on the part of the Senate?

Mr. KILGORE. It has been signed by all conferees on behalf of both the Senate and the House, with the exception of one House conferee who was not present. The report was signed by all conferees present. I am not sure whether it was signed by the sixth conferee.

Mr. WHITE. My information is that the Senate conferees were in agreement.

Mr. KILGORE. They were.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what the provision now is with respect to compensation of the reporters?

Mr. KILGORE. The Senate amendment fixed a maximum salary of $3,000 for court reporters to be appointed in the district courts. Representatives of the courts informed us that it would be impossible to employ efficient reporters for $3,000 a year. So the conferees fixed the minimum salary at $3,000 and the maximum at $6,000. On the other hand, in order to offset the increase in salary we have required that the reporter shall transcribe and furnish to the court a transcript of the proceedings on pleas and sentences, and that he shall furnish his own supplies. We felt that that was a sufficient offset to justify the increase in salary.

Mr. OVERTON. What arrangement has been made with respect to copies of testimony?

Mr. KILGORE. As is usual, the testimony will be paid for by the Government or by the litigants, as the case may be. On appeals in civil cases in forma pauperis the Government will pay for the

transcript if the trial or circuit judge certifies that it should be paid for by the Government.

Mr. OVERTON. That is not for making the transcription, but for the extra copies.

Mr. KILGORE. There is to be no charge for transcription. There will be a charge only for transcripts in cases in which trascripts are ordered by the litigants. In pauper cases the Government will pay for the transcripts upon certification of the trial or circuit judge.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the reporter receive additional compensation for copies of transcript furnished to attorneys?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS. But not for trancript furnished the court?

Mr. KILGORE. No.

Mr. ANDREWS. I was thinking of criminal cases in which copies of the testimony might be needed by the court in passing upon an appeal for a new trial.

Mr. KILGORE. The transcript in those cases would have to be paid for by the Government. The bill as originally passed by the Senate was much less liberal to the reporters in that regard than is the present bill.

Mr. ANDREWS. I have forgotten how the bill reads. Are there any duties to be placed upon the court reporter in addition to those of taking the testimony during trials?

Mr. KILGORE. Of course, the reporter will be made an official of the court, and his certification of transcript shall be prima facie evidence of the record. In addition to that, the court reporter must without cost to the Government, take down, transcribe, and deliver to the court all proceedings involved in pleas and sentences, which was formerly not done. In addition, he must furnish his own supplies.

Mr. ANDREWS. His duties would include the reporting of transactions in chambers which might take place at various times?

Mr. KILGORE. That is true. They would include such proceedings.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senate bill included a provision with regard to printing companies preparing the record. Does the bill as now agreed to provide that the appellant shall have the right to choose the printing company which will print the record on appeal?

Mr. KILGORE. The amendment which the Senate put into the bill covering that matter has been left in.

We struck out the part which directed the Supreme Court to provide rules, because the courts represented that they were getting the rules straightened out under the former law empowering them to prescribe rules. We were told that if we would give them a little more time they would have the rules straightened out. We struck out that part, but the portion to which the Senator from North Dakota refers and which we straightened out in the Judiciary Committee, with reference to the printing of records by a printer to be designated by the appellant, remains in the bill without change.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the conferees appointed by the two Houses on Senate Joint Resolution 103 have met and agreed on a compromise between the two dates. The House fixed the 5th of February; the Senate fixed the 29th of February, and the conferees have agreed on February 17. The conference report is now before the House under consideration. I do not know how long it will take to dispose of it; so we are compelled to take a recess momentarily.

If the House agrees to the conference report and it is agreed to by the Senate, it is my purpose to move that when the two Houses conclude their business on next Tuesday, they stand adjourned sine die. Then there will be another resolution to fix the date for the reconvening of the second session of the Seventy-eight Congress on January 10, 1944. Both resolutions are contingent upon the adoption of the conference report by the House and the Senate.

PAYMENT OF SUBSIDIES BY RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter from the Honorable Jesse H. Jones, Secretary of Commerce, a letter from Mr. J. B. Hutson, President of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and a letter from Mr. Chester Bowles, Price Administrator, indicating the subsidies being paid through the R. F. C. and through the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Office of Price Administration.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, December 17, 1943.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: I have your letter of December 14, requesting a short letter showing the amount of subsidies the R. F. C. is paying on a yearly basis for the transportation of oil, minerals, and other items.

Since the programs in question may not be continued for as long as a year, I am listing below the materials for which we are absorbing the abnormal transportation costs in the United States, together with the estimated monthly costs for each:

Petroleum and petroleum products	$8,500,000
Coal	1,000,000
Jute and other foreign fibers	140,000
Chilean nitrate	130,000

We have certain programs which are either direct subsidies or purchases and sales in the nature of subsidies for the purpose of obtaining the necessary maximum domestic production of critical and strategic materials required for the war effort.

* * * * *

Sincerely,

JESSE H. JONES.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION,
Washington, D. C., December 15, 1943.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: Enclosed is a statement regarding price support and stabilization programs of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which, I believe, contains the information requested in your letter of December 14.

Sincerely yours,

J. B. HUTSON,
President.

PRICE SUPPORT AND STABILIZATION PROGRAMS OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

For a large number of agricultural commodities, the funds and authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation are used to assure price support to farmers in order to encourage production. The programs for most of these commodities operate with little or no cost to the Government because market prices for most of the commodities are higher than the support levels. For some commodities, however, producer returns are supported at higher levels than the prices which can be realized in the market under existing ceiling regulations. In these cases the difference between the ceiling price and the support price is absorbed by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a loss in its operations.

The particular commodities for which this situation prevails are in most instances commodities for which the demand exceeds the supply, so that in the absence of ceiling regulations market prices would be higher than they are. For some commodities fairly accurate estimates can be made of the amount of price increase which would be required to eliminate the loss to Commodity Credit Corporation and of the cost of such a price increase to consumers. For some commodities, however, it is difficult to make such estimates because of the numerous forms and channels in which the commodities reach consumers. In all cases, however, it is certain that the rise in consumers' prices necessary to eliminate the loss to Commodity Credit Corporation would be somewhat larger than the amount of the loss. This is because these losses are incurred at or near the farm level in the distributive system and, if a corresponding price increase were made at this level, the increase would be subject to some pyramiding on account of the customary percentage margins of distributors.

The following is a brief summary for each of these programs, indicating the approximate amount of price increase which would be required to eliminate losses by Commodity Credit Corporation on the commodity, the effect of such price rises on consumers, and the effect upon the cost to the Government.

DRY BEANS

Support prices for the principal classes of dry beans at country shipping points are 70 cents per hundred pounds higher than ceiling prices for civilian sales. The prices are supported by means of loans to producers and price-supporting agreements with country dealers. The loss to Commodity Credit Corporation on the civilian share of the 1943 crop is estimated at $8,000,000. This represents the difference between the support prices and the ceilings. Supplies required for the armed forces and other governmental purposes are purchased at the full

support prices. If civilian price ceilings at country shipping points were increased to the support levels, the resulting increase in the retail price of dry beans probably would be about 1 cent per pound, which would be a 10-percent increase in the retail price. This increase would amount to about $13,500,000 on the part of the crop used for civilian consumption.

POTATOES

Producer prices for potatoes are supported at about 90 percent of parity by means of loans to producers and cooperative associations, loans to dealers who pay the support prices for the potatoes they buy, and marketing agreements with dealers who buy from producers at the support prices. Although ceiling prices for potatoes are higher than the support level under the loan and purchase programs of Commodity Credit Corporation, some losses will be incurred in moving potatoes into consumption without spoilage while maintaining grower prices at the support level. The loss to Commodity Credit Corporation in connection with the 1943 crop may be as much as $20,000,000. If this were passed on to consumers in the form of higher prices, the necessary price increase probably would be about 10 to 15 cents per bushel, or 5 percent of the current retail price. This would be an increase of about $30,000,000 in consumer expenditures for potatoes. A corresponding price increase in potatoes used for governmental purposes would amount to about $8,000,000.

RAISINS AND PRUNES

The ceiling prices on dried raisins and prunes for civilian consumption are about $45 per ton lower than the support prices for these commodities at the grower delivery point. That part of the output used for governmental purposes is purchased at prices which reflect the full support prices, but the Commodity Credit Corporation absorbs losses amounting to about $14,000,000 on the civilian share of the production. If civilian ceiling prices were increased by the amount necessary to cover the grower support prices, and the present mark-ups at wholesale and retail were maintained, the price increase would amount to 3½ to 4 cents per pound at retail. This increase would amount to about $20,000,000 on the quantities going into civilian consumption.

CANNING VEGETABLES

Ceiling prices on canned vegetables for civilian consumption have been maintained at approximately the 1942 level, but grower prices for the vegetables have been increased about 20 percent. This increase, together with certain increases in processing costs, is being absorbed by the Commodity Credit Corporation on that part of the production going to civilians. This is accomplished by means of contracts with vegetable processors, who undertake to pay farmers not less than the support prices. The output procured to meet governmental requirements is purchased at prices which reflect the full support prices to growers and coverall processing costs. The estimated loss to Commodity Credit Corporation on this program for 1943 is $30,000,000. If civilian prices were increased sufficiently to eliminate this loss, and present wholesale and retail mark-ups were maintained, there probably would be an increase of 1 to 2 cents a can in civilian prices for the major canned vegetables. This increase would amount to $40,000,000 to $50,000,000.

SUGAR

Prices to domestic sugar beet growers for the 1943 crop are being supported at about $1.50 per ton above the returns which producers obtained from present sugar prices and payments under the Sugar Act. This increased return is being absorbed as a loss by the Commodity Credit Corporation under contracts which have been made with sugar-beet processors. A similar increase of 33 cents per ton to Louisiana sugarcane growers is also paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation. In addition, the Corporation is absorbing certain wartime increases in ocean freight and insurance, handling charges, and internal rail transportation on sugar, in order to permit foreign and offshore domestic sugar to be sold at existing ceiling prices. For the 1943 crop the losses under this program are estimated at $50,000,000. An increase of about 1 cent per pound in sugar prices at retail would be necessary in order to eliminate these losses. This would amount to about $100,000,000 on the quantity of sugar consumed by civilians, both directly and in manufactured products. In addition, there would be an increase of about $20,000,000 in the cost of sugar used for the armed forces and other governmental purposes. For the 1944 crop it is probable that a somewhat greater price increase would be necessary in order to reflect an adequate return to sugar-beet and sugarcane farmers.

DAIRY PRODUCTS

Payments amounting to about $20,000,000 a month are being made to dairy farmers on their sales of milk and cream to help them meet increases which have occurred during the past year in the cost of dairy feeds. In addition, the Commodity Credit Corporation will incur a loss of about $70,000,000 during the current fiscal year in selling wheat for feed at less than the cost of the wheat to the Corporation. A similar loss of about $1,000,000 will be incurred on hay for certain drought areas. Also, about $5,000,000 of the Corporation's funds are being used in 1943 to provide price increases to producers for milk sold in a number of urban markets where the price ceilings do not reflect sufficient returns to producers to maintain the needed volume of production. Through purchase and sale agreements with cheese factories, the price of milk used for making cheese is also supported above the level reflected by the ceiling prices on cheese. The loss on this cheese program will amount to about $25,000,000 in 1943. If the price ceilings on dairy products were increased by amounts sufficient to provide the returns dairy farmers are now receiving, the resulting increases in retail prices probably would amount to from 1 to 2 cents per quart on fluid milk, 1 to 2 cents per can of condensed and evaporated milk, 8 to 10 cents per pound on cheese, and about 4 cents a pound on butter (not including any increase to replace the Reconstruction Finance Corporation butter payments of 5 cents per pound). Price increases of this magnitude would amount to from $350,000,000 to $450,000,000 on dairy products used for civilian consumption and from $75,000,000 to $100,000,000 on products for governmental requirements.

OILSEEDS AND PRODUCTS

An estimate of $60,000,000 has been used as the losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation in connection with the 1943 crops of oilseeds. It now appears, however, that these losses are likely to be from $10,000,000 to $20,000,000 less than the previous estimate. These losses occur because of the increased support prices to farmers for oilseed crops that have been necessary in order to obtain the tremendous expansion needed in the production of these crops. Ceiling prices for the oils have been maintained in most instances at 1942 levels. The price paid farmers for peanuts averages about $140 per ton, while the value of peanuts for oil under existing ceiling prices is about $90 per ton. This difference of $50 per ton, which is equivalent to about 8 cents per pound of peanut oil, is absorbed by the Commodity Credit Corporation in selling peanuts to crushing mills. If the price of peanut oil were increased by this amount, it would represent an increase of approximately 60 percent and would amount to about $15,000,000 at the crusher level. The increase at the consumer level undoubtedly would be somewhat larger. Commodity Credit Corporation also makes payments of 4.5 cents per pound on peanut butter for household consumption. These payments have the effect of reducing the cost of peanuts used for making peanut butter. The accompanying reduction in retail prices of peanut butter amounts to 6.5 to 7 cents per pound. On an annual basis the cost of this project to the Corporation is about $20,000,000 and the saving to consumers about $30,000,000. Losses incurred on soybeans vary, depending upon the efficiency of the mill in which they are crushed and the distance the beans have to be shipped to find crushing facilities. The average loss probably will amount to about 1 cent per pound of soybean oil, but on some beans the loss will run as high as 2 cents per pound of oil. An increase of 2 cents per pound in the price of soybean oil would be about a 17-percent increase and would amount to about $25,000,000 plus whatever pyramiding would occur between the processor of the oil and the consumer of the products made from the oil. On the other hand, if price ceilings were increased only sufficiently to permit the oilseed project as a whole to cover the grower support prices for oilseeds, an increase of from 5 to 10 percent in retail prices for products made from these oils probably would be adequate. Such an increase would amount to at least $75,000,000 on products used for civilian consumption. In addition, the cost of oils and products for governmental purposes would increase by about $25,000,000.

SUMMARY

The total loss to the Commodity Credit Corporation for all of the 1943 programs of this character is estimated at $350,000,000. It probably would not be practicable to avoid all of these losses through increasing ceiling prices. The maintenance of support prices to farmers in all areas undoubtedly would still require the absorption of some transportation costs and the incurring of small losses from time to time in order for the commodities to move through distribution channels and into consumption without depressing prices to farmers. The increases in prices which would be necessary to eliminate the bulk of these losses without reducing returns to farmers probably would add $625,000,000 to $750,000,000 to the annual expenditures of civilians for food. At the same time, for those commodities which Government procurement agencies also purchase at civilian price ceilings, there would be an increase of $125,000,000 to $150,000,000 a year in Government food expenditures. The increases in consumer prices would amount to a rise of 4 to 5 percent in the index of the cost of food and about 2 percent in the total cost of living index. These estimates do not include any allowance for the meat and butter programs financed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF HOW PRICE-SUPPORTING PROGRAMS INVOLVING LOSSES TO COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION OPERATE

A. Dry beans

Prior to planting time in 1943 the War Food Administration announced that the prices for dry edible beans would be supported at $7.50 per hundredweight for U. S. No. 1, Lima, Baby Lima, Light, Dark, and Western Red Kidney beans, and $6.50 per hundredweight for U. S. No. 1, Pea, Great Northern, Small and Flat Small White, Pink, Pinto, Cranberry, and Small Red beans, cleaned and bagged, in carload lots at ship-

ping point. The support price for No. 2 beans is 15 cents lower. These support prices exceed the existing maximum prices for sales into civilian consumption by the following amounts:

	Per 100 lbs. (cleaned)
$6.50 varieties:	
Pea	$0.70
Great Northern	.70
Small White	.70
Flat Small White	.70
Pinto	.60
Pink	.50
Small Red	.70
Cranberry (Western)	.15
Cranberry (other than Western)	.60
$7.50 varieties:	
Lima	0
Baby Lima	.80
Light Red Kidney	1.20
Dark Red Kidney	1.20
Western Red Kidney	1.20

In order to implement the support-price guarantee, the following actions were taken:

1. Commodity Credit Corporation entered into contracts with country shippers, under which the country shippers agreed to purchase dry beans from producers on the basis of the announced support prices, taking into consideration approved charges for cleaning, bagging, and other services that would have to be performed in order for the beans to be in position for sale at the support price. Under these contracts Commodity Credit Corporation agreed to make a support-price payment to country shippers at rates equal to the amount by which the support price exceeded the civilian ceiling price on all beans sold into domestic civilian channels. The Corporation also agreed to buy at the support price any stocks the shippers were unable to sell during the season.

2. Food Distribution Administration, acting as agent for Commodity Credit Corporation, offered to purchase at the support price any dry beans offered, cleaned, and bagged, in carload lots at country shipping points. Such beans will be used for lend-lease, Army, Navy, and other governmental purposes, and no support payment will be made with respect to such beans so used.

3. In order to assist producers in holding their beans until they could be sold, Commodity Credit Corporation offered to make loans to farmers on farm or warehouse stored beans which had not been cleaned or bagged, the loan rates being $5.50 per hundredweight for beans that would grade out No. 1, $5.35 per hundredweight for beans that would grade out No. 2, and $5.10 per hundredweight for beans that would grade out No. 3.

4. Commodity Credit Corporation offered to purchase through county A. A. A. committees any thresher run beans that could not be handled immediately by country shippers if Commodity Credit Corporation bins were available for storing such beans. The purchase price for such beans is the support price less approved cleaning, bagging, and other charges for services yet to be performed in order for such beans to be in position to be sold at the announced support price.

B. Dairy feed payment

In order to assist dairy producers in maintaining production of milk, the War Food Administration announced that from October 1, 1943, to December 31, 1943, inclusive, payments would be made to dairy farmers in an amount approximately equal to the increase in the cost of dairy feed between September 1942 and September 1943, with adjustments for relative changes that have occurred in the price of milk and the proportion of dairy feed purchased in each area. These payments are made as follows:

1. The amount of payment to which a farmer is entitled is measured by the quantity of milk, cream, butter, or butterfat sold by him between October 1 and December 31, 1943.

2. The rate of payment is established by areas and ranges from 30 to 50 cents per hundredweight of milk and 4 to 6 cents per pound of butterfat. The rate on butter is 80 percent of the rate on butterfat since there are approximately 4 pounds of butterfat in 5 pounds of butter, and the rate on cream is about 20 percent of the rate on butterfat since there is approximately 1 pound of butterfat in 5 pounds of cream.

3. Producers became eligible on November 1, 1943, for payment in connection with their October sales of milk, cream, butter, and butterfat, and the first payments were made on that date. The farmer obtains his payment by submitting to the county A. A. A. committee an application for payment and substantiating data showing the quantities of milk, cream, butter, or butterfat sold by him during October. Upon approval of this application the county A. A. A. committee draws a draft on Commodity Credit Corporation and payable to the producer covering the amount to which the producer was entitled in connection with his October sales. The producer takes this draft to his local bank where he obtains cash, and the draft is then forwarded to the Federal Reserve bank or branch bank serving that area for payment on behalf of Commodity Credit Corporation. The same procedure will be followed with respect to sales during November and December 1943.

C. Fluid milk, Baltimore (Md.) milkshed

In April 1943, milk producers in the Baltimore milkshed were granted an increase of 35 cents per hundredweight in their ceiling prices on class I milk. No increase was granted, however, in the ceiling prices on class I milk to consumers. In order to make it possible for the handlers to pay to producers the higher price for milk, Commodity Credit Corporation offered to pay handlers 35 cents per hundredweight of class I milk purchased by them at the new ceiling prices and sold at the ceiling prices applicable to consumer sales. Under this program the farmer gets the increased price at the usual time of settlement with distributors, and the distributors in turn apply to Commodity Credit Corporation for the payment to offset the increase in the price of milk to producers.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., December 18, 1943.

The Honorable BURNET R. MAYBANK,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: I am enclosing a tabulation giving a break-down of subsidies which you requested a few days ago.

As I stated before the Banking and Currency Committee, we say another one hundred and fifty to two hundred and fifty million dollars will be needed which we know will be necessary to hold food prices during 1944. And, in my opinion, we would make a great mistake to take responsibility for holding food prices at their present levels unless we had a further reserve of two hundred to two hundred and fifty million, which would give us a top limitation of a billion and a half.

We would, of course, make every effort to keep our expenditures somewhat less than this figure. However, I do not feel that I personally can take the responsibility of saying that food costs will be held unless we have a sufficient amount of money to really do the job. Moreover, the holding of all prices is, of course, based on the assumption that wages will be held by the War Labor Board.

I do hope that you will have a very pleasant Christmas.

My best personal regards.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator.

[Millions of dollars]

	Total estimated annual expenditure	Amount for Government purchases	Amount for civilian purchases	Amount civilian must pay if subsidy withdrawn	Total amount civilian and Government must pay if subsidy withdrawn
Subsidies to permit higher prices to farmers without reflecting in consumer prices	519.3	79	440.3	555	634
Canned fruits and vegetables	27				
Cheddar cheese	29				
Dried beans	9.7				
Milk—					
Dairy feeds	200				
Fluid	5				
Hay	2				
Peanuts	10				
Potatoes	25				
Prunes and raisins	13				
Soybeans	10				
Sugar beets	11				
Truck crops	5.6				
Wheat for feed	68				
Wheat for flour	100				
Vegetable shortening	4				
Subsidies on transportation to prevent higher prices to consumers	51.75	10	41.75	70	80
Corn	5.00				
Apples	3.75				
Sugar	43				
Subsidies to roll back prices to consumers	533	178	355	526.5	704.5
Butter	82				
Meat	436				
Peanut butter	15				
Total, all food subsidies	1,104.05	267	837.05	1,151.5	1,418.5

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee advises me that there is on the way over from the House of Representatives another matter involving the extension of certain farm-labor provisions which will expire on the 1st of January. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 3:20 p. m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection (at 3 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.), the Senate took a recess until 3 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.

On the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 209) extending until January 31, 1944, the provisions of the act of April 29, 1943, making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN FARM LABOR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 209), extending until January 31, 1944, the provisions of the act of April 29, 1943, making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution which the House has just passed and sent to the Senate, be now considered. Before it is considered, however, let me read it, so Senators may know just what it is. The joint resolution is as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the act of April 29, 1943 (Public Law 45), making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, is hereby amended by striking out the date "December 31, 1943," in section 1 and inserting in lieu thereof "January 31, 1944," and is further amended so that the funds appropriated by section 1 and not heretofore or hereafter apportioned by the Administrator among the several States pursuant to section 2 shall be available for expenditure by the Administrator for the purposes specified in section 3.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any provisions to the contrary in the act approved July 12, 1943 (Public Law 132), funds available to the War Manpower Commission for the current migration of Mexican or Canadian nationals under the auspices of the War Manpower Commission for industrial and railroad purposes essential to the war effort, may continue to be expended during the fiscal year 1944.

I shall state the purpose of the joint resolution. The House has passed a bill governing the entrance of farm workers from Canada and Mexico, and that measure is now before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. It is quite a lengthy bill. It reached the Appropriations Committee only this morning, and I believe the committee will not have time before we recess or adjourn over the holidays to give the bill consideration. The program will stop on December 31 this year unless the measure extending the date from December 31, 1943, to January 31, 1944, is passed. The joint resolution extends the time 1 month.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The public law which is sought to be amended authorized the importation of farm labor into the United States?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Within certain limits and for a certain period of time; is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. And the proposal now before the Senate is simply an amendment to the law?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is an amendment to the law extending the time from December 31, 1943, to January 31, 1944.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from Maine uses the expression "farm labor into the United States." The importation is limited, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; it is.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is limited to the nationals of certain countries.

Mr. WHITE. Yes; I so understood.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. What is the limitation on importation insofar as numbers of workers are concerned?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will have to get the original law in order to answer the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. I do not ask for the legal limit, but what is the limit as a practical matter?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona can answer the question. I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. HAYDEN. The agreement with Mexico provides for a limit of 50,000 agricultural workers.

Mr. LODGE. And how about the Canadian situation?

Mr. HAYDEN. So far as Canada is concerned, railroad labor only is affected.

Mr. LODGE. So this is the law which is designed to meet a specific situation in the Southwest, and the railroad situation——

Mr. HAYDEN. In the East.

Mr. LODGE. To meet that situation only?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. It does not affect the Bahamas or Puerto Rico?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. May I ask the Senator from Arizona, was the original legislation, the public law to which the Senator referred, limited to the Mexican labor and to the railroad labor?

Mr. HAYDEN. This is the situation. We passed a law last spring for the calendar year 1943 because we were dealing then with seasonal agricultural labor. So we were handling it by the calendar year, and the legislation would expire at the end of the calendar year. The House reenacted practically all that legislation. There was no basic law for it. In doing so the House changed the terms in some way. We do not know just what the House did do about it, as we have not yet had opportunity to study the bill. So we thought that rather than try to rush a bill through, it would be better to continue the present arrangement for 30 days so as to give the Senate committee time to hold hearings on the House measure.

Mr. WHITE. Whatever of good or harm there may be in the proposal, it is only for a definite period of 30 days.

Mr. McKELLAR. Thirty-one days.

Mr. LODGE. This program has been proceeding for 1 year; is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. Under legislation which emerged from the two Appropriations Committees in the first instance?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. The bill which has been referred to the Senate Appropriations Committee is not simply to make appropriation of a sum of money; is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. The measure provides for reenactment of legislation which would expire at the end of 1 year.

Mr. LODGE. It is simply reenactment of legislation, without change of policy?

Mr. HAYDEN. We hope so, but there are certain changes in the legislation as it passed the House which we do not quite understand, so before we act on the measure we desire to hold hearings in order to ascertain just what the House did by way of changing policy.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me say that all the arguments in favor of the House bill and the papers connected with it were sent to me yesterday afternoon with the hope that the Senate might consider the measure today and pass it, but when I looked over the bill I found that it contained a great many provisions on which I thought there ought to be a hearing. For that reason we cannot agree to the bill itself, but we can postpone the date of the expiration of the present law for 31 days. That is the reason for the joint resolution.

Mr. LODGE. The action we are asked to take today is to extend the present situation, without change, for a month?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I am in favor of the motion which the Senator from Tennessee will make that the Senate pass the House joint resolution to extend the period. In the interim we may have time to consider the House bill on its

merits. But there is in the bill the new element that, instead of being confined to agricultural labor it now includes labor for the maintenance of railroad tracks, which is hardly agricultural, but it is necessary labor nevertheless.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me state the necessity for the second provision. There has been made available from the President's emergency fund $140,000 for the importation of railroad labor. In the proposed legislation there is a provision relating to it. A Budget estimate has been submitted to Congress, but since no action has been taken on it, the emergency fund cannot be used any longer. It will also die unless Congress takes action. So the measure now before the Senate extends that situation, and gives us an opportunity to look at the whole problem.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me call attention to a statement made by Representative TABER in the House yesterday, which is very clear and shows just exactly what is proposed. I read as follows:

> Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, so that the House may understand this amendment, there is $140,000 that has been allocated out of the President's funds to the War Manpower Commission to permit them to promote the migration of Canadian and Mexican workers into the United States temporarily in a similar manner to the manner in which they are being brought in here for work upon the railroads in this country. It has been used quite successfully and we would like to have it continued, especially in view of the fact that the paragraph relating to the importation of Puerto Rican laborers was cut out of the deficiency bill that was up here yesterday.

Senators will recall that there was a provision in the deficiency bill to allow Puerto Rican and other West Indian islanders to come into the country; but that was stricken out of the deficiency bill and is not now a part of it. For that reason I think the pending joint resolution, which would extend the time for 31 days until we can consider the House bill and see what it provides, should be passed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for yielding to me.

In the Appropriations Committee and on the floor of the Senate, I have been, as I now am, very much interested in how our American labor shall be protected in the period following the war. We all know—it is no secret—that many persons have been imported into this country under the pretext that they are refugees, and that undoubtedly many of those persons are to remain in this country. That seems to be the program. It is not a program which meets with my approval at all, and I would vote against it at any time and at any place, and would do anything within my power to block it.

If the joint resolution comprised permission for foreigners to come into this country and to remain here after the war emergency has subsided, I would remain on the floor of the Senate and would devote my last breath to defeating it.

I must take it from the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee that he and I understand each other in this respect, that such nationals of other countries are brought into this country temporarily, and under our existent laws will be immediately removed from this country at the close of the emergency. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and other members of the committee, including the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who is listening to me today, were in agreement with me on this point as affecting other nationals—as, for instance, Haitians and Jamaicans.

So in the Appropriations Committee we voted to strike out provision for such persons to remain.

What I am fearful of—and probably I express this thought out of turn—is the peculiar feeling, which seems to pervade our own administration and our own hour, that we are letting down the bars of Americanism and American standards of living, to the end that we shall spread our gratuities in every respect over the entire world. In my judgment such a program cannot and should not be carried out.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I have not the floor, I am speaking in the time of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me, so that I may comment on the statement just made by the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I entertain the same apprehensions the Senator from Nevada has expressed. The Federal departments that presumably are regulating immigration tell us, after the event has occurred, that great populations are coming into this country. We do not know a thing about it until they are already here.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee will further yield to me, let me say, further expressing my thought, that there is prevalent—and I am sorry to say that it is apparent in high places—the peculiar preachment which would make us, as an American Government, a part of the entire world, to absorb those who would come to us from the entire world. I think freedom is best sustained by those who know and understand and love it, and who have descended from generations which have known and understood and loved it in this country. If they have not that doctrine inculcated in their very hearts, they do not belong to a sphere of freedom for which we have given our blood and our energy.

If the joint resolution means that we shall bring in, take care of, and employ, under regulations, those who come in from foreign countries, and who will go out, I am entirely content. I have voted for that in the Appropriations Committee time and again, as has the Senator from Tennessee, as has the Senator from Massachusetts, and as have other Senators. But if the joint resolution means that any part of such a group of nationals of a foreign country is to remain in the United States after the war emergency is over, to come into competition with our citizens, and to tear down the American standard of living for our working classes, I shall oppose it with the last breath I have.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I will yield; but first I should like to say that, of course, the joint resolution does not apply to the real question about the entry into this country of such persons. The joint resolution would merely extend the operation of the law for 31 days.

Mr. LODGE. But, Mr. President, in extending the operation of the law, of course we must give some thought as to whether the need for this type of legislation is as pressing as it was purported to be when we first enacted the law. The thought comes to my mind that a number of industrial contracts are being canceled, and that by common consent if not actually by public release from the Manpower Commission, the shortage of manpower is not so critical or so extreme as it has been.

So the whole question of the urgency of pursuing this policy should, I think, be examined de novo. To be sure, this is not the time or place to do so; but when we come to the time and place, at the end of January, I believe we should go into the question very thoroughly indeed, and should not blindly reenact a piece of legislation simply because we enacted it a year ago.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I entirely agree with the Senator. That is why I was unwilling to bring up the bill itself at this time. By the joint resolution we would merely extend the time for 31 days. I hope the Senator will remind me to instruct the clerk of the committee to give proper notice, just as soon as we return after the New Year, to call the committee together to consider the legislation. The joint resolution is merely to extend the operation of the law for 31 days.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 209) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INVESTIGATION OF THE EFFECT OF THE CENTRALIZATION OF HEAVY INDUSTRY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on October 12 I submitted a resolution (S. Res. 190) which I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That a special committee of seven Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is hereby authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the effect upon interstate commerce of the centralization of heavy industry in the United States, with particular regard

to whether such centralization inhibits or deters adequate use and development of natural resources or hampers the full and free flow of commerce between the States, and to make a comprehensive study of plans and proposals for industrial recentralization, particularly through establishment of new or expanded facilities for the production of iron and steel. Such committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation and study, with such recommendations for legislation as it may deem necessary and desirable, and shall also report to the Senate from time to time its views on needed or desirable executive or administrative action by any department or agency of the Federal Government.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to request such assistance and information from any departments and agencies of the Government, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on or about November 4, the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce filed a favorable report on the resolution. I may state offhand that the resolution is one which would seek to save heavy-commodity industry from further centralization and to place it where it would be of the greatest benefit to the greatest number of persons. The purpose of the resolution is to provide opportunity for the study of the important subject whether steel should be manufactured in places where the God of nature has afforded supplies of the native commodities for the manufacture of steel, and also relative to the transportation required because of the distribution of steel commodities.

The Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce is in agreement that the resolution should be adopted. It carries a provision for an appropriation of $5,000 from the contingent fund of the Senate, for study and investigation.

About 10 days ago the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate voluntarily stated to me on the floor of the Senate that he would report the resolution immediately following the disposition of the bill in which he was then interested, which was the soldiers' vote bill. He made the same statement to other Senators. We are now about to conclude the work of this session, and yet the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, presided over by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] has not made a report on this all-important resolution.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Not only is the resolution supported by a distinguished group in the Senate, but meetings have been held between the group in the Senate and the group in the House who are interested in the building of a great nation for the future.

I now yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I should like to make a few observations in connection with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

In the past 3 years, in furtherance of the war program, our country has spent billions of dollars in the construction of plants throughout the United States. Among them are many steel plants which have been constructed at places where there is an abundance of iron ore and an abundance of coking coal.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that today there is a trend—I do not know where it originated, nor do I know by whom it was initiated, but just as sure as we are standing here the trend has begun—to cut down those plants and to continue the production of steel in the large centralizations which now exist.

I commend the Senator now, as I have done in the past, on the submission of his resolution. In my opinion, no committee of the Senate is today in a position to do a greater service to the country than the committee of which the Senator speaks. It seems to me that now is the opportune time for that committee to get under way and render the great service to the Nation which it can render.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am very grateful to my colleague from Utah, who understands and advocates the cause of the great section of the West from which we both come.

Mr. President, there is a movement on foot to destroy, if possible, the development of the natural resources of this country and initially to defeat this resolution. I know what is going on. I know that in my State there is the greatest magnesium plant in all the world. It has produced more magnesium, which is a war essential, than any other single plant in all the world. I know that magnesium is a commodity which is competitive with aluminum. I know that today certain interests are seeking to shut down that plant. I have in my office a copy of a letter from an individual in authority in a high place in America who would shut down the basic magnesium plant at Las Vegas, Nev., under the guise of saving fuel, when the basic magnesium plant at Las Vegas, Nev., uses only electrical energy, rather than fuel oil. So all kinds of excuses are being made by those who have been placed in positions of power in the War Production Board and other agencies to hold back the development of America.

The development of America does not mean the development of certain points in America. The development of America means the development of all America—from the Atlantic to the Pacific; from the Canadian border to the Gulf; and into Alaska and other Territorial possessions.

There are those who would control this development for their own selfish interests. Mr. President, I sincerely hope that there is nothing sinister behind the deferment of the adoption of the report by the Committee on Interstate Commerce, headed by the able Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] with reference to Senate Resolution 190.

I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Committee on Interstate Commerce approving the provisions of Senate Resolution 190, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report (No. 519) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Interstate Commerce, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 190) to investigate the effect of the centralization of heavy industry in the United States, after full consideration, without dissent report favorably thereon, with an amendment, and recommend that the resolution, as amended, do pass.

The amendment proposed is as follows:

Page 2, line 21, strike out "$10,000," and insert "$5,000."

One of the important problems presented for the attention of the Congress is the problem of a proper use of our natural resources. This is true not only in relation to post-war planning, where it is a vital factor, but also now, while the war is in progress, because it is important to the conduct of the war.

Much of this country's expansion for war production has ignored such basic factors as the location of resources, and has followed what appears to have been the line of least resistance; that is, augumentation and expansion of facilities already in existence. Whether this policy has prevented the country from reaching its maximum potentialities in various lines of production, and how much this policy has contributed to transportation bottlenecks, are questions of great importance.

These questions, and others proposed for consideration by the committee, which this resolution would create, are so broad in scope, and embrace so many factors related to the economic development of various sections of the country, and of the country as a whole, that your committee deems it proper they should be the subject of inquiry by a special committee of the Senate.

Of immediate concern is the fact that shortages of scrap, of iron ore, and of steel continue serious. The war needs of the country for steel have been reported as more than 25 percent in excess of production. Yet vast natural resources for steel production remain unexploited.

The following table, based on information furnished by the United States Bureau of Mines, shows one phase of this situation State by State:

State	Has coal	Has iron ore	Produces iron or steel
Alabama	X	X	X
Arizona	X	X	
Arkansas	X	X	
California	X	X	X
Colorado	X	X	X
Connecticut		X	X
Delaware			
Florida			
Georgia	X	X	X
Idaho	X	X	
Illinois	X		X
Indiana	X		X
Iowa	X	X	
Kansas	X		
Kentucky	X	X	X
Louisiana			
Maine			

State	Has coal	Has iron ore	Produces iron or steel
Maryland	X	X	X
Massachusetts		X	X
Michigan	X	X	X
Minnesota		X	X
Mississippi		X	
Missouri	X	X	X
Montana	X	X	
Nebraska			
Nevada	X	X	
New Hampshire			
New Jersey		X	X
New Mexico	X	X	
New York		X	X
North Carolina	X	X	
North Dakota	X		
Ohio	X	X	X
Oklahoma	X	X	
Oregon	X		
Pennsylvania	X	X	X
Rhode Island			
South Carolina			
South Dakota	X	X	
Tennessee	X	X	
Texas	X	X	X
Utah	X	X	X
Vermont			
Virginia	X	X	X
Washington	X	X	X
West Virginia	X	X	
Wisconsin		X	
Wyoming	X	X	

It will be noted that known coal deposits are to be found in 32 States, while iron ore in usable quantity and quality is known to exist in 34 States. Twenty-seven States have both iron ore and coal, but only 13 of these States have any iron or steel production. On the other hand, 7 of the States which now produce iron or steel lack, as a part of their natural resources, either coal or iron ore.

Many States which do produce iron or steel produce so little that their contribution to the total national output is almost inconsiderable. It is a question which should have the attention of the Congress whether those States whose production now is so small should not, through some coordinated program, be given opportunity to achieve a substantial expansion of this industry, so as to attain whatever place in the national picture should be theirs on the basis of their natural resources.

As to the States which have both iron ore and natural coal deposits, in usable quantity and quality, but which produce no iron or steel, it is a proper subject of inquiry whether any factors other than natural economic laws are hampering or preventing establishment in such States of such facilities for iron and steel production as their natural resources justify.

Centralization of industry can be a self-perpetuating economic factor. To whatever extent it is self-perpetuating, rather than dictated by the more basic factors such as resources, transportation, and labor supply, it is unsound and detrimental to the national economy. The importance, to the Senate, of having the full and true facts regarding this situation, in the United States, is obvious. Such facts are basic to a proper consideration of the problems incident to the post-war planning which is and must be the responsibility of the Congress.

The Senate should have no hesitancy in authorizing a special committee to secure these facts, to study their implications, and to make sound recommendations for dealing with the complicated problems involved. For a proper discharge of its duties, the Senate must have such facts and such recommendations, and it should not be required to rely, in this regard, upon any outside source.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I do not propose to give up in this matter. There is no power on earth to which I am subservient save my God and my country. I propose that this resolution shall be kept before the Senate, either at this session or in the session to come. If the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, after having voluntarily given me his word, and given his word to other Members of the Senate, that he would report the resolution, now proposes to hold it in abeyance, then I shall keep it before the Senate, because I believe in the justice of my cause. Otherwise, I would have no cause. I have never presented a matter to the Senate in which I did not believe in my very soul.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have received information that the House has agreed to the conference report on the extension of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The message from the House is on its way to the Senate. I expect it to be here in a few minutes. I therefore ask that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objection, the Senate (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 3 o'clock and 55 minutes, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair).

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN BILLS, ETC.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the impending recess of the Senate the Vice President be authorized to sign bills and resolutions ready for signature; that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives, and that the committees be authorized to report to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BARKLEY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "February 17, 1944"; and the House agree to the same.

ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
FRANCIS MALONEY,
GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE,
JOHN THOMAS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

BRENT SPENCE,
THOMAS F. FORD,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
CHARLES L. GIFFORD,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, what is the effect of the agreement?

Mr. BARKLEY. The conferees agreed on the 17th day of February as the date to which the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation should be continued, which is an exact middle date between the 5th and 29th of February, the dates fixed by the House and Senate, respectively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

FINAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the concurrent resolution.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Tuesday, December 21, 1943, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered, and agreed to.

DATE OF MEETING OF SECOND SESSION OF SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may introduce a joint resolution, and that the Senate proceed to consider it at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 105) fixing the date of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress shall begin at noon on Monday, January 10, 1944.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, for some reason or other unknown to the

members of the committee, this matter was submitted to the Appropriations Committee, and we amended the measure presented so that the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress would commence on the 19th of January. I believe that was in conformity with the desire of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY].

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has reference to a joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and referred to the Committee on Appropriations. As usual, the procedure in matters of that sort is worked out between the two Houses of Congress, and in this case there has been agreement with the majority and minority leaders of the other House, as well as with the Members on the other side of the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is customary, I take it, for such questions to be submitted to the Appropriations Committee. Naturally, that committee has the matter of appropriations under its jurisdiction and knows the situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no recollection of any occasion when a resolution of that sort was submitted by a Senator prior to an agreement between the two Houses as to when there should be an adjournment and reassembly. I make no question of the propriety of the reference of the resolution, but obviously it is a matter which has to be worked out, and it has been worked out in connection with the joint resolution now pending.

I thank the Senator for calling it to my attention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 105) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to consider executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Public Health Service nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Alexander A. Vandegrift to be Commandant of the Marine Corps with the rank of lieutenant general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Merritt A. Edson to be brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. I now move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, December 21, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 18 (legislative day of December 15), 1943:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

J. Brock Havron, of Tennessee, to be a Foreign Service officer, unclassified, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

David C. Berger, of Virginia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

William D. Moreland, Jr., of Oregon, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Denis W. Delaney, of Lawrence, Mass., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Massachusetts, in place of Thomas B. Hassett, resigned.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Alden H. Baker, of Noblesville, Ind., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 40, with headquarters at Indianapolis, Ind., in place of Charles E. Kemper, deceased.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Col. William P. T. Hill to be the Quartermaster of the Marine Corps, with the rank of brigadier general, for a period of 4 years from the 1st day of February 1944.

Col. William J. Wallace to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 5th day of December 1943.

Col. Thomas J. Cushman to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 7th day of December 1943.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Katherine D. Wright, Auburn, Ala., in place of Homer Wright, deceased.

CALIFORNIA

Joseph L. Hewes, Encinitas, Calif., in place of R. J. Homan, removed.

Alice L. West, Rocklin, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

DELAWARE

Florence E. Williams, Dagsboro, Del., in place of Elmer Layfield. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Otto Dickerson, Milton, Dela., in place of F. H. Carey. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Edna E. Conner, Townsend, Del., in place of E. A. Conner. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

FLORIDA

Jennie D. Carlton, Nocatee, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

GEORGIA

Katherine F. Underwood, Cadwell, Ga., in place of B. B. Hicks, resigned.

Durell W. Knight, Dexter, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Edgar F. Allen, Folkston, Ga., in place of V. J. Pickren, resigned.

Bob H. Elliott, Milstead, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Julia E. Custer, Montrose, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Marie E. Harrell, Pearson, Ga., in place of Harley Davis, transferred.

Charles P. Suber, Ben Hill, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Hubert H. Watson, Warner Robins, Ga. Office became Presidential October 1, 1942.

HAWAII

Francis K. C. Foo, Kailua, Hawaii. Office became Presidential July 1, 1938.

IDAHO

Claus J. Breier, Jr., Lewiston, Idaho, in place of Fred Kling, deceased.

INDIANA

Joshua Rothrock, Brooklyn, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Frank A. Anderson, Deputy, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Madelyn O'Dell, Fillmore, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Dale E. Pherigo, Flat Rock, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Willard W. Goble, Freetown, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Leta McComb, Huntertown, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Louvisa E. Rainford, Lake Village, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Lester A. Madden, Lynnville, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Winnie Johnson, North Terre Haute, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Andy Dillon, Otwell, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

James H. Witherspoon, Sr., Patoka, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Leonora T. Anderson, Poland, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ruth Kennedy, St. Bernice, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Grace Mitchell, Springville, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Harold T. Conrad, Zionsville, Ind., in place of P. R. Moore, transferred.

IOWA

A. Woodruff Moore, Onawa, Iowa, in place of Ben Jensen, retired.

Mildred L. Thoreen, University Park, Iowa, in place of L. C. Hewitt, resigned.

KANSAS

Clarence F. Danielson, Clyde, Kans., in place of J. J. Menard, transferred.

Roy W. Sanderson, Hamilton, Kans., in place of Otis Barngrover, transferred.

Paul D. Randel, Havensville, Kans., in place of W. T. Flowers, transferred.

Philip P. Voran, Kinsley, Kans., in place of W. C. Reeder, resigned.

Caleb A. Bedmer, Natoma, Kans., in place of A. V. Hoskins, not commissioned.

May B. Lawson, Plains, Kans., in place of N. W. Woodworth, transferred.

Clifford I. Percival, Smolan, Kans. Office became Presidential October 1, 1942.

G. Lowell Kelley, White Cloud, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

KENTUCKY

James A. Usher, Farmington, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Elizabeth Godsey, Hardburly, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

James L. Howard, Kings Mountain, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mary H. Buckler, Loretto, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Arnold E. Adkins, Raceland, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Thelma Chloe Howard, Summer Shade, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

LOUISIANA

Willie A. Dearman, Delhi, La., in place of J. W. Stegall, transferred.

Edith W. Ott, Fisher, La., in place of F. H. Wootton, resigned.

Anatole E. Ayo, Jr., Lockport, La., in place of Conrad Bourgeois. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Pauline M. Netterville, Newellton, La., in place of A. B. Netterville. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1942.

MAINE

Verna G. Clark, Albion, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Lester G. Sands, Bar Mills, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Katherine C. Duntley, Casco, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MARYLAND

Emma B. Gardner, Arnold, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

William E. Bowman, Silver Spring, Md., in place of Howard Griffith, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS

Hester L. Sherman, Brimfield, Mass., in place of J. W. Brown, deceased.

MISSOURI

Stephen H. Biggerstaff, Wheeling, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MONTANA

David R. Bowen, Worden, Mont., in place of D. R. Bowen. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEBRASKA

George W. Lincoln, Lexington, Nebr., in place of P. J. Hewitt. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEVADA

William Harold Morgan, Yerington, Nev., in place of E. M. Booth, removed.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Edward Reilly, Dover, N. H., in place of J. J. Cavanaugh, removed.

Walter E. French, Dublin, N. H., in place of F. B. Farley, resigned.

Julia W. Blair, Fitzwilliam, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

George G. Helsberg, New Ipswich, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ralph E. Avery, West Campton, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEW JERSEY

Almira C. Goff, Bridgeport, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Edna M. Bowen, Franklin Park, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Thomas L. Hunt, Greystone Park, N. J., in place of W. J. Dugan, removed.

Lena McCain, Hope, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEW YORK

Clyde M. Johengen, Collins, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Charles J. Jones, Garnerville, N. Y., in place of F. P. Morstatt, deceased.

Mary T. Mushler, Rocky Point, N. Y., in place of A. R. Cardona, resigned.

Anne N. Cisler, Stillwater, N. Y., in place of W. H. Nolan, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Clara C. Craven, Trinity, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

OHIO

James E. Rosser, McArthur, Ohio, in place of J. E. Warren, deceased.

Albert N. Weckerly, Whitehouse, Ohio, in place of D. K. Studer, resigned.

OREGON

Gertrude K. McKinney, Elkton, Oreg., in place of A. R. McDonald, resigned.

Dorathy V. Elliott, Florence, Oreg., in place of E. L. Basford, resigned.

Clinton F. Trow, Ontario, Oreg., in place of C. F. Cox, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

Jane F. Mackley, Bainbridge, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Arthur R. Lovell, Blandburg, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Besse C. Peffer, Boiling Springs, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Donald A. Noll, Bowmanstown, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Beulah McConnell, Clinton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Julia M. Fuleki, Commodore, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Catherine Matlock, Cumbola, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Kermit E. Reisenweaver, Drums, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Walter R. Weir, Floreffe, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Charles W. Staley, Plymouth Meeting, Pa., in place of E. A. Howell, resigned.

Walter C. Starinshak, Ranshaw, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Lafayette Lawrence, Renfrew, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Arzella A. Plummer, Sidman, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Frank O. Shenton, Slatedale, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Katherine M. Evans, Springville, Pa., in place of M. L. Lake, resigned.

Grace E. Strattan, Strattanville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ruth A. Groover, Upper Black Eddy, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Emma E. Foster, Wall, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Elizabeth N. Nolt, Willow Street, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

PUERTO RICO

Angel Socorro, Caguas, P. R., in place of Augustin Carbonell, retired.

Tomas S. Gutierrez, San Sebastian, P. R., in place of J. V. Hernandez, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Grover C. Henderson, Greenwood, S. C., in place of G. N. Burnett. Incumbent's commission expired June 8, 1942.

James N. Cleveland, Marietta, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Thomas M. Moore, Rembert, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Clarence R. Dregseth, Baltic, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Alton B. Nelson, Toronto, S. Dak., in place of O. I. Ohman. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

TENNESSEE

Edgar M. Quisenberry, Atoka, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mattie Ida O'Brien, Christiana, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

TEXAS

Claud S. Campbell, Borger, Tex., in place of J. E. Morris, resigned.

Thomas L. P. Lindley, Fairfield, Tex., in place of Lonnie Childs, retired.

Stella Gliddon, Johnson City, Tex., in place of C. C. Redford, retired.

Fannie E. Taylor, Murchison, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Marion J. Edwards, Rankin, Tex., in place of A. J. Bushong, retired.

Robert E. Johnson, Round Rock, Tex., in place of J. W. Ledbetter, transferred.

UTAH

Etta Moffitt, Kenilworth, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

VERMONT

Marjorie B. Carroll, Graniteville, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Olive M. Lobdell, Hartland, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

George E. Lee, Pawlet, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

VIRGINIA

Russell D. Davis, Axton, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Cecil I. Bruce, Bastian, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

WASHINGTON

John H. Thompson, Midway, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Roy W. Peterson, Parkland, Wash., in place of A. R. Lehmann, deceased.

Fred Kelly, Woodinville, Wash., in place of L. M. Crim, deceased.

WEST VIRGINIA

Gaylord Smith, Ellenboro, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Dallas R. Yeager, Mason, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 18 (legislative day of December 15, 1943):

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS

Ray H. Vanderhook	Paul W. Lucas
William D. King	William J. McAnally
Roy E. Wolfe	Clarence K. Aldrich
Clarence B. Mayes	Steve F. Price
William B. Hoover	

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Alexander A. Vandegrift to be Commandant of the Marine Corps with the rank of lieutenant general for a period of 4 years from January 1, 1944.

Merritt A. Edson to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from December 1, 1943.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, infinite in power and wisdom, we trust that we approach Thee in the spirit of humility and in the consciousness of our needs. We pray that our demeanor and our influence may reflect the teaching of the Man of Nazareth,

realizing that nothing finally wrong can live.

Bless and guide our citizens of every station; grant that labor and industry may be so bound together that they may come to that unity and cooperation which forbids intolerance and any sort of idleness. The Lord God help us all to be grim fighters for the truth, for individual freedom, and for the rights of man wherever he may live—"Never strike sail to fear. Come into port greatly, or sail with God the seas."

Heavenly Father, as we approach the fore-glow of the Advent season, may we hear Thy call, not as a ruler summons his underlings but as a father calls his child. O let us hear that voice in tones of cheer and love, in hope and gladness. As we gather about our encircled tables may we know that they have been purchased by midnight vigils, by parental strivings, and are being wrought on the battle fronts of freedom. In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on December 17, 1943, the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On December 17, 1943:

H. R. 247. An act for the relief of the estate of Richard Dodge Beale, deceased;

H. R. 302. An act for the relief of Robert Griffin;

H. R. 937. An act for the relief of the estate of Luther Clyde Nanny;

H. R. 977. An act for the relief of Clare A. Miller;

H. R. 1379. An act for the relief of Gerald Estell Proctor;

H. R. 1640. An act for the relief of Mrs. J. D. Price;

H. R. 1933. An act for the relief of Ronald A. Cox;

H. R. 1973. An act for the relief of Albert Ferguson and Ozelle Ferguson;

H. R. 2080. An act to provide temporary additional pay for equipment maintenance for each carrier in Rural Mail Delivery Service;

H. R. 2188. An act to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2190, An act for the relief of Marguerite R. McElroy;

H. R. 3039. An act for the relief of Mrs. C. W. Selby;

H. R. 3070. An act to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3299. An act for the relief of Victor H. Loftus, disbursing clerk, American Embassy, Mexico, D. F., Mexico;

H. R. 3309. An act to suspend temporarily the application of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended;

H. R. 3363. An act extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made.

H. J. Res. 175. Joint resolution commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the first airplane flight by Wilbur and Orville Wright; and

H. J. Res. 176. Joint resolution to provide for the proper observance of the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of the adoption of the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) entitled "Joint resolution continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. THOMAS of Idaho to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL COUNSEL

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 386) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas section 304 of the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943 (Public Law 132) provides:

"No part of any appropriation, allocation, or fund (1) which is made available under or pursuant to this act, or (2) which is now, or which is hereafter made, available under or pursuant to any other act, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, shall be used, after November 15, 1943, to pay any part of the salary, or other compensation for the personal services, of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett, unless prior to such date such person has been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for leaves of absence or salary, or of any refund or reimbursement, which have accrued prior to November 15, 1943: *Provided further*, That this section shall not operate to deprive such person of payment for services performed as a member of a jury or as a member of the armed forces of the United States nor any benefit, pension, or emolument resulting therefrom."; and

Whereas the President of the United States did not appoint Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., or Robert Morss Lovett by and with the advice and consent of the Senate prior to November 15, 1943; and

Whereas said Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett have pretended to render service as employees of the United States Government since November 15, 1943; and

Whereas the said Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett, respectively, have filed petitions in the Court of Claims of the United States in separate proceedings entitled "Goodwin B. Watson, plaintiff, versus the United States, defendant; William E. Dodd, Jr., plaintiff, versus the United States, defendant; and Robert Morss Lovett, plaintiff, versus the United State, defendant"; and

Whereas the said plaintiffs in said proceeding ask to recover compensation alleged to be due them prior to the time of the commencement of said proceedings on account of services alleged to have been rendered to the United States; and

Whereas said proceedings are now pending in the Court of Claims of the United States; and

Whereas the Attorney General of the United States in communications addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the Vice President of the United States has indicated that the Congress should be afforded an opportunity to be represented by their own counsel; and

Whereas the House of Representatives has a specific interest in the subject matter of said proceedings due to the fact that the matter originated by virtue of action of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the special subcommittee heretofore appointed by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, pursuant to House Resolution 105, Seventy-eighth Congress, is hereby authorized to appoint counsel to represent the United States in the Court of Claims and in any appellate proceedings resulting therefrom in the actions now pending in said Court of Claims heretofore referred to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXPENSES OF SPECIAL COUNSEL, ETC.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 387) providing for the expenses in connection with the resolution just agreed to and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That (1) the expenses incurred pursuant to House Resolution 386, Seventy-eighth Congress, including compensation of counsel appointed pursuant thereto and expenses of the litigation referred to therein; and (2) the expenses of such further proceedings as may be conducted under House Resolution 105, Seventy-eighth Congress, not to exceed $15,000 in the aggregate, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of the special subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations appointed pursuant to House Resolution 105, Seventy-eighth Congress, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPENSES OF COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit another privileged resolution (H. Res. 389) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 282 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, and continued under House Resolution 26 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, House Resolution 321 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, House Resolution 90 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, House Resolution 420 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and House Resolution 65 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, incurred by the special committee appointed to investigate un-American activities in the United States and related questions, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $7,500 in addition to sums heretofore made available, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants,

shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. As I understand, this resolution provides enough money to keep the committee going until the chairman has had an opportunity to present the facts before the gentleman's committee?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes, the committee requested the chairman to appear, but he was unable to be here. There is a balance of $3,000. For salaries for the month of December alone, the amount is $4,695. This does not include the expenses of the committee. There is something around $4,000 in bills for expenses that have not been submitted. They are being withheld although I have urged they be sent in so we would know just what the balance is from week to week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is to keep it going until the gentleman has had an opportunity to inquire fully into the matter?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes, this is to keep the committee going, to pay the employees money they have earned. The committee has asked the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] to appear before it not later than January 15 and advised him no additional money will be appropriated until he appears and justifies the appropriation, as well as explain expenditures. That is the usual procedure.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Can the gentleman inform the House how much money has already been appropriated for that committee?

Mr. COCHRAN. There has been appropriated all together since this committee was originally authorized by the House several Congresses ago about $575,000, of which $3,000 remains unexpended, but if the outstanding bills were paid now there would be a small deficit rather than $3,000 to their credit. This $7,500 and the $3,000 gives them $10,500 to run during December and January.

Mr. SABATH. Was any evidence presented to the gentleman's committee of the work these gentlemen are doing who are on the pay roll of this committee and what activities they are engaged in and whether it is necessary to continue to keep them on the pay roll and to continue this expenditure when the money is needed fo more important purposes?

Mr. COCHRAN. The only witness before the committee was the secretary of the committee who gave us a list of the employees and stated that six or seven employees had left the committee in the last few months. He stated that the committee yesterday voted to make an investigation in reference to orders issued by the Civil Service Commission relative to investigations of applicants for positions. The committee has just closed a hearing in reference to the Japanese situation. Outside of that, the committee has been engaged in cooperating with the Military Intelligence, Naval Intelligence, and the F. B. I. by furnishing them their records relative to various individuals that those organizations are investigating.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman recognizes that we have no quarrel, and even if a call of the House were ordered, and I do not intend to make a motion of that kind, it would perhaps do no good, because if there are men who have been working and who have not been paid I am in favor of their being paid. If the resolution is for that purpose, of course, I shall not object.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will say to the gentleman that I am acting at the direction of the committee of which I am chairman. I will say, also, that I share in his views, the employees should be paid, but so far as I am concerned, I will welcome the day when this committee will go out of business. It has done some good work but other agencies are investigating subversive activities every day. The House as a whole, after the gentleman from Illinois' committee, reported a resolution passed it continuing this committee's activities for the present Congress. After that was done, it was and is the duty of the Committee on Accounts to provide expenses. I want to hold the expenses down as much as we possibly can and I want the chairman to come in before the committee and justify his request for additional expenses and explain its activities.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield, for a question.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that the membership of the House does not entertain his views which he expressed a moment ago, nor do they entertain the views of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] relative to the Dies committee. The Dies committee has rendered wonderful service to the American people. It is so well known to the Members of Congress, it is so well known to the F. B. I., it is so well known to the Army, it is so well known to the Navy, it is so well known to the people of this country who are interested in keeping down subversive elements, that I do not think it is necessary for the Dies committee to come in with witnesses and offer proof as to the necessity of continuing it at this time.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the Committee on Accounts has the same right to call witnesses before it as his Committee on World War Veterans Legislation. We are trying to do our work in a proper way and we want to do it right.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand that the majority of the committee voted for this resolution and if the gentleman from Illinois wants to call the roll we would welcome it, because we will pass the resolution overwhelmingly.

Mr. COCHRAN. I voted for the resolution myself because it is to pay employees who have done work.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. What I would like to know is just what this money is for?

Mr. COCHRAN. It is to pay employees that are on the pay roll now and working, their salaries for the month of December and part of January.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Was there not an unexpended balance that could have covered that?

Mr. COCHRAN. The unexpended balance is $3,000, which is not sufficient to meet the December pay roll. The question involved is, Do you want to pay the employees' salaries for the work they have been performing during the month of December?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am not opposed to paying the salaries of people who have been working, but I am opposed to using this resolution as an opening wedge for more funds for this Dies committee. I want to state on the record that I am opposed to this resolution and shall vote against it.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. FOLGER. I want to ask the gentleman if this will commit the House to anything except to pay what is already owed? I want to be done with this committee and have it ended.

Mr. COCHRAN. No; I cannot commit the House as to future action. It does provide for more money than is needed to pay the December salary, but these people will continue to work in January.

Mr. FOLGER. Will that have any effect on any other motion that may come in here to continue this committee?

Mr. COCHRAN. You will not have a motion to continue the committee because the committee has already been continued for this entire Congress.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. I did not quite grasp the gentleman's answer which he gave me originally as to the activities. Have you stated they will now investigate the civil service? And do you think, under the House resolution, the House gave them any such power? We have a special committee, the committee of which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] is chairman, who has been given that power and he has been doing a mighty good job. He has secured the elimination from the pay rolls, if I am not mistaken, as he last stated, of over 125,000 people. Now, that shows he has accomplished something, and he has not asked for any such vast sums of money. If this money is needed to be paid to these employees, all well and good, and I disagree with the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. As the question involved applies to subversive activities of applicants for positions with the Government, the committee certainly has

jurisdiction. I might also say the Ramspeck committee likewise has jurisdiction.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE REPORT ON INVESTIGATION OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 972) back favorably without amendment a privileged resolution (H. Res. 380) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the second intermediate report (H. Rept. No. 862) of the Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That 7,000 additional copies of the second intermediate report (H. Rept. No. 862) of the Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies be printed for the use of said committee.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE REVENUE ACT OF 1943

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 970) back favorably without amendment a privileged resolution (H. Res. 359) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the bill entitled "The Revenue Act of 1943," together with the accompanying report thereon, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be printed 2,000 additional copies of the bill entitled "The Revenue Act of 1943," for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives; and that 8,600 additional copies of the report (H. Rept. No. 371) thereon be printed, of which 5,000 copies shall be for the use of the House document room, 500 copies for the use of the Senate document room, 3,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and 100 copies for the use of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS RELATIVE TO RAILROAD REORGANIZATION

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 971) back favorably without amendment a privileged resolution (H. Res. 384) authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings on the bill (H. R. 2857) to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said subcommittee during the current session on the bill (H. R. 2857) to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAR CONFERENCE AT MOSCOW

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Report No. 973) back favorably a privileged resolution (H. Res. 370) authorizing that House Document No. 351, being the press releases of the Department of State containing the declaration of four nations on general security, pledging themselves to united action for the prosecution of the present war against their enemies, which was signed at the conference held at Moscow, Russia, together with other papers relating thereto, be reprinted with corrections conforming to the official texts now on file in the Department of State, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That House Document No. 351, current session, being the press releases of the Department of State containing the declaration of four nations on general security, pledging themselves to united action for the prosecution of the present war against their enemies, and recognizing the necessity for the eventual establishment of a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security, which was signed at the conference held at Moscow, Russia, by the Foreign Secretaries of the United States of America, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union, and the Chinese Ambassador at Moscow, together with the Anglo-Soviet-American communiqué, and the declarations regarding Italy and Austria issued by the three Foreign Secretaries at Moscow, and the declaration by President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Premier Stalin regarding atrocities, be reprinted with the necessary corrections required to make the document conform to the original official texts now on file in the Department of State.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUISITION AND DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY REQUIRED FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE (H. DOC. NO. 367)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk, and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am submitting herewith to the Congress a report of operations for the period April 16, 1943, through October 15, 1943, under the act of October 16, 1941, as amended, which authorized the President to requisition and dispose of property required for national defense.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 18, 1943.*

ERECTION OF MEMORIAL AND ENTOMBMENT OF BODIES IN THE ARLINGTON MEMORIAL AMPHITHEATER (H. DOC. NO. 368)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the requirements of the Public Act No. 397, Sixty-sixth Congress, I transmit herewith the annual report of the Commission on the Erection of Memorials and Entombment of Bodies in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 18, 1943.*

SIXTIETH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by the act of Congress to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States approved January 16, 1883, I transmit herewith the sixtieth annual report of the Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 18, 1943.*

THE WRIGHT BROTHERS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, December 17, marked the fortieth anniversary of the first airplane flight. The people of North Carolina, led by the Governor of the State, had prepared exercises to be held at Kill Devil Hill, on the coast of North Carolina in Dare County commemorating this great event. Unfortunately the weather prevailed against the great State of North Carolina and the people, and the exercises necessarily had to be canceled, due to an unprecedented sleet and snow storm. As chairman of the arrangement committee I invited to these exercises the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JEFFREY], who has the honor to represent the district that Mr. Wright lives in. There had also been invited the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRIFFITHS], the North Carolina

delegation, and certain other Members of Congress. It was a great disappointment.

Last night, Mr. Speaker, there was held in Washington an outstanding event, a great banquet given in honor of Mr. Wright—the first aviator. The plane now in England is to be returned to America, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, it will be placed at Kitty Hawk, in the monument commemorating this great accomplishment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks an address made by the Honorable Lindsey C. Warren, the Comptroller General of the United States, a former Member of this House. At a future date, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the address which would have been given by the Governor of North Carolina at Kitty Hawk, be also included in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk Senate Joint Resolution 103 continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, with a House amendment, that the House insist on its amendment and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Mr. SPENCE, Mr. FORD, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. GIFFORD, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Dr. C. S. Longacre at the Masonic Temple in Detroit, Mich., under date of December 11.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial on our distinguished colleague the gentleman from North Carolina, Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on two subjects, one including an article on the Bonneville Dam and the other including a certain resolution adopted in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of other special orders, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INDUCTION OF MEN INTO THE ARMED FORCES DURING THE CHRISTMAS SEASON

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that boys who were inducted into the Army of the United States under the Selective Service System on December 1, 2, and 3 are about to be taken from their homes into the camps of the Army on the very eve of Christmas. I have addressed a communication on this subject and have talked in person to the proper Army authorities and have asked them to defer until after Christmas the actual transportation of these men from their homes to the camps for this reason. Many of these men are fathers of small children. It seems an unnecessarily inhumane thing at this time on the very eve of Christmas to take these men from their families of small children and put them into the Army of the United States. Certainly 2 or 3 days' postponement of the actual date of the transfer of these men will not materially affect the training of these men or the cause of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

RECESS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order that any time during the day for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does that provide for interruption of the program? I notice there are some special orders.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That will be subject to the order of the Speaker, of course.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not think they want to interrupt any special orders. This is simply to provide for a recess while we may wait on the Senate for some action.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize all Members who have special orders before he declares any recess.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not know what the program is, but the Senate has just passed the discharge pay bill for the men in the armed forces. It is my hope that we may take that bill up by unanimous consent when it is messaged here and put it on passage today. I want to serve notice now that I am going to oppose any adjournment over the holidays until that measure is disposed of.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia has made a simple request; that is that when the business before the House is concluded and while we are waiting on other important matters that may come from the Senate, the Chair be privileged to declare a recess. The Chair does not think that should be controversial. If it is, let somebody object.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the business of the day and such special orders as may be on the Speaker's desk, I may be privileged to address the House for 15 minutes on a report from the Subcommittee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an excerpt from the magazine Flying, and a brief letter; also, to extend my remarks and to include an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RATIONING OF PORK AND PORK PRODUCTS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the rationing of pork should be discontinued for at least 2 weeks. That would relieve the congestion in the markets and in the storage houses.

I have received a telegram from a meat-processing concern in my district, which I want to read:

> Great hog supply and consumer inability to purchase because of limited points is causing serious emergency. Cold-storage space unavailable. O. P. A. and W. F. A. deny relief. We earnestly urge your influence to obtain 10-day emergency point-free period on fresh pork.

Action should be taken by the O. P. A. to relieve the situation. To do otherwise is unfair to farmers, packers, processors, and the consumers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include two editorials from the Bay City Times, of Bay City, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of the other special orders today I may be permitted to speak for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and to include certain extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LET US PROVIDE DECENT BURIAL FOR OUR SOLDIER DEAD

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to bills introduced by Senator McNARY and myself the Congress enacted Public Law 388, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, which was approved by the President December 29, 1941, and which reads as follows:

S. 793

An act to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to establish and maintain, in accordance with the provisions of law governing national cemeteries, a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg. The Secretary of War is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise such suitable lands as are in his judgment necessary for the establishment and maintenance of such cemetery.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this act.

Approved, December 29, 1941.

The Secretary of War is authorized, under the terms of this law, to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise such suitable lands as are in his judgment necessary for the establishment and maintenance of such a cemetery. At the present time there is great need for such a cemetery. Existing facilities are wholly inadequate to care for the burial of veterans in the Northwest area. The Federal Government had a plot set aside in the Lincoln Memorial Cemetery in Portland for the burial of deceased veterans, but this plot is fully occupied. The State of Oregon purchased adjoining land a few years ago to provide facilities for veterans' burial which was intended for a limited time only, which is now entirely inadequate. Funds are not sufficient to maintain this plot adequately and to provide for the increasing number of burials of veterans made necessary by deaths in this locality, including many from World War No. 2.

The nearest veterans' cemetery is south of San Francisco, a thousand or fifteen hundred miles distant from the various portions of the territory which will be served by a veterans' cemetery in Portland. This cemetery would give burial facilities for veterans from the State of Oregon and adjoining territory in which there are no facilities for burials in a national cemetery, in which there are at the present time approximately 155,000 veterans of the various wars, as shown by the following tabulation:

There are in the State of Oregon 41,219 World War veterans, 41 Civil War veterans, 47 Indian war veterans, 2,673 Spanish-American War veterans, and 393 peacetime veterans. In the State of Washington there are 64,999 World War veterans, 46 Civil War veterans, 65 Indian War veterans, 4,169 Spanish-American War veterans, and 747 peacetime veterans. Idaho has 15,457 World War veterans, 11 Civil War veterans, 19 Indian war veterans, 672 Spanish-American War veterans, and 103 peacetime veterans. Montana has 20,610 World War veterans, 5 Civil War veterans, 75 Indian war veterans, 892 Spanish-American War veterans, and 148 peacetime veterans. The figures for Alaska are a total of 2,500. In the above States there are a total of 142,285 World War veterans, 103 Civil War veterans, 206 Indian war veterans, 8,406 Spanish-American War veterans, and 1,396 peacetime veterans. The total number of veterans in the above territory is 154,896.

The average age of the World War veterans is 48; Spanish-American War veterans, 69; Civil War, 96; Indian war, 81. It is estimated that a total of 103 World War veterans die each day; Spanish-American War veterans at the rate of 24 a day; Civil War, 3 a day; and Indian war, 1 a day. These figures are the 1940 rate. There are approximately 4,000,000 World War veterans surviving, 159,230 Spanish-American War veterans, 2,381 Civil War veterans, and 2,216 Indian war veterans. In applying the death rate proportionately to the number of World War, Spanish, Indian, and Civil War veterans residing in the Northwest, there are approximately 4⅔ deaths per day. This figure does not take into consideration the peacetime veterans or officers and enlisted men of the Army and Navy, since mortality figures covering these groups are not available.

Most of the veterans in the above-mentioned territory would only have to be transported within a radius of 400 to 500 miles to this cemetery authorized under Public Law 388.

Another thing that should be taken into consideration is the fact that in the last year or so there have been established numerous Army and Navy camps and other military establishments in the Northwest. There are pursuit bases established at the following locations in the Northwest: Portland Columbia Airport; McChord Field at Tacoma, Pendleton, Spokane; a large munitions dump at Hermiston; Army camps at Camp Adair, Medford, Fort Stevens, Camp Clatsop, Camp Murray, Camp Lewis; Navy stations at Tongue Point at the mouth of the Columbia River; and a large Navy and Coast Guard personnel located in the Puget Sound area. The approximate number of Army and Navy personnel in these various camps would exceed 100,000 men who would be entitled to burial in a national cemetery in case of death.

We also have in this Northwest area four veterans' hospitals, besides the one at Portland—one at Walla Walla, 248 miles from Portland; Boise, Idaho, 479 miles from Portland; Roseburg, Oreg., 196 miles from Portland; and a new Army hospital located at Vancouver, Wash., 8 miles from Portland.

Under the increased military activities in the Northwest incident to the present program of national defense, Portland is the principal center of extensive military activity. The number of the Army and Navy personnel in active service in the various encampments in the Northwest are considerable in excess of 100,000 men and these numbers are being steadily increased—exact number prohibited by censorship. As I have stated, there are five veterans' hospitals in the radius of Portland as the center. Most of these men reside in the Northwest in the area which will be served by a national cemetery. It is but natural, of course, that there will be a number of deaths in addition to those taking place in normal times and after the intensified defense program ends. These men who have taken part in it and have been enrolled in the service will be eligible for burial in the veterans' cemetery as death may overtake them in the future.

A large number of deaths have occurred in the United States as casualties from the present war and burial facilities are required in national cemeteries in the vicinity of the residences or place of death of the veterans. After the war the remains of many deceased veterans will be returned from overseas. The friends and relatives of these heroes who have paid the supreme sacrifice for their country will want them to lie in their last resting place in the soil of their homes which they died to preserve. Their remains should not be taken to some distant national cemetery for burial.

These increased demands have overburdened the already inadequate burial facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I am advised that there is a tract contiguous to the existing plot being used by the Federal Government for the veterans' cemetery which is available at a nominal price through the activities of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion, and the Portland Chamber of Commerce, working through their council for national defense.

This land has been examined by the War Department and found to be of a type and character to render it especially well adapted for use as a national cemetery.

The Board of Control of the State of Oregon has tendered to the War Department without charge the present State veterans' cemetery which adjoins the plot now being used for veterans by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, since the passage of this law (Pub. Law 388) the veterans organizations of the Northwest and public and civic groups, realizing the great need for this cemetery, have been urging the construction of the cemetery pursuant to the mandate of this law. I have on many occasions presented the urgency of the cause to the Congress, the President, the War Department, the Budget Bureau without avail. I include in these remarks some of the correspondence on the subject in which I have urged action, and the letters in reply. They are as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 3, 1942.

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ANGELL: I am writing to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of June 27, 1942, to the President, in the interest of an appropriation for the establishment of the national cemetery authorized by Public Law 388—Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 29, 1941.

At the time the President approved S. 793, he wrote a letter to the Secretary of War in which he said: "* * * I am writing to indicate to you my view that under present conditions funds for land purchases should be limited to urgent defense needs, and that, in view of the burial space that is still available in existing national cemeteries, I would not expect that there would be a need for sending forward at any early date any estimate of appropriation under the authorization provided by this enactment."

I am confident that the President is of this view still, and that he would not favor an appropriation for the establishment, at this time, of this national cemetery.

Sincerely yours,
MARVIN H. MCINTYRE,
Secretary to the President.

PORTLAND, OREG., *October 13, 1942.*

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.:

Have just inspected burial facilities for veterans here in my district and conferred with veterans' organizations, and they are urging initiation of action for development of veterans' national cemetery project under Public Law 388, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved by you December 29, 1941. Burial facilities for veterans exhausted and State of Oregon will deed to the Government the cemetery facilities owned and developed by it for veterans to be used in connection with adjoining lands to be purchased by Government for site of national cemetery recently inspected by War Department. We all earnestly beseech your cooperation in initiating the project, which will require only small appropriation and not interfere with war activities, but will furnish burial facilities for deceased veterans in this area who desire to rest in their native land. Nearest veterans' cemetery now San Francisco or Montana.

HOMER D. ANGELL,
Member of Congress.

OCTOBER 21, 1943.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am taking the liberty of calling to your attention again the urgent matter of securing funds for the establishment of a national cemetery pursuant to Public Law 388, Seventy-seventh Congress, copy of which I enclose. I wrote you on May 29 with respect to this matter and on the same date addressed a similar letter to the Secretary of War, who, under date of April 7 advised me that at that time there had been no change in the situation relative to the establishment of the cemetery pursuant to your decision at the time you signed Public, 388, that funds for land purchases should be limited to urgent war needs.

My purpose in writing at this time is to ask whether the situation now does not require a change in the above policy. As you know, there are no burial facilities left in the Portland area for veterans, and there are a number of cases arising out of the present war, as well as many from veterans of former wars, whose ages are such that death is occurring much more rapidly among them. It will take, of course, some little time to construct the cemetery, and all the veterans' organizations of the northwest area who are now without any burial facilities are greatly concerned and aroused over the failure to secure funds with which to proceed with the construction of the cemetery under the law passed by the Congress.

I am sure that you are as anxious as we on the Hill are to provide adequately for those who are fighting for us and who in many instances are giving their lives for our country. We realize that provision must be made that their remains may rest in their homeland upon their decease. The nearest national veterans' cemetery is now some eight hundred to a thousand miles away, which makes it impossible for providing burial facilities for veterans in their homeland.

It would seem now that the providing of burial facilities for veterans not only of former wars but of the present war is an urgent war need, and therefore suitable allocation of funds for the construction of the cemetery at this time would come well within your limitation at the time you signed the bill. I know the people of the whole northwest area, as well as the thousands of veterans there, will appreciate your O. K. on an appropriation sufficient to start construction of the cemetery.

The War Department has already made an examination of the site, and it is my understanding has reported favorably upon it, and the State has agreed to surrender the lands it has in the existing facilities which were provided for veterans, so that there is nothing to be done except make provision for funds to carry out the mandate of Public Law 388, Seventy-seventh Congress.

Respectfully yours,
HOMER D. ANGELL,
Member of Congress.

OCTOBER 26, 1943.

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANGELL: The Secretary of War has asked me to acknowledge your letter of October 21 in further regard to the appropriation of funds for the acquisition of land for the establishment of a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg., and to advise you that he has directed that your comments be taken under consideration and a report rendered to him at the earliest practicable date.

When this report is available, Mr. Stimson will doubtless reply in further detail to you.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN W. MARTYN,
Administrative Assistant.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, November 20, 1943.

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANGELL: This is in further reply to your letter of October 21 concerning the appropriation of funds for the acquisition of land for the establishment of a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg.

The matter of establishing a national cemetery in Portland, Oreg., together with identical requests from different parts of the country and similar proposals contained in several bills now pending before Congress has been made the occasion of a special study of the entire problem as now presented to the War Department. As a result, it has been determined that no American dead beyond the continental limits of the United States will be returned before the cessation of hostilities, that at the end of the war the decision of the nearest of kin of deceased soldiers will be determined and definite plans then made, and accordingly that no expansion of national cemeteries of the United States will be planned at this time.

You realize, I am sure, that many considerations incapable of definite evaluation at this time must be known before any program for the proper interment of our war dead can be intelligently established. To mention a few, we cannot predict how many casualties will occur on the widely distributed battle fronts of war; we cannot predict what the wishes of the nearest of kin will be at the time when shipping space becomes available for this purpose, and we cannot know before the cessation of hostilities what the desires of the nearest of kin will be concerning interment of our war dead in private rather than national cemeteries. At present a sufficient number of burial sites is available in this country to provide for any presently apparent or expected number of war dead.

In view of these indeterminate factors, and also in view of the Presidential directive that funds for land purchases be limited to urgent war needs, a directive issued by the President at the time he signed the bill authorizing the establishment of a national cemetery at Portland, the War Department does not contemplate at present to submit an estimate for funds in connection with the provisions of Public Law 338.

Sincerely yours,
HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

NOVEMBER 11, 1943.

Hon. HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Executive Office of the President,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: I have for acknowledgment your letter of November 10 in reply to my letter of October 21 addressed to the President urging approval of a sufficient appropriation for the establishment of a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg., in pursuance of Public Law 388 of the Seventy-seventh Congress.

I note from your letter that it is expected that a plan will be developed at an early date based on the requirements for such cemeteries throughout the Nation, and in view of this fact it is believed that action on any particular cemetery site should be held in abeyance until tentative plans are completed.

I am in full sympathy with this comprehensive study and the inauguration of a plan for the construction of cemeteries in all States of the Nation where their need is shown. However, I do not feel that this at all justifies refusal to proceed with the construction of the cemetery pursuant to Public Law 388, which has been passed by the Congress and approved by the President. The need for this cemetery is so urgent that no delay is justified. All of the information which any study or investigation will disclose is already in the possession of the War Department as well as the Military Committees of the Congress, which passed upon the legislation, and the merits of the plan were sufficient to secure the passage of the law by both Houses of the Congress and approval by the President.

As you know, there are no burial facilities now available for veterans in the whole

Northwest territory, the nearest cemeteries being south of San Francisco and in Montana, or from 1,000 to 1,500 miles from the various places in the Northwest which would be served by a cemetery constructed under the provisions of Public Law 388. Increased numbers of deaths of servicemen in the Northwest are taking place from day to day in World War No. 2, which add to the large number of veterans of former wars who are passing away in increased numbers by reason of advancing age, making it imperative that immediate steps be taken for the construction of this cemetery.

As I have said before in urging approval of an appropriation for the cemetery, it would seem to be as much a legitimate war activity to provide decent burial places in the homeland of men who gave their lives in the war as it is to provide them with food, protection, and ammunition during life.

I do certainly hope that those in charge of the President's program will yield to the demands of the thousands of veterans in the Northwest and approve an appropriation now for beginning construction of this cemetery.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

HOMER D. ANGELL,
Member of Congress.

THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., December 17, 1943.

The Honorable HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ANGELL: I have received your letter of November 11, 1943, in which you emphasize the immediate need of establishing a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg. Accordingly, I have had the question reexplored with the War Department.

I am advised that under existing law the responsibility of acquiring land for national cemeteries, when and where needed, rests with the Secretary of War. It is interpreted, therefore, that Public Law 388 of the Seventy-seventh Congress did not add to the authority of the Secretary of War but rather gave expression of the will of Congress that a national cemetery should be established near Portland when the Secretary determines that such a cemetery is needed.

The statistics available to the War Department indicate that, exclusive of persons who will become entitled to burial in national cemeteries as a result of the present war, the cemeterial space now owned by the Government at national cemeteries would not be adequate to provide burial for all who are entitled to it. It is also true, however, that only a relatively small percentage of those who are legally entitled to burial in national cemeteries do so request, and the deaths of those requesting such burial are expected to be spread over a considerable span of years. Consequently, it is not essential to provide space at this time for all who are now entitled to burial.

The number of persons who will be entitled to burial in national cemeteries will be greatly increased as a result of the current conflict. The War Department is of the opinion that in planning cemeterial expansion it must give due consideration to this new load involved and to the question of reinterment of those who are today being buried overseas. In view of the importance of the problem, the War Department considers it essential that its current study be completed before new cemeteries are established.

The War Department reports that it has been determined that no American troops dying beyond the continental limits of the United States will be returned before the cessation of hostilities, and that there are at present a sufficient number of burial sites to provide for the reasonably expected current need.

You may be assured that your views on the subject will be kept in mind for consideration in connection with any action in this field which the Bureau of the Budget may be called upon to take. Proposals for the establishment of new national cemeteries would, of course, originate with the War Department.

Very truly yours,

WAYNE COY,
Acting Director.

Mr. Speaker, decent burial of our deceased citizens, who gave their lives for their country, in a national cemetery in the land of their fathers is a sacred obligation resting upon our Government. Burial of our countrymen who give their lives in war is a war obligation as much as the furnishing them with powder and guns. I cannot subscribe to the doctrine that the burial of our heroic dead whose bodies are here in America can wait until the war is over. Let us act now and provide dead veterans with decent burial.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I plead with you before we adjourn for the Christmas holidays that we all urge upon the President and the Secretary of War and the Director of the Budget that they make immediate provisions to abide by the will of this Congress and construct the veterans' national cemetery as provided in the law we passed unanimously. If we can spend billions of American hard-earned tax dollars in South America and overseas to aid others, we can provide enough money to bury our own dead soldiers in their homeland.

GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, for over a year we have heard from the Well of this House the absurd and senseless regulations of big things by the O. P. A. I want to speak of two of the smallest things that are absolutely indefensible, and I challenge any Member to stand up and defend either one of the regulations. A serviceman on furlough or on leave has only 5 gallons of gas for his furlough or his leave. That is perfectly indefensible.

The other thing is, there is no legal gas for anyone to attend funerals. You cannot go 50 miles even to attend your own mother's funeral, under the regulations of O. P. A.

I do this with the hope that the O. P. A. will change these fool regulations on these two little things at least.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix an editorial from the Washington News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WOODROW WILSON'S LAST WARNING

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include therewith the last message from Woodrow Wilson and his last warning to the American people.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

[Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two different subjects, in one to include a letter to my constitutents; in another to include a release from a disabled American veteran.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SOLDIERS' VOTING BILL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] in his attack on southern Democrats and the Southern States generally, accused me of leading the Republicans. I do not know whether any Republicans are following my leadership or not, but I do know the Democrats are not following the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

He can pose here as the official leader of the so-called American Labor Party, which seems to have become one wing of the Communist Party, but he does not represent any real Democrats.

A few days ago there was an article in the newspaper PM, the uptown edition of the Communist Daily Worker, attacking me and accusing me of jumping on the Jews because I inserted in the RECORD some names which it said were Jewish. That article was signed "I. F. Stone," whose real name is not I. F. Stone at all, it is Isidor Feinstein.

I merely inserted in the RECORD the names of people who had written me from New York opposing the Eastland-Rankin soldiers' voting bill. I did not know whether they were Jews or Gentiles.

A few days ago a gang of them came down here and paraded up and down the corridors of the House Office Building lobbying against what they call the "Rankin bill." If I am any judge, they were Communists, pure and simple—probably more simple than pure.

When they came to my office, one of them looked up and saw my name on the door and said, "Gosh, we don't want to go in there." That was one thing I agreed with them on. They looked like foreigners to me. I never saw such a wilderness of noses in my life.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] says that the people whose names I inserted in the RECORD are "wives of men in our armed forces." Now let us see about that.

One of the names I inserted on December 7 was Julius Reisman. I do not suppose he is the wife of a serviceman.

The next one was Mr. William Liebouwitz. I wonder whose wife the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] thinks Mr. Liebouwitz is?

Another was Miss Pearl Preiss. If she is the wife of a serviceman, she should take his name.

Another was Hirsch Zibbman. I wonder whose wife he is?

Now of the names inserted on December 10, the first one was B. Marcein, the next one E. S. Blamc, the next H. M. Reuben, the next Aaron L. Rochman, and the next one J. M. Grohol. I wonder if the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] will contend that these are wives of men in the armed forces.

I have a batch which I received this morning. One is from Abraham Gomerontz, another is Robert Strassburg. I do not suppose that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] will contend that these are the names of wives of men in our armed forces.

In addition, I have received letters and postal cards from large numbers of individuals since I made the last insertion. Some of those letters were so filthy and abusive that I had them destroyed rather than leave them in my files. Some were unsigned, and on others the signatures were so poorly written that I could not make out what the names were. I had the others tabulated as they came. Here they are. I hope you will pay strict attention and go over them carefully, and see if you think they are all wives of men in our armed forces.

B. Ragell, Brooklyn; Anita S. Rosen, Far Rockaway, N. Y.; Mary E. Billingsley, Mrs. Mary Schroeder, Brooklyn; Mrs. Lloyd Motz, W. G. Kearney, New York City; Mrs. S. Turk, Brooklyn; Esther Lipschultz, Jersey City, N. J.; Irwin Ilsham, Flushing, N. Y.; June Liss, Mrs. Lucille Bader, Martha King, Beverley Kistenberg, Mrs. John A. Welton, Elaine Shaffer, Harrill Roberts, Brooklyn; M. W. Cohn, New York City; Mrs. Frances Miller, Lewiston, Maine; Jay Sammy, New York City; Evelyn Schnitzer, South Norwalk, Conn.; R. Schwartzberger, Mrs. Wild, Brooklyn; Mr. and Mrs. D. B. Tullen, Hartford, Conn.; Mrs. Lion A. Gove, New York City; Robert Forsberg, Wooster, Ohio; Dixie Louise Fiske, Washington, D. C.; Morton Lownes, Philadelphia, Pa.; Ella Grace Webb, New York City; Anne Kolevyon, Lakewood, N. J.; Mrs. Nathan, Brooklyn; Miss E. Gershon, New York City; S. Weintraub, P. Seldon, Lillian Hauptman, Brooklyn; H. Jacobs, Flushing, N. Y.; Gerry Kinne, Baltimore, Md.; G. Marchisio, New York City; Laurin G. Fischer, Brooklyn; C. Dwoskin, Sheepshead Bay, N. Y.; Evelyn F. Parkes, Viggo Westergaard, New York City; Sylvia L. Lyon, Mount Vernon, N. Y.; Mrs. Nellie Lagal, New York City; Helen Brown, Mount Vernon, N. Y.; Winifred L. Chappell, New York City; William and Minnie Dalton, Passaic, N. J.; Jerry Stern, New York City; Morris Shom, Passaic, N. J.; Lorna R. F. Birtwell, New York City; Mrs. A. Bisberg, Brookline, Mass.; Ruthe Pessin, Sylvia Fuchs, Mrs. Segal, New York City; Walter M. Stone, Waltham, Mass.; Irving Smith, Brooklyn; Uric Cole, Joan Solomon, New York City; Mina Ohringer, Brooklyn; Mabel W. Smith, Philadelphia, Pa.; M. A. Werner, New York City; Alice G. Meyer, Ann Nustgarten, Bronx; Miriam A. Ness, Lillian Hoffman, New York City; Max R. Kahn, Brooklyn; L. M. Tickerman, New London, Conn.; M. Gelford, Brooklyn; Mrs. Milton Schlachman, New York City; Sally Fondel, Bronx; Henry Payne, Saugatuck, Conn.; Bertha Lurie, Bronx; Fredric S. Kless, Swarthmore, Pa.; Helen Relkin, New York City; Mrs. Roine Harris, Brooklyn; Miss Barbara Haber, Bronx; Ben Rabinowitz, Brooklyn; Harry Brown, camp in Georgia; Mrs. Frances Cohen, Vivian Cohen, Henry E. Cohen, Brooklyn; Valerie Hickerson, New York City; Mrs. Albert F. Kroll, Pittsburgh; Ellen Thomas, Brooklyn; Mrs. Earl Collins, C. M. Wisegarver, Mrs. C. R. Foy, Charles R. Foy, Johnstown, Pa.; Rae Sturm, Brooklyn; Augusta Wallace, New York City; Mildred Brofman, Brooklyn; Maud Slye, Chicago; Mr. and Mrs. Philip Bernstein, Forest Hills, N. Y.; Francos Simon, Philadelphia, Pa.; Evelyn Kaplan, Brooklyn; Maria De Blasio, New York City; Edith Zeitler, Frances E. Klein, Bronx; Emma Begun, Rebecca Mechnikoff, Edith Bergman, Rose Gropman, Eugene B. Foley, Brooklyn; Yetta Messing, New York City; Drane Selberling, Sylvia Berger, Ruth L. Drossin, Selma Diamond, Marie Latilla, Gertrude Valitsky, Mary Berger, Doris L. Wills, Samuel Lepine, Estelle Marcus, Marion E. Kasner, Brooklyn; Sylvia F. Wolf, New York City; Florence R. Kaufman, Brooklyn; Anna D'Auella, Mary A. Golub, New York City; Muriel Smith, Paul F. Stevens, Theodore Fagin, George E. Bollar, Bernard Shor, J. S. Scheiner, G. S. Schaeffer, George Bell, John Johnson, Fred James, Pearl Sadowski, Elizabeth Hansen, Ernest J. Pepper, Charles W. Davis, Mary Glickert, Harold Seigel, John A. Perry, Nancy Cuttitio, Helen Miller, Gertrude Neibel, Kathleen Emery, Ottilie Affel, Rose M. Beal, Martha Brady, Mary Biscardi, Florence Schilder, M. Baines, Barbara Morris, Helen Weinstein, Ida Hertheig, Frances Fila, R. Kellman, J. Carro, A. Dumruf, E. Soppe, E. Hock, J. Finch, J. Distefano, E. Delosh, J. Sanfillipo, F. Baque, J. Fay, W. Fusco, F. Foeppel, W. Slaughter, P. Isaacs, R. Bothwick, G. Finny, B. Kennedy, B. Rothenberg, A. Ferro, A. Maffe, R. Andreas, T. McCormick, C. Leone, D. Arbuse, J. Barsuaskas, Alec Donner, Isabel Fantel, Sarah Lar, Ann Green, Helen Gardstein, Sarah Sparago, May Farber, Ada Jaffe, Sam Eppy, Alien Friendlich, Sylvia Lichtman, Doree Abramson, Sophie Sobel, Francis Berkwitz, Brooklyn; Rowe Wright, Katonah, N. Y.; A. R. Garrett, New York City; Elizabeth H. Cagle, Baltimore, Md.; Colleen P. Roth, Nancy Starbuck, Richmond, Va.; Thelma Stein, Beatrice W. Chinnock, Mrs. B. T. Chusid, New York City; Donald T. Braider, New Brunswick, N. J.; Barbara Haber, Bronx; Ada M. Clarke, Norwich, Conn.; Lorraine Carter, New York City; Eva Michelson, Freida Hessel, Charlotte Lee, Mrs. L. Buyum, Brooklyn; Grace N. Thompson, Eatontown, N. J.; Helen Thaler, Brooklyn; H. M. Winston, New York City; Mrs. H. Bull, Mildred Block, Long Beach, N. Y.; Florence Horowitz, New York City; A. Mass, Brooklyn; Mary Arnone, Rockaway, N. Y.; Erich P. Fritscel, Eatontown, N. J.; Yetta Saiewitz, Bayonne, N. J.; Mrs. H. Granet, Brooklyn; Mrs. M. Steinberg, Samuel Levine, New York City; Dora M. Herwiz, Brooklyn; Katherine Steiglitz, New York City; Anna K. Rogers, Brooklyn; Mrs. R. J. Doyle, Mrs. Jay Williams, Ernest J. Fantasia, Celia Polimany, New York City; G. J. Grohol, Scarsdale, N. Y.; Janet Laken, New York City; Mrs. M. Thompson, Baltimore, Md.; Jerome Ackerman, Yonkers, N. Y.; John L. Debes, Syracuse, N. Y.; Olga G. Collinson, Cambridge, Mass.; Ephriam F. Hubert, Brooklyn; Hattie M. Herrick, East Syracuse, N. Y.; Rita Rosenthall, New York City; I. Lerner, Henry King, Brooklyn; Nancy Thompson, West Palm Beach, Fla.; Mrs. Hiram Hays, Pelham Manor, N. Y.; Julius Birnbaum, Brooklyn; J. E. Pikell, Baltimore, Md.; Edward Venkler, New York City; Mr. and Mrs. F. A. Warren, Hempstead, N. Y.; B. Birnbaum, C. Stern, I. Lerner, Brooklyn; Mary Miller, Benton Harbor, Mich.; S. N. Urman, Forest Hills, N. Y.; Kay Brown, New York City; Dorothy J. Sevush, Virginia Smith, Long Branch, N. J.; Theodore N. Shavit, Estelle Farbstein, H. Weston, New York City; Rev. Jas. H. Screven, Newark, N. J.; Anna Lo Presti, Seymour, Conn.; Alice Smith, New York City; Charlotte Miller, Brooklyn; M. Cornog, Media, Pa.; Rupert J. Graham, Saugatuck, Conn.; Naomi Rodman, Betty Rodman, New York City; Dorothy C. Busch, Catherine Thompson, Bordentown, N. J.; Mrs. J. Cunningham, Philadelphia, Pa.; Florence R. Connolly, Kathryn M. Sulzberger, Isabel Lipscomb, New York City; Sylvia P. Freedland, Philadelphia, Pa.; Muriel P. Hailpern, Forest Hills, N. Y.; Helen M. Zippert, New York City; Mrs. M. L. Villano, New Haven, Conn.; Pearl Waxman, Washington, D. C.; Margaret Epstein, Elizabeth Swift, Cambridge, Mass.; Rosalie Gilbert, Brooklyn; Noah Lichtenberg, Hoboken, N. J.; R. Schlein, Julius Polinger, Mrs. T. Hamilton, New York City; Veronica A. O'Neil, Aurora, Ill.; Beth M. Strunk, New York City; Solomon Landman, Kew Gardens, N. Y.; Mrs. L. O'Connor, New York City; A. Goeringer, W. Goeringer, Haskell, N. J.; George Blass, New York City; E. S. Tamblyn, Rutherford, N. J.; Elsie Cohen, Elizabeth, N. J.; Virginia Scholz, Boonton, N. J.; Mrs. Charles Haywood, New York City; Mrs. S. W. Shapiro, Brooklyn, Rebecca T. Morris, New York City; Jane F. Paterson, Washington, D. C.; Harriet Borten, Philadelphia, Pa.; Sylvia B. Altman, A. Kastenbaum, Miss Campbell, Brooklyn; Harold Tamain, G. Bullock, Charlie Whitfield, T. J. Phelan, Stanley Dombroff, Baltimore, Md.; Susan R. Kaufman, West Chester, Pa.; Louis Kustas, Manteo, N. C.; Muriel I. Symington, Brooklyn; D. Roth, Yonkers; Mrs. A. Citron, New York City; Minnie B. Stern, Brooklyn; Mrs. F. Sullivan, Ruth Veletzkin, New York City; J. Keisler, Philadelphia, Pa.; William Reine, Brooklyn; J. S. Brown, R. Levering, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mrs. M. Marashinsky, Mt. Dale, N. Y.; Ethel Miller, New York City; Mr. and Mrs. R. W. Barstow, Jr., Pauling, N. Y.; Anne E. Cohen, Shirley Prussin, New York City; Harriet Silver, Mrs. M. Frank, Robert Halpern, Edna Halpern, Brooklyn; Pauline Mazur, St. Paul; Estelle Grusky, Bronx; Ida Sherman, Brooklyn; Ellen O'Connor, New York City; A. R. Romer, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. B. Lovinger, Brooklyn; Mrs. Martin L. Morris, Ella Grace Webb, New York City; Sylvia M. Campbell, Montclair, N. J.; Elizabeth Schneider, New York City; Donald Miles, Dunmore, Pa.; Kay Mott, Philadelphia, Pa.; Miss Feldman, Woodside, N. Y.; Gussie Hoffman, Faye Sternberg, Mrs. Robert Rosenfeld, Bernard Adelburg, Louis Brotkin, Bernard M. Klein, Brooklyn; Miriam Mandelbaum, New York City; Gloria Heitman, Bronx; Tillie Klein, Rae Teret, Brooklyn; Jane McGlove, New York City; Mr. and Mrs. Arnold Jacoby, Harold Jacoby, Mr. and Mrs. Jack Ruby, H. Margulis, Brooklyn; C. Pat Quinn, Mort Furay, Detroit; Pauline Plaks, Brooklyn; Gertrude Burke Jacobs, Oceanside, N. Y.; George F. Connolly, Paterson, N. J.; Harriet Kremer, New Brunswick, N. J.; Mrs. J. Boris, Jamaica, N. Y.; Mrs. Harriet Bier, Long Island City, N. Y.; Sol Atter, E. H. McFadden, U. M. Falk, New York City; J. I. Braver, Brooklyn; J. R. Thomas, New York City; Margaret Solar, Mrs. Luly Lewis, A. Goldman, Sidney Wendroff, Brooklyn; E. Lewanski, New York City; Sam Bloom, Brooklyn; Ursula Reinhardt, New York City; Allan Mullgraw, Spring Valley, N. Y.; Gerald Beckman, New York City; Lean J. Lawson, Mrs. L. Snider, Brooklyn; Dr. and Mrs. Richard A. Freedman, New York City; Freddie Freidman, Boston; Rudolf Ekstein, George C. Murphy, Ray O'Connor, Brooklyn; Frank S. Regan, Ridgefield, N. J.; Rhoda Woolf, New York City; Mary Ward Parker, Fairmont, W. Va.; P. A. Sutherland, Hyde Park, Mass.; J. Robert Garrapit, Flushing, N. Y.; B. Murphy, L. O'Connor, F. Finnegan, Bronx; Mrs. A. Blumin, New Haven, Conn.; Beatrice Nelson, Mollie Gelenter, Marie L. Colt, New York City; Lillian Konigsberg,

Bronx; Nellie H. Rosalsky, Sylvia Bier, Brooklyn; George Lackides, Bronx; Lucille B. Levy, New York City; Sally Rosen, Lawrence, N. Y.; Alma Wade, Kate Lublich, New York City; Claire Libner, Brooklyn; Robert C. Waddell, New York City; Pvt. (1st cl.) Jules Glenn, Long Island City; Elaine M. Rosenweig, Gertrude Ettenson, New York City; Ethel J. Mason, Brooklyn; Fuld Neighborhood House, Newark, N. J.; Mina Schneider, Mina Zinet, Gladys Rivlin, Clara S. Straus, J. A. Burrell, Raymond Weaver, New York City; Frida Rosenbusch, Brooklyn; Lee H. Bell, Lake Mahopac, N. Y.; Eleanor Emerson, S. Hagen, New York City; Leon Solis-Cohen, Philadelphia, Pa.; Ed Murphy, Utica, N. Y.; Fredda A. Groner, Bronx; Alma T. Colson, Westfield, N. J.; Mrs. George Abeloff, Jack Toppel, Brooklyn; William Bandes, Nescopeck, Pa.; Irwin Ferris, Bronx; Elizabeth Carney, Rose L. Waters, Brooklyn; Horace Braham, New York City; M. V. Brett, Detroit; Mrs. William Taylor, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mrs. Matthew Uchansky, Bronx; Rosalind Cherry, Rosalyn Papkin, New York City; Jack Badash, Jr., Brooklyn; James T. Smallway, Utica, N. Y.; William C. Kernan, New York City; Ernest Malter, Chicago; Sada Zimmerman, Bronx; Elizabeth Mannes, New York City; Belle Cohen, Brooklyn; Edith Greenberg, Gertrude Metz, New York City; Riva Shapkautz, Mae Greenburg, Rita Harris, Brooklyn; Augusta Levinson, Mina Suser, Bronx; Oscar Marks, New York City; Susan F. Ronson, Brooklyn; Louis Villano, Fort McKinley, Maine; Samson Winikoff, New York City; Celia Soloman, Washington, D. C.; Grace I. Lewis, New York City; Jules Rubin, Philadelphia, Pa.; Ida Sach, Brooklyn; Mrs. P. Sokolow, New York City; Betty Leiberman, Bronx; Lewis H. Davis, Seymour, Conn.; Alice R. Hart, Wayne, Pa.; Roberta S. Leibovitz, Eleanor Weaver, Arlington, Va.; Beatrice Olinger, New York City; Aurora Acanfora, Newark, N. J.; Rachel Reese Sady, Raymond Ross, George J. Leech, Mrs. M. G. Warth, New York City; Irvin Lambert, Bronx; Mary C. Scheele, New York City; Dr. and Mrs. J. Rubin, Morristown, N. J.; Janet Manning, Newark, N. J.; M. H. Rubenstein, New York City; Emma Gelders Sterne, Cambridge, Mass.; Lonnie Rasin, Norwich, Conn.; Sarah Seltzer, Harriet Taglicht, New York City; Elizabeth Neabitt, St. Louis; Esther G. Chernofsky, Jersey City, N. J.; Gertrude Housen, Leonard Gerstein, New York City; Mrs. Jerome Paul Friedman, Brooklyn; Margaret R. Tansley, South Orange, N. J.; Beverley Hancock, Lincoln, Nebr.; Lawrence H. Leder, Bronx; Howard R. Coan, Lawrenceville, N. J.; Leroy Dixon, New York City; Hilda Peirez, Jackson Heights, N. Y.; Mrs. L. Ham Kaplan, Chicago; Paul Covais, Maria Pacheco, New York City; Mary K. Schiller, Brooklyn; Ada M. Clarke, Norwich, Conn.; Mrs. H. Shapiro, I. Diverman, Brooklyn; Ruth Fields, Bronx; Mrs. M. Sickler, Brooklyn; Pat Sullivan, New York City; Catherine Duba, Great Neck, N. Y.; S. C. Fisher, Mrs. G. Kallivera, New York City; E. Bettelman, Brooklyn; Eugene W. Sutherland, Detroit; Mrs. I. Suslock, Jamaica, N. Y.; Eleanor M. Strachner, Washington, D. C.; M. Krontz, Bronx; Mr. and Mrs. N. H. Moss, Long Branch, N. J.; Beatrice Bell, Philadelphia, Pa.; Florence Ferris, New York City; Edward Kramer, Waltham, Mass.; Lawrence C. Goldsmith, New York City; Jerome Beller, Waltham, Mass.; Sona Holman, Flushing, N. Y.; M. Miller, Jamaica, N. Y.; Rose B. Freeman, Brooklyn; Betty Levin, New York City; Ethel H. Levy, Cincinnati, Ohio; R. Greenberg, New York City; B. V. McGrath, Alice Schreiber, Ridgewood, N. J.; Mr. and Mrs. Charles Faskon, Brooklyn; Mary Kuhl, Bowie, Md.; Thomas Spike, New York City; Martin Gelenter, Bronx; Mrs. Glonia S. Myers, Baltimore, Md.; Theodora M. Harvey, New York City; Miriam Siffert, Brooklyn; Charles Berkowitz, New York City; Harry H. Hoffenberg, Baltimore, Md.; L. J. Carriero, August Sukdorf, New York City; Charlotte Clyne, Washington, D. C.; Eleanor Wallace, New Haven, Conn.; H. Reingold, New York City; D. F. Bottosff, Riverhead, N. Y.; Pauline Freeman, New York City; Thea Steele, Hempstead, Long Island, N. Y.; Mr. and Mrs. S. A. Lange, Brooklyn; Robert S. Moore, Syracuse, N. Y.; Dorothy M. Roller, Washington, D. C.; H. Miller, Ethel F. Chalfin, New York City; D. Moss, Detroit; Mr. and Mrs. H. J. Morris, Mrs. John Ackerman, New York City; Gladys K. Diamond, Highstown, N. J.; Florence Bluberg, Bronx; Fred De Feo, David Gordon, G. M. Haley, Beatrice Gordon, Edward De Salisburg, New York City; Nadia Rostova, Brooklyn; Mini F. De Feo, Mrs. N. Rodenwald, Michael Relenbo, Dave Cohen, New York City; Hollis Dean Fairchild, Bay Shore, Long Island, N. Y.; Mrs. R. Steigman, New York City; A. C. McLaughlin, Staten Island, N. Y.; Sadie M. Heinemann, New York City; Sam Dorfman, Presque Isle, Maine; Mrs. Francis Gallagher, Omaha, Nebr.; Arline D. Weitch, Terry Watchell, Amelia Jaskulski, New York City; Marvin B. Rodney, Chicago; Joyce Borden, Balokovic Zlatko, B. Elizabeth, Whiting Worcester, Courtney Borden, New York City; Helen H. Walter, Chicago; John R. Tunis, Rowayton, Conn.; Dorothy Krass, New York City; Morton Kulick, Bronx; Helen Huss Parhurst, New York City; Willard Uphaus, New Haven, Conn.; Muriel Meirowitz, Bronx; E. A. Herz, Sidney Mandelsohn, New York City; Adelie Landis, Michael Arond, M. Baket, Brooklyn; Martin Gelenter, Bronx; Morris Turitz, Mike Niederhoffer, Lee Hoenig, L. Grill, New York City; B. A. Drucker, Woodmere, Long Island, N. Y.; S. B. Prenn, Forest Hills, Long Island, N. Y.; Fred Van Eps, New York City; Carl M. Rubin, Brooklyn; James A. Martenhoffer, East Rockaway, N. Y.; Eva Greenberg, Gertrude Yourman, Brooklyn; H. A. Overstreet, New York City; Mrs. John K. Vance, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; Dorothy Brewster, New York City; Will H. Pierson, Newark, N. J.; Ken A. Powenstein, New York City; Martha H. Fletcher, Boston, Mass.; Max Kimbrig, Huntington, N. Y.; Myron Galewski, New York City; Sam M. Goldfus, Bradley Beach, N. J.; Mary S. Briody, East Norwalk, Conn.; Mrs. Dale Holt Fatow, New York City; Max Bellak, Browns Mills, N. J.; Moe Greenspan, Brooklyn; Mrs. David Moskers, New York City; Mitchell Burnstein, Brooklyn; Shirley La Zar, Bronx; Michele Cimbalo, Groton On Hudson, N. Y.; Isador W. Ellman, Brooklyn; Milton T. Malkin, Norwalk, Conn.; Eve Bartram, East Norwalk, Conn.; Elia Favrean, Redding, Conn.; Mildred U. Banks, Norwalk, Conn.; Ethel Wilmott, South Norwalk, Conn.; Winifred Malkin, Norwalk, Conn.; Winifred Pennington, Wilton, Conn.; Myrtle England, Loretta Byington, Norwalk, Conn.; Esther Blackman, Stamford, Conn.; Winnie Ferris, South Norwalk, Conn.; Grayce Bredice, Pearl Byington, Norwalk, Conn.; Mae Pape, South Norwalk, Conn.; Agnes B. Colwell, Norwalk, Conn.; Richard Acer, Freeport, N. Y.; Mary D. Hoey, Saranac Lake, N. Y.; Bernard Bernstein, Holyoke, Mass.; Mrs. Daniel Kutzko, Brooklyn; Marian Ward, Mr. and Mrs. J. Lonberger, Joyce M. Kingsley, New York City; Charles W. Ervin, Bronxville, N. Y.; Ruth Phelps Morand, E. W. Kesper, Dorothy Weaver, New York City; Pat Mullison, Tunnie Martin, Detroit; Alfred T. Soloman, New York City; Norman Nash, Brooklyn; Moe Rosenthal, Bayonne, N. J.; Mary Faroin, Belleville, N. J.; Alan Feigen Baum, New York City; Isabel J. England, Pittsfield, Mass.; Elizabeth K. Hold, North Bergen, N. J.; Mrs. Laurence I. McCloud, New York City; Lewis M. Morozty, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; Mike Meahh, Lawrence S. Kubie, Cora M. Paradis, New York City; Mrs. Charles W. Greer, Brooklyn; Paul Gardner, New York City; David Rosenberg, Brooklyn; Louis Shulman, Philadelphia; Helen Gottleib, Alice G. Simensky, Brooklyn; J. B. Horowitz, New York City; Milton R. Stern, Fort Belvoir, Va.; A. S. Allen, Louis Bernstein, Mrs. B. F. Perry, Mrs. Sol Brandzel, New York City; Reuben Freidman, Providence, R. I.; D. Newman, Brooklyn; Cora Clarke, Norwich, Conn.; Rose Katzman, Brooklyn; Alison Sulloway, Joseph Taili, New York City; Frances Glantz, Philadelphia, Pa.; S. Miceh, Brooklyn; Jane Eager, Mary K. Daniel, New York City; Sam Rosen, Laurelton, Long Island, N. Y.; Emanuel Kalish, John Alcorn, New York City; Stephen L. Peake, Boston, Mass.; R. Schwadron, Albany, N. Y.; Lazette Van Houten, New York City; Marion Greene, Mrs. Schwartz, Brooklyn; Jessie Wahrman, Elizabeth Eric, New York City; Jan Ziebach, Herbert R. Lottman, Joan Zilbach, Miss Sylvia Charner, Brooklyn; S. Jacobs, New York City; S. Lehman, Mr. and Mrs. Norman Engler, Brooklyn; Eleanor Walker, Alex Handis, Rose Ettelman, New York City; Mrs. L. R. Scott, Flushing; Mrs. E. S. Lang, Detroit; E. V. Reidinger, Stamford, Conn.; Mrs. K. G. Streiger, Eleanore Collettle, Michael Morrissey, Harry Gladstone, Jess Fish, New York City; Martin Gelenter, Bronx; Muriel Walzer, New York City; Sam Kushner, Chicago; June Gogolick, Brooklyn; Sandra Slayton, Helene Minda, Ester Delsignore, New York City; Mrs. Lawrence T. Fish, Mrs. Howard F. Lillich, Washington, D. C.; R. L. Shoemaker, Los Angeles; Evelyn Knauff, Brooklyn; Yeta Silverman, Mrs. Ruth Silverstein, New York City; Asher Yeude, Far Rockaway; Margaret Farrar, Miss B. Hoffman, J. G. Bendick, New York City; Helen R. Muhlberg, Brooklyn; Sophis Gelber, Washington, D. C.; Max Berger, Boston; Evelyn Klein, Brooklyn; Edith Schulman, New York City; Sima Okum, Mount Vernon, N. Y.; Helene Blanchard, Erich Etten, Isabel C. Chamberlain, New York City; Esther Millon, Providence, R. I.; Jeanette Stern Turner, Mr. and Mrs. Abraham Paul Meyer, New York City; I. De Kaiser, Pittsburgh; Nina Miranda, Brooklyn; H. S. Ehrlich, Helen Rosenberg, New York City; Walter Eiselton, Warrenton, Va.; Mr. and Mrs. E. Mardfin, L. Pilisuk, Brooklyn; Irene Wilson, Cliffside Park, N. J.; Natalie Garvin, Evelyn Horowitz, Michael Satzman, Brooklyn; Jerome J. Kravatz, Bronx; C. Shalit, Browns Mills, N. J.; Mr. and Mrs. P. L. Krohm, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Howite, P. Cullen, S. Levy, New York City; Marie Moran Rosenfield, Minneapolis; Max B. Greenstein, Brooklyn; William Thalheimer, New York City; Carrie Freidman, Brooklyn; Jean Corwin, New York City; Arthur Eidus, Brooklyn; Mrs. Lea Etta Sitomer, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; John M. Whitmore, Reisterstown, Md.; M. L. Barrett, A. Rosengweiz, Bronx; H. Frank, New York City; F. L. Cohen, Bronx; Fred F. Gold, New York City; Violet Rasmussen, Port Washington, Long Island, N. Y.; Elsie Kratz, Margaret Cohen, Sarah Kay, New York City; Lessie Pfiffer, Sylvia Solomon, Brooklyn; Sara Aiken, Forest Hills, N. Y.; Abe Sharugrudsky, Brooklyn; Melvin Wiene, Bronx; Ruth Mandel, New York City; Gertrude Wolfson, Bronx; Mr. and Mrs. S. Coleman, A. Pesso, M. Cohen, Brooklyn; R. B. Irwin, Elkins Park, Pa.; Norman Kupfenberg, Brooklyn; S. Goodman, New York City; Max Gross, Brooklyn; Martin F. Schneer, Denver, Colo.; Ruth M. Brilliant, Bound Brook, N. J.; Bertha B. Cole, J. M. Cole, New Hope, Pa.; Le Roy S. Rosenbaum, New York City; Pvt. L. Gedaly, Fort Bragg, N. C.; Irene Rosoff and family, New York City; Marjorie N. Bennett, Cambridge, Mass.; Adelaide B. Crandall, Mansfield, Conn.; Robert Cenedella, Mount Vernon, N. Y.; H. L. Miller, Cecilia P. Miller, Nichols, Conn.; Benjamin Fox, Bronx; B. Hoffman, Middle Village, N. Y.; Mrs. Eleanor Scholz, Boonton, N. J.; Harry Gitlin, Bronx; D. Renan, New York City; Alvin Maurer, Brooklyn; R. M. Handshoe, Mrs. Dorothy Nissim, Freda Lane, Bronx; Mrs. E. S. Adelson, Brooklyn; Celia Malishefsky, J. S. Volkert, Bronx; Helen Freidlander, New York City; F. Goldberg, Ruth Kaye, Doris

Kauyar, Bronx; Linda Schuer, Goldens Bridge, N. Y.; Pauline Englander, Jersey City, N. J.; Mrs. Natalie Rothblatt, Elmhurst, Long Island, N. Y.; Lillian Stern, New York City; Mrs. Edith Gluckman, Newark, N. J.; Harry Bretz, Brooklyn; Mr. and Mrs. Arnold Sundgaard, Old Westbury, Long Island, N. Y.; Roslyn Zwicker, Bronx; George Gluck, Gloria Rogoff, New York City; Valerie Lois Gretel, Charles S. Belkin, Brooklyn; Carmen Pena, New York City; Herman Schneider, New York City; Beatrice Winser, Newark, N. J.; Sidney Hess, Wallington, N. J.; Mrs. Dora Dimen, Brooklyn; Hans Mueller, Mrs. Vivian Yale, Carmen Rodriguez, New York City; Sam Dorfman, Presque Isle, Maine; Lottie Mintzes, Brooklyn; Mr. and Mrs. Edward L. Rich, Derby, Conn.; Arnold Weiner, Ruth Brickner, New York City; Molly Epstein, Brooklyn; David Levidow, Long Island City, N. Y.; Eleanor Redick, Forest Hills, N. Y.; I. L. Weinberg, New York City; Mr. and Mrs. H. L. Glazer, Brooklyn; Ruth C. Foote, New York City; Dorothy Robbins, San Antonio, Tex.; Sylvia Utensky, New York City; Philip Kronish, Brooklyn; Estelle Herstein, Newark, N. J.; Rose Marks, Nina Schneider, Mrs. R. Safer, New York City; Anne C. Lukoff, Miss L. Glasgow, Brooklyn; Milton C. Simon, Ithaca, N. Y.; Mildred Ginsberg, Brooklyn; Isadore M. Zamost, New Brunswick, N. J.; Maurice Kaufman, Bronx; O. M. Resen, Jay M. Cornell, M. H. Lichtenberg, New York City; Mrs. E. Guberman, Baltimore, Md.; William Feinberg, New York City; Mrs. Thomas Wallace, New Haven, Conn.; Nathan Budnetz, Richard Desmond, New York City; Mary J. Brettin, Toledo, Ohio; Lee H. Sharp, Bayside, N. Y.; Herman Kaplan, Clara E. Straus, New York City; Shirley Mauer, Brooklyn; Rose P. Spanier, Forest Hills, N. Y.; Libby Weinberger, Brooklyn; Dolores Ortiz, New York City; Leonard Schwartz, Mrs. Edgar I. Scher, Mrs. Benjamin Mann, Perth Amboy, N. J.; H. Feldman, Brooklyn; Lionel Scheler, New York City; Herman L. Lieberman, Bronx; Joe Follberg, Lampoon, N. Y.; Emanuel Boyers, New York City; M. Rittenthal, C. Schulman, Brooklyn; Alex Panzer, Louis Supton, A. Allen, New York City; William Zewickler, Bronx; Sarah Levine, Brooklyn; Mrs. R. Festhers, E. Tublin, Nancy Minissale, Frances Vella, R. Korenlich, Rose E. Kanter, New York City; Sylvia Haber, Providence, R. I.; Charles Landison, Helene M. Miner, Jacob D. Goden, Brooklyn; F. Schacht, Browns Mills, N. J.; Harry Eliasof, Bronx; Bernard Steir, Mount Vernon, N. Y.; Mollie Drucker, Bronx; Jerome D. Langfen, Washington, D. C.; John M. Frantz, Arlington, Va.; Mrs. R. Brooks, Bronx; David Goldwater, Muriel Feuer, E. Jude Bien, New York City; Mrs. H. Sachs, Baltimore, Md.; Doris A. Ascher, Brooklyn; Ethel K. Hurwitz, New York City; Shirley Beinfield, Brooklyn; John C. Heinrich, Camp McCoy, Wis.; Sally Feldman, Brooklyn; Jean Schiraga, Philadelphia, Pa.; Norman L. Adolf, Jackson Heights, N. Y.; N. J. Minor, New York City; Elaine Simon, Brooklyn; Mrs. Irwin S. Rosenfels, Oak Park, Ill.; Florence Horowitz, Brooklyn; Lewis Steinfield, Bronx; Beverley Trachtenberg, Brooklyn; Helen Greenbaum, Jamaica, N. Y.; George N. Raybin, Bronx; Ida Seiden, Brooklyn; James Moyer, Brooklyn; Mrs. Charles A. Janeway, Weston, Mass.; Anita Kirkwood, Brooklyn; Christine Compton, Elizabeth Compton, Florence Cane, M. H. Cane, Arthur A. Halper, New York City; Anne Gadol, Brooklyn; E. Horowitz, Chicago; W. J. Donahue, Belleville, N. J.; Stanford H. Mirkin, New York City; David J. Monas, Pottsville, Pa.; Harold Lipshultz, Philadelphia, Pa.; Benjamin L. Hillson, Long Island City, N. Y.; S. Larson, New York City; Joseph A. Story, Brooklyn; Charles Mabrisso, Boston; Eugene Geiser, Oberlin, Ohio; Pauline Dichter, Astoria, N. Y.; Mrs. Morris Mason, New York City; Max Gross, Brooklyn; Lillian Palomino, New York City; Miss Jewenblatt, Bronx; Mrs. Hannah C. Katz, Brooklyn; K. Flowers, Columbus, Ohio; Sara M. Glantz, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mrs. N. King, Washington, D. C.; Mr. and Mrs. J. Samuels, Ethel Kahn, Mrs. Pearl Ransom, Frances Besner, New York City; Samuel N. Ray, Forest Hills, N. Y.; A. Bakat, Brooklyn; Randolph Phillips, Pittsfield, Mass.; Mrs. A. Taub, Lisbeth H. Goodstein, New York City; Regina Hotha, Chicago; J. Ostrower, Woodbridge, N. J.; David Geller, Boston; Mary Dustan, New York City; Mrs. G. A. Hansen, Brooklyn; H. R. Leish, New York City; William Palinski, Racine, Wis.; Robert Pontridge, Brooklyn; George Hornby, Jane Werner, Vivian Rotolo, New York City; Helen Kemaltz, Astoria, Long Island, N. Y.; Anne De Stefano, Brooklyn; Colby Cleveland, New York City; Mrs. B. Rubin, Brooklyn; Miss R. Englander, Jersey City; Mrs. J. Schwartz, New York City; Etta Preminged, Perth Amboy, N. J.; A. Sealzo, Brooklyn; Constance L. Moerman, Falls Church, Va.; Edna Solomon, Murray Levinger, New York City; Philip Balaban, Bronx; Gartin Pippen, Saul Ascher, Brooklyn; Juanita J. Saddler, Cambridge, Mass.; Mrs. A. Ammirati, New York City; Martin Blumberg, Fort Monmouth, N. J.; Rae Schaffyin, New York City; Mrs. Ben Yudenfriend, Brooklyn; Jeanette Shipper, A. D. Tinkel, Bronx; J. D. Hirsch, Newark; Mrs. Joseph Schwartz, Perth Amboy; Temmie Miller, C. Sloane, New York City; Rebecca P. Elliott, Esther Rubin, Philadelphia, Pa.; Welton Chipmanswain, New York City; Rosalie Shore, Philadelphia, Pa.; Leah M. Hoffman, H. Lennon, Mary C. Reick, Celia Gevelber, Rita Rullo, Katherine Richardson, A. M. Pulen, Sarah Kirstein, Ethlyn Schellak, Mary C. Hartzell, Rosemary Eitzen, Lola Casino, Elizabeth Davis, Mary Krasovitz, New York City; Ruth Fields, Rebecca Kopelsohn, Brooklyn; Harry B. Strebig, Lakewood, Ohio; Jeanette T. Dennis, Brooklyn; Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Gonzales, Bronx; Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Sherr, New York City; R. Siegel, Newark, N. J.; Elinor Woodruff Leland, Danbury, Conn.; Mr. and Mrs. Nathaniel Keisna, Bronx; Mrs. M. P. Reynaud, Long Island City, N. Y.; Mrs. Arthur A. Cohen, Los Angeles; Mrs. M. M. Danovitch, Norwood, Mass.; Margaret F. Sloss, Aurora Aponte, H. J. Roth, Minnie Altmann, New York City; Elizabeth V. Schrack, Norristown, Pa.; Sally Zeitlin, New York City; Milton H. Solomon, Fort Meade, Md.; Wilbur U. Jones, Wheeling, W. Va.; Charles Goldstein, Frances Grusberg, New York City; Helen Morrisson, Gloria Sultan, Brooklyn; Henry D. Demling, Bronx; Mrs. W. S. Stachenfield, Brooklyn; Barbara Lichtenstein, Yellow Springs, Ohio; Ruth Chechanover, Brooklyn; Anna Lemling, Greenbelt, Md.; Jacob Auerbach, Mildred Auerbach, Brooklyn; Sarah Zaber, New York City; Vernon D. Sutcher, Camp Gordon, Ga.; Sidney Kaufman, Hope, Ark.; Elliot R. Cades, Philadelphia, Pa.; Elsie Goldberger, Perth Amboy, N. J.; Stanley Silverman, New York City; Edmund J. Pickup, Brooklyn; Mrs. Alice Fletcher, Glen Mills, Pa.; Leon Moses, Jr., Columbus, Ohio; Irving Krauss, New York City; W. H. Haight, Hackensack, N. J.; Mrs. S. Konigsberg, Shirley, Mass.; J. C. Miles, Cleveland, Ohio; M. Flachs, Newark, N. J.; Jack Shore, Frances Shore, Brooklyn; Bee Workman, Anne E. Morley, New York City; B. A. Bianchi, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. S. L. Washburn, Thomas Spikey, New York City; Samuel A. Weiner, Paterson, N. J.; R. M. Shanoff, Chicago; Mrs. L. Fears, Astoria, Long Island, N. Y.; Estelle Freedman, Brooklyn; Mrs. William B. Rosenman, New York City; Sidney S. Grant, Bertram D. Halperson, Boston, Mass.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to concern myself with the comments on the political character of either the Republican, or Democratic, or American Labor Parties, made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] because I do not believe anyone else will pay any attention to his statement. But, I want the membership of this House to know one thing, that is, that the names singled out by the gentleman from Mississippi were the names of wives of American soldiers.

Everyone of those ladies whose name he mentioned in the RECORD the other day is the wife of an American soldier, either in a camp here or fighting overseas. It is my opinion, that when he makes targets of women of that character, women who have given their husbands for our war, it is hitting at genuine American patriots.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Ever since Adam and Eve had to get out of the garden, it has been the custom of a certain class of men to hide behind women's skirts. That custom still prevails, and if the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] wants to do that, as he did this morning, that is all right with me; that is his right.

Yesterday he said I was a "Rankin Republican," following JOHN RANKIN. I want to strike for independence now and say to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] that I disagree with him wholeheartedly and completely when he said, as he did a few moments ago, that the party of the gentleman from New York, and the Communists, were pure and simple. Neither is pure, neither is simple.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the conclusion of previous special orders today, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes at the conclusion of the other special orders today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LICK THE PLATTER CLEAN THIS CHRISTMAS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the declaration that we are going home for the holidays. I hope as we sit around our tables and enjoy ourselves we shall have the assurance—I know we shall—that all the men in the

armed forces will have turkey, too, with all the trimmings. We must not forget, however, that throughout the world there will be millions of hungry people who have not had bread or meat for a long time. We should conserve our food and share it with others less fortunate. Let us be mindful of them and lick our platters clean. It is the patriotic thing to do. Then to let us hope and pray that next Christmas the soldiers will all be at home with their loved ones with plenty to eat in all the world at peace, and then by the grace of God and by His help we will build a new and better world.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PROBLEMS OF THE EX-SERVICEMEN

Mr. HORAN. I see by this morning's paper that the other branch of Congress has passed a bill making an outright gift of from $200 to $500 to each discharged soldier. Being a veteran of the First World War I want to say that it will take more than that.

I wish to make plain my own conviction that it will take more than just money to rehabilitate our boys.

They must be made a part of our productive economy. A dollar spent in providing opportunities, or in preparing them to grasp opportunities, will be worth ten times as much as a dollar ladled out to them without thought.

Capital credit and the availability of education are the keys to the future as far as the returning boys are concerned. Credit to assure a start toward whatever capital investments these opportunities require and available education to assure the knowledge and training that these opportunities may demand.

Let me say again that money alone will neither serve the best interests of the returning men nor solve the looming problems of the post-war era.

The solution, to my mind, is founded upon the fact that he who works makes work for others, and the influence is cumulative.

The task before us is to integrate each man with a fitting and congenial job into the pattern of the whole.

Mere money in one's pocket tends to promote idleness and in the negative sense we can say that he who does not employ himself at purposeful and useful tasks makes in the end unemployment for others.

The problem is before us now. Already tens of thousands of men have received their discharges, for many reasons, medical and otherwise. Some have tasted the bitter cup of our unpreparedness for a return to their civilian life. We must guard against that bitterness.

I would like to read you a letter received in my office. It is from another veteran of the last war:

DEAR WALT: On December 6, I was in the Seattle city hall trying to get enough gasoline to return home when I happened to overhear a remark from the sergeant of police to a young fellow. "This is no flop house," was the answer to a request for a place to sleep.

You could tell from looking at the fellow that he was no ordinary kid, and I asked him why such a request was necessary, why wasn't he in the Army, the Navy, or the Marine Corps. The answer I got put me in my place, because he spent most of his enlistment in New Guinea and Australia.

I was in the last war and do not believe every soldier I meet or hear sounding off, so in due course of time I asked to see his service record when he was paid off. This was it:

Bosley, Richard. Age 24. Weight at time of enlistment, 196 pounds. That was February 3, 1941.

Discharged at Salt Lake City, September 18, 1943. Weight 158 pounds. Rate of pay, $56.

Wound caused by .25 calibre bullet, right leg, in action in New Guinea, Forty-first Division. Wearer of Order of Purple Heart. Sent to Australia after wound for treatment. Further transfer to the States for disposition.

After 2 months in hospital called before "survey and disposition" one day, signed off, and next day sent on his way with 300 other casualties to civilian life. Transportation and meals furnished to Spokane, Wash., from Salt Lake and turned loose with $31.03 in his pocket.

Tried to return to his old job with Safeway Stores, but was turned down, simply couldn't hack a job like that. Turned down by Boeing for the same reason.

Fortunately this story has a happy ending. When the facts were learned, I bought this boy some clothes, got him a room, got him cleaned up, fed him for a couple of days, and got him back into normal thinking lanes, and then took him to Hanford and got him a job with DuPont, working as a guard.

The damndest thing about it all is that we can give millions of dollars to build a maternity hospital in South America to raise a bunch of "mañanas," but not a cent for the rehabilitation of the boys who have given everything. Gone into the ash can are the promises to take care of the boys.

Eric Johnston states in the paper today that 17,000 a month are being discharged from the service and no facilities are under way to take care of them. Let the word get back to the troops on the lines that the boys are "getting the works" from the Government, and the morale of the United States armed forces will not be worth a tinker's damn.

The time for taking care of the wounded soldiers is not after the war, but now. The problem is not in the future. It is here now.

CLARENCE DURHAM.

And here's part of a letter from a former veteran, again in the service. He writes from New Guinea:

I have confidence, that as an ex-service man, you will give it the attention it deserves. The bonus we received in the last war never struck me as being the answer to a serviceman's prayer.

And that letter is from Frank Stark, boatswain's mate, first class, with the Fleet in the South Pacific.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, is it the gentleman's opinion that if we pay just in the form of money as an excuse for a greater duty that may fall upon us and in that very act we are admitting our own weakness?

Mr. HORAN. That is right. Any bonus should be administered with intelligence.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does it not seem, though, that if a flat payment were given to the men it would give them a little opportunity to get some clothing and look about for a position? I think many of the men—in fact, I know—do not know their rights under the law.

Mr. HORAN. I agree with what the gentlewoman says. My idea is that we must make sure also that those positions exist and so regulate our economy that we create more rather than less positions and opportunities. The mere putting of money in the pocket without assuming this greater responsibility is to me short-sighted and unworthy of our heritage as Americans.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Training should be given to the men not only after they get out of the service but training while they are still hospitalized in order to fit them in every way for their duties in civil life. I introduced a bill which I believe the gentleman would approve, and which would provide pay while they are in the hospital or until they get their cases rated for compensation or else give them a terminal furlough so their pay would continue until they were given final rating.

Mr. HORAN. That is a good thing, but we must do more than that; we must assure them employment after hospitalization, after training, after educating. We must be conscious of our responsibility and act with both objectives in view.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And with war industries closing, as they are, civilians are out of employment, and it is that much harder for the veterans.

Mr. HORAN. We are on the threshold of the need for some real reconversion of our economy for civilian or peaceful needs right now, I believe.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is not the primary need these veterans face and the primary problem that faces us, real employment for the soldiers when they are mustered out?

Mr. HORAN. Yes. My own theory, and I express only my own opinion in this matter, is that quite often the bonus is something the soldier looks at as a tangible matter, and it tends to cloud his vision as to what his greater purpose in our Nation should be.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I agree with the gentleman, but my real question is this: Is not the real problem facing this Congress one of providing employment? Is not that paramount to the bonus question? The bonus is something that can be had at any time.

Mr. HORAN. Yes. The bonus should be only a stopgap.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. We will do it; there is no question about that, but we should get busy and provide them employment.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Is it not true that the bonus may becloud the issue as to what the soldier is entitled to? It may becloud the issue that faces the Congress and make them tend to forget the greater problems once they have granted the bonus.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does it not seem fair beyond question that the soldier should be given mustering-out pay? I do not like the word "bonus"; it is not a bonus. It seems to me that pay is the thing that should be given to them. Bonus has always seemed to me to indicate something not earned. Certainly the veterans have earned it.

Mr. HORAN. The gentlewoman is correct. We must help our boys to help themselves, with credit capital, educational facilities, and what lump sums we give them should be honestly labeled as the gentlewoman indicates.

Our job is to make the returning boys a working part of a working America. Anything short of that will be fatal.

Mere doles of money can make but a minor contribution to the achieving of that end.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a poem which came to me through the mail dedicated to the All-American Gwibit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MORALE IN THE SOUTHWEST PACIFIC

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to continue blinking the fact that morale among some of our forces in the Southwest Pacific and Asia is being subjected to almost superhuman strains. The admitted toughness of our Japanese adversary is not the reason. Our men are the equals of any in the world.

The two chief causes are, first, the evidences on every hand that so many of us at home do not yet realize that this is an all-out, total war, and requires of us the same devotion and discipline, the same willingness to accept sacrifices of our comforts and our conveniences as we expect our men to make of their blood and toil and nerve.

The second factor is their approaching exhaustion, physical and particularly emotional, as a result of almost endless months without relief, and, even more, without any definite prospect of being relieved in any foreseeable future. Men can unwaveringly tread a road, no matter how hard, if they can see a definite turn up ahead. I believe we have reached a point where our military leaders must consider the assignment of a larger share of our growing shipping for replacing these troops to be as important as the transport of munitions. Men must be given guns and planes—yes, but guns and planes must also have fresh men more frequently than is now the case.

The situation is described most fairly in a letter written to his mother by a Minnesota boy who has been in the Pacific almost 2 years. May I read a portion of that letter:

> You sent a clipping on the observations of Senator LODGE and others who have visited different areas in the war zones. I think it's time, high time, that plans are made to relieve the early troops. Two years is more than enough. Since America has elected to whip Germany first we necessarily are giving Japan the kind of opportunity she wants to develop a strong inner defense and develop the industries and economies with which to fight a long, delaying, attritional war.
>
> I don't believe we have enough for quick victory. It can't be expected of a man that he go on and on year in and year out under these conditions without becoming bitter. LODGE says relief will make better soldiers, simply because we can go home, gratefully appreciating the loyalty of the American people. Without relief there may arise unhealthy and radical bitterness. Then, too, a man works better and more efficiently with a set deadline. He has a day to look forward to; he will speed it with occupation. I don't want you to think of this as complaining because it isn't. I'm simply asking that the reasonable thing be done, and Senator LODGE believes it reasonable and practical. He says we have the troops and the ships. It's not easy to take—reading letters that tell of fellows back there on furloughs every few months—going to school on the Government—striking from labor without sanction of the guys over here—striking for colossal wages. Would you permit us to do that? No; of course not; it's unthinkable.
>
> Yet this is a war of all people. Not a battle between two mercenary armies. Patriotism today means to me not a struggle for geographical America but a struggle for the decent people in it. Under the circumstances you can understand the growth of disillusionment and bitterness here when we read about some of the goings-on at home. If I were on a Minnesota farm, where I could drink fresh milk, eat palatable food, I'd be willing to help feed those who continue the fight here. I should ask for nothing more, and because I know what this is like, I wouldn't be wanting to strike.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Kansas [Mr. WINTER] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I had a special order. There were other Members ahead of me, I went out and when I got back I found that I had been passed. May I renew my request to address the House for 15 minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

There was no objection.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY FOR SERVICEMEN

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, a tremendous campaign is being waged throughout the country to provide mustering-out pay for the soldiers who are being discharged in this war and the demand is that this legislation must be enacted by the Congress immediately. They want it enacted before Christmas. The fact is if this Congress were to pass that legislation today no pay checks could be put out to the men who have been discharged within less than 6 weeks. So that you cannot consider this thing in the light of an emergency either for today or for tomorrow or for Christmas Day or for some other day. As a matter of fact, the great volume of men coming out of the service may not come out for another year or a year and a half, so that an immediate need does not exist. I think that the Congress should move slowly in enacting this legislation. Because of the fact that some criticism has been leveled at the Committee on Military Affairs for not having already reported to the House legislation on this subject, I feel some justification of this delay should be made.

The chairman of the committee, Mr. MAY, of Kentucky, has been called home by reason of the death of his nephew, who was recently killed in the crash of an Army plane in California. Before leaving Washington Mr. MAY directed that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] should call a meeting of the full committee in the event the special committee was prepared to recommend legislation on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Military Affairs has held hearings on the matter. The special committee that has been appointed to go into the subject very thoroughly and to consider the various pieces of legislation that have been introduced, has held several meetings. I may say that there are any number of proposals being made at this time to provide all sorts of different types of benefits for the men when they are discharged from the service. It is a duty we owe this House to study the various proposals before making any recommendation.

In connection with the mustering-out-pay proposal, the suggestion has been made of $300 per man. With 12,000,000 men in the armed services this means an expenditure of $3,600,000,000. I want you to bear in mind that the adjusted-service compensation paid to World War No. 1 veterans, over which there was such tremendous controversy throughout the country, amounted to $3,790,000,000,

practically the same amount of money you are proposing in the mustering-out-pay bill at the present time. The $300 proposal is five times the amount that World War No. 1 veterans received on being mustered out, namely $60.

The biggest evil of this campaign that is now being conducted is the confusion that has been created in the minds of the public and the confusion that has been sent to the men overseas and the men in the services everywhere because the mustering-out pay has been confounded with disability compensation, hospitalization, and similar things that are due our disabled veterans. This Congress has done everything within its power to provide the necessary legislation to take care of the disabled veterans of this war. Unfortunately, there has been a great deal of paper work necessary to take care of these cases. As a result some delays have ensued, but the Veterans' Administration is working today with the War and Navy Departments to expedite the handling of those cases. There are approximately 80,000 or 85,000 cases being considered at this time by the Veterans' Administration. They estimate that within 30 or 40 days every one of those disabled cases will have been rated by the Veterans' Administration and the men will be receiving their pay checks or will be admitted to hospitals in those cases where they are entitled to hospitalization.

They have set up additional rating boards in the Veterans' Administration and they are endeavoring to get the personnel necessary to create more. The Army is arranging to consolidate their mustering-out centers for disabled persons so that it will be more convenient and so that it will be possible for the Veterans' Administration to have a rating board at each one of these mustering-out places. In that way no disabled soldier will be discharged from the service until he has been rated by the Veteran's Administration and his papers are put on file with the Veterans' Administration. Everything is being done to expedite this matter.

Because of the fact a few disability cases have not been promptly rated, and because this has been confused with the mustering-out-pay proposition, great confusion has resulted, but no harm is being done or will be done by the fact a delay may ensue in the enactment of mustering-out-pay legislation. The great majority of the 630,000 who have been discharged from the Army are able-bodied and have been able to obtain civilian employment. They did not ask for, they did not request any mustering-out pay. The same is true of practically all of those who are now coming out of service with the sole exception of the disabled veterans and they will be definitely taken care of by legislation which this Congress has already enacted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be able to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am sure that the House of Representatives appreciates deeply the work of the gentleman's committee in this matter. I wonder if the gentleman and his committee have considered advising the War and Navy Departments not to release disabled veterans until they have been rated and their compensation arranged for?

Mr. COSTELLO. I may say to the gentleman that we had representatives of the Veterans' Administration, the War and Navy Departments before the special committee yesterday morning. We went into that matter and we find that they are endeavoring to definitely work a program so that no disabled veterans will be discharged until they have actually been rated by the Veterans' Administration and definitely taken care of. Unfortunately, some have been let out of the service who were disabled but who were not in direct need of hospitalization. No hospitalized veteran has been discharged from the Army and sent home unless it was at his own request. There have been some cases where the soldier has insisted on being discharged and being allowed to go home because perhaps the parents thought they could give him better treatment at home. Some of those have been discharged and sent home. Their papers may not have been processed by the Veterans' Administration. But within 30 or 40 days every one of these 80,000 or 85,000 disabled veterans, whose cases are pending, will have been rated by the Veterans' Administration and the difficulty will have been completely solved.

Mr. HINSHAW. It appears that the War and Navy Departments have been placing upon the retired list disabled officers. It seems to me that some time ago we passed a law to provide for disabled officers so that they would be treated in the same way disabled officers of the Regular service are treated. It does not seem, from the evidence that I have had presented, that that course is being pursued by the War Department now, but, on the other hand, these disabled officers are merely placed upon the inactive list of the Reserves instead of being properly compensated and taken care of.

Mr. COSTELLO. I am not familiar with definite facts regarding that particular situation.

Mr. HINSHAW. I hope the gentleman will take a careful look into that situation.

Mr. COSTELLO. I will be glad to do that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I can only judge by past performances and results. It is true that we have had this legislation for the disabled servicemen and women on the statute books for months, but the Veterans' Administration did not rate the cases properly. I have received word that they are not being rated within 30 days as stated by the gentleman from California after conference with General Hines. I am delighted the gentleman's committee is taking that up. I have been fighting and fighting and fighting for prompt adjudication and just rating of cases for months.

Mr. COSTELLO. I want the gentlewoman to understand. I did not state that the cases in the past had been rated in 30 days, but that current cases now pending will be rated within 30 or 40 days.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I may say, that we have special orders following the gentleman from California.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that he may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Out of the 635,000 men who have been honorably discharged from the service, only 27,000 cases have been given service connection. There are 60,000 cases that have been non-service-connected. The Veterans' Administration did not ask for enough personnel promptly enough and the situation is inexcusable. I hope and trust that something constructive is being done at this time.

Mr. COSTELLO. I must disagree with the gentlewoman when she says it is inexcusable. The Veterans' Administration has endeavored to remedy the situation. A rating board consists of a doctor, a lawyer, and a third person. The great difficulty today in getting new rating boards is trying to find additional doctors. That is an almost impossible task. But they are endeavoring to solve that problem and they have set up 150 rating boards that are capable of handling 20 cases a day, so that within 30 to 40 days they will have handled the 80,000 to 85,000 cases now pending. They will be cleaned up. In the past it has taken 2, 3, 4, or 5 months. There has been some difficulty in getting all the necessary information, medical records, and so forth, but both the War and Navy Departments are cooperating with the Veterans' Administration and are trying to expedite the matter. I think they will definitely get it straightened out very shortly.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Up to now there have been practically no contact men in the hospitals and no rating boards.

Mr. COSTELLO. That is being remedied.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In the Veterans' Administration they are 300 doctors short. Nothing is being done to insure proper medical service. They should be militarized in order to have the necessary number. They are 700 nurses short, they are short in the insurance section and in other sections of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. COSTELLO. The Veterans' Administration is aware of the fact they are short-handed and it has been trying to get additional personnel to take care of the difficulties but that is not easy to do at the present time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Then it should have taken the matter up with other departments and the necessary personnel secured, because our primary duty and responsibility today is the veteran. I suggested to General Hines at a hearing before the World War Veterans' Committee weeks ago that the Veterans' Administration employ discharged service men and women. So far as I can ascertain—I have been going into hospitals for service men and women—I find while they are hospitalized their care is good. My contention is that where they are discharged they are not given their rights under the law. The administration of the legislation has failed. But, of course, no legislation for mustering-out pay has been passed and that is the responsibility of the Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

INTERNAL SOLIDARITY

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there is a matter I have felt for some time we ought to consider. We ought to take under serious consideration the increasing evidence of trends toward internal disintegration.

One great strike is threatened, and others are in the picture. Too much interdepartmental friction is apparent. There is considerable friction between administrative agencies and the people, friction between the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

As we approach the coming election, the strain upon internal solidarity in this country is going to increase. I do not mean that these things have grown to perilous proportions yet. I mean that, actually and potentially, the situation is sufficiently dangerous as to challenge the deepest, most apprehensive concern of everybody, and especially those in official responsibility, Members of the Congress, and those of the executive branch of the Federal Government. I believe I will add, more especially, the people. This is their Government. Their boys are fighting this war. They suffer first from lack of teamwork at home.

What is the cause of all this? Of course there is some politics, some taking advantage of the war to get individual and group advantage, to forward some notion of ideology, ambition, hunger for power. There are many things. But as the situation and causes diagnose out, if I may use that expression, it is clear that we do not actually fully realize we are engaged in the dangerous venture as one of the most important and most involved participants of a great global war, the most destructive of all time, and therefore we are without the unifying, solidifying, vitalizing one-purpose-giving realization of the transcendent perils of such a situation. There is nothing which unites and gets a people on the job like the realization of a common danger. We are robbing ourselves of the strength and oneness-of-purpose and national solidarity which is the natural contribution of the realization of a common danger. The conflicts in this country could not occur if we had an intelligent appreciation of the danger into which we have moved ourselves. We are all in the same boat. We confront this situation not as Democrats or Republicans, nor as management or labor.

I am somewhat embarrassed by this talk. I am not posing as an example or lecturing anybody. I do not think anybody in this House will charge me with being intensely partisan. This House is not partisan under the challenge of a great patriotic duty. I have never seen the time yet in this House when the country was imperiled that we had any dividing line that ran through the center of this House between the parties. I do not see how anybody can fail to be conscious of the fact that weak spots, some definite changes are developing in the national solidarity which, unless arrested, could put this country in very great peril. Among other evidences of the truth of what I say we are confronted now with the prospect of two major strikes. Now I do not say that these people who may go on strike are primarily responsible. Let us leave that out. That is not the way to approach this thing. The purpose which I have in mind would be destroyed if we should try to fix responsibility upon any particular group. The fact is, it does not belong upon any particular group. Let each of us assume his share of responsibility and his share of duty. We want results. We must do justice all around. We must do justice to those at home. Above all we must do justice to our men who are fighting and dying now while we are secure behind the protection which they afford.

Now let us see what is the picture. Here is the country at war. It is a terrible, bloody, destructive war. Our boys are on nearly every battlefield of the world. We ought to know by now that we are not going to march in a sort of grand parade to a glorious victory, strutting our stuff across the pages of history as we once seemed to our great cost to believe, quickly eliminating Germany and wiping Japan off the map in a few weeks. It is a long, bloody road to Berlin, and probably a longer, bloodier road to Tokio. It will be a longer, bloodier road because, in the initial stages of this war, our swell-headed egotism made us incautious, and not unitedly, with a single purpose, on the job. Egotism breeds incaution and incaution invites disaster. We have not yet entirely gotten rid of incaution. If we had, we would not be taking the chances that we are taking. It would seem that we paid a high enough price at Pearl Harbor to cure us of taking chances. In one Sunday morning we lost domination in the Pacific. One incautious morning we lost the chance of a quick victory there.

Suppose in a small, isolated village, a fire broke out in the middle of the town, imperiling every single building in that village. The people would rush together. They would have but one business. They would be united by the realization of a common danger. The young men would go up on the roof where the fire was coming through and where the danger is. Some people would man the town pump and others form a bucket brigade. Everybody in that community has but one business at the time, and that is to put the fire out as quickly as possible and get the boys off the roof as quickly as possible.

Our boys are at the point of danger, of a greater danger. Our boys are on the roof. Some of them are falling through and being consumed by the flames. They had to go there. We put them there. They went gladly, bravely. They are fighting courageously. They are dying gloriously. They have got to have ammuntion. The factories have got to operate, the mines have got to operate. The trains have got to move. What do you suppose the people of the village would think if somebody quit manning that pump and if those manning the pump said, "Well, we are not going to pump any more water; nobody else shall pump any." The boys up on the roof and every house in the village are in peril. Suppose the ones who were carrying the water said, "We are not going to 'tote' any more water, we do not like something that is going on." They would not do it. That is a point I am trying to make. Human nature is the same. The explanation that the other fellow is meaner than I am will not stand up. Maybe he has too much power. Maybe he got it too quickly. Maybe at the time when he needed the statesman to apply the brake, the politician applied the accelerator because the politician could ride him into office. Too fast, maybe, and he ran away from the support of public opinion and brought in peril both his own and the public interest.

We have got to be fair about these things if we are to get the needed result. Whether intended or not maybe we have put a premium on strikes. The point I am trying to make is that we will get nowhere by denouncing the other fellow for being meaner than we are. It might not be so. We are all going to have to live with ourselves and with our neighbors on this proposition.

What sort of fix would the man who would not carry the water be in when he met the neighbors down the street and the neighbors said to him, "My boy

did not come down off the roof that night because the water played out." I want to emphasize the fact that it is the duty of the other people to see that there is a square deal as nearly as possible for the people at the pump and the people carrying the water. We shun responsibility if we fail to do that. These things which supply our fighting men must be kept going, not only for the sake of our boys, but for the sake of those in these industries. It is a matter of life and death to these boys and for their country that the flow of war material is not interrupted. The longer we protract this war the more of our boys will have to die. The longer the war goes on, the greater the danger that some new machine of destruction may be developed which will make largely obsolete other engines of war. The longer the war goes on, the greater the danger that a stalemate may develop, in which, while we may not be conquered, we will not be able to force our enemies to surrender.

I have been observing this so-called optimism all along. Going around here telling people we are bound to win, how many planes we are going to make, that we are going to do this, that, and the other thing, as though the war would await the conclusion of our program or depend upon its execution. That sort of psychology is all right for a war-tired people in danger of folding up, but not for a people just going into war. Our only sensible program is to do our level best concentrated on the one job. I have examined human reactions. Nothing on earth will get a people on the job as quickly and unitedly as the consciousness of a common danger. People do incredible things in such circumstances. The truth of the situation is this: All we have and all we can hope for is in danger.

People who have common sense, dealing with the most ordinary practical affairs of life, when they have as much involved relatively as we have in this war they do not go around acting as we are, prophesying how soon the war will end—in our favor, of course. Going back to the village fire, practical, common-sense people would say, "Let us put the fire out and get the boys down from that building as soon as possible." The blacksmith working in his shop would be making something with which to help fight the fire. The merchant would only be selling something to help fight the fire.

Our boys are dying in the jungles of the islands of the Pacific because we were asleep that fatal morning at Pearl Harbor, with no apparent realization of the danger that was naturally moving in our direction from what we were doing at that time, and the Japanese character well known to us. The people in France before the Germans struck the Maginot Line were divided, struggling for profit and social gains; they were going to pieces inside France before the Germans struck the Maginot Line, or they would never have broken that line. After that line was broken the men, women, and children of France worked until they dropped in their tracks, but it was too late.

Much of the war will not be won for the family whose boy does not come back home, regardless of the final ending.

I have a practical suggestion. We must establish a better cooperation between the House of Congress and the executive branch of the Government in the conducting of the war. This would not necessitate any surrender of independence. It would be the establishing of a more workable copartnership. This would not interfere with independence of individual judgment. It would necessitate no sacrifice in matters of principle or fundamental policy. It would not interfere with proper conduct in the selection of public officials. We would only have to keep in mind the one great dominant common job of everybody. People have got to settle this question. Public opinion has got much to do in the avoidance of these dividing and hindering things. There is a most definite limitation upon what can be done in our present situation by the mandate of legislative bodies.

The fact that we are having these interdepartmental feuds, at least that is the direction of the drift, conflicts between patriotic citizens and administrative agents of the Government, and these threatened suspensions on a large scale of activities essential to the prosecution of the war, warn us of a deep underlying danger of the first magnitude. The quicker we realize and face the facts, the more sensibly and safely we will be acting.

As we close for the Christmas recess we face a major strike which, if engaged in, will largely paralyze the productive energy of the Nation. I am not here just to hear myself talk. I am conscious of the fact that I am talking to the people who speak for my Nation at a time when my Nation itself and my Nation's boys are in peril. If we begin to have these strikes all over the country right now we will have on our hands the rich red blood of our American boys who are dying on the battlefields of the world because we have not done our job. I mean it. It is a solemn hour, men. Why, the idea of us now confronting the possibility of coal ceasing to come from the earth, coal which is necessary to produce the vital energy that will give our boys the stuff to fight with when they are on the far-flung battlefields of the world, is a monstrous thing to consider. The idea of this threat to paralyze the transportation of this country at a time when our boys are dying on the battlefields of the world is monstrous to think of. The responsibility is ours as a people. I do not want this to be a one-sided presentation. It is also monstrous if we should fail to give the men a square deal. I am trying to help get necessary results. I have been here a long time. I think I know something about reading the signs of the times. If I do not misread the signs of the time, dangerous influences of disintegration are at work in this country now at a time when this country needs the greatest strength, the greatest solidarity, and the greatest unity of purpose that it has ever had with perhaps two exceptions in its whole history. We must counteract them. I know of nothing comparable in effectiveness to the realization of our common danger.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri submitted the following conference report on the bill (H. R. 3598) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, for printing in the RECORD:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3598) "making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 22, 23, 26, 37, and 94.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 13 and 39; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8. That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum "$100,000", proposed in the House amendment insert: "$75,000, of which $20,000 shall be allocated to the Federal Board of Hospitalization"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the House amendment insert the following:

"The Comptroller General of the United States shall make a study of the proposed centralization of retirement fund records in the Civil Service Commission, both from the standpoint of statutory requirements and the sufficiency thereof for accounting purposes, and shall submit a report thereon to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives within 90 days from the date of approval of this act."

And the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum "$1,695,000" proposed in such amendment insert: "$1,550,000"; and in lieu of the sum "$100" proposed in such amendment insert "25 per centum"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

"For an amount in addition to the $20,000,000 appropriated under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act,

1944, and for the same objects and subject to the same conditions, $6,500,000; and the limitation of $60,000,000 in the authorization and direction to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make advances, contained under this head in said Act, is hereby increased to $57,500,000."

And the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum "$2,800,000" proposed in such amendment insert: "$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number proposed insert: "306"; and renumber the preceding section by striking out the number "306" and insert in lieu thereof: "305"; and the Senate agree to the same.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. W. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
H. C. LODGE, Jr.,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill H. R. 3598.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee with respect to the report on two items. The first item I want to ask about is the item relating to $50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate for community facilities. During the consideration of the conference report the other day, the statement was made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] that there is some $13,000,000 at present in the fund and unallocated. Has any further or later evidence come before the committee or the conferees on that subject?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That information was contained in the Senate report, which is the latest data available. In the Senate report, a copy of which the gentleman, no doubt, has at hand, the statement was made that there was $13,000,000 available and unallocated.

Mr. CASE. The reason I asked the question is that I have been told that without any funds being appropriated under this heading, the agency was without funds, and that a call would be made upon the appropriations which have been made available to the War and Navy Departments, to provide certain facilities essential to the prosecution of certain military projects. Personally, I feel that if those facilities are necessary, and if they are of a civilian character, they should be provided for under some other appropriation, rather than to call upon the War Department funds. A water supply for a civilian residential area, where workers are engaged on military projects may be needed but, if necessary it should be provided by civil rather than military funds.

And since this agency has been set up to provide such facilities, and for the building of schools, and so forth, it does not seem to me that the War Department appropriation should be called upon for such purposes. What is done, if anything, in the report? Has the report changed previous action at all?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The House insisted on its disagreement to the Senate amendment, and in the conference the Senate receded and the amendment was stricken from the bill.

Mr. CASE. I should like to ask the gentleman then if it should develop that this agency is without funds, and there are certain facilities which are essential to the prosecution of the war effort that are of a civilian character, would the gentleman, as chairman of the deficiency subcommittee, receive evidence on that before letting the War Department appropriation be called upon to take care of providing those facilities?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As the gentleman knows, the Congress will be here in January. The Committee on Appropriations will be glad to consider any estimates, which may come from the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. CASE. The second question I wanted to ask relates to the item for irrigation for the projects proposed by the War Food Administration. What does the report disclose on that?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. On that the original proposition submitted by the conferees, it was proposed to allow $700,000. However, in conference we agreed to increase that to $1,000,000.

Mr. CASE. As a compromise figure?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; $300,000 more than originally suggested by the House conferees.

Mr. CASE. How much of that then will be for investigations, and how much for construction?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The limitation in the original amendment remains unchanged at $800,000. We made no alteration in the language of the amendment, except to allow $1,000,000 for all purposes of the amendment.

Mr. CASE. So that the division up to $800,000 for investigation and surveys is within the discretion of the director?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes. I trust it meets with the approval of my friend from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the conference report, as above set out.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this conference report represents a complete agreement on the part of the House and Senate conferees. The Senate receded from approximately $113,000,000. The House receded on something like $2,000,000.

There were 13 items in disagreement between the two Houses. On the first, an appropriation of $175,000 for the Bureau of the Budget, we brought back a recommendation for $75,000, of which $20,000 is set aside for the Federal Board of Hospitalization.

On the second item, providing $688,000 for the Civil Service Commission, for a central reporting system and a retiring record system, we struck out the money, but included an amendment providing for investigation of the subject by the General Accounting Office.

On Senate amendment No. 13, which was in effect a part of the preceding amendment, the House receded and struck out the appropriation, pending the investigation by the Comptroller General, Mr. Lindsay Warren.

Under the Public Health Service item, providing for relocation of doctors and dentists to communities without medical and dental service, of the $345,000 asked by the Senate, the House agreed to an appropriation of $20,000, with provision for a 25-percent contribution by the local community or State.

On the public-works community facilities item, for which $50,000,000 was included in a Senate amendment, the item I have just discussed with the gentleman from South Dakota, the Senate receded and the item was eliminated.

The Senate also receded on the $9,000,000 asked for Puerto Rican relief.

The Senate also receded on the request for an additional $50,000,000 for the National Housing Agency.

The Senate receded on the amendment providing for crop insurance.

On the Farm Security Administration amendment, $6,500,000 had been asked for administrative expenses, and $37,500,000 for loans. The House yesterday agreed to the $6,500,000 for administrative purposes, but denied an appropriation for loans. However, in conference the House conferees agreed to an additional $7,500,000 for loans, as well as the $6,500,000 for administrative expenses.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman think we are following a rather untenable route there? We are setting up the overhead personnel, but they do not have the money to loan farmers to produce food with. From my contacts with the farmers in my district, their difficulties have been not having the money to make loans, rather than lack of personnel to carry it on. I wish the chairman of the committee would explain that to me.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Well, as explained by the proponents of the appropriation on the floor yesterday, the $6,500,000 is needed for the administration of current loans. The Farm Security Administration has $60,000,000 on hand available for loans. It was necessary, as was explained yesterday, that

our good friend Mr. Hancock should have sufficient administrative force to handle existing business and take care of the funds provided in the annual bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. But do I understand the gentleman to say there is $60,000,000 available for loans for food production in 1944?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman will recall that in the regular annual appropriation bill, which we passed a few months back, we authorized $60,000,000 for that purpose.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. How much of that money is available at the present time?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It was to be spent in 1944. We have given the full amount asked for overhead, $6,500,000.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I realize the amount of money for the overhead, but the point I am trying to make is that my correspondence leads me to believe that what they are short of at the present time is money to carry on the 1944 loans. I realize that on the agricultural appropriation bill coming in after the first of the year, no doubt ample provision can be made to extend credit for 1944 outside of this. But I cannot figure out why we gave this $6,000,000 for personnel and still only make a token appropriation as far as loans are concerned when the loan is the thing that is needed from my contacts with the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman will recall that on yesterday we were told—and the statement was based on evidence submitted in the hearings—that unless this extra $6,500,000 to which the gentleman refers was appropriated it would be necessary for Administrator Hancock to cut his force in half. This money was provided in order to prevent any cut in his present force and to take care of the current business of the agency. There is no difference between the gentleman and myself as to the value and desirability of this appropriation, but the House on yesterday decided not to appropriate anything for loans. Notwithstanding the decision of the House not to provide any additional appropriations for loans, the House conferees today agreed to add $7,500,000 for that purpose.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Is it not true that the real cause of this added appropriation for administrative purposes is because while Congress appropriated only $20,000,000 for administrative expenses for the fiscal year 1944 the agency was permitted for the matter of several months to operate on a larger scale on the basis of $26,500,000? They have so operated up to the present time and the funds are depleted. This additional money is essential if it is to continue its present setup. The funds do not provide for any increase in the size of the agency.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes. If they had in the beginning consumed each month only one-twelfth of the administrative appropriation they would necessarily have been forced to decrease their staff; but they proceeded at the same rate as heretofore under an understanding which was entered into at the time. If at this late date they were compelled to operate upon the amount originally given them for administrative expenses, they would have to discharge half of their force.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The only reason I brought the point up, I wish to say to my distinguished friend from Missouri, was because I surely did not want to be in the position of going home at Christmastime "cussing" the bureaucrats and then having to admit that I voted $6,500,000 more for the bureaucrats but refused to vote a dime to the farmers. How can I explain that?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Unless the gentleman votes this additional $6,500,000 for administrative expenses F. S. A. cannot service even the amount of money now available. If the gentleman supports this agreement he can tell his people he secured for them an additional $7,500,000 above what the House voted on yesterday.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think it should be the $37,000,000, myself.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. But the House yesterday voted by a decisive majority to appropriate nothing. Under this report you get $7,500,000 for nothing.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS. I should like to say for the benefit of the gentleman from Wisconsin that my information is that there is greater need for this money in some parts of the country than others, that in some parts the fund has been exhausted. There this emergency fund will be available, for those distressed areas. I understand that the State of Wisconsin is in such an area and that this money will be spent in those particular areas rather than prorated throughout the United States. Those States will be the favored States and will be greatly benefited by it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on the proposition to provide $650,000 for the agricultural census, the House receded.

On the Bureau of Reclamation and Water Conservation projects, as I have explained in my colloquy with the gentleman from South Dakota, $1,000,000 was allowed.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Did I understand the gentleman in reply to the gentleman from South Dakota a few minutes ago to say that $1,000,000 is the total provided for this reclamation but that there is no indicated division as to whether $800,000 is for surveys?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; there is no change in the verbiage of the provision; the $800,000 provision still stands.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is that $800,000 is the top limit for surveys in this work?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is right, but a total of $1,000,000 is appropriated for the purposes of the amendment.

On the McKellar amendment the Senate receded. The last amendment was merely a correction of a section number.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the chairman has described the provisions of the conference report. I just want to say that I yielded to the $7,500,000 for Farm Security to make loans because that was the only way we could get a bill. It is not as big an amount as it might be and yet it is $7,500,000 wasted if they continue to operate the way they have operated in the past. They have interfered with farm production and the production of food by putting people who were not competent to farm, putting considerable numbers of them on farms. Instead of being a help to the food-production program they have been a menace.

I do want to say this so that the House will know that we did not do so terribly bad. On this last conference the Senate yielded on amendments which total $143,000,000, including $30,000,000 for the Farm Security. The House yielded to the Senate on amendments put in by the Senate and left them in the bill at this conference today to the extent of $9,350,000. The House yielded on items it had in the bill which the Senate had stricken out to the tune of $739,000. I thought the House ought to have that picture to realize that we really had represented them to the very best of our ability.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to compliment the conferees of the House on the fine job they have done. This is something unusual, to cut the Senate down. The thing I wanted to know specifically was how much money there is in this bill for reclamation investigation?

Mr. TABER. There is $1,000,000 for operations under the Wheeler-Case Act. There is a limitation that not more than $800,000 may be expended for investigations. They can expend at most $800,000 for investigations or they can spend none of it according to what the department concludes to do.

Mr. JENSEN. According to that, then, there is $1,800,000 in this bill for reclamation.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. No; the total is $1,000,000.

Mr. JENSEN. A $1,000,000 total?

Mr. TABER. Yes; and of that million they may if they choose expend $800,000 for investigations or they may expend

the whole $1,000,000 on the construction of projects.

Mr. JENSEN. I think the matter was handled in a very fine manner.

Mr. TABER. Frankly, the House conferees have done the best they could. They worked hard. We were in session for nearly 3 hours and I think we did as well as we could under all the circumstances.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, unless some other Member desires to discuss the report, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING UNTIL JANUARY 31, 1944, THE PROVISIONS OF THE ACT OF APRIL 29, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 209, extending until January 31, 1944, the provisions of the act of April 29, 1943, making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the act of April 29, 1943 (Public Law 45), making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, is hereby amended by striking out the date "December 31, 1943" in section 1 and inserting in lieu thereof "January 31, 1944," and is further amended so that the funds appropriated by section 1 and not heretofore or hereafter apportioned by the Administrator among the several States pursuant to section 2 shall be available for expenditure by the Administrator for the purposes specified in section 3.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any provisions to the contrary in the act approved July 12, 1943 (Public Law 132), funds available to the War Manpower Commission for the current migration of Mexican or Canadian nationals under the auspices of the War Manpower Commission for industrial and railroad purposes essential to the war effort may continue to be expended during the fiscal year 1944.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I wish to ask the chairman a question. This resolution, Mr. Speaker, as I understand, and I will ask the chairman to correct me if I am wrong, is an extension of the provisions of the present Farm Labor Act that we passed last April, extending that act until the 31st day of January 1944, so that those laborers who have been brought in from foreign countries and are now here who are so urgently needed in California, Florida, and some other places at the present time, will not have to be sent back home because of the expiration of the act. It simply makes available until the 31st day of January 1944, unexpended balances of the $26,500,000, reallocating the funds to a certain extent where it may be necessary so that it may work. Is that the picture as the chairman understands it?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York has outlined the situation correctly.

The difficulty arises due to the fact that this appropriation is not for the fiscal year but for the calendar year which expires on December 31.

The House passed a bill and sent it over to the Senate to take care of the situation but due to the fact that it cannot reach consideration in the Senate by January 1, it becomes necessary to pass this continuing resolution.

This resolution is necessary for two reasons: In the first place under this law we have considerable foreign labor in the country. We have labor from Mexico, from the Bahamas, and elsewhere, and would be faced with the alternative either of immediately taking them from the jobs where they are so desperately needed and sending them out of the country by the 31st of the month, or leaving them in the country wholly unsupervised.

Mr. TABER. And it is a fact, is it not, that the Senate Committee on Appropriations is absolutely unable to take this up before the 1st of January?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We are advised by the members of the Senate committee that they are unable to take it up and it is necessary, therefore, to ask a continuation of the present law without change for 30 days to be financed with unexpended funds still available. These funds aggregate about $6,750,000. Of this six or seven million dollars, about three is available for the placement of interstate labor under the Extension Service and about $4,000,000 for use by the Food Administrator for the recruitment and placement of foreign labor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I ask the gentleman from Missouri if there has been any change in the situation since he told me yesterday that after the passage of this resolution there would, in the gentleman's opinion, be sufficient funds to continue the operation of the farm-labor camps?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There are ample funds to continue them for the period covered by this continuing resolution.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I understood the gentleman to say that the Farm Security Administration would continue to administer the work of these farm camps, is that correct?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No. The War Food Administration handles the camps.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The War Food Administration?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Under our former colleague, Judge Marvin Jones.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And he will continue to do so?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Exactly as heretofore.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The money appropriated in the bill that is here appropriated is to keep these folks in the country in some kind of camp so that they may be available when the work comes up for them?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. These men are already in the country and under employment at the present time. This will enable us to keep them on the job instead of having to send them back home before December 31.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Why is it necessary to send them home?

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman from Missouri will yield, I will answer that by saying that it would be necessary to send them home because it is absolutely impossible to get the bill which we considered here yesterday through the Congress before the 1st of January and there will be no recourse left to the officers in the Department except to send them home if their funds were definitely going to be out the first of the year. There are 40,000 of them, or a little better, actually working in California at the present time and two or three thousand Bahamans actually working on the citrus-fruit crops in Florida.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I see no reason why these laborers could not stay here. I think the committee and the House should bear in mind these men have come here in the past without any assistance from the Federal Government because there were ample wages and attractive wages for them in this country. We have always had from 40,000 to 50,000 men from south of the Rio Grande come into the United States as laborers. I noticed yesterday a statement from the Labor Department that before the end of 1944 there would be 2,000,000 men in the United States without jobs. I think this Congress ought to bear in mind the fact some of these 2,000,000 men may be returning soldiers and they will need a job instead of bringing people in from Mexico and the Bahamas to carry on this work. I hope we can see the end of this kind of program of subsidizing the workers of other countries. They come in anyway. Later on we are going to need these jobs for men in our own country.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. These men could not be brought in ordinarily due to the operation of the immigration laws. They have been brought in by the Government under every safeguard. They are Bertilioned and fingerprinted. We are under contract to return them as soon as the work period is completed. There can be no doubt or delay about their prompt return to their own country.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question as long as this is not brought in so that we get a chance to read it. Is the provision in there that any of these men can go from their counties without the O. K. of the county agricultural agent?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is no change in the law.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. May I say to the gentleman that I regret we did not have an opportunity to change that

because I think it is the wrong approach to the problem.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is not a matter before us at this time. The gentleman should have made the change at the time the law was enacted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION AS AN AGENCY OF THE UNITED STATES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SPENCE submitted the following conference report on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "February 17, 1944"; and the House agree to the same.

BRENT SPENCE,
THOMAS F. FORD,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
CHARLES L. GIFFORD,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,
Managers on the part of the House.

ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
FRANCIS MALONEY,
GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE,
JOHN THOMAS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on Senate Joint Resolution 103, extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 173]

Allen, Ill.	Burchill, N. Y.	Dingell
Anderson, Calif.	Busbey	Domengeaux
Arnold	Byrne	Douglas
Baldwin, Md.	Cannon, Fla.	Drewry
Baldwin, N. Y.	Capozzoli	Eaton
Barden	Celler	Elmer
Barry	Chapman	Fay
Beall	Chiperfield	Feighan
Bender	Cox	Fellows
Bland	Cullen	Fenton
Boren	Curley	Fisher
Boykin	D'Alesandro	Fitzpatrick
Bradley, Mich.	Dawson	Flannagan
Bradley, Pa.	Delaney	Fogarty
Brooks	Dickstein	Fulbright
Brumbaugh	Dies	Fuller
Buckley	Dilweg	Fulmer
Furlong	Lynch	Scanlon
Gallagher	McCord	Schiffler
Gamble	McGehee	Schuetz
Gathings	McKenzie	Schwabe
Gavagan	Maloney	Scott
Gavin	Manasco	Shafer
Gerlach	Mansfield, Tex.	Sheridan
Gore	Martin, Iowa	Sikes
Grant, Ala.	Mason	Simpson, Pa.
Grant, Ind.	May	Slaughter
Gregory	Merritt	Smith, Va.
Harris, Va.	Miller, Pa.	Smith, W. Va.
Hart	Mills	Snyder
Hartley	Morrison, La.	Somers, N. Y.
Hébert	Morrison, N. C.	Starnes, Ala.
Heffernan	Mott	Stevenson
Hess	Mruk	Sumner, Ill.
Hill	Murphy	Sumners, Tex.
Holmes, Mass.	Myers	Tarver
Jackson	Newsome	Taylor
Jeffrey	Norton	Thomas, N. J.
Jennings	O'Brien, Ill.	Thomas, Tex.
Johnson, J. Leroy	O'Leary	Tibbott
	O'Toole	Towe
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Peterson, Ga.	Treadway
	Pfeifer	Vursell
Johnson, Ward	Philbin	Wadsworth
Jones	Phillips	Ward
Kee	Pracht	Wasielewski
Kelley	Randolph	Weiss
Kennedy	Reece, Tenn.	Wene
Keogh	Reed, Ill.	West
Kilburn	Rees, Kans.	Whelchel, Ga.
Klein	Rizley	White
Knutson	Rodgers, Pa.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Landis	Russell	Wolverton, N. J.
Lane	Sabath	Wright
Larcade	Sasscer	
LeCompte	Satterfield	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 261 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion by Mr. COOPER, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] that the conference report be considered at this time and the statement be read in lieu of the report?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that if objection is not made, the conference report will be brought up for immediate consideration, and that there will be 1 hour debate on whether the conference report shall be adopted?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is entitled to 1 hour. He may yield to whom he desires in that time. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement as above set out.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does the gentleman intend to yield 30 minutes of the time to me?

Mr. SPENCE. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Thirty minutes, to be distributed by me as I desire. I have some requests for time on this side.

Mr. SPENCE. I understand that I have control of the time. I will be glad to yield to the gentlemen as they wish. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan what time he desires to use himself.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have some requests on the supposition that I would have time to yield.

Mr. SPENCE. I understand that is not customary; that I have control of the time. I am willing to yield to the gentleman whatever time he needs.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield 20 minutes to me personally?

Mr. SPENCE. Will that take care of those on your side?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I doubt it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] can yield as much as he pleases to the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Michigan may yield as he feels disposed if there is no objection. If the gentleman has any proposition to make, the Chair will entertain it.

Mr. SPENCE. I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan and I ask unanimous consent that it may be controlled by him.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Why does not the gentleman divide the time equally as has been the custom? Why does not the gentleman yield 30 minutes to me?

Mr. SPENCE. I think that is fair enough. I do not know that we will want 30 minutes on this side.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky that in yielding the gentleman from Michigan 30 minutes, the gentleman from Michigan may be allowed to yield it as he sees fit?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this conference report involves simply a continuing resolution, continuing the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Senate resolution provided that the Commodity Credit Corporation should continue until February 29, 1944. The amendment passed in the House provided that it should continue until February 5, 1944. We have been in conference this morning and the Members on behalf of the other body stated the question was one that should be decided by them; that the bill in reference to the Commodity Credit Corporation which has been so vigorously debated, was under their consideration, and they needed time to complete the consideration. They insisted on the original resolution, that the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation should be continued until February 29, 1944, in order to give them time to satisfactorily dispose of the problem. We insisted on the amendment of the House. We refused to accept their date. In a spirit of compromise we split the difference and made it February 17, the date for the continuation of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I think that was a fair disposition of the matter.

It is a matter that certainly is not of great importance. Twelve days' continuation of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which gives it no additional powers, which does not change the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t" of existing law. That is the question that is submitted to you. I think it needless to say more.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no compromise of this nature on this subsidy issue. The House voted overwhelmingly by a majority of 160 to prohibit the payment of consumer subsidies. There is no reason why the other body of the Congress should not have been considering this issue since last October. A bill was introduced in the other body at the same time a bill was introduced in the House. They were companion bills. It has been the strategy of those who were in favor of consumer subsidies to delay the enactment of this legislation just as long as possible. I warned the House, as did many others, as late as last October, when the bill was reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency in the House, that it was the strategy of those in favor of the payment of consumer subsidies to delay this just as long as possible, and particularly to delay it so that we would be pressured up against the Christmas recess, in order that we might do just as we did last July, pass a simple continuing resolution without a prohibition against the payment of subsidies.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you may yield to that strategy if you care to. I will not be a party to it. I did not sign the conference report.

A few days ago, when it became apparent that the other body probably could not get a quorum to consider the bill, although hearings on the bill had been concluded in the Senate, we were confronted with the condition. We said that because of this condition, because both branches of the Congress were desirous of recessing over the Christmas holiday, we would give the other body of the Congress 30 days in which to bring this up. That was a concession to a condition which existed in the Congress. They were told at that time that if they sought to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation without a prohibition against the payment of subsidies for 60 days, that that would be considered by the country and by the House, as a concession to those who favored the payment of subsidies. I believe that the other body of the Congress deliberately made this 60 days, knowing the attitude of the House, in the belief that they would split the difference and get as much time as possible to continue the payment of subsidies.

The payment of these subsidies is costing the taxpayers over $100,000,000 a month. This matter has got to be settled as expeditiously as possible. At the present moment, the War Food Administrator gives as his reason for not announcing food programs, the fact that there is so much confusion in respect to this legislation. The War Food Administrator therefore wants this disposed of as quickly as possible. Who wants it continued? Those who are in favor of the payment of subsidies, and this is the strategy which they have been formulating since at least the 14th of last October, when this bill was reported out of the Committee on Banking and Currency in the House.

There is no reason under God's heaven why the other body of Congress should not have been considering their own bill for the last 3 months. They did not consider the House bill before the committee. They considered the Senate bill. They refused to report the Senate bill out by a vote of 9 to 8.

Now, it is our responsibility. Because of the confusion on this issue, because of the gross exaggerations which are made in respect to this issue, because of the intellectual dishonesty which is apparent with respect to this issue, because of the fact that, if we adopt this conference report, it will be hailed on the radio and in the press as a great victory for those who are in favor of the payment of subsidies, this conference report should be voted down decidedly.

It is the responsibility of the other body to act expeditiously in this matter. We have seen that other body act on major legislation with less than 5 minutes' debate. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] on yesterday called attention to the fact that there was no opposition to the 60 days' continuance of the Commodity Credit Corporation, because there has not been any debate in the Senate. They did not debate this issue. Now, by voting down this conference report, we at least compel the other body of the Congress to give the same consideration to this problem that you and I have been giving to it since last June.

What happens to the Commodity Credit Corporation if we vote down the conference report and the Senate does not act? The same thing which happened last June and July when they forced us into exactly this same situation.

The resolution continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation after June 30 of last year did not become law until July 16, 1943, when the President signed Public Law 151; and the same thing might happen to Commodity Credit Corporation again. So it is not absolutely essential that we vote this resolution today to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation. This matter will be disposed of within a reasonable time after we reconvene, and no more danger to the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation will result from a failure to act on this than resulted last July when for 16 days the Commodity Credit Corporation was without legal life. Every lawyer in this House knows, of course, that they can continue their present commitments during the so-called liquidation period and that any legislation following that can be retroactive to pick up the life of that Corporation as of December 31, 1943. They cannot, however, if no resolution is passed, continue to make commitments and I do not think a majority of this House wants them to make further commitments.

It has been said here that they have agreed that they would make no new commitments on consumer subsidies, and thus we are not doing anything by defeating this legislation than they have promised Congress that they would not do. In the meantime, pressure groups are at work on this legislation and every Member knows they are, and the longer this continues the more and the greater pressure will be brought.

In a letter of December 8, of which I have a copy before me, Chester Bowles, Administrator of O. P. A., had this to say:

> Of course there are arguments against subsidies the validity of which I recognize. They will add to the tax burden and increase the national debt. They introduce new principles into American economy which have never before been experienced.

It should be decided definitely and as expeditiously as possible whether this Congress wants to adopt as a philosophy of government these new principles to which Mr. Bowles refers. He goes on to say:

> There will be an immediate rise in the cost of living by an amount of 20 to 25 percent greater than the amount now being expended in subsidies.

I want to call attention to the fact that he stated the increase would be $1,000,000,000, not the $8,000,000,000 Mr. Bowles said in his statement to the press 2 weeks before that. That is what I mean by gross exaggeration. Mr. Bowles at one time for the purpose of getting votes for consumer subsidies said that it would increase the cost of living $8,000,000,000, but in a letter written under date of December 8 he stated it would increase the cost of living by not to exceed 25 percent more than the amount now being expended in subsidies. The amount now being expended in subsidies is at the most $800,000,000. It was 25 percent of that that he had reference to, so you have $1,000,000,000 in consumer subsidies, but that means that $3,000,000,000 must be raised by the people in taxes to pay it off. Mr. Bowles' argument was that the increase would set in motion a new wave of wage demands many of which doubtless would have to be satisfied.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

If you take the amount that is being paid in subsidies annually and divide it by the population you will come to the conclusion that it amounts to 2 cents a day per capita. For a family of five that is the price of one glass of beer for the head of that family a day. I believe it is an insult to the patriotism of every wage earner in this country for Mr. Bowles to say that labor is going to strike, labor is going to tie up war production merely because they have to curtail their beer consumption by one glass a day. How ridiculous that is. But this whole program is in such a position today that we cannot justify a continuance beyond the 30-day period. When the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] suggested February 5 I said that of course we would not quibble over a few days; whether it is the 1st of February or the 5th is not material, but any concession beyond the 5th of February is a decided yielding to the subsidy group and the groups which

are pressing every one of us and the administration to continue this program just as long as possible without a prohibition against the payment of producer subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, you may do as you please; you may run up the hill and run down the hill just as much as you want, but this to me is a matter of principle and so long as I have any part of the responsibility for the formulation of Government principles and policies I am going to stand up and fight for those which I consider to be sound so long as there is a breath of life in my body to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I have a very high regard for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], who has just addressed the House. I am sure his ability is acknowledged by almost everyone on both sides. The gentleman, I am afraid, is not living up to the high reputation and standard he has set here that has gained for him an almost universal feeling of respect and caused him to have this high standing in the House. He says he is fighting for principles. I can appreciate when a man has worked as hard as he against subsidies how he might be inclined to become—well, for want of a better word, "captious"—and yet if it is wrong to extend it for 60 days it is wrong to extend it for 1 day.

Now, what are we talking about? About the difference between tweedledee and tweedledum. What is a difference of 10, 11, or 12 days? If we are going to extend this thing why be captious about it? What difference does it make whether we extend it for a few more days? The gentleman is familiar with the legislative status here; he is familiar with the fact that this would upset the whole applecart over the mere question of an extension of a few days. I have a very high regard for the gentleman; I feel just as he does about this House upholding its part of the dignity of this Congress, but at the same time we have had a meeting of minds; one side has given and the other has taken; one side has taken and the other has given. This certainly is a thing that we can all get together on and I hope the gentleman will not press his point.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I spoke against consumer subsidies. I voted for the Steagall bill that passed the House, but in doing so I offered an amendment to clarify, as I understood the situation, the language of the bill which I thought prohibited the payment of producer subsidies, such as the beet-sugar subsidy. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] assured me that I was wrong. I had a very limited time to present the amendment. It was overwhelmingly voted down.

There are still those who do not think that the bill as passed by the House will permit the continuation of that program. I do not believe anybody in this House is opposed to it.

I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi that the compromise agreed upon by our conferees to give 12 more days is not a compromise of principle. These are critical days. Next year I believe will be the most critical year we shall ever see, and the thing that makes it critical is a spirit of discontent, a spirit of bullheaded obstinacy, a group movement that "I must have what I demand and will make no concessions to the viewpoint of the other fellow." We did a fine job in this House yesterday; there was unity of purpose and action. I would hate to see that record marred now just before we are going home to celebrate the anniversary of the birth of the Prince of Peace. The Senate has made a concession to us; they ask us to make a concession to them of 12 days only. We do not agree to go back on anything that we have previously stood for; we merely agree in a spirit of sweet reasonableness to meet the viewpoint of the other fellow just a little way, just 12 days. I frankly do not see how we can do any less. We must not go home and let the Commodity Credit Corporation die.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, how does the time stand?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan has 16 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Kentucky 22.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am standing beside a man for whom I have great affection, and even more that affection. I have great admiration for his great and unquestioned ability. I am sorry to see him now rather dissatisfied with what we did in the conference today. I thought I was emphatic enough yesterday and that we voted the way he must have appreciated in his absence. I must confess that when we met the Senate in conference this morning and they told us they probably would not return from the recess until January 10, and that they really needed a little time beyond the 5th of February, I thought it fair to yield halfway. They wanted 20 additional days; however, we finally induced them to reconsider. I did not think that in doing that I was working against the wishes of my friend from Michigan. Under the circumstances I have outlined, we tried to act fairly for the House. We are not now discussing the principle. The gentleman from Michigan cannot be less yielding on this question of the principle of subsidies. I still fear the result of the threat and the shaking the plum tree and the votes that might be changed. That was my speech on yesterday; that was the whole issue, it is the issue here today. I should like to add that what worries me a little, as the gentleman from Michigan suggests, is the way the newspapers pan us—and do they pan us! They pan us because we do not stand up in our shoes and stop taking dictation from the White House. Then when we try to stand up in our shoes and vote our sincere beliefs, think what happens to us at the hands of the press as illustrated in this subsidy matter. We cannot suit the press. It is their method and joy to criticize more often than to commend. It is news when they criticize. This House has carefully weighed this matter of subsidies. We in the House have declared for an antisubsidy bill. As usual, the press largely takes the other side. It may be best to run down the hill a short ways, and I may have run up the hill pretty far yesterday. I can retreat a little when necessary and strengthen my position.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Would it be fair to inquire of the gentleman from Massachusetts if this conference report is signed by all of the conferees who were present at the conference?

Mr. GIFFORD. I do not like to have the gentleman put it that way: I think all signed it except the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. COOPER. Was the gentleman from Michigan present at the conference?

Mr. GIFFORD. He was there when I left.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say in closing that we are very proud of this man from Michigan. Just because I cannot follow him everywhere he goes, especially when he does not tell me where he wants to go, should not alarm him; but as I have before said to him and now repeat, How can I play second fiddle well when to me he will not tell? But I want him to know I am supporting him loyally on principle of the antisubsidy legislation. His personality and good judgment will continue to guide me. I do think highly of him. But in this case, I thought he might prepare to follow me.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the merits of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill are not in question in this resolution. It is simply extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which has done more for the American farmers than all of the other agencies of Government combined. The Corporation has been in existence now for 10 years. I remember in 1933 when corn and wheat were selling for 25 and 35 cents per bushel, when cotton was selling for 6½ cents per pound, the Commodity Credit Corporation was set up for the purpose of stabilizing the prices of agricultural products and made loans to the farmers in order for them to carry their surplus crops until they could sell them in an orderly way. So the question here is extending for a limited time the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which expires December 31 this year.

I am against certain types of subsidies; subsidies to roll back the prices to con-

sumers are unsound. I am for support prices and incentive payments in order to produce more war crops. The Commodity Credit Corporation bill which passed the House a few weeks ago did not change the benefits under the A. A. A. Act or the soil-conservation benefits. If we have to pay subsidies to consumers of this country when everybody has a job for the first time in a quarter of a century, what will we do when 25,000,000 or 30,000,000 people employed in making implements of war and 15,000,000 in the armed services of this country come back without jobs?

Mr. Speaker, we are not deciding that principle today. We conferees met this morning. We might not have a quorum on Monday. We must extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. As your representatives, we did the best we could. The Senate wanted to extend the life of the Corporation until the 29th day of February. I voted yesterday to extend its life until the 5th day of February. The best we conferees could do was to split the difference, and we agreed on the 17th of February. We have done the very best we could, and it is important that we vote now to sustain the conferees in order to extend the life of the corporation that has done so much for the American farmer. If not, on January 1 we will be without the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, at the outset, though I belong to a different party from my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], I am going to stand right square shoulder to shoulder with him on the matter of refusing to believe that the conference report coming back with an added extension of 12 days is a mere source of quibbling. I join him as a Member of this House in that it is a matter of principle, it is not a matter of quibbling. This is the first time since I have been a Member of this body that I have ever felt myself so moved as to say that even though a long vacation means as much to me as it does to any Member of this House, possibly more, and that as an individual for private reasons I have more reasons for wanting to be home than most of those who are anxious to go home, still I cannot believe that the public confidence of this Nation will be aided and strengthened by the House of Representatives coming to an agreement purely because of the argument that we are quibbling over a few days. It is more than that.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers of the South of this great Nation and in the far West, the great State of California, have a right to know, in view of the fact the planting season is already upon them, as soon as possible just what is going to happen to this program. This Nation is entitled to the utmost in food production and, to use the Speaker's own words, in unity to both produce and fight more than it has ever done in its history. Surely the matter of settling the issue between the Houses, if there is any quibbling over time it is set aside in view of the fact that an expenditure of billions of dollars was passed in the other body without going into the facts involved and the merits of the case in approximately 5 minutes, in the 35 days under the House amendment they cannot claim they will not have enough time.

No, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of putting before this country the fact that certain people are trying to saddle a gigantic octopus on this Nation which would sap the very virtue of its people, a virtue upon which its continuity depends, and which will sap the foundations from our American way of life that men and women both are dying to preserve. If this House is in too big a hurry to get home for vacation with conditions like that facing it, I will not stand up and argue that it is a matter of quibbling among friends over time. There is a grave difference of opinion between me and those gentlemen who consider this matter to be of such trivial significance that they would be willing to trifle with the intelligence of the American people further, and at the same time undermine their confidence in the one branch of Government which stands and should stand eternally vigilant over the price of liberty, and I refer to the Congress of the United States. It would be a sad thing indeed, if the decision were reached this afternoon because of the haste of Members in their desire to go home, to settle this matter and agree upon the little item of 12 days as being of such great importance that we have to do it upon that basis, yielding to the power of propaganda and publicity which we know so well will be used in this case, and at the same time further fixing this monster, this festering cancer already begun, still further upon the American people.

Mr. Speaker, if I vote alone in this case, I will vote the conference report down, and not up on the matter of the so-called adjustment based on 12 days, and take my chances in the forum of American reason on the issue.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I hardly think it is fair for my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] to try to leave the impression that the Members of the House are taking this action just to go home. I hardly think any fair-minded person in any man's district has not already recognized the fact that Members of Congress like to be home on Christmas Day the same as they do. But this is not for the purpose of going home.

We are nearing the close of a session. This session will be over on January 3.

The other body passed a resolution providing for 60 days. We passed it providing for February 5—35 days. In the orderly legislative processes in conference the matter is adjusted, which is done on many, many occasions and on every bill where there is a disagreement between both branches of the Congress. From the farmer's angle, the extension is vitally important. Unless we do something by December 31 the Commodity Credit Corporation expires. Subsidies may continue thereafter under the R. F. C. So it is not a question of stopping subsidies. We know that between now and December 31 the chances of final action being taken in the present legislative set-up are remote so far as continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation Act is concerned. So that this very action and extension is of vital concern to the farmers of the country.

There is no controversy about the extension, no matter how we feel on subsidies; but if the act is not extended there is danger. Suppose the Senate did not act, or suppose it did and the bill was vetoed and the veto did not come until after January 3. The Commodity Credit Corporation Act has expired. Certainly none of us want that to happen. So the extension of the matter 12 days or 15 days, or whatever the adjustment between the two branches may be, is a minor matter and certainly should not be termed quibbling, but is a practical way of meeting a practical question confronting us.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said about the fact that we should adopt this conference report in a spirit of compromise. I was under the impression that on yesterday when the House agreed to the date of February 5 it represented a compromise. We all know that there was not any fight made in the House as to the adoption of that date, February 5. I think it was the general understanding of those who voted for that date that it did represent a compromise and that the Senate would probably agree to accept the date the House agreed upon. I am very sure if there had not been that impression prevalent there would have been a fight here in the House upon that resolution when it came before us yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, a good deal has been said about the difference 12 days might make. Twelve days at this particular time of the year, when farmers are outlining their programs for planting and sowing during the coming year, mean a great deal. We are all aware of the fact that Marvin Jones has twice stated publicly that it is imperative we pass this legislation now before we recess for the holidays; that is, that we pass legislation extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation and settling the question of subsidies, because until we do that the Food Administrator is absolutely unable to tell the farmers of the country what kind of a program they will have next year. The farmers cannot make their plans and proceed with their operations until they know what that program is going to be. So far as I am concerned, I dislike very much to see this thing go over even until February 5, because it is going to seriously interfere with our food program next year.

Twelve days can make a great deal of difference, 1 or 2 days might make a great deal of difference, and I think in all fairness to the Food Administrator we ought to insist that this question of subsidies be settled at the earliest possible date. The thing to do is to vote down this report and insist on the House's position.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon completion of the pending business I may be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes to explain the provisions of the soldiers' vote bill which I have introduced today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from Mississippi, I, too, have great admiration for the gentleman from Michigan. I think we all do, but we are not discussing the merits of subsidies or the demerits. The only thing we are undertaking to do here is to carry out the Constitution of the United States. Our forefathers, in their wisdom, provided us with two branches of the legislative department and they said we had to agree on the identical language before anything became law. We followed the processes of the Constitution in this case and each House has conceded to the other an equal amount of the difference existing between them. So we have this conference report here and it is up to us whether we take it or reject it.

Suppose you reject it? Does that force the other body to consider the question of subsidies before the end of this session of the Congress? It does not. Does it insure the continuance of the Commodity Credit Corporation beyond December 31? It does not. You do not accomplish anything by rejecting this conference report unless you can force the other body to agree to your terms and they have already made as much concession in this matter as have the conferees on the part of the House. So it seems to me the part of wisdom and of common sense for us to adopt the conference report and come back here in the beginning of next session and undertake to settle this matter, which has so disturbed the Members of Congress and the people through the country. But we are not going to gain anything, in my judgment, by rejecting this conference report, except to upset further the people of this country who are dependent upon the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, because it is entirely possible that if we reject this report the Commodity Credit Corporation will go out of business on December 31, and we will make a bad situation worse.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I cannot quite agree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] that a compromise should be made today. I think we made it yesterday. So far as I personally am concerned, we did make it. I was my intention to oppose any extension of time but I did agree to the date of February 5, upon the theory if that was the best we could do we would give the other body opportunity and time to work out a bill we could accept and adopt. I felt the need and urgency for immediate action. I feel it today. This Congress could and should have acted on this important measure before January 1. The country is going to hold us responsible for not so doing. We can talk about delaying it for just a matter of 12 days as though that were inconsequential. But remember that food is an essential and important item, not only for this Nation but for our allies. The farmers of this country must know what they are to do. It is all right to talk about it not making much difference, 12 days or 30 days, but it is most important when the next harvest season comes around to see that we have a food supply for people.

The farmers of our Nation are confronted with a labor shortage, a farm machinery shortage, and now you want to confuse and delay the planning of their farm programs. Any delay on this measure is inexcusable. Restrictions, red tape, regimentation have already hindered full production, and now you want to add confusion.

Those who favor this delay will and must be held accountable for any reduction in food production that results from uncertainty in securing early action on this legislation.

And that is what is at issue here today. That is one of the reasons why I do think we should vote down the conference report. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has taken a definite stand and I believe his stand is in the interest of our people.

Now something has been said about the extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I think it has been a most vital and effective agency for the agricultural sections of our Nation. But what happens if we do not extend it? What happened between July 1 and July 17? There was not any serious calamity. It will be taken care of as it has in the past. Therefore, I urge you this afternoon to support the position of the gentleman from Michigan.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the only thing I feel is of vital importance in this matter is to make certain there is no period of time during which the Commodity Credit Corporation cannot function at all. If that should happen, I want to testify that there are thousands upon thousands of dairy farmers in this country, and some of them in my section, who today are able to produce only because they are in receipt of subsidies to cover their cost of production, or a portion of it. If there is not any Commodity Credit Corporation, I do not know how those men are going to keep going. Of course, this issue should be settled at the earliest possible moment one way or another, but those producers of vital and necessary commodities have either got to have higher prices or they have got to have subsidies to cover their cost of production, and if there is not any Commodity Credit Corporation in existence, until this basic issue has been settled, I do not know what those men are going to do.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the arguments advanced by the speakers of the majority party in trying to secure this additional extension of time in which to settle the subsidy question pretty well add themselves up to two simple contentions, one of which is, they contend there is no matter of principle involved, and the second one of which is that we ought to compromise with the Senate in proposing a delayed decision and meet them at some halfway point.

It is amazing to me that no speaker of the majority party except the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG], who is supporting the position of the gentleman from Michigan, no other speaker on the Democratic side today said one single thing about the most important issue, that is, the vital question of getting food at this critical time in the Nation's history. Nobody speaking for this additional delay seems to have been concerned about the necessity of supplying food to our allies and for the soldiers and for the people on the home front. They simply limit their arguments to two points, one a matter of principle and the other a matter of compromise with the Senate. Let us consider the arguments. The principal argument of the gentlemen of the majority adds up to whether it is tweedledee or tweedledum, according to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], only that and nothing more.

It seems to me, however, there is a greater principle than that involved, certainly, and that is the principle of whether or not the House is an integral part of this Congress and is going to respond to the demands of the people to settle this very significant problem of subsidies one way or the other at a very early date. The gentleman from Texas, Mr. Marvin Jones, our former colleague, has told us very candidly we are jeopardizing the entire food supply of this Nation if we continue to dilly-dally with this problem. No speaker of the majority side, as a matter of principle, has refuted that argument here this afternoon. An additional delay of 2 or 3 weeks can have a tremendous effect in the maturing of crops. In my State that much time, for

example, sometimes marks the difference between a bumper corn crop and a crop ruined by an early frost. We owe it to the farmers of America to settle this subsidy question, so that they can make the plans for their farm operations.

Now, as a matter of compromise, the Democratic speakers say, let us meet the Senate halfway. If we meet the Senate halfway on this conference report, this extension of time should go no further than January 31, because the House by its emphatic action a month ago said that subsidies should be abandoned after December 31. If we are going to compromise on a 50–50 basis, halfway to the time limit set by the 60-day extension would come in January, not on February 5. Yesterday I voted against it—an extension even to February 5. I think the subsidy question should be settled before the first of the year. However, on yesterday the House decided to extend the time to February 5 to meet Senate requests, and now they come back asking for additional delay.

The big difficulty with new dealers, Mr. Speaker, is that when they get into a situation involving mathematics, they get confused and bewildered. They cannot even recognize what 50–50 is. They do not know what a 50–50 basis is. First of all they give in to the Senate 50 percent, and then they divide the remainder 50–50 again, leaving the House one-fourth as a matter of practical application. I think that now is the time for us to take action in this question and that if a delay is to be authorized, it should certainly not defer the decision beyond February 5 at the most.

Mr. Speaker, the relentless march of the seasons goes on whether Congress meets or not and whether it acts when it does meet or simply adds up apologies for delay. Those who produce the foods and fabrics of America are entitled to know what the ultimate decision on subsidies is to be so they can plan accordingly. We must either stand by our guns, make an about-face, or accept some compromise solution. Whatever we do, it should be done soon so that the uncertainty can be ended and plans developed to make 1944 the greatest farm-production year in American history.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that it was precisely because we suspected that some such "squeeze play" as that now confronting us would be resorted to in order to defer and delay the decision on subsidies that a number of us late in October organized the drive-for-action committee to stop the procrastination and speed up the decision. At least partially as a result of this committee's insistence, the House met the issue clearly and candidly last month and took emphatic action on the subsidy question. Now the whole decision languishes over in another body of this Congress. I presume there is nothing the drive-for-action committee can do to inspire action in that other body, but today we shall vote to reject this conference report and to oppose granting still additional delay beyond February 5 in deciding this important issue. I hope that sufficient Members of the majority party will join with us so that the conference report will be rejected. If it is, I feel confident the Senate will accept February 5 as the new deadline and that it will meet it. The Commodity Credit Corporation will continue to function in either case—the issue is simply and clearly one of devoting ourselves to the subsidy problem until it is finally and decisively decided for once and for all, so that we can get on with the job of producing the maximum from the farms of this Republic

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, we have about a five-way split on this proposition. If I should say what I would think about the two bodies of Congress, provided I thought either body or both of them would defer the 1944 food program for the mere purpose of going home to see their families, and mine has not been in this city for 2½ years, I say if I should say what I thought about that, provided I believed such a thing, it would be against the rules of the House to put it in the RECORD. So I will skip that part of it.

Mr. Jones has indicated that he cannot announce the 1944 food program because the 1944 food program has become involved in the Federal Treasury's activities, until we do something about the subsidies and about the Commodity Credit Corporation. So I do not believe that either House of Congress would stultify itself in delaying a program or a law beyond February 5 or beyond January 21 or beyond February 17, provided the two bodies can reach an agreement first as between their own Members and then as between themselves before that date. So extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is what we are talking about here, until February 17, does not say to me that Congress will take until February 17 to reach a decision. And if it does not take until February 17 to reach a decision, you will get action before that date. If Congress decides by a roll call or otherwise to defer further action until February 17 that is a decision for Congress. When Congress makes that decision I will stand on it regardless of the political consequences. There are some things I do not propose to do now or later, and that is to die a political death every time I have to vote on a roll call. I am just not so constituted and I do not lose any sleep over those things.

You can take that for what it is worth. Yesterday I questioned the extension to February 5, because of what Mr. Jones said, as the RECORD will show. I will give the other man credit for having just as much interest in the 1944 food program as I have, so we will leave that as it is.

Now here is another proposition. I was informed by the leader of the other body this morning that the Commodity Credit Corporation and the administration had agreed not to initiate any new subsidy program until Congress acts on this proposition. That covers the five-way split that I mentioned when I first began to talk. I signed the conference report.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman not think when Congress is supporting the administration program to control inflation and provide food for the country, as long as Congress has made the commitment and gone on record in support of this program we ought to continue through and support the administration in what they have undertaken?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I cannot agree with the gentleman on that, because I am not supporting the administration in its subsidy inflation prevention program. I have voted against it before and I shall vote against it, as the gentleman from Texas said, if I am the only one, on a roll call, because I do not intend to vote for the subsidy program as a means of preventing inflation. The subsidy program as proposed will not prevent inflation. I signed the conference report to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation to February 17. That is what the conference report deals with. Between now and that date and at the earliest moment possible the Congress and the President should deal with this question in full and give the country the answer.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLCOTT) there were—ayes 134, noes 66.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-eight Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER [after counting]. Thirty-two Members have arisen; not a sufficient number.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 10 minutes following the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONTROLLING THE SALE OF SURPLUS WAR MATERIALS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point and to include therein a copy of a bill being introduced today at the request of the House Small Business Committee, on

controlling the sale of surplus war materials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous approval of the House Small Business Committee, today I am introducing a bill designed to control the sale of surplus war materials by the Government. The Select Committee on Small Business of the House is composed of the following Members: ROBINSON of Utah, KEOGH of New York, JACKSON of Washington, KEFAUVER of Florida, HALLECK of Indiana, LEONARD W. HALL of New York, PLOESER of Missouri, STEVENSON of Wisconsin, and myself, chairman.

This measure deals with one of the foremost problems now confronting the Nation. Surplus materials already are being disposed of by the Government, and it is estimated that the total value of such goods to be sold after peace will be approximately $75,000,000,000. At present, goods are being sold by junior executives located in more than 100 field offices of the different branches of the Government. This is being done without any general policy and chiefly by authority of an Executive order. Doubt exists in many quarters as to the legality of these sales, but there is general agreement that Congress has an immediate duty to legislate an over-all sales program into law.

The House Small Business Committee bill is simple in its provisions and will, your committee believes, deal adequately with the situation without creating any extensive new bureaus or involving any great cost. Primarily, it would make use of existing Government personnel widely experienced in business and finance, aided by advisory committees from retail business groups.

The chief aims of the bill are to obtain the greatest possible return for the taxpayer from the sale of goods, to assist in providing employment for returning members of the armed forces and others, to secure an even flow of goods to those places which need them most, and to help reestablish retail businesses which are now suffering from a lack of goods. The bill seeks to discourage speculation in surplus goods and to prevent the indiscriminate dumping of Government property at junk prices.

Principal provisions of the measure are as follows:

A central committee composed of the chairman of the board of directors of the Defense Supplies Corporation, as chairman, and the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Treasury and three experienced businessmen to be chosen by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall assemble and declare for sale all Government-owned surplus goods.

An immediate inventory shall be made of all surplus goods, which shall be kept up to date through frequent revisions.

Actual sales of material shall be made under the direction of R. F. C., acting in cooperation with advisory committees chosen from the retail groups represented by the surplus goods in question in each instance. R. F. C. will be charged with responsibility for getting fair prices for goods and shall see to it that they are properly distributed so as to meet the needs of consumers. Goods are not to fall into the hands of speculators, but are to be sold so as to help provide employment and to aid retail business in getting back on its feet. In outlining a general program for R. F. C. to follow, however, the measure does not bind the bureau with too many inflexible provisions. It is the thought of this committee that R. F. C., in cooperation with these business advisory committees with plenty of latitude for action and a sincere desire to solve the problem, can do the job effectively.

A primary reason for selecting R. F. C. as the selling agency is that it already is charged with responsibility for disposing of industrial plants in which the Government has investments. Thus, this measure would bring all war materials investments of the Government under one management.

The only new positions sought to be created by this bill are memberships on the central and advisory committees. They would carry only nominal per diem compensations.

In general, this bill meets the outstanding wishes of all groups in and out of government who have been seeking surplus war goods legislation. On the question of need for a central operating agency all are agreed. Secretary of Commerce Jones, Under Secretary Forrestal, Admiral Land, and Under Secretary Patterson, who will be responsible for the sale of a vast quantity of Army goods, have all endorsed such an agency in testifying before two congressional committees. All business groups who have expressed an opinion to this committee are for such an agency. Likewise there is universal agreement that a sales agency experienced in selling and distributing goods should be set up.

This requirement seems to be adequately met by R. F. C. That retail businessmen should be asked to contribute their best advice and counsel is recognized by all. Hence the provision for the advisory committees.

Approximately a dozen governmental groups today are endeavoring to find solutions of the surplus war-goods situation.

Director Byrnes, Bernard M. Baruch, the Bureau of the Budget, the Procurement Division of the Treasury, O. P. A., O. D. T., and certain branches of the Army and the Navy are all concerned about the situation and trying to contribute something to its solution.

A variety of sales plans are being offered. The Navy is selling its surplus directly to bidders. The Army is selling some goods direct and others are being turned over to Treasury Procurement. Officials of Treasury Procurement are having a hard time trying to evolve a satisfactory sales plan. For instance, they are getting trucks and cars for sale from the Army, but they have not yet arrived at a definite selling plan for these items. Some officials want to sell direct to the public. Dealers, who are virtually without trucks, are eager to buy the surplus, but first they are told they will not be permitted to bid on them and, later are told that they will have to compete against individual bidders. At first, O. D. T. planned on setting up a truck rationing plan, then this was abandoned. Today, no one apparently knows exactly just how these trucks and cars will be sold. Similar situations exist in other lines.

The most amazing thing that has come out of direct Army selling is the beautiful catalog mailed broadcast from the Memphis branch of the Air Service. A 32-page catalog, resplendent in a 3-color cover, this piece of advertising literature would compare favorably with the mailing pieces of any large mail-order house. Recipients were advised that a tremendous volume of surplus goods were on hand and more were to come. Many items described were of such a rare nature that dealers have not been able to buy them in months. Yet when dealers ordered them they invariably got back mimeographed letters saying, "Sorry, the goods are gone." These things are disturbing to industry and not the way in which our agencies can build public confidence in their actions.

This surplus-property situation is a job for Congress to clean up. The cold fact is that in delaying further action on it, we are not doing our duty toward the Nation. Half a dozen different congressional committees have been wrestling with various phases of it. We must get together on one measure which will be fair to all. That is the kind of bill your Small Business Committee has tried to prepare and has authorized me to submit to the Congress at this time. Your early consideration of this measure is earnestly requested.

A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act by adding a new title thereto relating to the sale or other disposition of surplus property of the United States

[Referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.]

Be it enacted, etc., That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is amended by inserting Title I, immediately before the first section thereof, by striking out the word "act" wherever it appears therein as a reference to such act (except in the short title of such act), and inserting in lieu thereof the word "title", and by adding at the end of such act, as amended, the following new title:

"TITLE II

"SHORT TITLE

"SECTION 201. This title may be cited as the 'Surplus Property Act of 1943.'

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 202. As used in this title—

"(1) The term 'property' means any supplies, materials, or equipment including real estate and improvements thereon, or tangible property owned by the United States, or by any corporation owned or controlled by the United States, which is under the jurisdiction or control of any governmental agency.

"(2) The term 'surplus property' means any property which has been declared to the central agency handling surplus property to be surplus to the function, activity, or project

in connection with which it was acquired or accrued.

"(3) The term 'government agency' means any executive department of the Government or any administrative units or subdivision thereof, any independent agency in the executive branch of the Government, and any corporation owned or controlled by the United States.

"SURPLUS PROPERTY POLICY BOARD

"SEC. 203. (a) There is hereby established a Surplus Property Board (referred to in this title as 'the Board'), which shall consist of the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Defense Supplies Corporation who shall be the Chairman thereof, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Treasury, and three individuals to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The three individuals so appointed shall be businessmen who have had at least 5 years' experience in the business of the retail sale and distribution of merchandise.

"(b) The Board (1) shall determine and prescribe the methods to be used by governmental agencies in making and maintaining inventories of property, and (2) shall determine the surplus property under the jurisdiction of the various governmental agencies that should be sold or leased, and shall inform the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as to every such determination.

"DUTIES OF GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

"SEC. 204. Every governmental agency (1) shall make and maintain accurate uniform inventories, in accordance with methods determined and prescribed by the Board, of property under its jurisdiction, (2) shall cooperate with the Board for purposes of determining which of the property under its jurisdiction is surplus property, and (3) shall cooperate with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in connection with the sale or lease of surplus property pursuant to the provisions of this title.

"DUTIES OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

"SEC. 205. (a) Surplus property which the Board has determined should be sold or leased shall be sold or leased by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in a manner consistent with the provisions of this section.

"(b) The Corporation shall appoint an advisory committee for each class of property which is to be sold or leased. The members of such advisory committee shall be appointed from among persons who, by reason of their business experience, are familiar with the handling and marketing of such class of property, or similar property. It shall be the duty of the Corporation, in selling or leasing surplus property, to consult with the appropriate advisory committee or committees so appointed as to the price, time, method, and manner of disposing of such property.

"(c) In the sale or lease of surplus property pursuant to this title, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall, so far as practicable, be governed by the following considerations:

"(1) Distribution of such property should be through established trade channels.

"(2) The acquisition of large quantities of such property for speculative purposes should not be permitted.

"(3) The prices at which any particular property or class of property is sold or leased should be uniform.

"(4) Such property should be sold or leased at prices low enough to facilitate the disposition thereof, but high enough to enable the United States to secure a fair return therefor.

"(5) The sale or lease of such property should be at a rate which will not unduly disrupt trade and commerce.

"(6) The sale or lease of such property should take into consideration the need for facilitating and encouraging the establishment in the various communties in the several States by members of the armed forces of the United States upon their discharge or release from active duty, as well as by others, of small business enterprises and with a view to strengthening small business enterprises.

"(d) The sale or lease of surplus property shall be in accordance with such regulations as the Board shall prescribe regarding the times, places, quantities, and terms and conditions of the proposed disposition of such property; and such regulations shall require advertising for competitive bids except in such cases and with respect tc such property as the Board determines that sales or leases by competitive bids would be contrary to the public interest.

"EXCLUSIVE METHOD OF DISPOSING OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

"SEC. 206. No surplus property shall be sold, leased, or disposed of otherwise than in accordance with the provisions of this title, except that where provisions of law are in force specifically authorizing the sale or other disposition of any particular property or class of property, such property or class of property may be sold or otherwise disposed of in accordance with such provisions of law if the Board approves such action as being consistent with the public interest.

"TRANSFERS BETWEEN GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

"SEC. 207. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, governmental agencies shall make the fullest practicable utilization of surplus property in order to avoid waste and unnecessary expense, and for such purposes surplus property may be transferred from one governmental agency to another, in lieu of its sale or lease pursuant to the provisions of this title. Such transfers shall be made subject to such regulations as the Board shall prescribe.

"DISPOSITION OF NONSALABLE PROPERTY

"SEC. 208. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, surplus property which is not salable, or which for any other reason it is impracticable to transfer, sell, or lease as provided in this title, shall be repaired, rehabilitated, donated, destroyed, or disposed of in accordance with such regulations as the Board shall prescribe.

"PROCEEDS FROM SALE OR LEASE OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

"SEC. 209. All proceeds from the sale or lease of surplus property under this title shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"MISCELLANEOUS

"SEC. 210. (a) The Board is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation, subject to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, of such employees as may be necessary for the performance by the Board of its functions under this title.

"(b) Each member of the Board appointed thereto by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and each member of any advisory committee appointed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under this title, shall be paid compensation at the rate of $_____ per diem when actually engaged in the performance of his duties under this title, and shall be allowed necessary traveling expenses and subsistence expenses (not in excess of $_____ per day) incurred when absent from his place of residence in connection with the performance of such duties."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking Republican member of the House Small Business Committee, I desire to add my approval to the bill to regulate the sale of surplus war materials which Chairman PATMAN has introduced today.

This measure is the mature product of careful investigation and consideration. It is not a half-baked, suddenly inspired, half-coverage product. Your Small Business Committee has gone to the very roots of this problem, and it has, I feel convinced, prepared a measure which will be helpful to all taxpayers, the buying public, returning members of the armed forces, and particularly small businessmen and their employees.

The feature which pleases me most with this measure is its simplicity and clarity. It is a short bill of only a few hundred words. Any businessman can understand it; it does not require one versed in law and legislation to know what it is about.

Primarily it would set up a central agency to collect the goods. The R. F. C., an established Government agency, would be given the task of selling and distributing the goods. Advisory groups of businessmen would aid in the dissemination of the goods. Thus the Government and taxpayers will be assured of getting fair prices for goods on which billions of dollars have been spent, the public will be assured of an opportunity to buy these goods at fair prices and small retailers will be able to fill their now vacant shelves and meet their running costs while they are waiting for factories to get into production.

One thing which appeals to me about this bill is that under its provisions Congress does not try to set up a lot of complicated rules under which the agencies shall operate. It simply lays down general principles and then trusts to the judgment of those administering the measure to do a fair and decent job.

Speculators in war surplus goods and others who want to take advantage of taxpayers by getting materials at less than their fair values are not going to like this bill. Such persons had a field day in the sale of surplus goods following the last war. They bought at a few cents on the dollar and sold at top prices. This must not happen again, and I do not believe it will happen if this measure is enacted into law.

There is need for speedy action on this bill. Surplus war goods already are being dumped in a shameless manner. The sales scandals which have come to light so far have not been pleasant reading, and my first-hand knowledge of the situation tells me that if Congress does not legislate soon, worse scandals are coming. The only other alternatives to legislation are a continuation of the divided, haphazard methods of selling by various Government departments which now are being followed, or selling under the highly unsatisfactory Executive order plan. This country wants no part

of either. The duty of Congress is clear. That is to pass this bill soon. I hope it is done by the united efforts of Members of all parties just as this bill has been jointly approved in the Small Business Committee.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes at the conclusion of other special orders today.

The SPEAKER. Is there obpjection.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a national broadcast made by myself on the reasons for a simplified monetary system.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the conference report on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2562. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey to The State Hospital at Goldsboro, Goldsboro, N. C., a certain tract of land, situated in Wayne County, N. C.; and

H. J. Res. 209. Joint resolution extending until January 31, 1944, the provisions of the act of April 29, 1943, making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3598. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3611. An act to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States, to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

ABSENTEE SOLDIERS' VOTE

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, apparently everyone agrees that the soldiers should vote. But for the past several weeks the air has been filled with charges and countercharges of insincerity, unconstitutionality, vote steals, threatened secession, and a thousand and one other things which have done no one any good whatever. The only groups hurt by these heated arguments have been the members of the armed forces and the great rank and file of this Nation's people.

Never have I heard as many misleading statements and as much false propaganda directed at any legislation as has been done in the case of the Green-Lucas bill in the Senate and my bill in the House.

I have never believed that the Green-Lucas bill or my proposal was perfect. Indeed, it is seldom Congress passes a bill which is perfect. I have continually asked for suggestions which would better my bill and have received sound and constructive points from both Republicans and Democrats, members of the armed forces, and private citizens. I gratefully acknowledge these suggestions and have attempted to incorporate them in a bill which I have introduced today.

So that the people of the Nation might have a better idea as to the necessity for any new legislation at all, let me give a brief résumé of the present circumstances. All but 2 of the 48 States provide an absentee voting method. Unfortunately, however, the great majority of these voting procedures were modeled for peacetime and not for wartime.

All the members of the armed forces are primarily civilians. They laid down the plow and pen. They left their desks, homes, farms, factories, and businesses to answer the call to arms. They are civilians primarily and are accustomed to exercising the greatest democratic privilege of the greatest democratic country—the privilege to vote.

Now, it is impossible for any State in the Union to keep track of its citizen soldiers because they have lost their identity as citizens of a given State and have become units in a fighting machine which functions as a nation.

Let me say with pride that many of the States have made diligent efforts to provide a vote for their men. Even in those States which have tried hard to overcome the problems which war has brought about, their efforts have been unsuccessful. It is not their fault. They simply do not possess the necessary machinery nor can they revise their laws to overcome the tremendous physical difficulties of absentee voting. Let me illustrate this. Many States require that an application for absentee ballot be made on an official application blank. The soldier writes to his secretary of state. The secretary of state returns the official application for a ballot. The soldier fills out the application which is returned to the secretary of state. The secretary of state then sends him the ballot. The soldier marks the ballot and returns it to the secretary of state. Here are five separate and distinct transactions and each step consumes many days.

The average time in which an absentee vote can be cast is limited to 30 days. Obviously, even with air-mail facilities, these five steps cannot be completed within that time even by many of the men stationed within the continental limits of the United States. And to say that those 5,000,000 stationed abroad could secure a ballot in this fashion would be stating the impossible. Further, during the process of any one of these steps the man himself might be removed from his original point of application.

Some States, however, do not require an official application blank and in such States only three steps will be involved. The soldier requests an absentee ballot; in numerous States the secretary cannot, however, send out an absentee ballot until a certain number of days before the election. Then the soldier returns the ballot and hopes it reaches the proper election official in time to be counted. Even the three steps mentioned have proved largely ineffective because of the red tape involved. Further, it has been reliably estimated that even with air-mail facilities, from 2 to 4 months would be required for a soldier in Australia and other points in the southwest Pacific to vote under the average State absentee voting law. The same is true of those forces stationed in north Africa, Italy, Great Britain, and other points scattered over the globe. The best proof of the ineffectiveness of the present system is that in the general election held last year only 28,000 out of a possible 7,000,000 votes were cast and counted. This means only 1 soldier out of every 250 voted.

At the time of the general election in 1944, which will probably mark the most important Presidential election in our history, we will have about 11,000,000 men and women in the armed forces of this Nation. This means about one-fourth of the total electorate of this Nation will not be in a position, under present laws, to be heard in the selection of officials who will shape the policies and destinies of the Nation for the next 4 years. Under the present inadequate machinery their voices are effectively stifled. If they do not vote, then the election will be an empty one. It will not be a representative vote of the people and by the people and for the people.

Let us first see what Congress has done. Last year the Congress enacted Public Law 712. This law provides that a member of the armed forces, if otherwise eligible according to the law of his State, may vote for Federal officials without registering or paying a poll tax in that State. These are the two points which have given rise to constitutional questions. I would be the last man in the House to question the sincerity of anyone who raised the constitutionality of these two points. Many eminent

lawyers, jurists, and statesmen find themselves in disagreement on these two questions, and I do not feel personally competent to shed any additional light at this time on either point.

Apparently Congress resolved this constitutional doubt in favor of the man bearing the truly terrific hardships of war. Presumably every Member of Congress was faithful to his oath of office, because those who believed in its constitutionality supported Public Law 712. Those who doubted its constitutionality voted against it. This law which was adopted by top-heavy majorities in both the House and Senate has been the law of the land for well over a year, but no one has questioned its constitutionality in the courts. Since there have been 28,000 instances which presumably could have been taken into the courts, I must conclude that the people of this Nation are willing to subscribe to the wisdom of this action.

Throughout the months and months of study, hearings, and debate I have tried hard to arrive at a formula which would provide an effective means for 11,000,000 members of our armed forces to exercise the right of suffrage. I have not had in mind a bill which would elect Democrats or Republicans or candidates of any particular party. I have not had in mind any desire or intention to permit the Federal Government to control or attempt to control State elections. Congress has certain powers—the States have certain powers. My purpose has been to find a way within legal and constitutional grounds to overcome the mechanical difficulties which beset us and to eliminate the void which has effectively prevented soldier voting.

There must be a way. There is a way. I believe that the proposal which I have introduced today will be acceptable to those who are sincere in their desire to help the soldiers vote.

Let me give a brief résumé of the provisions of my bill. In the first place, it creates an agency known as the War Ballot Commission. The President appoints, subject to Senate confirmation, the membership thereof from a list of six names submitted to him by the chairman of the Republican Party and by the chairman of the Democratic Party, respectively.

The purpose of the Commission is to secure information from the several States as to the identitiy of its nominees for Federal office, to relay that information to the Army and Navy, and to print the Federal ballot. It keeps a record of the ballots printed and returned, the number forwarded to the various States and is required to report on these matters to Congress. And I might say the only purpose of the Commission is to relieve the War and Navy Departments of heavy administrative duties.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WORLEY. The Commission has no powers to investigate alleged irregularities. It has no power to act except in a purely administrative capacity. If it has other powers, then it is because I have been unable to find the necessary language to restrict it and I welcome any suggestions.

As an additional safeguard I provide that a majority of all the Commission shall be necessary to a decision by the Commission on any matter.

The bill provides that only members of the armed forces of the United States shall be eligible to vote thereunder. Much sound argument has been made for including members of the Red Cross, members of the merchant marine and others who are not literally or actually members of the armed forces but many of whom are exposed to the same deadly dangers of war as the soldiers themselves. It might even be argued that those migratory laborers that moved from one State to the war plants of another should be included. Does Congress possess such power? Suffice it to say that at the present time my proposal includes only those who are members of the armed forces.

An official Federal war ballot is provided. This ballot contains spaces whereby the soldier can vote either for the name of his choice for President, Vice President, United States Senator, and United States Representatives in Congress, or he may vote for the party of that candidate. Democrat, Republican, Progressive, Farmer-Labor, and other parties are mentioned on the ballot.

The voter is provided with this uniform ballot. He takes the oath of an elector which shows that he is a citizen of the United States, that he is of certain age, his home State, county, city, town, or village, street number and/or rural route, and how long he had lived there before induction. He votes this ballot in a secret place, seals his envelope, which is placed within an outer envelope for transmission directly to the War Ballot Commission. Immediately upon receipt by the Commission the ballot is forwarded to the State of the voter's residence. Once it reaches the voter's State it is transmitted to the local election official of the precinct in which the voter resides. Please bear in mind that no official is permitted to open or in any way tamper with any ballot until it reaches the local precinct election official. It will not be necessary under this procedure for the secrecy of the ballot to be violated by censorship. As all of us know, State ballots today are subject to censorship for obvious reasons.

Priorities, including free air mail, on the transmission of Federal war ballots and other communications under title I are provided insofar as they will not conflict with the effective prosecution of the war.

Now we come to the point of who is to determine the validity of the ballots actually cast. As pointed out, the present statute, Public Law 712, eliminates the necessity of registration or poll-tax payment by members of the armed forces for the privilege of voting for Federal officials. With these questions my bill does not deal. It provides, however, by the clearest and most specific language in my power that with the exception of these two points the duly constituted election officials of the States themselves shall have the power to determine the validity of all ballots cast. It is further provided that such ballots shall be canvassed, counted, and certified by its proper canvassing boards in accordance with the laws of such State in the same manner as ballots cast within its borders are canvassed, counted, and certified. An additional safeguard is the following language:

> The War Ballot Commission shall have no powers or functions with respect to the determination of the validity of ballots cast under the provisions of this title.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WORLEY. All of this means, of course, that, with the exceptions pointed out, if a State wishes to recognize the ballot prescribed herein, it may do so. If it does not wish to recognize the ballots cast by its soldier citizens it will not do so. It would seem therefore that anyone who argues the question of States' rights has an empty and meaningless argument.

All voting safeguards are provided for. My bill says that the provisions of State and Federal laws prohibiting offenses against the elective franchises shall apply.

These are the major points of title I of my proposal. Title II facilitates voting under State law for State as well as Federal officials. If the soldier is willing to take a chance in attempting to comply with the complex provisions of his State law then he may follow that procedure. In an effort to assist those who desire a State ballot we have provided for air mail free of postage. Personally, I hope that as many of the soldiers as possible will take advantage of the State procedures.

Now so far as the question of propaganda, political speeches, dissemination of biased or prejudiced information, let me say I have also provided for that. I have adopted virtually intact the amendment offered by Senator TAFT in the Senate. The effect of this amendment is to provide equal time and facilities for any candidate for Federal office. It is a rather involved and complex problem but I believe we have found an effective solution. This will give all sides an equal opportunity to reach the soldiers both here and abroad.

As I stated in the beginning, my purpose is not to elect Democrats or Republicans. My purpose is simply to go as far as we can go in trying to restore to the soldier one of the most precious rights he had in peacetime. When we put him in uniform we took away many rights and privileges of both the Federal and State constitutions. When we make it possible for him to vote we still have not restored many of the privileges taken from him, but we have at least done our best to say to him, "While you fight for this democracy you will also have an opportunity to vote for this democracy."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. WORLEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I desire to commend the gentleman from Texas, who has the distinction of serving several months as a naval officer in the present war, not only for his introduction of this measure which if enacted into law will make certain that all qualified men and women in the armed forces of the United States will have an opportunity to vote, but also for this informative adddess he has delivered here today. May I add that I would go still further. I am strongly of the opinion that every man and woman in the uniform of the United States should be, irrespective of age, given the opportunity to vote. Surely anyone who is willing to lay down his life if need be for freedom's cause should be given the right to vote. I hold that anyone who is old enough to fight for his country is sufficiently matured to cast a vote for any candidate from President to constable.

Mr. WORLEY. I appreciate very much the comments the gentleman has made.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. I yield.

Mr. ROLPH. I also want to compliment the gentleman on his very able address.

Mr. WORLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROLPH. I should like to have him explain to the House how his plan would operate as far as primary elections are concerned.

Mr. WORLEY. No one is more interested in primary elections than the people of Texas and the Southern States. They are very important elections, but we have been advised by officials of the Army and Navy that it would be physically impossible to transport ballots all over the world for the boys to vote in the primaries in all the States. It is not a matter of desire, it is a question of how far we can go to provide some form of ballot.

Under title II they can vote the State ballot for candidates in the primaries; however title I applies only to the general election of Federal officials.

Mr. ROLPH. Under title II they may vote in the primaries?

Mr. WORLEY. Under title II, yes; and we provide free air-mail service for those who would like to vote in the primaries in their States.

Mr. ROLPH. I wish to emphasize that so far as California is concerned—and I presume it is likewise in the other States—the primaries are very important.

Mr. WORLEY. They are in Texas.

Mr. ROLPH. I hope provision will be made if possible for the men in the service to vote in the primaries.

Mr. WORLEY. Provision is made in title II.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman from Texas be allowed to proceed for 10 additional minutes. This is an important subject; a number of Members want to ask questions and this is probably the closing day of the session. I think he should have 10 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that the resolution for adjournment is coming back in 20 minutes. This would not leave any time for the opposition to be heard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may proceed for 10 additional minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to proceed with my special order. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two particulars, in one to include excerpts from an address by Mr. Blandford, and in the other to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of Chairman SHEPPARD, who is ill, and on behalf of the Naval Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, I wish to make a statement to the House respecting currently available naval appropriations. I shall endeavor to be brief.

The naval budget for the current fiscal year was not presented by the President until April 3, 1943. It was presented late because in war it is not possible to project a long-range fiscal program, and the estimates were held back in order that they would represent the last-minute judgment of those conducting our Naval Establishment.

The course of war continually brings about new situations, changed conditions, and these affect in varying ways and degrees the funds the Congress provides. They might result in larger demands in some directions and lesser demands in others. The net might be either "red" or "black." In the case of the Army, as has been reported, it appears that there will be a very substantial amount in the "black."

Premised upon such considerations, following the close of the first quarter of the current fiscal year, namely, September 30, 1943, I communicated to the Secretary of the Navy that my Naval Subcommittee desired a restudy made of currently available funds as a prelude to a hearing to determine the Navy's latest financial status.

That restudy has been made and the committee followed it with an examination of the Secretary of the Navy, Vice Admiral Horne, who is Vice Chief of Naval Operations, the Budget Office of the Navy Department, Admiral Allen, and the heads of the several bureaus and offices of the Navy Department, including the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard, the examination extending over several days.

Its investigation has netted some substantial savings. On the other hand, it has disclosed that in all probability it will be necessary before the close of the fiscal year to provide some additional funds. The net result at this time indicates a deficiency in the neighborhood of $700,000,000.

The Navy commenced the current fiscal year with a total obligational availability of $31,109,623,798. Two billion dollars of that sum consisted of contractual authority—aviation—and $1,472,397,600 was made up of unobligated prior-year appropriations—mainly for new ship construction.

Of the total of $31,000,000,000 plus, estimated savings, according to the committee's investigation, aggregate $1,229,308,699, and presently estimated deficiencies aggregate $1,930,492,112, or a net deficiency, as I previously have indicated, of about $700,000,000.

By far the larger portion of the savings has been previously reported. They occur under the head of "Ordnance and ordnance stores," and aggregate $1,171,378,404. The amount flows from many projects under such appropriation and is traceable primarily to reduced costs due to quantity production, and to consumption running less than the actual requirements of current operations.

It will be recalled that $750,000,000 of this ordnance saving is used in the pending deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 3598) to increase the capital of the "Naval stock fund," instead of providing an additional appropriation for such purpose. That, of course, is an actual direct saving of three-quarters of a billion dollars.

The remainder of the ordnance saving—$421,378,404, has been placed in reserve by the Bureau of the Budget, and let me say that it is just about as difficult to get funds so reserved released as it is to get an appropriation through the Congress.

Apart from ordnance, all but a relatively negligible amount of currently available funds, which it now appears will not be needed for the purposes for which provided, is Coast Guard money. Admiral Waesche reported to us that present indications are that his activity will be able to get along with $29,267,802—net—less than he first anticipated. There are two principal reasons: First, the Coast Guard has been able to enroll temporary reserves without compensation; and second, it has been able to augment its submarine-patrol service by utilizing privately owned craft without purchase.

On the other side of the ledger, Mr. Speaker, we found that before the fiscal year closer we probably shall be confronted with supplemental requests totaling somewhere around $1,930,000,000. Primarily, that is because the operating force plan of ships and personnel upon which the appropriations previously made were based has been quite considerably expanded. The building program has been accelerated to fit into revised

operating plans, and that means a larger outlay upon vessel construction, for more ships completed, for more men, and for more operating expenses. It is expected that there will be an increase of 608 operating units, and an increase of 173,500 enlisted personnel, Navy, and 80,860 enlisted personnel, Marine Corps. There will be some relatively small additional amounts necessary, besides, all because of the fact that the Navy has not yet levelled off, and I wish to stress that fact, Mr. Speaker.

The Navy's job in the Atlantic and in the European and Mediterranean areas continues to be a large one, and the future, particularly the immediate future, will make heavier demands upon it in such areas than at any previous time since the beginning of the war.

In the Pacific, I need not tell you that the war has only begun. No navy in all history has even been confronted with a larger task. The offensive has begun and will be prosecuted vigorously, and I am sure not a Member of the Congress will hesitate a moment to give the Navy full support in every way sought by our naval leadership.

The net result of our inquiry, Mr. Speaker, is a saving of roundly $1,230,000,000. That money will not be needed for the purposes for which appropriated. Seven hundred and fifty million dollars of that amount already has been reappropriated by the Congress to another use, and the remainder, so far as we now can tell, will revert to the Treasury.

I am glad to report to the House that the Department, in our judgment, is endeavoring to function as economically as war conditions permit, and is cooperating with the committee in holding costs to minimum levels.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. HOLIFIELD and Mr. PLUMLEY asked and were given permission to revise and extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

(Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to speak for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. KING]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

SPECIAL ORDERS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was just told that the other body has passed a resolution to adjourn from next Tuesday until the 10th of January. I suppose that is good news to some, but in my judgment we should stay in session until we have passed the legislation giving mustering-out pay, the legislation necessary to enable the servicemen to vote, and any legislation that may be required to prevent or end any strikes which may occur.

Once upon a time, long, long ago, there was a great Democratic Party with principles. Then the New Deal came along and something happened to that party. New dealers took over. Since they have taken over it has become—may I say—the custom to shove the Constitution a little further back in order to pass legislation which the New Deal seemed to want. Over in the other body a few days ago—I did not hear this, I read it in the RECORD—one of the Members, and he was a Republican, said in effect that the Constitution did not amount to so much in time of war, we might just disregard it. He was speaking on this bill to permit soldiers to vote. My own judgment is—I do not know much about it, it is just a guess—that these men who are doing the fighting, and the women, too, are more interested in their job of getting the war over than they are in voting. At least that has been the indication when in other wars they have had the chance to vote, except possibly the Civil War in the last election which occurred while that war was on.

None of us wants to deprive anyone who is in the armed services of the right to vote. As I get the proposition it is just a difference of opinion as to how that should be accomplished. That is all there is to it. There is one school of thought advanced by those who want to take a short cut, right straight across the Constitution, or, rather, disregard it entirely. While it is true, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] said on the floor of the House last night, the Congress has the power and the authority to determine when, where, and the time of election. The determination of the qualifications of the electors is left entirely to the States. That is the constitutional provision. If we want to adopt the proposition and adhere to it, that we are going to shove the Constitution aside, throw it into the ashcan, while the war is on, then all right, if that is the will of the Congress. But that I do not believe we have any right to do. But if we do that we ought to go into the thing with our eyes open.

I recall sometime ago on the floor here the gentleman from California [Mr. ROGERS], asked me to yield and I did. I put to him the question, after some discussion, whether or not he thought we could carry on a war under the terms of the Constitution, and he said, "No; we could not." That was the substance of his answer. I do not subscribe to that doctrine at all. It is my firm conviction that the people of America adhering to the principles of the Constitution will voluntarily do more than any Federal Government or State government can force them to do. It may be unfortunate, but there is in every one of us a disposition not to be pushed around, so we who believe that the soldiers should be given the opportunity to vote want the soldiers to vote and we want them to vote their convictions. We do not want them to have their judgment, their opinion, influenced by any Federal commission.

It is a matter of record from committee reports submitted at the other end of the Capitol that money which we appropriated back in 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, along in there, money which was appropriated by this Congress for the relief of the unfortunate, was used to influence elections. That report was not made by Republicans. That report was made by members of the majority party, so we can accept it at its face value. It was charged on the floor of the other body that under the terms of the Lucas-Green bill the election could be stolen. If there is in power, as there is, a party that has used money appropriated for, let us say, charitable purposes, appropriated to aid the unfortunate, the hungry, the ill-clad, and ill-housed, with that kind of a party in power, that desires to give the soldiers, the service men and women, an opportunity to vote, I say who wants to entrust the election machinery to an organization of that kind?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. For a question.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The majority of the States of the Union are governed by Republican Governors. Under the bill just introduced by the gentleman from Texas, the counting of ballots will be in the hands of those Republican administrations in those States.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Those that get back will be counted, but they will be marked under the supervision of a Federal agency. They will be cast and counted under State laws, not under any Governor. You have your elections up in Pennsylvania, and your politicians up there have charged each other with fraud and corruption. We do not have any of that in Michigan.

The supporters of the Green-Lucas bill do not want to leave this to the States where the Constitution places it. Oh, no. They want to put it in the hands of some of these bureaucrats, let them take the ballots over, let them submit the ballots under conditions which they create, let them be marked under situations which they make, or as the issues are painted by Federal officials, then have the ballots brought back by this Federal commission—bring them back 3,000 miles. What is going to happen to them on the way back? Who knows? The ballots all the time in charge of a Federal commission appointed by and acting under the Commander in Chief who is himself a candidate—none of that for me. Listen to some of the Kentucky election frauds. Get the gentleman from Kentucky, or from Tennessee rather, to tell you some day about how the Democratic Party carries on an election down there and what they do with the ballots before and after the election boards get them. A party that will take money, mind you, appropriated to buy food and clothing,

a party that will do that, take it away from the unfortunate, I would not trust across a duck pond, to say nothing of letting them have this election 3,000 or 6,000 miles away. No. We want the service people, the men and women, the WAVES, the WAC's, the Marines, and all the rest of them to have a vote, but we do not propose to have somebody else vote them.

Mr. BURDICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. The gentleman said he thought we should carry on a war and at the same time operate under the provisions of the Federal Constitution.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right.

Mr. BURDICK. Does the gentleman maintain that in World War No. 1 we followed the Constitution?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know what we did in World War No. 1, but I never knew the Congress disregarded the Constitution during that war.

Mr. BURDICK. What about free speech in any war; is that not curtailed?

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is always curtailed to a certain extent; that is, as to military information but not otherwise.

Mr. BURDICK. When we have war there are many provisions of the Federal Constitution that must necessarily be curtailed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not agree with the gentleman. I just disagree with that statement. The observance of constitutional provisions in no way interferes with the war effort.

It is a strange situation that free people cannot carry on the war under the fundamental law they have adopted and to which they adhere. Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]—last night, I think it was, I noticed it in the RECORD—said I was a "Rankin Republican." I do not know whether he meant the rest of the Republicans were rank Republicans and I was just a Rankin Republican or just what he did mean. I will say this, at least, if I am a Rankin Republican, at least there are two of us which is one more than the party, which the gentleman represents, has in Washington. I will say another thing, we have been talking a long time, some of us have, some people in this country, about a coalition. Now the parties are beginning to line up. It is no longer, as has been said here so often, Republican against Democrats or Democrats against Republicans.

There has been a sort of New Deal, a New Deal Party which has taken over the Democratic Party, and perhaps there has been some disagreement on our side along certain lines. And so the situation has come to where today there are those who believe in adhering to the Constitution and then there are those who think that you can just scrap it or perhaps cut the corners here and there. Now if the time comes when I must make my choice, and I think it has, as between Democrats from the South, West, or the North, who believe in the old Constitution and in the customs and practices of America as we have known them for the last one-hundred-and sixty-odd years, if that day comes when I must make a choice to go along with those men or to join with that group of new dealers or bureaucrats and wild, woolly, and fuzzy-headed individuals or whatever you want to call them, professors, then I will not hesitate 1 minute, not 1 minute, I will go with the Democrats who believe in the Constitution, if I am forced to make a choice. And if I am forced to choose, as the gentleman seems to think I am, between the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], much as I hate to make the choice, great as my grief may be, weeping as I make that choice, I will go with the man from Tupelo, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I want to say that the gentleman is welcome to the company he has chosen.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And I will say to that gentleman that under the Constitution it is my privilege to make my choice.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Certainly, and you are welcome to your chosen leader.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am, and I am glad I do not need to hold my nose after making it.

Mr. McMURRAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. McMURRAY. Does not the gentleman take into consideration it is also the privilege of these fighting men and women to vote? Does not the gentleman think our Constitution intended that people who fight and are willing to die for their country likewise should have the privilege to vote, and not any so-called phony privilege, not a sham privilege to vote, but a genuine privilege?

Mr. HOFFMAN. What are you doing; making a speech? Why do you not get a special order?

Mr. McMURRAY. I am asking the gentleman a question and I will ask him to answer yes or no.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, yes or no? Well, when did you stop sucking eggs? Tell me that, yes or no. I have made it plain that I want the men and women in the service to have the privilege of voting; that I do not want someone to vote them. I do not want to argue with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY] because I recall when he stood down here in the Well of the House, on some tax bill I think he was talking, and how he told us how many years he had been a professor teaching taxation or economics or something over there in Wisconsin. I recall very distinctly at that time he told us of his qualifications to pass on every conceivable subject that might come before the House. Certainly after that testimonial which he gave to his own knowledge I am not so presumptuous as to enter into any debate with him on any question that he puts. I would not think of it. The gentleman is possessed of such great knowledge and ability and is so aware of it that I would not think of venturing an opinion when he has spoken.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think I can ask the gentleman a question that he can answer "yes" or "no."

Will the gentleman inform the House whether he favors the Rankin bill? That is easy to answer "yes" or "no," I submit, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, it is? If I must answer "yes" or "no," I will say, "Yes." I say yes. Is that plain enough?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am delighted to know the gentleman is in favor of it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You might have known the answer without having to ask me. I have never been for any fraudulent scheme that would deprive anybody of the right to vote. Nor have I knowingly supported a measure which opened the door to fraud.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am glad to know that the gentleman from Michigan is following the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not following anyone. There are no rings in the noses of Republicans. I heard some of the debate in the Senate. I heard the Members of that body who adhere to the Democratic Party, some of them, tell what that bill was and the sort of steal it would permit and how it would enable a small group to control the elections. I cannot be for that. Up in our country we let them vote and we count the votes as they are cast.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY], chairman of the committee concerning a soldiers' voting bill that he proposes to introduce, and that we other members of the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress have never seen.

What he should do would be to call the committee together and let us report out the bill that passed the Senate, with some minor amendments, and pass it through the House now, in order that every man in the armed forces may be able to vote in the coming election and have those votes counted.

Remember that this bill that passed the Senate meets the test of constitutionality. When you go to overriding the Constitution of the United States under the pretense that this is a war measure, when it is more or less a political measure, if not a political measure pure and simple, you are dangerously tampering with the Constitution, the greatest safeguard the American people ever had.

It took 2,000 years for mankind to build up to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. This Senate bill with our amendments would enable every serviceman to vote by absentee ballot, not only to vote for the Members of the Congress and the Senate, and President and Vice President, but it will go beyond that and enable him to vote for State, county, and other local officials. They are more interested in that than they are in voting

for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] or the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] or the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. It was stated a while ago by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] that it would take five transactions, if this bill passed, to get these ballots to the men and back. Nothing of the kind. Every Governor of every State in this Union is ready to cooperate, and some of them have already announced the calling of extra sessions of their legislatures for that purpose.

So if their laws do not meet the requirements, they can change them so they will meet them. What does our bill do? In the first place we ask the States to take the necessary steps to enable their men in the service to vote by absentee ballots. The next thing—and this is not any gesture, either—the next thing we do is to provide that the Army and Navy shall do everything possible to expedite getting these ballots to them and back.

But the gentleman from Texas a while ago, echoing the statement of Colonel Cutler, Boston lawyer, who seems to have assumed the attitude of a propagandist more than an adviser before the committee, said it would take from 2 to 4 months to get these ballots there and back. Why, Wendell Willkie went around the world in 49 days, and kissed the barmaids and fan dancers as he went.

Mr. WORLEY. And Mr. Willkie was looking for votes.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, sir; and is yet. If the Army and Navy does what we command them to do in this bill they will expedite getting these ballots to the servicemen. They will go directly from your home State through the mails to those boys in various parts of the world, and they will not need a Federal commission to meddle with them in the meantime.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. WORLEY. I do not like to take any of the gentleman's time, except to ask if I may ask him to yield for several questions as he goes along.

Mr. RANKIN. I will yield if I can get some extra time.

Another thing it does, it gives them free air-mail service, not only for the ballots, but for communications in connection therewith. It does not change the qualifications of the electors in your States. The bill that has been pending before our committee does. In doing so, it violates section 2 of article I of the Constitution of the United States, which provides that electors for Representatives in Congress shall have the same qualification as electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislature. You would wipe out that provision which had been in the Constitution 126 years when it was reenacted in the seventeenth amendment. Yet you would wipe that out. You would wipe them both out, if you please. You would wipe out that provision that leaves to the States the manner of electing their electors for the President of the United States. When you do that, this election will be null and void and you will have a contest in the courts of practically every State of the Union.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I am afraid I cannot present what I wish to present in a question, but you have raised one vital issue as to the qualifications of electors.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, that is right.

Mr. REED of New York. I wish you would enlarge as to just why that was left to the States.

Mr. RANKIN. Why, simply because if they had left the selection of electors to the Federal Government, the States might have disappeared, as some of the modern radicals would like to have them do now.

Mr. REED of New York. Would the gentleman mind my telling just why?

James Wilson, who sat on the Constitutional Convention, stated the reason. They wanted to assure the States that the Federal Government would not become so centralized in its power that it would impinge on the rights of the States and so, to bring about confidence in the States, they said, we are willing to take the same qualifications that you fix for the most numerous branch of your State legislatures.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

In other words, they said they wanted the States to do the electing and not concentrate all this power in the hands of the Federal Government. Let me tell you two things that have killed republics in the past. The first is centralization of power, and the other is the concentration of wealth. This is one of the most dangerous steps toward centralization of power in the Federal Government that I have ever seen proposed. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], and others, have talked about the men who take my position not wanting the soldiers to vote.

When did they become the only friends of the soldiers? Do you know that two of the United States Senators—Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, and Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas—who supported this bill wholeheartedly when it passed the Senate have already lost sons in this conflict? One of the other Senators who supported this bill has three sons in the war. Everyone in this House and everyone in the Senate has some loved one in this conflict. Do not forget that the people at home, the people back in your State, think more of their loved ones than anybody else on earth does, and they will see that these ballots are sent to them.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I contend, if the gentleman from Mississippi will permit, the machinery set up by your recommendation in the States is so cumbersome it will result in preventing many of the service people from voting.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes, I know some people think that State government is cumbersome. You have an element in this country that wants to get rid of State government. I am not so sure but what the gentleman from Pennsylvania is gradually gravitating in that direction, or, I might say, rapidly gravitating in that direction.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Less than 1 percent of the men in the armed services voted.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not yield any further, Mr. Speaker.

I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] jumped on the white people of the South, and he went on to say how so few men voted by absentee ballots in that State last year. The facts are that we had nothing but a congressional election last year, and there was not a single candidate for Congress who had opposition. The only candidate we had for the Senate had no opposition. Therefore, they did not attempt to vote in the general election. In addition, every intelligent lawyer knew that that bill which we passed last year was unconstitutional, and they did not want to become involved in something that would vitiate the election.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I simply wanted to correct the gentleman. I did not jump on the people of the South. I was simply attempting to jump on the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from New York can read his own words. God forbid that the people of the South should ever need the leadership of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SADOWSKI. On the question of voting for electors, the gentleman made the statement that under the Lucas bill, by not permitting the soldiers to vote for electors, it nullified the Constitution. I want to call to the gentleman's attention to the fact that in my State of Michigan, we have already amended our election laws so that only candidates for President and Vice President appear, and the names of electors do not appear on the ballots. So we are not voting for electors.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further. The gentleman can deliver that lecture in Detroit. They may need it in Detroit and he may need to lecture there next year. Other States have made no such changes and Congress has no power to compel them to do so.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi, has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand there is some legislation on the Speaker's desk?

The SPEAKER. Not yet.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not like to object to the gentleman's proceeding further, but I hope he will finish within the 5 minutes, because there are

many people who want to vote on this legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. I will finish in 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. What we are trying to do is to make it possible for these men in our armed forces to vote in the local elections, as well as the national elections. What we are trying to do is to maintain the election machinery in the hands of the States. What we are trying to do is to maintain our American system, and that is what these boys want. What we are trying to do is to enable them to vote, in a legal, constitutional election, not only for Federal officers, but also for county, State, and local officers as well. Under our bill the names of all candidates would be printed on the ballot that goes to the soldier, and more soldiers would vote under it than would under the other bill, for the reason that they are more interested in local affairs than they are national affairs, especially when their relatives and friends, or they themselves, are running for local offices.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Does not the gentleman believe that the right of a citizen to vote in the primary election is as important as the right to vote in any general election?

Mr. RANKIN. I am not so sure about that, because in the general election he can vote against the primary nominees if he wants to.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Is there anything in either the bill as proposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] or the bill that is proposed by the gentleman from Mississippi, that will assure to any citizen, who is in the armed services, the absolute right to vote in a primary election, except as that right is prescribed under the absentee voting laws of the various States today?

Mr. RANKIN. No.

Mr. KEEFE. So that under either one of these bills, the right to vote in a primary election is not assured, unless they can do it pursuant to the provisions of the absentee voting laws?

Mr. RANKIN. That is true.

Now, in conclusion let me say this: The people of the States are most interested in their servicemen from their particular community than anybody else in the world. They are ready and willing to make every possible provision and to see that these ballots are sent out.

Do you think I would be opposed to this measure, that I would be making this fight, if I did not think there was a great constitutional question involved, that probably involved the fate of our constitutional form of government?

Talk about your friendship for the veterans. Go back and search the record for 20 years. I have gone through every fight for the veterans of the last war every year here for the last 20 years. I have helped override the veto of every President since I have been in Congress, in order to take care of our disabled veterans, their widows and orphans. Last year it was my amendment that raised the base pay of the soldiers to $50 a month, and some of the very men who rushed into print to criticize me for my stand on this proposition voted against that amendment.

I am in favor of their voting; but I want to tell you now that if every man in the armed forces knew what was in these two bills, if they could have their choice, they would say, "Maintain our dual system of government. Maintain our States' rights. Maintain the election machinery in the hands of the States, and give us the right to vote for local offices, as well as for State and county offices, and print the names on the ballots so we will know whom we are voting for. See that we get to vote in a legal election."

I do not know what changes have been made in this last bill, but under the other one there was a provision for a fine of $5,000 and 5 years' imprisonment or both, after prosecution in a Federal court, for any election holder anywhere in the country who was charged with violation of the Lucas-Worley bill. With that hanging over them, how would you get any men and women to help hold elections?

No, we are not going to usurp the States' election machinery in any such way. But I will go the limit to make provision for these men to vote a free ballot in a legal election and to get those ballots to them and back just as quick as possible. But we are not willing to violate the Constitution or usurp the election machinery of the States, or deny them the right to vote for candidates for local offices.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 103) entitled "Joint resolution continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution providing for final adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress; and

S. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 174]

Allen, Ill.	Gale	Mruk
Anderson, Calif.	Gallagher	Murphy
Arnold	Gamble	Myers
Baldwin, Md.	Gathings	Newsome
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gavagan	Norton
Barden	Gavin	O'Brien, Ill.
Barry	Gerlach	O'Brien, N. Y.
Beall	Gordon	O'Leary
Bender	Gore	O'Toole
Bland	Grant, Ala.	Pfeifer
Boren	Grant, Ind.	Philbin
Boykin	Gregory	Phillips
Bradley, Mich.	Gross	Pracht
Bradley, Pa.	Gwynne	Randolph
Brooks	Hall,	Reece, Tenn.
Brumbaugh	Leonard W.	Reed, Ill.
Buckley	Harris, Va.	Rees, Kans.
Bulwinkle	Hartley	Rizley
Burchill, N. Y.	Hébert	Rodgers, Pa.
Burgin	Heffernan	Russell
Busbey	Hess	Sabath
Byrne	Hill	Sasscer
Camp	Holmes, Mass.	Satterfield
Canfield	Jackson	Scanlon
Cannon, Fla.	Jeffrey	Schiffler
Capozzoli	Jennings	Schuetz
Carrier	Johnson,	Schwabe
Celler	J. Leroy	Scott
Chapman	Johnson,	Shafer
Chiperfield	Lyndon B.	Sheridan
Cox	Johnson, Ward	Sikes
Cullen	Jones	Simpson, Pa.
Curley	Kee	Slaughter
D'Alesandro	Kelley	Smith, Va.
Davis	Kennedy	Smith, W. Va.
Dawson	Keogh	Snyder
Delaney	Kilburn	Somers, N. Y.
Dickstein	Kleberg	Starnes, Ala.
Dies	Klein	Stevenson
Dilweg	Knutson	Sumner, Ill.
Dingell	Landis	Sumners, Tex.
Disney	Lane	Talbot
Domengeaux	Larcade	Tarver
Douglas	LeCompte	Taylor
Drewry	Lemke	Thomas, N. J.
Durham	Luce	Thomas, Tex.
Eaton	Lynch	Tibbott
Ellis	McCord	Towe
Elmer	McGehee	Treadway
Engle, Calif.	McKenzie	Vinson, Ga.
Fay	Magnuson	Vursell
Feighan	Maloney	Wadsworth
Fellows	Manasco	Ward
Fenton	Mansfield, Tex.	Wasielewski
Fisher	Martin, Iowa	Weiss
Fitzpatrick	Mason	Wene
Flannagan	May	West
Fogarty	Merritt	Whelchel, Ga.
Ford	Miller, Pa.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Fulbright	Mills	Wolverton, N. J.
Fuller	Morrison, La.	Wright
Fulmer	Morrison, N. C.	
Furlong	Mott	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 242 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. McCORMACK, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following privileged resolution (S. Con. Res. 29), which was read:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Tuesday, December 21, 1943, and that when they adjourn on said day, they stand adjourned sine die.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on the adoption of the concurrent resolution I move the previous question.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for recognition.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognized the majority leader.

Mr. CROSSER. I am opposed to this resolution and I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and forty-two Members have just answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, on the previous question I ask for a division.

The House divided, and there were—ayes 200, noes 17.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECOND SESSION, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 105.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 105), as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress shall begin at noon on Monday, January 10, 1944.

The Senate joint resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOLDIERS' SEPARATION BILL

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire with reference to the so-called soldiers' separation bill. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] understands that I was anxious to have that taken up before Christmas, and I realize he was, too. May I ask him if there is any possibility of it coming up on Monday or Tuesday next?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sorry to say there is no chance.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. In that event, may we have some definite assurance that that bill will be brought to the floor of the House by January 15?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, any definite assurance is dependent upon the committee reporting the bill, but I can assure the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I think I speak the overwhelming sentiment of all the membership of the House, that the bill ought to be out by January 15 and acted upon. I am authorized to make this statement for the Speaker, which is a joint statement of the Speaker and myself, that we will do everything within our power to try and have the Committee on Military Affairs report the bill on or before January 15.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman. I know every Member of this House is anxious to see that full justice is given to the soldiers, and I appreciate the gentleman's answer.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

PREVENTING MONOPOLISTIC ABUSE OF PATENTS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, monopoly now constitutes and will constitute after the war the No. 1 problem of American democracy. For a long time several Members of Congress, including myself, have been making speeches and have introduced a number of bills in an attempt to curb this danger and to help to create a situation in which free enterprise in the real sense of that word will be possible in the America of tomorrow. Many people who talk about free enterprise do not really mean that at all. They mean only that monopoly shall be free from governmental restraint as it gobbles up and destroys smaller business.

Sometime ago I introduced H. R. 1371, a measure aimed to curb some of the worst abuses in connection with patents including their use as a means of restraining trade, throttling competition, and fastening monopolistic control upon whole industries. I am today introducing a revision of that bill and desire to lay before the House briefly its provisions.

The bill consists of five sections amendatory of the Clayton Antitrust Act. These sections would become sections 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31 of the Clayton Act so that the definitions such as those covering antitrust laws, commerce, and other basic matters already contained in the Clayton Act will apply as to these new sections.

SECTION 27

Section 27 follows logically from the very definition of a patent. A patent is an extension by government to a person of certain rights and privileges relative to the patented process which are in and of themselves in the nature of a limitation upon the commerce of the country. This is deemed to be right and proper in order to encourage invention and to give to those responsible for research and invention unusual benefits as a reward for contributions made to human or national welfare. Since however, this is the nature of a patent, it becomes correspondingly the duty of a government to see that the use of patents is confined to their real purpose and that they do not become in the hands of great corporations instruments for the creation of greater monopolistic control than they would otherwise be able to exercise.

Section 27 authorized the United States to intervene in any action in the Federal courts where the issue of patent infringement is raised, and provides that, upon intervention, the United States shall have all the rights of a party, including rights of appellate review, to present evidence and argument relating to the patents alleged to be infringed. The purpose in allowing such intervention is to provide safeguards against the establishment, in purely private litigation, of spurious or distorted claims of patent privilege.

The provisions of this section correspond closely to those of section 1 of the act of August 24, 1937—28 United States Code, section 401—which authorizes the United States to intervene in any suit in the Federal courts where the constitutionality of an act of Congress is drawn in question.

Patent litigation is notoriously long drawn out and costly. Most of the patents of large commercial importance are owned by corporations possessing great financial resources and able to command the services of skilled counsel and technical experts. Because of the disadvantages under which the party contesting infringement usually labors, he can frequently be forced into accepting a settlement at some point on the long road of litigation. The result is that many patents and patent claims of doubtful validity are not subjected to the test of judicial scrutiny, particularly by appellate courts, or are not subjected to an adequate test.

In considering the effect of this situation upon the public interest, it must be borne in mind that patent privileges constitute ipso facto a limitation upon freedom of trade and competition. It is therefore a matter of public concern that the special privileges conferred by patent law, which are granted for the sole purpose of stimulating invention, should be confined to their true sphere. In *United States* v. *Masonite Corporation*, decided May 11, 1942 (316 U. S. 265), the Supreme Court said:

> Since patents are privileges restrictive of a free economy, the rights which Congress has attached to them must be strictly construed so as not to derogate from the general law beyond the necessary requirements of the patent statute.

Under existing law the function of the Government in confining patent privileges to their legitimate sphere stops with the issue of the patent—except insofar as the Government, in antitrust proceedings, may attack the misuse of patent claims. Determination of scope and validity, once a patent has been issued, is left to private negotiation and contract and private litigation. For reasons already indicated, there is at present no adequate check upon the misuse of patent rights and claims by large corporations—and sometimes by others—for the purpose of throttling free enterprise or levying tribute upon competitors.

The Government, if allowed to intervene in infringement proceedings, would act as the guardian of the public interest in assuring, so far as possible, that special privileges, which the Government itself has granted for a specific and limited purpose, are kept within their legitimate boundaries. Grant of the power to intervene would not impose any implied obligation to exercise this power in every infringement suit. As a matter of policy, the power would probably be exercised only where the patents involved appeared to be of considerable commercial importance and where there was doubt as to the ability or willingness of the party defending against infringement to litigate the issue effectively and uncompromisingly.

SECTION 28

Section 28 provides that all patent assignments and transfers of rights thereunder shall be in writing and that a copy thereof shall be filed with the Attorney General. Authority is conferred upon

him to issue rules and regulations necessary to carry out the purpose of this section and section 30. The penalty for violation is a monetary fine recoverable by the United States in a civil action. The purpose is to furnish the Government with accurate, up-to-date information as to the actual use being made of patents, in order to facilitate the discovery and the prompt prosecution of violations of the antitrust laws.

The Supreme Court in several recent decisions has passed upon the validity of various patent-licensing arrangements and agreements and has found them unlawful under section 1 of the Sherman Act. There are also numerous cases now pending in court charging similar illegal restraints of trade. In most of these cases the facts which were the basis of suit were discovered only after a long, painstaking, and costly investigation. There are doubtless many other illegal restraints of this nature which have not yet come to the attention of the Government. Furthermore, in practically all of these cases the restraints have been in effect over a long period of time. Eventual discovery of the facts and successful prosecution furnish no relief with respect to the prior period of restraint.

The registration provisions would furnish data which would materially aid the Government in uncovering questionable exercises of the patent privilege and in promptly prosecuting those deemed illegal. The result should be more efficient and more effective enforcement of the antitrust laws in the patent field.

The civil fine, as a sanction for enforcement, is similar to the penalty provided for violation of various provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act. See section 1 (17) (a) of that act—49 United States Code, supplement 7, section 1 (17) (a).

This proposed new section 28 of the Clayton Act would apply the same remedy to purely domestic problems as is provided in the field of international cartel agreements by another bill I recently introduced, H. R. 3786. That bill would require all American corporations making cartel agreements with foreign corporations involving production, price, marketing area, patents, or any sort of monopolistic practice to give full facts regarding such contracts or agreements to the Department of Justice. The Attorney General is directed to make such facts available for public inspection. Had the American people known fully about some of the cartel deals made before the war it is doubtful that we would have suffered such restrictions on vitally necessary production as has been the case.

Similarly, if as section 28 would require, everyone knew that all assignments or transfers of patent rights had to be in writing and filed with the Attorney General a great deterrent against harmful action would by this one means be set up.

SECTION 29

Section 29 is the heart of the bill. It reads as follows:

Any use or nonuse of a patent or patent application, or of any interest therein, including any failure or refusal to grant licenses thereunder which has the effect of unreasonably limiting the supply of any article in commerce or of unreasonably excluding the supply of any article from commerce is hereby declared to be illegal. Every sale, assignment, or conveyance of a patent or patent application, or of any interest therein, or agreement relating to a patent or patent application, and every transfer of rights under a patent or patent application by license or otherwise, involving any condition, agreement, or understanding which restricts the price of any article sold or handled in commerce and which embodies or is made by the use of an invention covered by such patent or patent application, is hereby declared to be illegal. The use or nonuse of any patent or patent application or of any interest therein in violation of this section shall render such patent or patent application null and void, and any court having jurisdiction of an action, civil or criminal, involving violation of this section shall adjudge that such patent or patent application is null and void. Every person who shall violate this section or who shall engage in any combination or conspiracy to violate this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $5,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or by both said punishments in the discretion of the court.

It will be noted that it makes illegal both the use and the nonuse of patents under certain circumstances. It is hardly necessary to emphasize the fact that refusal to permit use of a patented process by a corporation owning right to it may be a restraint on production and commerce of the most far-reaching consequence. We need only remember what has happened in connection with synthetic rubber in the United States within the past very few years to see the importance of this point.

Briefly, this section forbids: First, the use of patents as a means of restricting unreasonably the production of important needed commodities and second, the use of patent agreements, assignments, or leases as a means of controlling prices. The penalty is severe, namely, voidance of the patent itself.

To explain this section a little more fully:

Section 29 makes illegal any use or nonuse of a patent which has the effect of unreasonably limiting the supply of any article in commerce. The purpose of this section is to make it illegal to impose, under the cloak of patent privilege, undue restraints upon production or price competition.

The word "unreasonably" is used so as to make the limitation applicable only if the limitation on supply creates a real bottleneck in production or commerce and is, therefore, actually detrimental to the public. The courts have applied the concept of reasonableness in determining what restraints upon competition—not involving price fixing or boycotts—violate section 1 of the Sherman Act. Any rigid prohibition, with reference to limitation of supply through exercise or nonexercise of patent privilege, is open to objection. Use of the concept of reasonableness provides for flexibility and means that the courts will determine each case of alleged violation in the light of the peculiar facts and circumstances of the particular case.

This prohibition would probably be invoked only infrequently, but its enactment should prove a useful deterrent.

The proposed section also makes it illegal to assign patents or to license rights thereunder involving any condition or agreement which restricts the price of any article which may be produced under the patent. To some extent such conduct may be unlawful under the existing provisions of section 1 of the Sherman Act but it is desirable that the question, as well as the area of illegality, should be definitely fixed by statute.

The above prohibitions would not unduly limit the reward which the patent owner may obtain from his invention. He or his assignee or licensee would still be permitted to sell the patented product at any price he may choose. There would be no impairment of the exclusive right to "make, use, and vend" conferred by the present patent law; the only thing outlawed would be imposition of price restrictions in connection with assigning or granting to others all or part of the owner's patent privilege. Further, there seems no reason in policy for conferring upon the patent owner, in addition to the other privileges which the law grants him, the privilege of price fixing.

The section also provides for the voidance of patents or patent applications, where they have been misused. The additional penalty provided in the case of the new prohibitions, patent forfeiture, cannot be deemed too harsh since it applies only if there has been no advance disclosure of the facts to the Attorney General, as provided in section 30.

SECTION 30

The point may be raised by some that passage of this legislation would make businessmen fearful and would interfere with perfectly proper and even beneficial business arrangements with regard to patented processes.

Section 30, however, provides that there shall be no criminal prosecution or loss of the patent if a full and complete statement of the facts has been submitted to the Attorney General in advance of action and the Attorney General fails within 90 days to issue an opinion holding the proposal to be in violation of section 29. If the Attorney General is of the opinion that the proposal is unlawful, then machinery is afforded the proponent to file a complaint under the Declaratory Judgment Act for a decree declaring the proposal not to be in violation of section 29. If the court should decree that the proposed course of conduct is not in violation of section 29, the Attorney General may request the Court to retain jurisdiction for the purpose of reconsidering at some later date whether the effects resulting from the proposed action are in contravention of the public interest and in violation of section 29.

The Attorney General, however, is not barred from filing an equity suit for violations of section 29 and, of course, where a proponent departs from the provisions of the plan the Attorney General is free to prosecute criminally. This provision generally corresponds to the present policy pursued by the Department of Justice in enforcing the Sherman Act.

In the case of new prohibitions it is proper to make such policy a matter of statutory right, and to enable a proponent to test out in court the legality of a proposed plan in the event of disapproval by the Attorney General.

Thus it may be seen that all anyone would need to do to avoid criminal prosecution under this act would be to make a full statement to the Department of Justice of any proposed negotiations with regard to a patent before such contracts were entered into. Even if the Attorney General ruled against him, he has opportunity to test out in court the legality of his proposed plan.

SECTION 31

Section 31 of the bill is made necessary because in some instances recently the lower courts of the country have refused to permit the Department of Justice to challenge the validity of patents in connection with antitrust suits. Obviously, however, since patents are one of the principal devices used by corporations to establish monopolistic controls, it is a completely unrealistic and impractical situation and one certainly not in the public interest to disbar the Department of Justice from introducing evidence in antitrust suits bearing upon the validity or scope of patent rights.

Section 31, therefore, permits an attack upon the validity and scope of any patent in a proceeding involving a violation of the antitrust laws. Recently in *United States* v. *United States Gypsum Co.* (D. C. Nov. 1943) the district court refused to admit Government's proof to show invalidity of the patents used by the defendants to support a restrictive licensing structure on the ground that the Government in antitrust actions could not attack validity of patents. Yet in the case of *Sola Electric Co.* v. *Jefferson Electric Co.* (317 U. D. 173, Dec. 7, 1942), the Supreme Court held that a patent licensee, by virtue of his license agreement, is not estopped to challenge a price-fixing clause in the agreement by showing that the patent is invalid, and that the price restrictions would be accordingly unlawful because not protected by the patent monopoly. In reaching this conclusion, the court argued that local rules of estoppel which would fasten upon the public the burden of an agreement in violation of the Sherman Act must yield to the Sherman Act's declaration that such agreements are unlawful, and to the public policy of the act, which in the public interest, precludes the enforcement of such unlawful agreements.

The principal purpose of section 31 is to enable the Government—and plaintiffs in treble damage suits—to attack the validity and scope of patents in antitrust litigation. In following the reasoning of the Supreme Court in the Jefferson Electric case, that every patent grant is a restraint on competition, this section would also permit a party to show the invalidity or limited scope of any patent in any action involving a patent or any interest therein.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House on Tuesday next for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KELLEY (at the request of Mr. EBERHARTER), for today, on account of illness.

To Mr. ROWE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. JEFFREY (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois, and to Mr. RIZLEY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), indefinitely, on account of illness.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1543. An act to provide for mustering-out payments to members of the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1169. An act for the relief of Samuel Margolin.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, December 20, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

974. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 76 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 386. Resolution authorizing the employment of counsel to represent Congress in certain litigation brought by Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett; without amendment (Rept. No. 967). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 387. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred in connection with House Resolution 386 and of further proceedings under House Resolution 105; without amendment (Rept. No. 968). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 389. Resolution providing additional funds for the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities in the United States, and related questions; without amendment (Rept. No. 969). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 359. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the bill entitled "The Revenue Act of 1943," and the accompanying report thereon; without amendment (Rept. No. 970). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 384. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings on the bill (H. R. 2857) to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 971). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 380. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the second intermediate report (H. Rept. No. 862) of the Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 972). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 370. Resolution authorizing that House Document No. 351, being the press releases of the Department of State containing the declaration of four nations on general security, pledging themselves to united action for the prosecution of the present war against their enemies, which was signed at the conference held at Moscow, Russia, together with other papers relating thereto, be reprinted with corrections conforming to the official texts now on file in the Department of State; without amendment (Rept. No. 973). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 1488. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to Jose C. Romero, all right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain described tract of land within the Carson National Forest, N. Mex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 974). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURCH of Virginia:

H. R. 3870. A bill to amend section 214 of the act of February 28, 1925; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. COSTELLO:

H. R. 3871. A bill providing for the retirement of certain officers of the regular armed forces previously retired for physical disability; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILLIE:

H. R. 3872. A bill to remove for the duration of the war certain limitations upon the appointment and compensation of retired commissioned officers employed in civilian positions by the Government; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 3873. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act by adding a new title thereto relating to the sale or other disposition of surplus property of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 3874. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 3875. A bill to grant to enlisted personnel in the land or naval forces and to Army and Navy nurses certain benefits with respect to accumulated leave; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WORLEY:

H. R. 3876. A bill to provide a method of voting, during the period of the war and 6 months thereafter, by members of the armed forces absent from the place of their residence; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 209. Joint resolution extending until January 31, 1944, the provisions of the act of April 29, 1943, making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 3877. A bill for the relief of Clara E. Deane; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 3878. A bill for the relief of Clara E. Deane; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 3879. A bill granting a pension to Clara E. Deane; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 3880. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Zukas; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 3881. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Chandler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3882. A bill for the relief of C. Guy Evans; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 3883. A bill granting a pension to Ella G. West; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4148. By Mr. HALE: Petition of the Cumberland County (Maine) Council of the American Legion, that the Congress of the United States authorize the War Department to issue some method of identification to those inductees who have been requested by their respective draft boards to report for induction and have been rejected for physical disability and prevented from entering the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4149. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4150. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Delta Council, Stoneville, Miss., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to favoring enactment of legislation levying a Federal retail and wholesale sales tax to be designated as a "war tax" at such rate or rates as will produce revenues sufficient to pay as we go an appreciable part of the expense incurred in prosecuting the war, in which we are engaged against the Axis Powers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4151. Also, petition of R. L. Scott, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Treasury check No. 9,505,866; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we praise Thee for the advent of the world's Redeemer; for His serene nature and for His all-encompassing sympathy. All things abide in Him, measuring out our golden years and giving us the full knowledge of our God. O let the wounded, the bruised, and the suffering take renewed comfort in His blessed promises. "Strengthen ye the weak hands and confirm the feeble knees. * * * In the wilderness shall waters break out and streams in the desert. An highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called the way of holiness."

On this earth is a staggering load of war; the scorpion whip of slavery and murder is in the deadly hands of conscienceless men. Upon the relentless darkness of this world we pray that the spirit of the Christ may rise in all its full-orbed glory. Help us to rise ever higher, going from strength to strength, from nobility to nobility, and to become more just, more beneficent, and over the fields of human life to have an equitable regard for human rights. O forgive America's indulgence and self-enjoyment and lift up our words, thoughts, and deeds that the angels' song shall out sing the rewards of man. O the exhaustless bounty and power of Him who loved us for His own name's sake. Not unto us but unto Thy name be the praise of our salvation forever and ever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, December 18, 1943, was read and approved.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the calling of the Consent Calendar be dispensed with today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the calling of the Private Calendar on tomorrow be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the completion of the business on the Speaker's desk and other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on veterans in the RECORD, and also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a letter and a newspaper clipping concerning Montana Bill Musgrove.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DISBURSING OFFICE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 390) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 1, 1944, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, an additional sum not to exceed $2,500 during a fiscal year for the employment of professional and other necessary help in the disbursing office in accordance with the provisions of House Resolution No. 585, adopted December 16, 1942.

SEC. 2. That effective January 1, 1944, there shall also be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, additional compensation to the Disbursing Clerk of the House, at the rate of $1,000 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REVISED EDITION OF CANNON'S PROCEDURE

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report an original privileged joint resolution (H. J. Res. 210) authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be printed and bound for the use of the House 1,500 copies of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives by CLARENCE CANNON, to be printed under the supervision of the author and to be distributed to the Members by the Speaker.

SEC. 2. That notwithstanding any provision of the copyright laws and regulations with respect to publications in the public domain, such revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives shall be subject to copyright by the author thereof.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand we gave this authorization last year and this is merely an amendment that you are adding on with reference to the copyright.

Mr. JARMAN. The copyright; that is all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, after the regular business today and other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of all legislative matters in order today and matters on the Speaker's desk and other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURCHILL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two short articles, one on the safe return of the President to the United States and the other on child welfare and care in the city of New York.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio speech.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today after the other special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a very short letter from the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein an article from the New York Herald Tribune entitled "Warren of the West: Republican of New Type."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Ernie Pyle appearing in my local home newspaper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday last I obtained permission to insert in the RECORD an address delivered by Dr. Longacre at Detroit, Mich., entitled "The Greatest Menace in the Present Emergency." The Public Printer advises me the cost of the insertion exceeds the amount normally permitted in the sum of $135. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be inserted in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article. I also ask unanimous consent to again extend my remarks to include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by Judge Charles A. Graham, of Denver, who is chairman of the National War Labor Board for the ninth region.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2207), an act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a letter from the Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. Bashore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the conclusion of the special orders heretofore granted, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 20 minutes today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after conclusion of the other special orders I may be privileged to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONGRESSIONAL ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I believe I am voicing the sentiments of the people of the Seventeenth District of Ohio, as well as the majority of the people of our Nation, when I say I regret that Congress has voted for an adjournment, effective tomorrow. As a Member of this body, I feel that we should remain in session and take care of some very important legislation that has a direct bearing on our war effort, both on our home front and on our military front.

I want to go home; so do the boys and girls in our military units. But they cannot go and we should not go. Let us all remain on the job every day—fight and work as one unit and in this way bring victory at an early date.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter I received from a veteran.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include in the Appendix, an editorial from the Marietta (Ohio) Daily Times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include an article on the decision handed down a few days ago by the Emergency Court of Appeals on the question of fixing of prices by administrative officials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

A TOAST TO OUR BOYS—WHEREVER THEY ARE

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I thought this would be a good time to read a short poem, a toast to our boys, which was written by Mr. John E. Kennedy, secretary to former Congressman O'Connell.

A TOAST TO OUR BOYS—WHEREVER THEY ARE

Let's drink a toast to the widening host—
Of Americans serving the Nation—
To those millions of lads (and their brothers and dads)
Who are saving our civilization;
To the men from the mills and the farms and the hills
And the cities and mountains and plains—
To the workers and miners and airplane designers,
And crews on the ships and the trains.

Wherever they are—be it near, be it far,
On the land, in the air, on the sea—
With a stoutness of heart they are doing their part
To keep this—"the land of the free."
So good luck and God speed them—may nothing impede them
Nor make them delay or digress—
May Christmastime find them with power behind them
To roll up a final success.

—*John E. Kennedy.*

DECEMBER 25, 1943.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a copy of a weekly release.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address recently delivered by the Governor of the State of Vermont in Boston on the Bill of Rights. I have just received within a half hour the manuscript and I have not had an opportunity to submit it to the Public Printer, but because of the situation which obtains I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the fact that it may exceed the limit, I may include it in today's RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARNOLD] may extend his own remarks and include a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MAYOR EARL RILEY AND O. W. I.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago when the House was considering the supplementary appropriation bill containing about $5,000,000 for the O. W. I., it was contended by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that Mayor Earl Riley, of Portland, Oreg., was not authorized officially to represent the O. W. I.

I am pleased to report to the House, so that the record may show, that Mayor Earl Riley was the official representative of O. W. I. I have a letter written on December 18 by Mr. Elmer Davis, Director of O. W. I., stating that Mayor Riley spent about 3 months in England. I quote this letter:

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION,
Washington, December 18, 1943.

The Honorable HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DWORSHAK: In reply to your letter of December 4, I am only able to give you an estimate of the costs of Mayor Riley's trip, as he has not yet processed his voucher. You are right that he received no compensation or salary. We merely covered his expenses by providing transportation and $10 per day while in England.

He traveled to England by boat and returned by plane. The total estimated cost to the O. W. I. for the period of his service from the first part of September to the 29th of November, including transportation from Portland to London and return, is approximately $2,000. I shall be glad to give you an accurate audit of this as soon as it is available.

Cordially,

ELMER DAVIS, *Director.*

I believe it is an insult to the many thousand American men and women serving overseas in the armed forces to send glamor boys like Mayor Riley to England ostensibly to acquaint our allies with the part being played by America in winning this war. The men and women in uniform are doing an efficient job, and I believe that the record should show that the O. W. I. has been indiscreet in sending civilians like Mayor Riley to represent our Government in England. Little good can result in seeking to cultivate a better understanding between Britain and this country by permitting Mr. Riley to indulge in intemperate remarks like those when he assailed five United States Senators who had visited the combat zones.

The Associated Press, on November 20, reported from England that Mayor Riley said in a public speech:

We in America think Winston Churchill is the best Prime Minister we ever had. He could be President of the United States any day, and Roosevelt Prime Minister of Britain.

This same dispatch stated that—

Mr. Riley is touring under auspices of the United States Office of War Information.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. CELLER, by unanimous consent, were granted leave to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain newspaper excerpts and editorial comments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I keep hearing of men who have been discharged from the service because of disability, who have not established service connection for their disability. Other men have been discharged from the service without any funds or any money. We still have today and tomorrow. It is cruel. I cannot see why we cannot pass at least a moderate mustering-out pay bill and then later we can perfect it. We will not be back until the 10th of January, and it is incredible, it is inexcusable that we should not pass some sort of legislation before recesses. Three weeks is far too long a time to elapse. The servicemen and women need assistance much more in the winter here than in the summer. I am going to do everything I can, and I believe every Member on the floor will do everything he can to secure the passage of a mustering-out pay bill. The time for action is now.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I have today placed in the RECORD a letter from a veteran who has been discharged 5 months ago, without any pay or any mustering-out pay or any other benefits, and was sent home to his parents.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We never can explain it to any of the veterans or to the country. The country is solidly behind winning the war and caring for those in service who are making every sacrifice for us to win the war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

THE LATE GEORGE N. PEEK

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a word on the passing of George N. Peek. The first time I ever visited this Capitol was in February 1926, when I came here as a member of the Committee of 22—2 from each of 11 States—primarily in the interest of the McNary-Haugen bill. George Peek was our chairman. Chester Davis was our secretary. George Peek was comprehensive in his farm ideas and he was a sincere and earnest character; a splendid American. I regret his passing. Our country is the loser.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

ABSENTEE SOLDIERS' BALLOT

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, as a World War veteran who had the privilege of casting an absentee ballot during the period of the World War, I am earnestly anxious that every World War veteran, whether at home or abroad, be able to cast some form of ballot in 1944.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder and I ponder over the fact whether or not all these people who express their desire that veterans be given a chance to vote in 1944 are sincerely earnest. With the statement that they desire veterans to vote, they turn immediately and use the Constitution as an excuse. I desire to preserve the Constitution. I desire to preserve all the ways of American life. I desire to preserve those institutions which our fathers have handed down to us. But yet, Mr. Speaker, I believe the Constitution is sufficiently elastic to find some way in a simple form that our men overseas who are now serving us and de-

fending us and protecting the Constitution may be given some way to express themselves. Yes, Mr. Speaker, my mail has been flooded with letters from New York and Northern States, from people whom I have never heard of. Yet, on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I am getting letters from the South. I am getting letters from my own congressional district in North Carolina. I know there must be and there will be some way found if the Congress earnestly desires to find a way. Whether they avail themselves or not, I want the men who are defending us to have this privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter I received recently from a constituent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CARE OF WORLD WAR VETERANS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphatically endorse the statement that was made by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] a few moments ago. I am absolutely in favor of our passing a mustering-out pay bill just as quickly as we can.

We have a number of problems to consider in connection with our homecoming soldiers. We will have to face a lot of questions about what is going to happen to the serviceman when he returns from the front. How many are you going to put into agriculture? How many are you going to give an opportunity to re-educate themselves and to complete the half-finished education which they received before they went away, willing to give their lives for their country?

What are you going to do in the way of providing vocational and skilled training which every one of these service men and women, if they do not have anything else to turn to, should be able to expect at the hands of this Government, if and when they get back from the front. Nine and a half million will ask you the same questions.

I hope we may take immediate action upon this matter and all the others relating to the veteran after the war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to second the suggestion of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] that something be done at once on this question of mustering-out pay. Even if it is only a small amount, a token payment, perhaps only $100, something that will show that we mean to do something substantial and permanent as time goes on. I hope the gentlewoman from Massachusetts will find the parliamentary situation such that we can take some action here in the House either today or tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

COAST GUARD AUXILIARY AND RESERVE ACT OF 1941

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table, the bill H. R. 1616, to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 9 to 16, inclusive.
Page 2, strike out all after line 18 over to and including line 3 on page 3.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I want to say in reply to the statements that have been made with reference to Congress not adjourning until it does something about the mustering-out pay for men in the service. I am one of the Members who voted against adjournment. But, that matter can be taken up and disposed of if the Congress wants to do it. If we could take the bill that has been passed by the Senate and get recognition to move to pass it under suspension of the rules, that could be done with or without amendments. Or, if it were taken up in the House, instead of adjourning, the two Houses could recess from day to day until the measure could be disposed of.

But I must say that it would have been much more proper, perhaps, and that these demands would probably have been much more effective if they had been made earlier.

As far as I am concerned, however, I am willing and anxious to dispose of that legislation now, and I am willing to support it under a suspension of the rules, or I am willing to have the House just recess from day to day, and the Senate do the same thing until we take the measure up and finally dispose of it.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, the Coast Guard is under the Navy for the duration. The Senate amendments to H. R. 1616 with reference to the Coast Guard Auxiliary makes it conform to the provisions of the law creating the Naval Auxiliary. This will be explained further by the acting chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California is correct. As the bill passed the House it was different from the provisions which were subsequently enacted for the women's organization in the Navy. The Senate amendments make it conform to the Naval Auxiliary Act, and I think that is the way it ought to be.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE SOLDIERS' VOTE BILL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] discussed at length a new bill which he has introduced on the soldiers' absentee voting question. I have now secured a copy of that bill, and I am compelled to confess that it is worse than the original. Neither one of them, in my opinion, was written by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY]. It seemed to be a case of the hand of Esau and the voice of WORLEY.

These statements to the effect that we are hiding behind the Constitution are ridiculous. The Constitution is the ship of state of this Nation. It is our sworn duty to uphold it.

What we are trying to do is to give our men and women in the service the opportunity to vote for State, for county, for local, and for national offices in a legal election.

On yesterday a statement went out that has been referred to as the Marcantonio round robin, attacking United States Senators in the most vicious manner. It was a gratuitous insult to the Members of the Senate who supported this measure, and who are just as much interested in the servicemen as are the ones who signed that vicious round robin. Those radicals are now backed up by Harry Bridges, the west coast Communist.

The Communist Party and the C. I. O. are supporting the Green-Lucas bill and opposing the Senate bill, because the Senate bill preserves State's rights. The Senate bill would provide for a legal election. We could pass it, and have passed it before now, if the chairman had called the committee together. That bill simply calls on the States to provide the absentee voting privilege for every legalized voter in their States. It also gives them free air-mail service and guarantees the assistance of the Army and the Navy in getting these ballots to the men and women in our armed forces and getting them back. This would enable them all to vote in a legal, constitutional election.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi, if I understood him correctly, contended that the gentleman from Texas did not prepare this bill. My information is to the contrary; my information is that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY], did prepare the bill, that it is his own bill; and while I have not had a chance to read the bill, yet from the newspaper reports I think it is a very good bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Georgia that I am on the committee. I asked the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] who wrote the original bill and he could not tell me, or did not do so.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I am not talking about the original bill; I am talking about the bill he discussed Saturday.

Mr. RANKIN. This is merely a modification of the original bill.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield further.

I want to say only that as far as I am concerned I think it is up to the Congress of the United States to do everything it constitutionally can to put a ballot in the hands of every man and every woman who is serving in the armed forces of the United States; and we can do that without violating the Constitution of the United States; we can do it by furnishing them a ballot and sending it back to the States. It is the responsibility of the States then to see whether or not the voter is qualified and whether they might cast the ballot. We ought to do our job of furnishing the machinery so that the ballots can be taken to far-flung battlefields of the world and given to those boys, bring them back and put them in the hands of the State authorities before the election.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KELLEY (at the request of Mr. EBERHARTER), for 2 days, on account of illness.

THE SOLDIERS' VOTE BILL

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the original bill in the last Congress was introduced by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAMSEY] and finally approved by the secretaries of the various States who sent a delegation down here. It was opposed then by the gentleman from Mississippi; nevertheless, the vast majority of the Members voted for it. The present bill that the gentleman from Mississippi charges was written by someone, he does not know whom, was introduced by me. I had the cooperation of the legislative bureau. The gentlemen from Texas amended the bill, which I believe was in the right direction, and the gentleman from Mississippi was present when I appeared before that committee and urged the passage of that bill that will give the boys the right to vote.

I said that I did not care whether it was my bill, his bill, or any bill; but that it should be a bill that will give them the right to vote and not a bill that will deprive them of that great privilege as the gentleman from Mississippi is trying to do.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand that those words be taken down. I make the point of order that his statement is false and slanderous. I demand that those words be taken down.

Mr. SABATH. I demand that those words be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will take down the second words demanded.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the words are taken down, and if the House should be required to vote upon the propriety of some ruling by the Speaker, and that would result in a point of no quorum being made, would we be deprived of our opportunity to speak under special orders?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If a quorum is not present, there would be no opportunity to speak.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, are the rules suspended when a quorum is not present?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. They are not. The Clerk will report the words demanded to be taken down.

The Clerk read as follows:

I demand those words be taken down. It is false, it is slanderous. I demand that those words be taken down.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this is a divided proposition, and I want a ruling on the first ones first.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the words demanded to be taken down by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has already reported them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I want the words of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] read in which he accused me of trying to deprive the men in the armed forces of the right to vote.

The regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has instructed that the words demanded to be taken down be read, and when they are ready the Clerk will report them.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SABATH. I said I did not care whether it was my bill, his bill, or any bill, but a bill that will give them the right to vote and not a bill that will deprive them of that great privilege as the gentleman from Mississippi is trying to do.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that those words violate the rules of the House, and, so far as my denouncing them as false is concerned, I am clearly within the rules of the House, as has been demonstrated here and pointed out time and time again.

I remember one time when the question was before the House in connection with a row between the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Fordney, and the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. Byrnes, that this occurred. Mr. Fordney made a statement to the effect that the gentleman from South Carolina had made a false statement and that the gentleman from South Carolina knew it was false when he made it.

A controversy arose over that issue. The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Mann, the greatest parliamentarian I have ever seen in this House, finally rose and said:

When the gentleman from Michigan stated that the gentleman from South Carolina made a statement that was false, he did not violate the rules of the House; but when he said the gentleman from South Carolina knew it was false, he violated the rules of the House.

When any Member rises on the floor and makes a false statement, any other Member has the right to say that that statement is false; and when that statement is slanderous, any gentleman is within the rules of the House when he says so.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary for me to answer the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, the regular order.

Mr. SABATH. His own statement shows he is wrong.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule. There are several ways of averting a ruling on this matter, but the Chair is prepared to rule, neither gentleman having asked unanimous consent that the remarks be withdrawn. As the Chair stated, the Chair is prepared to rule on both statements in the absence of such a request.

No unanimous-consent request having been made that the remarks be withdrawn by both gentlemen, the Chair will rule on the remarks made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] in which he made a certain statement in reference to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], as follows:

but a bill that will give them the right to vote and not a bill that will deprive them of that great privilege, as the gentleman from Mississippi is trying to do.

The Chair feels that the question is very close to the line, but does transgress the rules when the gentleman from Illinois used the words "deprive them" in that those words tend to impugn the motives of the gentleman from Mississippi.

A Member may take the floor and make as vigorous an attack as he desires on any bill and its merits, but when it comes to the question of impugning the motives of another Member, one has to

be exceedingly careful. Many times these questions are very close, and the Chair is frankly of the opinion that this is a very close question. But in order to preserve that understanding among Members which is so essential in a legislative body, the Chair is of the opinion that the words used, while very close to the line, tend to transgress the rules of the House.

So far as the remarks made by the gentleman from Mississippi are concerned, the Chair has no difficulty in ruling that those words clearly transgress the rules of the House, and the Chair so rules on both statements made, taken down, and reported by the Clerk.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the entire colloquy be stricken from the RECORD and that the gentleman may be allowed to proceed in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have an appeal from the ruling of the Chair on the last ruling pending. The Chair's ruling is so one-sided I do not think the House will sustain it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is out of order.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is out of order when he says to the Chair that the ruling is one-sided and unfair.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am appealing from the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, may I ask, Will the gentleman withdraw his request?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to withdraw the request after the Chair apologized for the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair may say that there was no apology for any Member in his ruling.

Mr. RANKIN. It sounded like it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Member will be seated.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have an appeal from the ruling of the Chair pending and I will not be seated until the House votes on that appeal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will be seated. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair be the judgment of the House?

The question was taken, and the ruling of the Chair was sustained.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I think it is unfortunate that the House Military Affairs Committee did not see fit to act on the mustering-out pay bill before we leave here for a few days; however, it is my understanding, and I hope it is the understanding of those interested in the matter, that within 2 or 3 weeks the Military Affairs Committee will be ready to pass and report a bill which will give the soldiers and sailors adequate mustering-out pay. I regret that we cannot do that now. I have always favored doing it as early as possible. Unfortunately, I will not be able to vote on it myself because I would be a recipient of part of that mustering-out pay. I do hope, though, the Military Affairs Committee will report a decent, adequate bill. Something should be done now, but maybe hearings will produce a better and more comprehensive aid to our fighting men.

I have conferred this morning with some Navy officials, and they are trying to work out mechanics which will be of benefit to all disabled Navy veterans. Regardless of any mustering-out bills, pay bills, we may pass, they will not, if possible, muster out any disabled Navy veteran until all his papers and all of the matters that he must do to get his rights and benefits are taken care of and adjusted satisfactorily. I hope the Army will follow suit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the statement of my friend and colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and likewise for the information of the House, I would like to be heard briefly in order that the RECORD may be clear as to the true situation regarding the soldiers' mustering-out bill.

The chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs is in Kentucky at the present time, and I understand he was called down there because a nephew who was a bombardier in the Air Corps was killed, and he has gone there in connection with that unfortunate incident. The Committee on Military Affairs has conducted hearings on this bill for 2 weeks and full and fair consideration has been given the measure. Representatives of the War and Navy Departments, as well as official spokesmen for the national servicemen's organizations, have been heard. Every member of the committee, so far as I know, strongly favors this legislation and prompt passage of the bill. I know that is my own feeling about it. There has not even been a suggestion of dilatory tactics. A bill, however, as important as this and which carries with it the expenditure of a few billion dollars deserves careful study and consideration and cannot be passed in a day. The Senate bill was only referred to us a couple of days ago. Last week the chairman appointed a special subcommittee to study all the pending bills and report the one they thought would come nearest doing justice to the soldiers, and at the same time be fair and reasonable to the taxpayers. It should not be forgotten there are more than 20 bills on this subject before our committee and I think no two alike. The subcommittee is composed, as I recall them, of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] from the majority side, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] from the minority side. They have been in session every day, including this morning. They have worked hard to get out a good bill and, I understand, are in agreement as to the objective. I think it safe to predict that they will report a bill in the next few days, and certainly within a day or two after we reconvene.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] may have 5 additional minutes. This is a very important question and the 1-minute speeches apparently are over.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair calls attention to the fact that the 1-minute speeches are not over apparently, and hopes that the custom which has previously existed will continue to exist.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain a unanimous-consent request that after the 1-minute speeches have been concluded and other special orders the gentleman may have 5 minutes to address the House. Does the gentleman from Mississippi make that request?

Mr. RANKIN. I do not know whether the gentleman from Texas wants it or not.

Mr. THOMASON. Yes. I want the House and the country to know the facts. Some people are not being fair about it, or else ignorant of the true situation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make that request.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the Members of the House understand the situation. The committee is unanimous in trying to get fair and just legislation on this subject at the earliest possible date. Inasmuch, however, as this is permanent legislation that in the course of time will affect several million men, many of whom have a different status, different length of service, also some at home and some overseas, a reasonable time is necessary to work out the legal and technical questions.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman make that 10 minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] may address the House for 5 minutes at the conclusion of the other special orders for today. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is there any disposition on the part of the leadership to limit the number of hours today or may we run along as long as Members have something to speak about?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Naturally, there is no disposition to do that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The Chair said "naturally"?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Naturally. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, later in the day I have permission to address the House for 10 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject I had in mind and to include certain excerpts and correspondence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

There was no objection.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT ADJOURN

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the resolution for adjournment the House adopted last Saturday. I would enjoy a rest as much as anyone here. I appreciate that we have had a long, hard grind in almost continuous sessions of the Congress during these critical war years. The grim reaper has taken a heavy toll from our membership to which the long sessions and arduous duties here have contributed in no small measure, nevertheless we have a duty to perform. It comes first. It must supersede any personal considerations. Mr. Speaker, I urge that we should, before adjourning, bring up and pass the legislation providing for subsidies, the soldiers' vote, soldiers' mustering-out pay, railroad pay bill, and old-age social-security, providing increased allowance to our old folks in dire need.

There are other bills which should have had our consideration before this but, Mr. Speaker, we should not adjourn before completing the ones I have named. That is the reason I voted against adjournment.

WEST COAST GASOLINE SITUATION CRITICAL

Mr. Speaker, the west coast gasoline situation is most critical. Unless immediate steps are taken, the west coast may soon be without gasoline to keep the wheels of war industries turning. I have urged upon the O. P. A. and the Oil Administrator the urgent necessity of acting at once to avert such a catastrophe. Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks the following correspondence giving details of this threatened breakdown in the supply of this essential war product:

STATE OF OREGON,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Salem, December 14, 1943.

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HOMER: At the request of several fellow Governors, I am forwarding a copy of a letter concerning the oil situation as they present it and which is forwarded for your inspection.

Very truly yours,

EARL, *Governor.*

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Santa Fe, November 19, 1943.

The *Honorable* EARL SNELL,
Governor of Oregon, Salem, Oreg.

DEAR GOVERNOR SNELL: This letter, sponsored by Governors Coke Stevenson, of Texas; Andrew F. Schoeppel, of Kansas; Sam H. Jones, of Louisiana; Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma; Dwight Griswold, of Nebraska; Dwight H. Green, of Illinois; Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania; Lester C. Hunt, of Wyoming; and myself, is the result of a recent conference and an exchange of correspondence in which we discussed the extreme seriousness of the oil situation.

The outlook for sufficient oil supplies for the Nation's fuel and essential driving needs is rapidly becoming so critical that we have deemed it advisable to bring the matter to the attention of all the Governors.

Gasoline rationing was initiated originally in the East for lack of transportation facilities and throughout the rest of the country as a tire-conservation measure. Tighter rationing of gasoline and fuel oil later became necessary because of continual decreases in storage reserves. Now, increasing demands of the military forces have reached the stage where even stricter rationing is necessary on a Nation-wide basis because of actual shortages for civilian use.

Depletion of available reserves has continued to the extent that we face the condition where production is not able to take care of demand.

With continued heavier requirements of the military forces, we may expect to reach by spring a truly precarious situation in the oil industry, which will inevitably make necessary further reductions in fuel and gasoline for civilian use.

To provide for military requirements and the essential driving and fuel needs of the American public in 1944, production of oil must be increased. But production cannot be increased or reserves built up without new discoveries.

Under present price control ceilings, exploration is virtually at a standstill. Increased costs of material and labor, coupled with arbitrary price restrictions, have stifled incentive for new development. Since much crude is being produced below the cost of operation, there is little inducement even to bring in a producer. While the bigger companies might be able to offset such losses through profits in many outlets, the independent, who produces crude oil only, is in no such favorable position and is facing elimination from the oil industry.

In addition, stripper wells, which individually yield only a few barrels daily, but in the aggregate account for a considerable portion of the Nation's total output, are being abandoned due to excessive production costs.

The situation is really critical, but the solution is so simple that we continue to be amazed that prompt action is not taken.

Authorization of a 50-cent raise in the price of crude oil would cover the increased costs of production, and would add only 1 cent a gallon to the price of gasoline. A 1-cent increase in the price of gasoline would, we feel, be readily accepted by the American public if it gave assurance of continued supplies of gasoline for essential driving.

Unless higher production costs can be offset in some way, we have no hope of stimulating discovery and new production. So far we have the choice of further depletion of reserves and lowered production or offering an incentive for new discoveries and new production. This can be accomplished either by an increase in the price of crude oil or a program of Government-financed drilling.

The Government recognizes that something must be done to remedy the situation. Federal officials have advocated a subsidy. We want to do it the time-honored American way—through encouragement of private initiative.

We do not believe there is any State in the Union which would advocate turning the production of oil over to the Government and eliminating this great industry from the business scene.

In normal times, only the oil producing States would be greatly interested in exploratory work and the expansion of existing fields. Now, however, with the Nation facing an acute shortage of crude oil, every State has a vital interest in this problem.

As Governors of our respective States, we feel that it is our responsibility to see that civilians obtain sufficient gasoline to perform essential duties and to make certain that sufficient fuel oil is available for industrial and domestic purposes. This is an obligation that must be fulfilled if our present economic system is to be preserved. If the motorcar disappears from our streets and highways our whole economic structure will have to be reorganized. We are sure that you share this view of the problem confronting us, since this problem is common to all the States.

Final solution must rest with Congress, because recommendations of the oil industry, the oil-producing States, and the Office of the Petroleum Administrator for War have gone unheeded by the Office of Economic Stabilization.

We feel that united action on the part of the Governors of the 48 States will have great influence in relieving this grave situation. There is no doubt in our minds that through our united action Congress will authorize the requested increase in the price of crude. Once this price is increased we are confident that wildcat operations will bring in new fields and assure sufficient oil for essential civilian needs, and, of course, continue to provide all the oil necessary for war purposes.

We therefore urge that in behalf of the people of your State you bring this matter to the attention of your State's congressional delegation with the recommendation that prompt action be initiated to avert a crucial gasoline and fuel oil shortage in the United States in 1944.

We will appreciate your advice and any suggestions you have to offer which will carry forward this program.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. DEMPSEY,
Governor.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Santa Fe, November 23, 1943.

The Honorable EARL SNELL,
Governor of Oregon, Salem, Oreg.

DEAR GOVERNOR SNELL: Reference is made to page 2, fifth paragraph of my letter of November 19.

On further consideration we feel that we should ask that the price of crude oil be brought to parity, rather than increased a specific amount.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. DEMPSEY,
Governor.

P. S.—Gov. John W. Bricker, of Ohio, has added his endorsement to my letter of November 19.

WE MIGHT JUST AS WELL FACE THE FACTS—THE CIVILIAN GASOLINE SITUATION HERE IN THE WEST WILL PROBABLY GET WORSE BEFORE IT GETS BETTER—YOU'RE ENTITLED TO KNOW THE TRUTH—HERE IT IS

No one can make accurate predictions about our gasoline supply. The actions of the enemy will have as much to do with it as the plans of our own general staff. But we can analyze the situation as it exists today. And it doesn't look good.

The Pacific coast petroleum industry is turning out 30 percent more gasoline today than it did in 1940. On top of our normal production, that's an enormous amount. The increase alone amounts to almost as much gasoline as the entire German Nation

consumed before the war. Yet in spite of this, the West is facing a gasoline shortage. Here's why:

PACIFIC THEATER DEPENDS ALMOST ENTIRELY ON WEST COAST

When the Japs took the Dutch East Indies and the submarine menace cut off South America, the major job of supplying the Allied forces in the Pacific fell squarely on the west coast. This meant that almost every gallon of 100 octane used by a plane in the Solomons, and practically every barrel of fuel oil consumed by destroyers off the Aleutians had to come from California refineries.

When you realize that the gas tanks of one Flying Fortress hold enough gasoline to supply 23 A cars for 1 year; that a destroyer steaming under forced draft from San Francisco to Sydney, Australia, burns up enough fuel oil to heat 1,120 homes for a year, you can get an idea of what this means.

HASN'T RATIONING HELPED?

Yes; we are driving fewer miles in private automobiles than we did before the war. But we have a lot more people out here than we had then. For example, civilian gasoline consumption in California (net taxable gallonage) during July of this year was only 4½ percent below July of 1940. That's a long way from what we might have to face in 1944. In fact, the only reason we've been able to carry on at our present rate of consumption this year is because a great deal of the gasoline we are using now is coming from supplies—accumulated by the industry in the past. At the present rate of consumption, these surplus stocks will be gone in 2 months.

WHAT CAN WE DO ABOUT IT?

The industry is taking every means that human ingenuity can devise to increase refinery yields and improve refinery facilities. New plants are being rushed to completion, new motor-fuel blends are being tested, new techniques are being explored by talent pools of the best men in the industry. All of this will help some.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

But the industry can't solve the problem alone. We've all got to help. If civilian gasoline is not conserved now, there will not be enough for essential driving later. This is your personal war problem.

THIS IS HOW THE GASOLINE PICTURE HAS CHANGED

1940

Military and export took 14 out of every 100 barrels of gasoline produced. That left 86 barrels for civilian use on the Pacific coast.

1942

We increased gasoline production 11 percent above 1940. That meant we were making 111 barrels for every 100 we made in 1940. So while the armed forces took 27 out of every 111 (24 percent) it still left 84 barrels for civilian use.

This year

We increased gasoline production to 30 percent above 1940. But the armed forces now take over 50 percent of the gasoline we make. That leaves less than 65 barrels out of every 130 for civilian use—24 percent below our normal consumption of 86 barrels.

CALIFORNIA OIL & GAS ASSOCIATION,
Los Angeles, Calif.

PORTLAND AND OREGON BUSY WITH POST-WAR PLANNING

Mr. Speaker, Portland, Oreg., in my district and the whole State of Oregon, are busy with post-war planning. We must make certain that when the firing ceases and the war ends and our boys in uniform come home that they will not find closed factories, bread lines, and no jobs waiting for them. The Federal Government, the States, and the local communities must take time by the forelock and formulate plans for immediate operation when the war ends so that the transition period from war to peace may be bridged. There must be no gap. The Federal Government alone cannot solve this problem; the various States of the Union and the local subdivisions of Government and the local communities as well as private enterprise must pull the laboring oar. If the plan succeeds we must give free private enterprise full opportunity to provide employment.

My home city, Portland, is awake to the problem and is doing an excellent job and the State of Oregon is perfecting its post-war plans. Portland employed experts from New York to make a complete survey of post-war projects for it. This has been completed. I include herewith a report from the Post-War Survey Committee of the Portland Chamber of Commerce under date December 11, 1943. It is a preliminary report for post-war purchase in that community.

The report follows:

DECEMBER 11, 1943.

To the Members of the Portland Chamber of Commerce.

GENTLEMEN: This committee appointed by President Simpson has, at the board of directors request, adapted to Portland, its metropolitan area, its retail area, and the State of Oregon, the consumer buying intention survey of the United States Chamber of Commerce, and herewith presents its findings.

These data present specific indications of what families of this area intend, in part, to buy within the first 6 months following termination of the war.

Since this report is an adaptation of national consumer buying intentions, we regard it as reasonably accurate. These figures should be considered as merely preliminary and by no means final. Nevertheless, the figures presented here are indicative of consumer buying intention rather than exact tabulations.

If this serves as a gage to consumer thinking in sufficient manner to permit you to understand what the average consuming family has in mind for immediate post-war purchase, this committee believes it serves the purpose for which it has been compiled. It is our plan to supplement these data with later figures as they become available.

Submitted by,

POST-WAR SURVEY COMMITTEE,
R. G. BARNETT.
EDW. L. COLBY.
WM. A. HEALY.

THIS REPORT BY THE PORTLAND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE PRESENTS THE CONSUMER PHASE OF THE UNITED STATES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SURVEY AS DEVELOPED BY APPLYING TO FAMILIES FOUND IN OREGON THE PERCENTAGES DERIVED FROM THE SURVEY BY THE UNITED STATES CHAMBER

The survey by United States Chamber of Commerce reported (1) the total number of families in the United States, and (2) the percentage of all families which stated its intention to purchase certain goods or services within 6 months after close of war.

Our survey applies to families found in Portland, Portland metropolitan area, Portland retail-trade area, and the State of Oregon. The data presented covers: (1) Total families, (2) percentage of families intending to purchase, (3) the number of family units based on these percentages, (4) the unit price of commodities or services, and (5) proposed expenditures (in dollars) for these commodities or services. These expenditures to be made within 6 months after the close of the war.

POPULATION AND FAMILIES

The population is that established in Census of Population, 1940. The number of families has been ascertained by dividing population by 3.3 persons per family:

Area	Population	Persons per family	Families
Portland	305,394	3.3	92,544
Portland metropolitan area	406,406	3.3	123,154
Portland retail trade area	633,108	3.3	191,851
State of Oregon	1,089,684	3.3	330,021

Expenditures to be made for post-war needs within 6 months after the close of the war

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED PURCHASES OF GOODS AND SERVICES FROM A SURVEY WHICH APPLIED TO FAMILIES IN OREGON, THE PERCENTAGES DERIVED FROM A NATIONAL SURVEY BY UNITED STATES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

	Portland	Portland metropolitan area	Portland retail-trade area	Oregon	Percentage of total purchases
Automobiles and appliances:					
Automobiles	$6,163,200	$8,201,700	$12,778,200	$21,979,000	28.6
Refrigerators (mechanical)	793,625	1,055,950	1,645,175	2,829,925	3.7
Washing machines	433,160	576,420	897,910	1,544,530	2.0
Stoves	341,460	454,410	707,940	1,217,790	1.6
Vacuum cleaners	208,200	277,125	431,700	742,575	1.0
Radios	341,149	453,960	707,130	1,216,477	1.6
Sewing machines	83,280	110,820	172,680	297,000	.4
Electric irons	26,840	35,710	55,640	95,710	.1
Electric kitchen mixers	20,360	27,100	42,200	72,600	.1
Total automobiles and appliances	8,411,274	11,193,195	17,438,575	29,995,607	39.1
Furniture and house furnishings:					
Living room	649,620	864,540	1,346,760	2,316,780	3.0
Dining room	340,025	452,550	705,075	1,212,750	1.6
Bed room	499,800	665,100	1,036,050	1,782,150	2.3
Rugs, carpets	319,275	424,875	661,875	1,138,575	1.5
Linoleum	68,292	90,882	141,588	243,558	.3
Total, furniture and house furnishings	1,877,012	2,497,947	3,891,348	6,693,813	8.7

Expenditures to be made for post-war needs within 6 months after the close of the war— Continued

	Portland	Portland metropolitan area	Portland retail-trade area	Oregon	Percentage of total purchases
Buy or build home:					
$2,000 value	$1,772,000	$2,356,000	$3,674,000	$6,316,000	8.2
$4,000 value	2,792,000	3,712,000	5,788,000	9,944,000	12.9
$7,500 value	4,830,000	6,427,500	10,020,000	17,212,500	22.4
$10,000 value	1,890,000	2,500,000	3,900,000	6,690,000	8.7
Total buy or build	11,284,000	14,995,500	23,382,000	40,162,500	52.2
Total purchases	21,572,286	28,686,642	44,711,923	76,851,920	100.0
Per family	233.10	232.93	233.05	232.86	

AUTOMOBILES: UNIT COST $900—FAMILIES INTENDING TO PURCHASE, 7.4 PERCENT

	Total families	Percentage intending to purchase	Number intending to purchase	Unit price	Proposed expenditure
City of Portland	92,544	7.4	[illegible],848	$900	$6,163,200
Portland metropolitan area	123,154	7.4	9,113	900	8,201,700
Portland retail trade area	191,851	7.4	14,198	900	12,778,200
State of Oregon	330,021	7.4	24,422	900	21,979,800

MECHANICAL REFRIGERATORS: UNIT COST $175—FAMILIES INTENDING TO PURCHASE, 4.9 PERCENT

	Total families	Percentage intending to purchase	Number intending to purchase	Unit price	Proposed expenditure
City of Portland	92,544	4.9	4,535	$175	$793,625
Portland metropolitan area	123,154	4.9	6,034	175	1,055,950
Portland retail trade area	191,851	4.9	9,401	175	1,645,175
State of Oregon	330,021	4.9	16,171	175	2,829,925

WASHING MACHINES: UNIT COST $130—FAMILIES INTENDING TO PURCHASE, 3.6 PERCENT

	Total families	Percentage intending to purchase	Number intending to purchase	Unit price	Proposed expenditure
City of Portland	92,544	3.6	3,332	$130	$433,160
Portland metropolitan area	123,154	3.6	4,434	130	576,420
Portland retail trade area	191,851	3.6	6,907	130	897,910
State of Oregon	330,021	3.6	11,881	130	1,544,530

STOVES: UNIT COST $90—FAMILIES INTENDING TO PURCHASE, 4.1 PERCENT

	Total families	Percentage intending to purchase	Number intending to purchase	Unit price	Proposed expenditure
City of Portland	92,544	4.1	3,794	$90	$341,460
Portland metropolitan area	123,154	4.1	5,049	90	454,410
Portland retail trade area	191,851	4.1	7,866	90	707,940
State of Oregon	330,021	4.1	13,531	90	1,217,790

VACUUM CLEANERS: UNIT COST $75—FAMILIES INTENDING TO PURCHASE, 3 PERCENT

	Total families	Percentage intending to purchase	Number intending to purchase	Unit price	Proposed expenditure
City of Portland	92,544	3.0	2,776	$75	$208,200
Portland metropolitan area	123,154	3.0	3,695	75	277,125
Portland retail trade area	191,851	3.0	5,756	75	431,700
State of Oregon	330,021	3.0	9,901	75	742,575

RADIOS: UNIT COST $97—FAMILIES INTENDING TO PURCHASE, 3.8 PERCENT

	Total families	Percentage intending to purchase	Number intending to purchase	Unit price	Proposed expenditure
City of Portland	92,544	3.8	3,517	$97	$341,149
Portland metropolitan area	123,154	3.8	4,680	97	453,960
Portland retail trade area	191,851	3.8	7,290	97	707,130
State of Oregon	330,021	3.8	12,541	97	1,216,477

SEWING MACHINES: UNIT COST $60—FAMILIES INTENDING TO PURCHASE, 1.5 PERCENT

	Total families	Percentage intending to purchase	Number intending to purchase	Unit price	Proposed expenditure
City of Portland	92,544	1.5	1,388	$60	$83,280
Portland metropolitan area	123,154	1.5	1,847	60	110,820
Portland retail trade area	191,851	1.5	2,878	60	172,680
State of Oregon	330,021	1.5	4,950	60	297,000

ELECTRIC IRONS: UNIT COST $10—FAMILIES INTENDING TO PURCHASE, 2.9 PERCENT

	Total families	Percentage intending to purchase	Number intending to purchase	Unit price	Proposed expenditure
City of Portland	92,544	2.9	2,684	$10	$26,840
Portland metropolitan area	123,154	2.9	3,571	10	35,710
Portland retail trade area	191,851	2.9	5,564	10	55,640
State of Oregon	330,021	2.9	9,571	10	95,710

ELECTRIC KITCHEN MIXERS: UNIT COST $20—FAMILIES INTENDING TO PURCHASE, 1.1 PERCENT

	Total families	Percentage intending to purchase	Number intending to purchase	Unit price	Proposed expenditure
City of Portland	92,544	1.1	1,018	$20	$20,360
Portland metropolitan area	123,154	1.1	1,355	20	27,100
Portland retail trade area	191,851	1.1	2,110	20	42,200
State of Oregon	330,021	1.1	3,630	20	72,600

LIVING-ROOM FURNITURE: UNIT COST $180—FAMILIES INTENDING TO PURCHASE, 3.9 PERCENT

	Total families	Percentage intending to purchase	Number intending to purchase	Unit price	Proposed expenditure
City of Portland	92,544	3.9	3,609	$180	$649,620
Portland metropolitan area	123,154	3.9	4,803	180	864,540
Portland retail-trade area	191,851	3.9	7,482	180	1,346,760
State of Oregon	330,021	3.9	12,871	180	2,316,780

DINING-ROOM FURNITURE: UNIT COST $175—FAMILIES INTENDING TO PURCHASE, 2.1 PERCENT

	Total families	Percentage intending to purchase	Number intending to purchase	Unit price	Proposed expenditure
City of Portland	92,544	2.1	1,943	$175	$340,025
Portland metropolitan area	123,154	2.1	2,586	175	452,550
Portland retail-trade area	191,851	2.1	4,029	175	705,075
State of Oregon	330,021	2.1	6,930	175	1,212,750

BEDROOM FURNITURE: UNIT COST $150—FAMILIES INTENDING TO PURCHASE, 3.6 PERCENT

	Total families	Percentage intending to purchase	Number intending to purchase	Unit price	Proposed expenditure
City of Portland	92,544	3.6	3,332	$150	$499,800
Portland metropolitan area	123,154	3.6	4,434	150	665,100
Portland retail-trade area	191,851	3.6	6,907	150	1,036,050
State of Oregon	330,021	3.6	11,881	150	1,782,150

RUGS AND CARPETS: UNIT COST $75—FAMILIES INTENDING TO PURCHASE, 4.6 PERCENT

	Total families	Percentage intending to purchase	Number intending to purchase	Unit price	Proposed expenditure
City of Portland	92,544	4.6	4,257	$75	$319,275
Portland metropolitan area	123,154	4.6	5,665	75	424,875
Portland retail-trade area	191,851	4.6	8,825	75	661,875
State of Oregon	330,021	4.6	15,181	75	1,138,575

LINOLEUM: UNIT PRICE $18—FAMILIES INTENDING TO PURCHASE, 4.1 PERCENT

	Total families	Percentage intending to purchase	Number intending to purchase	Unit price	Proposed expenditure
City of Portland	92,544	4.1	3,794	$18	$68,292
Portland metropolitan area	123,154	4.1	5,049	18	90,882
Portland retail-trade area	191,851	4.1	7,866	18	141,588
State of Oregon	330,021	4.1	13,531	18	243,558

TO BUILD OR BUY NEW HOME WITHIN 6 MONTHS AFTER CLOSE OF WAR, 2.9 PERCENT

	Total families	Percentage will build or buy	Number will build or buy
City of Portland	92,544	2.9	2,684
Portland metropolitan area	123,154	2.9	3,571
Portland retail-trade area	191,851	2.9	5,566
State of Oregon	330,021	2.9	9,571

TO BUILD OR BUY NEW HOME WITHIN 6 MONTHS AFTER CLOSE OF WAR, AVERAGE COST $2,000

	Total families	Number that will buy or build	Percentage paying $2,000	Number paying $2,000	Proposed expenditure at $2,000 per unit
City of Portland	92,544	2,684	33	886	$1,772,000
Portland metropolitan area	123,154	3,571	33	1,178	,356,000
Portland retail trade area	191,851	5,566	33	1,837	3,674,000
State of Oregon	330,021	9,561	33	3,158	6,316,000

TO BUILD OR BUY NEW HOME WITHIN 6 MONTHS AFTER CLOSE OF WAR, AVERAGE COST $4,000

	Total families	Number that will buy or build	Percentage paying $4,000	Number paying $4,000	Proposed expenditure at $4,000 per unit
City of Portland	92,544	2,684	26	698	$2,792,000
Portlant metropolitan area	123,154	3,571	26	928	3,712,000
Portland retail trade area	191,851	5,566	26	1,447	5,788,000
State of Oregon	330,021	9,561	26	2,486	9,944,000

TO BUILD OR BUY NEW HOME WITHIN 6 MONTHS AFTER CLOSE OF WAR, AVERAGE COST $7 500

	Total families	Number that will buy or buil	Percentage paying $7,500	Number paying $7,500	Proposed expenditure at $7,500 per unit
City of Portland	94,544	2,684	24	644	$4,830,000
Portland metropolitan area	123,154	3,571	24	857	6,427,500
Portland retail trade area	191,851	5,566	24	1,336	10,020,000
State of Oregon	330,021	9,561	24	2,295	17,212,500

TO BUILD OR BUY NEW HOMES WITHIN 6 MONTHS AFTER CLOSE OF WAR, AVERAGE COST $10,000

	Total families	Number that will buy or build	Percentage paying $10,000	Number paying $10,000	Proposed expenditure at $10,000
City of Portland	94,544	2,684	7	189	$1,890,000
Portland metropolitan area	123,154	3,571	7	250	2,500,000
Portland retail trade area	191,851	5,566	7	390	3,900,000
State of Oregon	330,021	9,561	7	669	6,690,000

10 percent of total families planning to **buy or** build are not certain how much they will spend.

TO BUILD OR BUY NEW HOMES WITHIN 6 MONTHS AFTER CLOSE OF WAR AT AVERAGE COST OF $2,000 TO $10,000

	Total families	Number that will buy or build	Percentage paying $2,000 to $10,000	Percentage uncertain as to expenditure	Proposed expenditure indicated by 90 percent of families
City of Portland	94, 544	2, 684	90	10	$11, 284, 000
Portland metropolitan area	123, 154	3, 571	90	10	14, 995, 500
Port'and retail trade area	191, 851	5, 566	90	10	23, 382, 000
State of Oregon	330, 021	9, 561	90	10	40, 162, 500

WILL MAKE HOME IMPROVEMENTS AND REPAIRS WITHIN 6 MONTHS AFTER CLOSE OF WAR, 34 PERCENT

	Total families	Percentage that will improve or repair	Number that will improve or repair
City of Portland	92, 544	34	31, 465
Portland metropolitan area	123, 154	34	41, 872
Portland retail trade area	191, 851	34	65, 229
State of Oregon	330, 021	34	112, 207

TO PAINT HOUSES OUTSIDE WITHIN 6 MONTHS AFTER CLOSE OF WAR, 16.7 PERCENT

	Total families	Number that will improve or repair	Will paint	Number that will paint
City of Portland	92, 544	31, 465	16. 7	15, 455
Portland metropolitan area	123, 154	41, 872	16. 7	20, 567
Portland retail trade area	191, 851	65, 229	16. 7	32, 039
State of Oregon	330, 021	112, 207	16. 7	55, 114

TO PUT ON NEW ROOFING WITHIN 6 MONTHS AFTER CLOSE OF WAR, 7.2 PERCENT

	Total families	Number that will improve or repair	Will roof	Number that will roof
City of Portland	92, 544	31, 465	7. 2	6, 663
Portland metropolitan area	123, 154	41, 872	7. 2	8, 867
Portland retail trade area	191, 851	65, 229	7. 2	13, 813
State of Oregon	330, 021	112, 207	7. 2	23, 762

TO DECORATE INTERIOR WITHIN 6 MONTHS AFTER CLOSE OF WAR, 6.5 PERCENT

	Total families	Number that will improve or repair	Will decorate	Number that will decorate
City of Portland	92, 544	31, 465	6. 5	6, 015
Portland metropolitan area	123, 154	41, 872	6. 5	8, 005
Portland retail trade area	191, 851	65, 229	6. 5	12, 470
State of Oregon	330, 021	112, 207	6. 5	21, 451

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, was the unanimous consent request that the gentleman from Texas have 5 minutes to address the House granted?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes; immediately after disposition of special orders heretofore pending.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did the Chair recognize the gentleman to make a point of order that a quorum is not present?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair may say that the point of order that a quorum is not present is a constitutional right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, another parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, does that constitutional right to make a point of order that a quorum is not present take precedence over the constitutional right of free speech?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman raises a very interesting question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, another parliamentary inquiry, May I state it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will be glad to have the gentleman state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I understand there is a "gentleman's agreement" that there would not be a point of no quorum today and tomorrow. Am I in error?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is hopeful that the gentleman from Tennessee will withdraw his request.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I insist upon my point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently a quorum is not present.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 21, 1943, at 12 o'clock p. m.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 390. Resolution providing additional funds for the employment of necessary help in the disbursing office and additional compensation to the disbursing clerk so long as the position is held by the present encumbent; without amendment (Rept. No. 977). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. House Joint Resolution 182. Joint resolution to create the War Shipping Field Service; with amendment (Rept. No. 978). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1569. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act creating the circuit court of appeals in regard to fees and costs, and for other purposes," approved February 19, 1897 (29 Stat. 536; 28 U. S. C. 543); with amendment (Rept. No. 979). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1623. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide fees to be charged by clerks of the district courts of the United States," approved February 11, 1925 (43 Stat. 857), as amended (28 U. S. C., secs. 548–555); with amendment (Rept. No. 980). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 3884. A bill to repeal section 2 of the act entitled "An act for the preservation of American antiquities"; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 3885. A bill to provide for payment of mustering-out pay to members of the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3886. A bill to permit individuals to deduct for income-tax purposes from gross income the depreciation on their residences; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 3887. A bill for the relief of Georgios M. Tsarouchas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3888. A bill for the relief of Dennis H. Sullivan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 3889. A bill for the relief of Joseph C. Fochs; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GIFFORD:

H. R. 3890. A bill for the relief of Katherine Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4152. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of T. M. Tuerffs, commander, and K. W. Schwarm, adjutant, of Fairmont Post, No. 17, American Legion, Fairmont, W. Va., urging that legislation be enacted providing for mustering-out pay, clothing, and hospitalization facilities for discharged servicemen immediately upon their return to civilian life; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4153. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the City Council of Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to discharged soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, December 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we thank Thee that as the time draws near the birth of Christ and bells of hope answer each other through the mist, casting aside all cynicism which the gray years may have brought, we join the radiant company of the world's dreamers whose eyes are on future days when the world will fill up with men of good will. We live in a black world—black sky, blackened earth, black deeds—but at Christmas we are dreaming of a white tomorrow.

We think gratefully of those who in spite of the stare of the wise and the world's scorn have been true to the vision of a better day, a finer order, a cleaner and a kinder world. We thank Thee for prophetic souls who painted it and preached it until the crowd has said, "Let us go and see this strange thing that has come to pass." Set our feet in that great succession. As dreamers may we never barter what is over our heads for what is under our feet. Keep our hearts brave and believing, pioneers of that coming yet distant time when men shall lay aside their weapons, when lust shall be refined into love and greed into goodness. Make us citizens of the New Jerusalem, mankind's true country, coming down out of heaven from God himself. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Saturday, December 18, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The VICE PRESIDENT announced his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1169) for the relief of Samuel Margolin, which had been signed previously by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 18th instant,

The Secretary of the Senate received the following message from the House of Representatives on December 20, 1943:

That the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 105) fixing the date of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress;

That the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1616) to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended; and

That the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) providing for final adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

THE BARI BLOW

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I approach this subject with some trepidation because I believe that every man at his post—field, ship, or sky—is doing his level best; but what has happened at Bari makes it apparent to those of us who are not privileged actually to take arms but who are on the home front doing what we can to bring this conflict to a successful conclusion, that a momentary relaxation can produce a terrible disaster. My thought is that the commanding officers in all the departments should renew what must have been original orders, that for every moment in the 24 hours, the eye, the ear, and the senses must be kept attuned to the approach of the enemy. Any momentary laxity may bring catastrophe; and I ask, in this unceremonious way, that a further word be given that the commanding officers insist upon eternal vigilance, the price of liberty, and which must not be forsaken even for a fraction of time.

Mr. President, in connection with my remarks I ask that there may be printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Bari Blow," published in the Washington Star of December 18, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BARI BLOW

The story of what happened on December 2 in the Italian port of Bari is a grim reminder that we are up against an enemy whose sting is still deadly and whose resourcefulness demands of our Allied forces the fullest possible degree of vigilance at all hours of the day and night. At dawn, within the space of a few minutes, some thirty Nazi bombers sank 17 United Nations merchant ships and killed or injured about 1,000 individuals. The raiders came in very low and very fast—in much the same way as our own planes have often attacked—and they were able to complete their mission almost before our side knew what it was that had struck.

The blow must be marked down as an Allied defeat serious enough to have impeded the Eighth Army's operation for 2 or 3 days. Apparently the Nazis themselves did not realize how damaging was the job they had done, for in their communiqué originally reporting it, they made only relatively modest claims. The story just revealed by Secretary Stimson must therefore please them quite as much as it should sober us. Until yesterday, presumably for reasons of security, we had been told merely that Bari had been raided. Now we know the real magnitude of the attack, and although it is not clear whether our Allied forces were off the alert, something seems to have been lacking somewhere. The deficiency, whatever it may have been, whether a shortage of fighter planes or an inadequate warning system, has probably been taken care of by now. The enemy, at any rate, obviously still packs too much of a punch to warrant anything less than full Allied preparedness everywhere.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

JOSEPH LUKE LYDON: RECONSIDERATION OF SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION

A letter from the Attorney General, relating to the case for suspension of deportation of the alien, Joseph Luke Lydon, stating that new evidence had been presented requiring that the matter be given further consideration, and requesting that the case be withdrawn from Congress and stricken from the list of deportation cases submitted for suspension; to the Committee on Immigration.

LAND ACQUISITION FOR SHIP REPAIR FACILITIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy reporting, in accordance with Public Law 1, Seventy-eighth Congress, chapter 1, first session, that no acquisition of land by lease or otherwise for ship repair facilities, has been effected pursuant to the above-mentioned statute; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORT ON FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Report on Forest Roads and Trails for the fiscal year 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—PROGRESS REPORT (S. DOC. NO. 140)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from Senator BYRD, chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, transmitting, pursuant to law, an additional report of the joint committee, being a progress report, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask that the report just laid before the Senate by the Vice President and ordered printed, also be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report is as follows:

DECEMBER 21, 1943.

PROGRESS REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES; THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE; THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Pursuant to title 6 of the Revenue Act of 1941 (Public Law 250, 77th Cong.), approved September 20, 1941, the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures was established in order to "make a full and complete study and investigation of all expenditures of the Federal Government, with a view to recommending the elimination or reduction of all such expenditures deemed by the committee to be nonessential, and to report to the President and to the Congress the results of its study, together with its recommendation."

ACCOMPLISHMENTS: OVER $[illegible]00,000,000 SAVED

On December 24, 1941, prior to the President's Budget message to Congress, the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures rendered a preliminary report to the President of the United States and to the Congress, in which reductions in

12 items, nonessential to the war effort, were recommended.

On July 25, 1942, the committee rendered a supplemental report to the President and to the Congress, in which it itemized the savings effected and indicated that further even greater savings might be made in purchasing, salaries, transportation, publicity, and overhead. Other economies in most, if not all, Government departments were suggested. During the committee's existence it has operated on an annual budget of about $10,000.

The committee has issued 11 reports:

1. Preliminary (S. Doc. 152, pt. 1, 77th Cong.).
2. Supplemental (S. Doc. 152, pt. 2, 77th Cong.).
3. Questionnaires required of the public (S. Doc. 4, 78th Cong.).
4. Federally owned passenger automobiles (S. Doc. 5, 78th Cong.).
5. Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation (S. Doc. 20, 78th Cong.).
6. Home Owners' Loan Corporation (S. Doc. 48, 78th Cong.)
7. National Youth Administration (S. Doc. 54, pts. 1 and 2, 78th Cong.).
8. Federal travel and communication expenses (S. Doc. 57, 78th Cong.).
9. Reduction of Federal personnel (S. Doc. 66, 78th Cong.).
10. Federal ownership of real estate (S. Doc. 130, 78th Cong.).
11. Federal personnel (additional report) (S. Doc. 131, 78th Cong.).

In each instance recommendations were made to the President and to the Congress of the United States which, when carried out, would effect substantial economies. But in concentrating on the curtailment of overhead expenditures the committee has made every effort to accomplish this saving in such a way as to contribute to the war effort rather than to interfere with it.

Results have been gratifying in some respects. In all, a total savings of over $2,000,000,000 were effected in items which the committee recommended be curtailed. Three depression-born agencies—the Civilian Conservation Corps, the Work Projects Administration, and the National Youth Administration—are being, or have been, liquidated following recommendations of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. These alone total savings of over $1,000,000,000 annually.

A detailed break-down of savings accomplished, following committee recommendations, is as follows:

SAVINGS, FISCAL YEAR 1943

1. Congress followed the committee's recommendation that the Civilian Conservation Corps be abolished. Savings, $238,960,000.

2. The committee recommended the abolition of all nondefense activities of the National Youth Administration. Congress eliminated a major portion of the National Youth Administration's nondefense program. Savings, $83,767,000.

3. The committee recommended drastic reduction of the Work Projects Administration's activities, which Congress accepted. Savings, $540,000,000.

4. The committee recommended deferment of land purchases, reduction of overhead costs, and curtailment of nondefense activities in the Department of Agriculture. Congress reduced the appropriation of the Department of Agriculture. Savings, $195,731,208.

5. The committee recommended that the farm-tenant program be abolished. Congress reduced this appropriation. Savings, $2,270,000.

6. The committee recommended that the Farm Security Administration be abolished. Congress reduced the administrative expenses for the Farm Security Administration. Savings, $26,180,000.

7. The committee recommended a 50-percent deferment of expenditures for Federal highway projects. Congress reduced appropriations for this function by about one-third. Savings, $50,300,000.

8. Congress followed the committee's recommendation that nondefense public building construction be deferred. Savings, $33,148,000.

9. Congress limited appropriations to the Interior Department for nonessential public work projects to projects already under construction. This followed committee recommendations. Savings, $56,985,000.

10. The committee recommended cancelation of loan authorizations for farm-tenant programs. Congress reduced the amount authorized to be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this program. Savings, $17,500,000.

11. The committee recommended cancelation of loan authorizations for the Farm Security Administration. Congress reduced the authorization for the Farm Security Administration to borrow from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Savings, $22,500,000.

12. The committee recommended that the nondefense Rural Electrification expansion program be deferred. Congress reduced the loan authorization of the Rural Electrification Administration to borrow from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Savings, $90,000,000.

13. The committee recommended the abolition of the National Youth Administration. Congress accepted this recommendation. Savings, $56,744,000.

14. The committee urged the complete liquidation of the Work Projects Administration's activities, which recommendation was accepted by Congress and the unexpended appropriation was returned to the Treasury. Savings, $106,168,499.

15. The committee recommended that publicity in the Federal Government be curtailed. Congress reduced the appropriation of the domestic operations branch of the Office of War Information. Savings, $5,811,199.

16. The committee recommended that overlapping and duplicating functions of the Federal Government be eliminated. Congress reduced the appropriation for the National Resources Planning Board. Savings, $937,922.

17. The committee recommended that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation be liquidated. Congress reduced the authorization for administrative expenses. Savings, $1,857,800.

18. The committee continued to recommend that reclamation projects not connected with the war program be deferred. Congress reduced appropriations for these reclamation projects. Savings, $52,719,470.

19. The committee continued to recommend that work on rivers and harbors be deferred. Congress further reduced appropriations for these projects. Savings, $181,894,100.

20. The committee recommended that the Farm Security Administration be abolished. Congress reduced appropriations for administrative expenses. Savings, $18,022,142.

21. The committee recommended that the farm-tenant program be abolished. Congress reduced appropriations for administrative expenses. Savings, $298,930.

22. The committee recommended the immediate liquidation of resettlement projects. Congress reduced the appropriation for administrative expenses. Savings, $78,961.

23. The committee recommended cancelation of loan authorization for the Farm Security Administration from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Congress reduced the amount available for loan authorization from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Savings, $37,500,000.

24. The committee recommended cancelation of loan authorization for farm-tenant programs. Congress reduced the amount available for loan authorizations from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Savings, $2,500,000.

25. The committee continued to recommend over-all reductions in Federal personnel. Reductions, totaling 134,395, have been accomplished by act of Congress, through the application of the Byrd-Langer amendment to the overtime-pay law, and through voluntary action of various agencies. Savings, $295,669,000.[1]

Total savings, $2,117,543,231.

Many of the savings of the committee cannot be indicated exactly. For example, in addition to the stated reductions in Federal personnel, sharp curtailment in recruiting in certain agencies has been noted, occasioned, no doubt, by means of congressional action inaugurated by the Byrd-Langer amendment to the Overtime Pay Act, by the reports and recommendations of the committee, and by the activities of the House Civil Service Committee. Consequently, although hundreds of thousands of unnecessary Federal employees are still kept from more valuable war work by reason of their needless and duplicating activities, thousands of man-hours and considerable money have been saved already by restraining employment.

Similarly, since the committee's investigations and reports to Congress, the flood of questionnaires, reports, and forms required of the public by Federal agencies, threatening for a time the continued progress in the war effort, has been sharply reduced.

Other savings, difficult to estimate in extent, have been, or are being, effected. The committee has sponsored a new personnel reporting system in the Federal Government which, when carried out, will bring about an estimated savings of $10,000,000 in personnel reporting to the Civil Service Commission. Such a system, in addition to saving manpower and money in eliminating certain overlapping features of reporting requirements now in use, will provide detailed information on occupations and geographical distribution of employees never before obtainable. It is hoped that this system will remove the present confusion resulting from recent changes in reporting procedure installed by the Civil Service Commission.

The question of the disposition, use, and sale of waste paper from the Federal establishment is being studied by the committee, which hopes to make early recommendations to eliminate the misuse of this no longer small item. Steps are being taken to curtail the irresponsible use of Federally owned passenger automobiles and trucks and its resultant waste of manpower, gasoline, and rubber. Travel and communication expenses of executive agencies have been brought to the eyes of the Appropriations Committees of the Congress and further reductions may be expected. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation is at present in the process of gradual liquidation. The question of Federal purchase of large tracts of land is being studied and recommendations will be made which will attempt to promote savings to the Nation and to the several States.

In addition, the committee has provided numerous legislative and executive groups with information and advice pertinent to the savings of expenditures. The House of Representatives Civil Service Investigating Committee has secured from the Federal departments and agencies copies of the monthly personnel report regularly sent to the Joint

[1] Excludes estimated salaries of employees reduced from agencies cited above for fiscal year 1943.

Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. Moreover, the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, the Labor Department, the Department of Commerce, the House Special Committee on Draft Deferments, the House of Representatives Select Committee to Investigate Acts of Executive Agencies Beyond the Scope of Their Authority, the House of Representatives Special Committee to Investigate the Farm Security Administration, as well as numerous individual Members of Congress, have availed themselves of the committee's investigations, statistics, and personnel.

FUTURE PROGRAM

In July 1942 the committee stated that the economy surface has merely been scratched. What has been accomplished is considerable. What remains to be done is still greater. On the basis of information received by the committee, a gigantic task faces it in the coming year.

In general, the committee will continue its investigations as outlined in the preliminary report (S. Doc. 152, pt. 1, 77th Cong.). That is to say, it will continue to examine all Federal expenditures, particularly military expenditures, to determine where reductions can be made. It will probe more deeply into the activities of Federal departments for examples of duplication of functions. The committee will examine purchasing, classification, salaries, transportation, publicity, and other items of expense to determine where further economies may be made. It will also continue to make recommendations to eliminate waste and inefficiency in administration of war and nonwar activities.

Specifically, in the future, the committee intends to investigate and make recommendations on the following subjects:

1. The committee will investigate the large appropriations for the continuance of normal peacetime and nonwar activities, which have been placed in the category of war activities.

2. Investigations will continue regarding the unexpended balances of the War and Navy Departments, the Maritime Commission, and the War Shipping Administration, as well as those amounts which are now obligated on a contractual basis, with a view toward returning portions of these large balances to the United States Treasury.

As shown by the following table the unexpended appropriations of these departments and agencies totaled $186,000,000,000 in September 1943, of which $92,000,000,000 are unobligated balances of unexpired appropriations which means they do not have any orders placed, contracts awarded, services received, or any other transaction charged against these funds, and they are available for expenditures.

	Unexpended balances
War Department	$118,909,963,187
Navy Department	58,609,475,565
War Shipping Administration	2,590,350,007
U. S. Maritime Commission	6,675,595,038
Total	186,785,383,797

The committee will urge an investigation of these huge unobligated balances by the Appropriations Committee to determine whether additional appropriations will be needed until such time as all the outstanding unobligated balances have been encumbered.

3. The committee will continue its investigation of nonessential personnel in the hope of eliminating 400,000 or more nonessential employees from the June 1943 peak of 3,095,463 paid Federal civilian employees. The committee believes that there is a great opportunity, particularly in the war agencies, to reduce administrative expenses which, if effected, will strengthen these agencies. Duplication of function and overlapping of personnel must be eliminated. Indiscriminate hiring where it exists must cease. Hearings will continue to be held to determine where needless personnel may be eliminated.

4. The committee will continue to examine Government-owned corporations to ascertain whether present loan policies, in the light of added budgetary commitments and changes, are still advisable.

5. Continued efforts will be made to reduce needless travel and communication expenses. A Federal automobile pool, together with a strict accounting of automobile use, has been recommended in the hope of further savings in critical materials and money.

6. Certain duplicating and useless functions of agencies within the Department of Agriculture, notably the separate functioning of some 20 agricultural lending agencies and allied groups, will be brought to the attention of Congress again in the hope that these will be consolidated.

7. All new adventures and commitments in public works and similar costly governmental programs which may be undertaken will be carefully watched. The committee will particularly scrutinize the practice of creating agencies to handle some new phase of the war work where it is possible for an existing agency to assume this function.

8. The failure of the Civil Service Commission to execute a sufficiently intensive Federal manpower-utilization program which function was delegated to it by the War Manpower Commission will continue to engage the attention of the committee.

9. The inequitable promotion policies of the various agencies involving skip-grade promotions and violations of the Classification Act of 1923 will be studied further and recommendations will be made.

10. As directed by Congress, the committee intends to investigate the penalty mail privilege exercised by the various establishments to determine whether excessive use is being made of this privilege and if economies may be effected.

THE NECESSITY FOR ECONOMY

The Federal Government must unfalteringly carry during this coming year the heaviest load ever imposed on any country. Total expenditures in the fiscal year June 30, 1943, were $78,182,348,641—more than double the expenditures for the previous year. Average monthly expenditures for war purposes alone were a little more than $6,000,000,000—well over $8,000,000 an hour; and we are told that these may be increased. The Federal debt which stood at $61,000,000,000 at the start of the war has risen to the unprecedented heights of about $170,000,000,000. For the first time in history this Nation must now speak of its debt in terms of 12 figures.

While it is true that our national income is increasing, yet our per capita debt has been quadrupled in 4 years. In 1938 the debt was $285; today it is $1,204. At the close of the last war it was $250 per capita. In more realistic terms, the present debt of each taxpayer in the country is about $3,500. The interest load on this public debt is in itself staggering, it being estimated that the interest on Government borrowing alone is $2,700,000,000 per year.

It is estimated that revenue from our present tax system will produce $41,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1944. Of this, only $7,000,000,000 comes from "pay-as-you-go" income taxes. The present deficit (for fiscal year 1944) will be $57,000,000,000.

Even today the country as a whole does not feel the full impact of this debt load, for the financial horizon gives no promise of early relief, but rather a greater burden in the future. There was a time when the Federal income tax was called a rich-man's tax; the masses believed that they would benefit and that the wealthy would pay the bill. Today all that has changed. From now on our Federal expenditures will be traced directly to tax burdens in the lower-income brackets, it being estimated that 50,000,000 people will now file income-tax returns. The Secretary of the Treasury must have had a similar idea in mind when he stated: "For the first time in our history the income tax is becoming a people's tax."

There can be no illusions as to this debt; for the welfare of the country it must and shall be paid. There are those economists who, advancing the "new philosophy of public debt," are brash enough to state that the debt need not be paid; that a gradually expanding public debt is healthful to a country with a "mature economy"; that continual pump priming is an economic necessity to the United States in the future. The committee sharply takes issue with such a philosophy, believing, as it does, that public confidence in the financial integrity of a country—the acknowledgment of its obligations—is necessary to the economic stability of that country. No nation may safely repudiate a debt and retain the confidence of its citizens. No nation which has lost the confidence of its citizens may remain a democracy.

One method of combating the latter is by elimination of nonessential expenditures. As can be seen from this report much has been done toward reducing nonessential expenditures, but much more remains to be done.

The committee believes it imperative that every effort be made to streamline the Federal Government, to reduce to a minimum all expenditures not implicity furthering the successful prosecution of the war. It is not enough that expenditures are curtailed in a few instances, nor is it sufficient that a handful of employees are transferred from one nonessential function to another nonessential function. Nor is it enough to combine one group of offices with another, merely to erect a new superstructure at their head. Rather the value of each employee, each office, and each dollar expended must be consciously weighed in its relation to the welfare of the people of the Nation. Agencies which have been built on years of depression must be abolished. The nonwar activities of those establishments not devoted entirely to war work must be curtailed. Bureaucratic policies which sap the Nation of both financial solidity and a surplus of manpower must be eliminated. Only in so doing may the Federal Government do its part in preparing for an economically sound post-war Nation.

Thus the committee feels that just as it is the patriotic duty of all citizens to reduce their spending to a minimum, so it is even more the patriotic duty of the Congress of the United States to curtail irreducibly all nonessential expenditures. That the people will hold this Congress strictly accountable for all wasteful or extravagant appropriations which divert sorely needed funds from the war effort is self-evident. Consequently it is hoped that Congress will continue to participate actively in this endeavor to provide a checkrein on runaway nonessential spending wherever it is found.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 17, 1943.*

HON. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Washington, D. C,

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: While the progress report of the committee includes much

that I endorse, I cannot sign it in its present form.

I think there is no basis for asserting, as this report does, that "hundreds of thousands of unnecessary Federal employees are still kept from more valuable war work by reason of their needless and duplicating activities," or for implying that there are "400,000 or more nonessential employees."

If I were to sign this report, I would be in the position of predetermining judgments about Federal personnel which I am required by law to make quarterly.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director.

RESOLUTIONS OF AGRICULTURAL COOPERATIVE COUNCIL OF OREGON

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I am in receipt of several resolutions which recently were adopted by the member organizations of the Agricultural Cooperative Council of Oregon. The resolutions contain real wisdom, in my opinion, and, for the benefit of the Congress and of the American people, I request unanimous consent to have them printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and appropriately referred. I also ask that following the resolutions the stated purposes and the membership roll of the Agricultural Cooperative Council of Oregon be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolutions will be received and appropriately referred, and the matter referred to by the Senator from Oregon will be printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

RESOLUTION NO. II: RELATING TO AGRICULTURE LABOR

Whereas in the opinion of all interested parties, the shortage of agricultural labor in 1944 unquestionably will become much more acute than was the case during the year closing; and

Whereas the Agricultural Extension Service ably and efficiently carried out the belatedly assigned duties of labor procurement to meet the critical situation existing in Oregon during the past harvest season; and

Whereas legislation is now pending in Congress for the purpose of extending the responsibility of the Agricultural Extension Service for procurement and placement of agricultural labor for 1944 and appropriating necessary moneys therefor: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Agricultural Cooperative Council of Oregon hereby record its position in favor of continued supervision by the Agricultural Extension Service of procurement and placement of agricultural labor, and urge the members of the Oregon Delegation to lend active support for immediate passage of appropriate legislation.

RESOLUTION NO. III: RELATING TO ANTI-COOPERATIVE ATTACK

Whereas there is being made a concerted attack upon farmers marketing and supply cooperatives, and upon Farm Credit Administration banks that assist in financing farmers and their business institutions; and

Whereas such attack, if successful, will jeopardize the stability of American agriculture and thereby affect adversely the Nation's supply of food and fiber; and

Whereas no nation can long continue in a healthful condition without a dependable supply of these essentials of human life: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Agricultural Cooperative Council of Oregon take such action as will most effectively safeguard the public interest.

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

RESOLUTION NO. I: RELATING TO FOOD SUBSIDIES

Whereas the administration's food-subsidy program, if continued, will lead the Nation down the road to economic chaos, with complete political control, scarcity, excessive debt, and disastrous inflation the ultimate outcome; and

Whereas America's grocery bill is now being subsidized to the extent of $800,000,000 a year on borrowed money, thus developing one of the greatest inflationary threats existing in the country today; and

Whereas every time a subsidy fails in its purported objective of keeping down the general price level additional inflationary pressure results; and

Whereas the American wage earner today is receiving nearly twice as much as in 1939, yet is spending only 20 percent of his income for food, the lowest percentage of such expenditure on record, is eating far better than he did in 1939, and if he were eating the same kind and quality of food he would be spending only 16 cents out of each dollar; and

Whereas America must operate on a pay-as-you-go basis for its current food bill, and since high-price subsidies which place the debt burden upon the men now fighting for freedom and upon their children can be no part of a pay-as-you-go policy: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Agricultural Cooperative Council of Oregon, That we urge our Senators and Congressmen to vigorously support the antisubsidy bill, and, in the event that the bill is passed and then vetoed by the President, we earnestly urge their support in overriding the veto.

The stated purposes and membership roll of the Agricultural Cooperative Council of Oregon, ordered to be printed in the RECORD on request of Mr. HOLMAN, are as follows:

The purposes of the Agricultural Cooperative Council of Oregon shall be as follows:

1. To promote the success of farmers' cooperative marketing and supply enterprises in Oregon.

2. To secure and maintain cooperation and coordination of effort among all agencies engaged in or supporting agricultural cooperation.

3. To foster a better understanding of cooperative principles and practices on the part of growers and the general public by educational methods and by cooperating with educational agencies and institutions in conducting such work.

4. To provide a representative body which may consider and pass upon the feasibility of proposed agricultural cooperative ventures which are of sufficient importance to affect the status of existing agricultural cooperatives and the future development of the movement within the State. Recommendations regarding such enterprises may be made by the council for the information of its members and the public.

5. To serve, upon the request of interested parties, as adviser or mediator in the settlement of any dispute or difficulty that may arise within an agricultural cooperative association or between agricultural cooperatives, when the dispute or difficulty is one involving cooperative principles or practices.

6. To consider existing laws and proposed legislation affecting agricultural cooperatives, for the purpose of supporting or opposing legislation as the need for such action arises, and otherwise to represent Oregon agricultural cooperatives in legislative matters.

7. To consider and deal with problems of finance, transportation, distribution, and other marketing functions or services of general interest to Oregon agricultural cooperatives.

8. To provide a contact point for all official, public, and private agencies which desire or need to confer with a group representing Oregon's agricultural cooperatives.

9. To secure and maintain public confidence in cooperative enterprises by the pursuit of a conservative course of action by the council and its members, at all times considering the rights and interests of both consumers and producers.

10. To perform other similar activities or to take part or in formulating and carrying out programs of cooperative work designed to benefit agriculture in general and cooperative associations in particular.

Apple Growers Association, Frank C. Dethman, president; J. E. Klahre, general manager, Hood River; Baker County Livestock Marketing Association, Inc., Roy Vanderwall, president, Haines, P. T. Fortner, secretary-treasurer, Baker; Blue Lake Producers Cooperative, J. L. Goss, president, O. E. Snider, manager, Salem; Central Oregon Cooperative Creamery, Marion Taylor, president, Marvin Davidson, manager, Redmond; Columbia Fruit Growers, H. C. Nielsen, president, W. R. Bailey, manager, The Dalles; Dairy Cooperative Association, L. Minoggie, president, W. W. Henry, manager, Portland; Division of Agricultural Economics, Oregon State College, E. L. Potter, chief, M. N. Nelson, Corvallis; Douglas County Farm Bureau Cooperative Exchange, D. N. Busenbark, president, C. E. Banning, manager, Roseburg; Douglas Prune Growers, D. N. Busenbark, president, M. F. Middelburg, manager, Roseburg; Dundee Fruit Growers & Packers, F. W. Meyer, president, John L. Meyer, manager, Dundee; Eugene Farmers Creamery, J. W. Maxwell, president, G. A. Harnden, secretary-manager, Eugene; Eugene Fruit Growers Association, Frank Harlow, director, E. A. McCornack, Eugene; Extension Service, Oregon State College, Paul Carpenter, extension economist, L. R. Breithaupt, extension economist, Corvallis; Farmers Cooperative Creamery, Herman Bernards, president, Carlton, George C. Johnson, manager, McMinnville; Farmers Gas & Supply Exchange, Willard Bliss, director, Portland, R. A. Tribou, manager-treasurer, Gresham; Farmers Union Cooperative Creamery, Clyde W. Smith, president, Amos Henton, secretary, Sheridan; Farmers Union Cooperative Warehouse, Glen DeHaven, president, C. A. Curry, manager, Dallas; Gresham Berry Growers, C. A. Becker, president, Boring, J. J. Fisher, manager, Gresham; Hood River Grange Supply Co., Chester Shute, president, Richard H. Wilcox, manager, Hood River; Interstate Associated Creameries, A. P. Ireland, vice president, Forest Grove, G. A. Brown, manager, Portland; Jackson County Cooperative, George H. Hiles, president, V. A. Turpin, secretary, Medford; Lower Columbia Cooperative Dairy Association, M. J. Johnson, president, C. W. Laughlin, manager,

Astoria; McMinnville Fruit Growers Cooperative Association, James W. Richardson, president, Dayton, Fred Muhs, vice president, McMinnville; Monmouth Cooperative Creamery & Warehouse, Chas. Bowman, president, E. W. Staats, vice president, Monmouth; Moro Grain Growers Association, Clarence Sparling, president, W. T. Balsiger, secretary-manager, Moro, Mount Angel Cooperative Creamery, R. J. Berning, president, Frank Hettwer, manager, Mount Angel; North Pacific Canners & Packers, Inc., Jos. J. Fisher, president, Gresham, J. W. Mayo, executive secretary, Portland; North Pacific Nut Growers' Cooperative, R. A. Duncan, director, Portland, A. C. Jacobson, general manager, Dundee; Oregon Farmers Union Cooperative Association, Chester Wohler, president, Hillsboro, Homer M. Smith, manager, Salem; Oregon Grange Wholesale, Inc., T. H. Fenton, field representative, W. J. Wilcox, manager, Portland; Oregon Nut Growers, Inc., W. J. Sullivan, president, John E. Trunk, manager, Newberg; Oregon Prune Exchange, H. Normandin, president, Forest Grove, John F. White, manager, Portland; Oregon State Farmers Union, Ammon Grice, president, Salem, Harley Libby, vice president, Jefferson; Oregon State Grange, Morton Tompkins, master, Dayton, Ray W. Gill, member executive committee, Portland; Oregon Turkey Cooperatives, Inc., O. C. Brown, president, Roseburg, J. J. Jendrzejewski, director, Hermiston; Oregon Turkey Growers, O. C. Brown, vice president, Jay Conn, secretary-manager, Roseburg; Pacific Cooperative Poultry Producers, Henry Erickson, president, Tigard, G. C. Keeney, manager, Portland; Pacific Supply Cooperative, R. W. Hogg, president, Salem, Charles Baker, secretary-manager, Walla Walla, Wash.; Pacific Wool Growers, R. L. Clark, president, North Portland, R. A. Ward, manager, Portland; Pendleton Grain Growers, Inc., Carl Engdahl, president, James Hill, Jr., manager, Pendleton; Polk County Farmers' Union Cooperative Oil Association, R. O. Dodson, president, Monmouth, R. W. Hogg, secretary-treasurer, Salem; Producers Cooperative Packing Co., Paul Wallace, president, W. H. Wood, manager, Salem; Salem Cooperative Prune Growers, J. W. Simmons, president, C. A. Ratcliff, secretary, Salem; Southern Oregon Sales, Inc., S. M. Tuttle, manager, V. A. Turpin, assistant secretary, Medford; Springbrook Cooperative Prune Growers, Victor E. Rees, president, Springbrook, Myron H. King, manager, Newberg; Springbrook Packing Co. Cooperative, Frank Carlisle, president, Victor E. Rees, manager, Springbrook; State Department of Agriculture, J. D. Mickle, director, Salem, W. E. Upshaw, Portland; Stayton Canning Co. Cooperative, Joe Schrewe, director, Sublimity, George A. Smith, manager, Stayton; The Dalles Cooperative Growers, Ray F. Kelly, president, H. G. Miller, manager, The Dalles; Tillamook County Creamery Association, Jos. Maxwell, president, Carl Haberlach, secretary, Tillamook; Twin City Oil & Gas Co., Andrew Millar, president, George F. Preas, manager, Milton; Union County Cooperative Creamery, James A. Kofford, director, Union, O. W. Howell, director, Imbler; Wallowa Livestock Marketing Association, Inc., Oscar Maxwell, president, Wallowa, E. L. Pratt, vice president, Enterprise; Willamette Cherry Growers, Inc., J. G. Hogg, president, Robert E. Shinn, secretary-manager, Salem; Woodburn Fruit Growers Cooperative Association, Chas. Sweaney, president, Earl Houseworth, manager, Woodburn.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC DURING THE WAR—PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present petitions for appropriate reference, and also to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a tabulation showing 662 petitioners, praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2032) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

California	98
Maryland	23
Minnesota	119
Nebraska	36
Pennsylvania	45
Texas	325
Wisconsin	16
Total	662

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. I also ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a tabulation showing 5,513 petitioners, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic beverages to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

California	67
Colorado	25
Delaware	520
Illinois	1,229
Iowa	124
Maine	95
Maryland	46
Minnesota	2,377
Nebraska	5
New York	66
Ohio	144
Oregon	267
Pennsylvania	211
Texas	337
Total	5,513

PRESERVATION OF SURVIVING JEWISH PEOPLE OF EUROPE—TELEGRAM TO SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram, numerously signed, addressed to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, proposing the creation of a special governmental commission to find ways and means to save the surviving Jewish people of Europe.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As Christians and as Americans, we urge the passage of the Senate resolution proposing the creation of a special governmental commission to find ways and means to save the surviving Jewish people of Europe.

As Christians, how can we do less? As Americans we recall our liberal traditions of the past.

Universally is it known that more than 2,000,000 European Jews have been slaughtered by the Nazis. There has been no surcease, no intermission. The living remnants of European Jewry are still being drawn and quartered with unabated ferocity. Therefore, we cannot approach Christmastide without declaring that too many of us have been found wanting in the will to rescue these suffering people. If the will be strong enough and the heart be stout enough, then efforts of rescue will be made and will succeed. If we remain feeble and complaisant, then death alone will have its way. Let no possible sanctuary be closed, whether in America or elsewhere. Let each door of refuge be opened and kept open. This is the Christian way.

Shall we forget that Christ's greatest passion is fatherly love for all men? Surely we can find nothing in His words and deeds that would exclude our Jewish brethren from His divine love and compassion. Surely was it never His wish that His own crucifixion should usher in countless others. And yet we Christians suffer by delay and inaction, the crucifixion of a whole people whom the Nazis have sworn to destroy root and branch.

Could the more than 2,000,000 Jewish dead speak from the grave, should they not with gestures exclaim: "Our pain has followed us into the tomb, for how can we rest when our living brethren suffer no less than we have suffered?"

This is why we as Christians and Americans urge the immediate adoption of the resolution.

Rt. Rev. William T. Manning, D. D., Bishop of New York, Protestant Episcopal Church; Archbishop Athenagoras, Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America; Dr. Henry Sloan Coffin, moderator of the General Assembly, Presbyterian Church, and president of Union Theological Seminary; Bishop William J. McConnell, resident bishop of Methodist Church; Rt. Rev. Thomas J. Heistand, Bishop of Harrisburg, Pa., Protestant Episcopal Church; Dr. Angus Dun, dean of Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary, Cambridge, Mass.; Dr. Russell Stafford, minister of Old South Church, Boston, Mass.

ADJUSTMENT OF MILK PRICES

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have in my hand a communication addressed to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], chairman, Senate Agricultural Committee, by the Natural Milk Producers' Association of San Gabriel, Calif.

I also have a petition addressed to the Senator from South Carolina signed by 1,819 individual milk consumers of the same vicinity, requesting an adjustment of the milk prices and expressing oppo-

sition to the roll-back subsidy program for milk.

I ask that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD. I do not ask to have the petition printed, but it will be available at the office of the Senator from South Carolina to anyone who desires to see it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 10, 1943.

Hon. ELLISON D. SMITH,
Chairman, Senate Agricultural Committee, Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: In view of the wholly misleading and unfair propaganda being used by the advocates of the administration's roll-back subsidy program, we have felt an expression of uncontrolled free individual consumer opinion on the milk phase of the question would be of service.

We transmit herewith a petition consisting of 85 sheets and bearing the signatures of some 1,819 individual consumers. This petition was prepared by us as a test of public opinion and given to 16 of our dairy farmers who as producer-distributors deal directly with their customers.

The matter was submitted to the latter without argument and without any high-pressure persuasion and thus these signatures represent the free expression of the signers' opinion. We feel such expression is infinitely more truthful than statements issued or made before committees by officers of various organizations who claim to speak for thousands of alleged members, not 1 in 100 of the rank and file having been consulted.

Please consider the petitions herewith submitted as preliminary only—many thousands more signatures will reach you in the next few days. However, those herewith, it will be noted, do represent an excellent cross section of southern California, not only the city of Los Angeles, but also such communities as Pasadena, Santa Monica, Venice, Burbank, Glendale, North Hollywood, Montebello, El Monte, Chino, Pomona, Upland, Ontario, San Bernardino, Bakersfield, etc.

Our experience convinces us the public is no more in favor of subsidies than is the farmer once the falsity of the proponents' statements are understood, and we also are convinced the public is most seriously alarmed over the dwindling supply of milk, and certainly willing to pay a price which covers the farmers increased cost of production.

Most truly yours,
NATURAL MILK PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
FRANK S. GLASS, *Assistant Secretary.*

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I also have two telegrams addressed to Hon. JOHN PHILLIPS, Member of Congress from California, one from the Ralphs Grocery Co., of Los Angeles, the other from the Homemakers Club, signed by Grace F. Glasser, of Los Angeles. These also request adjustment of producers' milk prices, and express opposition to the subsidy program. I ask that the telegrams be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *November 17, 1943.*

Hon. JOHN PHILLIPS,
Member Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Between October 8 and 14, 1943, our organization mailed to Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C., petitions asking for adjustment of producers' milk prices, and expressed willingness to pay proper increases. Approximately 50,000 consumers and, in addition, the Homemakers Club, advised us their members forwarded in similar petitions of 25,000 signatures to Office of Price Administration. We also estimate 25,000 additional petitions were mailed by individuals direct. We would request your bringing this knowledge of same to the attention of Congress.

Respectfully,
RALPHS GROCERY CO.,
By WALTER W. RALPHS, *Vice President.*

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *November 17, 1943.*

Hon. JOHN PHILLIPS,
Member Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

This is to advise you the Homemakers Club mailed to Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C., petitions containing over 25,000 signatures asking for adjustment of producers' milk prices, and expressed willingness to pay proper increases. We would respectfully request your bringing this knowledge of same to the attention of Congress.

THE HOMEMAKERS CLUB,
By GRACE F. GLASSER,
Los Angeles, Calif.

REPORTS OF FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 18th instant,

The following reports of the Committee on Foreign Relations were submitted on December 20, 1943:

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

H. R. 2924. A bill to give effect to the Provisional Fur Seal Agreement of 1942 between the United States of America and Canada; to protect the fur seals of the Pribilof Islands; and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 626).

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. Res. 100. Resolution favoring action looking to relief for starving peoples of Europe; without amendment (Rept. No. 624).

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. Res. 203. Resolution favoring the appointment of a commission to formulate a plan to save the Jews of Europe from extinction by Nazi Germany; with an amendment (Rept. No. 625).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 18th instant,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted on December 20, 1943:

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Hugh B. Cox, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Solicitor General of the United States, vice Oscar S. Cox, resigned;

Emil C. Peters, of Honolulu, to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, Territory of Hawaii. (Judge Peters is now serving in this post under an appointment which expired August 5, 1943);

Albert M. Cristy, of Honolulu, to be second judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii. (Judge Cristy is now serving in this post under appointment which expired August 5, 1943);

Willson C. Moore, of Hawaii, to be fourth judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Francis M. Brooks, term expired; and

Cable A. Wirtz, of Hawaii, to be Judge of the Second Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Daniel H. Case, term expired.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for Mr. CONNALLY), from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

David C. Berger, of Virginia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general;

William D. Moreland, Jr., of Oregon, now a Foreign Service office of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul;

Richard W. Byrd, of Virginia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul;

John Goodyear, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 8 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul; and

J. Brock Havron, of Tennessee, to be a Foreign Service officer, unclassified, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate were submitted:

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. Res. 136. Resolution increasing the limit of expenditures for the holding of hearings by the Committee on the Judiciary in respect to judicial nominations; without amendment; and

S. Res. 198. Resolution to investigate the matter of the termination of Government procurement contracts; with additional amendments.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CONDITIONS IN PUERTO RICO (REPT. NO. 628)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, I submit a report of that committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 26, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to economic and social conditions in Puerto Rico. I request that the report be printed, with illustrations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be printed, with illustrations.

EMPLOYERS' ASSOCIATIONS AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN CALIFORNIA (REPT. NO. 398, PTS. 2 AND 3)

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, on behalf of the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, pursuant to Senate Resolution 266, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, I submit parts VI and VIII of the report on Employers' Associations and Collective Bargaining in California.

Part VI is entitled "A Study of Labor Policies of Employers' Associations in the Los Angeles Area, 1935–39."

Part VII is entitled "A Study of Labor Policies of Employers' Associations in the San Francisco Bay Area, 1935–39."

I also ask unanimous consent that a brief collection of excerpts from parts VI and VII, constituting the introduction to and conclusions of these volumes be printed in the RECORD so that the Members of the Senate may have a readily available outline of the subject matter treated. These volumes are the sixth and seventh of a series of 10 parts based upon the committee's final field investigation into undue interferences with the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively.

The volume dealing with Los Angeles is particularly concerned with policies

and activities of the associations of industrial employers in the metropolitan area of Los Angeles which are either violative or perversive of the national labor policy as expressed in the National Labor Relations Act.

Part VII is concerned similarly with policies and activities of organizations of employers operating in the San Francisco Bay area, which are importantly related to the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively. It considers the apparent transition from antiunion employers' associations to organized employer coordination, based upon the professed acceptance of collective bargaining in that area. It explores the various devices of organized employer activity that were directed not only to a destruction of labor's rights but also the use of "pressure tactics" that renders those rights of dubious value even when recognized in collective agreements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and printed and the excerpts referred to by the Senator from Wisconsin will be printed in the RECORD.

The excerpts are as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REPORT ON EMPLOYERS' ASSOCIATIONS AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN CALIFORNIA

PART VI. A STUDY OF LABOR POLICIES OF EMPLOYERS' ASSOCIATIONS IN THE LOS ANGELES AREA, 1935–39

[Pursuant to S. Res. 266, 74th Cong.]

Introduction

Pursuant to the authority of Senate Resolution 266 (74th Cong., 2d sess.),[1] the committee herein submits to the Senate the sixth part of its report on employers' associations and collective bargaining in California. This volume is concerned particularly with policies and activities of associations of industrial employers in metropolitan Los Angeles which are either violative or perversive of the national labor policy as expressed in the National Labor Relations Act. As such, it deals with events during the period 1935–39, inclusive.[2]

Preliminary investigations were made by this committee in the winter months of 1938–39 and in the latter part of 1939. Public hearings were held in the city of Los Angeles from January 10 to and including January 24, 1940. Testimony taken during the 13 days of these public hearings related almost entirely to industrial labor relations in Los Angeles.[3] This part VI is an analysis of the testimony and exhibits introduced into the record during this period.[4] The entire report consists of the following parts:

Part I. General Introduction.

Part II. Organized Antiunionism in California Industry Prior to the Passage of the National Labor Relations Act.

Part III. The Disadvantaged Status of Unorganized Labor in California's Industrialized Agriculture.

Part IV. Employers' Associations and Their Labor Policies in California's Industrialized Agriculture.

Part V. The Organization of Resistance to Collective Bargaining in California, 1935–39.

Part VI. A Study of Labor Policies of Employers' Associations in the Los Angeles Area, 1935–39.

Part VII. A Study of Labor Policies of Employers' Associations in the San Francisco Bay Area, 1935–39.

Part VIII. The Associated Farmers of California, Inc.—Its Reorganization, Policies, and Significance, 1935–39.

Part IX. The Origin and Promotion of Recent Legislation in California Limiting Labor's Civil Rights.

Part X. Conclusions and Recommendations.

In part II there is a discussion of the historical background dealing with labor policies in Los Angeles before 1935 and the development and character of the employers' associations responsible for that policy.[5] In part V there is a broad analysis of these policies in comparison and contrast with the State-wide patterns of employer oppositions to collective bargaining.[6]

The city of Los Angeles has long been considered a stronghold of antiunion industry. Termed by the open-shop advocates as the "white spot"[7] of the Nation, this industrial center has frequently been held up as an example of an urban area that is traditionally nonunion and actively antiunion. As part II of the committee's report on California has indicated, this traditional labor policy was sponsored actively and supported effectively by leading industrial and financial groups long before the passage of the National Labor Relations Act. Such organizations as the Merchants and Manufacturers Association and the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce marshaled an imposing array of economic and political influence against any local application of an effective system of collective bargaining. The nature, personnel, leadership, and method of these organizations prior to 1935 were described in part II of this report. Their failure to respond favorably to the national policy established in the National Labor Relations Act in 1935 was accompanied by an organized and aggressive campaign of interference with the rights of labor.

In a city of the size and importance of Los Angeles, this conspiratorial pattern of malfeasance is a phenomenon which demands careful scrutiny. There are many industrial areas in other parts of the country which are known as open shop or nonunion centers where, as in Los Angeles, there is a phalanx of opposition to trade-unionism composed of employers, civic groups, and public officials supported by dominant banking and newspaper interests. In such an atmosphere, labor's civil rights cannot be properly exercised and the tyranny of local persecution and opposition to trade-unionism is intolerable. Proceedings against an individual employer for unfair labor practices under the National Labor Relations Act may not prove to be an effective measure of protection. When this opposition in the community is due to a lack of understanding or familiarity with labor relations, it may dissolve with the passage of time. But when this opposition to the exercise of the rights of employees to organize and bargain collectively is a pattern of organized interference, strong and precise measures of protection must be devised. Such opposition to the national labor policy, as has existed in the Los Angeles metropolitan area, can only result in a wholesale violation of labor's civil rights and in societal attitudes which are at variance with the spirit of industrial democracy.

Such areas are a haven for would-be exploiters and those who would preach radical political and economic doctrines. They are breeding grounds for strange nostrums. They are subject to a continuing unhealthy unbalance of economic power and position, often accompanied by occasional outbursts of class violence and a constant undercurrent of class hostility. They frequently provide a reason for the location of industry at substandard levels and thereby stimulate counteraction in other urban areas where real estate, banking, and service business are drawn into a circle of vicious competition. Where there are large tributary areas, a whole State or section of the State may be dominated by the attitudes of industrial autocracy that prevail in the urban center. National, State, or local policy and authority may be plunged into a conflict or into an inconsistent position that destroys respect for law on all sides. Such areas are likely to be vulnerable to the economic, social, and political evils that democracy must meet and vanquish if it is to survive. Our society has adjudged them not the white spots but the cancer areas. From this point of view, this study of the Los Angeles area is of national significance.

This inquiry constitutes the most extensive analysis of the integrated labor policy of employers' associations in one metropolitan area ever undertaken by this committee. In this analysis, the origin, structure, finances, labor policies, and activities of seven employers' associations operating in Los Angeles were studied. These include the Merchants and Manufacturers Association, previously identified[8] as a typical belligerent or antiunion employers' association, and the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce,[9] which is similar in outward organizational appearance to the typical local chamber. Southern Californians, Inc.,[10] was a somewhat streamlined, modernized version of the employers' association and was significant for its application of techniques more obliquely angled against effective trade-unionism than those commonly employed. Three separate but related trade organizations, the Cabinet and Store Fixture Association,[11] the Southern California Garment Manufacturers Association,[12] and the Southern California Restaurant Association[13] provided sharply etched examples of the labor-relations policy

[1] A subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor was appointed by the chairman June 6, 1936, under Senate Resolution 266, which reads, in part, as follows: "*Resolved*, That the Committee on Education and Labor is authorized and directed to make an investigation of violations of the right of free speech and assembly and undue interference with the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively." The limit of expenditures under this resolution was extended by various resolutions in the 74th, 75th, and 76th Congresses.

[2] A similar study for the period 1890–1935 appears in pt. II of this report.

[3] See testimony in pts. 52, 53, 56, 57, and 58.

[4] Supplementary exhibits for this phase of the committee's inquiry were introduced into the record on July 1, 1940, and appear in pts. 63–66, inclusive, of the committee's public record.

[5] See pt. II of this report, pp. 77–78, 99–114, and 126–141.

[6] See pt. V of this report, pp. 717–736, 750–754, and 767–775.

[7] See pt. 63, exhibit 9686, p. 23109.

[8] For a discussion of the Merchants and Manufacturers Association for the period 1890–1935, see pt. II of this report, pp. 106–112 and 126–141; for testimony and exhibits relating to the activities of the Merchants and Manufacturers Association, see pts. 52, 56, 57, 58, 61, 63, 64, and 65.

[9] For a discussion of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce for the period 1890–1935, see pt. II of this report, pp. 112–114 and 126–141; for testimony and exhibits relating to the activities of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, see pts. 52, 53, 56, 57, 58, 61, 63, 65, and 69.

[10] For testimony and exhibits relating to the activities of Southern Californians, Inc., see pts. 56, 57, 58, 61, 63, 64, 65, 66, 69, and 71.

[11] For testimony and exhibits relating to the Cabinet and Store Fixture Association, see pts. 52 and 64.

[12] For testimony and exhibits relating to the Southern California Garment Manufacturers Association, see pts. 52 and 64.

[13] For testimony and exhibits relating to the Southern California Restaurant Association, see pts. 56 and 64.

sponsored by the more inclusive employers' associations. The seventh organization treated in this pt. VI, The Neutral Thousands,[14] purported to be an organization of women and consumers who were interested in labor relations as a community service. Its precise character and relationship to the other antiunion bodies is developed in this report.

Further, the committee inquired into the activities of other employers' associations which, although not directly identified with Los Angeles industry, were closely related to it.

While Los Angeles is important as an industrial center, it is also the richest agricultural county in the country and has been one of the focal points of the labor policy of agricultural interests in southern California. The activities of these employers' associations, the Farmers Transportation Association,[15] and the county units of the Associated Farmers in Southern California,[16] will be treated in part VIII of this report.

The enactment of the National Labor Relations Act in 1935 and the fear of the increase in trade-unionism as a result of section 7 (a) of the National Industrial Recovery Act led the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce to reexamine the open-shop movement in that city which, as has been previously described, was a synonym for antiunionism. This reexamination did not entail a change in the open-shop policy—efforts were directed only to the maintenance and reinforcement of that policy. The immediate result of this activity was a reorganization of the Merchants and Manufacturers Association in 1936. Here again the alleged reorganization consisted merely of a restatement of the old open-shop principles and the installation of a new program designed to effectuate them.

This program was characterized by the emphasis placed on the coordination of the work of various law-enforcement agencies with the activities of the Merchants and Manufacturers Association, the establishment of a regular pool of strike guards by the signing of an annual supply contract with the Bodell Detective Agency, and by a program intended to influence or coerce recalcitrant or noncooperating employers who were inclined to adopt a labor policy which included collective bargaining. The new program was also marked by the resignation of Edgar R. Perry as president of the Merchants and Manufacturers Association because, in his own words, this militant antilabor program was to be carried on in a manner violative of the National Labor Relations Act.[17]

Under this program, the Merchants and Manufacturers Association organized small groups of employers, industry by industry. Two of the organizations studied by the committee were the Cabinet and Store Fixture Association of California and the Southern California Garment Manufacturers Association. These employers' associations found their reason for existence in a clause included in the membership agreements of each group. In this provision, drafted by the Merchants and Manufacturers Association, each member bound himself not to enter into any agreement—oral, written, or implied—with any labor organization. The membership agreement also provided for a penalty of at least $5,000 in one case[18] and $10,000 in the other[19] for violation of its terms. When a member of the cabinet and store fixture industry refused to sign such an agreement, efforts were made to embarrass him by informing a bank to which he was under financial obligation of his attitude.[20]

The reorganization program of the Merchants and Manufacturers Association also included the reopening of its employment bureau for the supplying of strikebreakers, payments to municipal police for strike-guard duty, and a continuance of cooperation with the intelligence bureau of the Los Angeles Police Department in matters of labor espionage.

These militant tactics of the Merchants and Manufacturers Association proved ineffective in stemming the tide of increasing trade-unionism. The teamsters' union, which was the spearhead of the drive, had started an organizing campaign in southern California in 1935 and the Merchants and Manufacturers Association promptly assumed leadership of the opposition. The struggle by the teamsters against low wages and poor working conditions finally culminated in the Pacific Freight Lines strike in March 1937.[21] In a final effort to maintain its position as the leader of the open-shop interests, the Merchants and Manufacturers Association marshaled all of Los Angeles industry to combat the union. The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce publicly took a supporting role in the creation of a strike fund of more than $85,000[22] which was collected from employers in every type of industry in southern California. The efforts of the Merchants and Manufacturers Association proved unavailing. The strike was terminated when the Motor Truck Association of Southern California, representing the Pacific Freight Lines, signed a written, closed-shop agreement with the Teamsters' Union in June 1937. Fear of reprisals by the open-shop forces led to strict secrecy as to the terms of the strike settlement, and these were not publicly revealed until October 1938.

The Pacific Freight Lines strike marked the end of the first reorganization program of the antilabor interests in Los Angeles. While the chamber of commerce was drafting a new program, however, the trade-unions were not idle. The American Federation of Labor instituted an organizing drive in the restaurant industry in Los Angeles, that was immediately confronted by the industry's organization called the Southern California Restaurant Association. Working through a secret and mysterious group, called group A, within the restaurant association, the industry met the union drive with blacklists, strike guards, and the private employment of municipal police for strike duty.[23] The creation of Southern Californians, Inc., in the midst of this struggle caused a change in the antiunion tactics of the industry. Under an express agreement, Southern Californians, Inc., assumed the burden of combating the union in return for substantial contributions by the restaurant association, and the latter slipped quietly into the background.

The validation of the National Labor Relations Act in April 1937, followed immediately by the union victory in the Pacific Freight Lines strike, made the chamber of commerce sharply aware of the ineffectiveness of its antilabor program. Once again came the realization that a second reorganization of the antiunion forces was necessary if the open shop was to be maintained. Out of this realization came Southern Californians, Inc.,[24] and the Neutral Thousands,[25] both formed in the fall of 1937. In this reorganization the chamber of commerce adopted the modern integrated corporate set-up. Southern Californians, Inc., became the top holding company, the Merchants and Manufacturers Association was relegated to a secondary role, and, together with the Neutral Thousands, acted under the supervision of the major association. With this new alinement of forces, the chamber of commerce confidently entered the arena with labor.

The primary function of Southern Californians, Inc., was to coordinate the activities of other employers' associations, namely, the Merchants and Manufacturers Association, the Neutral Thousands, the Associated Farmers of Los Angeles County, and the Farmers Transportation Association. Its position was likened to that of the general staff of an army,[26] with all employers' association activity clearing through it. The Neutral Thousands and the other groups were to serve as combatant units, occupying a front-line position in the battle to maintain the open shop.[27] In addition to this activity, Southern Californians, Inc., occupied itself with securing the enactment of antilabor legislation, with obtaining the cooperation of various law-enforcement agencies in the promotion of its open-shop policy, and with the creation of an antilabor propaganda campaign identical in many respects with that instituted by the National Association of Manufacturers in 1937.[28] To carry on its activities, the organization received more than half a million dollars from various Los Angeles industries during the 2 years from November 1937 through November 1939, of which some $300,000 was contributed by Southern Californians, Inc., to the support of its subsidiary employers' associations and of the campaign to enact antipicketing ordinances in the city and State.[29]

The Neutral Thousands, second of the new organizations created by the chamber of commerce, was financed almost wholly by that group and by Southern Californians, Inc. Structurally, it was a citizens' committee and closely resembled similar organizations previously studied by this committee.[30] In short, it was neither neutral nor representative of thousands. Under the slogan "Truth, not terror," the Neutral Thousands disseminated antiunion propaganda and set up company-dominated independent unions. In its propaganda work the Neutral Thousands worked very closely with its parent, Southern Californians, Inc., and utilized all the media of modern high-powered publicity, including billboard advertising, pamphlets, newspaper propaganda, and radio broadcasting. The independent union activities of the employers' associations were carried on in a very

[14] For testimony and exhibits relating to The Neutral Thousands, see pts. 56, 57, 61, 65, and 66.

[15] For testimony and exhibits relating to the Farmers Transportation Association, see pts. 58 and 71.

[16] For testimony and exhibits relating to the activities of the Associated Farmers in Southern California, see pts. 55, 56, 58, 63, 64, 65, 70, and 71.

[17] See pt. 52, exhibit 8639–A, p. 19345.

[18] See pt. 52, exhibit 8646, p. 19354.

[19] See pt. 52, exhibit 8652, p. 19361.

[20] See testimony of Clarence L. Dawson, Jr., pt. 52, pp. 19104–19107.

[21] For a detailed description of this strike, see this pt. VI of the report, pp. 830–834.

[22] See pt. 53, exhibit 8711, pp. 19603, 19604; pt. 53, exhibit 8726, pp. 19658–19662.

[23] The activities of the Southern California Restaurant Association and "group A" are described in this pt. VI of the report, pp. 835–843.

[24] For the discussion of the formation and activities of Southern Californians, Inc., see this pt. VII of the report, pp. 844–914.

[25] The Neutral Thousands, its formation, functions, and activities, are described in this pt. VI of the report, pp. 915–996.

[26] See pt. 56, exhibit 9065, p. 20764.

[27] Ibid.

[28] See S. Rept. No. 6, pt. 6, 76th Cong., 1st sess., Labor Policies of Employers' Associations, pt. III, The National Association of Manufacturers, chs. V and VI, pp. 154–206.

[29] See pt. 56, exhibit 9057, p. 20748.

[30] See S. Rept. No. 151, 77th Cong., 1st sess., Labor Policies of Employers' Associations, pt. IV, The "Little Steel" Strike and Citizens' Committees, ch. 15, pp. 291–315.

circuitous way. The Merchants and Manufacturers Association and Southern Californians, Inc., maintained contact with employers and the Neutral Thousands with employees—their joint endeavors being masked by a claimed independence, one from the other. More than 150 company-dominated unions were set up by the Neutral Thousands in the short period of 18 months.[31] Apparently having served its purpose, the Neutral Thousands was liquidated by March 1939, although its independent union work was continued by Southern Californians, Inc., through the Employees Advisory Service, created for that purpose.

The effectiveness of this rejuvenated open shop program cannot be accurately estimated. In 1938 these employers' associations were successful in securing the enactment of a municipal antipicketing ordinance, but it was invalidated by the California courts in the following year. Friction between Southern Californians, Inc., and the Merchants and Manufacturers Association developed because of professional rivalry and jurisdictional disputes. Efforts were made to resolve these differences and finally, under the guiding spirit of Harry Chandler, publisher of the Los Angeles Times,[32] the two organizations were merged in the spring of 1940, and a new employers' association called the Merchants and Manufacturers Association of Southern California was created. This event occurred shortly after the conclusion of the committee inquiry in California, but was contemplated by the dominant leadership of employers' association activity during the course of the hearings.[33]

Conclusion

The facts recited in this part VI force the committee to the conclusion that the most influential business and financial interests in Los Angeles have deliberately attempted to sabotage the national labor policy of collective bargaining as expressed in the National Labor Relations Act. Despite the enactment of that law and its declared constitutionality by the United States Supreme Court, these business and industrial leaders determined to nullify it not only by negative but also by positive action. Pursuant to this determination, they engaged in a series of organized conspiracies to destroy labor's civil liberties. They sought to prevent bona fide collective bargaining from obtaining a strong foothold in the urban community of Los Angeles and its tributary business and agricultural areas.

To carry out their conspiracy, they set up various employers' associations and auxiliary groups of women, consumers, agriculturists, and even employees. They lavishly financed these organizations and for the most part supplied them with a type of professional personnel that by reason of their background was wholly out of sympathy with trade-unionism. They concluded alliances with the local press, local police, local law-enforcement officials, and local business organizations. Behind their illegal and antisocial policy they concentrated economic and political power that defied any local application of the law and custom of the Nation.

Against this community of opposition the civil rights of labor were beyond even the protection of the National Labor Relations Act. This pattern of organized conspiratorial interference with collective bargaining included the mass application of the common antiunion devices such as labor espionage, the use of professional strikebreakers, the use of industrial munitions, the blacklist, discriminatory discharge, and a host of similar weapons. It also included a vigorous and widespread application of newer tactics designed to defeat trade-unionism and collective bargaining through the now recognized third party technique. Subsidiary elements of this technique were the extensive use of all types of propaganda, the pressure for the enactment of local laws declaring illegal the normal operations of trade-unions, a constant attempt to pervert local law-enforcement to the support of their antiunion policy, and the persistent effort to prejudice the general public against labor organizations, labor leaders, and the practices of collective bargaining. There was mass production of company unions through organizations maintained indirectly for that purpose. Perhaps the most outstanding feature of this broad sweep of antiunion activity was the enormous effort devoted to bringing the individual employer in line with the community labor policy by inducing his affiliation with a group organized to operate its particular trade or industry without the benefit of a collective agreement between employers and employees.

Behind this vast and powerful movement stood the leaders of business and industry, titular and real, the banking and financial groups, leaders of the local press and, until recently, many of the public officials. This made the situation peculiarly difficult for trade unions and for those public officials whose duty it was to protect the rights of labor. The very spectacle of a local chamber of commerce, comprising the sum total of the business influence in the community, actually dictating and stimulating the development of tactic after tactic to defeat the national labor policy, made anything but the strongest measures protective of labor's civil rights seem futile. The creation and maintenance of this policy of antiunionism in Los Angeles for magnitude and versatility of the effort far surpasses anything the committee has previously encountered in its 4-year inquiry. For example, the investigation of the Associated Industries of Cleveland, Ohio, showed a total income over a 4-year period (1930–37) of $264,432.58.[34] During a similar 4-year period in Los Angeles (1936–39), the sum of $916,925.14 was collected to finance the two principal antiunion employers' associations.[35]

In any appraisal of this situation, the recent effort of the National Labor Relations Board to deal with organized antiunionism in the Los Angeles area should receive close scrutiny. While the powers and ability of the Board to deal with the unfair labor practices of an individual employer or concern have been demonstrated, it is not clear as yet that these powers are adequate to deal with such a situation as was presented in Los Angeles. It was 1939 before the Board attempted to meet the problem head-on. In proceedings against certain tent and awning companies,[36] the Board joined the leading antiunion employers' associations as they existed at the time (the year 1939). The breadth of the proceeding and the scope of the evidence submitted raise sharply the question of whether or not the Board's powers and procedures are adequate to deal with this type of law infringement.

As yet, there has been no judicial determination of the case and the committee is without the benefit of the views of the courts on the adequacy of the existing legal measures to deal with the situation. In the meantime, one of these employers' groups (the Neutral Thousands) has gone out of existence and two others (Southern Californians, Inc., and the Merchants and Manufacturers Association) have merged into a new entity. The committee feels that the outcome of this proceeding is a matter of public interest deserving the close attention of the Congress. If the courts feel that the existing law is not adequate to enjoin the individual and corporate participants in these various organizations from future antiunion activity of the type disclosed, except at the risk of criminal contempt proceedings, then certainly Congress should act to close the door against further evasion and breach of the national labor policy by organized antiunionism. It may be that in any event Congress should declare it to be a crime to enter into and knowingly support a conspiracy to perpetrate wholesale interference with the rights of labor to organize and bargain collectively. The salutary effect of criminal penalties for antiunion activity in the Railway Labor Act should not be overlooked in the constant favorable public reference to other features of that act. The prospect of facing merely an administrative proceeding which, after a lengthy period of litigation, could only result in an order, has not been sufficient to deter organized antiunionism which functions through "belligerent" employers' associations and their related instruments.

If this situation were confined to the city of Los Angeles and the area surrounding it, it would still be a matter of national significance. Los Angeles is a large and important industrial center and the influence of a labor policy dominant there is bound to reach far beyond the confines of that area. The very fact that industry may be enticed to Los Angeles because of an alleged freedom from unions and collective bargaining may bring banking, real estate, and related interests in other competitive urban areas to press for the establishment of a similar "community" policy. Law breaking is contagious, particularly where it is highly profitable.

Furthermore, Los Angeles has become the center of important industries in which employer-employee conflicts and ill feeling must be reduced to a minimum because of national defense considerations. The great aircraft industry in southern California has been built in the very shadow of a labor policy that breeds work stoppages, inefficiency, unrest, and disorder. Because the events connected with national defense problems in the aircraft industry in southern California occurred after the close of the committee's investigation, it cannot comment upon the precise degree of their relationship to organized antiunionism in Los Angeles. It can only say that the contempt for democratic trade-unions historically displayed by many leaders of Los Angeles business and industry is an inescapable part of the backdrop upon which the unbiased observer must appraise the events of the Vultee Aircraft Co. strike, the strike at North American Aviation, Inc., and the other labor disturbances that obstructed our early national defense program. So long as this organized antiunionism persists, southern California will be a breeding ground for disturbers of all varieties, be they on the side of labor or in the ranks of employers.

Los Angeles is but a symbol of many other areas in various parts of the Nation where the exercise of labor's rights and the practice of collective bargaining are met with hostility of an organized community character, engendered by the strong industrial or agricultural groups who stand to gain from

---

[31] See pt. 66, exhibit 10853, p. 24169; exhibits 10858–10862, pp. 24184–24189.

[32] See Business Week, June 1, 1940.

[33] See testimony of Paul Shoup, pt. 57, pp. 20918–20919.

[34] See S. Rept. No. 6, pt. 7, 76th Cong.; 1st sess., Labor Policies of Employers' Association, pt. II, The Associated Industries of Cleveland, p. 45. The committee's investigation of the Associated Industries of Cleveland was completed in early 1938 and therefore the organization's income for 1938 and 1939 is not available.

[35] See pt. 52, exhibit 8611, facing p. 19317. See also pt. 56, exhibit 9057, p. 20748.

[36] See *In the Matter of Sun Tent-Luebbert Co. et al.* v. *Textile Workers Union of America, Local No. 99, C. I. O., and Independent Canvas Workers Union, Inc.*, Cases N. XXI–C–1007–1113–1114–1116.

an anti-union-labor policy. In many of these districts the force of trade-unionism are so weak that the potential conflict between the rights of labor and organized antiunionism is not observable in a dramatic context. The very weakness of trade-union groups reflects the strength of the nascent spirit of hostility that exists. There, even the rights of labor to speak freely and assemble peaceably are in jeopardy. The advanced exercise of these rights through trade-union organization and collective bargaining is, as yet, not attempted. In many such areas, it is not necessary yet for antiunion forces to expend the funds and establish the organizations necessary to enforce their policy. That will come in the future. The Los Angeles situation does and will have many counterparts before the national labor policy is observed on a Nation-wide scale. The battle for industrial democracy is far from won. The tools which the Nation must use to secure the rights of labor are not adequate until they include the necessary legal devices to stamp out organized interference with the right of labor to bargain collectively, such as has existed in Los Angeles and southern California. Even then, the use of these devices for enforcement of the national labor policy against groups organized in definance of the law must receive the full support of public opinion if it is to be effective.

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.,
United States Senator.
ELBERT D. THOMAS,
United States Senator.

EXCERPTS FROM REPORT ON EMPLOYERS' ASSOCIATIONS AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN CALIFORNIA

PART VII. A STUDY OF LABOR POLICIES OF EMPLOYERS' ASSOCIATIONS IN THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA, 1935–39

[Pursuant to S. Res. 266, 74th Cong.]

Introduction

Pursuant to the authority of Senate Resolution 266 (74th Cong., 2d sess.),[1] the committee herein submits the seventh part of its report on employers' associations and collective bargaining in California. This volume is concerned particularly with policies and activities of organizations of employers operating in San Francisco Bay area, which are related importantly to the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively.[2] It considers an apparent transition from antiunion employers' associations to organized employer coordination, based upon a professed acceptance of collective bargaining within a particular urban industrial area. It explores the various devices of organized employer activity that were directed not only to a destruction of labor's rights but also to the use of "pressure tactics" that renders those rights of dubious value even when recognized in collective agreements.

The entire report consists of the following parts:

Part I. General Introduction.

Part II. Organized Antiunionism in California Industry Prior to the Passage of the National Labor Relations Act.

Part III. The Disadvantaged Status of Unorganized Labor in California's Industrialized Agriculture.

Part IV. Employers' Associations and Their Labor Policies in California's Industrialized Agriculture.

Part V. The Organization of Resistance to Collective Bargaining in California, 1935–39.

Part VI. A Study of Labor Policies of Employers' Associations in the Los Angeles Area, 1935–39.

Part VII. A Study of Labor Policies of Employers' Associations in the San Francisco Bay Area, 1935–39.

Part VIII. The Associated Farmers of California, Inc.—Its Reorganization, Policies, and Significance, 1935–39.

Part IX. The Origin and Promotion of Recent Legislation in California Limiting Labor's Civil Rights.

Part X. Conclusions and Recommendations.

As indicated above, part II of this report was devoted to labor policies in California before 1935, which had been dominated in San Francisco by the controlling antiunionism of the notorious Industrial Association of San Francisco.[3] There the origin, financing, control, and sweeping antiunion operations of that organization were outlined. In part V the evolution of the various types of employers' associations were analyzed on a State-wide scale covering the years 1935–39. The interrelationships of the various organizations were traced; their variety of tactics was recited; their over-all strategy and motivation were outlined.

From those recitals it is evident that the tactics of the San Francisco employer groups underwent a perceptible transition in the years following the passage of the National Labor Relations Act. Unlike the Los Angeles groups studied in part VI, certain dominant employers' associations in San Francisco, ostensibly at least, by the end of 1939 had accepted the procedures of collective bargaining for urban industry and sought primarily to represent and support the employer position in that bargaining process on a unified basis. They had become "negotiatory" employers' associations, such as the various water front employers' associations and the San Francisco Employer's Council. In that sense they may be distinguished from "belligerent" or "hostile" employers' associations,[4] such as the Industrial Association of San Francisco, which was dissolved in December 1938,[5] a date between the inauguration of the committee's field investigation and its hearings. Indeed, organized labor in San Francisco has more than kept pace with the national growth of trade unions. Membership has increased substantially. Collective bargaining has become, for the time being, the basis of employer-employee relationships in San Francisco.[6]

Despite these developments, the committee determined to pursue its study to a conclusion. Several considerations prompted this determination.

The collective-bargaining rights of large and important elements of labor in San Francisco, although recognized in collective agreements even before the passage of the National Labor Relations Act, have been persistently subjected to a variety of undue interferences stemming from organized employer influence. The practice of industrial democracy in San Francisco, seemingly accepted in the years from 1935 to 1940, was a dangerous one, full of peril to labor's rights. Harsh and evil devices, properly and obviously cataloged as oppressive labor practices and violative of human rights and decency, were blended with more subtle techniques to create one vast repertoire of antiunionism. The course of advancing unionism seemingly inspired the ingenuity of organized employers and their henchmen to devise new methods of obstruction. The committee felt that an analysis of these maneuvers would throw light on events that may accompany similar changes in other parts of the Nation.

Traditions developed over a long period of years did not disappear overnight. There was a considerable identity in the support and membership of the belligerent and negotiatory employers' associations, the old and the new. Hence, only a new order of problems emerged when labor's rights were recognized by contracts with such employers. They held a new type of peril for labor's civil rights. Unified action by employers, seeming to accept collective bargaining, became allied to forces that sought to destroy or nullify the rights of labor. Unfair pressure tactics in the bargaining process occasionally rendered those rights of dubious value. Undue interferences appeared which are more difficult to hold up for public condemnation than the use of labor espionage or professional strikebreakers. Even the acceptance of the forms of collective bargaining concealed efforts to thwart and weaken its desired economic and social purposes.

A study of San Francisco employers' associations from 1935 through 1939 has a peculiar value. It demonstrates that, even though collective bargaining becomes the nationally or locally accepted procedure for the conduct of employer-employee relationships, certain accompaniments of that procedure may present significant problems of labor's civil liberties. Failure to recognize and meet head-on the issues so tendered may make of those rights a respectable facade for exploitation, or a form without substance that will be swept away. And so, throughout this part of the California report the emphasis will be upon the dangers to the civil rights of those workers who have won collective agreements from those who outwardly profess to accept collective bargaining by signed contracts. These dangers may not be cataloged under the National Labor Relations Act as unfair labor practices. They are nonetheless real interferences with the collective-bargaining operation on a plane that permits it to perform its true economic, social, and political function. To avoid repetition, and because they are rich in content, the relationships between the water-front unions and the various employer groups are chosen most often for illustration.

Several factors directed an emphasis less upon the details of specific oppressive labor practices and more upon the changing form of employer resistance to labor's rights although recognized in a collective agreement. These factors deserve mention here.

Most important was the flagrant and willful destruction of much of the minutes, books, records, and files of the Industrial Association of San Francisco in face of an anticipated investigation by the committee[7] and,

---

[1] A subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor was appointed by the chairman June 6, 1936, under Senate Resolution 266, which reads, in part, as follows: "*Resolved*, That the Committee on Education and Labor is authorized and directed to make an investigation of violations of the right of free speech and assembly and undue interference with the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively."

[2] Hearings were held in San Francisco dealing with the subject of this pt. VII on January 26, 27, and 29; see pt. 60 and pt. 61. For supplementary exhibits, see pt. 76 and pt. 77.

[3] See pt. II of this report, pp. 79–98, 117–125.

[4] For a complete discussion of this distinction, see S. Rept. No. 6, pt. 4, 76th Cong., 1st sess., Labor Policies of Employers' Associations, pt. 1, the National Metal Trades Association, pp. 2–3.

[5] See pt. 60, pp. 21972–21973.

[6] See testimony of John Shelley, pt. 60, p. 21954.

[7] See testimony of John F. Forbes, pt. 49, pp. 17934–17935, and pt. 60, pp. 21957–21959, 21961–21962.

even, after the service of a subpena.[8] The necessary result of this contumacious action was characterized by Senator THOMAS in the following terms:

"As a result of the systematic destruction of records, Mr. Forbes, the Industrial Association has effectively prevented this committee from carrying out its duty to Congress to secure information relative to the inquiry relating to activities of the Industrial Association prior to the service of the second subpena in 1938."[9]

The committee believes that this act speaks more eloquently than could hundreds of pages of testimony or reports of the questionable character of much of the activity of the association. The tacit admission of unworthy deeds of record creates an irrebuttable presumption that the conduct of the association included indefensible violations of the civil liberties of the laboring men and women of San Francisco. The sponsors of the association were apparently not willing to risk the opprobrium that they felt would ensue from a public examination of the records of the organization. This is a sad commentary on the Industrial Association of San Francisco and the attitude of leaders of industry who participated in the formation and execution of its policy.[10]

Furthermore, a complete and closely woven analysis[11] of the more flagrant antiunion activities of the Industrial Association of San Francisco and certain related employer groups in San Francisco would only be cumulative. Other parts of this report dealing with Los Angeles and the rural areas and previous reports of this committee are devoted specifically to the use of labor spies, the practice of professional strikebreaking, and union-busting systems that are characteristic of the belligerent employers' association. Any exposure, with detailed examples of these reprehensible practices by those connected with that organization, would have constituted only an essay into passing personalities and would have been primarily of local consequence.

Portions of part V[12] constitute an introduction to this part of the report. A few of the aspects of the San Francisco situation will be further accented here. They point up the significance of the factual summaries contained in the sections that follow.

[8] See pt. 60, exhibit 9393, pp. 21958–21959. The correspondence in the exhibit noted, though obscurely worded, included the inescapable admission that vouchers and records were destroyed after the service of the committee's first subpena in November 1936. As the testimony of Mr. Forbes, the president of the association (see pt. 60, p. 21957), and Mr. Anson, the outside auditor (see pt. 60, pp. 21959–21961), indicated, a considerable portion of the records was destroyed prior to the service of the committee's original subpena. In his letter, Mr. W. G. Storie, while seeming to deny destruction after the service of the subpena, gave the show away in the exception stated. It reads in part:

"Nor have any vouchers or records for any subsequent period been destroyed *except pursuant to the established practice of the association in force prior to the service of the subpena.*" [Italics ours.]

[9] See pt. 60, p. 21962.

[10] See pt. 60, exhibit 9384, pp. 22121–22122, for a tabular summary of the members of the board of directors of the Industrial Association of San Francisco from 1933 through 1938. See pt. 60, exhibit 9390, pp. 22130–22135, for a list of the major contributors to the association in 1936.

[11] See testimony of Eliel, pt. 60, pp. 21962–21971, inclusive, for a general description.

[12] See particularly pp. 710–716, 724–736, 742–746, and 750–754 of pt. V.

The continuance of organized antiunionism in San Francisco after the 1934 strike and the passage of the National Labor Relations Act[13] was not unusual. Other reports by the committee show this not to be an uncommon reaction to the national labor policy by autocratic employers when compelled to accept it outwardly by a seeming acceptance of the forms of collective bargaining. The point of emphasis in San Francisco was the realization by the laborers who had achieved recognition of their rights in a collective agreement that the Industrial Association was a threat to the continued enjoyment of these rights. Organized workers, such as those in the water-front unions, sophisticated in their knowledge of the history of San Francisco's employer organizations,[14] sought constantly to strengthen their rights by extending the scope of collective bargaining to workers in allied industries. They recognized that the maintenance of organized antiunionism in these industries was not only an "undue interference" to the achievement of collective-bargaining rights of unorganized workers; it was a menace to their own hard-won rights.

As if to give point to their fears, members of the negotiatory water-front employers' associations, with whom the water-front and other organized workers had collective-bargaining contracts, continued their membership and contributions to the Industrial Association.[15] This fact raised an important question of good faith and propriety which unions, appropriate public agencies, and the public should press continually before employers who profess to accept collective bargaining. It is a question which has been persistently obscured, namely: Is membership in, and contribution to, a hostile employers' association to be excused, even if the particular employer is a party to a collective agreement with a bona fide trade-union?

The reaction of the unions in San Francisco in 1935 to this situation was not unexpected. The water-front unions, for example, were genuinely alarmed by the threat of eventual suffocation implicit in the continuance of the Industrial Association, particularly with the support of the water-front employers. Through a strengthening of job control and the aiding of the organization of employees in allied trades, they sought a broader base for survival. Aiding in the organization of the unorganized in the warehouses, processing plants, and even the fields and forests became a struggle against the encirclement that had marked San Francisco labor history on several previous occasions.[16]

This natural development need not have disturbed the existing contractual relationships with the water-front employers had it not been for one important factor. The appearance of unions in the allied trades and industries was greeted with fierce resistance engendered by the instruments of antiunionism, such as the Industrial Association and its allies, with the active collaboration of the water-front employers.[17] This circumstance provided a variation on an issue previously marked for emphasis, namely: Is active participation in a program of interference with the achievement of collective-bargaining rights by an employer to be excused because he grants those rights to his own employees? May not the defeat of trade-union principles in a related field of industry undermine or vitiate the bargaining position of one's own employees?

[13] See this pt. VII of the report, sec. 1, ch. 1A.

[14] See pt. II, pp. 79–98, 117–125.

[15] See this pt. VII of the report, sec. 1, ch. 1B.

[16] Ibid.

[17] See this pt. VII of the report, sec. 1, ch. 1C.

The unions on the water front saw their own cause in the struggle against this alliance by warehousemen, canning employees, and agricultural laborers. They unhesitatingly used so-called "hot cargo" tactics, refusing to handle the goods made or handled by allegedly unfair employers. To the cries of outrage against this conduct as sympathetic action in violation of contract, the unions were insensitive because of the existence of organized antiunionism.

The unions felt that the persistent legislative and judicial attempts to prohibit the use of these tactics were but drives to license and protect the continued employer violation of labor's civil rights. The contempt of many employers for the National Labor Relations Act and the failure of that act to protect agricultural laborers obscured any relief from the public side and aggravated the situation. The tactical exchange was one of considerable intricacy. Crisis after crisis developed. The water front became a symbol of employer-employee failure to make collective bargaining achieve industrial stability.

It is not necessary here to trace all of the steps in the movement of employers' associations and unions along the San Francisco water front. The committee conducted an intensive examination of the available documents which were presented in response to subpenas upon the various water-front employers' associations and some of the leading shipping companies. From these documents, which are primarily minutes and correspondence, the labor policy of this group of employers, operated on a unified basis for collective bargaining, may be ascertained. Certain of these documents have been organized and assembled in a memorandum which was prepared by the committee staff and submitted for comment to the counsel for the principal water-front employers' associations. This memorandum and the supporting exhibits referred to are reprinted as part 76 of the committee's public record.[18] It covers only the period from the conclusion of the 1934 water-front strike through the year 1937. It is supplemented by other documents relating to the Industrial Association and various allied employers' groups in part 77.

The committee deems it necessary to point out here that these documents, so selected, do not purport to be a complete reflection of the labor policy and activity of the water-front employers during the period indicated. There is at least one important omission. That policy and activity also was importantly reflected in the acts of the Industrial Association of San Francisco, to which many of the water-front employers were allied. The opprobrium that attaches to the destruction of the records of the Industrial Association, previously recounted, must extend to the individual water-front employers who were affiliated with that organization, if not to the negotiatory associations through which they bargained with the unions. By that destruction much of the conclusive evidence of labor espionage and related activity that was directed by the Industrial Association at the water-front unions was lost.

To illustrate the realities of more subtle, but equally dangerous, pressure tactics that may be used even by negotiatory employers' associations such as the water-front employers' associations within the framework of an acceptance of collective bargaining, three examples have been chosen. They are the so-called suspension program, designed to destroy the collective bargaining arrangement; the attempt to split or divide water-front unions and thereby weaken their bargaining power; and collaboration in an attack upon

[18] Other documents not commented upon are also reprinted in pt. 76 of the public record.

the leadership of an outstanding union, designed to intimidate the leaders or damage the prestige of the union before the public.[19] These practices, it should be emphasized, were boldly indulged in by organized employer groups that were committed by contract to collective bargaining. Their discussion will serve to underline a type of problem that will be of increasing importance to the efficacy of labor's rights as collective bargaining becomes the accepted national procedure for handling employer-employee relationships.

The culmination of many of those pressures was the expiration of the contract between the water-front unions and employers in the fall of 1936. This contract was concluded at the end of the 1934 general strike. Perhaps it was inevitable, in the light of the intervening events, that both parties would be dissatisfied with the performance under the old contract and would seek a new trial of strength. The resulting strike, which covered the last 2 months in 1936 and ended early in February 1937, is not so important in retrospect as an event. It is important because it marked a definite turn toward the new patterns of organized employers' association activity with which the water-front employers had experimented in 1935 and 1936.[20]

The 1936–37 water-front strike was an end and a beginning in terms of the labor policy of organized employers in San Francisco. The long-awaited test of the vigorous trade-unionism that had characterized the water-front employees and their fellow workers in related trades was concluded. It satisfied the more acute and realistic employers that organized employer activity should be premised for the immediate future upon a continuance of the forms and procedure of collective bargaining. The hostile techniques of the Industrial Association had been tried and found wanting, at least for many situations with which employers were confronted. The 1934 strike had been lost and the water-front and maritime unions had emerged with full recognition. The years intervening before the 1936 strike, given over by employer policy to checking the growth and development of a broader union front, had been generally unsuccessful from the standpoint of the staunch Industrial Association advocate. The careful build-up for the 1936 strike had produced only a long and painful cessation of trade, not a collapse of union strength, discipline, or organization.

Even the 1936–37 strike was fought new style. There was little or no violence. There was much preliminary fencing before the bar of public opinion to fix the blame on the opposite party, much sidling away from collective bargaining toward arbitration before what was thought to be a relatively favorable tribunal, much effort to build up the appearance or reality of outraged public opinion against the strike or rather the refusal of the union to leave all issues to arbitration. There was a threat of third-party intervention from innocent bystanders such as the Associated Farmers.

The prelude and the actual strike convinced many that a new-style over-all organization that would mass organized employer activity behind such "negotiatory" groups as the water-front employers was a necessity. The old Industrial Association was not cast aside. It was merely pulled back to a more limited role before the public and the unions. Many recalled the exchange of ideas that had accompanied the search for new organizational structures and policies at conferences such as that held at Del Monte in February 1936.[21] It was in this frame of mind that the employers of San Francisco received in April 1937 the tidings of the confirmation by the United States Supreme Court of the constitutionality of the National Labor Relations Act. The reality of collective bargaining was established beyond early question.

The first tangible sign of a major policy transition among organized employers in San Francisco was the formation of the Committee of 43.[22] It was established by the leading business interests of the city. It professed its purpose to be an organized review of wages and working conditions to the end that unsatisfactory conditions which might lead to disputes might be eliminated. It assumed the role of a tribunal for the public hearing and investigations of employer-employee disputes. It assumed to speak for and direct the expression of the public interest of the urban community, despite the absence of other than employer representation. Indeed, the membership of the Committee of 43, viewed from the standpoint of the corporations represented, strongly resembled the leadership of the Industrial Association.[23] Its relatively minor expenses were paid from contributions from the Industrial Association and the Chamber of Commerce.

The meaning of the Committee of 43 was characterized by its participation in certain activities. They were expressive of new trends of organized employer policy which sought a unified employer front that would be supported by a carefully cultivated public opinion. Five examples are sufficiently illustrative.

The Committee of 43 conducted an investigation of wages and working conditions among office workers,[24] seeking to remove the apparent iniquities that might be a target for union activity or public condemnation and to provide a uniform basis for a unified employer stand. The Committee of 43 urged and promoted the Association of San Francisco Distributors to make possible a unified negotiatory action in behalf of employers engaged in wholesaling and distributive business.[25] It promoted and conducted a public inquiry which riveted public attention upon the unpopular "hot cargo" disputes, involving agricultural interests and unions in the transportation field; it omitted a determination of a basic factor, namely, the "organized antiunionism" of the agricultural group.[26] It participated in the preparation and conduct of the campaign to impose statutory restrictions upon trade-union activities.[27]

The common thread of these activities is the outward acceptance of the procedure of collective bargaining, accompanied by the development of "pressure" tactics that preserve the maximum advantage to the employer. The most interesting aspect of these tactics is their strategic basis: the inducement of public intervention or public opinion to the side of employers.

It must be noted that this type of activity was long foreshadowed. The Law and Order Committee of 1916[28] and the early Industrial Association[29] were aimed to inspire a public opinion that would curb the rising strength of trade unions by public act or indulge a restraint by private combine. After the loss of the 1934 general strike and the passage of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, the urban business community encouraged organizations that would enlist public opinion in the hinterland of San Francisco. The reorganization of the Associated Farmers in 1935–36[30] was a beginning. The arrangement of the meetings by the Committee of 43 with the representatives of this group for airing of grievances, whether or not so intended, cultivated this hostile opinion as "grist for the mill" of the urban employers.

But the most disillusioning commentary on the heralded change in employers' association philosophy in San Francisco was the activity of the organized business community on behalf of Proposition No. 1, the anti-union initiative. In that campaign[31] the Committee of 43 and the employer groups represented joined with the avowed antiunion forces of Los Angeles and the Associated Farmers, which were counted upon to pay off the heavy investment of urban interests.[32] Hampered by law in using private unfair labor practices, the organized employers of San Francisco seemed only to have shifted their policy from one of direction to indirection. They sought to persuade the public to curb the exercise of the rights of labor by law. The oldest method of violating civil liberties, the one most feared by the sponsors of the Bill of Rights—namely, the law of the sovereign—was invoked.

Having demonstrated the advantages and matured the techniques of the "negotiatory" employers' association, the Committee of 43 gave way to a more formal and ambitious organization, the San Francisco Employers' Council.[33] This association of associations, hailed as a phenomenon in this country, deserves much attention from all those who are interested in industrial democracy. It marked the climax of the trend that was begun in San Francisco with the unified activities of the water-front employers in various water-front organizations after the 1934 strike. It possesses great potentialities for good or evil. It may be a useful instrument for collective bargaining, which should be a model for numerous counterparts, or it may become the mechanism for a new and more subtle tyranny. Its short life at the time of this committee's final field hearings (1940) and its potential usefulness for the industrial peace and understanding that San Francisco so badly needed, caused the committee to forego any detailed public hearings on the activities and policy of the San Francisco Employers' Council. Hence, there will not be any findings or conclusions regarding this body.

The committee will only point out the varying attitudes that may drive such an organization into channels which provide useful outlets for the collective-bargaining procedures or, conversely, choke off the practical economic and social utility of that democratic device. The Nation will do well to inform itself of the ascendancy of these conflicting philosophies as reflected in the activities of the San Francisco Employers' Council.

In the pages that follow there will be a detailed treatment of the particularly indicated phases of this transition in organized employer policy during the years from 1935 to 1940. Certain obvious limitations affected the manner of treatment of some of the items covered, which the committee wishes to announce by way of introduction lest some assume that the analysis herein purports to be definitive.

---

[19] See this pt. VII of the report, sec. 1, ch. 2.

[20] See this pt. VII of the report, sec. 1, ch. 4.

[21] See pt. V of this report, pp. 724–733; see also sec. 1, ch. 4, of this pt. VII.

[22] See this pt. VII of the report, sec. 2, ch. 1.

[23] Id., sec. 2, ch. 1A.

[24] Id., sec. 2, ch. 1B.

[25] Id., sec. 2, ch. 1C.

[26] See this pt. VII of the report, sec. 2, ch. 1D. See also pt. VIII, sec. 3, ch. 5.

[27] See this pt. VII of the report, sec. 2, ch. 1E. See also pt. IX, sec. 2.

[28] See pt. I, p. 86 ff.

[29] See pt. I, p. 98 ff.

[30] See pt. VIII, sec. 1.

[31] For a full account, see pt. IX, sec. 2.

[32] See pt. VIII, sec. 1, ch. 2.

[33] See this pt. VII of the report, sec. 2, ch. 2.

For example, the committee does not assume herein the burden of determining the merits of the innumerable points of controversy between such groups as the water-front employers and unions over the 5-year period surveyed. Much of this conflict involved matters other than collective-bargaining rights. Much of it has been treated extensively by other agencies of the Government. Much of the detailed maneuver, if discussed, would add little to the total picture of the rapidly evolving strategy of the employers' associations improvised to meet the advance of unionism in the Bay area.

Furthermore, the relationships between the water-front unions and the water-front employers, covered presumably by collective agreements since the 1934 general strike, were marked by literally hundreds of strikes, controversies, and disputes involving a wide range of problems. These employer-employee difficulties have been made the subject of searching analysis by the erstwhile Maritime Labor Board,[34] accompanied by carefully prepared recommendations for legislation designed to encourage successful mediation and arbitration practice in this field.

Likewise, allegations of the affiliations to the Communist Party of union leaders, notably Harry Bridges, leader of the longshore unions, have colored the employer-employee relationships in this field. The committee did not take upon itself the burden of finding whether or not Mr. Bridges was so affiliated, because it was collateral to the basic inquiry for the reasons stated in part I concerning similar allegations as to some engaged in trade-union activity in California agriculture.[35] During the California inquiry, this particular item became the subject of extensive hearings before the executive departments duly authorized to carry on deportation proceedings, and is being judicially determined. As in other instances of this character, the committee will confine its comment to the evidence of participation of employers' associations in generating allegations of this sort, true or false, for public consumption.

This phase was highly relevant because of its bearing upon the common practice of some employers of assiduously cultivating the unpopularity of union leadership with which they do not wish to deal, for the primary purpose of diverting attention from or excusing their infringement of the rights of labor.

Again, during the period covered, the operations of key unions (water-front and teamsters) were colored importantly by the jurisdictional difficulties encountered as each moved into new trades or territory. Obviously the committee's only concern with this intricate phase was with any attempt of organized employer groups to avoid collective bargaining by playing one group off against the other.

Conclusion

There has been a shift in employers' association policy in the San Francisco area since the 1934 general strike and the passage of the National Labor Relations Act. That shift is from outright public belligerency toward unionism and collective bargaining to a new and as yet undetermined, attitude. In outward form, employer organization has assumed the primary character of the negotiatory employers' association. The organization of employers in various trades and industries for the purpose of collective bargaining with unions representing workers in the particular trade or industry has been a progressive step toward making collective bargaining work. It is the combination of all such negotiatory employers' associations into a city-wide federation (the San Francisco Employers' Council), successor to the old belligerent industrial association, that presents a relatively unpredictable phenomenon. It is yet too early to make any final judgments concerning the relationship of such an organization and the labor policy which it promotes to our national labor policy. However, it is appropriate now to voice conclusions concerning certain tendencies observable in the background of this organization which, if continually reflected in its positive operations, may be damaging both to collective bargaining and ultimately to labor's rights.

It should be recognized that these tendencies are most apt to develop at a time when labor unions are achieving increasing gains in terms of numbers of workers covered by contracts and improvements of wages, hours, and working conditions. Such was the situation in San Francisco in the last half of the decade of the thirties.[36] In industry after industry, the overwhelming majority of workers achieved effective organization and collective-bargaining rights. It was an era of public recognition of the rights of labor. The successes in San Francisco called forth new and increased efforts by employers to undertake and, if possible, to counter this measure of employee organization. The adaptation of older devices and attitudes to fit the framework of collective bargaining became a necessity. Such was the atmosphere in which the Committee of 43, the San Francisco Employers' Council, and the tendencies to be noted, developed.

The first tendency was to use the negotiatory employers' associations to resist the entrenchment of unionism and collective bargaining in a particular industry or in related industries. This tendency is all the more difficult to combat because the respective parties are themselves covered by the cloak of a collective agreement with their employees. The collaboration of the organized water-front employers committed to collective bargaining with organized antiunionism in San Francisco (see sec. 1, ch. 1) illustrates this tendency.

As the unions in the transportation and handling industry around San Francisco sought a greater security of position against the counterattack expected from antiunionism, they found themselves confronted by the collaboration of the employers' association with whom they were dealing with the old Industrial Association, the relentless foe of unionism. Resort by the unions to boycotts and so-called hot cargo tactics to break resistance to the advance of collective bargaining in related industries was affirmatively contested by this negotiatory employers' association. On occasion it precipitated industry-wide work stoppages because of a refusal to handle a particular consignment. This practice left the unions the unhappy choice of either permitting an employer in the production or processing sphere to pursue relentlessly a policy of antiunionism or of carrying through a general work stoppage that would injure employees and employers not involved in the particular movement of goods. The constant striving for union entrenchment against undermining tactics of other years gives rise to continued demands for guaranties of security through job control. Resistance by the negotiatory employers' association to these guaranties creates a suspicion that they are instruments designed to pave the way for a return to organized antiunionism, constituting a substantial obstacle to the natural course of collective bargaining.

A statement made to the committee by the president of the San Francisco Labor Council reflects this attitude of labor, one which has a substantial measure of justification in the light of union-labor experience in other years:

"It seems rather peculiar to anyone having a knowledge of the history of labor and its relationship with employers in San Francisco to arrive at an understanding of the renewed drive for open-shop conditions. For you to understand the point I am trying to make, it will be necessary for me to give some explanation as to why labor, not only in San Francisco but everywhere, has sought what is generally termed a union-shop or closed-shop clause in its contracts. This, like practically every other position which labor has taken over the years, is a defensive mechanism which their experience with employer tactics has forced them to take. Union-shop contracts, with all of the employees of a given firm or given industry being members of the union, are not new in San Francisco. As a matter of fact, they are practically as old as the city itself. The only logical reason the employers can advance (and they don't advance it) for their demand for an open shop is so that they may keep the door open to break down the strength of the labor organizations. In the past year or so we find a very determined and much-publicized effort on the part of employers in San Francisco to resist any union-shop clause in their labor agreements, even though in some instances these same employers have had union-shop clauses over long periods of years prior to this time.

"I call this point to the attention of the gentlemen of the committee simply for the purpose of laying the foundation for this statement: Labor in San Francisco met this problem before—in 1901, in 1916, in 1921, and in 1934, and on each of those occasions we were able to cope with the problem. If this renewed activity is the infancy of a renewal of such a drive against labor, I wish to state here and now that we feel able to meet it again." [37]

In the second place, organized employer groups in San Francisco, while purporting to be organized for the primary purpose of collective bargaining, have pursued a policy of using pressure tactics designed to weaken the position of the leadership chosen by their employees. A negotiatory employers' association (the Waterfront Employers of San Francisco) attempted to divide the unions which confronted them at the bargaining table, by seeking to have a leadership replaced that was repugnant to them. The water-front employers collaborated in personal attacks upon this union leadership in a fashion designed to intimidate the leaders or damage the prestige of the union before the public because of the alleged character of the leaders. Finally, the association sought to develop a so-called suspension program for the purpose either of destroying the collective agreement or of providing an opportunity for circumventing dealings with a militant segment with whom they were fated to deal by contract and the choice of their employees.

It is unrealistic to refuse to recognize that so-called negotiatory employers' associations may employ pressure tactics not consonant with the development of successful collective bargaining. The public must examine the activities of these negotiatory employer associations with a scrutiny even more persistent and searching than that given to organizations of the union-busting type. The tendency to seek the substantial inequality of bargaining power within the framework of collective bargaining through the use of pressure devices is likely to become a commonplace. A discriminating public opinion will single out these measures and show them exposed for what they are.

The third observable tendency was the inclination of employers in the urban business community to encourage or collaborate with

[34] See report to President and Congress, Maritime Labor Board, March 1, 1940.

[35] See Part I, General Introduction, pp. 27 ff.

[36] See testimony of Shelley, president of the San Francisco Labor Council, pt. 60, p. 21954.

[37] See pt. 60, p. 21956.

organizations designed to enlist public opinion on a State-wide or regional basis on the side of employers in San Francisco. The reorganization of the Associated Farmers in 1935–36, the arrangement in 1937 of meetings with their hand-picked representatives, and the promotion of the dissemination of anti-union sentiment through these channels was a part of the eventual pressure system which slowly took form at the behest of San Francisco employer leaders. Other manifestations of this same tendency were attempts to widen the influence of employer public opinion along the entire Pacific coast, through the creation of coast-wide employer unity and an ever-increasing collaboration between various types of employers' associations on a local, State, and coast-wide scale.

Perhaps the outstanding illustration of this trend was the State-wide political alliance forged between antiunion, open-shop interests in Los Angeles, the Associated Farmers, and San Francisco employer leaders to secure the enactment of a State law regulating the activities of unions in 1938. (See Part IX, The Origin and Promotion of Recent Legislation in California Limiting Labor's Civil Rights.) This event is the outstanding illustration of the fact that, as yet, the difference between the philosophy of negotiatory employers' associations in San Francisco and avowedly open-shop and anti-labor groups in Los Angeles and rural areas is not a broad span but a narrow line. The function of this unity of employers' associations was to deprive organized labor, by State law rather than by private action, of some of the more important rights and privileges which it might exercise in achieving employee organization and effective collective bargaining. The campaign for proposition No. 1 served to focus attention on a likely strategy of negotiatory employers' associations not far removed from belligerent anti-unionism. That strategy is to broaden the organizational base for a political onslaught on the legitimacy of some of labor's most imporant bargaining rights.

In addition to noting some of the tendencies of employer organization that serve as a background for the San Francisco Employers' Council, there are certain policy expressions of contemporary employer leaders that are worth noting. They serve to earmark some of the policy tendencies which, whether or not dominant today, are nonetheless potential.

Even representatives of the Waterfront Employers' Association, a unit with extended experience in San Francisco as a negotiatory group, did not wholly accept the proposition that it is the right of employees to select their own bargaining representatives. In his report on programing for negotiations filed on May 11, 1939, with the Waterfront Employer Associations of the Pacific Coast, John Cushing, who was in charge of that responsible function, stated:

"I may hold views contrary to the majority of you here, but I firmly believe that there will be no relief from what we are now enduring as long as the present union leadership with its policies is in the saddle. To me that and that alone is the key to the problem.

"As long as that leadership continues I think any hope of restoring efficiency or doing more than resisting daily job-action is close to impossible. I would not vote against spending money for programs of enforcement on the job but I would feel that it was money wasted. It is treating for symptoms without coming anywhere near the root of the disease." [38]

In that spirit the report continued with specific recommendations for action. They are worth noting because they are reflective of psychological attitudes that breed drawn-out labor struggles in which the leadership of the employer group has for its objective the destruction of the leadership of the employee group. They read:

"Concretely then, I believe—

"1. We should consider sharpening our most effective weapon. On some real issue we should invoke coast suspension for a local dispute. Frankly I know we could not maintain it long enough to accomplish any main purpose, but as a test to ourselves of our own strength and as a warning to the opposing leadership I believe it would be worth its cost. Concretely I would like to see this meeting appoint a committee to work with our officers in exploring the feasibility of such a program.

"2. We are committed to the principles of arbitration, with force as last resort if arbitration fails. I believe we should streamline our program and procedure in all the ports, so that any dispute can be carried to disagreement and arbitration with a minimum of delay. I believe that our representatives on the labor relations committees with some short-cut control from headquarters should always be in a position where they can talk strongly and definitely to the union representatives on any threatening issue. An ounce of prevention is still worth a pound of cure.

"Our present procedure is cumbersome and lacks uniformity and definiteness. It is the primary job of this board to correct that defect.

"3. We should cheerfully accept any decision against us and fight to the limit for the enforcement of those in our favor. You don't gain much by winning a lawsuit if you lie down on collecting the judgment. There again we have been weak and again this board has a job to do.

"4. We should take no action which will give the present union leadership the slightest semblance of any real rallying cry or any opportunity to build itself up with its people on what we do. I would reluctantly bow to a contrary majority opinion, but on that score I do not believe we should move to reopen the agreement this year. I would like to see us work for a renewal unchanged.

"5. We should prepare ourselves for a union reopening, and if that comes we should resist any concessions whatsoever—to and through a strike.

"6. Finally, we should prepare our own minds and the minds of those to whom we are responsible so that if a strike is forced on us we will go through with it and steadfastly refuse under any conditions whatsoever to make our peace again with the present union leadership and the philosophy it represents.

"That leadership today is fighting for its life. We haven't begun to fight as yet." [39]

The following cryptic minute should, in the years that are to come, give pause to any public opinion which assesses an unmixed blame on the unions for strikes or the failure to settle strikes quickly and peaceably:

"Upon motion of Mr. McGowen, seconded by Mr. Winkler, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"*Be it resolved,* That Mr. Cushing's report on programing for negotiations ahead be adopted."

So long as the fundamental objective or policy of any substantial group of organized employers in a collective bargaining arrangement is to undermine or make impossible the position of leaders chosen by their employees whom the employers consider objectionable, just so long will the collective bargaining processes fail to attain a maximum of industrial peace and stability in labor relations. This will be so regardless of the good, bad, or indifferent character of the labor leadership.

Another policy which has been articulated as an appropriate one for the negotiatory employers' association is contained in a statement by Mr. Almon Roth, at the time he was the head of the San Francisco Employers' Council. He explained as one of the fundamental premises of the council that: "Collective bargaining is primarily a pressure game."

Such a conception raises sharply the question of differentiating between proper and improper pressure tactics within the framework of collective bargaining. The problem of identifying, classifying, and assaying the propriety of the various pressure moves of an organization such as the San Francisco Employers' Council will be constantly presented.

Such a policy as that described does not embody a psychological attitude toward collective bargaining and its underlying economic theory that bodes well for industrial peace. It frankly assumes the reality of a class struggle with an ease that startles those that have become accustomed to hearing that assumption roundly denounced from the employer side. It precludes the possibility that there may be no fundamental divergence of interest between employers and employees in collective bargaining. It destroys the possibility result in agreements fixing them which are mutually advantageous to employers and employees.

[38] See minutes of Waterfront Employers' Association of the Pacific Coast for May 11, 1939, pt. 76, exhibit 14994.

[39] Ibid.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUSHFIELD (for himself, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. SHIPSTEAD, and Mr. MOORE):

S. 1608. A bill to provide for the enforcement of the penal laws of the States on Indian Reservations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

(Mr. MURRAY introduced Senate bill 1609, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 1610. A bill to amend the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. O'DANIEL:

S. 1611. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States district court for the northern district of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of R. A. Quince against the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

UTILIZATION OF SURPLUS MACHINE TOOLS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for the equitable disposition and effective utilization of Government-owned surplus machine tools.

This measure was drawn to meet the problem: What is to be done with the staggering volume of surplus machine tools accumulated in the course of our war production effort over the past 3 years?

A few figures will serve to convey to the Senate some idea of the enormous proportions to which this volume has already grown. From 1941 to 1943, inclusive, not less than 700,000 machine tools were produced in this country compared with 250,000 produced during the 10 years ending 1939. Stated in dollar

terms, our machine-tool output totaling more than $3,000,000,000 for 1941 to 1943, inclusive, exceeds the value of our total output for the entire 20 years preceding Pearl Harbor.

Making due allowance for normal peacetime needs, the excess of this expanded supply over the most liberal estimate of current wartime needs, amounts to at least 300,000 tools which are now lying idle in storage or occupying valuable space in the war plants of the country.

It is common knowledge among those conversant with cut-backs and contract terminations in ordnance and related procurements that the abundance of war matériel and the equipment on hand which these machines have already produced now renders a substantial portion of them surplus to current needs. This sharply raises a problem which is the particular concern of this measure.

What shall we do with this enormous potential of productive capacity paid for with over $3,000,000,000 of public money, not to mention the additional millions that went into the construction and equipment of the plants which produced these tools?

To me, it is unthinkable that these machines should be disposed of in the conventional manner by public sale to the highest bidder. In fact, Mr. President, I prefer to regard these properties as presenting a problem not merely of disposal but rather one of their utilization for the protection of our American economy. That is why this measure is called the Surplus Machine Tool Utilization Act. Any other method of disposal would create a high degree of speculation and distress and would operate to the obvious disadvantage of small and intermediate-sized business and, therefore, of free enterprise itself. Such a course, moreover, would be certain to retard post-war employment and the technological development of the machine-tool industry. This would strike an irreparable blow at an industry that lies at the very nerve center of our economy as a whole.

Mr. President, what is called for here is legislation which will define and provide the means of carrying out a clear and consistent policy to utilize this vast reservoir of productive power for the preservation of free enterprise and the attainment of maximum employment now as well as in post-war America. For this is truly an immediate problem, Mr. President. It cannot be otherwise with an estimated surplus of 300,000 idle machine tools waiting to be used.

The measure which I have just introduced is designed to achieve these broad purposes. It establishes what is no more than a policy-making commission and in no sense a new bureau. It is to be composed of representatives of the War and Navy Departments, the Maritime Commission, and the Defense Plant Corporation, besides five additional members representing the industries concerned and the public at large. Existing Government personnel and facilities are to be used to the utmost extent feasible, and the employment of additional personnel avoided wherever possible.

Procedures are provided for determining what tools are surplus and the standards for their classification prescribed. The manner of disposition of all surplus tools which is provided in section 5 has been conceived to carry out in concrete terms the broad purposes defined in section 1. After reserving a sufficient supply of tools for all Government needs, current and future, the remainder under appropriate terms and conditions are to be allocated for the maintenance and establishment of small metal-working concerns generally and in particular to aid in setting up war veterans in metal-working enterprises. Government loans and advances are provided for these purposes.

Provision is also made for permitting the schools and colleges of the country to avail themselves of these machine tools to initiate and extend courses of instruction in the sciences and in the development of skills connected with their operation. The residue is to be available for export in foreign trade subject to license by the Secretary of State in each instance in accordance with the requirements of our foreign policy. The life of the act is limited to 3 years following the termination of hostilities, after which any tools then remaining on hand are to be sold as broken scrap.

Mr. President, I confidently believe that the principles underlying this measure and its provisions for carrying them out, offer a satisfactory solution of a problem which is certain to grow in scope and urgency as the war progresses toward victory.

I ask that this bill be printed at this point in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1609) to provide for the equitable disposal and effective utilization of Government-owned surplus machine tools, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the purposes of this act, which shall be cited as the "Surplus Machine Tool Utilization Act," shall be to provide for the equitable disposal and effective utilization of those machine tools now or hereafter owned or controlled by or in behalf of the United States as a result of the prosecution of the war, which have or will become surplus to Government needs and functions upon termination of war procurement contracts or otherwise; and, by the disposal thereof, to aid and promote (a) the national defense; (b) the preservation and establishment of small business concerns in an economy of free enterprise; (c) international trade; and (d) public education in the mechanical skills and the sciences connected with the operation of machine tools.

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(a) The term "Government-owned machine tool" shall mean any power-driven mechanism, whose primary use and function are to form or shape metal by means of a cutting process and in which the United States Government or any department, agency, or establishment thereof has heretofore acquired and, at any time prior to the sixtieth day next following termination of hostilities in the present war, shall hereafter acquire any title, right, or other possessory or property interest for the primary purpose of using such mechanism in connection with the prosecution of the present war or to aid the national defense.

(b) The term "termination of hostilities in the present war" shall mean the conclusion of an armistice with all the nations now at war with the United States, or such time prior thereto as the President may declare for the purposes of this act.

(c) The term "political subdivision" shall mean (1) the District of Columbia; (2) any county of any State, possession, or Territory of the United States; and (3) in the absence thereof, the territorial unit of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States which the Commission, established under section 3 of this act, shall deem most nearly approximate to a county.

(d) The terms "public school" and "public high school" shall mean any institution supported, in whole or in part, by funds appropriated by any appropriating power of the United Statess, State, or local governments, whose primary function and purpose are to provide training and instruction of any kind to all persons conforming to standards of admission lawfully required.

(e) The term "war veteran" shall mean any member of the armed forces of the United States who shall have been honorably discharged therefrom and all members of the merchant marine who shall have received an honorable discharge or its equivalent certifying to satisfactory service.

(f) The term "larger metal working industry" shall refer to those metal-working concerns which are not within the definition of a smaller metal-working concern as that term is hereinafter defined in section 5 (c) of this act.

SEC. 3. A Federal Machine Tool Commission (hereinafter called the Commission) is hereby created, to consist of nine members who shall be appointed in the following manner:

(a) The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, and the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Defense Plant Corporation shall each designate for membership on such Commission one representative from his department or agency, whose functions and duties relate primarily to the acquisition or use of machine tools.

(b) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint the five remaining members from the following groups, namely: One member from large metal-working industry, one member from smaller metal-working industry, one member from the machine-tool industry, and two members from the public at large. A vacancy shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Commission and five members shall at all times constitute a quorum. The President shall designate the Chairman and Vice Chairman from among the appointees provided for in this subsection and each such appointee shall receive compensation to be determined by the Commission, at a rate not to exceed $50 per diem.

(c) The principal office of the Commission shall be in the District of Columbia, but the Commission may establish such branch offices in other places of the United States as it may determine. The Commission shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

(d) The Commission is authorized to accept and utilize such voluntary services and property as it may deem necessary to carry out its duties and functions and with the consent of any department or agency may utilize the services, facilities, and personnel thereof, including field services, to carry out its duties and functions. The Commission shall, without regard to the civil-service laws, appoint and prescribe the duties of a secre-

tary and general counsel. To the extent that such additional personnel as the Commission may require is not available to it from the other departments and agencies of the Government under subsection (b) of this section, the Commission, subject to the civil-service laws, shall employ such additional personnel, whose compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

(e) The Commission from time to time, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws, may employ the temporary services of such qualified engineers, agencies, or other qualified specialists as it may deem necessary to carry out its duties and functions under this act. It may fix the compensation of such personnel, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided,* That all such compensation be on a per diem basis, not to exceed $50 per diem for each such employment.

(f) The Commission may make such expenditures at the seat of government and elsewhere as are necessary in the exercise of its duties and functions, including expenditures for (1) rent and personal services at the seat of government and elsewhere; (2) traveling expenses; (3) office furniture, equipment and supplies, newspapers, periodicals, and books of reference (including the exchange thereof); (4) printing and binding; and (5) inquiries and studies concerning the supply, location, availability, disposal, and utilization of machine tools.

SEC. 4. The Commission shall require from any executive department or agency, and such department or agency shall thereupon furnish, any information and data with respect to such machine tools as are in the possession, use, or control of such department or agency. Upon the submission of such information and data, the Commission shall determine what machine tools, if any, are surplus to the needs and functions of such department or agency and such determination shall be final or conclusive upon such department or agency. The Commission shall thereupon classify all machine tools so determined to be surplus, according to the following manner:

Class A shall consist of those Government-owned machine tools which, for a period not exceeding 1 year next following their manufacture and prior to the date of such classification, have remained continuously unused;

Class B shall consist of those Government-owned machine tools which at any time prior to the date of classification had been in use for a total period not exceeding 7,200 hours.

Class C shall consist of all Government-owned machine tools determined to be surplus under the provisions of this act, which are not properly classifiable thereunder in class A or class B: *Provided,* That no machine tool which shall be acquired by the Government, or for its account, more than 60 days next following termination of hostilities in the present war shall be subject to classification under this section or be subject to the provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. Such machine tools, as so classified, shall thereupon be disposed of under the direction of the Commission according to the following order of priority and upon the following conditions:

(a) All Government machine tools of whatever classification which are specially designed, equipped, and manufactured for the production of military or naval equipment and which the Commission shall find are not readily replaceable from the open market, shall be retained by or redistributed among the appropriate Government departments or agencies in such types and quantities and according to such procedures as the Commission shall prescribe: *Provided,* That the retention of any machine tools under this subsection shall continue until such time, not exceeding 20 years, as the same become obsolete or are abandoned as otherwise unsuitable for military or naval purposes.

(b) Class A and B machine tools, excepting such quantities as the Commission shall deem required for the purpose specified in subsection (a) of this section, shall be allocated and made available first for the machine tool replacement needs of Government arsenals, navy yards, maintenance and repair facilities, shore establishments, and similar installations of the United States, in such types and quantities and upon such conditions as the Commission shall determine: *Provided,* (1) That no machine tool shall be allocated or disposed of under this subsection unless the Commission shall first determine that the same is superior in design or condition for the particular purpose of the machine tools which it is to replace; and (2) that the Government establishment receiving any machine tool pursuant to this subsection shall thereupon become accountable therefor in accordance with existing provisions of law relating to accountability for Government property and the Government establishment releasing any such tool shall thereupon be relieved of all such accountability.

(c) Classes A and B machine tools, excepting such quantities as the Commission shall deem required for the purpose specified in subsections (a) and (b) of this section, shall be allocated and made available to smaller metal-working concerns in such types and quantities and upon such terms and conditions as the Commission shall deem necessary or appropriate to maintain or establish any smaller metal-working concern in business: *Provided,* That in allocating and disposing of each type of machine tool under this subsection the Commission shall give preference to any war veteran desiring to maintain or establish himself individually or as a participant having a substantial interest in a smaller metal-working business and the Commission shall prescribe appropriate rules and regulations to carry out the purpose of this proviso, which shall govern the determination of such preferences: *Provided further,* That the Commission, in disposing of machine tools under this subsection to war veterans and smaller metal-working concerns, shall, in all proper cases, arrange through the medium and by means of the funds of the Smaller War Plants Corporation or any other existing agency of the Government (and such agencies are hereby directed to comply with the Commission's directives issued under this subsection) for the extension of credit to the purchaser or user of such tools or, through such media and by means of such funds or otherwise, to make or guarantee such other financial arrangement respecting the use and disposition of such machine tools as in its judgment will carry out the purposes of this act: *Provided further,* That the rate of interest in connection with any credit, loan, or deferred payment under this subsection shall not exceed 3 percent per annum: *And provided further,* That for the period of 10 years following the disposition of any machine tool pursuant to this subsection the same shall be subject to repossession by the appropriate department or agency of the Government if in the event of war or national emergency it is not being utilized for the production of military, naval, or maritime equipment. To carry out more effectively the purpose of this subsection, the Commission shall promptly conduct a general survey of the machine-tool capacity and potential capacity of the smaller metal-working concerns of the country, the results of which shall be made public. For purposes of this act, a smaller metal-working concern or business shall be deemed to be any independent, unaffiliated manufacturing enterprise which utilizes not more than 100 machine tools for not less than 75 percent of the number of man-hours involved in its total productive operations. Upon the delivery of any machine tool to any smaller metal-working concern pursuant to this subsection the accountability of any Government department or agency under existing provision of law relating to accountability for Government property shall terminate, but such accountability on the part of such department or agency shall thereupon attach to any property or other thing of value received by it or for its account in consideration of or in connection with the particular transaction involved.

(d) Class A, B, and C machine tools, excepting such quantities as the Commission shall deem required for the purposes specified in subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section, shall be made available without charge and for the purposes hereinafter specified, in such types and quantities and upon such terms and conditions as the Commission shall determine, to promote training and instruction in the skills and sciences connected with the operation of machine tools, in public schools heretofore and hereafter established in the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories and possessions of the United States: *Provided,* That no allocation of any machine tools shall be made under this subsection unless (1) such courses shall be planned and supervised by a local board of five members for each political subdivision, three members of which shall be supervisory employees of industrial plants; one member a representative of the local school system and one member a representative of the local public at large; and (2) that the standards of eligibility for admission to such courses shall not be permitted to vary or differ from the standards of general admission to public high schools lawfully prevailing in the particular political subdivision involved. The Commission, for each allocation and disposal under this subsection, shall prescribe suitable terms and conditions concerning the scope, character, and duration of the courses to be given.

(e) Class A, B, and C machine tools, excepting such quantities as the Commission shall deem required for the purposes specified in subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section, shall be made available for sale, exchange, lease, or other suitable disposition to friendly nations and their nationals in such types and quantities and upon such terms and conditions as the Commission shall deem appropriate within the purposes of this act: *Provided,* That each such allocation made for foreign consignment pursuant to this subsection shall first be authorized by license issued by the Secretary of State or by such other Government establishment as he shall designate for that purpose. The accountability of any Government department or agency in respect of all machine tools disposed of under this subsection shall terminate upon delivery thereof and such accountability on the part of such department or agency shall thereupon attach to any property or other thing of value received in consideration of or in connection with the particular transaction.

(f) Whoever, in connection with any transaction under this section, makes any material statement in writing, knowing it to be false; or for the purpose of influencing the action of any Government establishment or any employee, agent, or designee thereof, or for the purpose of obtaining any machine tool, property, or other thing of value hereunder from any Government establishment, offers or tenders to any employee, agent, or designee, of any Government establishment any bribe, gratuity, or other consideration or thing of value in connection with the performance of any official act or duty under this act and any employee or agent who accepts the same, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment of not more than 2 years, or both. The provisions of sections

112, 113, 114, 115, 116, and 117 of the Criminal Code of the United States (U. S. C., title 18, ch. 5, secs. 202 to 207, inclusive), insofar as applicable, are extended to apply to contracts or agreements made under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 6. (a) The authority granted under this act shall cease and the existence of the Commission terminate on a date which shall be 3 years following the termination of hostilities in the present war, except that within 60 days after such date the Commission shall make a final report of its operations, together with its recommendations under this act, to the President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Such reports shall include a summary and brief account of all transactions not previously reported and a full itemization of all Government machine tools remaining on hand, together with the reasons for their nondisposal under this act.

(b) On expiration of 60 days next following submission of such final report, all machine tools remaining on hand shall be broken up as scrap by and at the expense of the departments and agencies of the Government accountable therefor and the same shall be sold as broken scrap metal for the purpose of being remelted: *Provided*, That no part of any such scrap metal shall be at any time thereafter resold or consigned to or for the account of any foreign purchaser and all Government departments or agencies making any sale under this subsection shall incorporate therein such terms and conditions as will apply the intent of this proviso to the particular transaction in each instance. The proceeds of all sales under this subsection shall be paid into the general fund of the Treasury.

SEC. 7. In addition to the final report required under section 6 of this act, the Commission shall render semiannual reports, in writing, to the Congress, beginning the first day of the sixth month following the effective date of this act, setting forth in detail its operations under this act and such recommendations as it may deem appropriate within the purposes of this act.

SEC. 8. The Commission shall adopt and promulgate appropriate rules and regulations which shall be binding upon all executive departments and agencies, to carry out its duties and functions under this act.

SEC. 9. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 10. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this act, no department, agency, or establishment of the Government shall be in any degree relieved of its accountability for any Government-owned machine tool in accordance with existing provisions of law relating to accountability for Government property.

(b) In complying with such directives as the Commission may issue to carry out its functions under this act, the departments, agencies, and establishments of the Government to which such directives are issued shall be responsible for all expenses and charges connected with the storage, protection, preparation for shipment, and shipment of any Government-owned machine tool involved in any such directive or in any transaction under this act: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the assumption of such expenses or charges by any other party to such transaction, excepting the Commission.

SEC. 11. Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Commission or with any other Government establishment involved in the administration of this act, embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or wilfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, received or connected with any transaction under this act, or with intent to defraud the Commission or any Government establishment, or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Commission or other Government establishment, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Commission or to any other Government establishment in connection with the administration of this act, or, without being authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or, with intent to defraud, participates, shares, receives, directly or indirectly, any money, profit, property, or benefit through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Commission or Government establishment, or gives any unauthorized information concerning any future action or plan of the commission or of any Government establishment under this act which might affect the value of securities, or, having such knowledge, invests or speculates, directly or indirectly, in the securities or property of an company or corporation receiving or about to receive loans or other benefits under this act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment of not more than 5 years, or both.

SEC. 12. This act shall take effect immediately.

VIOLATIONS OF FREE SPEECH AND RIGHTS OF LABOR

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 224), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the authority conferred under Senate Resolution 266, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, agreed to June 6, 1936; and under Senate Resolution 70, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, agreed to February 19, 1937; and under Senate Resolution 154, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, agreed to August 12, 1937; and under Senate Resolution 266, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, agreed to May 18, 1938; and under Senate Resolution 126, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, agreed to August 4, 1939; and under Senate Resolution 135, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, agreed to June 28, 1941; and under Senate Resolution 98, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, agreed to February 25, 1943, to investigate the violation of the right of free speech and assembly and interference with the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively is hereby continued during the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress for the sole purpose of concluding the printing of hearings and reports.

READJUSTMENT IN CIVIL LIFE OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR NO. 2

Mr. CLARK of Missouri submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 225), which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance, or a subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a study of problems relating to the readjustment in civil life of veterans of World War No. 2, particularly as such problems affect their employment or reemployment. The committee, or a subcommittee thereof, may conduct hearings, public or executive, assemble and publish data, analyses, and shall report to the Senate such findings as it may make from time to time, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or a subcommittee thereof, may sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to borrow from Government departments and agencies such special assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the limits of such funds as shall be set aside for its use by the Committee on Finance or shall be appropriated to it directly by resolution of the Senate. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee which shall not exceed $10,000, in addition to the cost of stenographic services to report such hearings, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

GRACE D. MEYERS

Mr. TYDINGS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 226), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Grace D. Meyers, cousin of Hazel P. Yates, late an assistant in the Senate Library, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PRESERVATION OF DYING CHILDREN OF EUROPE—ADDRESS BY DR. HOWARD E. KERSHNER

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred, a radio address entitled "Strategy and Humanity of Rescuing the Dying Children of Europe" delivered by Dr. Howard E. Kershner, on November 24, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A skeleton sits at the conference of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration meeting in Atlantic City to consider relief to occupied nations after liberation—a hideously grinning skeleton which says: "I represent more human beings dead or dying from starvation than Hitler's armies have slain on the battlefield. We will not need relief after liberation, but some of us you could save now." To the skeleton, the head of the conference, former Governor Lehman replies: "You are not on the agenda." But the skeleton sits there, in the minds of the delegates if not on their lips. Like Banquo's ghost it will not "avaunt."

Periodically the governments in exile have pleaded with Britain and America to allow them to use their own funds and neutral ships to send food to their dying children. Two years ago General de Gaulle asked for milk and vitamins for the children of France. Six months ago a joint French and Belgian request was made. Queen Wilhelmina and the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands have implored help for Dutch children. The Norwegians and others have done likewise but always the answer is "No."

Jean Monnet, recently escaped from France, says the average Frenchman has lost 33 pounds in weight. Hervé Alphand, second in rank of the French delegation at Atlantic City, says: "the last thing the people of France want to do is help the Germans, whom they hate more than the devil, but we are convinced that a limited and properly

controlled distribution in the cities could not benefit the Germans."

Mr. Spaak, Belgian Foreign Minister, says: "We ask for 2,000 tons a month. It might save our children. We have a ship of our own that could transport the supplies." But Britain and America say "No."

In Washington a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has held hearings on Senate Resolution 100 which urges immediate help to the children. Many distinguished witnesses, headed by former President Hoover and including representatives from organized labor, the church—Catholic and Protestant—relief committees, societies and spokesmen for the invaded countries, urged adoption of the resolution. Not one word was said against it.

The testimony made three things clear: (1) the children can be saved without aiding the enemy or detracting from our war effort, (2) such action would shorten rather than prolong the war, and (3) it would make post war reconstruction much less difficult.

Note some of the high points of the evidence.

As a free gift from Canada, Greece receives 15,000 tons of grain a month while the United States sends 3,600 tons of dehydrated vegetables and dried milk monthly. The Germans do not take any of this food, the operation is of no benefit to Axis economy, and it does prevent the extinction of the Greeks. If it is right to save the Greek children, why not the children of the other Nazi-occupied countries? So far Greece is the only country to which the American and British Governments will permit the sending of food through the blockade.

From June 1940 to the fall of 1942, 100,000 children in unoccupied France were fed under my direction, with food bought in Asia, Africa, and central Europe. The Germans never took a mouthful of this food nor interfered with the operation in any way. Moreover, each child helped ate just as much of the local food as it would have eaten had we not been there. Obviously this did not leave any extra French food as a result of our operation by which the Germans could profit even indirectly.

Impressive testimony was given by spokesmen for the occupied countries showing that the children are dying. In some areas over half of them have tuberculosis and the others are threatened. They faint in the schoolrooms. They have stopped growing, are tragically underweight, have no breakfast, a small piece of bread for lunch with an onion or a turnip, and vegetable soup for supper—perhaps one small portion of meat a week. Millions of children are getting no more than 700 to 900 calories of food daily, about one-third of what we give our children, and not enough to sustain life over a long period of time. I have seen these children with starvation bloated stomachs. I have seen their blue lips and bloodless faces, their rickety legs, and hollow chests. Their sad little eyes accuse us of murder. I have heard the tubercular cough mingled with the cry for bread and I can never forget it.

Hitler wages biological war. He seeks to destroy whole peoples and we play into his hands by doing nothing to save them. Those who survive will be subnormal in mind and body, unable to compete with the Germans in the reconstruction of Europe. The people who established the principles of free speech, free press, free religion, trial by jury, and all the institutions of freemen are dying while the Nazis are still getting enough to eat. What will the future be if the people who believe in human freedom are not here when the war is over?

It is not a choice between sending food to the children or sending more bombs, for the food would go in neutral ships that cannot be hired for the war effort and would not cost the American people a dollar. No food needed for ourselves or our allies would be sent from this country. It could be brought from South America and South Africa. Half of what we waste here would save the lives of at least 10,000,000 children.

The witnesses agreed that the war comes first, but they insisted that giving strength and moral courage to our friends and allies who are fighting hard for us now would shorten rather than prolong the war. One witness said it is as shortsighted to refuse help to those who are fighting for us as it would be to short ration our own Army. What a ghastly and costly blunder we are making by depriving the people who are helping us of the strength to do more.

We trust the German Red Cross to distribute over 7,000 tons of food a month which we send to prisoners of war. It is meticulously done to the satisfaction of all concerned. If we can trust the German Red Cross to do this, surely we can trust the International Red Cross to do it for the starving children of these same prisoners. Imagine the feelings of a European prisoner eating a food package from America when he knows that we will not permit the sending of food to save the life of his child who at that very time is dying of starvation. If we are willing, as we all are, to feed able-bodied prisoners of war who work for the Germans, it is entirely illogical to starve their children who cannot possibly assist the Axis war effort.

Furthermore, we are sending to each British and American civilian interned in German-held territory 50 pounds of food and other relief supplies monthly, while we will not permit our Dutch, Belgian, Norwegian, French, and other allies to use their own funds to send even a little powdered milk to their starving babies. How is that going to look when the war is over? Will we ever live down such a shameful disgrace? Who can justify such selfishness? How can we send food through the blockade to our own but deny it to the dying children of our friends?

The abnormal mentality of many Germans today is no doubt due in part to undernourishment in childhood during the previous war. But at the worst German children then got twice as much as large numbers of French and Belgian children are getting today. What, then, of the future of these children of our friends and allies, even though they survive?

It was pointed out that one of the strongest appeals used in soliciting subscriptions to the National War Fund was to send food to the starving children of the occupied countries. This was definitely promised and the American people have a right to demand that this promise be kept.

One witness pointed out the injustice of asking Norwegian seamen to continue risking their lives to take food to England, Russia, and elsewhere while their own wives and children are starving in Norway.

Much evidence was presented to show that American and British public opinion want immediate action to save the children. A large collection of editorials from leading journals in both countries was presented, all urging child feeding. Posters making graphic the suffering of the children in German-occupied countries are in use all over England. Samples were presented to the committee, as were statements by churchmen and labor leaders in both England and America. The British Red Cross has long urged that food be sent to the children on the continent. Probably a strong majority of the members of the American Congress and the British Parliament want it done immediately. Certainly 85 percent of the members present at a meeting which I addressed in the House of Commons in London last winter favored it. No opposition was expressed at an informal meeting of Members of the House of Representatives which I was privileged to address in Washington last week. I have talked with seven top men in the administration at Washington who favor it and none who oppose. I believe our Commander in Chief and his principal advisers want to do it. I believe we the people ought to tell him that we approve and that we will back him in whatever action is necessary to save the children. There is every evidence that a great majority of the American and British people would welcome such action on the part of our Government.

The British Government took a stand against feeding in 1940. We can understand and sympathize with that position when Britain was unarmed and alone, but conditions are different today. She is well armed and has powerful allies. We are pulling our full share of the war load, and there is no longer any reason why British tenacity in high quarters should block the desire of the people of both countries to rescue Europe's dying children.

On the platform, over the radio, and in the press of both Britain and America I have paid high tribute to the integrity and capacity of the British people and to their Government. I have continuously urged the closest unity between our two countries. I still do and shall so continue. It is the brightest hope of the future. The two countries should stand together, but on this issue the British have stood on us and not with us. Our Government has been prevented from doing what ought to be done and what it would like to do for humanitarian as well as strategic reasons. This has become intolerable.

If your best friend were making a serious mistake, you would try to restrain him, and the closer he was in friendship to you the harder you would try to prevent the catastrophe. I feel exactly that same way about Britain except that we, as well as our friend, are involved in the tragedy. All honor to Britain for the noble stand she has made and is making and thank God for the great leadership of her Prime Minister; but surely we are close enough in friendship to our great ally to save her and ourselves from the needless sacrifice of the lives of millions of our best friends.

We know and approve of the efforts the President has made on behalf of sending food to the children and we honor him for them. We also know and approve of his diligence in maintaining cordial American-British relationships, but there comes a time, after long patience and years of delay, when the will of one man or a few men in London cannot be allowed to prevail against the good sense of our Commander in Chief, backed by the American Government, the American people, and, there is every reason to believe, a large majority of the British people.

Will you help save these innocent children? Write a letter or card to the President, the Secretary of State, your Congressman, and your two Senators urging immediate action to get food to them. They are dying every day.

Copies of this talk, my previous talk over the Columbia Broadcasting System and other literature may be obtained free from the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York.

With grateful thanks, good morning.

UNITY—ADDRESS BY HON. SAM RAYBURN AND HON. CHARLES E. WILSON (SENATE DOC. NO. 142)

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, a short time ago the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, made what I considered a very great speech on unity, and Hon. Charles E. Wilson, vice chairman of the War Production Board, also made an outstanding

address on that subject. In unity there is no partisan opinion. We all know that our distinguished Speaker is an outstanding Democrat, and that Mr. Wilson, who is serving in this administration, is of Republican political faith. I ask that the two addresses be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BENEFITS FOR VETERANS (S. DOC. NO. 141)

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I have before me a tabulation prepared at my request by the Veterans' Administration of the benefits presently afforded members of the military forces of the United States under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. This document contains a great deal of very valuable information, and, therefore, for convenience of Senators, I ask unanimous consent that the matter may be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the matter will be printed as a document.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY BEFORE MEDICAL SOCIETY OF COUNTY OF MONROE, ROCHESTER, N. Y.

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator MURRAY on November 17, 1943, before the Medical Society of the County of Monroe, Rochester, N. Y., which appears in the Appendix.]

SCIENCE, FAITH, AND FREEDOM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BURTON

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Science, Faith, and Freedom," delivered by him at the commencement exercises of the Case School of Applied Science, Cleveland, Ohio, December 20, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE REALTOR AND THE NATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Realtor and the Nation," delivered by him on December 14, 1943, before the Milwaukee Real Estate Board, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY NORMAN H. DAVIS AT ANNUAL MEETING OF RED CROSS

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Norman H. Davis, chairman of the American Red Cross, at the annual meeting of the Red Cross, held in Washington, D. C., on December 8, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ALLEY SLUMS IN THE DISTRICT—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Price Paid in Lives," published in the Washington Post, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHINA AND THE CAIRO PARLEY—ARTICLE BY JAMES D. WHITE

[Mr. ANDREWS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Chinese Regaining Prestige as Result of Cairo Parley," by Associated Press writer James D. White, published in the Washington Star of December 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRODUCTION OF SYNTHETIC RUBBER—ARTICLE BY HIRAM HOWARD

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding the production of synthetic rubber, written by Hiram Howard and published in the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegram of December 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEND-LEASE—EDITORIALS FROM THE DECATUR (ILL.) HERALD AND PEORIA (ILL.) JOURNAL-TRANSCRIPT

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "It's 'Lend,' Not 'Give'," from the Decatur (Ill.) Herald of November 13, 1943, and an editorial entitled "Worth 20 Billion," published in the Peoria (Ill.) Journal-Transcript of November 12, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON MOSCOW CONFERENCE

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD several editorials commenting on the Moscow Conference, which appear in the Appendix.]

ALARMING TENDENCIES IN THE NATION'S LIFE—EDITORIAL FROM THE RICHMOND TIMES DISPATCH

[Mr. DOWNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "When Will America Wake Up?" from the Richmond Times Dispatch of December 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR CHARTER OF LIBERTY

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, here in the United States, where the light of freedom glows with undiminished power, we are commemorating the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of the American Bill of Rights with the observance of Bill of Rights Week.

In all the history of the world there has never been a document of human liberty so far-reaching, so inspiring, and so impelling as that which is comprised by the immortal Bill of Rights inscribed in the Constitution of the United States.

During these times of great crisis, when the bastions of civilization and human liberty are everywhere menaced by the benighted forces of treachery and oppression, it is well that we should rededicate ourselves to the Bill of Rights and to the principles of human liberty which are contained in that enduring charter.

For that reason, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial written by Harry H. Schlacht, entitled "Our Charter of Liberty," which appeared in the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph on Sunday, December 19, 1943. This editorial describes in words more appropriate than I could choose, the true value and enduring significance of the American Bill of Rights, which is now being defended with full gallantry by the courageous fighting men of a free America.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR CHARTER OF LIBERTY

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Born in the birth of a new nation, our historic Bill of Rights has become the charter of liberty.

In the midst of war America has paused to celebrate the covenant of our freedom, to rededicate its principles and its practices.

In commemoration of its one hundred and fifty-second anniversary, we declare in the words of the Great Master to the Apostle Peter:

"Upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

Liberties explicit in the Bill of Rights are the same liberties our forefathers won with their lives.

It was purchased with their blood and tears.

It sprang from an innate desire of mankind to be free.

It is the echo of past centuries.

It is the brightest gem in the crown of our American democracy.

It is our protective mantle.

It is the high concept of man's estate proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence—the birth certificate of our Nation—and embedded in the Constitution of the United States.

Like fibers of gold running through the history of the human race are the stories of man's struggle for liberty.

The scale of justice came from Egypt, the modern concept of right from wrong from the Ten Commandments, and the rights of man from the Magna Carta.

It typifies the path man has laboriously traveled from servitude to civilization, from slavery to freedom.

The seeds of man's struggle for human rights were planted and nurtured more than 2,500 years ago.

It continues its slow growth through the various governments of ancient Rome.

It survived the blighting influence and oppressions of the Middle Ages.

It came into full flower in the definite provisions of our Constitution.

Our Bill of Rights affirms the right of every man to these great basic freedoms which keep inviolate the personality and the conscience of man: Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, and the other inalienable freedoms of a self-respecting nation. America has emblazoned these ideals upon her shield.

From the masterful blood of many great races has sprung a mighty people—America. America does not mean gigantic forests, towering peaks, or far-reaching valleys and crystal lakes. It means our cherished and glorious traditions. It represents the political institutions of the most democratic republic ever conceived by the genius and the daring statesmanship of man.

It signifies the acceptance of the eternal law based upon the postulate of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

Refuge of the oppressed, America is the cradle of religious toleration, the citadel of liberty, and the great exponent of man's inherent dignity.

In the twenty-fifth chapter of Leviticus, we hear God speaking to Moses on Mount Sinai:

"Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof."

That command has come down through the ages.

It is recorded on the Liberty Bell.

The American flag is humanity's noble and glorious answer to that divine edict.

God-given principles are now challenged.

They are menaced by a world-engulfing bondage.

The mailed fist of the strong has smitten the jaw of the weak.

The iron heels of tyrants are grinding the defenseless into dust.

Miss Liberty has grasped the sword.

The torch of liberty is ablaze.

The command: Fall in! has been given.

The campfires are burning.

We are keeping faith with our countless dead who sacrificed their all that we might live.

However long our travail, however heavy the blows which the structure of liberty has to endure, this we know: when the holocaust is over, we shall be able to say like the prophet of Isaiah of old:

"The bricks are fallen down, but we will build with hewn stones; the sycamores are cut down, but we will change them into cedars."

Right will win the day.

The dreams and visions of our poets and prophets and saints will some day find acceptance among the nations of the earth. After the darkest hour of the night comes the splendor of the morning, the glory of the sunrise, and the grandeur of the newborn day.

May we ever realize what the Bill of Rights means to us.

May we always strive to exemplify its principles in our daily lives, and may its pure white light, streaming from the throne of God, illuminate the world.

So "Conquer we must
When our cause it is just,
And this be our motto,
'In God is our trust.'"

HEROES ON THE HOME FRONT—COMMANDER MALCOLM ARNOLD

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, heroes on the home front should be recognized during the emergency. I call the attention of the Senate to the heroic work of Commander Malcolm Arnold, of the Navy Medical Corps, after the unfortunate train wreck in North Carolina last week.

En route to his home in Gettysburg, Pa., from 18 months sea duty, Commander Arnold, with scant medical supplies, saved many lives. Clad only in an overcoat and his underwear, with the temperature at 10 degrees above zero, he aided injured civilians and service men and women in the wreck, working heroically for 8 hours before outside medical aid arrived.

I ask that attention of the Secretary of the Navy be called to Commander Arnold's conduct and that his heroism be recognized by the Navy Department.

AUTHORIZATION TO FILE REPORT DURING RECESS

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for permission to file during the recess a report from the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PRELIMINARY REPORT ON CONTRACT TERMINATION LEGISLATION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in September 1943 the chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], appointed a subcommittee to consider certain problems involved in war contracts. The subcommittee is composed of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and myself, as chairman.

The subcommittee is submitting a report to the full committee, and also an outline of a proposed bill. The matter is of such importance that I ask that the preliminary report be printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRELIMINARY REPORT ON CONTRACT TERMINATION LEGISLATION

INTRODUCTION

In September 1943, Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, established a subcommittee to handle certain problems involved in war contracts. The members of the subcommittee are Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana (chairman); Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN, of Missouri; and Senator CHAPMAN REVERCOMB, of West Virginia.

The following measures have been referred to your subcommittee:

I. On contract termination:

S. 280. To provide authority to the Secretary of War to use funds now or hereafter appropriated for adjustment of contracts, and for other purposes. (Introduced by Senator REYNOLDS.)

S. 1268. To facilitate the termination of war contracts. (Introduced by Senator MURRAY.)

S. 147. To provide for mandatory loans to small business concerns upon termination of their war contracts. (Introduced by Senator MURRAY.)

S. Res. 198. To investigate the matter of the termination of Government procurement contracts. (Introduced by Senator MURRAY.) (This resolution defines the functions of the subcommittee and provides the necessary funds.)

II. On cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts:

S. J. Res. 80. To prohibit the use of the cost-plus-fixed-fee system of contracting in connection with war contracts. (Introduced by Senator FERGUSON.)

III. On surplus property disposal:

S. Res. 195. Requesting an investigation concerning Government property and materials no longer needed for war purposes. (Introduced by Senator MURRAY.)

S. 1478. To provide for the conservation and proper disposal of surplus war properties, and for other purposes. (Introduced by Senator MURRAY.)

Of the above measures, Senate Resolutions 195 and 198 have been reported favorably by the subcommittee to the full committee. Senate Resolution 198 has been reported favorably by the full committee, with amendments, and sent to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. Senate Resolution 195 has also been reported favorably by the full committee and is now on the Senate calendar.

Thus far the subcommittee has concentrated its attention mainly on contract termination and has therefore been unable to make any detailed study of Senate Joint Resolution 80, on cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts, or of Senate bill 1478, on surplus property disposal.

With regard to the bills on contract termination the subcommittee has held extensive hearings.[1] Detailed testimony has been taken from individual businessmen who have had difficulties in obtaining settlements on claims arising from terminated war contracts, and from representatives of business organizations. The subcommittee has also heard from important Government officials, such as the Comptroller General, the Under Secretary of War, the Under Secretary of the Navy, the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, the Secretary of Commerce, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Labor, the General Counsel of the Treasury Department, and the Acting Chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

Furthermore, hundreds of statements have been received from representatives of business and people in all walks of life, stressing the importance of prompt settlements of contract-termination claims and decisive action by the Congress to expedite such settlements.

The subcommittee has also been in close touch with the Special Senate Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, whose excellent report of November 18, 1943, entitled "Cancelation of War Contracts, Disposition and Sale of Surplus Property, and Industrial Demobilization and Reconversion," has been most helpful. The subcommittee intends to carry on all its future studies of proposed legislation in close cooperation with the special committee under the chairmanship of Senator GEORGE. Joint hearings may be held and legislative proposals may be jointly sponsored.

For the present, your subcommittee is not reporting any bill on contract termination. It is the intention to await fuller exploration of these problems by the George committee.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Certain general conclusions have been reached by your subcommittee on contract termination:

First, Congress must develop an omnibus contract-termination statute and avoid the enactment of a host of separate, conflicting, and ill-related acts.

It has been the thought of some Government officials that we should have a separate law on advance payments, a separate law on the validation of defective contracts, another separate law on the personal liability of contracting officers, and separate laws on many other individual problems. Your subcommittee rejects this approach.

Many Government officials prefer legislation that deals only with organization and procedures and omits any declaration of congressional policies. Rather than have the Congress clearly define their responsibilities, they prefer to operate under amorphous, incomplete legislation that would leave them full powers of discretion in formulating basic policies. Your subcommittee feels that this approach is not acceptable to the Congress.

Second, regardless of the type of legislation enacted, the Congress must exercise a full and constant check upon its administration.

Congressional vigilance is an essential part of any program to prevent the overpayment of huge sums of money in settlement of contract-termination claims. This is particularly necesssary if the policies that will be set forth by the Congress are to be administered in conformance with the intent of the Congress.

Your subcommittee, therefore, advises that in any legislation enacted Congress should underscore this principle by spelling out the responsibilities of appropriate Senate and House committees in surveying and studying the administration of the act and developing necessary amendments.

Third, the legislation should be based upon a declaration of policy that imposes upon the Government and its executive agencies the following responsibilities:

A. To provide all business enterprises having claims arising from terminated war contracts, whether prime contracts, subcontracts, or purchase orders, with (1) the opportunity to obtain quick equitable final settlements, and (2) adequate interim financing during the period between termination and final settlement.

B. To protect the interests of small business in contract termination.

C. To protect the Government's interest by preventing overpayments, recovering excess payments, and vigorously prosecuting all cases of fraud.

[1] October 14, 15, 21, 22, 27, and 28, and November 4, 5, 8, 9, and 10.

SUMMARY OF BILL OUTLINE

Your subcommittee also submits an outline of an omnibus bill, based upon the three conclusions set forth above.

Until now no proposal that has been offered, whether in the form of a bill or otherwise, has undertaken to cover the entire subject. In this respect the attached bill outline is unique.

It is the thought of the subcommittee that widespread study of the bill outline by business and labor, as well as by the Members of the Congress and Government officials, will help develop constructive thinking upon the problem as a whole. The crystallization of informed opinion on this subject will enable the Congress to work toward the enactment of an omnibus contract-termination statute by the end of February.

While concurring in the general principles embodied in the bill outline, the subcommittee emphasizes the fact that it has not yet finally committed itself to any of the specific sections.

The bill outline, which is in five parts, may be briefly summarized as follows:

Title I sets forth a declaration of policy, the responsibilities of Congress, and definitions of terms.

Title II sets up an office of contract settlement under the present Office of War Mobilization. Your subcommittee, however, is also studying the desirability of having the office of contract settlement operate under a new demobilization agency to be set up by the Congress.

The director of the office of contract settlement is given the task of formulating all major administrative policies under the legislation. He is given specific responsibilities, including the promulgation of uniform termination clauses for prime contracts and subcontracts, the establishment of uniform record-keeping systems, the promotion of company-wide settlements, the establishment of machinery for appeals, consultation with industry, and the submission of quarterly reports to Congress. He is instructed to use existing administrative machinery to the fullest extent possible, but is authorized to establish his own administrative machinery wherever necessary.

A list of allowable charges in contract-termination claims is provided for in this title. The specific definitions of such charges are to be developed by the director.

An advisory committee on contract settlement is also provided, under the chairmanship of the director. Representation on this committee is given to the General Accounting Office, the contracting agencies, the War Production Board, the War Manpower Commission, the Department of Labor, the Department of Justice, and the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

Title III lays down the general rules under which final settlements are to be made.

The existing authority of the contracting agencies to negotiate final settlements is recognized and clearly defined. The personal liability of individual officers, in the absence of fraud, is removed. The General Accounting Office is given the power to avail itself of all records and the responsibility of reporting all cases of suspected fraud to the Congress, the Department of Justice, and the particular agency involved, but shall not have authority to withhold payment of funds.

Special attention is given in the bill outline to the specific methods available to the contracting agencies in discharging their responsibilities toward subcontractors. First, the contracting agencies are to encourage the prime contractors to negotiate the bulk of the settlements with subcontractors on the basis of the policies laid down by the office of contract settlement. Where this is not feasible, the contracting agencies—with the consent of the prime—are to negotiate settlements directly with the subs. Where, for one reason or another, the prime's consent cannot be obtained, the contracting agencies may purchase the sub's claims.

Policies to be followed with regard to materials left on hand and goods in process are outlined in detail. Registration of released manpower with the United States Employment Service is required. Provision is made to protect against misuse of termination for default in contract performance at the end of hostilities; to coordinate contract settlement with renegotiation; to continue the responsbilities of sureties; to protect the rights of assignees; and to perfect or validate defective contracts under appropriate circumstances.

Title IV deals with interim financing.

Mandatory advance payments shall be made to prime contractors within 30 days after submission of claims; these payments shall be at least 75 percent, and may be 100 percent, of the amount certified as due.

The contracting agencies are authorized to make termination loans directly and to guarantee termination loans of banking institutions. Borrowers from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Smaller War Plants Corporation are given the same protection on termination as holders of V and V–T loans.

Title V deals with assistance to small business through the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

The Smaller War Plants Corporation is given the power to purchase contract termination claims from small companies; make or guarantee contract termination and reconversion loans; buy, sell, or lease facilities and materials; and advise small companies on their contract-termination problems.

The present bill outline does not take up the subject of judicial review, which must be considered in connection with the final legislation. Your subcommittee expects to deal with this matter in the near future.

OUTLINE FOR A CONTRACT TERMINATION BILL

TITLE I. GENERAL PROVISIONS

SECTION 101. Declaration of policy:

(1) That it is the responsibility of the United States Government to provide all business enterprises having claims arising from terminated war contracts, whether prime contracts, subcontracts, or purchase orders, with the opportunity to obtain quick, equitable final settlements and adequate interim financing during the period between termination and final settlement.

(2) That it is the further responsibility of the United States Government to protect the interests of independent small business enterprises having claims arising from terminated war contracts and subcontracts.

(3) That it is the further responsibility of the United States Government to protect the Government's interest by preventing overpayments by the Government in the settlement of claims arising from terminated contracts and, whenever such overpayments have been made, to use all possible methods to recover excess payments and prevent the recurrence of similar overpayments, and to vigorously prosecute all cases of fraud.

(4) That this policy is binding upon, and shall be adhered to by, all the departments, agencies, commissions, and corporations of the United States Government.

SEC. 102. Responsibility of Congress: The Military Affairs Committees of the Senate and the House, acting through appropriate subcommittees, shall currently appraise the administration of the act, shall study each report to Congress submitted under the act, and from time to time shall recommend additional legislation or improvements in administrative policies and procedures.

SEC. 103. As used in this act, unless the context indicates otherwise—

(1) "War contract" shall mean (a) any prime contract which is connected with or related to the prosecution of the war, entered into by any department or agency which has been or may hereafter be authorized to place contracts pursuant to the authority granted by section 201 of the First War Powers Act, 1941, or (b) any subcontract as defined herein.

(2) "Subcontract" shall mean any contract, agreement, or purchase order directly or indirectly connected with or related to the performance of any prime contract referred to in subsection 1 (a) of this section or of any subcontract.

(3) "Termination," "terminate," or "terminated contract" shall refer to the termination, in whole or in part, of any prime war contract for the convenience or at the option of the Government (but not termination for default) or the termination or cancelation of any subcontract resulting from any such termination of a prime war contract.

(4) "Material" shall mean any commodity, equipment, accessory, part, assembly, or product of any kind.

TITLE II. OFFICE OF CONTRACT SETTLEMENT

SECTION 201. An Office of Contract Settlement shall be established within the Office of War Mobilization. A Director of Contract Settlement shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive a salary of $15,000.

SEC. 202. The Director of Contract Settlement is authorized to establish field offices wherever necessary: *Provided*, That he works through the existing offices and personnel of the contracting agencies to the fullest extent possible.

SEC. 203. The responsibilities and powers of the Director of the Office of Contract Settlement shall be as follows:

(1) To make all major decisions of administrative policy under all the titles of this act, except where specified to the contrary. This does not include determination of the volume of contracts to be terminated, the choice of particular contracts to be terminated or the disposal of Government-owned surplus war property.

(2) To promulgate regulations with regard to uniform termination clauses for prize contracts and subcontracts, advance payments, guaranteed loans, disposal of materials and equipment that are not taken over by the Government, etc.

(3) To promote the integration of the contract-settlement program with other programs relating to war production, demobilization, disposal of surplus war property, and the renegotiation of war contracts.

(4) To promote the decentralization of contract-settlement operation.

(5) To promote the development of industry-wide Government policies on contract settlement.

(6) To advance and protect the interests of smaller prime contractors and subcontractors in contract settlement and to work jointly with the Smaller War Plants Corporation toward that end.

(7) To promote the use of simple reporting forms that minimize the burden on record-keeping and accounting personnel, particularly, of smaller companies.

(8) To direct the contracting agencies in the training of personnel competent to handle contract-settlement problems.

(9) To cooperate with the contracting agencies in advising the major prime contractors on the organization of their contract termination departments.

(10) To provide businessmen with current information on termination policies and procedures.

(11) To establish a regular reporting system on the progress of termination settlements and to obtain such additional information from the contracting agencies from time to time as may be determined necessary.

(12) To review regularly a sample of contract-settlement negotiations and agreements as a means of checking on possible overpayment, violation of policy directives, etc.

(13) To report to Congress every 3 months on the status of contract terminations and contract settlement, on the exercise of his responsibilities and powers, on the operations of each of the contracting agencies under the act and on the need for any additional legislation.

SEC. 204. The Director of Contract Settlement shall have the power to intervene in any particular settlement negotiation and set forth terms of settlement. These terms shall be fully binding on the agency or agencies involved.

SEC. 205. The Director shall have the power to assign individual companies having claims against terminated contracts or subcontracts that originated with a number of agencies or a number of bureaus or departments within an agency to any particular agency or department thereof for an agency-wide or Government-wide settlement of its claims.

SEC. 206. In setting forth uniform regulations and contract provisions under this act, the Director is authorized to include as allowable charges against the Government direct costs, indirect expenses and overhead, preproduction costs, a fair profit on the uncompleted portion of the contract, an interest charge on the amount owed the contractor to cover the period between termination and settlement, the cost of canceling leases on property no longer needed, the cost of removing materials or machines from the plant, storage costs on materials or machines, and other legitimate termination or settlement expenses. The Director is authorized to define these allowable charges and to allow the use of standard costs.

SEC. 207. The Director shall set forth policies and procedures with regard to advance notice of contract termination. These shall include (1) immediate stopping of new work, except insofar as starting new work is necessary to avoid injury to plant or materials; (2) a minimum of 15 days advance notice with regard to work-in-process, with additional advance notice wherever possible; (3) the completion of work-in-process to the extent that a saving to the Government may be effected thereby; (4) to the fullest extent possible, prior consultation with the contractor; (5) immediate notification of subcontractors; (6) adoption by prime contractors of the same policies followed by the Government.

SEC. 208. The Director shall establish a system whereby adequate advance notice and other information on contract termination and on the settlement of claims against terminated contracts is made available to the War Production Board, the War Manpower Commission, and other Government agencies.

SEC. 209. The Director shall set forth policies and procedures in accordance with which appeals boards shall operate within the contracting agencies. He is authorized, wherever he deems necessary, to direct the establishment of local appeals boards or interagency appeals boards and to direct the appointment of public members of such appeals boards.

SEC. 210. There is hereby established a Committee on Contract Settlement, to be made up of full-time representatives of the procurement agencies, the War Production Board, the War Manpower Commission, the Smaller War Plants Corporation, the General Accounting Office, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Labor. The Director shall act as chairman of the committee and shall convene and consult with the committee at regular intervals on the major problems involved in administering the act.

SEC. 211. Through advisory committees or such other methods as he may determine, the Director shall consult to the fullest extent possible with war contractors, small and large, and with labor and other interested groups on basic policies and procedures.

TITLE III. FINAL SETTLEMENT

SECTION 301. The head of each contracting agency shall have the power to negotiate final settlements on terminated war contracts based on the specific policies and regulations set forth by the Office of Contract Settlement. Once approved by the head of a contracting agency, such settlements will not be subject to reversal or change in any fashion outside of the individual contracting agency, except through court action. This power may be delegated and redelegated within the agency or among the agencies.

SEC. 302. In the absence of fraud, no officer of the Government shall be personally liable for excess payments made in settlement of claims against terminated contracts.

SEC. 303. The contracting agencies shall have the following responsibilities and powers with regard to subcontractors and suppliers:

(1) To the fullest extent possible, delegate to the prime contractor the responsibility of negotiating final settlement with subcontractors.

a. In so doing, the contracting agencies shall set forth the general policies and procedures to be followed by the prime contractors and negotiate with the prime contractors for the insertion of uniform termination clauses in subcontracts.

b. The contracting agencies shall make spot checks of payments negotiated by the prime contractors, varying the intensity and frequency of such checks in accordance with the size of the claims.

c. The contracting agencies shall hear appeals from subcontractors against the prime contractors and intermediate subcontractors.

(2) To the extent that final settlement with subcontractors cannot be properly handled by the prime contractors, and provided that the prime contractor consents, negotiate final settlement with subcontractors directly.

a. Where necessary, and with the consent of the prime contractor, the contracting agencies may enter into new contracts directly with subcontractors for the settlement of termination claims or for the transfer of subcontracts from the prime contractor to the contracting agencies.

(3) To the extent that final settlements cannot be properly handled by the prime contractors and that consent of the prime contractors cannot be obtained for direct negotiations between the contracting agencies and the subcontractors, the contracting agencies may purchase the claims of the subcontractors.

a. This process shall be used in the case of subcontractors whose prime contractors are insolvent, irresponsible, or out of business or whose contracts have been canceled as a result of default on the part of the prime contractor.

b. This process shall also be used in developing agency-wide or Government-wide settlement of all the claims of a company.

SEC. 304. In case of the insolvency of any prime contractor, the subcontractor shall have a lien upon any final settlement funds paid to the prime, prior and superior to the lien of any general creditor. This would be along the lines provided in section 4 of the Dent Act of 1919.

SEC. 305. DISPOSITION OF MATERIALS—

(a) Contracting officer is to give contractor directions as promptly as possible as to delivery of material to be transferred to Government.

(b) Title to material as to which contracting officer fails to give directions within 30 days after submission of inventory by contractor automatically vests in the Government.

(c) Government shall accept, as adequate credit for value of material in hands of subcontractor, the price received by subcontractor, if material is sold in good faith at public sale under general conditions set forth by the Government.

(d) Contractor may remove and store material if Government fails to authorize delivery within 30 days after written request.

(e) Disposition of material is subject to all priorities orders and regulations.

(f) The War Production Board is authorized and directed to obtain from prime contractors and subcontractors information on raw materials, tools and facilities released through contract termination.

SEC. 306. All war contractors, whether prime or sub, releasing employees as a result of contract terminations shall file with the local office of the United States Employment Service a list of the released employees.

SEC. 307. To assist in the identification of claims, all termination notices to primes shall require that notices going down the line to subs include such basic information as would enable the subs to know the particular Government agency that originally awarded the contract. Such information shall also be made available, to the fullest extent possible, before termination.

SEC. 308. If termination of contracts is part of general termination of war contracts at the end of hostilities, contract may not be terminated for default unless contracting officer finds defaults have been gross or willful and have caused substantial damage.

SEC. 309. Wherever possible, contracting agencies shall settle contracts on such a basis as to enable them to agree that payments made on terminated war contracts shall not be subject to renegotiation.

SEC. 310. Sureties remain responsible for all obligations of contractors as modified by termination notices.

SEC. 311. Any payments made in settlement of, or on account of, claims against terminated war contracts shall be subject to any valid assignment of such contract or subcontract or of any claim thereunder.

SEC. 312. Informal or defective contracts made prior to the passage of this act may be validated by the contracting agencies. Agencies are to convert existing contracts of this type to formal contracts, to the fullest extent possible, within 90 days and report to Congress on the matter within 120 days.

SEC. 313. Provisions of section 35 (a) of Criminal Code are applicable to any statement submitted in support of any claim against terminated war contracts.

SEC. 314. The Comptroller General shall have access to all records included in the settlement of claims against terminated war contracts and is authorized to examine such records before or after final settlement. He shall have the responsibility of reporting to the agency involved, to the Department of Justice and to Congress any case of apparent fraud. He shall not have the power to withhold payment of any funds.

SEC. 315. The Director of Contract Settlement is authorized to set forth the policies to be followed in the administration of all sections of this title except section 314. He is authorized to delegate this authority to any other Federal agency.

TITLE IV. INTERIM FINANCING

SECTION 401. Mandatory advance payments shall be made to prime contractors within 30 days after application, of at least 75 percent and up to 100 percent of claim submitted by prime contractors.

The contracting agencies are authorized to make advance payments to subcontractors.

Advance payments in excess of the sum paid in final settlement shall be treated as loans, with interest of 6 percent.

SEC. 402. The contracting agencies are authorized to pay to prime contractors or subcontractors any partial sums that have finally been agreed upon.

SEC. 403. The contracting agencies are authorized to make contract termination loans or to guarantee such loans made by banking institutions.

Amount of loan made or guaranteed, plus any advance or partial payments, shall be no larger than the total estimated final settlement.

Where existing V loans are terminated as the result of a contract termination, the contracting agency or agencies involved shall arrange for another guaranteed loan or for a direct loan to take its place.

Any Federal Reserve Bank may act as the fiscal agent of the United States in making the authorized loans or guaranteed loans.

SEC. 404. Any funds now or hereafter available to a contracting agency may be used for making advance payments, partial payments, direct loans, guaranteed loans, or any other purposes authorized under this act.

SEC. 405. Upon request of Reconstruction Finance Corporation and Smaller War Plants Corporation borrowers with terminated war contracts, the proper portion of interest and amortization payments shall be suspended until date of final settlement.

SEC. 406. Provisions of section 35 (a) of Criminal Code are applicable to any statement submitted in support of application for an advance payment or loan.

SEC. 407. The Director of Contract Settlement is authorized to set forth the policies to be followed in the administration of all sections of this title, including the information required in applications for advance payments, the type of investigation to be made, and the terms and conditions of direct and guaranteed loans.

TITLE V. RESPONSIBILITIES AND POWERS OF THE SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION

SECTION 501. It shall be the duty of the Smaller War Plants Corporation to take all possible steps to aid small business production concerns in problems connected with the termination of war contracts, the settlement of claims thereon, and the conversion to peacetime production or other types of war production. For these purposes it shall have and exercise the following powers:

(1) It may purchase claims of small business production concerns arising out of the termination of war contracts, together with such material and machinery as may be incidental thereto or a part thereof.

(2) It may make or guarantee loans against claims on terminated war contracts. Identification and appraisal of individual claims shall not be a necessary condition for receiving a loan.

(3) It may make or guarantee loans to assist in conversion to peacetime production.

(4) It may purchase and sell or lease machinery, plants, or materials released through contract terminations.

(5) It shall advise and help small business concerns on the various problems involved in contract terminations—including the selection of contracts to be terminated, obtaining authority to continue all or parts of certain contracts accounting and record-keeping systems, and so forth.

SEC. 502. The above activities shall be administered on a decentralized basis, with broad delegation of lending and purchase powers to local offices. Contract termination advisers shall be appointed in all local offices.

SEC. 503. The sum of $ shall be appropriated to the Smaller War Plants Corporation for the above purposes.

SEC. 504. The Director of Contract Settlement is authorized to set forth the policies to be followed in the administration of section 501 (1) and section 501 (2) of this title, but of no other section of this title.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 210) authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 1203. An act to limit private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States;

H. R. 1616. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended;

H. R. 2562. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey to The State Hospital at Goldsboro, Goldsboro, N. C., a certain tract of land, situated in Wayne County, N. C.;

H. R. 3598. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 103. Joint resolution continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States;

S. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress;

H. J. Res. 171. Joint resolution to permit the importation from foreign countries free of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed, and suspending for 2 months the increase in the tax rates under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act; and

H. J. Res. 209. Joint resolution extending until January 31, 1944, the provisions of the act of April 29, 1943, making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

REVISED EDITION OF CANNON'S PROCEDURE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House Joint Resolution 210, just messaged over from the House, be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a joint resolution coming over from the House of Representatives.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 210) authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author was read twice by its title.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 210) authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PHYSICIANS' FORUM SUPPORTS HEALTH INSURANCE

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and myself, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a statement released yesterday by the Physicians' Forum for the Study of Medical Care, a group of more than 250 doctors. On November 3, I inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD extensive materials explaining proposed legislation on the subject of health insurance, Senate bill 1161, and showing the falsity of the widespread propaganda which has been circulated against it in some quarters.

The report of the Physicians' Forum just released supports the general principles of the medical and hospital insurance provisions of the social-security bill, which the Senator from Montana and I have sponsored in the Senate and Representative JOHN DINGELL has sponsored in the House of Representatives. We are pleased that this important group of physicians, including many of the highest rank in professional attainment, have taken this view of the proposed legislation. We are especially gratified also that they have presented constructive criticisms and suggestions for its improvement. This important group of physicians is to be congratulated on its public spirited and constructive outlook, as citizens and as professional men and women.

The sponsors of the proposed legislation have repeatedly stated that they make no claim to perfection in its terms; that it is put forward as a basis for study and earnest attention on the part of Congress, and all interested in improving the quality and distribution of medical care for the American people. We therefore welcome most heartily the constructive suggestions which have been made in this report. They will receive our open-minded and careful study.

I ask that full text of the report by the Physicians' Forum be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHYSICIANS FORUM TAKES ISSUE WITH AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION—ENDORSES WAGNER BILL

Taking issue with the American Medical Association's opposition to the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, the Physicians' Forum today hailed the bill as epoch making and the most realistic legislation yet proposed for improving the quality and distribution of medical service on a national scale.

The Physicians' Forum is a national organization, with headquarters in New York, founded in 1939 for the study of medical care. Its membership includes more than 250 doctors. Dr. Ernst P. Boas is chairman of the group.

The general principles of the medical and hospitalization provisions of the social-security bill introduced by Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER and JAMES E. MURRAY in the United States Senate and Congressman JOHN DINGELL in the House of Representatives were approved by the Physicians' Forum in a statement released by the executive committee.

"The basic concept of the bill should not only be accepted but actively supported by

all physicians," the Physicians' Forum declared. "This concept is that sickness has profound economic and social consequences and that measures for its prevention and treatment are therefore the concern of the entire community as well as of the doctors.

"The bill comes to grips with the fundamental issue of economics which is at the core of the entire problem of improving distribution of medical service. Recognizing that scientific advances have so increased the costs of modern medical care that it is beyond the reach of most people, the authors of the bill rightly declare that only through compulsory health insurance on a national scale can these costs be met.

"Compulsory Federal health insurance through social-security payments is at present the most practical and soundest financial method of assuring in democratic fashion the greatest medical benefits to the greatest number of people. This insurance provides that all but the completely indigent will receive medical services not as a charity but as a right for which they have individually contributed; this likewise assures doctors of payment for all their services, thereby raising the general level of physicians' income.

"Federal insurance funds are allocated for medical research, education, and post-graduate study, the benefits of which will redound to the advantage of the people whose contributions make this possible. Medical standards will be universally raised through the formulation of policy on a national basis. The provision for scientific study of distribution of medical services marks a notable advance in legislative recommendations.

"The bill, as Senator WAGNER himself says, is by no means a perfect instrument in its present state. Many modifications, additions, and clarifications are necessary. Administrative procedures need particular study; certain principles must be assured. Matters of a medical nature must be controlled by physicians. The administration should be entirely nonpolitical; the maximum degree of local autonomy through local councils representing the medical profession and the lay public should be assured; and participation of these councils in all major policy decisions should be permitted.

"The Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service should be the chief administrator, as the bill now provides, but policy should be formulated by a health officer with Cabinet rank or a board representing physicians and the public. The bill should specifically provide for the promotion of group medical practices, particularly should consideration be given to capital funds necessary for hospitals and related facilities. The section of the bill relating to hospitals and specialists needs further study and clarification. The bill does not provide for payments for drugs, an item which represents one of the main costs in medical care.

"Notwithstanding these defects, the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill contains all the chief requisites of a democratic and efficient distribution of medical care. It has our whole-hearted support."

HOUSING AT NORTH AMERICAN AVIATION PLANT, DALLAS, TEX.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, in order that North American Aviation of Dallas might comply with the request of the Army for increased production of bombers and fighters, it was necessary that additional temporary housing be built, and it is being built by the National Housing Authority in the form of 3,000 temporary housing units. The production of bombers and fighters for our boys overseas is actually being delayed because of a lack of adequate housing for needed employees.

In the face of this situation, a dispute arose between the painting contractor and the union because the contractor wanted to dip the trim instead of spreading the stain on with a brush. After substantial negotiation, the contractor pointed out that if he agreed to put the stain on with brushes it would mean the use of a tremendous amount of additional manpower, that it would slow up the job of finishing the housing, and, furthermore, he could not buy the brushes necessary to apply the paint.

While this controversy was proceeding, Mr. Sorenson, labor relations adviser for the National Housing Authority, went to Dallas to make a speech. Let it be borne in mind that this Mr. Sorenson was a Government representative paid by the taxpayers, and that his job was to try to get these houses built and to avoid labor difficulties. But instead of talking to the painters and endeavoring to get them to take a common-sense view of the situation, the report of his speech shows that he took exactly the opposite course, and that his remarks were calculated to incite and continue labor trouble rather than to settle any labor difficulty.

I think it is time for the National Housing Authority to call in this Mr. Sorenson, who is being paid with the taxpayer's money, and at least keep him parked here in Washington, where he will not be sabotaging war work, which he most definitely was doing in the type of statement he made in Dallas. I think it is easy for us to understand why the building of housing throughout the United States for our war workers has been so poorly handled, when we read this statement of Mr. Sorensen and discover the kind of people the Federal Housing Authority have selected to be their labor advisers. We can understand the kind of advice they are uniformly getting with such men as this as advisers.

Mr. President, in connection with these remarks I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, at this point, copy of letter from Holmes Green, Chairman War Housing Committee, Dallas, a letter from Frank H. Abel, painting contractor, of Dallas, addressed to Holmes Green; copy of letter from Frank H. Abel to Robert E. McKee, general contractor, of Dallas, and copy of sworn statement of remarks of Mr. Sorenson, labor adviser of the Federal Public Housing Authority.

There being no objection, the letters and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

W. A. GREEN CO.,
Dallas, Tex., December 13, 1943.

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: For over 3 years I have been chairman of the local war housing committee and during that time we have secured the construction of many thousands of small houses for war workers in order to take care of the tremendous immigration of people to Dallas. The same conditions which have confronted our city have also confronted the other large cities of Texas.

Recently we passed through a very critical and threatening manpower shortage. In order to remedy this situation and to furnish quick housing for several thousand war workers who desired to move to Dallas, the National Housing Agency authorized the construction of 3,000 temporary housing units. These units were necessary and it was vital that they would be mass-produced with all the speed posssible.

About 3 weeks ago the painters' union walked off the job because they claimed that certain interior shelving was being dipped rather than painted with the hand brushes. Needless to say the contractors involved have gone right ahead with the work, and these units should be completed by February 1. Attached is a record of the controversy. I thought you would be particularly interested in the remarks made by Mr. Sorenson, who is the labor adviser to the Federal Public Housing Authority, which agency is charged with the duty of constructing these temporary units. Mr. Sorenson attended a meeting of the painters' local in Dallas and encouraged the painters to walk off the job. It seems amazing to many of us that anyone whose salary was paid by the taxpayers would encourage any delay in the construction of planes during a period of tremendous labor shortage. I thought you would be interested in this data, and I am quite sure that you will be interested in the remarks of Mr. Sorenson, which are on page 13.

Very sincerely yours,

HOLMES GREEN,
Chairman, War Housing Committee.

DALLAS, TEX., *December 9, 1943.*

Mr. HOLMES GREEN,
Care of W. A. Green Co.,
Dallas, Tex.

DEAR MR. GREEN: Enclosed please find copies of letters and statements relative to the strike on the war-housing project in Dallas which you requested.

You have my permission to use these in any way you see fit without reservation. You need not worry about anything you might wish to do affecting me or my work, because I am fast coming to the conclusion it is rather hopeless to have to fight Government agencies and unions backed up by these agencies putting them in a position to force you to their terms, regardless of conditions.

If in the future I might be of service to you in any way, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Yours very truly,

FRANK H. ABEL.

DALLAS, TEX., *November 30, 1943.*

ROBERT E. MCKEE,
General Contractor, Dallas, Tex.

DEAR SIR: In order that you might fully understand my position and what has taken place up to this date regarding the dispute between the Painters Local Union, No. 53, and myself, in connection with the dipping of the interior stain trim, I am giving you the following information from the beginning of the discussion and the beginning of the job.

After receiving the award of the painting on the above-described project, I was advised through one of my workmen, Mr. Jerry Gateley, that Mr. Marr, the painting business agent, advised him that no dipping would be permitted on this job. In view of this I contacted Mr. Dave Marr prior to commencing work on the job and requested a meeting with the painters' executive board for the purpose of arriving at the best and fastest means of handling the large quantity of interior trim.

The meeting was held in my office prior to November 9, at which time no stain work had been done on the project. After a quite lengthy discussion regarding the job (the stain trim in particular), the executive board agreed that the method described by me, which was dipping, was the most practical way to handle this particular item. It was agreed also at this meeting that I would not request permission to spray any part of this

project and that all walls and ceilings, both interior and exterior, would be brush painted. Each member of the executive board agreed to make a statement to that effect, setting forth the conditions under which the project would operate in order that no controversy would come up among the workmen regarding this dipping. The following meeting night, which was November 9, the painters' local voted on the agreement made between the executive committee and myself, overruling their decision. This information, however, was not conveyed to me by Mr. Marr or other officials of the union until several days later, which was November 12.

Certain preparations for doing this work were made in the meantime, which included the renting of a large tent to house this trim and other general preparations of an expensive nature. Mr. Marr came to the job on November 12, at which time he advised me the dipping would have to stop. I advised him that this was the first knowledge I had of a reversed decision on the subject and asked why I had not been previously notified. He advised me that possibly he was a little lax in informing me of the painters' meeting at which time they overruled the executive board's decision. He also stated that we had better call another meeting and try to get the matter straightened out. I agreed with Mr. Marr, and a meeting of the executive board was called that evening, November 12. At this meeting there were some new faces in the executive board, together with some of the members that were present at the first meeting. The dipping of trim was discussed thoroughly again and the committee agreed again that the method of dipping was the most practical means of executing the work in question, in the working time allotted for the job and this particular item. They also advised me at this meeting that they could not give me the authority to go ahead without taking the matter up with the painters at their next regular meeting. I then advised them that there was a large quantity of this trim being delivered to the job that evening which was going to be installed in the buildings the following Monday, and that it would be necessary for me to dip this trim in order to make it ready for installation. They concurred with me and advised me to dip this trim and at their next meeting they would use their influence with the painters to secure their permission to continue the practice of dipping on the remainder of the project.

I proceeded with the dipping and was notified the night of November 16, by their president, Mr. Fuller, that again the members had voted against dipping this trim, and that no member of local union No. 53 would be permitted to dip such trim and if they did they would be subject to fine. In view of the painters advising me they would not permit any of their members to dip said trim, on November 17 I employed laborers to carry on the work they had refused to do. Mr. Fred W. Thompson, superintendent on the job, was instructed by me to carry on the work as originally directed by me.

I was advised by my superintendent the morning of November 24 that Painters Local Union No. 53 had declared me unfair at their meeting held November 23. The official notice, however, was not given me until Saturday, November 27, at which time I received notice by mail of their action.

On November 26 a meeting was held in the office of Project Engineer H. R. Dillingham for the purpose of settling the dispute and continuing with the work. At this meeting the following were present: Mr. John Gemaro, superintendent for Robert E. McKee; Mr. Dan Kennard, labor-relations adviser; Mr. D. H. Marr, representative of local union No. 53; and myself, Frank H. Abel, painting contractor.

I will state briefly that Mr. Kennard's attitude was anything but helpful in that he took issue with both myself and Mr. Gemaro on every detail. I also wish to state at this point that Mr. Kennard was in the city prior to our first meeting held on November 23 at which time he met with union representatives, receiving their views and complaints prior to the meeting of November 23 and at no time did he question me or converse with me regarding my problems in the matter prior to this meeting.

On the morning of November 24 I was advised by several members of the painters' local union that Mr. Sorenson, a representative of the Federal Public Housing Authority, met with the painters on the evening of November 23 and made a number of derogatory remarks about me. I am attaching a statement made and signed by several members of the local union who were present at this meeting. I fully believe had Mr. Sorenson stayed away from the meeting and not aroused the members the way he did that there would have been a vote taken in my favor. I feel that it is not necessary for me to make further comment on Mr. Sorenson's lecture, except that his actions to me in such an important matter are deplorable. Omitting the personal slander, his actions were not becoming a Government representative who is charged with dealing fairly with both sides.

Briefly, my sole purpose for insisting on dipping this trim is to save bristles, of which we have a very few, and the Federal Government has requested that we contractors conserve these bristles. The method used is also a labor-saving procedure, and using any other method would definitely delay the finishing of this project. The bylaws of the local union, No. 53, or their general constitution does not make mention of this procedure and therefore, according to their own working rules, has no jurisdiction over this dipping. I consider that every contractor or subcontractor has a duty and obligation to develop a labor-saving method that is practical and workable at this time. However, due to the opposition encountered with the union and the Federal Housing Authority representatives, Mr. Sorenson and Mr. Kennard, I agreed to proceed with the staining of this work in question by these methods as they recommended, which is brushes, as long as the brushes hold out, or apply stain with rags or lamb's wool. I agreed to this at the meeting November 23. The special meeting the night of the 23d refused to consider my proposal and declared me unfair.

My only request in agreeing to their demands was that the entire matter be disposed of and members of their union who worked on the job as superintendent and foreman not be penalized. My reason for that request was to protect the superintendent and foreman who stayed on this job during the period of discussion, also forestall any attempt made by some of the prejudiced members and business agent to bar these men from the job. It would be a serious matter and would delay the painting to be forced to change keymen at this time.

Mr. Marr and Local Union No. 53 are responsible for the confusion in this matter, and they themselves doubted that their bylaws could require this stain to be brushed. Members of the executive board made those statements to me. I feel my actions are justified for the following reasons:

1. This is an important war-housing job, and time is the essence of the contract.

2. Not possible to execute a job of this type in time allowed for completing by methods other than dipping.

3. Dipping or staining not covered in bylaws or constitution of the painters, therefore they do not have jurisdiction.

3A. Specifications do not require this trim to be brushed.

4. Painters have refused to do this dipping, therefore it belongs to someone else.

5. Laborers should be the ones to do this work, because no skill is necessary. The treatment is no more than an oiling which is usually done with unskilled labor.

6. Executive board made investigation of conditions, granted permission, some members of executive board being employed on project were familiar with conditions job had to be done under, and was in a better position to know the facts before granting permission. Members of the Local Union No. 53 did not aquaint themselves with the necessity of doing this dipping.

7. Job does not carry priority high enough to purchase brushes, if brushes were available. Quality of brushes and mechanics not good enough to cut into walls with stain without damaging walls.

Since the painters have struck on the job, and after 3 days' delay, I have employed any painter available for work, whether he belonged to the painters' union or not. By December 5, I expect to catch up with all the work which has fallen behind due to the above conditions.

Very truly yours,

FRANK H. ABEL.

The following general remarks were made by Mr. Sorenson of the Federal Public Housing Authority at a special meeting of the painters local union held November 26, 1943, in the Painters Hall, at Dallas, Tex., in regards to dipping stain trim on the Federal public-housing project No. Tex-41605.

"I was sent over here by the Federal Housing Authority heads to assist in this controversy between the Local Union No. 53 and Frank H. Abel, contractor. I was sent here as an adviser and you do not have to take this advice, but nevertheless we are not in an enviable position, but it is still our job. He then went on to explain the stabilization agreement, with a few words on it in regards to the general contractors having signed the stabilization agreement with the F. P. H. A., and that the subcontractor or subcontractors were a party thereof, and also the members of the Local Union No. 53. He explained about it being made in regards to keeping down stoppage of work but he said, to my opinion that when this was made it was not made with the idea that the contractors and certain Fascist elements could cram open-shop conditions down our throats. [Loud applause from the union members.] Also the Smith-Connally bill was not made with these thoughts in mind, and I advise this organization to take this case before a board of review of the F. P. H. A. You have had this same trouble with this contractor before in Orange, and you are having it now, and I don't expect this to be the last time. I don't blame you for holding up for your rights that you have fought for for the last 40 or 50 years, and your forbears before that. I don't see why our conditions have to be torn down because some man is waving an American flag in our faces. I realize that this is a Government job and it has to go on and you men will have to do it. I still want you to know that I am only here for the purpose of giving advise and you are not compelled to take it and neither is the contractor compelled to take it. I am only here in an advisory capacity."

I, the undersigned, was present at this meeting and heard Mr. Sorenson of the Federal Public Housing Authority make the above remarks. I am also a member in good standing with the Painters, Paperhangers, and Decorators Union of America.

W. H. GLASS.

Sworn to before me this 30th day of November 1943.

[SEAL] ROSE MARY MORRIS,
Notary Public.

PRESERVATION OF SURVIVING JEWISH PEOPLE OF EUROPE

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, yesterday by direction of the Committee on Foreign Relations I reported favorably Senate Resolution 203. I wish to say in that connection that I have been requested by the chairman of the committee to ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution, but I have been informed that the leaders on both sides of the aisle have made certain commitments. In deference to the plans which have been made by the leadership I shall not ask for present consideration of the resolution.

OREGON'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, as the calendar year 1943 draws to a close and this session of the Seventy-eighth Congress is about to terminate, I want to record and to call to the attention of the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the American people, a little noted but tremendously important event in the Oregon country.

On December 14, 1943, the tenth and last generating unit of the Bonneville Authority on the Columbia River went into operation. This, in my opinion, represents the symbol of Oregon's many outstanding war contributions, and fixed the beginning of the State's transition from the status of an empire producing chiefly raw, or unprocessed, products to an ever-expanding industrial development, whereby the almost boundless and infinite variety of raw products will be refined in the area for use and consumption throughout the world. The completion of the Bonneville plant signifies the advance of the area known as the Oregon country, and its growing importance in the industrial and commercial enterprise of the Nation and of the world. For these reasons this accomplishment must be considered Oregon's outstanding event in the past year.

As one of Oregon's representatives in the Senate of the United States, it has been my good fortune to urge successfully those enactments which made possible the completion of the Bonneville Dam project, together with its adjacent projects which effect a better utilization and distribution of the State's resources.

When I came to the Senate in 1939 and was designated as the only Pacific coast representative on the Senate Appropriations Committee, I found that a fixed policy had not been established covering the completion and utilization of the Bonneville plant, and of the hydroelectric power generated in the Columbia River. During the course of an investigation of this entire subject I also found that our country was woefully lacking in electrochemical and metallurgical plant capacity, and that this deficiency would retard seriously any possible modern defense effort. Fortunately, the Senate accepted the proposals I offered, and the House reversed its limitation enactment and adopted the Senate bills. This provided one of the means of rectifying the Nation's defense deficiencies.

The war contribution of Columbia River power has not been fully understood. Columbia River power is furnishing about one-third of the light-metal requirements of our total airplane program; about one-fifth of the power required by our maritime construction; and about one-third of another most important tool of offense. For military reasons, the details of these contributions cannot be fully given; but they are of major importance, and so located as to be beyond the range of enemy attack.

This industrialism, and the work, will, and the sacrifices and contribution of Oregonians, have placed our State high on the list of the States underwriting victory.

Columbia River power, fortunately, is also a great instrument for furthering regional development in the post-war period. It can be made the means of providing expanded employment and extending opportunities for our returning soldiers to rehabilitate themselves in peaceful pursuits. In this objective all of us have a common cause.

The Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and the staff and personnel of the Bonneville Power Administration are to be congratulated on the successful, early, and efficient completion of the Bonneville plant and of its marketing facilities.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS FOR THE NAVY

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the majority leader the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the acting minority leader the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]. I should like to make a preliminary statement prior to asking unanimous consent for consideration of Calendar No. 631, House bill 3741.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3741) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I am reluctant to ask unanimous consent for consideration of the bill, in view of what may perhaps be an understanding reached in reference to no legislation being taken up at this time, but I am compelled to make the request because of the needs of the war effort, as evidenced by a very urgent letter which has come to me from Vice Admiral Horne, which I should like to read:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, December 20, 1943.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
Chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The bill, H. R. 3741, "To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes," was reported out by your committee on December 18, 1943, with certain amendments.

The prospective adjournment of Congress, together with other developments, make it imperative that the Navy Department obtain contract authority for the full amount of the authorization contained in the bill, H. R. 3741, prior to the adjournment of Congress.

The Bureau of the Budget has cleared the request of the Navy Department to submit to the Senate Naval Affairs Committee for possible inclusion in H. R. 3741 a provision which will grant the necessary contract authority. Accordingly, it is requested that your committee offer an amendment to the bill, H. R. 3741, which will include the provision as cleared by the Budget. It is recommended that the amendment read as follows:

"At the end of section 1, change the period to a colon and add the following: '*And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to enter into contracts under the appropriation "Public Works, Bureau of Yards and Docks", for public-works equipment, materials, and construction, including collateral public-works items, to the extent of the total cost hereby authorized and without regard to the provisions of section 3709, Revised Statutes.' "

Sincerely yours,

F. J. HORNE,
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. President, the bill provides that the approximate cost indicated for each category may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be varied upward or downward but that the total cost shall not exceed $271,060,000. This flexibility is deemed necessary in order to permit the Navy Department to make changes in its construction program as the military situation changes.

The bill also provides that prior to the acquisition, by lease or otherwise, of any land under authority of this act, the Secretary of the Navy shall report to the Senate and House Naval Affairs Committees all such prospective acquisitions.

The bill as originally introduced authorized an appropriation of $200,000,000. This was increased by the House of Representatives to $235,060,000. The Senate committee increased the amount authorized to be approved under three headings and reduced the amount under one heading. The original amount, the increases, the decreases, and the total now authorized to be appropriated are as follows:

	Original bill	Changes made by the House of Representatives	Changes made by the Senate committee	Total now authorized
Fleet facilities	$4,000,000			$4,000,000
Aviation facilities	25,000,000	+$2,000,000	+$23,000,000	50,000,000
Storage facilities	20,000,000		+3,000,000	23,000,000
Ordnance facilities	60,000,000	+12,000,000	+20,000,000	92,000,000
Personnel training and housing facilities	81,200,000	+11,060,000		92,260,000
Shore radio facilities	5,000,000			5,000,000
Naval Research Laboratory	800,000			800,000
Miscellaneous structures	4,000,000	+10,000,000	−10,000,000	4,000,000
Total	200,000,000	+35,060,000	+36,000,000	271,060,000

I hope the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] may feel at liberty to permit exception being made in the case of this bill so that it can be passed today. It has a unanimous committee report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that for various reasons I feel constrained to object to the present consideration of the bill. I think there has been a general understanding, if not a specific agreement, that business of a general character would not be considered and transacted in the closing hours of this session. I should like to see that general understanding respected. Furthermore, Mr. President, the bill, if it were passed by the Senate, would have to go back to the other House, for action by it. There are involved in the bill some six or eight amendments—I have not counted them accurately—and the Senate amendments would increase the amount carried in the House bill by more than $35,000,000. I feel that no public interest will be jeopardized if the matter is delayed for 3 weeks. Therefore, reluctantly, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

AUTHORIZATION FOR FINANCE COMMITTEE TO REPORT TAX BILL AND FILE REPORT THEREON

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be given until midnight tonight to report to the Senate the tax bill, House bill 3687, and that the committee be given until midnight tomorrow night to file its report to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION TO FILE MINORITY VIEWS ON TAX BILL

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I, together with other members of the Finance Committee, may, during the recess of the Senate, jointly file minority views in opposition to certain renegotiation provisions reported in the Senate tax bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none; and it is so ordered.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 223), as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join a similar committee appointed by the House of Representatives, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses, having completed the business of the present session, are ready to adjourn unless the President has some further communication to make to them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] as the committee on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a resolution (H. Res. 391), as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 210) authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author, and it was signed by the Vice President.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND TO SIGN BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS AFTER FINAL ADJOURNMENT

On motion by Mr. BARKLEY, it was

Ordered (by unanimous consent), That notwithstanding the final adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, authority be given to the Secretary of the Senate to receive messages from the House of Representatives, and to the Vice President to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

ANNA BELLE LLOYD

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably Senate Resolution 218, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 218) submitted by Mr. TYDINGS on December 9, 1943, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Anna Belle Lloyd, widow of Daniel B. Lloyd, late an official reporter of debates of the Senate, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

GRACE D. MEYERS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably Senate Resolution 226, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 226) submitted by Mr. TYDINGS on December 21, 1943, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Grace D. Meyers, cousin of Hazel P. Yates, late an assistant in the Senate Library, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me inquire whether the resolution and the one previously agreed to would authorize payments to employees of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, Mr. President; they would authorize the customary payment to be made as a result of death.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

EXPENSES OF COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—INVESTIGATION OF HEALTH CONDITIONS AND FIRE ESCAPES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably Senate Resolution 147, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 147) submitted by Mr. MCCARRAN on May 4, 1943, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate the sum of $105.70, for expenses incurred by the Committee on the District of Columbia in the investigation of health conditions and fire escapes in the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I have some explanation of the resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. The resolution would authorize the payment of $105.70, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, for expenses incurred by the Committee on the District of Columbia in investigating health conditions and fire escapes in the District of Columbia. The resolution was submitted by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN].

Mr. WHITE. I presume it would be cheaper for the country to have the Senate speedily agree to the resolution and speedily adjourn, rather than to have

Senators raise any question about the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

INCREASE OF LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES OF MILITARY AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE STUDYING MOBILIZATION OF THE NATIONS' RESOURCES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the so-called Kilgore subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs is out of money. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 216, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me inquire whether the resolution would make available to the subcommittee of which the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is chairman, funds for the further work of that committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. It would. The resolution would not change the duties or responsibilities of the subcommittee. But, as the Senator will remember, the investigation has been proceeding for a considerable time, and is very important. The Senator has advised our committee that it is necessary to have the additional sum of money in order to carry on the work.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from West Virginia spoke to me about the resolution. I understand, as does the Senator from Arizona, that the real purpose of the resolution is to bring the study to a conclusion—to pull in the ends and tie the knots on this study, which the subcommittee has been conducting for several months. I may add that a good deal of criticism has come to me, first in the nature of objection to contemplated legislation on the subject involved—and I have a suspicion that the objection is well founded—and also criticism that the proponents of the legislation had occupied the major part of the committee's time and attention. The Senator from West Virginia assured me that those who might be opposed to it would be given full opportunity to appear if the life of the committee, through the aid of this appropriation, was extended. In the circumstances, I simply cannot object, and I do not object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 216), which had been reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "by", to strike out "$10,000", and insert "$5,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures of the subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee authorized and directed to study the mobilization of the Nation's resources, including the technological resources, pursuant to Senate Resolution 303 of the Seventy-seventh Congress and Senate Resolution 107 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, is increased by $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF CONDITIONS IN PUERTO RICO—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 222, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been submitted by Mr. CHAVEZ on December 17, 1943.

The amendment was, in line 5, after the word "by", to strike out "$15,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures authorized by Senate Resolution 26, agreed to January 28, 1943, authorizing the subcommittee of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs to hold hearings during the Seventy-eighth Congress, is hereby increased by $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF THE EFFECT OF THE CENTRALIZATION OF HEAVY INDUSTRY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am advised that there is in the hands of the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] a resolution which we have been trying for several months to have considered. I refer to Senate resolution 190, which would create a special committee of seven Senators to investigate the effect upon interstate commerce of the centralization of heavy industry in the United States, and would provide an appropriation of $5,000 for the expenses of the investigation.

I am particularly interested in the question as it affects the steel industry. The steel industry is essential to the war effort, and it will be essential in the years to come. In the West there are available large deposits of iron ore. If at this time the resolution should be agreed to, there would probably be some time between now and the reconvening of Congress when the committee which is making a study of this matter and is very much interested in it might go forward with some of the work which is deemed essential.

I hope the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] can see fit to relent in his objection to this particular resolution.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I came here today with my mind filled with worthy purposes. I felt that all these new matters should go over until the next session. My resolution has already broken down in half a dozen instances, and I will not now oppose the request of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Nevada whether the resolution would create a new committee, or whether it relates to a committee already in existence?

Mr. McCARRAN. It would set up a new special committee, consisting entirely of members, as nearly as we could select them, from the States having iron ore deposits.

Mr. BARKLEY. How many members would the proposed committee have?

Mr. McCARRAN. Seven members. There is a like committee in the House, with seven members.

Mr. BARKLEY. Would the committee include members from all the States in which there is any suspicion of the presence of iron ore.

Mr. McCARRAN. Not all. We could not include all unless we had a much larger committee. However, members were selected from the South, the Southwest, the North, and the Northwest. There is a comparable committee in the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. Would the membership of the committee be selected from the membership of the Senate generally, or from some standing committee?

Mr. McCARRAN. From the membership of the Senate generally.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would not be limited to the membership of any committee already in existence?

Mr. McCARRAN. No.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without additional amendment, Senate Resolution 190.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been submitted by Mr. McCARRAN on October 12, 1943, and previously reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, with an amendment, on page 2, line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That a special committee of seven Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is hereby authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the effect upon interstate commerce of the centralization of heavy industry in the United States, with particular regard to whether such centralization inhibits or deters adequate use and development of natural resources or hampers the full and free flow of commerce between the States, and to make a comprehensive study of plans and proposals for industrial recentralization, particularly through establishment of new or expanded facilities for the production of iron and steel. Such committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation and study, with such recommendations for legislation as it may deem necessary and desirable, and shall also report to the Senate from time to time its views on needed or desirable executive or administrative action by any department or agency of the Federal Government.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate during the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to request such assistance and information from any departments and agencies of the Government, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to the resolution just agreed to, the Chair appoints the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] members of the special committee.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committee.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit certain reports of executive nominations: From the Committee on Finance, one nomination in the Bureau of Internal Revenue; and from the Committee on Naval Affairs, three Marine Corps nominations.

I ask the Senator from Maine if he objects to the immediate consideration of the nominations, or whether he insists that they be placed on the calendar.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think the nominations should be placed on the calendar in order that Members of the Senate may have opportunity to familiarize themselves with them. I therefore object to their present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard. Without objection, the reports will be received, and the nominations will be placed on the calendar.

The nominations reported by Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts are as follows:

From the Committee on Finance:

Denis W. Delaney, of Lawrence, Mass., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Massachusetts, in place of Thomas B. Hassett, resigned.

From the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Col. William P. T. Hill to be the quartermaster of the Marine Corps, with the rank of brigadier general, for a period of 4 years from the 1st day of February 1944;

Col. William J. Wallace to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 5th day of December 1943; and

Col. Thomas J. Cushman to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 7th day of December 1943.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hugh B. Cox, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Solicitor General of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Emil C. Peters, of Honolulu, to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, Territory of Hawaii.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Albert M. Cristy, of Honolulu, to be second judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Willson C. Moore, of Hawaii, to be fourth judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Cable A. Wirtz, of Hawaii, to be judge of the Second Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nomination in the foreign service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nominations this day confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

STATUS OF NOMINATIONS UNACTED UPON DURING THE CURRENT SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY submitted the following order:

Ordered, That paragraph 6 of rule 38 of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to proceedings on nominations, be, and it is hereby, suspended with respect to nominations unacted upon during the present session, and their status quo shall not be affected by the final adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the proposed order?

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire what it means? In the Military Affairs Committee we are holding up several nominations. I have a particular interest in holding up two of them.

Mr. BARKLEY. The meaning of the order is that nominations which are not acted upon will remain in status quo, without having to be resubmitted to the Senate after the Senate reconvenes in January.

Mr. HOLMAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the only effect of the order is to avoid the general rule that at the termination of the session nominations not acted upon must be returned to the White House.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true.

Mr. WHITE. Otherwise such nominations would have to be resubmitted.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true.

Mr. WHITE. And committees would have to consider them all anew.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true.

Mr. WHITE. The proposed order would obviate that difficulty.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. There are some 200 nominations of postmasters still not acted upon in committee, and there are military nominations, and others. The order would simply preserve their status as though Congress were not adjourning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the proposed order? The Chair hears none, and the order is agreed to.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. WHITE appeared and Mr. BARKLEY said: Mr. President, as in legislation session, I wish to report that the committee appointed earlier in the day to wait upon the President to ascertain whether he had any further communication to make to the Congress has performed its duty, and that the President has advised the committee that he has no further communication to address to the Congress.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on today, December 21, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following bill and joint resolutions:

S. 1169. An act for the relief of Samuel Margolin;

S. J. Res. 103. Joint resolution continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States; and

S. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in accordance with the terms of Senate Concurrent Resolution 29, heretofore agreed to, providing that when the two Houses of Congress adjourn today they adjourn sine die, I now move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned sine die.

REPORT OF REVENUE BILL BY FINANCE COMMITTEE SUBSEQUENT TO FINAL ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of December 21, 1943,

Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3687) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, reported it on December 21, 1943, with amendments, and on December 22, 1943, he submitted a report (No. 627) thereon.

MINORITY VIEWS ON THE REVENUE BILL (PT. 2 OF REPT. NO. 627)

Under authority of the order of December 21, 1943,

On January 6, 1944, Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. CONNALLY, and Mr. LUCAS), as members of the Committee on Finance, submitted minority views on the renegotiation provisions of the revenue bill (H. R. 3687).

INVESTIGATION OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—THE CANOL PROJECT (PT. 14 OF REPT. NO. 10)

Under authority of the order of December 21, 1943,

On January 8, 1944, Mr. KILGORE (pursuant to S. Res. 71, 77th Cong., and S. Res. 6, 78th Cong.) from the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program submitted an additional report relating to the Canol project.

APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The President of the United States, subsequent to the final adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, notified the Secretary of the Senate that he had signed and approved acts and joint resolutions as follows:

On December 21, 1943:

S. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

On December 22, 1943:

S. 1169. An act for the relief of Samuel Margolin; and

S. 1576. An act to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas leases.

On December 23, 1943:

S. J. Res. 103. Joint resolution continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 21 (legislative day of December 15), 1943:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Fred A. Canfil, of Missouri, to be United States marshal for the western district of Missouri, vice Henry L. Dillingham, term expired.

SELECTIVE SERVICE

The following-named person for appointment as State director of Selective Service for Delaware, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940:

Col. Albert W. Foreman, United States Army, retired. (Recalled to active duty.)

Compensation for this office will exceed $5,000 per annum and will be in accordance with the rates prescribed for officers of his rank and length of service in the Army pay tables.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Lt. Col. Thomas Francis Keefe, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from November 24, 1942.

Maj. Charles Metz Seebach, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from July 1, 1940.

TO FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Lt. Col. Harold Stuart Ruth, Infantry, with rank from December 11, 1942.

First Lt. Joseph Henry Wiechmann, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1938.

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Capt. John Frederick Thorlin, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 13, 1943.

TO INFANTRY

Lt. Col. Albert Gillian Kelly, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Robert George Fergusson, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1939.

TO COAST ARTILLERY CORPS

Second Lt. George Thomas Mehalko, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 20, 1942.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonel with rank from December 1, 1943

Lt. Col. Hume Peabody, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Martin John O'Brien, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. Joseph Cumming Haw, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Earl Larue Naiden, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Henry McElderry Pendleton, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Iverson Brooks Summers, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. Edmund DeTreville Ellis, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

To be major with rank from January 22, 1944

Capt. Earl Clinton Robbins, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Andrew Joseph Kerwin Malone, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Russell Keillor, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Ernest Harold Lawson, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. John Edward Bodle, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Russell Scott, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Burton Murdock Hovey, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel).

To be major with rank from January 23, 1944

Capt. Dale Davis Fisher, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Henry Weisbrod Dorr, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Carlisle Iverson Ferris, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Elwood Richard Quesada, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Capt. Willard Roland Wolfinbarger, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. Martin Robert Reiber, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from January 15, 1944.

Lt. Col. Forrest Ralph Ostrander, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from January 21, 1944.

To be captain

First Lt. Matthew Anthony Surrell, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from January 2, 1944.

First Lt. Donald Withers Lyddon, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from January 2, 1944, subject to examination required by law.

First Lt. Orland Stenberg Olsen, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from January 16, 1944, subject to examination required by law.

PHARMACY CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. William Harvey Kernan, Pharmacy Corps, with rank from January 12, 1944.

CHAPLAINS

To be captain

Chaplain (First Lt.) Max Walker Foresman, United States Army (temporary captain), with rank from January 6, 1944.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Russell S. Berkey, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 25th day of November 1942.

Francis E. Pierce, Jr., a naval aviator of the Marine Corps Reserve, to be a second lieutenant in the Regular Marine Corps in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended, to rank from the 10th day of September 1941.

Maurice L. Appleton, Jr., a citizen of Virginia, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 15th day of May 1942.

Donald B. Lee, a citizen of Connecticut, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 24th day of March 1943.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 4th day of May 1943:

Douglas E. Haberlie, a citizen of Texas.

Arthur J. Bilava, a citizen of Nebraska.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of August 1943:

Robert W. Anderson, a citizen of Indiana.

Charles C. Crossfield, III, a citizen of Texas.

Jerome J. Tuckner, a citizen of Minnesota.

Charles W. Boggs, Jr., a citizen of California.

The below-named commissioned warrant and warrant officers of the Marine Corps to be captains in the Marine Corps from the 16th day of September 1943:

Warrant Officer Robert E. A. Lillie.

Warrant Officer Marshall R. Pilcher.

Warrant Officer Madison C. Whiteside.

Commissioned Warrant Officer Tom Woody.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 21 (legislative day of December 15), 1943:

FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE A CONSUL GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

David C. Berger

TO BE CONSULS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

William D. Moreland, Jr.

Richard W. Byrd

John Goodyear

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, UNCLASSIFIED, VICE CONSUL OF CAREER, AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

J. Brock Havron

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

ASSISTANT SOLICITOR GENERAL

Hugh B. Cox to be Assistant Solicitor General of the United States.

THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Emil C. Peters to be associate justice of the Supreme Court, Territory of Hawaii.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Albert M. Cristy to be second judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii.

Willson C. Moore to be fourth judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii.

Cable A. Wirtz to be judge of the Second Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Lord of Love, we rejoice that the Christ child of St. Mary is called the Son of the Highest. In lowliness He was born, the manger bare received Him; a throne awaited Him and to His kingdom there shall be no end. With unutterable praise we invoke Thy presence and in our hearts raise the mighty song, Glory to God in the Highest, with the story of His wondrous birth and tidings of great joy. We pray that Thy guidance, the realized ministry of Thy spirit, may constitute a radiant hope amid the gloom and shadow of this evil world. Inspire us to stretch forth our hands, pulsing with love and overflowing with tenderness, enriching those who mourn, blessing the merciful and the peacemakers, for the world shall yet see in them the children of God.

Heavenly Father, trusting in Thy loving kindness, let Thy blessing in full measure descend upon our Speaker, the Members, the officers, and employees during the days of our separation. We come to Thee with gratitude and hope in our hearts that their home ties may be sustained and blest with Thy fatherly care. Keep them all free from sorrow, affliction, and beyond the sphere of grief until we meet again.

"If we can kneel as did those men of old,
Who laid frankincense and myrrh and gold
Before the Christ child's feet;
If we can bring our gifts, a grateful heart,
Where unkind thoughts and envy have no part,
And love dwells true and deep;
Then in Christ's birthday we may truly share
And feel His presence with us everywhere."

In His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on December 18, 1943, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 255. An act for the relief of Col. E. H. Tarbutton.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 210. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 223):

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join a similar committee appointed by the House of Representatives, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses, having completed the business of the present session, are ready to adjourn unless the President has some further communication to make to them.

The message also announced that pursuant to the above resolution, the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. WHITE members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

SIGNING ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, the Speaker be authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions, duly passed by the two Houses and examined by the Committees on Enrolled Bills and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, the Speaker be authorized to appoint commissions and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GENERAL EXTENSION OF REMARKS IN THE RECORD

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published, to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and may also include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extension of remarks; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think that request ought to be confined to Members who are extending their own remarks. Therefore I shall object for the time being.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

RECEIPT OF MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House the Clerk be authoried to receive messages from the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE TO INFORM THE PRESIDENT OF ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 391), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

The Chair appointed Mr. McCORMACK and Mr. MICHENER as members of the committee.

W. L. HURLEY AND JOE WHITSON—VETO MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 369)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 2299, a bill "Conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of W. M. Hurley and Joe Whitson."

The purpose of this bill is to waive the immunity of the Federal Government from suit in tort, so as to permit the claimants to prosecute in the district court a claim for damages to their property alleged to have resulted from the failure of the Government to maintain in proper repair a dike constructed by it on the Arkansas River as an aid to navigation.

This dike was constructed in the prosecution of the work of improving the Arkansas River for the benefit of navigation under the authority of acts of Congress. In the absence of a direct taking or physical invasion whereby owners have been deprived of their property,

any damage resulting from such an undertaking is generally regarded as indirect and incidental to the legitimate and proper exercise of governmental powers for the improvement of navigation, and the Government is not legally required to make compensation therefor. The present claim, however, is based on the theory that it is the duty of the Government to maintain such improvements in good order, and that it should, therefore, be held accountable in accordance with established principles of negligence law, insofar as they are applicable, for any damage to riparian owners that may result from a neglect of that duty.

It has not been the practice or policy of the Government in undertaking projects or constructing works for the improvement of navigation to assume an incidental duty or obligation to private interests, which may benefit thereby, to provide for their continued maintenance. In my opinion it would be contrary to the public interest for the Government to assume such an obligation. Such a policy would entail the expenditure of sums greatly in excess of those now provided by the Congress for such improvements. Under this bill a responsibility might be imputed to the Government which it has not heretofore been the practice to assume. If approved, it would provide a precedent for the presentation of like claims and recognize a corresponding obligation in connection with every similar improvement of navigable waters undertaken by the Government.

On two previous occasions I have withheld my approval from legislation in support of the present claim for the reasons herein set forth. On the second occasion, when the bill had been amended to provide for a judicial hearing and determination, I pointed out, in addition, that the language employed was susceptible to the interpretation that proof of negligence on the part of the Government was not required. The present bill was apparently enacted in the belief that my objections would be met if the interests of the Government were protected by requiring proof of negligence. While the present bill affords such protection, it nevertheless is subject to the fundamental objection which I have stated herein and in my two previous veto messages.

For these reasons, I feel obliged to withhold my approval of the bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The WHITE HOUSE, *December 21, 1943.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal; and the bill and veto message referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered printed.

PROPOSED ACTION OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM TO PROHIBIT BANKS FROM ABSORBING EXCHANGE AND COLLECTION CHARGES

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, while Congress has been absorbed with important legislation arising out of the war and has been preparing for adjournment, a matter of vital importance to many sections of this country has arisen which I feel it my duty to call to the attention of my associates in Congress. This is the recent action of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in holding the widespread practice of banks in this country to absorb exchange and collection charges to be in violation of its regulations prohibiting the payment of interest on demand deposits. The Committee on Banking and Currency has been holding hearings on this question for the last several weeks but has been unable to recommend legislation owing to the absences due to the adjournment of Congress.

The 1933 Congress passed a law prohibiting banks which are members of the Federal Reserve System from paying interest on any deposit which is payable on demand, and in 1935 this statute was amended to authorize the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to define what should be deemed a payment of interest within the meaning of the statute. This legislation arose out of the disclosures in congressional hearings which indicated that corporations and banks were placing large sums of idle cash in the New York and other metropolitan money markets at interest instead of investing these funds in their home localities. Many experts believed that this practice gave rise to the inflationary trends of the late twenties, when interest rates on call money on the New York markets reached an all-time high. Many of the New York and large eastern city bankers favored the enactment of this law because they realized that its prohibitory provisions would save them millions of dollars of interest on the idle funds of the country banks which they would have the use of anyway because of the necessity of the country banks to keep a substantial part of their money on deposit in these metropolitan centers in order that it might be available for the use of their customers in the metropolitan markets when required. In other words, these large city bankers supported this legislation because it enabled them to get for nothing what they had previously been required to pay interest to obtain. As usual, the country banks and smaller depositors were the sufferers.

In 1935 Congress passed a further law which authorized the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to adopt regulations prohibiting the payment of interest on demand deposits by all insured banks other than those which were members of the Federal Reserve System. Thus the law after 1935 subjected banks which were members of the Federal Reserve System to the interest regulations of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and submitted all other insured banks to the interest regulations of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

In 1936 both of these banking agencies adopted interest regulations which provided that interest should be deemed to mean any payment to or for the account of any depositor as compensation for the use of funds constituting a deposit. At that time the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System included a further provision in their interest regulations known as regulation Q, to the effect that the absorption of exchange charges by member banks of the Federal Reserve System for the account of their depositors, should be deemed a prohibited payment of interest. The exact language of this provision was as follows:

> The term "interest" includes the payment or absorption of exchange and collection charges which involve out-of-pocket expenses.

This provision provoked such a storm of protest from Members of Congress that the Board was forced hastily to withdraw this provision from its regulation. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation had steadfastly refused to include a provision of this kind in its own regulations affecting the nonmember insured banks, and following the withdrawal of this provision by the Governors of the Federal Reserve System in 1936 it appeared that the efforts of the Federal Reserve to abolish the absorption of exchange charges had been abandoned. In fact, they were abandoned until September 1943.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation had taken the position in conferences with members of the Federal Reserve Board regarding the latter's interest regulation, that the law did not authorize the prohibition of the practice of absorbing exchange charges under the guise of interest regulation and in the January 1936 bulletin, prepared by the Federal Reserve, a notice was published to the effect that the Federal Reserve had deferred the effective date of subsection (f) of section 1 of its regulation Q which contained the provision defining interest as including the payment or abandonment of exchange or collection charges. The exact language of this publication, under which the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System ran to cover is as follows:

> On December 28, 1935, all Federal Reserve banks were advised, and requested to advise their member banks without delay, that, pending action by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation on its regulation relating to the payment of interest on deposits by insured nonmember banks, the Board had deferred until such date as might be fixed by further action of the Board, the date upon which subsection (f), entitled "Interest," of section 1 of revised regulation Q, would become effective, but that all other provisions of regulation Q would become effective on January 1, 1936.

In the month of September 1943 the Board of Governors published in its monthly bulletin a ruling on the question, in which they held that under the facts of a specific case, a bank which I understand was a national bank in the State of Nebraska, had violated its interest regulation—regulation Q—by absorbing exchange charges for various correspondent banks and other depositors. In this opinion the Board stated that—

> From the facts of the present case it appears that the payments resulting from exchange charges are made by the subject bank for the purpose of soliciting and augmenting

its deposit accounts; in other words, as compensation for the use of funds constituting deposits. No other reason for the absorption of such charges is apparent.

In making its September ruling, the Federal Reserve dug up an old case concerning which they had had correspondence with the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency of the Treasury Department in 1938 and, because the facts appeared to them to be tailored to fit their particular purposes, they directed their ruling to this case. Although the ruling was purportedly limited to that particular case, the Board very adroitly gave widespread publicity to the ruling and sent circular copies thereof to the 12 Federal Reserve banks and to the examiners of these institutions who were in contact with most of the banks in the country. It was not long before what started out to be a ruling in a particular case had become a ukase of general application to all of the member banks of the Federal Reserve System in the United States.

When the controversy had arisen in 1936, I understand that there were numerous conversations between Hon. Henry B. Steagall, former chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, and the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Mr. Eccles, as a result of which the Federal Reserve had agreed to take no action to disturb the practice of absorbing exchange charges without giving ample notice to Congress. Shortly before the separate ruling was issued Mr. Eccles sent a letter to Chairman Steagall and Chairman WAGNER of the Senate reading as follows:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, August 6, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: You may recall that early in 1937 I talked with you and with several other Members of Congress about the question whether the absorption by banks of exchange and collection charges should be regarded as a payment of interest on demand deposits within the prohibition of the law and the Board's Regulation Q. As a result of these discussions, it was understood that I would advise you in advance of any future action which might be taken by the Board affecting the status of this matter. That time seems to have arrived, as the necessity for action has increasingly impressed itself upon us.

As you may also recall, the Banking Act of 1933 amended section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act so as to provide that no member bank "shall, directly or indirectly, by any device whatsoever, pay any interest on any deposit which is payable on demand," and the Banking Act of 1935 authorized the Board to determine what shall be deemed to be a payment of interest within the meaning of this section. In view of this provision of the law, the Board adopted a definition of interest under which the absorption of exchange and collection charges by a member bank as compensation for the maintenance of a demand deposit would be construed as a payment of interest on such deposit.

On January 30, 1937, however, at the request of Mr. Steagall and yourself, the Board deferred the effective date of this definition. Following a discussion with Mr. Crowley, because of the fact that the problem involved an interpretation of the law under which the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation operates with respect to nonmember insured banks, the Board amended its Regulation Q by striking out the definition in question and providing that, for the purposes of the regulation, "interest" should mean "any payment to or for the account of any depositor as compensation for the use of funds constituting a deposit," and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation amended its regulation so as to define interest in identical language. The regulations of both agencies therefore became uniform in this respect. At the same time, the Board and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation issued a joint statement for the press in which it was pointed out that the effect of the amendments was to declare existing law rather than to interpret and apply the law to particular cases. It was stated that this would permit the general application by each agency of a uniform law and a determination, based upon the facts involved, in specific cases.

Since then the Board's regulation has remained unchanged in this respect and no ruling has been issued by the Board regarding the question whether the absorption of exchange charges constitutes a payment of interest. It was hoped, and there was some reason to believe, that the practice would gradually diminish, particularly since many bankers regarded it as unsound, and that the problem would eventually solve itself without more specific action. Recently, however, it has appeared that the practice, instead of diminishing, has increased. The Board has been informed that some banks have taken advantage of the situation to engage in a competition for bank deposits on the basis of absorption of exchange and collection charges which other banks have believed to be unlawful. As a result, the Board of Governors has been urged on a number of occasions to take action. Requests of this kind have come from members of the Federal Advisory Council as well as from other bankers.

Last year the Board received a letter from the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency under date of July 31, 1942, calling attention to the continued absorption of exchange charges in considerable amounts by a particular national bank and urging upon the Board the desirability of a prompt ruling with respect to the question as applied to this specific case. A copy of this letter is enclosed for your information. The Board has reconsidered the entire matter carefully in the light of this case; and there is also enclosed a copy of the reply which has been prepared with a view to its transmission to the Comptroller on August 23, 1943. In this letter the position is taken that the absorption of exchange charges by the bank is a payment of interest on demand deposits in violation of the law and the Board's regulation Q. Since a ruling in conformity with this letter is one that would be applicable to all member banks, we contemplate publishing the ruling in the September issue of the Federal Reserve Bulletin, which will go to the press about the date of the letter to the Comptroller of the Currency. I am therefore writing you in accordance with the understanding mentioned in the first paragraph of this letter so that you may be advised of the proposed action before it takes effect, and I am writing letters to Messrs. Steagall and DOUGHTON to the same effect. If in the meantime any of you should desire to discuss the matter with me, I will be at your service.

Very sincerely yours,

RONALD RANSOM,
Vice Chairman.

Copies of this letter were furnished to Chairman Leo T. Crowley, of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, who promptly wrote a letter to the late Chairman Steagall, of the House Banking and Currency Committee, to Representative DOUGHTON and to Senator WAGNER, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, reading as follows:

AUGUST 20, 1943.

The Honorable HENRY B. STEAGALL,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We are interested to read the proposed letter of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to the Comptroller of the Currency accompanying Governor Ransom's letter to you under date of August 6, a copy of which was sent us with advice that it would be mailed on August 23.

In this letter the Board of Governors holds that the absorption of exchange charges by a national bank constitutes a payment of interest in violation of section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act and of the Board's regulation Q which prohibit payment of interest on demand deposits by member banks.

The subject matter of this letter was discussed by representatives of this Corporation with members of the Federal Reserve Board staff in January 1943, at which time they were advised that this Corporation believes the Board of Governors' position to be untenable, as the question involved appears to be one which Congress has pointedly refrained from delegating to the Federal banking agencies for disposition and in which the theory of the Board of Governors would appear to require it to outlaw as well the absorption of service charges and other expenses for depositors which all banks now incur to some degree.

In practically all systems of service charges on deposit accounts, credit, up to a maximum amount of the charges, is given for the worth of the balance to the bank in terms of an assumed or hypothetical rate of interest. A survey of service charges conducted by the American Bankers Association in 1938 showed that out of 478 clearing houses replying to the inquiries, at least 387, or 81 percent, used service-charge systems which in effect gave customers credit for interest on their accounts in determining the amount of service charges to be levied. Of course, no interest was actually paid; it was credited against charges which would otherwise be levied. The practice has become more widespread since that survey was made.

Under these methods of service charges the depositor whose account is considered to be desirable receives a pecuniary benefit which he would not otherwise receive in the form of free services, which represents essentially a rebate of charges. This benefit is an incentive for the maintenance of larger balances on deposit with the bank than might otherwise be maintained.

We know that it is a common practice of many depositors to balance the rate of return which they could secure on their funds, if invested, against the service charges which they would have to pay if their larger balances were withdrawn, and to base their decisions with respect to the use of their funds upon the relative advantage to accrue therefrom. The system of providing free services on the basis of minimum balances and of levying charges against those who do not maintain such balances appears to us to be as much a payment of interest as the absorption of exchange charges. In the latter case, the bank pays for something; in the former case, the bank refrains from collecting income which it would otherwise receive. The net result to the bank is precisely the same;

the purpose is precisely the same. The only difference is an accident of accounting.

Therefore, if the absorption of exchange charges constitutes a prohibited payment of interest, it seems to us equally clear that the absorption of internal service charges, telephone, and telegraph charges and postage for depositors is likewise a prohibited interest payment. Dollar-wise, the volume of service charges and expenses absorbed by the banks is immeasurably greater than the exchange charges which the banks pay for their customers. Yet, the Board of Governors, we believe, would frankly admit that to compel banks to pass on to their depositors expenses and charges of this character would not only be a disservice to the depositing public, but would, in their opinion, be as far beyond the scope of the Board's authority as we consider the proposed ruling to be.

As we view the proposed ruling, it is simply another attempt to force par clearance upon nonmember banks. In the past, all such attempts have been defeated administratively, legislatively, and judicially.

Over 2,100 insured banks charge exchange on items drawn against them and, while the total involved is relatively small, these charges constitute a vital source of income to these institutions. They have long fought the efforts of the proponents of free clearing to outlaw the practice and Congress was not unaware of that fact in enacting the interest provisions of the 1933 and 1935 acts. Yet Congress did not attempt to deal with the question then, and we do not believe it intended that the banking agencies do so indirectly under the guise of an interest regulation. This corporation does not intend to do so, and it hopes that the Board of Governors will not give rise to a situation where two Federal agencies make conflicting decisions to the consternation of the public. In such a situation we consider it singularly appropriate to await precise directions from Congress.

A similar letter is being sent to Senator WAGNER and to Representative DOUGHTON.

Very truly yours,

LEO T. CROWLEY,
Chairman.

Owing to the fact that Congress was in recess and immediately upon its return occupied its entire attention with the farm subsidy question, the House Banking and Currency Committee was unable to consider the question until after the proposed ruling of the Federal Reserve had been made public. Thereafter, the activities of the committee were upset by the untimely death of our beloved colleague, Chairman Steagall, and it was not until early in December that the matter came up for hearing.

During these hearings many members of the committee were amazed to learn that the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System had adroitly planned this entire matter. Their first step was to issue what appeared to be a ruling of limited application applicable only to one bank, or possibly to a few more banks which might have engaged in the same practice. This was followed by widespread publicity to the ruling and apparently by secret instructions to all of the 12 Federal Reserve banks to whip the banks in their districts into line by January 1 under threat of expulsion from the Federal Reserve System, or other severe disciplinary action if they did not cease absorbing exchange charges by that date. While Governor Ransom, of the Federal Reserve System, who appeared as the spokesman for the Board in these hearings, piously denied the giving of any such circular instructions, it nevertheless appears that by some peculiar coincidence most of the banks of the country that are affected by this ruling are notifying their depositors that they will cease to absorb exchange charges by January 1 because of the ruling which the Federal Reserve has given. The question immediately arises why January 1 has been fixed, and the obvious answer is that this is a date which could safely be fixed to force the issue on all of the banks without giving Congress a fair opportunity to act to prevent this bureaucratic bludgeoning of the banks into complying with a regulation which it is my opinion Congress never authorized and never had the remotest intention of permitting the Federal Reserve to adopt.

My colleagues, I want you to know that this innocent looking ruling, in my opinion, will have a revolutionary effect upon our banking system. It is a deathblow at many of the banks in my own State of Georgia and in the States of many of my southern and western colleagues and I exhort you to join with me in defeating this unparalleled effort to force over 2,100 of the small country banks of this Nation into the harness of the Federal Reserve Board's design. Bear with me and I will explain the full significance of this move but in order to do so I must go into the history of one of the most celebrated fights on economic questions that ever occurred in this country. This has to do with the so-called par-clearance system which, the Supreme Court of the United States has said, the Federal Reserve is under no obligation to enforce upon the banks of this Nation but which it has steadily and persistently fought for for over 25 years. The tragedy of the present situation is that because of the adjournment of Congress, it is impossible for us to pass legislation to defeat the efforts which the Federal Reserve are making and which they have timed perfectly to accomplish their purpose before Congress has an opportunity to act. Bankers everywhere tell me that if the ruling on which the Federal Reserve has undoubtedly set a deadline of compliance by banks generally for January 1, goes into effect and if the banks stop absorbing exchange charges that the practice will be dead and no amount of legislation can ever revive it. This, bear in mind, is being accomplished with the utmost adroitness without the reenactment of the provision in the 1936 interest regulation which was withdrawn because of the tumultuous protests from the Members of Congress, but by the simple expedient of a "ruling" which has the force of law but without observance of any of the formal requisites which usually accompany the adoption of a regulation.

Several members of the Banking and Currency Committee, including myself, urged Governors Ransom and McKee, of the Federal Reserve Board, to defer the operative effect of this ruling for 60 to 90 days beyond January 1, so as to give the House Banking and Currency Committee an opportunity to recommend legislation on this subject, if legislation is required, but they very blandly replied that they had not adopted a regulation and hence they could not defer its effective date, and further that they could not defer the effective date of an act of Congress. This, notwithstanding the fact that the law under which they purport to act was passed in 1933 and stayed on the statute books until 1936 without any attempt to apply it to the matter of absorbing exchange charges, and then when the regulation was promulgated to be effective on January 1, 1936, the same Board of Governors which now says it cannot postpone the effective date of its ruling published a formal suspension of the provisions of its own regulation, as I have outlined above, indefinitely postponing the effectiveness of this provision. I charge that they stand indicted of their shrewd and cunning maneuver to force par-clearance upon the country banks of this Nation by their refusal to give Congress an opportunity to act before this is put into effect.

What is par-collection or par-clearance? Par-clearance is the payment by a bank of a check drawn against it of the exact sum called for by the check without deducting any service or exchange charge for the payment thereof. In other words, if I give a check for $100 to a man in one State on a bank in another State and he places it in the hands of his bank for collection, the check is cleared at par if the bank on which it is drawn remits the full sum of $100 and this sum is credited to the payee of the check. Now, there are a great many banks in the United States which do not clear at par but on all out-of-town collections they charge an amount usually not in excess of one-tenth of 1 percent of the face amount of the check for issuing their out-of-town draft in settlement.

In other words, the check for $100 would be remitted for when sent to the drawee bank through the mails for payment in the sum of $100 less 10 cents exchange charges, or a net of $99.90. This exchange charge is exactly like the well-known service charges which depositors pay to their banks in the metropolitan areas, the only difference being that the exchange charge is imposed as a charge against the payee of the check in the case of the nonpar banks, whereas the service charge is assessed against the depositor by most of the banks which have service charge systems. However, the principle is the same. Now, there are over 2,100 banks in the United States which are not members of the Federal Reserve System but whose deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and some others whose deposits are not insured, which do not clear at par and, in addition, there are a substantial number of banks which are members of the Federal Reserve System which do not clear at par checks which are mailed in for collection directly by their correspondent banks. Checks are cleared in the United States through two principal channels, first, through the clearing facilities of the Federal Reserve banks

and, secondly, through banks in metropolitan centers, including banks in small cities which act as clearing agents for their correspondents. Under the latter procedure a bank, for example, in Atlanta, Ga., would act as the clearing agent for the banks in the smaller towns adjacent to Atlanta. These latter banks would send their checks to the Atlanta bank for collection and the latter would either send them to the Federal Reserve for collection or would send them directly to the banks upon which they were drawn, or to intermediate correspondent banks which in turn would send them to the banks on which they were drawn. Bear in mind that the Federal Reserve banks do not handle the collection of any checks on banks which do not remit at par. Therefore, checks on the so-called nonpar banks are usually cleared by sending them to a correspondent bank which sends them directly to the nonpar bank in the mails and the latter remits by a draft on its out-of-town correspondent nearest to the point from which the check originated.

The banks which undertake to collect these checks as clearing agents are usually qualified to carry the legally required reserve balances of other banks and the relationship between the two sets of banks is commonly known as a correspondent bank relationship which carries with it service to the smaller bank similar to that which the Federal Reserve banks render to the larger banks. In other words, the correspondent banks are the banks of the smaller banks.

For over 20 years it has been the custom of most of the correspondent banks to absorb the exchange charges assessed by the smaller country banks on out-of-town collections and to remit to their depositors the gross amount of the item collected. In other words, the $100 check which is remitted for at $99.90 by the country bank is credited to the depositor for the full $100, the 10 cents being absorbed as part of the expense of collection. The reason for this practice appears to be that the banks which engage in the business of making collections find it cheaper to do business by mail and pay the exchange charges themselves than they do to maintain the elaborate clearing system which the Federal Reserve banks maintain under Government sponsorship. Just as they pay their clerks and their tellers, their rent and other miscellaneous expenses, the correspondent banks have also paid the exchange charges assessed by the smaller institutions. The result is that the exchange charge practice is primarily something between bankers and the public knows very little about it.

Now, what the Federal Reserve System proposes to do is to prevent the intermediate collecting bank from absorbing the exchange charge on the theory that the absorption of this expense constitutes a payment of interest to its depositor. The history of the legislation leading up to the prohibition of the payment of interest on demand deposits shows that at all times Congress clearly distinguished between the payment of interest as such and the absorption of exchange charges. Hearings were conducted on H. R. 12379 by the Sixty-sixth Congress in 1920, the testimony in connection with which shows that the practice of absorbing exchange charges was then well known. When Congress investigated the payment of interest on demand deposits its investigation was clearly limited to the solicitation of money upon the payment of an agreed consideration to attract it and no word crept into the record indicating any criticism of the practice of absorbing exchange.

Now, you may ask me what the significance is of the prohibition against absorbing exchange. You may say, What of it; how will this affect the smaller banks? My answer is that experts who have studied the par-clearance question for a generation say that if the correspondent banks are prohibited from absorbing exchange charges for their customers it will have the effect of forcing the banks which charge exchange to clear at par or to go out of business. I believe that many of them will be forced to go out of business because their income is largely derived from exchange charges, just as many other banks today find a substantial part of their income in the service charges which they levy on their depositors.

Leo T. Crowley, Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, testified on December 17, 1943, before the House Banking and Currency Committee that the net result of the enforcement by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System of regulation Q against absorption of exchange would be, first, forcing of par clearance on all banks; second, detriment to small bank earnings possibly breaking some of them; and, third, opening the way for advocates of branch and chain banking to take over many small banks.

Everyone knows from the many speeches and publications of Mr. Crowley that he is the friend of the small-unit bank, and he has opposed the ruling which the Federal Reserve has made in a forthright and forceful manner almost without precedent as between Federal administrative officials. I think that his word of warning should be heeded before it is too late.

The controversy between advocates of par collection and those opposing it has been one of the most bitter in all of the banking history of the United States. During the hearings which preceded the passage of the Federal Reserve Act many objections to par collection were raised. Sections 13 and 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, which laid the foundation for a clearing and collection system through the instrumentality of the Federal Reserve banks, was permissive rather than compulsory so far as member banks are concerned. The power to collect checks on nonmember banks was founded on section 4 of the Federal Reserve Act, which authorized the Reserve banks to exercise such incidental powers as might be necessary to enable them to carry on the business of banking. The Federal Reserve started in 1914 with its efforts to enforce par clearance on all banks, and they have renewed their efforts from time to time ever since, the ruling which I have discussed being their latest effort. In 1920 W. P. G. Harding, who was then the governing head of the Federal Reserve Board, sent out a circular letter, in which he said that—

> The action of the various Federal Reserve banks in extending their par lists has met with the cordial approval of the Federal Reserve Board, which holds the view that under the terms of existing law the Federal Reserve banks must use every effort to collect all bank checks received from member banks at par.

To this end it developed that during the Board's campaign of that period, during and prior to the 1920's, the Federal Reserve banks would accumulate the checks drawn on nonpar banks and present them over the counter by messenger to the banks against which they were drawn, even though in remote localities. Sometimes the messenger chosen was an express agent and at other times an especially engaged person but in most instances, the checks were presented in large amounts shortly before the banks closed and cash demanded in payment. Many of the banks found it inconvenient to keep large amounts of currency on hand to meet these unexpected demands and as a result in order to block the intimidating efforts of the Federal Reserve Board to force them on the par list, went to their State legislatures which passed acts making it legal for them to settle by drafts on their correspondent bank balances, for checks against them presented over the counter by clearing agents. Many banks sought relief from the courts to protect themselves against the coercive efforts of the Federal Reserve banks to secure remittances at par and it appears from the history of these cases that most of them resulted in favorable decisions to the banks which invoked court aid at that time. One case went to the Supreme Court of the United States, which recites in a most interesting manner in a decision by Justice Brandeis the history of the whole par clearance controversy. This was the case of Farmers and Merchants Bank of Monroe, N. C., et al., against Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond reported in volume 262, United States Reports, page 649. In this opinion the Court explains what par clearance is, states briefly the legislative history of par clearance, and interprets the pertinent provisions of the Federal Reserve Act and the Board's powers and limitations thereunder.

This case arose out of a suit brought under a North Carolina statute, which is discussed in the opinion, by the Farmers & Merchants Bank, of Monroe, N. C., to enjoin the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond from dishonoring checks which the Farmers & Merchants Bank paid by exchange drafts on reserve deposits with correspondent banks. Two hundred and seventy-one other banks joined later as plaintiffs. The trial court granted a perpetual injunction. The supreme court of the State reversed the decree of the trial court, and the case was appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States. The Supreme Court of the United States sustained the lower court, reversing the

action of the supreme court of the State and held that the North Carolina statute under which the suit was brought did not obstruct the performance of any duty imposed upon the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks, and that the contention that Congress had imposed upon the Federal Reserve Board and banks the duty of establishing universal par clearance and collection of checks was irreconcilable with the specific provision of the Federal Reserve Act, which affirmed the right of banks to make limited charges for clearance and collection of checks, provided such charges are not made against the Federal Reserve banks. The Supreme Court held that Federal Reserve legislation did not "impose on the Federal Reserve Board or the Federal Reserve banks a duty to establish in the United States a universal system of par clearance and collection of checks."

That part of the decision pertinent to this discussion follows:

Par clearance does not mean that the payee of a check who deposits it with his bank for collection will be credited in his account with the face of the check if it is collected. His bank may, despite par clearance, make a charge to him for its service in collecting the check from the drawee bank. It may make such a charge, although both it and the drawee bank are members of the Federal Reserve System; and some third bank which aids in the process of collection may likewise make a charge for the service it renders. Such a collection charge may be made not only to member banks by member banks, National or State, but it may be made to member banks also by the Federal Reserve banks for the services which the latter render. The collection charge is expressly provided for in section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act (38 Stat. 268) which declares that:

"The Federal Reserve Board shall, by rule, fix the charges to be collected by the member banks from its patrons whose checks are cleared through the Federal Reserve bank and the charge which may be imposed for the service of clearing or collection rendered by the Federal Reserve bank."

Par clearance refers to a wholly different matter. It deals not with charges for collection but with charges incident to paying. It deals with exchange. Formerly checks, except where paid at the banking house over the counter, were customarily paid either through a clearing house or by remitting, to the bank in which they had been deposited for collection, a draft on the drawee's deposit in some reserve city. For the service rendered by the drawee bank in so remitting funds available for use at the place of the deposit of the check, it was formerly a common practice to make a small charge, called exchange, and to deduct the amount from the remittance. This charge of the drawee bank the Federal Reserve Board planned to eliminate, and in so doing to concentrate in the 12 Federal Reserve banks the clearance of checks and the accumulation of the reserve balances used for that purpose. The Board began by efforts to induce the banks to adopt par clearance voluntarily.[1] The attempt was not successful. The Board then concluded to apply compulsion. Every national bank is necessarily a member of the Federal Reserve System and every State bank with the requisite qualifications may become such. Over members the Board has large powers as well as influence. The first step in the campaign of compulsion was taken in the summer of 1916, when the Board issued a regulation requiring every drawee bank which is a member of the Federal Reserve System to pay, without deduction, all checks upon it presented through the mail by the Federal Reserve bank of the district. The operation of this requirement was at first limited in scope by the fact that the original act (sec. 13) authorized the Reserve banks to collect only those checks which were drawn on member banks, and which were deposited by a member bank or another Reserve bank or the United States. Few of the many State banks had then elected to become members. In September 1916 section 13 was amended so as to authorize a Reserve bank to receive for collection from any member (including other Reserve banks) also checks drawn upon nonmember banks within its district. Thereby the Federal Reserve Board was enabled to extend par clearance to a large proportion of all checks issued in the United States. But the regulation J then issued expressly provided that the Federal Reserve banks would receive from member banks at par only checks on those of the nonmember banks whose checks could be collected by the Federal Reserve bank at par. It was recognized that nonmembers were left free to refuse assent to par clearance. By December 15, 1916, only 37 of the State banks within the United States, numbering about 20,000, had become members of the System, and only 8,065 of the State banks had assented to par clearance.

Reserve banks could not, under the then law, make collections for nonmembers. It was believed that if Congress would grant Federal Reserve banks permission to make collection also for nonmembers, the Board could offer to all banks inducements adequate to secure their consent to par clearance. A further amendment to section 13 was thereupon secured by act of June 21, 1917 (ch. 32, sec. 4, 40 Stat. 232, 234), which provided, among other things, that Federal Reserve banks:

"Solely for the purposes of exchange or of collection, may receive from any nonmember bank * * * deposits of * * * checks * * * payable upon presentation * * *: *Provided*, Such nonmember bank * * * maintains with the Federal Reserve bank of its district a balance sufficient to offset the items in transit held for its account by the Federal Reserve bank."

To this provision, which embodied the legislation proposed by the Federal Reserve Board, there was added, while in the Senate, another proviso, relating to the exchange charge, now known in a modified form as the Hardwick amendment, which declares:

"That nothing in this or any other section of this act shall be construed as prohibiting a member or nonmember bank from making reasonable charges, to be determined and regulated by the Federal Reserve Board, but in no case to exceed 10 cents per $100 or fraction thereof, based on the total of checks and drafts presented at any one time, for collection or payment of checks and drafts and remission therefor by exchange or otherwise; but no such charges shall be made against the Federal Reserve banks."

Thus a Federal Reserve bank was authorized to receive for collection checks from nonmembers who maintained with it the prescribed balance; and strenuous efforts were then made to induce all State banks to so arrange. But the law did not compel State banks to do this. Many refused, and they continued to insist on making exchange charges. On March 21, 1918, the Attorney General (31 Ops. Atty. Gen. 245, 251) advised the President:

"The Federal Reserve Act, however, does not command or compel these State banks to forego any right they may have under the State laws to make charges in connection with the payment of checks drawn upon them. The act merely offers the clearing and collection facilities of the Federal Reserve banks upon specified conditions. If the State banks refuse to comply with the conditions by insisting upon making charges against the Federal Reserve banks, the result will simply be, so far as the Federal Reserve Act is concerned, that since the Federal Reserve banks cannot pay these charges, they cannot clear or collect checks on banks demanding such payment from them."

The Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks were thus advised that they were prohibited from paying an exchange charge to any bank. But they believed that it was their duty to accept for collection any check on any bank; and that Congress had imposed upon them the duty of making par clearance and collection of checks universal in the United States. So they undertook to bring about acquiescence of the remaining State banks to the system of par clearance.[2] Some of the nonassenting State banks made stubborn resistance.[3] To overcome it the reserve banks held themselves out as prepared to collect at par also checks on the State banks which did not assent to par clearance. This they did by publishing a list of all banks from whom they undertook to collect at par, regardless of whether such banks had agreed to remit at par or not. This resulted in drawing to the Federal Reserve banks for collection the large volume of checks which theretofore had come to the drawee bank by mail from many sources and which had been paid by remittances drawn on the bank's balance in some reserve city. If a State bank persisted in refusal to remit at par, the reserve banks caused these checks to be presented, at the drawee bank, for payment in cash over the counter. The practice adopted by the reserve banks would, if pursued, necessarily subject country banks to serious loss of income. It would deprive them of their income from exchange charges; and it would reduce their income-producing assets by compelling them to keep in their vaults in cash a much larger part of their resources than theretofore. That such loss must result was admitted. That it might render the banks insolvent was clear. But the Federal Reserve banks insisted that no alternative was left open to them, since they had to collect the checks and were forbidden to pay exchange charges. The State banks denied that the Federal Reserve banks were obliged to accept these checks for collection, and insisted that Federal Reserve banks should refrain from accepting for collection checks on banks which did not assent to par clearance.

It was to protect its State banks from this threatened loss, which might disable them, that the legislature of North Carolina enacted the statute here in question.[4] It made no

[1] See Report, Federal Reserve Board, 1915, pp. 14–17; ibid, 1916, pp. 9–11.

[2] North Carolina was placed on the par list on November 15, 1920. There were on January 1, 1921, in the United States, 30,523 banks, State and National. Of these, 1,755 State banks had refused to enter the par list. About 250 of the banks so refusing were in North Carolina. During the year 1921 the number which refused to consent to par clearance increased to 2,353. Annual Report of Federal Reserve Board, 1921, p. 71.

[3] See *American Bank & Trust Co.* v. *Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta*, supra; *Brookings State Bank* v. *Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco* (277 Fed. 430; 281 Fed. 222); *Farmers' & Merchants' Bank of Catlettsburg, Ky.* v. *Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland* (286 Fed. 610).

[4] Statutes similar in purpose were enacted in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Dakota, and Tennessee. See Annual Report of Federal Reserve Board, 1921, p. 70; Alabama, General & Local Acts, 1920, No. 35; Florida Laws, 1921, c. 8532; Georgia Laws, 1920, p. 107; Louisiana, Acts, 1920, No. 23; Mississippi Laws, 1920, c. 183; South Dakota, Laws, 1921, c. 31; Tennessee, Public Acts, 1921, c. 37.

attempt to compel the Federal Reserve bank to pay an exchange charge. It made no attempt to compel a depositor to accept something other than cash in payment of a check drawn by him. It merely provided that, unless the drawer indicated by a notation on the face of the check that he required payment in cash, the drawee bank was at liberty to pay the check by exchange drawn on its reserve deposits. Thus, the statute merely sought to remove (when the drawer acquiesced) the absolute requirement of the common law that a check presented at the bank's counter must be paid in cash, It gave the drawee bank the option to pay by exchange only in certain cases; namely, when the check was "presented by or through any Federal Reserve bank, post office, or express company, or any respective agents thereof." The option was so limited, because the only purpose of the statute was to relieve State banks from the pressure which, by reason of the common-law requirement, Federal Reserve banks were in a position to exert and thus compel submission to par clearance. It was expected that depositors would cooperate with their banks and refrain from making the prescribed notation; and that when the Reserve banks were no longer in a position to exert pressure by demanding payment in cash, they would cease to solicit, or to receive, for collection, checks on non-assenting State banks. Thus, these would be enabled to earn exchange charges as theretofore. Such was the occasion for the statute and its purpose.

As stated, the Court found against the Federal Reserve bank.

This latest move by the Federal Reserve is but another of its efforts to force par clearance but this time it takes on the guise of interest regulation. In 1936 the Board in its efforts to accomplish by regulation what it is now seeking to accomplish by a campaign of publicity and intimidation was defeated and nullified by the protests of the banks throughout the country and the representatives in Congress from their districts. From my own congressional district I have received many telegrams of protest and I know that the other Congressmen particularly from the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, Mississippi, Alabama and the Middle Western States have received similar protests. You are going home now for the holidays and will have an opportunity to investigate this matter first hand. I urge you to look into it carefully. Talk to your hometown banker and hear from him first hand what this ruling means. When you talk to him do not forget the address which Marriner S. Eccles, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System made on September 17, 1943, before the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks at their annual convention meeting in Cincinnati, Ohio. Mr. Eccles is himself a branch banker and comes from Utah where in the Twelfth Federal Reserve District branch banking has enjoyed widespread development. Mr. Eccles favors allowing banks to branch across State lines and in his speech to the State bank supervisors he said that he believed that—

The dual banking system, as now constituted, is outmoded.

He referred to the large mergers and consolidations in the industrial world and the development of modern transportation and distribution systems stating—

Attempts to halt this march of progress by antitrust, antichain-store legislation or other statutory pains and penalties have largely been in vain. It requires no gift of prophesy to foresee that the same economic forces will in time compel the banking system to follow a parallel pattern.

He then says:

I have long felt that limited branch banking is the practical solution of the banking problems confronting those areas where unit banks cannot succeed.

My colleagues, I ask you to mark those words well for it is my opinion that this is exactly what will happen if this regulation forces the independent unit country banks on the par list. They will not be able to succeed without the revenues which the exchange charges have brought them in the past and branch banking will follow in their funeral procession.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, after the other special orders today I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and the legislative calendar and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COOPERATIVE BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, 99 years ago today a few weavers of cloth at Rochdale, England, faced by a lock-out from their jobs, by poverty and desperation, worked out an answer to human problems which is today the most completely hopeful and constructive regenerative force to which the peoples of the world can look ahead through their present darkness and difficulty.

That answer was cooperation—an application of the Golden Rule to the everyday problems of mankind. No revolution was called for except in men and women's ways of thinking and attitude toward their fellow men. No special favors or help was asked of government. No quarter was given to private monopoly.

Four simple principles were laid down: First, one vote to each member of the cooperative business organization, one vote to each partner in the common enterprise; second, a limited dividend—generally 4 percent—on all capital invested; third, membership open to all men of good will regardless of politics, race, or creed; and fourth, business to be done at going market prices but earnings of the business to be returned to members at the end of the year in proportion to their patronage or participation in the business.

Today all around the world the cooperatives are the most solid hope of the common man.

The cooperatives of China have made it possible for the Chinese to rebuild in Free China the industries which Japan took over or destroyed; the cooperatives of Yugoslavia offer the one solid hope of guiding that country down a middle course between the extreme right and the extreme left; in Scandinavia the cooperatives have been intrumental in solving in fundamental and long range fashion such problems as unemployment, instability of farm income, and the deeper problem of reconciling true economic and political liberty with the necessary degree of security for the people; all over central and eastern Europe the cooperatives offer the one best method of rehabilitation of those countries through the efforts of their own people with such necessary assistance, primarily in the form of seeds and tools rather than direct relief, as other nations may be able to give.

In our own country some 10,000,000 people are members of cooperatives of one sort or another. Co-ops have enabled farmers to get fair prices in the market place for their crops; they have made possible the electrification of millions of farm homes; they have beaten the fertilizer trust; have given effective competition to the insurance trust; and are even challenging the oil monopolies. Two million American families trade at retail stores which they themselves own with a resulting increase of between 5 and 15 percent in their standards of living. And finally some 4,000,000 American citizens habitually place their savings with their own credit unions and borrow money when necessary from themselves.

The principles and methods of cooperation can lead us down a middle road to a better world after the war than any mankind has ever known.

Cooperation is right because it is the expression in the field of economics of the fundamental principles of the Christian religion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial from a paper in Montana upon the soldiers' vote.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article about Barney Old Coyote, the first Indian soldier enlisted from Montana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TAXES

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, whenever a revenue bill is brought in it is under a closed rule. The last one was no exception.

The Naval Affairs Committee of the House held hearings on renegotiation of contracts for over a month. We arrived at some conclusions. These renegotiation processes have brought into the Federal Treasury about $5,000,000,000. The new revenue bill is due to throw that all out. While we are to get about $2,000,000,000 in new revenue, we are giving back about $5,000,000,000 in unconscionable excess profits. I solemnly warn this House that you will hear more about it from the soldiers who come back if you do not hear about it from other people before that time. I propose myself to bring it to the attention of the House at a more appropriate time. I will tell you exactly what it means in dollars to the American taxpayer.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the other special orders today I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 20 minutes today at the conclusion of all other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 15 minutes after the other special orders today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech on Social Security in a Democracy, by Clement W. Hunt. This exceeds the permitted space, and the Public Printer has given me an estimate that the cost will be $120. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix, some of my own remarks on the subject of China, extending over the period of the past 20 months.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FULTON LEWIS, JR.

Mr. McWILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McWILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, last night while wrapping up Christmas packages and addressing last minute Christmas cards, I took time out to listen to Fulton Lewis, Jr., broadcast. The information which he gave the public last night would make any true American's blood boil and, if any of our boys who are spending their lives in the fox holes were listening in, they must have asked themselves this question, "What in the world are we fighting for?"

If what Fulton Lewis, Jr., said last night is true, and I have no reason to doubt his veracity, then hanging is too good for some people.

Mr. Speaker, I would like publicly to congratulate Fulton Lewis, Jr., on his splendid contribution in smoking out the rats and the termites who have gnawed and wormed their way into our political and military life. I hope he keeps up his good work, for by contrast to those he exposes, the men who are trying to do a clean, honest, respectable job appear as lily white.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

COMMITTEE TO INFORM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed to join the committee of the Senate to inform the President that the Congress is ready to adjourn, and ask him if he had any further communication to make to the Congress, has performed that duty.

The President has directed us to say that he has no further communication to make to the Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we are today closing the books for the session and the calendar year 1943. It has been a strenuous session and a strenuous and eventful year. In the last two sessions the Committee on Appropriations has handled more business, been in more continuous session, and disposed of more work than any Committee on Appropriations in the history of the Congress in any like period of time. We have reported out more money and more appropriation bills than any previous committee of this or any other country in the history of the world. We have reported out a greater percentage of reduction in Budget estimates on some bills than any previous committee. And we have devoted more time, more work, more detailed and painstaking research into the budgetary needs of the Government than any previous committee. It has been a work in which all members of the committee have participated, the minority and the majority alike, and I want to pay particular tribute to my colleagues on the majority side and to the indefatigable labor and cooperation of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and his associates.

The work of the committee has not been done in a corner. The record speaks for itself. It is written in documents that all may read. A complete record is found in the printed hearings and in the debate on the floor as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and is available to all. At the most critical time in the history of the Nation, the committee has met every emergency and supplied every need effectively, efficiently, and promptly. No department of the Government has found occasion for complaint, and the armed forces in particular have testified to the timely and adequate manner in which funds have been supplied for the war program. The records of the committee are open to the public, and at the beginning of a year in which the shafts of political criticism will try every rivet in the armor of every governmental agency we invite inspection and evaluation of our work from any source.

Preparation has already begun on the supply bills for 1944–45, and we expect to report the first early in January. The program of the committee calls for final disposition of all departmental supply bills in time for an early adjournment next year.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

COMMANDER MALCOLM ARNOLD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I think it is proper at this time to call the attention of the House to the heroic conduct of a member of the United States Naval Medical Forces. Last week there was an unfortunate railroad accident in North Carolina. Commander Malcolm Arnold was a passenger on that train. He was back home after 18 months of active sea duty in a combat area. After the wreck he spent 8 hours, clad only in his underwear, in temperature 10 degrees above zero, until medical assistance arrived, administering to the injured, and he saved many lives. He did one of the most heroic things that has occurred. His corps and all of us are proud of him. I think it is a fitting tribute to pay him for bravery on the home front.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURCHILL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD, a splendid article on renegotiation of contracts that appeared in a Washington paper today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURCHILL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may place in the RECORD an article by Damon Runyon, which he seriously recommends to his Democratic colleagues.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the estimated cost which is $120, that I be permitted to extend my remarks by including a speech by Judge Charles A. Graham.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of aviation legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. MILLER of Connecticut, and Mr. GATHINGS were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances, and in one to include an editorial from the Minneapolis Star-Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a resolution by the Iowa State Commerce Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THIRD WAR LOAN DRIVE

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I take great pleasure in calling to the attention of the Members the fact that West Virginia is the unchallenged winner in an undeclared war between the States to determine which would oversubscribe its quota during the Third War Loan drive by the largest number of percentage points. West Virginia bought 177 percent of its quota.

The population of West Virginia, according to the Sixteenth Census, was 1,901,974.

I know you will be interested to know that during this year—1943—West Virginia will have produced 160,000,000 tons of bituminous coal, which is 27 percent of the national production, and 250,000,000,000 cubic feet of natural gas, the major percentage of which is produced in my district. Our lumber mills will have cut 600,000,000 feet of hardwood lumber.

While West Virginia is not a farm State in the sense of some of the great Western States, being very mountainous, we do make an important contribution to the food supply of this Nation. The Fourth Congressional District contains many of the great farm counties of the State.

During this year we will have raised 670,000 head of cattle, 5,000,000 hens and pullets, 450,000 sheep and lambs, and 850,000,000 pounds of milk. We have furnished our full quota to the armed forces.

Down in West Virginia you will find patriotic American citizens who are always ready to make their contribution in peace or in war.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, our beloved President and Commander in Chief has just returned from a meeting, which Adolf Hitler hoped would never take place; a meeting which has helped cement the ties of the great Allied Nations; a meeting at which military plans have been laid to eliminate fascism and nazi-ism. I believe it is largely due to the great personal qualities of our President that this meeting has finally taken place.

Among his great qualities are his farsightedness, his courage, his abiding faith in democracy, and his willingness to assume the duties of a wartime President. Not the least among those qualities is his quality to take things in his own time. Patience—that great quality, because he gains his ends and our ends step by step. Oh, I know, Mr. Speaker, he probably does not take those seven league strides that some of our newspaper columnists and radio commentators would take were they in his place, but at the same time he gains his ends and our ends step by step. We should be proud that we have today in the White House as President, and Commander of the armed forces, a man of his great character and ability.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a radio address made by me this morning on the Blue Network.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request that all Members of the House shall have the privilege until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published, to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and may also include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extension of remarks; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter, which may have occurred, or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, that request having been granted, is it necessary to secure permission in order to extend our own remarks in the RECORD, individually?

The SPEAKER. Not a Member's own remarks; no. If a Member desires to include anything extraneous, he will have to get consent.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent tc extend my remarks in two instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LET US HIGHLY RESOLVE

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I trust the Speaker will allow me to impinge upon the rules of the House and to address particularly the membership of this body.

Last night I heard the address of our Speaker, a great oration, over the radio. I hope it went to every home in the United States of America and to every other land possible.

That speech was delivered extemporaneously originally in the House of Representatives. In my opinion, it has been one of the greatest contributions made to the winning of this war and the early conclusion of the struggle, since the war began. I desire to say further, in view of our early adjournment, that the speech of our Speaker should and will lead us to a sense of our own responsibility.

The Congress has passed a resolution that it will adjourn today. Three days after we shall have adjourned we shall commemorate the birth of the Prince of Peace. Notwithstanding this, we are in the midst of the most horrible war the world has ever seen. Men are fighting on the land, on the sea, and in the air. Someone has forgotten or despised that commandment which says: "Thou shalt not kill." What is the trouble? Where is the blame to be? It cannot be said that the hand of the Lord is shortened that he cannot save. The blame cannot be laid at the door of America, nor England, nor Russia, nor China. These countries made every effort for peace and, in some instances, probably delayed too long preparations for self-defense.

I recall the disinclination of Prime Minister Chamberlain to let England prepare and stand her ground. Many of us became impatient with our own Congress that it did not sooner prepare for the worst, though we knew we were hoping for the best. We had already suffered for China that she did not want to fight but had to fight. Do we not remember that Russia was stabbed in the back, and in utter disregard of a compact of nonaggression between that country and Germany? We will remember that Japan sneakingly made war on us while we were continuing in an attempt to arrive at an understanding that might stay the awful hand of war. We will remember that immediately after the attack on Pearl Harbor, Japan

and Germany declared war against the United States. The fault lies at the door of Germany and Japan. France had not gone in willingly with the Axis Powers, but was forced in. Italy, under that arrogant, unworthy Mussolini, had joined with Germany to carry on an unholy war of conquest against the world. It is not believed that the people of Italy, other than Mussolini and his coconspirators in crime, desired to make war. Many nations were ruthlessly overrun through absolute meanness and without any justification.

Great Britain, America, Russia, and China were left to bear largely the burden of the defense of the world against tyranny and oppression and to save the world for peace and good will. We are most fortunate and, I sincerely trust, very thankful that our South American neighbors, save one, joined with us in this battle for right.

To be somewhat brief about the matter, I am about to say that it must be recognized that the great sinners against humanity and against right and peace and good will are Germany and Japan, supplemented only by the unworthy leaders in another country or two. It is probably reassuring that nationally and internationally we have so many allies in this cause for freedom and for right living in the world.

Surely everyone will desire to take his definite stand alongside those who are fighting to preserve the good things of life and to put down, we hope, for once and for all, the influences that are unwilling to recognize the dignity of man and the value of good will and peace on earth.

A great concern to all of us—meaning by "us" those within our own borders and our allies—is that this terrible conflict, which must result in complete victory, may be ended as early as possible and with the least loss of life. Some may find, being seekers of such, some adverse criticisms with respect to the manner of our own operation and conduct of the war. Some may be willing to seek an opportunity to make some complaints with respect to our allies, or some of them. These are but things that tend to prolong this war and to subject our own soldiers to the dangers of needless death, as well as to jeopardize the lives of the brave soldiers of our allies. If ever it were true, it is now, that "in unity there is strength," and also that "united we stand and divided we fall." Our military forces are doing well. Shall we devote ourselves to fault-finding, or shall we devote ourselves to the establishment and the maintenance of fellowship and good will, as that must be applied among nations as well as among the people of the United States themselves. I regret to have to bring the indictment against some in our own country that it is not true that the main objective is to aid at every point the effort being made to accomplish a speedy victory. I know there are always protestations of devotion to this ideal and to this cause, but not everyone who professes this loyalty gives proof of it by his daily conduct and speech. There are things by comparison altogether inconsequential placed above the will to win this great battle for freedom, and we might as well recognize it. This applies to people of our own country and to too many people within our own borders. Every day we hear complaints, denunciations, unrestrained, bitter criticisms against men who ought to be accepted as loyal soldiers, even though not at the front. Such as this can have only one effect—to prolong the war and to cause needlessly the death of many of our own men.

We ought to be glad that we have as Allies in the great cause and struggle for freedom Great Britain, Russia, China, and other nations who stand ready to offer themselves in sacrifice to the accomplishment of peace on earth and good will among men. For these we should have too great a love and too much gratitude to exert ourselves in seeking for some seeming ground for complaint. We should not be striving to measure whether we are doing the most and they the least. I think this is a time and the occasion is such as to make us glad to say, "Here am I, send me." If I give myself to a disposition of complaint and fault-finding in relation to some act of someone in my own country or in relation to some fancied position or act or word of some of our allies, and thereby prolong this war 1 hour, I shall have probably caused the needless death of one or more of our soldiers, or, indeed, many lives of the soldiers of our own country and those who are fighting with us in this great cause. This contemplation should cause each one of us to be very careful what we say and what we do. If I am guilty of prolonging this war 1 hour by anything I say or do, knowing as I must know that thereby lives are needlessly sacrificed, even the lives of our own men, I shall confess that I am not guiltless and must acknowledge my wrong. What a contemplation! How careful then ought I to be of my behavior!

I trust that each one of us will resolve that we will do everything possible to the accomplishment of a glorious victory, and at the earliest time that may be; that we will put nothing in the way; that we will do nothing and will say nothing that might prolong this struggle.

I cannot close my observations without acknowledging that I have observed too much concern for political advantage and too little devotion to a grand statesmanship, which is love of country; and now a most sincere concern for our men in arms. The United States of America is composed of 48 States. To me, the terms "North" and "South" have no significance except a geographical one. We are one, and should be, in spirit and in truth. Everyone ought to be a soldier and a loyal one.

These things are addressed particularly to those who are regarded as of the home front. I do not apprehend that our men fighting on the fields of battle stop to argue as to which State one comes from, what party he belongs to, or that there is any comparison made by them as to which one is doing the most; but together they fight, each willing to die for the other. I offer the suggestion that if this spirit may obtain among us in the proportion that it ought to, the war will be sooner won and many will live to come home who would otherwise die.

SO THEY WROTE THEIR WILLS IN BLOOD

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, a large group of railroad leaders and workers have planned a rail strike December 30, thus tying up transportation facilities at a time when same are so vital to the prosecution of the war effort and our civilian economy.

The railroad brotherhoods have one of the best records of all groups. If it is determined that the workers are entitled to the 8 cents per hour raise, then it should be given, but in no event should a strike be called that would literally freeze the movement of goods and materials during the war.

This is no time to strike. Many men are anxiously watching the timetables for an opportunity to spend a few hours with their loved ones. Hundreds of thousands of others on the far-flung battle fronts are fighting with all their might and anxiously await goods, wares, and merchandise from America and messages from the loved ones at home.

I have concrete evidence that seven servicemen who lay dying in Japanese prison camps recently wrote a final letter to their loved ones shortly prior to their death, each signing his name in blood. One write his will, using his own blood, giving final instructions to his loved ones.

Stop, look, and listen railroad leaders and workers and heed the warning. This Christmas time—a time when dying servicemen are writing their wills in their own blood—is no time to strike!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two topics; in one to include a resolution adopted by the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, and in the other to include a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in two particulars; in one to include two excellent editorials against inflation published by the Iola Register, a Republican newspaper of more than 50 years' standing in Iola, Kans.; and in the other to include a letter from ex-Senator Robert L. Owen regarding world literacy and a brief comment on a book review by him.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] that he be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter which he addressed to the editor of the New Orleans States.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix on two subjects and to include in each a radio speech prepared by me for transcription in my district.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a recent decision by the Emergency Court of Appeals.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by printing in the Appendix an article by Mr. Clifford A. Prevost, of the Detroit Free Press.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Further, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein one editorial and two short newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting a communication from a gentleman in Texas enumerating the number of new bureaus that have been created in the past 10 years. The number is so great that it may exceed the limit usually allotted to Members for extraneous matter. Notwithstanding this I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a publication issued by the Public Relations Department of the Commonwealth of the Philippines.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE A. A. A. PROGRAM

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a letter I inserted in the RECORD yesterday. This letter contained a direct charge to the effect that the men in charge of the A. A. A. program were by coercion compelling farmers in California to sign up for the program or be refused the priority they had to have for much needed machinery. It contains the exact names and the circumstances. It is a very grave charge.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a statement on rubber in South America by Douglas H. Allen.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INHUMAN TREATMENT OF DISABLED VETERANS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my own remarks by including therein a statement on the treatment of disabled veterans, by Art Thomas, on the Voice of the People program.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, in these closing moments of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress I feel that I cannot refrain from again saying something of the plight many of the disabled veterans of World War No. 2 find themselves. I know every Member of this House is anxious that these disabled war veterans get the best possible treatment and attention. That has been the anxiety of so many of those of you who are present here today. But I am continuing to receive complaints, Mr. Speaker, to the effect that under the present system of discharging these disabled veterans there may be something inhumane in the way they are being treated. I feel that we have passed some helpful legislation, but there must be additional legislation. I feel that perhaps we should have not adjourned until this legislation and some mustering-out legislation was passed, but that is now an impossibility because in a few hours this session of Congress will adjourn sine die. However, Mr. Speaker, I believe that some warning should be sounded here which may reach the ears of those administering for the war veterans. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts, the Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, ranking minority member of the Veterans' Committee, who is present today, has done much valuable work. She has sounded the warning so many times. She takes the floor so frequently to tell of her concern over the conditions faced by these discharged disabled war veterans. I am glad to join with her in doing what I can to be of assistance. There should be no suffering among these discharged disabled veterans. Just now I have a copy of a broadcast made from a radio station in my home town—Norfolk, Nebr.—which indicates great concern among the people at home over what is happening to these unfortunate disabled war veterans. This broadcast was made by the manager of that station, Mr. Arthur C. Thomas. This broadcast was made on a program known as The Voice of the People. It is a very popular program. It comes from one of the pioneer radio stations of our country. The station is owned and operated by the Norfolk Daily News, which newspaper has the rare distinction of being known as the world's greatest country daily newspaper. The Voice of the People program is heard in nearly every part of the Third Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent. This broadcast contains much concern over the treatment of our discharged disabled war veterans. It must have been heard by thousands of people who have sons in the service and by thousands whose sons perhaps are numbered among those disabled and discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines. For that reason I will include in my remarks the text of this broadcast in order that all Members may read it and, also, that the Veterans' Administration may have the benefit of its contents. Mr. Speaker, although we have passed some helpful legislation, I feel that we should, before we adjourn, have some word from some member of the Veterans' Committee in order that some explanation can be made as to prompt remedies. I will yield to the distinguished member of the Veterans' Committee, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is largely a matter of administration, I may say to the gentleman from Nebraska. Some legislation is needed, but most of it is a matter of administration. I think the Army and Navy are trying to be more cooperative, and am glad to say that at long last the Veterans' Administration is placing boards in the hospitals to rate the men and contact men to assist the men in settling their claims, but that will not be sufficient, in my opinion. The gentleman from Nebraska was standing beside me when he and I were voting against adjournment until a mustering-out bill should be passed.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for the explanation and for the constant work she is doing for the veterans.

Mr. Speaker, the remarks of Art Thomas referred to follow:

The directors of the Norfolk branch of the American Red Cross, speaking as individuals, are personally unanimous in believing that the present system of discharging disabled veterans of World War No. 2 is very inhumane. They believe that they, as individuals, should call this to the attention of Congress and do everything possible to secure corrective legislation, but they have been told by a paid employee of the Red Cross that they must not mention their Red Cross connection in participating in legislative matters. Well, here is one director of the Red Cross who will not be silenced by them, and they can kick me out if they want to. If necessary, I will conduct a one-man campaign to try to correct these inequalities. Let me tell you the facts, gained from debates in the Senate and House, about the need for legislation to help take care of disabled veterans discharged from hospitals before they are ready or able to resume normal civilian life.

So far 600,000 servicemen have been discharged and they are being discharged at the

rate of 2,000 a week, and this will increase as the war proceeds, especially after the European invasion.

Under present Federal law some of these disabled veterans are entitled to disability compensation, but to get it they must go through voluminous red tape and wait 1 to 7 months to get their first payment.

Unlike convicts they are not even furnished with civilian clothing when they are discharged. They are furnished transportation to their homes. If they need money, they must appeal to their Red Cross. In fact, commanding officers and Red Cross workers in camps and hospitals tell them to go to the Red Cross and even suggest the amount of money they shall ask for.

Warren H. Atherton, national commander of the American Legion, has submitted to Congress a survey of 1,535 cases of disabled men showing that there is a considerable delay from the time these men were released from the service, file their claims, and receive their first check. Some have been pending from 3 to 7 months and are still unsettled.

Many Congressmen have cited specific cases. Congressman O'KONSKI, of Wisconsin, says he has 50 such cases in his district alone.

Congressman MCCORMACK, Democratic leader of the House, says he is shocked at the number of such cases.

Representative MILLER of Connecticut said the Veterans' Association should put contact men in hospitals and veterans should not be sent home in a confused condition. Mrs. ROGERS, of Massachusetts, told of a boy who said, "I am just coming out of a haze. I am just beginning to realize that I am alive again, but I cannot focus my mind on things." She agreed with MILLER that such things should not be allowed to continue. MILLER said no man should be discharged until his records are complete in every respect. Some men have medical records about their cases scattered all over the world. Some of these records were destroyed at Pearl Harbor.

Congressman RANKIN, Democrat, of Mississippi, said when a man comes out of service disabled, the burden of proof should be on the Government that he was not in that condition when he was taken into the service, RANKIN said that was the presumption Congress wrote in the present laws and must be carried out.

There are several bills before Congress which, if adopted, would correct this situation. I am not recommending any particular one, but let me tell you about the resolution introduced in the House by Representative BROOKS, Democrat, of Louisiana, as an example of what might be done. It would accomplish these purposes.

1. Grant a discharged veteran a furlough of about 3 months, with pay and allowance, during which he may arrange his affairs and prepare to return to normal civilian life.

2. Give the Government time to assemble his service and medical records and have them available for use at time and point of discharge.

3. Return him at end of furlough to a point where all his records have been assembled, so that he may receive his final discharge examination, and receive proper clerical and technical assistance in filing applications and claims.

4. Provide that the Veterans' Administration process and adjudicate claims before final discharge.

I am going to send a copy of these remarks to Congressman KARL STEFAN and Senators BUTLER and WHERRY. If you listeners would like to join me in this one-man crusade, please write me for a free copy. Please tell me if you agree or disagree. Your name will not be used on the air. Let me read your views over this Voice of the People program. We helped correct the sugar for canning situation. We helped get batteries for radios. We helped get overalls for farm children. Why not help our disabled veterans? Here is how you can help: Talk to your local newspaper editor and solicit his cooperation. Write other radio stations and ask them to study the problem. My effort is strictly nonpolitical.

JOINT ACCOUNT CONTRACTS PROVIDE A SOUND FLEXIBLE METHOD OF UNDERTAKING AMERICAN POST-WAR COMMITMENTS

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 207, regarding which I am about to speak, is not only germane but indispensable to all matters of rehabilitation and reconstruction, because it will bring all such efforts under a single supervision; hence, the American people will know at all times the extent of their commitments in the post-war period.

Let us briefly review the record to date.

On April 7, 1943, the Secretary of the Treasury made public a proposal for stabilizing international currencies, entitled "An International Stabilization Fund of the United and Associated Nations," with an initial capital of at least $5,000,000,000. On July 10, 1943, a revised draft of the proposal was issued. In the foreword the Secretary stated that it had had consideration by finance ministers and experts of nearly 30 countries, but had not received the official approval of the United States Treasury itself. Evidently it is a sort of trial balloon.

Under the date October 4, 1943, the Secretary of the Treasury published a second proposal, entitled "Guiding Principles for a Proposed United Nations Bank for Reconstruction and Development," with a capital of $10,000,000,000.

On November 15, 1943, Congressman BLOOM, of New York, introduced House Joint Resolution 192, to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization. It is generally understood that the share of the United States in this undertaking will be $1,800,000,000.

It is not my intention to discuss the details of the first two mentioned projects, they are many and very technical. In both proposals, however, it is startlingly evident that the taxpayers of the United States will provide the major part of the capital, but will not receive an equivalent voting power on the board of directors that operates either the currency stabilization fund or the international bank. Such a disproportionate voting power might place the representatives of the United States in the embarrassing position of either having to recommend a complete withdrawal from either or both, or of "going along" with policies that were not equitable as far as our country might be concerned.

The third proposal for international cooperation now being discussed is for our participation in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. In this case we are a cosignatory in the agreement with 43 other nations, although the United States will again provide the major proportion of supplies and of the cash that will be expended.

When it comes to the question of generosity in extending a helping hand to a friendly nation in distress, the record of the American people speaks for itself. There can be no question of our willingness to supply even more than our equitable share of food, medicine, and clothing, and in doing so we know currently just what we ourselves will have to do without and can plan accordingly. On the other hand when we sign an agreeement with 43 other governments to do rehabilitation work in devastated countries, even if only collateral to relief purposes, we may discover that we have made a commitment that will be embarrassing to fulfill. I find among these rehabilitation provisions the same threat to our national solvency and our continued friendly relations with other nations, due to inability of carrying out agreements little understood at the present time, as I do in our responsibilities in the stabilization of international currencies and reconstruction of the world, as proposed by the Treasury.

With these thoughts in mind, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 207, to provide for a central reconstruction fund to be used "joint account" with foreign governments for rehabilitation, stabilization of currencies, and reconstruction. It has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I believe House Joint Resolution 207 is germaine to, and should be accepted as an amendment to, House Joint Resolution 192, which is broad enough in scope to do about anything.

It will be noted particularly that the central reconstruction fund provided in House Joint Resolution 207, which I am about to describe, can do everything proposed by the Treasury stabilization fund and reconstruction bank. It also cooperates with that section of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration attempting any rehabilitation work. It can do all these things in joint account, that is by specific contract agreement, with other interested nations. Each national project will stand on its own feet with all the facts known, and with the ultimate liability established, the United States will at all times be in control of its own sovereignty. Going joint account with a group of friends in the financing of some project, is typically American, we know in advance just what we are getting into, and can stay out of a particular project if we feel the risk is too great. It is my belief we should approach the post-war international problem in the same manner.

House Joint Resolution 207 establishes a central reconstruction fund. This central reconstruction fund has the authority to go joint account with other nations within the amounts annually appropriated by Congress, or limits to which the fund may be permitted to obligate itself for rehabilitation, currency stabilization, and long-term credits or credit guaranty.

The central reconstruction fund should be the office through which all international financial operations must pass. The enabling act should contain the following provisions:

The board of governors to be composed of two members of the State Department appointed by the Secretary, two members of the Treasury Department appointed by the Secretary, two directors of the R. F. C.—one of each political party—appointed by the Chairman, two Members of the Senate—one of each political party—appointed by the President of the Senate, two Members of the House—one of each political party—appointed by the Speaker, two governors of the Federal Reserve Board—one of each political party—appointed by the Chairman. One of each group to serve 4 years, the other for 2 years; thereafter the term to be 4 years.

The chairman of the board to be also senior executive officer of the fund to be appointed for a term of 4 years, by the President of the United States with the advice and consent of the Senate, but the President shall reserve the right of dismissal.

There shall be also appointed by the President two vice chairmen either to serve in lieu of the chairman in his absence or to perform such other executive duties as may be designated by the board of governors.

There shall be an executive committee to be presided over by the chairman, composed of one member of each group of the board of governors, which member shall serve on said committee for 6 months. The remaining members of said committee shall be the senior officer of each main division of the organization of the fund.

The fund shall not maintain an independent research division. A manager with such assistants as are required shall have made available for the work of the fund all information contained in statistical and research divisions of existing departments and bureaus.

The fund shall be divided into three main divisions:

a. Short and intermediate credit for financing seasonal operations and/or support of currencies under speculative or economic pressure.

b. Long-term construction or wealth-developing credits.

c. Financing of rehabilitation requirements of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

The board of governors of the fund, established by this joint resolution, through its chairman, may use the amounts in the revolving fund account to participate in joint account, to the extent of not more than 50 percent of the total cost in the case of any one risk, with any other government or governments—or with any duly authorized agent or agents thereof—for the purpose of promoting the economic welfare of any nation through, first, extensions of short-term and intermediate credit for financing seasonal operations, and/or support of currencies when under speculative or economic pressure, or, second, extensions of long-term construction or wealth-developing credits.

Such action shall be taken by the Board upon such terms and for such period or periods as may be agreed upon, but only if the general purpose of the extension of credit is for sound economic objectives, and only if the government receiving the credit will authorize the supervision of the use of the credit by a representative of a government participating in the joint undertaking, other than its own representative.

The Board is authorized and empowered to assign, sell, or terminate its participation in any such undertaking, in whole or in part, upon such terms as the Board may deem to be to the best interests of the United States and otherwise equitable.

The moneys appropriated to the fund by the Congress shall be deposited in three accounts:

a. The revolving fund, which shall receive an initial deposit of $500,000,000 by the assignment of that amount of the existing stabilization fund now under the direction of the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Treasury. The revolving fund to be employed exclusively for undertakings with governments of other nations in joint account.

b. The administration account to receive moneys appropriated for the administration expenses of the fund.

c. United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration account, this account to receive moneys appropriated by the Congress and earmarked in the annual budget of the Director General for rehabilitation activities. No disbursements shall be made from this fund without the certification of board of governors of the fund, acting through their chairman, that such disbursement is not in conflict with the fund's activities in joint account.

The first sessions of the Council of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was held in Atlantic City. The Journal—part II—of November 3, 1943, sets forth as Resolution No. 12, policies with respect to rehabilitation, and so forth. Paragraph No. 11 of this resolution reads in part, as follows:

> The task of rehabilitation must not be considered as the beginning of reconstruction—it is coterminous with relief—

It is for the express purpose of maintaining this policy that House Joint Resolution 207 is being offered as article XI to the U. N. R. R. A. bill. As provided in House Joint Resolution 207, all funds appropriated for rehabilitation work by U. N. R. R. A. must be earmarked and deposited with the central reconstruction fund. Once deposited, they will not be released unless the governors of the central reconstruction fund and the authorities of U. N. R. R. A. have had a meeting of minds and decided that no competition or duplication of effort exist in the same project. Any person having experience with relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction work after World War No. 1 knows only too well of the possibility of temporary relief rehabilitation growing into permanent reconstruction.

With all the good will in the world to cooperate, it behooves the United States to make haste slowly.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RENEGOTIATION OF EXCESSIVE WAR PROFITS

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, if this Victory Congress permits the making of excessive and unconscionable profits on war contracts, the act will haunt us forever. Some of the amendments proposed to the renegotiation statute since it left the House might have that effect. Every Member who has told his people that he would do what he could to prevent war profiteering should do some home work on this subject during the holidays. He should study the amendments now proposed and determine their actual effect by applying them to specific cases. Some of the proposals look nice on the face, but in operation they could convert the Nation's distress into a profiteers' paradise. That, Mr. Speaker, will not only injure the war effort today by discouraging hard-working men and women who are scraping to buy War bonds, but it will damn American business for a generation in the eyes and minds of the soldiers who return.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that I may extend my remarks on this subject by an analysis of the effect of some of the amendments now proposed to the renegotiation statute and include certain figures obtained from the War and Navy Departments.

I further ask that I may insert in the Appendix the transcript of my statement and the ensuing questions and answers when I appeared before the Ways and Means Committee during their hearings on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection, to the requests of the gentleman from South Dakota.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Toledo Blade and editorials from the Cleveland News and Cleveland Plain Dealer.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE NORTH CAROLINA TRAIN WRECK

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I have talked personally with two gentlemen who rode on one of the trains that was in the recent wreck in North Carolina. Their condemnation of the railroads in question was most emphatic. I feel therefore that a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate Commerce should make an investigation and I should like to suggest to them that they consider the advisability, the feasibility, the practicability of installing short-wave sending and receiving sets on these streamlined trains.

MERRY CHRISTMAS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Congressman, serving my first year in this great deliberative body, I take this opportunity to thank all the Members for the courtesies extended to me and to wish you, Mr. Speaker, and my other colleagues a merry Christmas and a very happy New Year.

We all appear happy here today and it leads me to believe that what we all need is a better understanding of each other, more faith in humanity, less fear and despair. Try to be kind to the world and your fellowman and the odds are great that both in return will be kind to you.

If in spite of all, dark days intervene,
Keep in the race, do not lose your head;
Don't be a quitter, be a thoroughbred.
Fortune's rarest favors wither fast
But those who have felt the genial warmth of April, May, and June
Should summon strength to meet unmoved the frosts and snows
Of bleak December that cover all at last.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of December 20 on the Vursell bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address delivered jointly by myself and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we cannot turn our heads away from the question the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] asked regarding the discharge of the soldiers. It has been an inhuman way that the veterans have been discharged before their cases have been properly rated. I would say to the gentleman and to the Members, every one of whom now on the floor agree with me, that we should pass some sort of mustering-out pay before we adjourn. I find that not only the veterans but the country as a whole feel that the Congress has been extremely callous because nothing has been done. The reason given now is that the chairman of the committee, the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is in the South because of the death of a nephew. We regret that very much, but I feel that there will be veterans who die in this country because they have no money after their discharge. There are other members of the Military Affairs Committee in Washington who could bring a bill to the floor. They are ill, they are cold, and they are unable to take care of themselves. The chairman of the Military Affairs Committee is away, it is true, but there are other members of that committee in Washington today. It is not too late to do something now, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two letters from Maj. E. T. Keenan.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of consumer subsidies and to include therein an article published by Raymond Clapper.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including a brief excerpt from an article by Mr. Frank Waldrop, of the Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a symposium of the speeches given at the testimonial dinner in honor of Orville Wright recently in Washington.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

UNSUSPECTED FRIENDS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I rise on the floor of the House today with mingled feelings of joy and suspicion. I have in my hand a card which I received this morning addressed to me at the House Office Building:

Wish you a Merry Christmas and victory in 1944 at home and abroad. The board of directors, the Wayne County Republican precinct organization.

So I want to encourage my colleagues on the majority side by telling them that all that bristles is not so tough, that we probably have more friends than we even suspect; and I wish to say to those on the Republican side who saw fit so to recommend me to the folks back home that I am deeply grateful.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement by a national Boy Scout executive.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two respects, in the first to include two brief newspaper articles regarding the exploits of some of our boys on the battle fronts and, in the second, to include an article by Walter Lippmann entitled "Taxes, the Best Solution."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to propound three unanimous-consent requests to extend my own remarks in the RECORD; in two of them to include certain excerpts from newspaper publications, and in the other to include a communication in the form of a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a report made by myself on a trip to South America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks heretofore made and to have them printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution from American Legion posts in the State of Texas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG]?

There was no objection.

RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN LEGION POSTS IN TEXAS

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to include with my remarks some resolutions from American Legion posts in Texas, I take this 1 minute to call the attention of the membership to this matter, which has had long study and which has been revolving in the minds of men who served in the last war for some time and who, therefore, have had some experience in what a bitter conflict and the aftermath means.

I commend the reading of these resolutions to the membership of the House in view of the fact that they are essentially American in concept, and I believe they are very worthy of your attention before we meet again.

I hope you will find things satisfactory at home and I trust you will enjoy your recess. I pray, Mr. Speaker, that never again may this fair land witness another wartime Christmas.

I have had occasion in the past to discuss the proposal contained in this resolution with Mr. L. W. Dirks, of Tuleta, Tex., and with Mr. Louis Lea, of Beeville, Tex., members of the American Legion, and inasmuch as the resolution speaks for itself and contains an expression of highest American ideals, founded upon the American way of doing business, I take this opportunity to call again to the attention of my colleagues in the House the importance of giving this resolution and the proposal it contains earnest and prompt attention immediately on our return from this short recess.

I feel perfectly sure that out of the suggestion contained in this resolution may well come a solution looking toward the end of bonus payments and so forth, which after all, are somewhat like subsidy payments and affect the recipient of the benefits paid out in this fashion with a sense of inferiority and in many cases of outrage.

From my personal assay of American men who offer, and in many cases give, their all in service of their country the proposition of an insurance policy does not contain the somewhat besmirching impact of a suggestion that Americans are interested in extra pay for doing their duty in answer to a call to arms in defense of our country. The resolution follows and again I bespeak your earnest and careful attention to its contents:

The American Legion, department of Texas, at its annual convention held in Fort Worth, Tex., in August, adopted the following resolution:

"Be it resolved by this convention, That the American Legion, department of Texas, recommends that the national organization of the American Legion appoint a committee composed of persons skilled in the knowledge of life insurance and social-security benefits to study and prepare a plan to be submitted to Congress for legislative action embodying the following principles:

"1. The issuance of a policy of term life insurance to be issued at the time of discharge to each veteran of the present war who receives an honorable discharge from service, said policy to be issued to such veteran and to provide for sickness, accident, and unemployment benefits; said policy to run for a period of 20 years after date of issuance thereof."

In line with the resolution adopted at Fort Worth, we submit to you a tentative plan or program, based upon 10,000,000 men and women to be demobilized, as follows:

1. Every individual, upon receiving an honorable discharge from any of the armed services, shall be issued a $3,000 20-year-end life-insurance policy, the premium to be paid by the Government; the policy to supersede and take the place of present Government policies. If at the end of 20 years the veteran is still living, he shall have the right or privilege of continuing this policy, at his own cost or expense, at rates set by the Government.

2. In the event of unemployment, caused either by his inability to secure work or by his inability to work because of ill health, the veteran shall have the right to draw $40 monthly until he is able to secure employment or until he is able to work again—the maximum amount to be paid any individual under this provision to be $3,000. At the end of 20 years the difference between $3,000 and the amount drawn under this provision shall be paid to the veteran at the rate of $40 monthly until fully paid.

3. The veteran shall have the privilege or right to borrow money from the Government for specific purposes at the rate of 5 percent. The money thus loaned shall be additionally secured by the $3,000 life-insurance policy hereinabove referred to.

It is estimated that the cost of this program to the Government would be about $15,000,000,000, which would be about $600,000,000 annually during the time the program is in operation. To finance this program, it is suggested that Congress appropriate the $15,000,000,000 now and charge it to the war program. The total amount to be paid out under the program should be about $30,000,000,000. It is estimated that the interest received under the loan feature of the program would be sufficient to make up the difference between the cost to the Government of the program and the total amount to be paid out.

The program as roughly outlined above has several distinct advantages, some of which are as follows:

1. The per capita cost to the Government of this program should not be excessive.

2. The additional cost of administering this program should not be great, for it could and should be coordinated with existing agencies, such as the Veterans' Bureau and the unemployment-insurance agencies of the Government.

3. It provides an immediate means to rehabilitate our service men and women as they are discharged from the armed services.

4. The veterans will, to a great extent, help finance their own program.

5. The program should forestall any future demands or claims by veterans for bonuses or additional help from the Government.

6. It would tend to further stabilize industry and the veteran during periods of depression.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS ON MUSTERING-OUT-PAY BILL

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include letters from veterans' organizations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Military Affairs is filing today with the House a report on the subject of mustering-out pay. In that report we are attempting to review the other related problems dealing with the veterans of the present war, particularly the various proposals that have been made to provide special benefits to the returning veterans. I trust that the Members will take the time to get a copy of this report and to study it because I believe it contains some very useful information regarding the problems that confront this Congress in relation to the various matters having to do with the veterans.

The estimate as to the cost of various proposals and the types of benefits that have already been provided for the disabled veterans are set forth in this report. I am sure it will be very helpful to you in trying to determine what this Congress should do when we return in January in regard to mustering-out pay and other forms of legislation regarding the veterans of the current war.

In considering these proposals, it is well to keep in mind that during the First World War there were four and a half million men in the armed services, while in this war we anticipate not less than 12,000,000 persons. Should the war continue through 1945, we may enroll as many as 15,000,000 persons in all the branches of the service. As a result the cost of each of these different proposals quickly runs into the billion-dollar figures. For example, a flat $300 for each discharged veteran as mustering-out pay will cost at least $3,600,000, which is as much as the so-called bonus for World War No. 1 cost the Government, and over which so much controversy raged. Likewise the veteran of World War No. 1 received only $60 as mustering-out pay, which proved to be an inadequate sum for effectively providing the cost of the transition from military to civilian life. The amount now proposed is 5 times the muster-out pay of the first war, in addition to which one must remember that it will be paid to nearly 3 times as many people.

Six hundred and thirty-five thousand persons have already been discharged from the Army and 130,000 persons from the Navy, so that there are now eligible for any benefits to be provided a total of 765,000 persons, and this total is increasing monthly by 70,000. The proposal already passed by the Senate makes a distinction as to the place of service in determining the amount to be paid. Actually it makes no difference where a person has served insofar as the expenses to be incurred at the time of discharge are concerned. The transition to civilian life is just as costly for the soldier who served within the continental limits as for the one who served outside. Such a distinction should not be made in this legislation, if it is actually intended to be mustering-out pay simply.

The suggestion has been made that the merchant marine should also be included in this proposal, although they cannot properly be considered as a part of the armed services, nor are they in fact to be mustered out, as it is to be hoped that we will be able to maintain our merchant marine in considerable size following the war. Consequently many of the present seamen will continue to follow their vocation in peacetime, in spite of the fact that they will not then be entitled to the increased pay they now receive due to their travel through war zones. Moreover the merchant seamen are paid at a much higher rate than are the members of the armed services, some of whom serve on the same ships as gunners but receive far less monthly pay.

It has been suggested that educational opportunities should be provided for the veterans following the war, in addition to the vocational training program already provided for the disabled veterans. This proposal would entail an expense estimated at $4,000,000,000. Social-security benefits as well as unemployment compensation have been recommended. These proposals are estimated to cost well in excess of five billions additional. Added to all this is the suggestion that adjusted compensation should be provided for all persons serving in our armed forces. This proposal is made in spite of the fact that the pay for the enlisted personnel has been greatly increased during this war, as well as the allotments and other benefits to which they are entitled. One proposal of this kind, instead of following the figures of the First World War, would provide double amounts—namely, $2 for each day of service at home and two and a half dollars for service overseas. It is estimated that the cost of adjusted compensation on the same basis as for World War No. 1 veterans would total fifteen billions.

Because of the enormous cost of each of these proposals, the Congress should not rush into this question blindly, but should determine carefully what the full program should be and exactly how generous we can afford to be in regard to each of the items of such a program. Excessive payments made to the able and physically fit veterans of this war might readily lead to a future economy drive. Such an economy drive would not affect any of these proposals, but would of necessity be aimed at current expenditures of that period, which means the economy would be directed against the disabled veterans and their dependents, those who are most deserving of any generosity we are prepared to display.

While speaking of the disabled veterans, I wish particularly to call attention to that part of the report which sets forth information regarding the various benefits to which the disabled are now entitled. You will see that the Congress has endeavored to discharge its obligation to the disabled veterans of this war and has provided for proper care and attention for those who suffer disability in this conflict. In spite of the picture which has been given to the public, the Congress has not been negligent in this regard, but has been most diligent. Unfortunately, delays have occurred in some cases so that some disabled veterans have not been promptly rated as to the degree of their disability. This is being remedied as quickly as possible, and might be remedied even more speedily were it possible to obtain the additional employees needed by the Veterans' Administration. Unfortunately, the Veterans' Administration has been placed in the fifth, or lowest, category of Government agencies, whereas they should be placed in the same category as any other war agency, thereby entitling the Administration to have priority in seeking and obtaining employees.

For the benefit of the Members I am including as a part of my remarks the statement of Millard W. Rice, which sets forth some suggestions made by the Disabled American Veterans. I also include the statement of Omar B. Ketchum, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which statement was addressed to the members of the Military Affairs Committee:

STATEMENT OF MILLARD W. RICE, NATIONAL SERVICE DIRECTOR DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

Gratifying as was the generous gesture of the United States Senate last Friday in unanimously passing a bill (S. 1543) to provide for mustering-out payments, in amounts ranging from $200 to $500, depending upon the length and place of service, for members of the armed forces of the United States who have served actively during the period of World War No. 2, nevertheless, we, of the Disabled American Veterans, feel impelled to call attention to the fact that such legislation would not lessen the responsibility of Congress to provide adequately for those who come back with service-incurred or service-aggravated disabilities.

Neither should any such mustering-out payments in any way lessen the obligation of the Congress to provide other post-war adjustments for discharged service men—accrual of credits based upon length of active service for unemployment compensation and old-age and survivor's insurance purposes, post-war educational opportunities, and placement into suitable gainful employment, as recommended by the President, as well as adjusted compensation based upon length, type, and place of service.

The D. A. V. agrees with the President that first things should come first! Men now in service, as well as those already discharged therefrom, also heartily concur, we believe, with such a policy.

Inasmuch as practically all of those now being released from active service are being discharged because of disabilities or inabilities, it is of first importance that those who have equitable claims for pension, or other benefits, should be enabled speedily to establish their technical entitlement to any such benefits as, under certain circumstances, they may be legally eligible for.

Unwarranted delays in the adjudication of just claims, because of the non-receipt of certified copies of official service records from the War Department or Navy Department, can be obviated by the requirement—by a resolution of the Congress if necessary—that no person in the armed forces who has any kind of a disability or inability shall be discharged from such service until after all of his official service and medical records have been assembled and are made available to the examining doctors at the time of his or her final pre-discharge examination, and that immediately after such discharge he or she should thereupon be extended the opportunity to appear before a rating board of the Veterans' Administration located at such demobilization center.

The immediate adoption of such a procedure, jointly between the Veterans' Administration and the War and Navy Departments—already inaugurated at the Walter Reed Hospital of the United States Army in Washington, D. C., last Wednesday—would remove the impelling rush for the enactment of a bill to provide for mustering-out payments, until after such proposals have first been coordinated with the other equally important post-war adjustments for discharged servicemen.

Bad defects in existing laws to provide rights and benefits to America's disabled war veterans, and their dependents, ought, moreover, to be given priority consideration.

It would be most regrettable if too hastily enacted mustering-out payments should subsequently create the false impression that the Nation had thereby taken care of its obligations to all dischargees. If mustering-out pay turns out to be inequitable, its equitable adjustment thereafter might be found to be impracticable. If mustering-out payments should turn out to be more expensive than anticipated, the enactment of other more essential legislation, for the service disabled, or for unemployed discharged servicemen, might then be found to be much more difficult to secure.

Even though conflicting congressional committee jurisdictions make it exceedingly complicated and difficult, nevertheless it is highly desirable, from the standpoint of America's disabled war veterans, if not also for the long-view welfare of all of America's veterans, that America's adjustments for its war veterans, immediately preceding and following their discharges from active service, should be coordinated with each other, so that they may be properly balanced with each other, and made equitable and workable.

DECEMBER 20, 1943.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, D. C., December 18, 1943.

To all members of the House Committee on Military Affairs:

The Senate has taken action on a bill identified as S. 1543, to provide so-called mustering-out pay to members of the armed forces serving in the present war. It is now up to your committee and the House to determine if S. 1543 shall prevail, or whether some other form of action shall be taken.

The national legislative committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, composed of Paul C. Wolman, chairman, Maryland; Lyall T. Beggs, Wisconsin; Merle Hopper, Michigan; Alex M. Miller, Iowa; H. T. Kern, Tennessee; R. K. Christenberry, New York; and J. R. Klawans, California, while meeting in Washington on December 17 and

18, is of the opinion that the Senate has gone beyond the idea of mustering-out pay and is now in the field of adjusted-service pay or bonus. They feel that the Senate bill is inequitable and arbitrary in the amounts payable and the periods of service for such payments.

For example, under the Senate bill scale of payments, a difference in 1 day, either in foreign or home service, could penalize or reward a discharged veteran to the extent of $100. While it provides higher pay to those who have overseas service in some instances, it fails to recognize long home service prior to foreign service. Typical among thousands is the case of Staff Sgt. R. L. Ashworth, a claims officer in the Washington, D. C., office of the V. F. W., now discharged for combat disabilities, who was in home service for 21 months before going overseas. He was overseas for 8 months, being severely wounded in the Tunisian campaign. His total service amounted to 34 months. Under the Senate bill he would receive $300, or the same amount payable to one who had 12 months of home service only.

The national legislative committee is not opposed to strictly mustering-out pay, but when the Senate moves over into the realm of adjusted-service pay, such legislation should be based on sounder premises with equity for length and type of service.

It is the committee's belief that the only fair way to establish equity in adjusted-service pay is to allow so much for each day served, with a premium on overseas service, and set a minimum and maximum in each category.

The committee suggests an allowance of $1 per day for domestic service and $1.50 per day for overseas service, to be combined where both types of service were had, with a fair minimum and reasonable maximum for each type.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

AMENDMENT TO NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2207) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, and I also ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the full report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, this conference report has the approval of the Immigration Committee and the conferees?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It has the approval of both Immigration Committees of the Senate and House and is reported unanimously by the conferees. It is a bill that is necessary and has been urgently requested by the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Marines. This legislation has been asked for, and I was called upon to try to have it adopted at the earliest possible moment because of its urgency.

Mr. MICHENER. There are a number of Members present who would like to have a general idea of what the bill does before consent is given.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the Army, the Navy, and the Marines came before our committee in executive session and portrayed a peculiar picture. I am not going to say how many, but there have been a number of desertions in both the Army and Navy at the war front. These men were court-martialed and stripped of their citizenship and civil rights under the War Act, and they cannot return to the war front unless we can restore the citizenship that was destroyed by these courts martial.

Practically all of these deserters are now appealing to the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Marine Corps to go back to the front, but the heads of those services cannot take them back because of these courts martial.

This simply restores back to them their citizenship; their status quo is restored to them as before the desertion.

Mr. MICHENER. This bill simply makes it possible for the military services of the United States to restore citizenship to a man who has served in the service and deserted?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. Who was apprehended, court-martialed, and punished, but who cannot be accepted in the service again without this legislation?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire, is this limited exclusively to that type of citizenship?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is all.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do these men have to go back into the service before their citizenship is restored?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No. If this bill is enacted into law and the general of the Army says, "We will take them back," then their citizenship can be restored as before their desertion, but if they do not want to take back one or two, they stand as an alien or a person without citizenship or without civil rights.

Mr. RANKIN. I am trying to find out whether or not they must return to their former services before their citizenship is restored.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. They must be ready to return to the front or to the armed services and be accepted by the War Department, the Navy Department, or the Marine Corps.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not willing to legislate on those words "be ready." I want to know if they have to return to the service before their citizenship is restored?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. They cannot very well return as aliens to the Army until the Army says that it is ready to take the men back and put them in the service or wherever it is, and in that way restore to him the rights that he had before the desertion and before the court martial.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not want to restore citizenship to some fellow who does not go back to the service. I want this contingent upon his going back to the service.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think that is correct. The conferees are of the same thought and it is entirely up to the armed services. We have nothing to do with it except to give the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps the machinery to bring this about.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman, is it not also true that all we do in this bill is grant discretionary authority to the armed services? They do not have to act if they are convinced that the individual is really of bad character?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is true.

Mr. CURTIS. It gives them authority to act in a meritorious case?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman is correct. I may say further that in executive session we were told that the majority of these boys and young men had made a mistake. Some of them went off the handle, or for some other reason which I do not care to disclose, and they are ready to go and fight. They made a mistake. When they were court-martialed they were stripped of that right.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. These are not natural-born American citizens, are they?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Most of them are native-born.

Mr. RANKIN. None of them are natural-born American citizens.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. A lot of them are natural-born citizens.

Mr. RANKIN. That does not add up because they would not be deprived of citizenship in the United States.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Under the War Act when a man is court-martialed, and I do not agree with the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, if a man is born in this country, and he is court-martialed, having deserted, under the War Act he is stripped of his civil rights.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman, this applies only to that class of deserters who deserted during time of war?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is right.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Why should we want to take a man back who has deserted in time of war?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The answer to that is this, as explained by the War Department, by the heads of the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Marine Corps: They were young boys; some of them went off on a tangent because they were misled by some other groups, but they are all loyal Americans aside from the mistake that they have made; they are willing to fight. They have done something that they want to be excused for.

Mr. BULWINKLE. This takes into consideration every deserter?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Not necessarily.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Whether he deserted in time of battle or not?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Oh, no.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Oh, yes. It is not limited at all. It just says that if he is a deserter in time of war, then we are going to turn around and give him his citizenship back.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No; in certain cases the armed forces will use their judgment.

Mr. NORRELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes, but I want to explain this. This is not my doing or the committee's doing. The War Department and the other departments have portrayed a picture which I do not think it is necessary for me to explain which we of the committee felt there was some equity or some justice in allowing these young men who did not know better and deserted the armed services to have their rights restored. They come along and appeal to their commanding officer to be restored back to the war front or firing line or whatever the case may be, but the War Department and the commanding officer, rightfully so, says, "You have been court-martialed, you have been charged with desertion, you have been stripped of all your civil rights, and unless we can get the Congress to give us the right to restore your civil rights again we cannot take you back." All of these good young men did not intend to desert. They were misled in one form or another. Those are the facts as given us by the War Department and the other departments.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I realize what the gentleman is up against, but in this very bill that the gentleman is attempting to have passed here today, we say to everybody in the Army, "You can go on and desert, we will give you a chance to get back again."

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman listen to this? The answer is that there are a number of them, one or two or whatever it may be, I do not care how many they are. It is up to the Army to say whether they will take these men back, it is up to the Navy Department to say whether they will take these men back, or the Marine Corps. They may not take anybody back. There are a number of good young men who have made an honest mistake and in order to give them a chance to go back to the fighting units and do their duty as Americans, we present this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Reserving the right to object, perhaps the House will bear with me just a moment. For the first time in our military history, as I understand it, the War Department—and I assume the Navy Department—is endeavoring to recover the services of young soldiers who have violated the rules and have been guilty of one kind of offense or another. They are trying to bring them back to their senses, to point out to them the error of their ways. In that effort certain camps or schools have been established at which these young men who have been convicted of military offenses are gathered together, the more promising of them, and are put through—and it must be borne in mind that they are still under sentence—they are put through a very severe course of training; educational work is done amongst them and it turns out that an overwhelming majority of those selected for that recovery work, if we may use the term, mend their ways, recognize the errors they have committed and become excellent soldiers again. Some of them indeed have been graduated from those camps and have almost immediately been made sergeants or corporals. It is a new undertaking and thus far it has proved exceedingly successful. I assume we must trust the Army to see to it that only those men are retrained, as it were, who show signs of being ultimately reliable soldiers. And we must trust the Navy to select those bluejackets who have gotten themselves into trouble in one way or another, who may be trusted after retraining to be good sailors.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That includes the marines also. They have asked for it also.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes. The point is that we are recovering a lot of men who have seen the error of their ways and are responding to an appeal. Believe me, the course of training they go through is very severe. It demands of them every atom of their energy and of their thought. They have to make good all over again, and even to a greater degree than would be the case had they never offended.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think the gentleman has stated the facts as they are and as they have been definitely stated by the heads of the various Government agencies.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Now, there are some instances where the offenses have been such that under the new War Act they cannot be returned to active duty. This bill leaves it within the power of the War Department and the Navy Department to take cognizance of what the man has accomplished in the way of retraining and gathering himself together again and establishing his reliability. In that case he may be returned to active duty and the old charge against him wiped out.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

Mr. NORRELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. This is a short bill which is being presented to us and for the information of the House I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read. I think that will be the end of the argument.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? The gentleman from Arkansas asks that the text of the bill be read for the information of the House.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, that does not waive our right to object?

The SPEAKER. No; it does not waive your right to object at all.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this seems to me to be a rather dangerous piece of legislation. It not only covers the ones who have deserted now but holds out hope to those who desert in the future. In my opinion, if such legislation were going to be passed at all it ought to be passed only with reference to those individuals that have heretofore gone back into the service and made good and manifested their patriotism.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I will say this to the gentleman: You cannot get back into the service if you are dishonorably discharged.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand that.

Mr. BULWINKLE. He could do it upon the recommendation of the Secretary of War as to which ones should come back.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not willing to write this into the statute books to cover all future cases. It is bad enough for Congress to take upon itself to pass legislation of this kind with reference to cases that have already occurred.

In answer to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] he said this is the first time. I want to say to the distinguished gentleman from New York that during the War between the States we had many deserters on both sides. Some of them deserted when they saw the blood on the battle lines for the first time and some of them deliberately deserted. Many of them came back after they deserted and they made good soldiers. But they did not come to Congress and ask Congress to pass a law nor did they go to the Confederate Congress and ask them to pass a law in advance to take care of future desertions. So if this law is going to be passed at all it certainly ought to be limited to those individual meritorious cases that have occurred up to this time.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. CURTIS. Without this legislation they cannot go back and fight. That is the reason this legislation is here.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Nebraska that the ones who are going to desert in the future do not need this legislation now and they do not need for us to hold out this hope to them. This conference report ought to be limited to cases that have occurred up to this time. I am not very strong for it at all. I rather doubt the advisability of Congress usurping the prerogatives of the executive department to review and pass upon and confirm or reverse these convictions. I think we are going far afield.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RANKIN. I am not going to object to the Members talking, but I am going to ask that it be carried over until those safeguards are thrown around it. I will not do so at this time, but I will wait until the other Members get through.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. The Chair intends to ask for regular order pretty soon if nobody else does.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I heartily agree in the program of the War and Navy and Marine branches of the service in setting up these rehabilitation of soldiers and sailors and marines that have been convicted of some offense and perhaps discharged from the service, to give them an opportunity to rehabilitate themselves. But if I understand it, this deals solely and only with desertion cases; is that right?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. At the present time.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I would like to inquire how many cases does it cover; I mean, up to this time?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I have the information, but I think it would be to the best interest of this country if we did not make any statement dealing with the number. I want to say to the gentleman now, this deals with nobody other than the boys or persons in the present situation, in the present war. This legislation deals with nothing but the present war. It does not deal with the matter of desertions outside of the area, but it deals with one particular question which is so vital to the armed forces to rehabilitate the men. I could not make my statement more strongly or plainer than has the distinguished gentleman, my friend from New York.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It not only covers past desertions——

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It takes care of all desertions during the war period.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But it covers future desertions.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If you will read the bill.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I think it is too broad. I shall object to the conference report in its present form until it is limited.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky objects to the conference report in its present form.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to make a point of order that no quorum is present.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been announced that the Committee on Election of President and Vice President is to be called together immediately after we return after the holidays, for the purpose of considering the bill providing for absentee voting for our men in the armed forces.

I think I can assure the House, and the country, now that an overwhelming majority of the members of that committee are ready to report out the Senate bill, with some minor amendments, and pass that measure that would give everyone in the armed forces an opportunity to vote in the coming election, not only for President and Vice President and Members of the House and Senate, but for State, county, and local officials.

Governors all over the country are already assuring us that they are ready to call extra sessions if necessary of their legislatures in order to straighten out their absentee voters' laws. I saw a letter this morning from the secretary of state of the State of Ohio, indicating that Governor Bricker of that State is getting ready to call an extra session for that purpose. The same report comes from the State of Iowa, and from Georgia, and from many other States.

Instead of depriving the soldiers of the right to vote by the passage of this bill, we will enable them to vote, and with the assistance of the States, we will permit them to vote in the coming election in a legal, constitutional election.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

AMENDING THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I really regret that the gentleman from Kentucky saw fit to stop the passage of this urgent and necessary resolution and conference report, which was agreed to by both major parties and at the solemn request of the heads of the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Marine Corps. I think the gentleman from New York has ably presented the case of the War Department. As chairman of this committee, I could not possibly give the number of desertions, or other facts, because I do not think it would be very proper to let the enemy know that such conditions are existing. All of those men are citizens, and they are willing to go back and fight. They will make good soldiers, if given an opportunity. It would be up to the War Department to take them back after checking on their records.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

SOLDIERS' BENEFITS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time for a different purpose, but I would be less than honest if I did not reply briefly to the statement just made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] by simply saying that it is my earnest hope that the Congress of the United States will, at least, do its primary duty with regard to providing opportunity for men in the armed forces to cast a ballot in the next national election. Ours is a Federal army and navy and not a State army and navy. Men were drafted under Federal law and not under State law. Our responsibility is not State elections, but the election of Federal officials. I hope that we will provide in the most simple and direct way possible for ballots to be delivered to those men and for those men to have an opportunity to cast them, and for that to be done under such supervision of a bipartisan nature as will make as nearly certain as possible every man called upon to fight for his country will have opportunity to vote if he wants to exercise it. My own belief is that a bill similar to the Green-Lucas bill should be passed. But I simply point out that under the terms of the bill introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] if any State, or any locality, should really want to disqualify any ballots cast by its citizens in the armed forces, it would still have it within its power to do so. I cannot see how any further recognition of States' rights or voting qualifications could possibly be asked for. And yet the Worley bill has been attacked as roundly as the Green-Lucas bill. Why?

The thing I wanted to speak about today, Mr. Speaker, is legislation for the benefit of veterans of this war. Considerable discussion has been had on that subject in recent days. Before this a mustering-out pay bill should have been enacted. And the only reason that such a bill has not been enacted, as I understand it, is because a great many other matters of evident importance and justice to men in the armed forces have been presented in the course of discussion of this proposition.

A mustering-out pay bill there ought to be, but so ought there to be some provision for a reasonable period of economic security for men coming out of the armed forces; some provision whereby over a period of time there will be periodic payments to those men, at least, under conditions where their own earnings do not exceed such periodic payments as Congress might allow. These are questions of the greatest importance, and it is the evident duty of the Congress to attend to them at the earliest possible moment. But I am of the opinion they ought not to be mixed too much together. Mustering-out pay is one thing, veteran security is another.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would prefer to go ahead a little if I may, and then I will yield later.

The question that I want to discuss first is this:

There have been apparently some cases of men who have been discharged even with disabilities, without those men being cared for as provided by the laws already

on the statutes books, enacted by the Congress. In my judgment, every one of those cases is a real tragedy and never should have been allowed to take place. But the problem is one of administration, not one of law. The laws are already on the statute books.

I made a speech a few days ago and stated that, in my judgment, the first necessity was to be sure that every man at the time of discharge had in his possession a simple statement of his rights and benefits and everything to which he was entitled under laws enacted by the Congress, and before his discharge he should be fully informed about such matters.

A few days later I received from the office of the Under Secretary of War a release from that office, stating that such a piece of literature was being prepared and would be put into the hands of every single man before his discharge from the Army. I do not know how far along this job is. I do not know whether, as of today, every man is getting this information in printed form, which the War Department describes in this release, but I earnestly hope that every one of them is.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent to include this War Department release with my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHEPPARD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The release is as follows:

RIGHTS, DUTIES, PRIVILEGES EXPLAINED TO DISCHARGED SOLDIERS

In furtherance of its policy to facilitate the return of the discharged soldier to his proper place in civilian life, the War Department announced today it has adopted a single document which not only clearly informs him of his rights, duties, and privileges but also is designed to give adequate information to those governmental agencies which can help him.

The new form, called Report of Separation, replaces seven forms and five letters hitherto required. The soldier receives one copy while others go to the Veterans' Administration, the State director of Selective Service for his State for the information of his local board, the reemployment committee man of that local board, the veterans' employment representative in the local office of the United States Employment Service and The Adjutant General's Office of the Army.

The soldier's copy is certification of his status as a veteran. It informs him that if he is registered under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, he must report to his local board that he has been separated from the armed forces, and that if he has not registered he must do so. He is reminded that as a civilian he has the same obligations under the act as any other.

The soldier is advised that if he desires his former employment and is entitled to it under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act, he must apply to his former employer within 40 days after his discharge. The certificate also points out that if he saw active military service on and after December 7, 1941, and has been honorably discharged, he has the right to apply to the Veterans' Administration for hospitalization and domiciliary care, disability pension, or vocational rehabilitation, if entitled to them under the law.

For his assistance and advice the following information is given:

"There is a reemployment committee man attached to every local Selective Service board who will act as your personal representative in your home community and aid you in reestablishing yourself after discharge. He will assist you either in getting your old job back or in getting you a new job if your old job is not available. He will act in your behalf with the other Government agencies concerned.

"Army Emergency Relief has been established by the War Department to furnish temporary emergency financial aid and other services to soldiers and their dependents. Assistance is extended to all eligible military personnel, including persons discharged since September 16, 1940, regardless of rank, grade, branch, or component and to their dependents, irrespective of relationship. A. E. R. officers are located at posts, camps, airfields and in most principal cities. You may apply by mail or in person to the A. E. R. officer at any of these places.

"The United States Employment Service maintains contacts with employers and will assist you in securing work if you have had no previous job, or if for any valid reason your old job is not available. In each local U. S. E. S. office, you will find a Veterans' Administration employment representative.

"The Veterans' Administration maintains hospitals for the care of men incapable of rehabilitating themselves for civil life. They handle your pension claims and your service-connected vocational rehabilitation.

"The Vocational Rehabilitation and Training Division of the Federal Security Agency, which operates under the State department of education in each individual State, will assist you in your training and education if it is necessary for you to learn a new trade or profession before returning to civil life.

"You may obtain information concerning Federal employment at any post office or any civil-service office.

"The American Red Cross is the official medium of communication between the people of the United States and the Army. Its field directors at Army camps and hospitals and chapters in every home community will assist you and your family in solving your personal and family problems. They will arrange temporary financial assistance when you require it and will help you in filing and presenting claims for pensions or other Government benefits.

"On your request the United States Armed Forces Institute will undertake to provide records of courses taken by you while in the service for submission to civilian educational institutions, employers, and other properly interested agencies. In addition, the Armed Forces Institute will give you, on application, special examinations which will serve as a basis for the granting of academic credit by civilian schools and colleges, and will provide reports of the results of these examinations. For either or both of these services you are required to pay the Institute's regular membership fee of $2. No other payment is required. Inquiries should be addressed to the Commandant, United States Armed Forces Institute, Madison, Wis."

The discharged soldier is advised to keep in force all of his Government insurance which he can, as one of his most valuable assets. Full instructions are given to him on the subject.

The report of separation gives pertinent information about the individual. It includes considerable personal data, his character at discharge, his military and civilian occupations, the cause of his separation from the service, and the type of his discharge.

The present procedure was arrived at through experience during the present war and in the World War. It is recognized that modifications in procedure may be necessary from time to time in the light of changing circumstances.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In the next place, the Disabled American Veterans issued a release a short time ago, which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] put in the RECORD, and which pointed out a new policy on the part of the Veterans' Administration which seems to be of sufficient importance so that it should be spoken about on this occasion. That policy is one of adjudicating benefit claims of veterans before they are discharged from hospitals; while they are there to go over their case, to bring in their records and to go over the records and find out what their entitlements are, and to grant those men their compensation before they leave the hospital. If that could be done with regard to every single man who is hospitalized, it would answer a great percentage of their problems. I want to congratulate the Veterans' Administration on this move.

I myself happen to have been the author of a bill in the last session, which was enacted by the Congress, which provided in brief, that a man who had been in active service and the circumstances of whose service could logically be assumed to have led to the disability from which he now suffered, would be assumed to be suffering from a service-connected disability.

The reason that bill was necessary—and I do not think it has led to nearly the results I had hoped for—but the reason that bill was important, was precisely because this policy was not followed to anything like the extent it should have been, namely, the policy of adjudicating veterans' claims before they left the hospitals or, at any rate, before discharge.

Mr. Speaker, we have got to have legislation of a far-reaching character for the benefit of men in this war.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right at that point?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from California, that the Veterans' Administration now is carrying out the policy to which he has just referred, and when these men are discharged and it is indicated on their discharges that their disabilities occurred prior to their service, the Veterans' Administration is following out the policy that we prescribed, of placing the burden of proof on the Government to show that their disabilities were incurred before their service, or that they were not aggravated during their service. So that is the provision which the gentleman has referred to.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I know, and I think it is a tremendous forward step. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I think so.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think, if generally applied, it will answer a great many of the problems that veterans would otherwise face.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to go forward from this point and say that the thing that every man coming out of

this war will want more than anything else, is to have a real opportunity to make his readjustment to civilian life, with a good job as the basis. That is the thing, after all, that counts for most. It is the thing that every one of them is going to be entitled to by every right in the world.

Mr. Speaker, when we think about it from that point of view, we have got to recognize the fact that jobs for 11,000,000 men can only be assured if we also do the fundamental things necessary to assure our entire Nation of economic health, full production and general full employment. For more than 3 years, I have been appealing to the Congress that we should set up an outstanding commission, of not only Members of Congress, but of leading men in all walks of American life, to tackle in broad fashion the greatest problem of economic readjustment that any nation has ever known.

Mr. Speaker, in a brief 15 minutes, I cannot give a complete prescription as to just what we need to do to make certain that these 11,000,000 men will come back to a Nation where there will be hope for all.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield just for an observation?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield briefly.

Mr. ROWE. A primary element to the bringing about of that must of necessity be that some of the so-called selfishness that is now evident on all sides must first be eliminated?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I agree with the gentleman. I will say that one reason I set up my proposed commission like I did was because I was hopeful that on a commission of that kind, representatives of industry, listening to representatives of agriculture, and labor, and the churches, and education, and veteran groups, and so on, might go back from those meetings to industry and tell industry the very message the gentleman has just suggested. I was hoping that representatives of labor might do likewise, and representatives of agriculture and every other group; for Americans, after all, stand or fall as one people. Our Nation is one, not many, and that Nation will stand or fall together.

I want to issue one or two warnings about this matter as we look ahead. A tremendous drive is going on against the back drop of Government regulation such as this Nation has never dreamed of, the ultimate effect of which may be to discredit government, as such, in the minds of the American people. Nothing more dangerous than that could be done. After all, there is a vast difference between poor administration—if it happens, in certain instances—of a necessary measure of wartime control, on the one hand, and the fundamental job of Government of guaranteeing justice and hope to the American people as a whole, on the other. Some of the attacks that are being made are not discriminating enough to make this distinction clear to the people.

In the next place, I want to warn to this effect: Never in all the history of this country was the hand of private monopoly as strong as it is today. Those who seek a truly free America, one with a basic security for the common man, must remember that the net effect of the monopoly and the cartel inevitably is to take an inordinately large share of the buying power of the people for itself, at the same time restricting, artificially, what otherwise might be abundant production. You cannot have freedom, you cannot have hope, you cannot solve the unemployment problem or the problem of low agricultural income as long as monopoly grips your Nation.

I have a speech in the RECORD last Saturday in which I described a bill regarding patents which would prevent the use of patents as a means of monopolistic control. That bill would have given us enough synthetic rubber, it would have solved a lot of the problems of war production, if it had been on the statute books.

If we believe in freedom we have to be thoroughgoing. One job of government is to see to it that no private group has the power of denying similar freedom to any other group of citizens. A tax program could be used to combat monopoly. If, for example, the percentage of deduction that is allowed one corporation on income received from dividends from another corporation were reduced from 85 to 50 percent, it would be more effective in breaking up holding-company control than anything I know of. This is only one brief suggestion, of course.

A little while ago I spoke about cooperatives. Cooperatives of farmers and other groups of American citizens have been one means whereby the common citizens of this Nation could take hold of the monopoly situation and beat it with their own strength. But there has to be effective legislation, too.

There has to be, finally, recognition of one basic job on the part of government, a job which must be done and done well if jobs for returning fighting men are to me assured. Government need not, in a free democratic state, control and direct the economic activity of its citizens, but it does have the definite responsibility of guaranteeing that the home market for the goods of industry and agriculture never fails.

In other words, it is the economic job of government to see that over-all consumer demand for goods does not fall below the potential power of industry and agriculture to produce at the level of full employment. I submit these things as being some of the things that, while we are thinking about veterans of this war, we must consider as well as the essential matter of discharge pay, of provision for a period of economic security for these men, hospitalization, and the other things that should be assured to every veteran before he leaves the armed services.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. HOBBS. I am sure the gentleman is one of the most sincere and honest Members of this House.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOBBS. And, therefore, I want to ask him with the high regard that I have for him if he has read the Worley bill.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; I will say to the gentleman I have.

Mr. HOBBS. Does the gentleman then feel that it is no impingement upon the rights of States with regard to registration and poll-tax requirements of certain State constitutions? It seems to me that the exception in the Worley bill does deprive the States of those two rights.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I do not set myself up as being as good a constitutional lawyer as the gentleman from Alabama. Indeed, I am not an attorney at all. I see what the gentleman means, but I sincerely feel that neither registration nor poll-tax payment should prevent soldiers from voting. I frankly feel that it is a Federal responsibility at the bottom anyway.

Mr. HOBBS. I will say the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] does believe that these exceptions deprive the States of certain rights.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. POULSON. I merely wanted to commend my colleague from California because he has brought out some fundamental facts and principles which we must face if we are to solve these pressing war problems.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am much obliged to the gentleman for his kind comment.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. I just wanted in this connection to point out the fact that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] has been giving her attention to this problem of mustering-out pay and the treatment of the soldiers as they have been discharged, continuously now for a matter of weeks.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; I know she has.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE GOVERNMENT ALSO HELPS TO WIN THE WAR

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, there is at present in this body, and among some organizations and groups, a tendency to blame all of the war's domestic unpleasantness on the agencies created at the instance of the Democratic administra-

tion as necessary aids to a successful war effort. To hear some of our own worthy Members, and to read some of the current articles and advertisements in the press and periodicals, which, in substance, call for the elimination of all Federal controls and planning, you get the impression that Government activities are the cause of all our present discomfort on the home front. The fact that we are at war is given no part in it.

There seems to be the feeling that we should be able to engage in the greatest war of all time, equip and prepare ten to twelve million fighting men and send a large proportion of them abroad without any serious dislocations at home. Even with our great resources, our great agricultural and industrial systems, we are expected to do this and continue with great profits, high wages, low prices, no shortages, and the minimum of suffering and hardship. We are to wipe away a tear with one hand for those who have gone down in glory, and grab for everything we can with the other.

It is to be regretted that such is the sentiment of any person. Fortunately, they are few, for if democracy in this Nation means anything, and I know that it does, there must be a widespread willingness to share what privations the war brings.

Two years ago when we looked at the terrific problem confronting us, at the size of the forces opposing us, and at the woeful state of our own forces, many in this country were in a state bordering on panic. But we rolled up our sleeves and went to work. And because this is a democracy, it was the Federal Government's job to carry the ball and to expect teamwork and support.

The fact that today we stand assured of victory, even though we realize it is not yet close at hand, is due in no small measure to the planning and coordinating functions of the Federal Government. And I include in that term the Congress, the Federal agencies, the Government employees, the local rationing boards, and all the others who do the hard, the unglamorous, and often the thankless tasks of a nation at war.

Day after day we see charges of confusion and incompetency in Government. Certainly there has been confusion and incompetency. To deny that would be to say that the United States and all of its people are perfect. But would any of you say there exists no confusion and incompetency in industry, among labor, or within agriculture? I defy anyone not to find within any emergency mobilized organization some of the elements of confusion. That is only human nature. And the weeding out of these, as well as the constant striving for improvement, are legitimate aims.

But appraise, if you will, the job of industrial conversion to war, the overwhelming production job that has been accomplished, and the great military mobilization that has taken place in this country since the war began. Of this, the Federal Government was the planner, the forcing agent, at times the pleader, and always the disburser of the funds to do the job. And no nation has ever accomplished more in such a little time.

There are, of course, some in Government who seek to promote their own self-interests, or to secure benefits for the particular group they previously represented in private life, or to put special interest above the national interest. Thank God, these are very much in the minority. But strangely enough, this minority is not included among those who are castigated day after day for the inconveniences of war.

The greater part of the present criticism of legitimate governmental operations springs from the same old disgruntled sources which are so well known to us. And while these sources today create a smoke screen of criticism against the hypothetical powers of the Government, they admit the general necessity for over-all Government planning and direction in wartime. Thus, what they say means this: "We admit that Federal coordination and Federal controls in certain fields are essential in wartime. But those things are for other people. They must not apply to us."

As a part of the criticism of government, the Federal employee has been blanketed with ridicule. Yet I think we should remember that Federal employees are human beings like the rest of us. Many of them have unpopular duties to perform, duties which are also unpleasant to the worker. We may not like their methods, but we must admit they stick to the task assigned them. They know it is all a part of the ugly business of war.

I have read some of the statements which currently praise free enterprise for the job it has done in this war. Free enterprise has done a great job and it should receive full credit for its accomplishments. Yet, I note that many of these statements carry bitter criticism of the necessary and legitimate acts of the Federal Government, and demand a return to the old days of real free enterprise. There is inconsistency in these arguments. First they do not indicate that Government is a part of free enterprise and that democratic government makes free enterprise possible. Second, all of the credit for accomplishing the miraculous conversion to war production and mobilization is claimed for industry or other private activity. The part that the Federal Government and this Congress took in planning, hastening, and making possible the conversion, mobilization, and production job is considered unimportant and negligible. If that be true, and the job has been done entirely by industry, there is no need to return to anything. Sound thinkers in industry do not fall into this error. They know that Government and industry and labor and agriculture are all required to do a part in this great undertaking, and that there is credit enough for all to share.

There is no question but that we want and will have free enterprise in this country. Let us not forget, however, that government is a part of the system of free enterprise. None of us wants too much interference by Government. That is the way we are constituted. But we can make the best of a situation that the Japs and the Germans—and not our own Government—made necessary. We can work together and we can work with our Government until our job of winning the war is done, and while we are doing that let us take out our hate on Hitler and Hirohito.

This Nation is justly famous for its organizing ability. It is this genius, plus the facilities and resources we fortunately possess, that has enabled us to arrive at our present powerful status. The Federal Government is a part of the Nation-wide organization, and an expression of that organizational ability which is now devoted to winning the war, to fighting it as efficiently as possible, and to keeping the domestic economy operating.

When the morale or effectiveness of any part of the Nation-wide organization is undermined by untrue and caustic castigation—which, after all, is sometimes a scarecrow thrown up for other reasons than winning the war—it indicates a breach in our fundamental unity of purpose.

I like to see talk backed up with work. There has been more talk than work on the subject of going all-out to win the war as soon as possible. Obviously, the necessity for an all-out war effort has failed to get home to many. Perhaps some of the critics are included in that group, yet I seek to be fair to the critics because every reasonable person knows there are serious home-front problems before us. I do strongly make the point that cooperation, hard work, and understanding can solve those problems. But criticism and distrust only add to the difficulty of the job. Anyone can tear down a plan or a reputation. It is the ability and the will to build them that counts.

Let us get down to brass tacks. Have the critics produced anything that could be described as a coherent, considered, and intelligible policy on domestic issues? What is their position on the control of inflation, on control of prices, on control of wages, on what to do about excess purchasing power? What is their position on demobilization, on reconversion of industry, on disposition of war plants and surpluses, on how to bridge the gap between war and civilian employment for the demobilized soldiers and the war workers? What is their position on the place in post-war economy of our huge merchant marine, of our vast aviation industry, of our greatly expanded industrial facilities, on the reconstruction of international trade, on the tariff structure, on our world trade and financial policies? You see, it is easy to tear down, but we must have builders to win wars, or to win the peace that follows.

This administration has a program. This administration is doing a job. With what shall we replace its program, and its accomplishments?

Today we are engaged in the greatest free enterprise job of all time, the democratic mobilization of all our resources toward final victory in the severest test democracy has yet experienced. Let us

look to our sights. Let us keep them clear and sharp. And let us keep them trained on the real target—the enemy.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman on his splendid statement. I agree with him that our material accomplishments in this war have been the greatest of this or any other nation in human history. I also agree with the gentleman that all factors contributing thereto have not been duly appraised, as I see the picture. A stool or any other thing that requires support must have more than one leg. It must have more than two legs. I cannot conceive how a physical object can be supported by less than three legs or supports. This great objective of turning America into the arsenal of democracy which we have been attaining has had the support of three great groups of citizens, including management under free enterprise, as the gentleman has so well pointed out.

In saying this good word for management, I would not detract one bit from the credit we ought to give our army of labor and Government. We find these last two factors are usually neglected of mention by the apologists or by those who laud the total accomplishments of American war production. I think the gentleman has made a splendid statement today and he has given a fair overall picture. I believe with him that we ought to regard with equal appraisal the part which has been played by Government and also that part which has been played by labor along with free enterprise of industry in total war production.

Mr. SIKES. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, for I know his judgment is sound and highly respected in this House.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief speech.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the last few months we have been told on the floor almost every day that the country is at war. The parents and relatives of those who have gone to war certainly know that we are at war, and we in Congress ought to know it by this time and act accordingly. I want to ask, Is it not about time that the Congress itself acts upon the assumption that we are at war and insist that all others do the same? That observation is made because just recently, within a week, some 1,300,000 men, upon whom the transportation of war materials depends, have announced that they intend to strike unless they get a $3 a day increase in pay, some of them, and the others a few cents an hour in increased compensation.

Everyone knows that the men up in the front line cannot do the fighting unless they get the material to fight with. Everyone knows, of course, that unless the transportation system here at home continues in operation they cannot be supplied with guns and ammunition, to say nothing of the food and clothing which enables them to fight. Yet we are told that unless they get these increases in pay they will go on strike December 30. If my recollection serves me correctly, it was on the 14th day of November 1941 that the President told the country that no man would be forced to join a union in order to hold his job. That was at a time when John Lewis was telling us that we could not have any coal unless certain concessions were made to the United Mine Workers.

New York Times of November 14, 1941, quoted Roosevelt as stating:

> The Government of the United States will not order, nor will Congress pass legislation ordering, a so-called closed shop.

Talking face to face with Lewis, Mr. Roosevelt said:

> The Government will never compel this (remaining) 5 percent to join the union by a Government decree. That would be too much like the Hitler methods toward labor.

According to the New York Times of Monday, December 8, 1941, the preceding night, the three-man arbitration board appointed by the President, by a 2 to 1 vote, gave John Lewis the closed shop in the captive coal mines. The dissenting member, Benjamin F. Fairless, president of United States Steel Corporation, said:

> In my opinion the Congress in these days of national emergency should alone undertake to change a long-established open shop into a closed shop, or a closed shop into an open shop. Furthermore, deliberate and wise action on a complicated and controversial issue cannot be expected when all of us are, or should be, straining every effort to attain our paramount objective, namely, complete national security and the destruction of Hitlerism.

From that day to this the administration has followed a policy of appeasement. It has on each occasion, as I read the record, surrendered to the demands of the labor politicians, who were and are, its political allies. Sometimes it has surrendered directly, at other times the surrender has been in a roundabout way but always the same end was reached. The taxpayer, the individual worker, the consumer, one or the other, or all, were made to pay the cost of the yielding. I have no comment to make on the merits of the demands of the miners. They may have been justified in asking for more pay. The significance of the thing is that ever since that day, down to the present moment, if some group wanted to enforce a demand they threatened a strike which would retard the war effort, they made the granting of that special privilege a condition precedent to their participation in the war effort and to our shame, be it said, the administration yielded.

How much longer will the Congress permit the administration to play with these pressure groups on this question of supporting the war effort? When any man or group of men says or say that he or they will not transport materials in this country to the seaports, materials to be sent across the seas to help the men fight, unless then can get $3 or 3 cents more per day, then what are they doing? There is no use disguising the issue. There it is. The boys who are called by the draft boards go and when they are selected and sent into the armed forces they go, and they go wherever the Government sends them. And they die by the thousands far, far from home and country. But today men who are drawing as much as $484 for 11 days' work in one month, that is engineers on a fast run between Washington and New York, I repeat, for 11 days' work in 1 month, say that unless they get so much per day "We will not turn a wheel." Railroad men threaten that they will not transport needed supplies to the front lines unless they get additional dollars or cents.

What are we going to do about it? Are we, as a Congress, going to support these men we sent across the seas or are we once more going to let the President get away with this idea that every time a pressure group controlling votes makes a demand he can in some roundabout way, by portal pay or lunch-time pay or overtime pay or pay and a half or double pay or through some other subterfuge, give them what they ask as a sop, as a payment for their patriotism, or pay for support of their sons or brothers who are doing the fighting—for their effort to support the men who are doing the fighting? That is the issue I intend to talk about when I get home. That is an issue I intend to present to the wives, the fathers and mothers, the brothers and sisters of the fighting men, the WAVES and the WAC's who are across the sea. That is an issue that the men and women, too, when they come back from overseas are going to talk about and they are going to ask the Members of Congress, "How come that you did not do something about that?" If some major battle across the seas is lost, if men die because of our failure to demand that these men shall do their duty, keep the supply lines running, then no one can be blamed but the Congress itself. They will ask, "What did you do about it?"

Some time ago a bill was introduced by me which provided that when the men in essential war industries quit their jobs, they had 10 days to get another job in some other essential industry. I would not try to make a man work at any particular job if he did not want to, but I would say to him, "Listen, brother, if you do not like that job, then you get

another one and you get another one within 10 days. If you do not get another one in 10 days, Uncle Sam will give you one at soldier's pay," not necessarily in the fighting line, because many of these men are too old and their physical condition will not permit them to fight effectively. But they would get a job at Government pay and be put to work or in the fighting line by the commander of the military district in which they lived. It is my judgment that we all get in this war and support it, that those who will not willingly do so be forced to do it, or else that we cease to demand that others die for us.

ONE-YEAR MEN ENTITLED TO REST

Many letters have come to me—some from the men themselves, more from the relatives of men who have served overseas a year or more. Some have been wounded; some have been sick and ill; some have suffered for months from malaria. Those men and their relatives want to know why they should not be sent home for a furlough. They want to know why others cannot come to take the places which they have filled when they have become exhausted by long months of fighting or of illness.

Far be it from me to set myself up as a judge of when men should be relieved from duty but I do know that the exhausted, disease-ridden soldier is not the most efficient fighting man. I do know that the other day in the papers appeared a notice that more than one million and a half pre-Pearl Harbor fathers were to be drafted. I do know that about the same time around a million, three hundred thousand railway workers gave notice that they no longer would carry on by transporting munitions of war or anything else for that matter, to our sick, disabled, disease-ridden soldiers across the seas or to the men who in the South Pacific, were losing their lives in attempts to take a beach head, unless they received additional pay.

The threat to strike, to me, does not make sense, nor does it seem sensible that those who have served for months, for a year or two, should be held relentlessly to their jobs until in the course of time they die in the battle line in an effort to lessen the burden of those who have not made sacrifices.

I have today introduced a bill calling, if possible, for the granting of furloughs to those who have served a year or more, to those who are serving in disease-ridden districts. The bill is not perfect, it is but the expression of a thought, which the general staff should take up and work out to a reasonable solution.

AGAIN THE SMEAR

A great deal has been said by those who have endeavored to smear Congress about the loyalty of Members of Congress and about the loyalty and patriotism of the Congress as a whole. One of those who has been most vocal is the gentleman from New York, Walter Winchell. It is my purpose today, not to prove it because everyone knows it already, but to put in the RECORD where all can read the evidence that Walter is dirty and nasty, the evidence that Walter is untruthful and the evidence that he is not smart. I will start with the evidence which shows the last statement to be true.

WINCHELL IS NOT SMART

Permit me to read from a report from Frank Knox dated February 9, 1943, which accompanied H. R. 95, sent to the Naval Affairs Committee which contained this statement:

INFORMATION AS TO STATUS OF WALTER WINCHELL

Question 8. (a) During the month of January 1943, was Walter Winchell an officer in the United States Navy? And, if he was, what was his rank?

Answer. Yes. Lieutenant commander, United States Naval Reserve.

(b) If Walter Winchell was an officer in the United States Navy during January 1943, did he, on January 31, 1943, in a radio broadcast, or in his column as printed, in substance refer to American citizens who voted for certain Representatives in Congress as "damned fools who voted for them"?

Answer. Walter Winchell was an officer in the United States Naval Reserve with the rank of lieutenant commander on active duty on January 31, 1943, and, according to a transcript of his broadcast given at 9 p. m., Eastern War Time, over the Blue Network on that date, made the following statement:

"You bet I'm prejudiced against those in high office who guessed so wrong before Pearl Harbor. They're still guessing wrong. I am not in the least comforted by their confessions of ignorance. What worries me most are all those damn fools who reelected them."

Winchell is talking about the great body of American voters who returned Members of Congress here in the November 1942 election. The gist of his remarks is that not only are those voters fools, and damn fools at that, according to his statement, but they guessed wrong and the people who reelected them guessed wrong.

To show you how smart Walter thinks he is and how utterly mistaken he has been, let me quote from Walter's column which appeared in the New York Daily Mirror on April 11, 1939. This has been printed in the RECORD before but Walter is now pushing the sale of the Armenian's Pagnanelli book, Under Cover, which condemns all who opposed war. This is Walter Winchell speaking. He said:

Once again Europe is rolling the loaded dice of destiny. Once again her miserable diplomats are pointing down the one-way street to war—as the only avenue to peace. And once again America is asked to play her role of the great international sucker.

The time has come for us to pause and consider. If we must have another unknown soldier, let us not ask him to die for an unknown reason. And just what will be accomplished by dying in the mud? He will not increase America's resources; the last war nearly ruined the Great Plains. He will not increase America's wealth. In the last war we loaned our gold and were gold-bricked in return. He will not increase our liberties—for no man may protest slaughter after it starts. The truth is that external disaster never solved internal trouble. We must develop our youth—not sacrifice it. America must learn that her sons abroad will bring monuments to her glory, but her sons at home are a monument to America's common sense. The future of American youth is on top of American soil—not underneath European dirt.

Well, Walter, you later became a war monger and now American youth is being put under European dirt by the thousands. May God forgive you, Winchell, and may you sometime still your slanderous and vile tongue.

How smart was Walter, any smarter than anyone else?

In fact, Winchell was mistaken so often that back in July 13, 1940, an article appeared in the New Yorker which took up some of Walter's brain children, and I am going to print it in the RECORD, where it shows that Walter is right in his statements over the radio and in his column just 41 percent of the time. That statement is as follows:

PROFILES

GOSSIP WRITER

V—Flash—is it true what they say?

"Accuracy! Accuracy! Accuracy!" wrote Joseph Pulitzer in a commanding style. It was his cardinal rule of journalism, a practical code, in his judgment, as well as an ethical one. If Walter Winchell had gone over to the World from the Evening Graphic around 1926, when he was invited to do so by the World's executive editor, there is a question whether he would have been able to abide by the founder's vehement dictum. Pulitzer believed that inaccuracy will out. He reasoned that inaccuracy in journalism is instantly recognized by readers and that a journalist soon loses his readers if he fails to stick at least reasonably close to the facts. He worked all this out before gossip writing like Walter Winchell's had become an accepted feature of American journalism. Winchell has humbled Pulitzer on three counts. He has flagrantly disobeyed the great journalist's command of "Accuracy! Accuracy! Accuracy!" He has kept his readers and increased them many times over. And, as far as can be determined, his readers possess to this day an unshakable faith in Winchell's often reiterated claim that he is fiendishly and uncannily accurate.

A large number of the flat statements Winchell makes in his column and on the radio are impossible to prove or disprove for a reason which is scientific and philosophical but sound. Many of the married people whom he accuses point-blank of being "on the verge" or "readying a flash" do not themselves know at the time of the item's publication whether it is accurate or not. This also is true of young and middle-aged unmarried couples who are reported by Winchell to be "that way" or "blazing." In many cases, of course, Winchell appears to be proved accurate by subsequent events: A divorce action is instituted, or a Stork Club romance flowers into marriage. But love is tricky; it is a treacherous and unpredictable phenomenon which the cautious Pulitzer would never have allowed himself to become tangled up with as a journalist striving for accuracy. Had Mr. and Mrs. John Doe, who got divorced after Winchell said they were readying a flash, finally and definitely decided that they were incompatible before they read Winchell's item? Or was that simply the last straw? Who knows what perverse thoughts and emotions mingled in the secret souls of Mr. and Mrs. John Doe, who had loved once, presumably, had stood before an altar, had perhaps raised children together? Do Mr. and Mrs. John Doe know about these things themselves? Their gossipy friends? Winchell? How many couples have talked of divorce, then buried their secret and lived on together till they died? How many lovers have loved and then decided that they hadn't been "blazing" or "that way" about each other at all? Were their first or second thoughts on this matter correct?

Winchell himself has admitted that "blazing" is indefinable. On August 24, 1931, he wrote:

"Mrs. J. Loose, who has more money than her Loose-Wiles plants have biscuits, and Vice President Curtis are blazing."

Four days later he explained:

"The line on Monday about Vice President Curtis and Mrs. Loose of the biscuit company "blazing." Well, the Trib yesterday refuted it by saying that Mr. Curtis denied he was engaged or going to marry. Who said anything about engaged or marriage? Can't a Vice President get that way about a girl without marrying her?"

Then there are people like Mr. and Mrs. So-and-So. They were reported to be Renobound and never went, either of them. They are still married and just had another child. What of this? Was Winchell right? Was Winchell wrong? Were you really on the verge that time, Mrs. So-and-So? You, Mr. So-and-So? Do you know how you felt then? How you feel now? What you will do today? Tomorrow?

This state of affairs baffles and upsets Winchell continually. He is sure he is right, but subsequent actions of citizens who don't seem to know their own minds seem to suggest that he is wrong. "It burns me up," he once said passionately, referring to this situation. There are hosts of people in New York whom he has reported on the verge who have never yet gone over it. There are hosts of others who have told him personally that they are not on the verge and have gone over it without so much as a word to him. The same sort of thing is true of stories about births, critical illnesses, changes of employment, industrial machinations, political jockeying, international affairs, and a number of other things. For example, on February 14, 1938, Winchell wrote complacently:

"Henry Ford is contemplating retaining title to all his cars and renting them on the drive-yourself plan. That's one of the biggest stories in years boiled down to less than two lines."

But is it accurate? Did such an idea cross Mr. Ford's mind? If it did, was he contemplating it or just toying with it? Who knows? Winchell has been outwitted in such matters time and time again by the human element. It is something he has never been able to get a firm grasp on, and neither has science or philosophy.

Winchell prints many flat statements which are in a less dreamy realm and the accuracy of these items may be determined either by general knowledge or research. "E. B. W. is Elinor Wylie's brother," he once informed his readers. Inaccurate. In September 1938, Winchell said over the radio:

"Flash! Buron Fitts, district attorney of Los Angeles County, is reported to have boarded a ship for an unknown destination. There is another report that he is doing a Justice Crater."

Mr. Fitts was surprised to hear this. He was sitting at the home of a friend with nine Los Angeles judges listening to Winchell's news broadcast. Inaccurate.

Reports on Ambassador Bullitt's marital intentions belong in the dreamy rather than the verifiable category of Winchell items, but in view of the time that has elapsed and the prominence of the people involved, the accuracy of some statements Winchell made about him may be judged by general knowledge. In 1934 he reported:

"Ambassador to Russia William Bullitt and Margie Le Hand, Roosevelt's personal secretary, still deny blending reports, but she's over there now!"

Two years later (people are so slow!), on September 7, 1936, Winchell wrote:

"The newly appointed Ambassador to France, William Bullitt, will marry soon. Marguerite Le Hand, the President's girl Friday?"

Another year another nudge from Winchell:

"Ambassador Bullitt's return to Washington brings him closer to F. D. R.'s confidential girl, Friday, Marge Le Hand."

The sands of time! June 19, 1939:

"The Ambassador Bullitt-Beth Leary merger talk is taken seriously by her chums, but not by his."

Finally, desperately, but with a quip on his lip, Winchell writes on September 11, 1939:

"Society suspects Beth Leary is Ambassador Bullitt's secret bride, but she wouldn't do such a thing to Cholly Knickerbocker, would she?"

General knowledge may also be used to check Winchell's announcements about the former King of England. The June before the abdication of King Edward VIII, Winchell reported that he would not marry a Danish princess at all but the daughter of a German prince.

There are innumerable instances in which general knowledge may be applied in judgment of Winchell's accuracy. A great many inaccurate items have appeared in his column through the years. They have touched on almost every field of human activity. Some of these items follow:

Hollywood: "The Mary Pickford-Buddy Rogers 'bunk' is just that," he wrote in 1934. This referred to reports in other newspapers that these two were to be married. Motors: "The Cadillac firm has shelved building their 16-cylinder." This was in 1931; Cadillac is still building its 16-cylinder. Dentistry, September 7, 1931: "After having her molars fixed so that they would photograph better, Barbara Stanwyck will make no more flickers." Cellophane: "Rigid cellophane will replace shatterproof glass in windshields in a year at one-third the fee of safety glass." This innovation should have made its appearance in 1933; not a word of it to date.

Back in Hollywood, October 10, 1932: "The orb operation on Joan Crawford is gradually blinding her!" Domestic politics, November 7, 1932: "Norman H. Davis of New York will be Secretary of State if Roosevelt wins." Diplomacy, August 12, 1935: "The Vincent Astors probably will replace the U. S. Ambassador in Paris any day now." Haberdashery, September 2, 1935: "William Fox, who once owned so much of the flicker industry, will open a chain of haberdashery shops in Greater New York." Royalty, January 17, 1937: "England's next sensation will be the separation (pending divorce) of Marina, Duchess of Kent, from George, Duke of Kent. It is anticipated within a pair of fortnights." International politics, March 29, 1937: "Adolf and Benito have phffft! The break will be officially announced soon enough." Hoover (Herbert), August 1, 1938: "Herbert Hoover starts colyuming soon—in 250 gazettes." Television, September 18, 1938: "The local stores will be selling television sets for as low as $3.95 by October 1." Hungary, March 20, 1939: "Those who like to salute the Hungarian flag better do it within the next few weeks." Wall Street, March 27, 1939: "The new chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission will be President Hutchins of the University of Chicago." Magazines, May 22, 1939: "S. S. McClure will revive 'McClure's (once America's leading magazine) in about 4 months." Communism, June 19, 1939: "Litvinoff, Russia's best brief case carrier, will arrive here in the fall with Stalin's blessing." Greece, August 28, 1939: "If Hitler marches into Poland, a dozen hours later Italy will march into Greece, led by Field Marshal Badoglio." And so on.

Taking a Winchell item which looks accurate, and then going to the source to find out whether it is or not, is more illuminating and more fun than simply picking out items which everybody knows to be wrong. This procedure has been followed in the preparation of this article. For example, on April 29 last, Winchell printed this item:

"Sometime ago we ran the denial of Dorothy Thompson after we heard that Monsignor Sheen (who converted Heywood Broun) was giving her instructions. We challenged the source again last week after he insisted our denial was bum reporting. He replied: 'Her name is still on the list of those taking instructions,' and when the good padre was asked point-blank whether the report was true about Miss Thompson changing her faith, he answered beautifully: 'Maybe she isn't changing her faith—perhaps she is just finding it.'"

Monsignor Sheen, in reply to a letter asking whether this item was accurate or not, said he was not giving instructions to Dorothy Thompson and that he had told Winchell he wasn't.

Then there was this item in the same month of April:

"Sue Brewster has Steve Hannagan's ring—so it looks like the merger is any day."

Inquiry into this statement revealed the fact that Sue Brewster had had Mr. Hannagan's ring since the previous November, in which month she was married to Mr. Hannagan.

Another example is the following Winchell item:

"Stockholders are battling Standard Oil. Henry Stimson against John W. Davis. The defendants are willing to settle for 25 mill. But, nh-nh, the plaintiffs want a mere 65."

Mr. Davis writes:

"The statement is only partially true. There never was any suggestion by any of the defendants to settle for 25 millions, or any other sum. By and large, I think it may be said that the paragraph you quote was substantially incorrect."

Even when writing about residents of Harlem, where Winchell's column is extremely popular, Winchell is often at least partially inaccurate. In April he printed this item:

"Ethel Waters of Mamba's Daughters and Richard Wright, author of the best seller, Native Son, are in high. He's a leader of the intelligentsia in the mahogany-skinned set."

"Absolute rot," is the comment of Paul Reynolds, Mr. Wright's literary agent, who spoke on behalf of Mr. Wright. Mr. Wright was in Mexico at the time and Miss Waters was in New York. Mr. Wright, Mr. Reynolds pointed out, is happily married and has met Miss Waters a few times at parties attended by himself and his wife.

In order to estimate how often Winchell is right, how often he is partially wrong, and how often he is wholly wrong, all five of Winchell's Monday columns for the month of April were clipped out of the Mirror and dissected. In these five columns were 239 separate items. Of these, it was discovered that 108 were unverified because they were what gossip writers call "blind" items, in which no names are mentioned, or were expressions of opinion, or were items which the persons concerned refused to confirm or deny. Thus, 131 items of the 239 were verifiable. Of these, 53 were completely accurate, 24 were partially inaccurate, and 54 were completely inaccurate. The percentages are as follows: 41.2 percent completely inaccurate, 18.3 percent partially inaccurate, 40.5 percent completely accurate. In other words, Winchell was not quite half right in the month of April.

The item concerning Mr. Wright is classed as partially inaccurate because "in high" is indefinable and may simply mean that Mr. Wright has met Miss Waters, which he has. Similarly, the item concerning the Standard Oil Co. is classed as partially inaccurate because there was a dispute, although no offer of settlement was involved.

Here is an example of a completely inaccurate item:

"Richard Whitney, the Stock Exchange biggie, has become Sing Sing's most popular prisoner. Because he found jobs for nearly 100 released intimates he met there."

According to Warden Lawes, who is professionally acquainted with all of Mr. Whitney's activities, Mr. Whitney secured a job for one ex-convict.

Here is another:

"The real reason Stokowski is feuding with the Theater Authority is that its agent shouted at him: 'How do you know? Some day they may have to run a benefit for you, and then you will need us'."

Mr. Stokowski writes:

"The statement of which you write is completely untrue. I have never had any 'feud' with Theater Authority. I have never had any dealings with them of any kind. No agent from them has ever 'shouted' anything at me. There never has been any question of my conducting a benefit for the Theater Authority. I belong to the American Federation of Musicians but I do not belong to the Theater Authority because I am not an actor but a musician."

Here is another:

"Mrs. Harrison Williams, often the leader of the 'best dressed' lists, is definitely headed for a cancelation."

Mrs. Williams writes:

"I am not quite sure what 'cancelation' means, but suppose it means divorce; if this is true, it is completely inaccurate."

Just one more:

"Jean Parker, the lovely actress, and Val Olman, La Martinique's batoneer, are cupiding via air mail. What fun is that?"

Miss Parker says the name is Doug Dawson, not Val Olman.

Winchell has told his readers over and over again in his column that he has a high regard for accuracy and that inaccuracy in his own column or in other gossip columns causes him intense pain. "Take it from one who is sensitive about his accuracy," he wrote in 1932, "when you find you've made a boner in reporting something, the blood rushes to your cheeks and you get a little ill. That, it seems to me, is the most severe punishment—finding out you are wrong." It was in that year that he was wrong about, among other things, the rigid cellophane for windshields, Joan Crawford's approaching blindness, and Norman H. Davis' becoming Secretary of State. In that year, too, he wrote that Miss Frances Perkins would not become a Cabinet member.

If one accepts Winchell's rather incredible claim that he is sensitive about accuracy, Winchell must simply be put down as a man in an occupational quandary of stupendous magnitude. He seems at times to be vaguely aware that his dislike of finding himself wrong and his passionate fondness for gossip cannot be reconciled; it may be this circumstance which has led him on occasion to set down prophetic items every which way on a coming event, like a man betting on all the horses in a race. On the question of a third term for President Roosevelt, for example, he has written at various times as follows:

"F. D. R.'s choice for President in 1940 is Senator BARKLEY of Kentucky.

"You can safely wager that F. D. R. positively will not run in 1940.

"If Roosevelt decides not to third term it Justice Sam Rosenman will resign and open a law office which F. D. R. will join after 1940.

"Insiders say that if the President doesn't run again he will connect with a New York evening paper as editor.

"F. D. R. will run a third term.

"F. D. R. up to now is ignoring his personal doc's advice against a third term."

Whatever happens, Winchell will probably be able to claim remarkable foresight.

Next to accuracy, which comes first with Winchell, it is his journalistic scoops he is proudest of. Some of these he considers historic. The three most widely accepted triumphs of Winchell's in this category are outside the field of gossip writing, or are supposed to be outside it. They have to do with two crimes and with the surrender of a known criminal: the killing of Mayor Cermak, of Chicago, by Giuseppe Zangara in February 1933; the Hauptmann case; and what has come to be referred to in other papers as Winchell's capture of the gangster Lepke, who was wanted by the New York police and who chose to turn himself over to J. Edgar Hoover, using Winchell as a go-between.

The Lepke episode is remarkable in every way and can reasonably be compared, as Damon Runyon and other journalists have compared it, to the finding of Livingstone by Stanley. It was a less difficult but more practical action all round on the part of Winchell and Lepke than the Stanley-Livingstone affair was. Whereas Stanley had to go to Africa and organize a safari in order to find Livingstone, Winchell simply received a telephone call from Lepke. Lepke did not wish to be prosecuted by District Attorney Dewey, who had sent Winchell's friend Lucky Luciano to prison for from 30 to 50 years. He therefore arranged to be turned over by Winchell to Winchell's friend, J. Edgar Hoover. He met Winchell by appointment and Winchell turned him over to Hoover. There may be a question about whether Hoover actually wanted to be mixed up in all this or not; on the one hand it was a triumph for the G-men over the New York police, but on the other hand, it served somewhat to minimize the efficiency of the G-men in the public mind, since they had been looking for Lepke, too, and got him only when Winchell delivered him to them. In any case, Hoover could not refuse to accept Lepke from Winchell once Winchell had Lepke. The meeting of the three was dramatic and historic. "This is Lepke," was Winchell's phrase, flung into the annals of journalism beside the more tentative "Dr. Livingstone, I presume?" of Stanley's. Hoover made an achingly guarded statement afterward and has never said much more about the matter, "Mr. Winchell," he said, "was of considerable assistance to the F. B. I. in leading to Lepke's apprehension."

Lepke's strategy in turning himself over to the Federal authorities was shrewd but futile. Mr. Dewey brought pressure on the Department of Justice and Lepke was eventually surrendered to the local authorities. He was convicted and sent to prison for from 30 years to life. Thus the actual result of the Winchell-Lepke triumph is comparable to the futility of the Stanley-Livingstone feat. After Stanley had found Livingstone, it turned out that Livingstone was not lost and did not want to do anything but stay where he was.

The extent to which Winchell's capture of Lepke was due to superior journalistic prowess on Winchell's part is open to question. It is the sort of question that has come up before in journalistic history. In 1925, two or three dozen reporters were trying desperately to interview Floyd Collins, trapped by a falling rock in a cave in Kentucky. The story of Collins in the cave was a national sensation. It was difficult to obtain an interview with him because the one crevice through which a reporter would have to squeeze in order to get near Collins was extremely narrow. Only one reporter was slim and small enough to crawl through. He won the Pulitzer prize that year for the best example of a reporter's work. Winchell could argue that he had a more reasonable claim to last year's prize, on the ground that it was he, of all the journalists, whom Lepke chose to act as his go-between.

As a scoop for Winchell, the Lepke triumph did not really work out. When he telephoned the Mirror to give his paper what is called the flash, the news had already reached the Mirror from the reporter covering the office of the F. B. I. Then, too, the News got to the newsstands with the story some 5 minutes before the Mirror.

What Winchell calls his Zangara scoop was not as sensational as the Lepke episode, or as widely acclaimed by his fellow-journalists. It was more of a feat of conventional journalistic prowess, though. Winchell was in Florida at the time, and rushed to the jail as soon as he heard about the shooting. There he talked to the sheriff, saw Zangara, and obtained some details which other reporters, at the scene of the shooting itself, had missed. The other reporters were later barred from the jail, so Winchell actually had a scoop when he left and rushed to a telegraph office. There the Associated Press man and other news-service men, who had direct wires to New York, were dictating their stories to telegraph operators. Winchell came in, got a typewriter, wrote his story all down, and gave it to a clerk to file. It was put on a pile of outgoing telegrams, to be sent when a wire was clear. Steve Hannagan, the Florida publicity man, who was writing the A. P. story in the emergency, was able to pick up Winchell's story, glance through it, and include its facts in his own story. Taking their cue from Hannagan, the other news-service men did the same thing. All the news services thus scooped Winchell on his own scoop. The Mirror printed Winchell's story when it came along, but played it down, giving the news-service story a more prominent position. The bitterest pill of all was that the Mirror thought so little of Winchell's story that the management insisted that he pay the telegraph tolls for his own scoop, which he did. Winchell forgets such details. He has a romantic attitude toward journalistic feats of the kind portrayed in plays like The Front Page, and he always refers to the Zangara affair in his column and in conversation as "My Zangara scoop."

It was on the Hauptmann case that Winchell was given an opportunity to display his talents as a reporter of an actual news story. He wrote close to 70,000 words on this case. After it was all over he took careful stock of what he had accomplished. He devoted one whole column to scoops which he claimed he had made. This column was headed proudly, "No. 13 on the Jury," and it reprinted each scoop from previous columns and news stories and noted under each one the date on which his item had been confirmed by other reporters in other newspapers. This column listed 19 of what Winchell unequivocally claimed to be scoops.

Two of Winchell's nineteen scoops possess most of the characteristics of scoops and have aspects which are mildly interesting. The first was an item printed by Winchell on September 12, 1934, 7 days before the arrest of Hauptmann, beginning as follows:

"The Federal men are convinced that they will break the most interesting crime on record—the Lindbergh snatch."

The same item went on to talk about a trip Winchell had made through the new Department of Justice building in Washington, told what it was like, and discussed some angles of prohibition enforcement. Thus an element of coincidence might be said by the captious to have entered into the matter. The Federal men had, of course, been convinced for months past that they would eventually break the case, and this had been printed by every paper in the country. When Winchell reprinted this item at the top of his column of scoops, he inserted the word "soon," which was not in the original item but made it sound more like a scoop.

The second scoop was claimed by Winchell as follows:

"For the first time in a year Lindbergh ransom money bobbed up in local banks last week. So sappy were the bank tellers, you'd think they would have detained the passers. From here. September 17, 1934.

"Bruno Hauptmann arrested! From all papers, September 20, 1934."

It is not true that the ransom money which appeared during the week before September 17, 1934, was the first that had appeared in a year. Banks had turned over bills to the police as recently as December 1933. Then, too, this item should perhaps be considered in connection with other similar notes which Winchell printed:

"They've found $2,000 of the Lindy ransom coin in local restaurants.

"Nearly 30 of the Lindy ransom $5 bills were picked up in the same Forty-second Street cafeteria."

These items were false.

The third scoop claimed by Winchell was in the Times 4 days before Winchell printed it. The fourth scoop claimed by Winchell was that he reported on October 1, 1934, that "scientists will battle to save Hauptmann from the chair. They argue that anyone guilty of the world's most monstrous crime should be put under a glass like a bug for scientific study." Winchell claimed confirmation of this scoop by the World-Telegram, but the only thing in the World-Telegram which could conceivably be called confirmation was a story which reported that "a leading psychiatrist" had said that "Hauptmann is not legally insane but he is a distinct mental case." Winchell misread or misinterpreted this in his claim of confirmation as "He is not legally sane." In any case, insanity was not Hauptmann's defense and it has not been recorded that a battle was fought by scientists to save him from the chair so that they could study him. This would seem to have been no scoop.

The next seven stories claimed by Winchell as his own scoops were in either the Times or the Herald Tribune or both, either the same day Winchell printed them or earlier. One of these was in the Herald Tribune the same day and one was in the Times the same day, in editions which were on the street an hour or two after the Mirror. Of the others, one was in the Times 4 weeks earlier, one 5 weeks earlier, one 6 weeks earlier, and two 7 weeks earlier.

The remaining eight scoops claimed by Winchell cannot be considered as scoops in the accepted sense of the term, because they were (a) an irrelevant piece of evidence offered by him but not used by the State; (b) an allegation that Colonel Lindbergh had attempted to interfere with the police investigation, which the police denied and which was never mentioned at the trial or elsewhere; (c) a matter of opinion as to what particular piece of evidence convicted Hauptmann; (d) an admission by Winchell of his own inaccuracy in another scoop; (e) a statement that if he had been the father of the Lindbergh child, he could not have sat in the courtroom as Lindbergh did, which was consciously or unconsciously paraphrased by the prosecutor later; (f) and (g) two editorial comments of Winchell's; and (h) an editorial comment made by the late Arthur Brisbane, then editor of the Mirror, which was reproduced by Winchell as follows:

"Walter Winchell reports that he has much inside information that he cannot print, but he is sure Hauptmann is guilty of the Lindbergh kidnaping. Winchell probably is right.—A. Brisbane, October 24.

Hauptmann Found Guilty! From all papers, February 14, 1935."

What Mr. Brisbane wrote was:

"Walter Winchell writes that inside information, which to his sorrow he cannot print, shows him that Hauptmann is guilty of the Lindbergh kidnaping. Winchell probably is right. But before executing Hauptmann, somebody should be sure that he is guilty."

Winchell's claims as a reporter on the Hauptmann case thus boil down to this: Of the 19 scoops, there were 2 scoops with qualifications; 1 scoop which, since it was never confirmed, is hardly a scoop; 2 scoops printed the same day by other papers; 6 scoops which had been printed 4 days to 7 weeks earlier in the Times; 7 scoops which cannot be considered as scoops in the accepted meaning of the word; and 1 scoop in which he misquoted his own editor.

ST. CLAIR MCKELWAY.

WINCHELL DOWN TO DATE

Now to bring it down to date and to show that the truth is not in him at the present time and that he is hard up for somebody to talk about, here is one in the Mirror of December 2, 1943:

CHICAGO.

DEAR WINCHELL: The following isn't important enough for your column, but might give you a chuckle. Your admirer in Congress, CLARE HOFFMAN, owns a small cottage at the edge of the little village of Grand Marais, Mich., on the shores of Lake Superior, where he has not endeared himself to the inhabitants. When HOFFMAN arrived this summer there was a new captain at the life-saving spot—pardon me, Coast Guard. But HOFFMAN didn't care anything about that—just his own pleasure. He proceeded to go fishing without going through any permission formula, and so on. The captain there sent for HOFFMAN. He had him brought in. Unexplained boats are not wanted on Lake Superior, he was told. The great obstructionist, HOFFMAN, was furious.

You gentlemen know just how mad I can get. But in 10 years here you never saw me angry.

Didn't the captain know who he was? He was Congressman HOFFMAN, by heck, he could do as he pleased. Such an insult to him, etc., etc., ad infinitum, blah, blah.

The captain listened in silence, and the more insulting HOFFMAN got, the cooler became the Cap. Then, with one softly spoken sentence, the captain did the trick. He cooed: "Wouldn't Walter Winchell enjoy knowing this?" That's all, brother. HOFFMAN actually became polite. Having stirred up so many waters till they were troubled, it seemed as if you might be pleased to learn of one time when you—

That is Walter now—

acted as the oil that smoothed them down.

If you want to know more about the incident, see the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A5462.

The fellow Winchell was pretty hard up when he had to go and refer to a private individual's conversation about so trivial a matter, where an individual, according to Walter, had a row with some man in the Coast Guard, or may have quarreled with the fish that got off the hook. So I thought I would prove once more that dear Walter was still without veracity. I know Walter is a l—untruthful, but I want to be sure he was untruthful this time, because by accident he might have told the truth. You can never tell what might happen. So I wrote the commandant of the Coast Guard down here and I asked him what happened up there. Under the date of 17th of December I got a reply. This is the reply from the Coast Guard at Grand Marais. I quote:

Headquarters is advised that the facts are as follows:

Last July a patrol, on his regular rounds, stopped a launch proceeding out of Grand Marais channel into Lake Superior on a fishing trip. When the patrol discovered that the operator of the launch did not have the usual Coast Guard identification, he was escorted to the lifeboat station. Congressman HOFFMAN was informed of the regulations governing such cases and was furnished the necessary credentials. In Mr. Winchell's article the following quotations are untrue. "Didn't the cap'n know who he was? He was Congressman HOFFMAN, by heck! He could do as he pleased. Such an insult to him! etc., etc., ad infinitum, blah, blah. Wouldn't Walter Winchell enjoy knowing this?" The Congressman said no such thing.

Until headquarters letter was received by me, I had no intimation that the visit of Congressman HOFFMAN at the Grand Marais Lifeboat Station was known to any others than myself and the men stationed there. I have no idea of how such a twisted account could have emanated from this occurrence.

Members may remember when we had to show our identification cards around here to get in, even though we had been here 10 or 15 years. You still had to show your cards to get into your own office building.

That letter was written by Ensign Stanley E. Plastner, United States Coast Guard, who was then in command at Grand Marais. Of course, they stopped me. I was going out in a lifeboat that some of Fred Bradley's friends gave me. I did not know anything about the regulations for they had either been put into effect since last I had visited the port, or the former commander who knew me and my boat, had been transferred. The man on duty stopped me and took me over to the office and I was never treated any finer in my life. The captain of the Coast Guard even made arrangements for me to go brook trout fishing at the Sauble Light Station some 7 miles away. All that I cite this incident for is to prove that Walter not only did not have the truth in him and would not tell the truth back there when the New Yorker wrote him up and for years previously but that he has not reformed. He does not get any better.

UNDER COVER

Here is something more along the same line. Here is this book, Under Cover. In it are many statements known to be false long before the book was written. That is a book that Walter recommends. The author smears some 100 or 150 Members of Congress, Senators and Representatives, in that book, not Walter, but John Roy Carlson.

Here is Walter's column:

There was a squib in the paper the other day reporting that the U. S. A. had bought 5,000 copies of John Roy Carlson's exciting book, Under Cover. These were to be sent to spots where a reading of them could do the most good—and it can do plenty—Carlson's book is a diary of his hobnobbings with the Government wreckers.

He does not name any wrecker. Walter, of course, is a wrecker of unity when you get right down to it.

I quote Winchell:

The names he names aren't especially new, since many of them have made the papers and the police blotters lots of times. But his general pictures of the plotters planting their hates and their subversive stink bombs around the country makes a whale of a piece of reading. It is a pleasure to report that it is a best seller in all the key cities. It is a sell-out in spite of—or maybe because of—some efforts to crack down on it. The antis talked tough to the publisher, who kept his upper lip stiff, and to some merchants who crawled. But the good old public kept shelling out its moola and now the author and publisher can chortle, "Thanks for the adv."

Here is something more along the same line, another column of October 31, which reads as follows. I am quoting Winchell now:

Recently the newspapers told of an Army colonel in the East, who had ordered all copies of the best-seller Under Cover taken from American soldiers. Your reporter (that is Walter Winchell speaking), in an open letter, asked Secretary of War Stimson's office, under what law or Army regulation, could the Army deprive any soldier of that exposé of alleged seditionists in the United States. I was notified within 48 hours that Congressman CLARE HOFFMAN, of Michigan, made that request to Col. James M. Roamer. Hm—Roamer. Congressman HOFFMAN is mentioned a lot, unflatteringly in Under Cover. The War Department, however, told newspapers that there is no law by which a soldier could be deprived of his own property although he could be told to keep undesirable property off the military post. In short, ladies and gentlemen, read Under Cover—soldier or civilian—read it, and see why so many frightened question marks are trying to keep you from finding out all that is going on.

Walter, working for Jergens, tells a lie, then quotes it as his authority. Most of the above is untrue—as a reading of the written statement of the War Department will show.

I never asked the War Department or any officer, to stop the sale of Under Cover or any other book.

Then here is more along the same line. Here is something under date of November 7:

Last week I told you about an attempt to stop servicemen from reading the best seller Under Cover. Over 400,000 copies sold to date, by the way, and how Congressman HOFFMAN, of Michigan, persuaded Col. James Roamer to issue a bulletin to Army bases and camps about that book. This is to add that a spokesman for the War Department has told me that such an order is illegal—that any Army officer who deprived any soldier of his personal property was violating the Articles of War and could be subjected to the severest military discipline. In short, ladies and gentlemen, no officer in our Army can stop any soldier from reading Under Cover, and any officer who tries to do so is without authority from the War Department. If you know of any officer who has taken away a soldier's book, please let me know so that I can submit the fact to the Secretary of War.

I never persuaded, I never asked Col. James Roamer to issue a bulletin to Army bases and camps about Under Cover. The above quotation is an example of how the untruthful Winchell will make a false statement, in fact manufacture it, quote it and then build up an insinuating, derogatory paragraph around it.

As a creator, a disseminator of the stinking falsehoods, Walter Winchell is a master and Jergens has certainly picked one who knows not the truth. If what he says about their product is no more reliable than what he says about people, everyone should be sure of the merit of what they purchase, before accepting Walter's recommendation.

Now, what are the facts? First, Walter says the War Department "had bought 5,000 copies of" Under Cover. Then he says I asked the Army to deprive soldiers of that book. The Army officially states it did not buy 5,000 copies of that book and it also proves Winchell to be a liar by showing that no request to deprive soldiers of it was made by me. Here is what happened. It is in writing. On September 14, I wrote to The Adjutant General, as follows:

Will you kindly advise me whether the War Department has purchased any copies of the book, Under Cover by one who calls himself John Roy Carlson?

Have there been any negotiations looking toward the purchase of any copies of this book?

Thanking you in advance for your reply, I am.

This is his answer under date of November 4, 1943.

MY DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: This is in further reply to your letter of September 14, 1943, inquiring as to the accuracy of the allegation that the Army has purchased 5,000 copies of the book Under Cover for distribution to our soldiers.

Reports from the field just now available to me reveal that in response to requests emanating from among some 5,500,000 soldiers, a total of 363 copies of this book has been purchased for post libraries from appropriated and non-appropriated funds, and that 107 additional copies are on order.

I am indeed sorry for the delay in transmitting this information to you but know that you understand, since it had to be compiled by military agencies distributed over the entire Nation, some delay was unavoidable.

It is hoped this information will meet your purposes.

Now, do you see what that fellow did? He just—pardon me, is it permissible? He just lied when he said 5,000 copies were being distributed. Now Walter advertised that book over the radio night after night and he induced less than 500 men in the service to ask for a copy of it. Any soldier, any WAVE or WAC can write to the Army Post Library and ask that certain books be put in the library and if the librarian thinks favorably of the number of requests, then from appropriated, or non-appropriated or donated funds, the book is purchased and put in the library. That is the way it gets in there and that is all there is to it. There were not 5,000 books. There were less than 500.

If Jergens Lotion does not get along any better in selling its stuff through Walter's advertising they had better just cross him off as a liability. And if their merchandise, their lotion, and their creams, Jergens, I mean, if that stuff smells like Walter's broadcasts, I do not see how anyone but a skunk could use it because you couldn't stand the odor from it. And why those people continue to use that man as their advertising agency, a man who is doing more to stir up disunity and to create disunity than all the other agencies that are putting out propaganda, how they can continue to spend their money, good or bad, is more than I can understand. I do not know why they do it. They must think that anything that brings the name of the Jergens Lotion Co. before the public is good. Millions of people are beginning to believe anything Winchell advocates is rotten.

Then, with reference to the other statement there, Walter says that I tried to get the Army to stop it. You heard me read the letter. The reason I asked the Army how many copies had been sold was to find out just how big a liar Walter was.

There are 5,500,000 men and women in the service, and I do not know how many million outside he has appealed to to buy that book. I do not know what his percentage is from the sale of the book. I do not know how it is split, if it is split. And all he was able to sell, as I said a moment ago, to the armed force of 5,500,000 was less than 500. Whether he persuaded the 470 out of 5,500,000 to buy it out of curiosity no one knows. And there was no attempt to stop the sale to the Army, the Army did not issue any order. Nobody asked them to issue any order to stop the circulation or purchase of the book. Walter had to have something to say.

Walter makes us think of the little bad boy in the neighborhood. There is always in every community one little bad boy who runs around with a dirty face. He is all the time throwing rocks at the windows in some vacant building. He is all the time, if he can catch a dog, tying a tin can to its tail, and throwing stones at the cat. He is doing every mean thing he can. He will run along in front of a flower bed and pull up a handful of flowers. He will do everything he can to make trouble. He is a little boy who all the time should have a handkerchief to wipe his nose. Walter would break a rotten egg just to smell it. He is like a dog which finds carrion, rolls in it, then runs around among other dogs thinking how sweet he smells. So Walter, like a little kid who has the name of being a bad boy, must every day think up something new, something dirtier, something nastier than what he said the day before, or he must say it about some individual he has not slandered before. Now, I said I would show you that Walter was nasty and that he was dirty. I will.

Listen to this. This is Walter's column. Now listen to this. I quote:

That you shouldn't score your kids for poor marks at school. G. B. Shaw was a dunce too. A Shaw article asserts Joan of Arc had no sex appeal.

That is Walter Winchell. This man who advertises Jergens lotion. The Jergens Co. employs a man who slanders

a woman who gave her life for her country. Jergens employs this fellow who makes that kind of a statement, and they know he made it because it has been put in the record before.

The fact is—

And I am not talking about Shaw. I am talking about Walter who said or wrote this—I quote:

> The fact is, according to an authority of Joan, too much sex appeal forced her to discard her dresses for male apparel, and too much sex appeal forced her to fasten them down with plenty of buttons.

A woman who was burned at the stake, who led the armies of France, and along comes this fellow, along comes Walter Winchell, digs down into a grave that has been closed more than a hundred years and comes up in his column with words in his foul mouth which question the virtue of a woman who by many has been looked upon as a saint.

Now you know Walter for what he is—no smarter than the average but so dirty, nasty, and untruthful that some folks listen to learn if next week he can be worse than he was the week before.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the remarks I made this morning the letter and part of the evidence of Mr. Leo T. Crowley before the Committee on Banking and Currency on the 17th of this month.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

NEW CONGRESS SHOULD TAKE UP MOST SERIOUS PROBLEMS FIRST

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, at this particular time after approximately 1 year's service here, I am constrained to join in the sentiments of perhaps the most dignified Member of this House, the gentleman from Nevada, Hon. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN, a perfect gentleman, a man who always has a smile, a man who criticizes no one. But this morning he brought to my mind just what we should do on this particular day.

I am grateful for the acquaintance of every Member of this House, both men and women. I am grateful for the leadership on both sides. There are times when we come to the House of Representatives, after receiving two or three hundred letters, some that are sent because of the emotions of folks that are stirred up, or are misled, and maybe we are hypersensitive. Being hypersensitive we criticize the Members of this body on both sides in a manner that, of course, we do not mean. There is not a man or a woman in this House who would not give everything he has for the world and for his country.

I was unusually impressed the other day at the floor leaders on both sides, at the time of the voting on adjournment. While I did not vote for the adjournment, I was impressed with the sincerity and patriotism of both men. They promised that when we return they will consider the most serious thing first, veterans voting. And they were sincere. There was no Alphonse and Gaston about it. They were just big men, patriotic men, and sincere.

It was Benjamin Franklin who said that experience is valuable because it is the lamp by which our future steps can be guided. The history of this great Nation of ours has its golden pages of growth, development, expansion, and prosperity, its blood-stained pages of war and destruction, and its dark pages of economic dislocation, strife, panic, and depression; generated from this historic dynamo of our national life is an ever-glowing light—the lamp of experience—shedding its rays across the path of each succeeding generation to help guide its future footsteps. And so as a Nation—as a people—we are not unschooled, we are not amateurs, because in the harsh school of experience we have learned many costly and valuable lessons from which we may profit, or which, foolishly, we may disregard; unfortunately, there are some signs that our course is set in the latter direction.

In these days of planners and superplanners, when such a vast mass of panaceas, nostrums, predictions, warnings, and schemes—many of them in direct conflict—are being shoveled out for public consumption, it is small wonder that the public mind, long suspect of the planners, is beginning to develop an attitude of suspicion and cynicism toward the hodgepodge of proposed post-war plans by which the economic structure of the country is not only to be rescued and saved but improved and, indeed, even perfected.

It seems to me that the time is more opportune than ever to bear in mind a few homely but vital truths. May I suggest that, try as the planners might, the fundamental economic laws cannot be repealed—they can be temporarily abridged, sidetracked, and even briefly ignored, but so long as two plus two equals four these laws will continue to operate—despite any attempt to distort them—in their own unrelenting, immovable, and inexorable way and will, eventually, bring to bay and defeat any flagrant violation of them. The admitted and well-established penalty for losing sight of this fact is disillusionment, disappointment, failure, and, finally, chaos. So it is important that we face facts, distasteful and difficult as many of them are, that we be realistic, and that we stay within the bounds of reason in dealing with solutions of the economic problems which now loom on the horizon of the post-war period.

It is axiomatic that true progress is an evolutionary process, that the milestones that mark every gain in human affairs can be seen only along a road that is tortuous, steep, slow, and upgrade every foot of the way; notwithstanding all the glowing and glib discussion we are hearing from some quarters just now about a new and shiningly prosperous world that suddenly is to spring into being in that post-war period, we will do well to remember that the millennium is still not within sight, that now, as always, it is merely a mirage, and that our post-war problems will be met and truly solved only by the same means that our victory is surely but gradually being won—through the sacrifice, sweat, and efforts of a courageous and determined people.

To this list of obvious facts I would add that the future is never wholly predictable and that always there are some bridges that cannot be crossed until they at least come within hailing distance or, indeed, have been reached. Likewise, there are some answers that cannot be given until the questions are fully evolved and correlated—as, for example, the disposition of the synthetic-rubber industry in the United States after the war; is it to expand into a great, independent, and nationally self-contained industry, absorbing huge supplies of domestic grain alcohol and oil, or, in the interests of world trade and harmony, will the synthetic-rubber industry be stifled and relegated to the laboratory while we resume purchasing and importing raw or natural rubber from the Far East? Or with tens of thousands of young Americans, trained as pilots, navigators, ground crews, all thoroughly aviation-minded, returning home from the world battle fronts, will the aviation industry in the next 40 years parallel the economic importance and expansion of the automotive industry of the past 40 years? What will be the sum total of the discoveries made, as a byproduct of war and as yet undisclosed, of new and more efficient materials and mechanical devices that can be used or converted to peacetime needs and improved standards of living? These are just a few of the as yet unanswered questions—just a few of the bridges that cannot be crossed by tomorrow evening.

With that brief preface on the importance of discarding the "baloney" and keeping our feet on the ground in dealing with the complex problems that definitely we know will confront us when the guns cease firing and military victory is ours, we can take a look at the score to date—incidentally, drawing from it much satisfaction and encouragement—and scan the plans now being formulated and as yet only dimly taking shape to meet and solve the problems of the post-war period.

On the score to date, Raymond Moley recently commented that as long as men thumb the pages of history they will ponder the miracle of America's production achievement in the 2 years just finished, marveling over the unparalleled strength and resourcefulness of this economy of ours which has produced so much so soon, surviving, as it has, any and all errors of judgment, meddling, and interference from a fumbling, confused bureaucratic Government, but instead ignoring the unnecessary and artificial handicaps placed upon it and forging ahead to increase the Nation's normal production 250 percent in a short

2 years on the industrial front, and on the agricultural front—after a 10-year pursuit of a will-o'-the-wisp scarcity theory designed and staged by WALLACE. I have no criticism of Mr. WALLACE; I have never a criticism of any man. I have always maintained that no man has a right to criticize another man as a man. I concede perhaps that he is a great metaphysician. He has visited the cults of India and I believe that he will see his mistakes. Any man has a right to make mistakes but we are looking at a 10-year period of a will-o'-the-wisp scarcity theory designed and staged by a man upping food production 30 percent over 1939. Summing up America's gigantic war industrial record, a national publication recently called attention to the fact that the mountaintop of production has been reached, with the "arsenal of democracy" now one long, clanging, smoothly operating assembly line, throwing out weapons of death and destruction in such prodigious quantities that quotas have been surpassed to such an extent that there are now on hand more than enough guns, bullets, and munitions to annihilate the last Jap and the last German. Glowing tribute to the American production miracle was paid by Marshal Stalin when he said at the recent Teheran conference: "Without American production the United Nations could never have won the war." Despite the constant bickering that goes on between them, American management and labor jointly share the praise, but let us remember that this unprecedented record is first of all the product of a system based on freedom of economic effort, of scientific inquiry, and of political expression, and stems from the inherent vitality of a still free and unhampered people—a people who neither desire nor know how to respond to unwarranted governmental interference or bureaucratic regimentation.

With the fortunate turning of the war-tide in our favor and the glorious rays of victory faintly beginning to stream across our horizon—even though we know the road to Berlin is as yet a long, muddy, and bloody one, and the watery route to Tokyo still must be made by patient fighting and heavy casualties from one insect- and disease-ridden island to another—we are hearing more and more talk about the controversy attendant on the renegotiation of war contracts, the dislocation that the outright cancelation of war contracts will cause, the reconversion of our national economy from a war to a peace basis, cushions and shock absorbers to tide over management, labor, and agriculture during the transition period, the disposition of Government-owned industrial plants and the Government's tremendous real-estate holdings acquired during this emergency period, and ways and means to bridge these changes with the least jar and hardship to the Nation as a whole, but at this juncture I feel constrained to sound a distinct warning, the end of this colossal global struggle in which we are engaged is not yet in sight.

Permit me to digress at this point to explain that I am fully aware that all "smart" candidates for public office should be perennial harbingers of good news, perpetually optimistic in their predictions, and seemingly oblivious to any and all obnoxious facts.

That formula, my friends, must be abandoned because the crisis through which we are passing is too perilous, too dangerous, and too much hangs in the balance for any responsible public official, having at heart the interest of, first, our gallant men on the fighting fronts, the people at home, and the Nation as a whole, to play politics—and that should go from the master politician who occupies the White House on down through the ranks to the newest and greenest Member of Congress, which includes your humble servant.

Only a matter of weeks ago, General Marshall and a staff of military experts from both Army and Navy, some of whom had just returned from the battle fronts, came with their maps, charts, and motion pictures to address a closed session of the Members of Congress; any Member who attended that meeting, and I did, can assure you that no responsible military expert in the armed services holds out any hope for a speedy conclusion of the war—despite the measured feeding out and long-delayed reports of our losses both in men and equipment or all the coloring done by the Office of War Information of the war news for home consumption, the American people should be under no illusions as to the task still ahead. The expectation does exist that Germany will collapse first, and there are various guesses—they are more than guesses, there are good reason to believe—that the happy event may occur anywhere from 6 months to 2 years hence; but take note of this fact, the official text of the Cairo Conference clearly states that Japan must be not merely defeated, but that the Japanese Empire must be crushed so as to render it impotent to conduct war again in the Far East, which means that we must continue to persevere in the serious and prolonged operations necessary to procure the unconditional surrender of Japan.

Two years have elapsed since the attack on Pearl Harbor, and we are not yet on the outer line of Japan's main defenses, although in the light of all the facts, we have made some substantial progress against Japan, but there is ample reason to heed the warning that the struggle in the Pacific may prove to be a slow, gruelling war. With the aid of the British Army, Navy and Air Forces, with the help of a revived and quickened spirit in the Chinese Armies, and with the eventual aid of Russia, victory in the Pacific, and the unconditional surrender of the Japanese Empire may be accomplished by the end of 1946.

Charles E. Wilson, Vice Chairman of the War Production Board, speaking at the annual convention of the National Association of Manufacturers early this month, said:

> Too many people are trying to position themselves for the post-war period, long before the country is out of danger, and long before our fighting men have any chance to position themselves.

With the United Nations now on the offensive and rapidly to move into large-scale aggressive operations, the Vice Chairman of the War Production Board has called for an over-all increase of at least 20 percent in war production during 1944.

On the basis of the cold, stark facts, there is more than a possibility of our being a bit premature in concentrating too heavily just now on the problems of demobilization and the post-war period, indeed, on the record of the facts, it would be more propitious, fitting, and wise for us to continue to keep our "eye on the ball"—on the business of winning the war—and bracing ourselves for greater effort and more and more sacrifice; and I believe every Member of Congress is doing just that.

In other words, let our paramount concern be the attainment of military victory—until that has been accomplished it would be unsafe to divert too much attention on the plans and problems of one post-war period. Let first things be first.

However, glancing ahead to the tremendous problems of readjustment and reconversion of the post-war period, I believe that the first fact—and it is one that is not generally recognized because we continue to think and talk in terms of free enterprise—to be squarely faced is this: our present economy is on a totalitarian basis, and unavoidably so during the past 3 years. Under the pressure of involvement in a war against totalitarian aggressors who had marshaled all their resources, human and material, we ourselves were compelled to adopt similar methods—we and our allies would not have been able to produce what it took to halt the march of Berlin and Tokyo had we not established practically complete authoritarian control of the use of our men and materials—but there would be little point in blinking the fact that the utilization of these resources has been directed from Washington without regard to its effect upon the post-war period or upon civilian business and our system of competitive free enterprise.

While few would argue the necessity of the process adopted during the past 3 years, or discount that during periods of emergency the main functions of government of necessity must be regulation, taxation, and control, an examination of what has transpired during the past 3 years, with Government the chief buyer and the big boss, as well as of what transpired from 1933 to 1940, can leave little doubt as to the coming struggle for the restoration of the normal system of free enterprise under which this country developed, thrived and prospered, affording to more people a higher standard of living than any other economic system devised by man. During the 7 years prior to our entry into the present world conflict, our system of free enterprise underwent certain fundamental changes, beginning with the enactment of the so-called National Industrial Recovery Act and the agricultural adjustment law, both so shocking in their monopolistic and strait-jacket controls that they were unanimously declared unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court;

subsequently, however, the pieces were picked up and, as we know, parts of these laws were reenacted and put into operation with varying degrees of success, and with their enforcement began the era of a loosely "planned" national economy and the drift toward more rigid Government control and the inevitable regimentation that goes with it. The structure of a wholly free system of competitive enterprise was slowly being thwarted and weakened from 1933 to 1940, and the war crisis of the past 3 years has been the means of completing the span to a wholly "planned" and controlled economy. Already there are signs that the battle lines are being drawn between the advocates of arbitrary private power in the field of commerce and industry and the advocates of arbitrary Government power for control of the post-war system—if the public interests are to be served, neither will score a complete victory. Indeed the magnitude of the post-war readjustment and reconversion problems cannot be overstated, and if these problems are to be solved in the interests of all the people the full cooperation of all groups and the complete coordination of every resource and potential capacity at our disposal will be required—private capital will have to be accorded full and fair opportunity and incentive to reconvert and exercise its initiative to expand and create jobs; the States and local governments must assume the responsibility of working out, properly timing, and executing constructive programs of needed public improvements, thus creating employment; and the Federal Government must concentrate on placing its economic house in order, intelligently expanding educational opportunities for the youth of the Nation, extending and strengthening the Social Security System for the benefit and well-being of our citizenry as a whole, and temporarily bridging such gaps as may be necessary in order to attain the highest possible level of employment.

There are now several congressional committees studying the problems of demobilization and reconversion, with the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Departments of Commerce and Agriculture, the War Production Board, the National Housing Administration, and other Government agencies making coordinated studies and cooperating with the congressional committees in the over-all investigation of the facts. Independent studies of the same problems are being made by such organizations as the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Bankers Association, the two major labor organizations, the American Society of Civil Engineers, the Forest Products Association, the Brookings Institution, as well as by industrial concerns such as General Electric, General Motors, and last, but by no means least, Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, Chairman of the War Industries Board of World War No. 1.

Among the specific problems under study are: Disastrous inflation and the controls necessary to avoid it. Empty stock bins of civilian consumer goods. Demobilized military personnel and war workers—the percentage of military personnel likely to be required for a standing army or world military police duty, the percentage of women war workers likely to return to their domestic duties in the home—jobs for all workers who will be available and need work. Timing of employment opportunities and area maladjustments. Disposition of war plants and supplies. Post-war problems of agriculture. A mass of statistics and opinions is being accumulated in order to assemble a complete and detailed picture of the entire problem, but so far only one unanimous opinion has emerged—"war to peace is much more complicated than peace to war"—and only one clear-cut suggestion has been voiced, "the agency that wound up the United States economy for war should unwind it"—meaning the War Production Board—said Mr. Baruch recently.

The first concrete step being taken toward that "unwinding" is the legislation, already passed by the House, making provision for smoother, fairer, and more efficient renegotiation of war contracts, the enactment of which is directly aimed at eliminating many of the causes of complaints over existing procedure.

The next important step to be accomplished will be the formulation of a clear ruling granting Government buying agencies authority to settle war contracts promptly, whether a prime, sub, or subsub contract, thus enabling any contractor to get his money back out of war jobs without undue delay. Getting paid for materials could easily be a matter of life or death to many companies with more money tied up in inventories than their entire businesses are worth—as war contracts are canceled many concerns will need money fast, and in order to avoid unnecessary hardship or even serious difficulty a plan is now under consideration to pay the contractor, without the delay of a Government audit, up to 75 percent of his claim, the remaining 25 percent to be held in abeyance as a backlog, pending a detailed Government audit and final settlement.

That the dismantling of our war industrial machine will be a gradual process will be a factor in favor of orderly procedure and will contribute to the ease of industrial reconversion, and that the demobilization of our armed forces will also be a gradual process will likewise serve to mitigate the proportions of post-war unemployment problems. With the defeat of Germany, an appreciable number of war contracts will be canceled and a definite start toward industrial reconversion will be made, but Government spending will continue at a high level as long as Japan is in the war, which fact will be a major cushion during the first period on the road back to peace. During this period total war production will taper off, but will not dip sharply, and civilian production will inch up as war production inches down; conversion can be quick in those lines of industry that are used for war but not made especially for war, such as textiles, clothing, upholstery, household linens, shoes, and so forth.

It is obvious that the second period, following the defeat of Japan, will be one of considerably sharper economic adjustments, with the wholesale cancelation of war contracts and the demobilization of military personnel on a big scale. Industry will be only partially reconverted to civilian production, but the heavy lines of industry, such as automobiles, trucks, refrigerators, electrical supplies and equipment, whose parts are not made in one plant but in hundreds of subsidiary factories, all of which will have to be retooled and converted, will require time to swing back into full peacetime production. While some internal shock and unavoidable temporary dislocation appears to be inevitable at that stage, immediately available will be muster-out pay to returning military personnel, Government payments to disabled veterans, to the dependents of our heroic dead, to persons retiring under old-age insurance, and to those entitled to unemployment benefits. Under the test that private enterprise will face, it can be counted on to speed toward a creditable performance to meet the long-starved demands for durable consumer goods such as automobiles, trucks, electric refrigerators, washing machines, vacuum cleaners, radios, and general household equipment, as well as industrial equipment, railroads, locomotives, cars, rails, and so forth; public utilities, telephone, electricity, water, sewers, and so forth; and new equipment, for laundries, cleaning and pressing establishments, garages, hotels, and the like, most of which by 1946 or 1947 will be limping along on thin, shabby, and dangerously worn equipment.

With the attainment of victory and the rekindling of hope throughout the world that peace will bring, the work of rehabilitation will get under way in the bombed and devastated countries of both Europe and Asia, and America will be the workshop from which some five to ten billions of dollars worth of industrial and farm equipment and other needed supplies will stream across the oceans for constructive and humanitarian purposes.

My friends, there are difficult and heartbreaking months immediately ahead of us in this war-torn world, and in the distance there are grave and serious problems of social and economic readjustment, but as our burdens are great so are our opportunities great. We have met the challenge of war; we know that it is only a question of time until Hitler will throw in the sponge and Tojo will, too, shortly after we really get going on him—and by the same token we will meet the challenge of the post-war period.

Once more an impression of a new man: I had heard a great many things about Congress before I reached here, and I felt somewhat inclined to agree with some of the criticisms. While perhaps I did not find as much ability in Congress as I expected, I did find far more sincerity. I have not found an insincere man in this House on either side. Most of the Members have sons fighting in the armed forces. A great many of the Members are heroes. They may have

different techniques, some may have a superiority of technique, but everyone is determined to do right as he sees it. Nine or ten Members have lost their lives here this very year because of the strain. There is not a man here but what is willing to give his every ounce of devotion. Every Member here realizes the seriousness of the times.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMEY. I yield.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Ohio for one of the finest, most humane, and most decent statements I have heard on this floor in this my first session in the House of Representatives.

Mr. RAMEY. I thank the gentleman very much.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PFEIFER] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD by including a Christmas message to the people of the diocese of Brooklyn and Long Island by His Excellency, the Very Reverend Thomas E. Malloy.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is recognized for 25 minutes.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a member, has been holding almost daily hearings on House Joint Resolution 192, which has as its purpose the authorization of appropriations and authorities whereby the United States can participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration—usually referred to as U. N. R. R. A.—which was tentatively set up during the recent conference in Atlantic City, with a potential membership of 44 nations. We have spent many, many hours in committee hearings with Dean Acheson, representing the State Department; with Governor Lehman, Director General of U. N. R. R. A.; with Leo Crowley and Oscar Cox, representing the Foreign Economic Administration; with Congressman SMITH, and the gentleman frm Illinois, Congressman DEWEY, speaking as Members of Congress, and with other witnesses. The hearings will be resumed immediately after Congress returns from its holiday adjournment.

In my opinion, U. N. R. R. A. has much to commend it, and I believe those representatives of the United Nations who met down at Atlantic City a short time ago developed a list of resolutions and agreements which have been carefully thought out in most instances and which aim at the direction of the activities and the scope of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration in a commendable manner. Many of these resolutions are wisely and carefully drawn and demonstrate that they have been carefully thought out. Some of the resolutions, however, present problems of interpretation which are perplexing and which call upon us to give careful attention from the standpoint of working out appropriate definitions of their meaning, and as yet some of these definitions have not been made clear to the committee.

WHAT IS TO BE DONE ABOUT INDIA?

One of my personal disappointments, Mr. Speaker, growing out of a study of the resolutions contained in the U. N. R. R. A. set-up, and I believe one of the disappointments shared by many of the members of the committee is the apparent indifference of the Atlantic City conference to the pitiable plight presented by the starving millions of people in India.

In answer to a direct question by me during the committee proceedings which I propounded to the Assistant Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, concerning the status of India under U. N. R. R. A., Mr. Acheson replied that under the scope of U. N. R. R. A. as written into the present resolution it would be impossible to include the people of starving India in the benefits growing out of the relief and rehabilitation operations of the organization. It appears that by some strange type of strained and labored reasoning, the Atlantic City conference decided that India did not come within the scope of relief and rehabilitation as conceived by U. N. R. R. A. because its sorry plight was "not directly attributable to the war" or because "its food-producing areas had not been overrun or destroyed by enemy action."

As nearly as I can follow the language legerdemain presented to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs with regard to the Indian situation, Mr. Speaker, the foregoing represents the reason for leaving India out of the relief and rehabilitation picture. Frankly, the reasoning is so curious that I am not sure that I am able to follow it. I am quite sure, however, that I cannot agree with it on the basis of any evidence submitted to our committee up to this moment. It occurs to me that by any normal and usual type of logic India's starving millions are victims of this war precisely the same as the unfortunate people starving in other lands because of the cruel operations of this global conflict.

It is true that Nazi hordes and Japanese troops have not overrun Indian territory, but it is also true that Japanese armies have occupied and retained possession of areas upon which India normally depends for a large portion of its food supply. To me, Mr. Speaker, it is neither logical nor humanitarian to bar India from the anticipated benefits of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration by the strained interpretations which have been drawn to distinguish between a hungry people starving because their food lands are occupied by the enemy and a hungry people starving because their food supply normally comes from lands outside their national domain but which have in turn been occupied by the enemy. It seems to me it matters very little to a starving people whether their storehouses have been taken over by the enemy or whether the farms from which their storehouses are supplied have been taken over by the enemy. To me it would seem that regardless of which situation obtains, the victims of starvation are still the victims of this war.

It may be argued, Mr. Speaker, that India was left out in the cold because she is not fighting as an independent belligerent on the side of the United Nations; however, if news reports are correct, it is true that India has supplied many thousands of volunteers for fighting and bleeding and dying alongside of the soldiers of this country and the soldiers of the other United Nations in the defeat of a common enemy. If this does not make India a belligerent on our side, it is certain that India has not become a belligerent on the side of the Axis. It is also certain that it is essential to our success that India does not become even a partial partner of the Axis. It is my opinion that India today is definitely one of our allies. At best it seems to me this distinction is not significant enough to bar India from assistance which she might otherwise expect from the operations of this all-purpose and all-inclusive world-wide attempt to decrease suffering, hunger, and starvation among the people arrayed as our allies in this war.

To include India among the areas to be benefitted by U. N. R. R. A. could by no stretch of the imagination do anything to alienate the present sympathy which India is manifesting to our side in this fight. To exclude India most assuredly can add nothing to her devotion to our cause nor to her respect for our fair-mindedness or our good intentions. It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I take this occasion today to plead for the inclusion of India among the nations and the peoples for whom the relief and rehabilitation activities of U. N. R. R. A. are to be made available. To do less would be to work a great injustice on a long-suffering and patient people who have proven to be mighty good friends of the United Nations in this war and whom, in my opinion, it is neither just nor right nor honest to discriminate against.

I expect to do what I can, Mr. Speaker, to amend House Joint Resolution 192 and/or the interpretation of the Atlantic City resolutions upon which it is based so as to provide for the inclusion of India among the beneficiaries.

While it may be possible by congressional action to amend or modify House Joint Resolution 192 in order to bring India back into the family of nations insofar as the benefits of U. N. R. R. A. are concerned, and while I propose to make the effort, if it becomes necessary, such a procedure for directing the activities of U. N. R. R. A. would be extremely awkward, to say the least, I feel that there may be better procedures. During the next 3 weeks while Congress is not in session I hope these other procedures

will be attempted so that by the time Congress votes its decision on U. N. R. R. A. it will have before it a proposal for relief and rehabilitation which does not slam the door of charity squarely in the face of one of the greatest and most patient and long-suffering nations from famine and disease which the world has ever known.

In order that there may be no excuse for not trying the other procedure first, Mr. Speaker, and for coming to Congress and opposing my suggested amendment to House Joint Resolution 192 on the basis that it comprises an awkward approach to a serious problem, in order that that situation may not develop, I have today written identical letters to Governor Herbert Lehman, Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and to Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, the American representative on the U. N. R. R. A. council. In these letters I am suggesting that either the language of U. N. R. R. A. be redefined in less labored terms so that India may be included in the benefits of the organization or that an amendment to the U. N. R. R. A. agreement be submitted to the member nations immediately so that India may be included among the beneficiaries by such an amendment.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, if Governor Lehman and Dean Acheson agree with the millions of Americans who feel that India should not be excluded from the table and denied access to the larder of U. N. R. R. A., and I am inclined to believe they do, this situation affords a unique and immediate opportunity to test the influence which the United States is going to be able to exert in directing the activities and scope of U. N. R. R. A.

It will be interesting and informative to learn how the other member nations react to the American suggestion for including India, if such a suggested amendment is proposed. I cannot conceive that the United States will refrain from at least making an earnest and specific effort to attain such inclusion. I expect, if you please, Mr. Speaker, such a response to the letters I have addressed to Governor Lehman and Assistant Secretary of State Acheson.

Throughout the hearings on House Joint Resolution 192 our Foreign Affairs Committee has received assurances piled one upon another that since the United States is to be by far the largest contributor to the U. N. R. R. A. budget it will also exercise a great influence in determining the activities and scope of the organization. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I feel confident that the United States Government and its representatives on U. N. R. R. A. can work out agreements between now and the time House Joint Resolution 192 comes before Congress for action whereby India will be included among the areas to be eligible for the benefits to be made available through this organization.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I commend to the House the hearings that took place before the Foreign Affairs Committee on U. N. R. R. A. The gentleman from South Dakota is one of the most able cross-examiners that we have in the Congress or in the country. I would like to ask the gentleman why he thinks India was left out, because to most people of the country there seems to be no excuse for it.

Mr. MUNDT. I may say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] that I prefer to think India has been excluded by an accident of language. I hope that is the case. It may develop there are other reasons. If there are other reasons, they should be made public. But I prefer for the time being to think that perhaps it is through an accident of language. Regardless of the cause, the cure is apparent; it is clear, it is available, and I hope that the Members of the Congress will insist upon the cure, regardless of the cause.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman feels that the greatest suffering from starvation is taking place today in India, while many East Indians are fighting with us and for us?

Mr. MUNDT. In the New York City Herald Tribune of December 12 the report comes to us that the people of India are dying from starvation and disease and pestilence at the rate of 50,000 people a week. Certainly it is a deplorable and a serious situation, one which we can get aid to without delay if the U. N. R. R. A. will adopt the responsibility.

May I add one further word, to point out that the Washington Times-Herald for this morning contains a full-page spread of pictures of actual cases of gaunt starvation taking place in Mother India today.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that a New York paper had some figures indicating the death rate from starvation in India to be at the rate of 50,000 a week?

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman have any information as to how those deaths from starvation compare with the death figure from starvation in normal times?

Mr. MUNDT. I am sorry, I do not have that information. I might point out, though, that starvation in India has become more acute now due to the fact that much of the food that was normally imported came from Burma. Burma has, of course, been occupied by the Japanese, consequently shutting off part of the normal food supply of India, which to me, even more clearly than anything else, emphasizes that those people in India who are victims of starvation are victims of the war, because it was as a result of the war that the Japanese Army took Burma, which formerly served as part of India's breadbasket.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman realizes that even in normal times the death rate from starvation in India is gigantic?

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. India has been a long, patient sufferer. But today her situation has become acutely worse.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does it not seem to the gentleman it would be better to have two bills, if you please, one bill for feeding, clothing, and so forth, a real relief bill, for the Allies, and another, a separate bill, for reconstruction? I fear that the real idea of relief will be lost in the reconstruction program, and that it may go very far and be very devastating to the economy of our own country.

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate the gentlewoman's apprehension about the scope of U. N. R. R. A. I do not want to be diverted into a discussion of that matter today, however, because I am simply pleading for the inclusion of India on the same basis as the other starving people of the world and the other nations for whom relief will become essential.

A distinction between a relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction program is something to which the committee will devote additional attention and about which the Congress will want to be very careful when the final decision is to be made.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I compliment the gentleman from South Dakota upon his bringing to the attention of the Nation this very inhumane treatment, may I say, of the people of India today.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I say also that I believe if the gentleman from South Dakota were not a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee he might perhaps become more specific and explain in a little different language the reason for the exclusion of the people of that country from the provisions of this act.

Mr. MUNDT. Of course, the Foreign Affairs Committee has a great many diplomats appear before it and perhaps diplomatic tact is rather infectious, I am not sure.

May I point out, sir, that U. N. R. R. A. proposes to be the world's greatest adventure in charity and good will. For such a great benevolent enterprise to start off with such a malevolent bias as to exclude long-suffering India from its benefits does not augur well for the future. Let us eliminate the black spot from this light of charity even before the current is turned on, which we hope will reach so far in bringing light and laughter to the world.

I trust that either Governor Lehman or Dean Acheson or both together will secure remedial action in response to the letters I have sent them today. However, if they try and fail or if they fail to try, I shall do what I can in a parliamentary manner when this proposal comes before the committee and the Congress for action to eliminate the injustice which I feel is incorporated in an agreement which blinds itself to the starvation and suffering in India while pur-

porting to be a world-wide crusade of relief and rehabilitation.

As further evidence in support of my position, Mr. Speaker, I include with these remarks a copy of a letter which I have just received from President J. J. Singh, of the India League of America, and a copy of a letter which Mr. Singh wrote under date of November 22 to Mr. Dean Acheson, chairman of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Conference, held recently in Atlantic City.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this time to incorporate those three letters as a part of these remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. I hope that a way will be found for including far-off India among those who will be benefited from the operations of U. N. R. R. A. and from the many thousand millions of dollars which the United States will contribute to the functioning of this set-up if it meets with the approval of Congress when the matter comes before us for action early in January.

India is being asked by U. N. R. R. A. to contribute to its support and to its budget.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize at this point, India is being asked by U. N. R. R. A. to contribute to its support and its budget. If India is important enough to include as a contributor, India is important enough to include as a beneficiary as well. Let us insist that this is done.

I would like to read now the letter which I am today sending to Gov. Herbert Lehman and to Dean Acheson:

DECEMBER 21, 1943.

GOV. HERBERT LEHMAN,
Director General, United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GOVERNOR LEHMAN: In studying the resolutions and agreements prepared at Atlantic City when the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was being established and for which Congress is asked to authorize money and membership in House Joint Resolution 192, presently before our House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have been disturbed and disappointed to find that India is not to be included among the areas to be benefited by U. N. R. R. A.

In order to be sure that I was not in error in this conclusion, I interrogated Dean Acheson about this matter when he was before our committee and he responded by stating that India was not considered eligible for benefits through U. N. R. R. A. due to the fact that her territory had not been occupied by enemy troops and that consequently she would not be considered a liberated area. To me, this interpretation of the scope of U. N. R. R. A. which would compel it to ignore the starvation and suffering of one of the United Nations' most populous and patient associates is both cruel and unjustifiable.

Since I have great respect for Dean Acheson's knowledge of what U. N. R. R. A. includes and how it will function, I must of course accept his interpretation of the intent and scope of the organization. I feel very definitely, however, that the exclusion of India whether by intent or by accident of language is highly unfortunate and entirely uwarranted. It is an omission which, in my opinion, can and should be corrected.

I am of the opinion that the correction of this omission either by amendment or by placing a more generous interpretation on the present language of U. N. R. R. A. would bring House Joint Resolution 192 more closely in line with what the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Congress, and the country desire. I am addressing the House on this subject today and the reaction to my remarks may provide a test of sentiment indicating whether I am correct or incorrect in this opinion. I hope that between now and the end of the congressional recess you will take the necessary steps to have U. N. R. R. A. amended so as to bring India into the list of countries eligible for its benefits. I believe the influence of the United States in U. N. R. R. A. is great enough to secure this desired change whether it be through interpretation or by amendment.

With best wishes, I am,
Cordially yours,

KARL E. MUNDT,
Member of Congress.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, who has a profound knowledge of the situation and conditions in the Far East growing out of his personal experience.

Mr. JUDD. Did either of these gentlemen in their appearance before the Committee on Foreign Affairs give any suggestion as to the reasons why India has not been included other than the reason that it has not been invaded? Of course, we all know India has been bombed. A most disastrous bombing took place the other day in Calcutta. She has not had an actual occupation of any of her major cities, but she has been constantly subjected to the terrors and disasters of war. I am curious to know. There must be some reason why this action, which seems arbitrary, has been taken.

Mr. MUNDT. As suggested to the gentleman's colleague from my neighboring district just across the South Dakota line, over in Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], the emissaries before our Committee were very tactful and very diplomatic and the best information that we could get from them was just that unfortunately India did not seem to come within the interpretation of the language that was drawn at Atlantic City and we were unable to pry behind that to find whether there was any reason or motive for such omission or whether it was simply an accident of language. I hope it was just an accident of language. I proposed in my letters to Governor Lehman and Mr. Acheson that, if it was an accident of language, it can be corrected, and if it was done deliberately with some motive, the reason can be exposed, I think, and exploded. Certainly the Congress and the country have a right and a responsibility to learn why India who needs help so badly was excluded from the proposed benefits of U. N. R. R. A.

Copy of letter from President J. J. Singh:

Executive Committee: Sirdar J. J. Singh, president; Dr. J. Holmes Smith, vice president; Hemendra K. Rakhit, secretary; Dr. Anup Singh, director research bureau; Roger N. Baldwin, treasurer; Nibahu R. Checker; A. Choudry; Frances Gunther; Sidney Hertzberg; Mirza Jaffer; Dr. S. R. Mandal; Mrs. Kamala Mukerji; S. S. Sarna; Rustom D. Wadia; S. J. Wynn.

Advisory Board: Dr. Sudhindra Bose, Louis Bromfield, Godha Ram Channon, Dr. M. N. Chatterjee, Dr. Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, Dorothy Canfield Fisher, Dr. John Haynes Holmes, Dr. Syud Hossain, Dr. John H. Lathrop, Profulla C. Mukerji, Dorothy Norman, Pierre van Paassen, Prof. James B. Pratt, Victor G. Reuther, Vincent Sheean, Norman Thomas, Oswald G. Villard, Dr. J. Max Weis, Dr. Lin Yutang.

INDIA LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., December 18, 1943.

Representative KARL E. MUNDT,
House of Representatives Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MUNDT: I am taking the liberty of enclosing herewith a copy of my report on famine in India, as well as a copy of my letter to Mr. Dean Acheson, Chairman of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

Famine in India continues. Hundreds of thousands of people are dying.

Some of the press reports that have been received in the past 2 or 3 weeks would indicate that the conditions in Calcutta have improved. The reason for such reports is clear. The Government has forcibly removed the starving people from the streets of fashionable Calcutta and have sent them back into the interior of the province.

Thus, the American newspaper correspondents see less of starving men, women, and children on the streets of Calcutta and hence the reports that the situation is getting better.

However, the havoc continues in the hinterland and thousands of people are dying of starvation every week. The latest report says 50,000 per week. (Herald Tribune, December 12.)

Disease which usually accompanies and follows famine is sweeping the Province of Bengal. In Kandi—population, 400,000—about 75 percent [1] of the people are suffering from malaria.

In Faridpur—population 2,888,000—more than 50,000 [1] have died of malaria in 3 months.

At a meeting of the Calcutta City Municipal Corporation a week ago, it was brought out that deaths from malaria for 1 week only, ending November 20, reached 566,[1] against the yearly average for the last 5 years of 651.

The mayor of Calcutta reported that 10,000 [1] have died out of the total population of 40,000 in Kutubdia, a district of Chittagong.

As you will notice in my letter to Mr. Acheson, I have requested that the famine-stricken areas of India should be brought under the jurisdiction of U. N. R. R. A.

I have pointed out that according to clause 2 (a) of article I, U. N. R. R. A. is required to give relief to victims of war in areas under the control of any of the United Nations.

And I have further pointed out in that letter that the famine conditions in India are directly the result of war and, therefore, the starving people of India are victims of war.

There is another point that I would like to bring to your notice. Almost a million refugees from Burma are today living in India, most of them in the famine-stricken area (Bengal). According to the terms of agreement of U. N. R. R. A., these refugees come under the jurisdiction of U. N. R. R. A. How can U. N. R. R. A. distribute relief to them and not give relief to millions of others dying very next door to these refugees?

India has been asked to contribute $35,000,000 as her share toward U. N. R. R. A. funds. The starving people of India would ask why they are being requested by U. N. R. R. A. to give money for the relief of suffering people in other parts of the

[1] These figures were taken from the New York Times, December 16, 1943.

world when U. N. R. R. A. is not considering giving any relief to the victims of famine in India.

I most earnestly beg of you to make recommendation to the House that relief to famine-stricken areas in India be brought under the jurisdiction of U. N. R. R. A.

Sincerely,

INDIA LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
J. J. SINGH, *President.*

Copy of letter from J. J. Singh to Mr. Dean Acheson:

NOVEMBER 22, 1943.

Mr. DEAN ACHESON,
Chairman, United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, Atlantic City, N. J.

MY DEAR MR. ACHESON: I acknowledge with thanks your kind letter of November 15.

I have read the contents very carefully and I have been greatly disturbed to note that in your opinion the Indian famine situation does not come within the competence of the council.

I quote here below your paragraph in full:

"You will note that, under the agreement signed on November 9, 1943, whereby the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was established, the scope of activities of the Administration is limited in substance to the relief of victims of war in areas liberated by the armed forces of the United Nations. The Council of the Administration which is now in session here has no power to amplify the scope provided for in the agreement. Consequently, I regret to inform you that the unfortunate situation that you refer to in your letter is not within the competence of the council to discuss at this session."

I have also read the revised text of the draft agreement referred to by you in your letter.

Though in the preamble of the agreement it is stated "that immediately upon the liberation of any area by the armed forces of the United Nations or as a consequence of retreat of the enemy the population thereof shall receive aid and relief—," yet, clause 2 (a) of article I has the following definition for the purposes and functions of U. N. R. R. A., "to plan, coordinate, administer, or arrange for the administration of measures for the relief of victims of war in any area under the control of any of the United Nations through the provision of food, fuel, clothing, shelter, and other basic necessities, medical and other essential services."

Along with this I have read with great interest and encouragement the message of the President of the United States to the Congress, recommending the enactment of the legislation authorizing appropriations for the work of the U. N. R. R. A.

In this message of November 16, President Roosevelt said "U. N. R. R. A. will be able to make only a beginning in the vast task of aiding the victims of war."

The President also said, "They do not want charity. They seek the strength to fight and to do their part in securing the peace. Aid to the liberated peoples during the war is thus a matter of military necessity as well as of humanity."

It would seem to me then, that if we were to follow the spirit of the draft agreement and the President's message, then famine relief in India does fall within the competence of the Council.

You will no doubt agree that the present famine in India is directly the result of war. If the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration's task is "to plan, coordinate, administer, or arrange for the administration of measures for the relief of victims of war * * *," then there can be no question that the first practical step of the Council to administer relief should be to render relief to India's famine-stricken areas.

The famine in India is certainly the result of war:

(a) Stoppage of imports of almost 2,000,000 tons of rice per year from Burma—result of the war.

(b) Export of huge quantities of Indian wheat to armed forces in the Middle East (exports of food grains exceeded imports 1942–43 by 361,000 tons)—result of the war.

(c) Military requirements have brought tremendous pressure on railways and other transportation facilities in India, thus disrupting the normal means of transportation—result of the war.

(d) Lack of available bottoms to transport wheat and other foodstuffs from different parts of the world—result of the war.

Thus, you will see, sir, that though India is not a liberated country, yet the present catastrophe is the actual result of war.

President Roosevelt said, "They do not want charity They seek the strength to fight and to do their part in securing the peace. Aid to the liberated peoples during the war is thus a matter of military necessity as well as of humanity."

This most eminently fits the India situation. We do not want charity. We want food to give us strength to fight against the common enemy. This is a matter of "military necessity" as well as of "humanity."

Furthermore, if U. N. R. R. A. turns down India, the Japanese propagandists will most gleefully jump upon this new vehicle to sow the seeds of poisonous propaganda amongst the peoples of Asia. The Japanese once again will tell the peoples of Asia that Western powers are not solicitous of the welfare of the Eastern peoples.

Any such fuel that we may supply for Japanese propaganda will lengthen the war and will require greater sacrifice of men and material.

There is yet another point to be considered. According to recent reports from India under the leadership of Brig. Gen. Haydon L. Boatner, Lt. Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell's chief of staff for China's combat troops in India-Burma sector, our forces have already thrust into upper Hukawang Valley from the source of Chindwin River in the Naga Hills and up to November 3, they had already cleared out the Japanese from that territory for about 40 miles.

Thus, according to strict interpretation of the draft agreement, people in this reconquered area will be entitled to U. N. R. R. A. benefits and yet the starving people 30 or 40 miles west of this area will be denied those benefits. That would be most impracticable and confusing to say the least.

In the end, I wish to repeat that from a military strategic point of view and propaganda and humanitarian point of view, the United Nations must find a way to prevent deaths by starvation of hundreds of thousands of Indians in areas where our most important military bases are situated.

I most respectfully suggest, sir, that if it is necessary to amend the draft declaration to cover aid to starving India, as a result of war, then an amendment to that effect be adopted in accordance with article 8, section C of the draft agreement.

Hoping that this matter will receive your immediate and favorable consideration, I remain, sir.

Yours very sincerely,

INDIA LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
J. J. SINGH, *President.*

CRITICISM OF THE ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, it has become the fixed policy of some Members to use every opportunity to criticize the administrative and executive agencies; to refer to all of the patriotic war workers thus employed as "bumbling bureaucrats"; to sell the American people the idea that Washington and the Federal Government is a generator of nothing but confusion. Such Members seem to be unaware of the fact that their course is not harming the present administration as much as it is the war effort; is not undermining faith in Democratic leadership as much as it is undermining faith in the entire Federal Government of which this Congress is a component part.

The fact that the vast majority of the accusations of mismanagement, of overstaffing, of inefficiency, and of all the other wild charges are not true is not the important point. The important and vicious element is the fact that this smoke screen has been thrown up in many instances by factions deliberately wishing to undermine the Government, wanting a weak government so that their special interests can better be promoted. Some Members of this House have apparently subscribed to this method of attack. There is no other conclusion that can be drawn from the constant and repeated attacks made by such Members against the executive agencies which are carrying out the various war programs.

Have they forgotten that they too are a part of the Federal Government? That this Congress is a part of the Federal Government? That should the people lose faith in the Federal Government, they will also lose faith in this Congress which is a part of it? No part escapes. Do they realize that the unfounded suspicions of the Federal Government which exist in some people's minds, and which these Members helped put there, is also directed against this Congress? Do such Members realize that they are helping to undermine the people's faith in the Federal Government as a whole at a time when that instrument of the people should hold the confidence of all, and when its record in waging this war, as shown by the results to date, entitle it to have the respect and confidence of all? Do they also realize that every unfounded criticism and untrue castigation weakens this Federal Government in the eyes of the people, when it should be receiving every assistance in welding a strong structure to cope with the weighty problems of peace, of world relationships, of employment, of national building, and of all such problems which only the Federal Government, working in the interests of all the Nation, can solve?

Criticism when made, particularly in these trying days, should be constructive. The object should be improvement—not criticism that only produces a greater uncertainty and division.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Minneapolis Star Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

HEARST PUBLICATIONS ADVOCATE ADEQUATE MUSTER-OUT PAY

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, December 15, 1943, the distinguished chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, Hon. ANDREW J. MAY, addressed this House on the subject, Care of World War Veterans.

At the time I had a colloquy with Representative MAY. It reads as follows:

Mr. ROLPH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. ROLPH. I am wondering when the Military Affairs Committee under the gentleman's chairmanship will report out the bill that carries an immediate pay for these men who are being mustered out of the service?

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman mean muster-out pay?

Mr. ROLPH. Yes.

Mr. MAY. I shall answer the gentleman very gladly by saying to him that within 2 or 3 days after the bill was referred to the House Military Affairs Committee I proceeded to go into action to do something about it. I notified all of the agencies concerned and asked them for reports of their favor or opposition to it.

I then called the committee together and started hearings. We conducted hearings all last week, and at the end of the hearings I set aside a day for Members of Congress to be heard and we heard all who came, including the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]. In addition to that, we find that most of the difficulty and the misinformation that is going out to the country which brings pressure upon the House of Representatives and the Senate goes out because of the fact that there are some hardship cases in the country where neglect perhaps has been found to exist, where hardship has been incurred by some of these disabled veterans.

Mr. ROLPH. Does not the gentleman think it should be brought out on the floor and that all those things should be cleared up?

Mr. MAY. We were going to bring it out yesterday when lo and behold the veterans' organizations on the outside that spend their time in peacetimes as well as in wartimes looking after the interests of the veterans of all our wars, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, and American Legion, asked for further consideration. We even met yesterday in a subcommittee to hear them. One of the representatives came before us and said they did not think we ought to consider simply muster-out pay but that we ought to take up at this time and consider the whole problem of muster-out pay and adjusted compensation, the latter of which will amount to some fifteen or sixteen billion dollars. We thought that was a rather large order just now.

Mr. ROLPH. Does not the gentleman think it would be advisable to consider muster-out pay to take care of these men that are being discharged at the present time?

Mr. MAY. There are many considerations that enter into that picture. The Senate has already reported for consideration, or, at least, the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate has reported for consideration what is actually an adjusted-compensation bill. We felt if we passed out some bill now and it was passed hurriedly, it might go to the Senate and be treated perhaps as unnecessary, that the Senate might pass a different bill, send it over here, it would come here and we might deal with it.

In view of all of the major problems involved we ought to give it more consideration and bring out a real bill perhaps, that will serve the whole purpose if that can be done, especially in view of the fact that out of 635,000 men already discharged—I believe 900,000 all told—there is hardly a man of them who has not a good job already. There are jobs hanging on the bushes for every man who comes out who is able bodied and the Veterans' Administration is standing by with its billions to take care of those who are disabled. Congress has already done everything within its power to provide for the sick, disabled, and wounded.

Mr. ROLPH. I am receiving many, many communications from my district urging that this legislation be considered at once.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman is not the only Member of the House who is receiving them. I get them myself.

Mr. Speaker, I want the country to know of the unselfish, devoted efforts being put forth by Mr. William Randolph Hearst and the Hearst publications in aiding the cause of those who are being mustered out. Mr. Hearst was born in San Francisco. He first became identified with newspaper publishing in my home city. One of his ablest editors, the late Fremont Older, of San Francisco penned it thusly:

William Randolph Hearst came back to San Francisco from Harvard in 1887, a gay, laughing, fun-loving youth, and took charge of the San Francisco Examiner. Who could have prophesied in a few short years he was destined to change the attitude of mind of millions of people?

Mr. Hearst is among the most distinguished and dominant personalities in contemporary American life.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota, who has been acting as chairman of this group in their endeavor to get adequate and immediate pay for these men who are being mustered out.

Mr. LEMKE. Does the gentleman agree with me that but for the patriotic service William Randolph Hearst rendered to the Nation by calling attention to the deplorable and unfair treatment that we are giving to our protectors who had been discharged, the Congress would not have been fully aware of what was going on?

Mr. ROLPH. Exactly.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I would like to interject also that the gentleman from California, Hon. TOM ROLPH, has done a wonderful job in attempting to be of service to discharged, disabled veterans of World War No. 2. The gentleman said something about William Randolph Hearst, and the gentleman referred to some of his editorial writers. Will the gentleman permit me to say that one of his most able editorial writers got his start in my congressional district, Mr. Charles Ryckman, a winner of the Pulitzer prize?

Mr. ROLPH. Yes; and he is now on the editorial staff of the San Francisco Examiner.

Mr. STEFAN. We in Nebraska think a great deal of him.

Mr. ROLPH. And we in San Francisco think a great deal of him. I thank my colleague for that excellent observation. I appreciate it.

Daily the San Francisco Examiner and San Francisco Call-Bulletin have been urging immediate and adequate relief. Daily these papers carry articles headed "Write your Congressman," one of which I quote:

DECEMBER 14, 1943.

Hon. THOMAS ROLPH,
Member of Congress,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:

I herewith call upon you, as my Representative in Congress, to support legislation guaranteeing mustering-out pay, adequate clothing, hospitalization, and all the necessities of life to discharged servicemen of World War No. 2 from the hour of their release.

I call upon you to prevent, through any legislation that may become necessary, any neglect whatsoever of any man rendered unfit—temporarily or permanently, through service in World War No. 2—to care for himself after he has been discharged from any of the various branches of our armed forces.

I call upon you to make this guaranty permanent, or active until such time as every man who fought in this war is capable of taking care of himself without the humiliation of accepting private aid.

This is urgent. Please act now.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Those of us who are working on the proposition were gratified last Saturday when the majority leader assured the minority leader that this meritorious legislation is almost a "must" when we reconvene. We hope his prediction will be fulfilled. We hope that the Military Affairs Committee will act promptly. We sincerely hope the bill will come to the House for a vote by January 15, 1944. However, I feel that section 2 in the bill should be amended to read:

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are hereby directed and authorized to pay $100 as mustering-out pay and to continue the regular pay to any veteran, as herein defined, that has been or may hereafter be honorably discharged from the armed forces on the basis of the pay of a private in the Army, or an apprentice seaman in the Navy, as follows: A veteran who has served for less than 3 months, for an additional 3 months; one who has served for less than 6 months but more than 3 months, for an additional 6 months; one who has served for less than 9 months but more than 6 months, for an additional 9 months; one who has served 9 months or more, for an additional 12 months.

We lose not a minute voting huge sums for people in other lands. Why should we be hesitant with our own? Fellow Americans have offered their all for our country. Simple justice demands they be treated fairly. God bless and help these patriotic loyal countrymen of ours.

Mr. Speaker, I shall make a part of my remarks a list of those who have been working under the chairmanship of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] in this very meritorious and worth-while effort.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WILLIAM LEMKE, North Dakota; THOMAS J. LANE, Massachusetts; JOHN M. COFFEE, Washington; HAROLD C. HAGEN, Minnesota; FRANK B. KEEFE, Wisconsin; COMPTON I. WHITE, Idaho; BERTRAND W. GEARHART, California; JOHN H. TOLAN, California; FRED E. BUSBEY, Illinois; GERALD W. LANDIS, Indiana; CHARLES M. LAFOLLETTE, Indiana; J. GLENN BEALL, Maryland; PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Massachusetts; JOSEPH P. O'HARA, Minnesota; WILLIAM C. COLE, Missouri; KARL STEFAN, Nebraska; USHER L. BURDICK, North Dakota; J. HARRY MCGREGOR, Ohio; VICTOR WICKERSHAM, Oklahoma; KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota; CHESTER GROSS, Pennsylvania; MERLIN HULL, Wisconsin; A. M. FERNANDEZ, New Mexico; CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Iowa; HARRY SAUTHOFF, Wisconsin; MARION T. BENNETT, Missouri; KARL M. LECOMPTE, Iowa; STEPHEN A. DAY, Illinois; WALTER E. BREHM, Ohio; EDWARD J. HART, New Jersey; THOMAS ROLPH, California; ED. V. IZAC, California; WILLIAM J. MILLER, Connecticut; J. HARDIN PETERSON, Florida; WILLIAM A. ROWAN, Illinois; MARTIN GORSKI, Illinois; FRED C. GILCHRIST, Iowa; GEORGE G. SADOWSKI, Michigan; WILLIAM A. PITTENGER, Minnesota; CARL T. CURTIS, Nebraska; A. L. MILLER, Nebraska; HOWARD J. MCMURRAY, Wisconsin; FRANK A. BARRETT, Wyoming; RAY J. MADDEN, Indiana; WIRT COURTNEY, Tennessee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

INVESTIGATORS FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, sound legislation is based on sound information. Too often faulty legislation is the result of inaccurate or inadequate information. From the beginning of the Congress, committees have been handicapped by lack of essential data and have sought practical methods of supplying the deficiency. As early as 1792, a special committee on investigation was appointed and from that time down to the present, thousands of investigations have been authorized and millions of dollars expended in conducting them, the larger part of which may be said to have been utterly wasted.

The Committee on Appropriations has especially felt the need of an agency for research and investigation which could be relied upon to supply data to supplement that submitted by the departments in their annual hearings on the general appropriation bills. It is an old problem and one to which a great amount of thought has been given. There has not been a Congress in recent years in which a number of bills and resolutions have not been introduced with a view to providing some practical and dependable means of meeting this long-standing need.

The first approach to a solution of the problem was made in the Sixty-fourth Congress when the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations began to avail themselves of the facilities supplied by the Bureau of Efficiency which assigned operatives from its staff for departmental investigations. The plan was singularly successful and was resorted to by the subcommittees with increasing frequency until the discontinuance of the Bureau, and was the basis for the plan now in use by the committee.

The present system was adopted after long study and the consideration and rejection of a number of alternatives. Perhaps the most frequently discussed alternative was the establishment of a permanent staff of investigators on the pay roll of the House, under the direction and control of the committee. A careful study disclosed many difficulties incident to such a plan. In the first place, the staff necessarily would be appointed by the committee—presumably by the chairman of the committee, or chairmen of subcommittees, who inevitably would be guided largely by personal considerations in their selections. It follows that such a staff would be made up of friends or acquaintances of local importance and would be chosen consciously or unconsciously on a basis of political influence rather than an impartial and scientific appraisal of qualifications.

In the second place, such employees would be placed on such intimate associations with the members of the committee that it would be only a matter of a few years before their salaries would be advanced through successive increases to the maximum—and out of all proportions to their real usefulness.

And as their familiarity with the committee and their salaries increased, their interest and enthusiasm for the work would wane until it became in effect a matter of routine. They would in a short time be on amicable terms with the departments they investigated and a comradery would be established which would not be particularly conducive to rigid retrenchment in the offices investigated. Most objectionable would be the permanency of tenure on the staff. There is a tendency to retain technical employees of the House and Senate indefinitely. That is as true of the Committee on Appropriations as of the other committees of the House and Senate. Regardless of the adaptability and fitness for the work, such appointments amount to lifetime assignments. In keeping with this long-established custom, a misfit once selected would be a fixture on the staff the rest of his life. So the plan of a permanent staff was rejected.

The second proposal was the creation of a permanent staff in one of the departments, as in the General Accounting Office, the Department of Justice, the Bureau of the Budget, or the Civil Service Commission. But here again most of the same objections applied, and that plan was likewise rejected.

The plan eventually adopted is subject to none of these objections. It provides for the assignment of operatives from any department of Government for the use of the committee on requisition.

The first step in the adoption of the plan was taken by the introduction of the resolution, House Resolution 69, which was approved by the House, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations, acting as a whole or by subcommittee or subcommittees thereof appointed by the chairman of such committee for the purposes of this resolution, is authorized to conduct such studies and examination of the organization and operation of any executive department or any other executive agency (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) as the committee may deem necessary to assist it in connection with the determination of matters within its jurisdiction.

For the purposes of this resolution, such committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such books or papers or documents or vouchers by subpena or otherwise, and to take such testimony and records as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or by any person designated by him, and shall be served by such person or persons as the chairman of the committee or subcommittee may designate. The chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses.

Recommendation of the resolution to the House was supplemented by the adoption by the committee of the following memoranda:

JANUARY 22, 1943.

If the House should pass the suggested resolution giving the committee authority to conduct studies and examinations of the organization and operation of executive agencies, the following procedure is recommended:

1. A temporary staff should be set up immediately within the limits of such funds as the Committee on Accounts recommend and the House approves and such other personnel as the committee may obtain by exercise of any other authority it has under existing law with respect to the use of executive agency personnel. Any such staff to be under the general direction of a special subcommittee appointed by the chairman of the full committee. Such special subcommittee should be authorized to exercise on behalf of the full committee any authority under existing law to call upon any agency for staff assistance.

2. Such studies and examinations to be initiated upon the written request of a subcommittee or subcommittees of the full committee and shall be reasonably specific and definite in character and shall be initiated only by a majority vote of the subcommittee with the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking minority member thereof participating as part of such majority vote. When so initiated such request shall be filed with the clerk of the full committee for submission to the chairman and ranking minority member of the full committee and their approval shall be required to make the same effective. Notwithstanding any action taken on such request by the chairman and ranking minority member, such request may be approved by a majority of the full committee.

3. Any request approved as provided in paragraph (2) shall be immediately turned over to the staff provided by paragraph (1) for action.

4. Any information obtained by the staff shall be reported to the chairman of the subcommittee requesting such study and ex-

amination and to the chairman and ranking minority member of the full committee, shall be made available to the members of the subcommittee concerned, and shall not be released for publication until the subcommittee so determines. Any hearings or investigations which may be desired, aside from the regular hearings of appropriation items, when approved by the full committee, shall be conducted by the subcommittee having jurisdiction of the matter.

Following the adoption of the resolution the House agreed to a report from the Committee on Accounts appropriating $100,000 to carry out the provisions of the resolution.

Under this plan any member of the committee, or any Member of the House, may apply to the subcommittee having jurisdiction of the subject matter for any investigation within the perview of the authority granted under the resolution. The request when reduced to writing is submitted to the subcommittee and approved by majority vote. It must then be approved and signed by the chairman and ranking minority members of the subcommittee and the Committee on Appropriations. This precludes any attempt to use the agency for personal or political purposes. To protect the right of the committee to investigate, the veto of a recalcitrant chairman or ranking member may be overruled by a majority vote of the whole committee. It is interesting to note, however, that although the system has been in continuous operation since its adoption there has been no case in which all four of the requisite signatures were not attached to the application. As a matter of fact, there has never been any suggestion or intimation of politics or partisanship in any of these investigations. The Committee on Appropriations is a business committee and the fact that there has been no attempt to use this system for partisan purposes—and that there has been uniform approval of all applications for investigations by the members of the committee and its subcommittees, is conclusive proof both of that fact and of the efficacy of the plan of investigation.

The investigation having been authorized, the application is transmitted through the clerks of the subcommittee and the committee to the staff where it is processed and a report returned in writing. Except in exceptional instances the members of the Committee on Appropriations do not see the men who make the investigation. The office of the staff is located in one of the House Office Buildings but I have never been in the office and no member of the staff has ever been in my office. I would not know one of them if I should meet him in the street. In fact one of the advantages of the system is that the staff changes constantly and the same investigator may not be on duty twice in the same session. In this way the service is wholly impersonal.

The advantages of the system are:

First. It is economical. The employees are on the House pay roll only as long as needed. If a permanent staff were employed the entire force would be drawing salaries whether the committee was conducting an investigation or not. But under this system a man is called from the department and placed on the House roll, at the same salary he is drawing in his present position. As soon as the assignment is completed he is returned to the department and goes off the House roll and back to his original roll. His salary cannot be raised by the committee and he is not paid a day longer than required for the assignment.

Second. Men especially qualified for the particular investigation involved are secured. In some investigations an auditor is needed, in some a lawyer, in some a chemist, in some an efficiency expert, in some a detective, and so forth. Accordingly, the man best fitted for the assignment is requisitioned. If an auditor is needed the General Accounting Office is asked to supply the man. If a chemist, the Bureau of Standards; if a lawyer, the Department of Justice; if a civil-service expert, the Civil Service Commission; if a detective, the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the Secret Service of the Treasury Department; and so forth. No other system yet suggested will so promptly and so exactly supply just the exact character of qualification needed for any specific investigation.

Third. The system is elastic. It supplies 1 man or 10 men on short notice. There are 10 subcommittees. If only 2 order an investigation, a half dozen men will suffice. But if all 10, or any considerable number of the 10, simultaneously request investigations, the requisition jumps to 50 or 60 men. Then during vacation, when only 1 or 2 subcommittees are investigating, the number drops again. But for any investigation or number of investigations, this system meets the emergency. It supplies just the number needed and no more—and for the time required—and no longer.

Fourth. The system supplies men of rare qualification. For such investigations the departments assign their best operators. These men are experienced. They are trained. They are tried and tested. They have come up through the ranks. They have demonstrated their fidelity and capacity. There are among them no tyros or amateurs. They are the ablest and most dependable men that are to be secured and incomparably superior to the men to be had by political selection of a permanent House staff. Furthermore, they are active and alert. Men on permanent staffs grow old and inert with the passage of the years, but the departments are a never failing fountain of youth and energy.

Fifth. The constant change in operatives sends into the departments men unknown and unacquainted in the bureaus which they investigate. They have had no opportunities to establish cordial relations. They are new faces and new brooms—and they sweep clean.

Sixth. The only interest of the operator is to secure the facts as quickly and as economically as possible and get back to his own office. Under the average committee of investigation the employee is likely to be swayed by two dominant interests: First, he wishes to prolong and perpetuate his job. He is drawing a better salary than he can get anywhere else and he wants to make it last as long as conditions permit. Second, he feels that he must justify his employment by "making his case" and "getting his man."

There is no such incentive under this system. Congressional committees of investigation now operating have expended vast sums—as high as half a million dollars—with little visible results. The Committee on Appropriations conducting investigations in many departments for the larger part of the year has spent less than $20,000 and secured invaluable results.

Seventh. The system cannot be used for the publicizing or aggrandizement of the chairman or any member of the committee. Requests submitted by the subcommittees are for facts. Opinions are not admitted. The investigators receive written assignments and make written reports, and from those facts reported the members of the committee deduce their own opinions. Results of the investigations are not released to the newspapers. The Department which has been investigated does not itself know what the investigator has reported and as a result must be on its toes ready for any development when its representatives appear before the committee in the hearings on the Budget estimates.

Eighth. On the other hand, the system cannot be used as an instrument of persecution. The fact that a department is investigated is in no way to its discredit. Investigations are routine and are expected and as a rule welcomed by the departments. While many instances have been reported which justified heavy retrenchments, there have been occasions when on the basis of the reports submitted by the investigator the appropriation was increased over the Budget estimate. The system makes for efficient administration as well as economical administration. And it is effective even when not in use. It is like the shotgun behind the door. The very knowledge that it is there is a deterrent—even though not in use. The mere fact that Congress can investigate, and is supplied with effective machinery for investigation, exerts a salutary influence.

On the whole, the system has proven remarkably successful. It has met every requirement. In fact, it is difficult to imagine a system which would be more responsive to our needs and more economical and effective in its operation and results.

The surprising feature of the system is that it has met with no criticism from any source. Every member of the committee, both of the majority and minority, approves of it without reservation. Even the departments which have been investigated uniformly express appreciation of the tact and courtesy with which the investigations have been handled, and have cooperated with the committee. It has not only been comparatively inexpensive but through the information deduced the subcommittees have been able to make material retrenchments.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. What happens to the work these individuals are doing in one of the Government departments when they are up here helping in an investigation? Does it go undone?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. All these departments have a mobile force sufficient in number to enable them to supply the men needed for the short time we require their services on an investigation.

Mr. JUDD. The savings therefore might not be quite as real as it would appear because while it saves on this end it might increase a certain amount on the other end.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Up to this time it has not increased a dollar on the other end.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I wonder how the gentleman would feel about having a fairly large group to work along for the Congress?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That would be subject to all of the objections I have enumerated.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I did not mean just for the investigation; I mean to look up statistics for us, things that are nonpartisan, nonpolitical.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. When we need statistics we get a man who is versed in statistics, a statistician. If we had a permanent staff, when you wanted a statistician, you might get a policeman, certainly a politician.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I believe my chairman will agree with me that when we hold our hearings before our various Subcommittees on Appropriations the Members on those particular subcommittees are more or less in the position of sitting as a member of a jury, having the defense come before us, but absolutely no prosecutor to protect the Treasury's interest.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is true; that has been our difficulty. In other words, the proceedings have been largely ex parte. The Department asking for the money was the plaintiff and presented its case, and the defendant, the United States Treasury, had no one to appear in its behalf. This system supplies that deficiency; this gives us witnesses and testimony for the defense to offset the arguments advanced by the plaintiff.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my colleague on the committee from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House Committee on Appropriations, I want to thank my distinguished colleague from Missouri, Mr. CANNON, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for giving the House and the public the benefit of our effort to save money and to check on the purse-strings of our Government through this program of investigation. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to make an observation. I was very much impressed in the closed hearings of the various subcommittees to find the chairman coming in, sitting down with us and listening to the hearings and justifications offered by the various department chiefs when they came before us to justify their appropriations. I do not know if that is the regular function of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee or not, but I do want to assure my colleagues that the present chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations is a hard worker. Besides working on the Deficiency Committee, the Agricultural Committee, and many others, he finds time to come to our sessions and listens in and keeps in close touch with what every subcommittee is really doing. I pay this compliment to my chairman and I thank him for making it possible for me to serve under such a distinguished hard-working colleague of this House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to express appreciation of the invaluable services rendered in the committee by my distinguished colleague from Nebraska. He is one of the hardest working and one of the most useful members of the committee and has contributed immeasurably to the work of the committee in the sifting of evidence and the resulting curtailment of expenditures, especially during the current session. May I say that the success of our program this session is due not to the work of any two or three members of the committee but to the cooperation of all Members on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. I am a new Member and I think it would be highly instructive to me if I could get the relationship of the Bureau of the Budget to the Appropriations Committee. I think the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations would be best able to advise me on that.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the departments first prepare their estimates and submit them to the Bureau of the Budget, which in turn digests them and allows or rejects, in whole or in part, the requests for funds for each activity.

These estimates are then transmitted by the President to the Congress, which refers them to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I understood that this was the last of the special orders and for that reason asked for an extension of time. Had I known that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts was to follow I would have resigned the floor at the conclusion of my time.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the special orders today I may be allowed to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to pay tribute to Mr. Hearst for his fight to secure passage of a mustering-out pay bill and more care for the veterans. He has been extremely helpful. I am very sorry that anything of that sort has been necessary.

On Saturday of this week we will give thanksgiving to the birth of the Christ Child, a Child who grew to young manhood, and then gave up His life in order that religion might live, in order that there might be truth, honor, justice, and a belief in God in all the world.

As we look forward to Christmas our minds are filled with those men who are giving up their lives for us in the fox holes across the seas, those men who go down with their ships, and the men in the hospitals. We are thinking what we can do to make the lot of the men in the hospitals easier, the lot of their families better. Many Members of Congress have one, two, or three sons in the service of their country, some of whom will give up their lives that others may live and that there may be religion and a love of peace in the world and a just and lasting peace.

A good deal has been said about the neglect of the veterans. There has not been a neglect of veterans in the hospitals, as I have observed the situation. I understand that the care given the men at the front is much better than it has ever been, due to careful planning, to the use of plasma, the sulfa drugs, and penicillin. Medicine is not an exact science. Some errors may have been made in the beginning, but the care now given at the front and on back to this country has been good. The food has been good.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I want to uphold the gentlewoman in her statement concerning the fact that, in her opinion and in mine, there has been no neglect of the veterans in the hospitals, and I base that opinion upon visits every year for 22 years to see a brother of mine who is an inmate of one of those veterans' hospitals.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am glad that has been the gentleman's experience.

Mr. Speaker, the experience that men of the World War had has helped tre-

mendously in the art of caring for our present World War veterans. I know that the men who fight wars contribute a great deal toward the advance of medicine. That is one of the contributions they make.

One of our great battles today is to see that there are enough Veterans' Administration hospitals and doctors and nurses in those hospitals to take care of our war veterans. There is a shortage today. We should see that the number of hospitals are kept up and that the number of nurses and doctors are kept up to care for the disabled when they are discharged from the armed services.

We should also see that the claims of the veterans are promptly and carefully handled. After many months contact men are now being placed in the hospitals to assist the men in establishing service connection for their claims. Veterans' Administration boards are being set up in the hospitals in order to help the men secure service connection for their disabilities wherever possible. Sixty thousand claims have already been turned down, many, I believe, due to faulty research or faulty presentation of the claim.

I offered a bill that would require that a man be kept either in a hospital or on a terminal furlough until his claim is rated before his service with the armed forces is severed in order that he may have the benefit of the pay he is receiving in the Army or in the Navy or in the armed forces for that period. May I say that I have secured a promise from both the Army and Navy that they would do all they can to secure the records of the men, the clinical records, the hospital records, and the records of treatment, in order that they may aid in a speedy adjudication of soldiers' and sailors' claims.

But we all know, for instance, at Pearl Harbor and at Tarawa, and in more recent engagements, that the records of these men are lost. Unfortunately many of our men have been lost also. But the records are lost and it will make the adjudication of the claims for widows and orphans much more difficult. The country has a great responsibility also in caring for these men, in giving them employment. But it does not seem to me that it is the responsibility of the civilians to give aid to the men when they immediately come out of the service. The Federal Government should give the men discharge pay to care for them for a while, while the civilian population and the Government are trying to secure employment for the men, while the Veterans' Administration is giving the men training and arranging for the training of the men. Also that should be done in the hospitals where there is space. I should like to say that the Air Corps has done a very fine piece of work and is doing it in giving the men a sort of training and rehabilitation when they are still in the hospital. It begins even with a sort of setting-up exercise before the servicemen are out of bed and then it goes on with training hikes and also with training along air aviation lines that they love so much. I have seen the Army in their hospitals in the regular hospitals taking up that same sort of training for the men. The Army is arranging to see that the men have the best, and well fitted, artificial arms and legs where they are needed, before the men are discharged. It is a very important part of the program that the men be taught to walk and use those artificial hands and legs before they are discharged. Nothing is too much to do for the care of the men before they are discharged. If the men want to go home and the hospital feels they are able to go, then they should be given the terminal furlough with pay that I spoke about. But there are other men who, of course, will not have a service connection and perhaps may be discharged as perfectly well, and discharged without a penny except their fare home, with no money in their pockets and no chance of employment. Many of those men are discharged when they are not well. I have felt that it was, as it works out, a very cruel thing to those men, that we have not passed a mustering-out pay bill.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentle lady yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I shall be glad to yield. I have not very much time.

Mr. JUDD. I would like to compliment the gentle lady from Massachusetts on her unfailing concern for the best interests of the soldiers and the veterans and for her effective efforts in that direction.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We are all interested—every Member here is interested. There is not a man or woman in the House who is not interested.

Mr. JUDD. But some are in a position to use their efforts and energies to more effect than the rest of us. I want to agree with my colleague from Minnesota that the care of veterans, once they are in the hospital, is excellent. Does not the gentle lady agree that the major difficulty, insofar as there has been a difficulty, is in the matter of getting them so that they themselves know what their trouble is and into the hospitals where they can get themselves cared for?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; I have stated repeatedly on the floor that information be given to the veterans as soon as they enter the hospitals in order that they may plan. You know, many of them lie in bed wondering what is going to happen to them when they go out of the hospital. It is a great help to a veteran to know that he will have compensation or that his widow and children will be cared for, or that if he is going to be well when he goes out that he will have a sum of money that he can use until the adjustment into civilian life is made. It is a great strain—it is a great shock—to those men to go out of the war and out of the hospital back into the normal flow of life. There are not jobs for the men today.

Mr. JUDD. I would like to inquire if the gentle lady does not agree that in some respects perhaps the Veterans' Administration should err on the side of leniency rather than on the side of keeping strictly to the rules that had to be worked out during peacetime where a man's application had to go through the local area and the regional area and had to come to Washington? And now does not the gentle lady believe it would be better to have a certain amount of decentralization and a certain amount of local authority for highly skilled and responsible physicians and boards to be able to make some of those decisions without having everything referred to Washington where there is inevitably this delay? It seems to me in the matter of these men we should lean over backward a little bit, if necessary, and to depart from red tape rather than just adhere to the regulations which ordinarily we expect and require from the Director of the Veterans' Bureau.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would say to the gentleman, then, the legislation we passed even recently would not be necessary if the Veterans' Administration had been more liberal and had acted promptly.

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Also, they should have a permanent medical staff.

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And a nursing staff and more personnel to rate the insurance cases. They should have more personnel in the contact section to help veterans with their claims and more rating boards. It is the kindest and most humane way that the country can spend money. It is a debt we owe the men and women who have served. Everybody in the United States wants the veterans taken care of. It would be just inhuman not to. It would be one of the cruelest things that could be imagined.

Mr. JUDD. Like physicians, we have a routine of scrubbing up before we operate. Ordinarily to go through it takes 15 or 20 minutes before they get on the operating table. But when a man comes in with an obstruction in his trachea we have to take out a penknife and do it right then without that 15-minute routine, as valuable and important as it is under ordinary circumstances. We are in an emergency.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And take the nervous cases. Many of them cannot describe their feelings themselves. There again the psychiatrists do not always agree whether a man's nervous disability comes from his service or not. This muster-out pay would help those cases very much if they do not establish service origin. I deeply regret the Committee on Military Affairs has not acted upon the mustering-out pay bill, even if it was not a large one, or not, perhaps, one that would seem adequate. They have had months and months in which to do something. It went before their committee, naturally. The chairman of the committee is away, but the other members, many of them, are here in Washington, and I believe that something could have been done.

Mr. BISHOP. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. One-half minute.

Mr. BISHOP. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I cannot yield to the gentleman, but I would suggest that he put his question in the form of a unanimous-consent request to put his question in my remarks.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman's time be extended 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is extended 3 additional minutes.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. BISHOP. Is it not true that this program, being so large, every State along with the Federal Government should take its responsibility? I bring to your attention that the State of Illinois has set up a rehabilitation program whereby at the present time throughout the State they are taking veterans who have been returned from the service wounded and they are now making it possible to extend employment and assistance when they return home?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And that is one reason I would say to the gentleman, why the men should be given their discharge at their homes instead of many miles away, in order that the communities and the States may help the men. Many States are doing the very thing that Illinois is doing, so that they may help the men with employment and with other matters. Massachusetts is very active.

Mr. Speaker, I do not like to ask this because I believe that committees should have charge of bills, but the beneficiaries of this bill have been in a grim and horrible war and as the committee has not acted, unusual methods should be used. In order to secure a mustering-out pay, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take Senate 1543, a bill to provide for mustering-out payments to members of the armed forces and for other purposes, which was passed by the Senate, from the Speaker's table and move that it do now pass.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I hate to say this, but if the gentlewoman persists in her request, I will have to move that the House do now adjourn.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I feel that every effort should be made. I feel very strongly about this, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not recognize the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for that purpose. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

INFLATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, our number one problem is the winning of the war. Problem number two is preventing inflation here at home. We have two departments of our Government that are concerned with fighting inflation. One is the Executive and the other is the legislative. The Executive branch of our Government has a good, consistent record in its effort to prevent runaway or ruinous or hurtful inflation. The President has done everything within his power to warn the people and Congress of the danger of inflation, and he has done everything within his power to persuade Congress to give him the necessary weapons with which to fight inflation. Congress responded to the extent of passing the act known as the Office of Price Administration Act of October 2, 1942. That is a good law, and the Executive has been making an effort to enforce that law in compliance with the will and wishes of Congress. That law contained a directive to the President to hold the line as of September 15, 1942. But Congress had not been carrying out its part of the burden. We passed the law which, in effect, gave lip service to combating inflation but at the first opportunity this Congress, the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, we cut down the appropriation for O. P. A. enforcement, thereby tying the hands of the President and making it impossible for him to properly and adequately enforce that law.

Next the Office of War Information was doing a wonderful job teaching the people of the danger of inflation and securing their cooperation and aid and assistance in combating inflation. But the first opportunity Congress had in this first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, Congress absolutely wiped out entirely that whole division of the O. W. I. that was doing such an excellent job against inflation.

In addition to that, this Congress is guilty of sins of omission as well as commission in the fight against inflation. On the question of subsidies, the President said there were certain selective items or articles and commodities that subsidies would help to keep down the cost of living in, and therefore recommended subsidies be paid. At the same time the President said if Congress had an alternative he would gladly accept it, but Congress, carrying out its sordid and almost scandalous record in failing to stop inflation or cooperate with the President in combating inflation, did not do anything in the way of offering an alternative. It offered no alternative, but again attempted to tie the hands of the President by refusing to permit the use of subsidies and offering no other alternative.

So this record is a sordid one, a scandalous one, almost.

FIRST CROP OF WAR MILLIONAIRES

In addition to that, the best way to keep down inflation is by levying adequate taxes. The President asked that adequate taxes be levied to siphon off the excess purchasing power. At one time he asked for $16,000,000,000 additional. Instead of that, the Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, passed a law which actually gave back to people seven and one-half billion dollars. That was the No. 1 group of war millionaires in World War No. 2. That is a sordid record.

So instead of taking off money as excess purchasing power, we actually paid back more money, gave it to war contractors, many of whom had gotten rich during this war and by reason of this war, notwithstanding the fact that the platforms of both parties have consistently proclaimed against people making money out of the war and by reason of the war; notwithstanding the fact that the veteran organizations, year in and year out, have said "We will not have any more war millionaires"; but the Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, comes along and creates crop No. 1 of millionaires of World War No. 2.

SECOND CROP OF WAR MILLIONAIRES COMING UP

In addition to that, we have another tax bill now, and there is a provision in it to change the Renegotiation Act that will make another crop of war millionaires. If that is successfully put through the House and Senate and becomes a law, that will be a crop of war millionaires No. 2, caused by the Seventy-eighth Congress, probably the second session, because it is not possible for it to go through this time.

So this Congress has a sordid record on combating inflation.

It is my sincere hope that all Members of this House will give earnest consideration to this vital question during the holidays, and that when we return we can have a more consistent record of fighting and winning problem No. 2, second only to winning the war—that is, winning the fight against inflation.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have read that through renegotiation, under a law we passed about 2 years ago to correct the war profits possible under the cost-plus system, there has already been saved between five and six billion dollars to the Treasury. As I understand it, these enormous profits have voluntarily been cut down to reasonable size. Do I understand the gentleman to indicate now that there is a proposal in the new tax bill which will make it possible to open up all that matter and possibly require paying out of the Treasury as many billion dollars as we have thus far saved? The Treasury would not benefit much from a law which would yield $2,000,000,000 and lead to paying out $5,000,000,000.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will read the statement that was issued by Mr. Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, on yesterday, published in the papers this morning, I believe he will come to the conclusion that the public interest will greatly suffer if the proposed renegotiation amendment becomes law. The statement as contained in the New York Times this morning is as follows:

SEED OF A SCANDAL PUT INTO TAX BILL, SAYS MORGENTHAU—RENEGOTIATION CLAUSES HELD TO OPEN THE DOOR TO "TRULY EXTORTIONATE PROFITS"—CUT IN YIELD DENOUNCED—GOVERNMENT WOULD BE "AWFULLY BADLY OFF" BUT STILL BETTER OFF WITH NO BILL, HE ADDS

WASHINGTON, December 20.—Secretary Morgenthau denounced Congress tonight for

batting down his new revenue bill to one-fifth of his recommendations and charged the lawmakers with opening the door to "truly extortionate profits" by war contractors.

The heated comment by the Secretary of the Treasury at a press conference immediately raised the prospect of a request for a Presidential veto of the entire tax bill.

Mr. Morgenthau held out one hope for his aims, a reversal of congressional opinion over the Christmas recess, which is not considered very likely.

Two actions by the House and by the Senate Finance Committee on the Treasury's $10,500,000,000 tax bill were denounced—the way it was cut down to $2,284,000,000, and the amendments rewriting the act for renegotiation of war contracts to recapture excess profits.

WOULD PREFER NO TAX BILL

As to the revenue yield provided now, Mr. Morgenthau said:

"The Treasury would be better off with no tax bill—but on that basis we would be awfully badly off."

Of the liberalized renegotiation phases, the Secretary, biting off his words, asserted:

"They open the way to truly extortionate profits. I predict that if they are enacted into law they will come back to plague not only the Congress but the war-goods manufacturers who get temporary gain from them.

"They hold the seed of a national scandal.

"I refer to provisions such as those eliminating from renegotiation the makers of so-called standard articles and the retroactive exemption of subcontractors whose goods do not enter into the final products. Other provisions of the bill would leave final settlements under renegotiation open for years to come."

The "smartest thing business can do," Mr. Morgenthau said "is to leave the renegotiation law alone, unless business executives want to spend the rest of their lives on the Hill before investigating committees."

STANDARD ARTICLES EXEMPTED

The Finance Committee wrote in a clause completely exempting from renegotiation all contracts and subcontracts for standard commercial articles. Since such articles were defined generally as identical to those sold for civilian or commercial use prior to January 1, 1940, it was believed that contracts for such things as blankets, lumber, bolts, electric motors, and so on would become final, and not subject to repricing by the Government.

Another Senate committee amendment exempts construction contracts let under competitive bidding. The House had written exemptions for contracts covering agricultural and dairy products. In any case, if a contract involves less than $500,000 a year, it would not be subject to renegotiation under the amended bill. The present minimum is $100,000.

Further, a new central price adjustment board, to be established under the act, would be required, in determining whether a contractor's profits are excessive, to give due consideration to his Federal taxes and the cost of reconverting his plant to peacetime uses.

FIVE BILLIONS ALREADY RECOVERED

Renegotiation so far has recovered more than $5,000,000,000 from war contracts.

In addition to the way Mr. Morgenthau feels about it, there are reports in the Senate that President Roosevelt himself may make an issue of the renegotiation changes if they finally are approved.

Proponents of the changes argue, however, that renegotiation has outlived its usefulness and one Republican Senator observed: "If our Government officials have not learned to write a proper contract in 2 years of war they ought to give up."

On the total revenue side, Mr. Morgenthau protested that while the tax bill appears to promise about $2,100,000,000, the calculations leave out of consideration the decision to freeze social-security pay-roll taxes at 1 percent. A resolution was adopted to do this, so that an automatic rise to 2 percent would not go into effect January 1.

This, the Secretary said, will mean reducing social-security collections by $1,400,000,000 (below expectations) next year and the effect will be to increase the amounts the Government will have to raise in future years.

Constitutionality of legislation authorizing the War Department to renegotiate war contracts was challenged in a petition filed today in the Supreme Court.

It was presented by the Alliance Brass & Bronze Co. of Alliance, Ohio, which wants the Supreme Court to prevent Secretary Stimson, of the War Department, from proceeding with the renegotiation of the company's 1942 contracts.

Charles F. Short, Jr., Chicago attorney for the company, contended that the renegotiation legislation is invalid because it confers on executive departments or administrative tribunals, the power to make final determinations of all matters in relation to what may constitute reasonable profits.

The controversy, Mr. Short said, is one which should be decided by a jury trial in a court.

Explaining that the Government had not claimed that the company had made any excessive or unreasonable profit, Mr. Short added:

"POINTS TO POSSIBILITY OF DEBT

"The threat is to reexamine the situation with the possibility of a debt against the company, created by the uncontrollable action of the secretary, should this court deny the prayer of this petition, with no right of review of his decision even if rendered ex parte.

"The author of this brief knows of no place outside Nazi Germany where such an arbitrary proceeding would be audacious enough to claim the blessing of legal or judicial propriety.

"A devotion to the concept that complicated matters of Government must increasingly be done through administrative agencies, is misguided if it leads in any degree toward the totalitarian goal of uncontrolled authority in any agent of Government."

Mr. Short filed his application directly with the Supreme Court without first going through the lower courts. Technically, he sought a writ of prohibition or a writ of mandamus to compel Secretary Stimson to stop pending renegotiation proceedings.

Now, what is the history of this law? I do not know all the history, but I do know that at one time people were making so much money on contracts involving the making of oceangoing vessels, maritime vessels, that the Committee on Naval Affairs brought in a bill which was later enacted into law, which fixed the limit of profits at 10 percent that any contractor could make. When this war came on the business people themselves said, "We do not want any arbitrary limit of 10 percent such as you have already fixed here as a yardstick. Let us have renegotiation. We know that we do not have the experience to make all these things. We will go ahead and we will take the contract and do the best we can. If we make too much money, we will give part of it back. Neither the Government nor the contractors have had any experience in making the things necessary to be made."

So they wanted renegotiation. They wanted to get rid of that arbitrary fixing of profits. So after they got rid of that and they got renegotiation of contracts; now they want to repeal the renegotiation feature. If it is done I warn Members of this House now that that will be recognized and branded, and properly so, as this Congress creating a second group of war millionaires in World War No. 2. We have already created one, against everything that all of us have said.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an editorial appearing in the Hopkins County Echo, a newspaper published in my district, on the question of inflation limited; and also a statement by Secretary Morgenthau before the Finance Committee of the United States Senate on November 25, 1943, on the question of the tax bill, and Mr. Morgenthau's statement on renegotiation, and a speech that was delivered by Mr. Randolph E. Paul, general counsel of the Treasury, before the Providence National Association of Cost Accountants at Providence, R. I., on November 15, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matters referred to are as follows:

[From the Hopkins County (Tex.) Echo of December 17, 1943]

INFLATION LIMITED

Remember when the dollar was devalued back in 1933?

This means inflation. So many an economist and editorial writer warned. But though often scheduled to make its appearance, this bogey did not reveal itself for 10 years.

Today, most of us realize that we have a mild form of inflation with us. Moreover, most of the American civilians rather like it. Quite a number want to see a little more. Yet they all shiver at the prospect of getting it out of control.

Inflation is rather like fire. A small amount of fire in a grate is comfortable and cheerful. Too big a fire makes the guests push their chairs back. But when the fire spills out on the floor and the guests do nothing about it the house burns down.

We have defined inflation before simply as the declining power of our circulating medium (money and bank deposits) to secure merchandise and services in return. Or one might put it as the declining purchasing power of the dollar.

If the supply of dollars increases faster than the supply of things and services to buy, the dollars become cheaper. That is, it takes more dollars to buy what we think we need than formerly. People can't eat or wear dollars. In the final satisfaction of human wants groceries and clothes are more important than metal or paper dollars. When the supply of groceries and clothes becomes limited people with dollars in their pockets will bid up the price of the real necessities of life.

Yes, the supply of dollars is increasing—and rapidly. It is coming about primarily because of the deficit financing of our National Government. By the strange operations of our credit system, when the National Government borrows a billion dollars from banks, it creates a billion dollars of new bank deposits on paper. But these bank deposits are identical for all purposes with an equal amount of the kind of money one puts in his purse.

Then why not borrow without restraint? Don't you have your cake and eat it too that way? Actually, some influential persons in the Nation believe and advocate just that.

Well, Germany after World War No. 1 is the answer. Bread came to be worth millions

of marks a loaf. In fact marks came to be worth exactly nothing save as waste paper.

And in the meantime the savings of the people in bank deposits, annuities, life insurance policies were wiped out—East Texas magazine.

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY MORGENTHAU BEFORE THE FINANCE COMMITTEE OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE, NOVEMBER 29, 1943

When I appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House on October 4 to present the administration's suggestions for increased war taxes, I gave to that committee as best I could a picture of the financial position of the Nation and its wartime revenue needs. I stated that the fiscal situation required much heavier wartime taxation and that it was our opinion that the people could pay additional wartime taxes of at least $10,500,000,000. The Ways and Means Committee and the House reached a different result and approved a bill increasing revenues by only $2,000,000,000. In view of this wide difference on a matter so important to the present and future welfare of this Nation, we have carefully reviewed the fiscal situation. I am appearing before you today to present our conclusions.

The outstanding fact in our financial picture is the stupendous bill which this war will leave behind. On that point there can be no quibbling. We are accumulating debt at the rate of over $150,000,000 a day. Last month (October 1943) the Federal Government spent $5,600,000,000 more than it collected in revenue. In the fiscal year 1942 the deficit was $21,000,000,000, in 1943 it was $57,000,000,000, and in 1944 it is expected to be $57,000,000,000 again. On the basis of any estimates we can now make, we foresee a public debt at the end of the present fiscal year of about $200,000,000,000. On such a debt the interest charges alone will be close to $4,000,000,000 a year. As the war continues the debt, the interest, and the problem of repayment will grow larger and larger.

In this situation if we pay in taxes any less than we can now afford to pay, we shall be unfair to those who must face the accumulated bill after the war has been fought and won. We shall be doing a particularly great injustice to the men who are fighting our battles on foreign soil. We shall not only be asking the 10,000,000 members of the armed forces to give the most important years out of their lives to fight the war; we shall also be requiring them as a large body of future taxpayers to pay in taxes after the war what we could and should have paid while they were fighting.

It is clear that we are not paying all the wartime taxes that we can and should pay. We are not now fighting an all-out war on the fiscal front. All the estimates of national income, by whomever made, bear eloquent testimony to the fact that the ability of the American people to pay increased taxes is far from being exhausted. In the fiscal year 1939 individuals had incomes, after personal taxes, of $65,000,000,000. In the fiscal year 1944 it is estimated that individuals will have incomes of $126,000,000,000, after allowance for all present taxes. That is, after paying taxes, incomes of people in the United States will have almost doubled since 1939.

The incomes of the American people are not only ample to pay much higher taxes. The spending power of these incomes is so great as to threaten rapid and burdensome increases in the cost of living. About half of American productive effort is going into war equipment and supplies for our armed forces. These products are not available for civilian consumption. Yet our people are being paid for all they produce. They thus have far more money to spend than there are goods on which to spend it. In the fiscal year 1944 this surplus of income over goods is expected to amount to about $36,000,000,000 after payment of personal taxes. If those who hold this surplus income try to spend it on consumer goods the inevitable result will be black markets, ruptured price ceilings, and substantial increases in the cost of living, followed by tremendous pressures for higher wages and farm prices, which will set in motion further forces in the spiral of inflation.

Up to this point spending has been held down and we have avoided disastrous price increases. We have done this through a variety of measures. Price ceilings and rationing, wage and salary stabilization, and the taxes already imposed have all had a restraining effect. The campaigns for the voluntary purchase of War bonds with their emphasis on saving have been a strong influence in curbing spending.

But we cannot expect these controls to hold indefinitely in the face of a continued large surplus of income over goods and a great accumulation of spendable liquid wartime savings. Day after day, the continuous pressure of spending power has been cracking our price controls a little here and a little there and threatens to produce a major break-down. We are courting danger if we do not do all that is possible through the tax mechanism to strengthen the foundations of our stabilization program.

I have been told that the American people do not believe in the dangers of inflation. I cannot believe that is true, but there may be a confusion of meaning. If by inflation is meant a situation where money becomes worthless, I agree that the danger now is not of that character. It is rather the danger of substantial and continuous and, at least in part, permanent rises in prices that would undermine standards of living, reduce the value of investments, and impair the security we seek to achieve through savings and insurance. Unfortunately, lack of belief in the danger of inflation does not remove that danger. There are few indeed who have followed with care the developments of the recent past who are not concerned over the possible break-down of the stabilization program. Higher wartime taxes obviously cannot meet the danger alone, but they are necessary if it is to be met.

I have also been told that some people have a defeatist attitude toward our fiscal problem. They argue that, since the deficit is so large, the Government debt so huge, and the inflationary possibilities of surplus income and accumulated private savings so great, a few billion dollars more or less will not make a great deal of difference and that therefore we might as well avoid the unpopularity of imposing additional taxes. I think this would be a poor excuse to give to the returning soldier who will be interested to know what sacrifices we incurred at home to protect his future.

In fact, however, $10,500,000,000 of additional taxes would have very important effects on the deficit, the debt, and the inflationary pressure. In its direct effects on spending, in the renewed assurance it would give that the elected and appointed representatives of the people take the problems of the public debt seriously, and in the sobering influence it would have on public understanding of the true cost of the war, a $10,500,000,000 increase in taxes would be immensely beneficial.

Perhaps the most superficially plausible and therefore the most insidious argument I have recently heard is that economy in governmental expenditures is a substitute for higher taxes. Economy is always an important objective and a tax bill makes it neither more or less desirable. I am in complete and hearty sympathy with any measure that can be adopted to reduce governmental costs, to reduce even war costs so long as the reductions do not impair our war effort. But if we are to fight the war to a speedy conclusion we cannot relax our fighting or our production for war. That means we cannot significantly relax our spending. I am not in sympathy with any measures or any proposal to cut expenditures in any way that will make our total production anything less than an all-out effort.

At the time I appeared before the Ways and Means Committee, I said that "while it may be possible, and I hope it is, to curtail some governmental expenditures, even that will not lessen our need for getting at this time all that the American people can possibly give us in additional taxation." That is still my position.

The Bureau of the Budget has just released estimates that total expenditures for the fiscal year 1944 which ends next June 30 will amount to $98,000,000,000 instead of the $106,000,000,000 in the estimate issued last August. It is understood that this decrease in expenditures represents a combination of changes in the war program and a delay in reaching the production goals of some items. Revenues were estimated at $41,000,000,000 instead of $38,000,000,000. The over-all result of the revision is to reduce the previously expected deficit from $68,000,000,000 to $57,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1944.

There is nothing in the new Budget figures in our opinion to warrant reducing our goal below $10,500,000,000 of additional wartime taxes. If no one had originally expected more than a $57,000,000,000 deficit for the fiscal year 1944, the amount would appear tremendous, which it truly is. It is no less so because it represents a reduction from a previously estimated higher figure. Fifty-seven billion dollars is equal to last year's record deficit, and is almost three times the deficit of 1942.

The Budget revisions do not alter the fact that we can pay much higher taxes; they do not in any degree affect our moral obligation to meet now all of the costs of the war that can be met by current taxation; and they do not affect in significant degree the serious inflationary dangers that face us for the balance of this fiscal year, the succeeding fiscal years as long as the war shall last, and in the post-war period. Our tax goal, as I pointed out to the Ways and Means Committee, was the amount that we believed could be fairly distributed without undue sacrifice and hardship. From every point of view it is a minimum fiscal program in the light of the deficit, the accumulated debt, and the inflationary pressure.

In view of all these facts, the House bill, in my opinion, falls far short even of an attempt to meet our fiscal needs in a realistic or courageous way.

Let us bear in mind that an essential part of fighting a war is paying for it in the right way at the right time. There is no escape from the costs of war. It is a great fallacy to suppose that we can fight history's greatest war to save what we hold most dear without financial sacrifice. Inevitably we shall experience much greater financial sacrifice than we have thus far. Taxation now, during the war, is the easiest way to make that sacrifice.

In presenting our national fiscal problem to you, I have endeavored to perform the duty placed on the Secretary of the Treasury by law and tradition. I have endeavored to show you as objectively and as clearly as I can that a tax program of not less than $10,500,000,000 is needed to safeguard the financial and economic future of this country during the war and after the war.

WARTIME TAXES

(Address by Randolph E. Paul)

It was very kind of you to invite me to talk to you this evening about wartime taxes. And I was very glad to accept an invitation to speak in the home town of one of the House Ways and Means Committee's ablest

members and hardest workers. This, I assure you, is not faint praise, for that committeee is indefatigable. It has had me at the ropes many times; and while I may be expendable, I am not quickly exhaustible. It is a great pleasure to thank Mr. FORAND for his never-failing courtesy in debate and for his patient understanding—even when he doesn't agree—of the Treasury's sincere desire to be of assistance to his important committee.

There is still another reason that I am glad to be here tonight. This is a pleasant reversal of usual procedure. I am accustomed to speaking before Mr. FORAND at sessions of the Ways and Means Committee. But Mr. FORAND always has the last word there.

In selecting the subject of the evening I shall assume that you had in mind something more definite than the general subject of taxes in wartime, and that your title refers to the specific crisis confronting this country at this particular stage of World War No. 2. Since our time is necessarily limited, I shall not burden you with details which are not essential. I shall try to give you a picture of the forest. One misses the forest if he tries to see every tree. In taxation the whole is not always the same as the sum of the separate parts. A difference in degree merges into a difference in kind. What we need more than anything else today is a balanced vision of the whole.

THE NECESSITY FOR INCREASED TAXES

Early in the war the necessity of increased taxes was clear enough. Even at the end of 1941 the Government was spending money at an unprecedented rate, $2,500,000,000 a month in December 1941. This governmental spending was creating a purchasing power which made direct controls necessary. Formal price control, which began in the spring of 1941, was greatly extended during the first half of 1942. A program of consumer rationing was instituted late in December 1941. At first it covered only rubber tires. Automobile rationing went into effect at the beginning of 1942. The rationing of sugar began in May, coffee late in November, shoes and processed foods early in 1943. In October 1942 the President, through the War Labor Board and the Treasury, attempted the stabilization of wages.

THE ECONOMIC SITUATION IN THE SUMMER OF 1943

Suppose we pass on to the situation on our economic front last summer. We had been through nearly a year and a half of war. The military tide was beginning to turn—our way. In 1942 Congress had enacted the longest and toughest revenue act in our history. By the middle of 1943 we had put our individual tax system substantially on a pay-as-you-go basis. This new method of payment enabled us to collect more promptly taxes due upon the higher incomes rapidly being produced by the war. We had reached the point—somewhat late—where the Congress was free to turn its attention to a rate bill.

THE NATIONAL DEBT

In 1942 only a few, chief among them the President, were bold enough to dream that we would attain a record level of war production as early as 1943. Our success on the production front was recorded in a sensational rise in expenditures, which was reflected in turn in a corresponding rise in the public debt. On December 7, 1941, our national debt stood at about $55 billion. By June 30, 1943, it had risen to $136,700,000,000. It is estimated that it will be about $206,000,000,000 at the end of this fiscal year, June 30, 1944. War expenditures, estimated at $100,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, had reached the monthly level of more than $7,000,000,000 in August 1943, the second month of this fiscal year. Every month since last February we had spent more money on war activities than we spent in the entire fiscal year 1941.

PRICE RISES

Prices had also risen. The amount of inflation registered by the cost of living index since it started to rise early in 1941 is now well toward 25 percent. Price increases have been heaviest for food and some of the basic necessities of life. A recent sampling of prices by O. P. A. indicated that in many instances actual retail food prices were above legal ceilings. Illicit trafficking in ration coupons, and the tendency of meat, poultry, and gasoline to leak out of regular channels and into black markets, threatened price stability. We have been learning the hard way that inflationary money is not easily discouraged.

WE HAVE INFLATION

In the summer of 1943 we had inflation. True, it was only a moderate inflation. Some argue, and many more feel, that a little inflation would be a good thing. Let me reply as the President did: A little inflation is like opium; soon you want more; and then you have the habit.

THE 1944 BUDGET AND NATIONAL INCOME

A heavy strain on prices was inevitable. With taxes at a level of $40,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1944, we were faced with a deficit of $66,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1944 and an almost certain heavy borrowing from the commercial banks. Huge war expenditures had resulted in an increased national income. The latest estimates put national income for the fiscal year 1944 at $152,000,000,000, even more than that for the calendar year 1944. Direct personal taxes would reduce spendable income after taxes by only $21,000,000,000, leaving $131,000,000,000 of disposable income, a figure about $50,000,000,000 higher than national income before taxes in the halcyon year 1929. The war had proved a bonanza.

THE PARADOX OF FINANCIAL PROSPERITY AND SCARCE GOODS

Our war production has given us an economic shot in the arm and put a new flush of prosperity on the Nation's face. The paradox of the situation is that the cause which produces this unparalleled prosperity removes the possibility of satisfying with consumer goods the desire to spend, created by expended income. About one-half of our productive capacity is marching off to war. The half that stays at home is producing no more than $89,000,000,000 of civilian goods at current prices. Disposable current income is more than $40,000,000,000 in excess of goods to be bought. We have developed an economy in which only $10 of goods are available for each $15 of disposable income. Yet the American people are spending an increased amount to eat, drink, and be merry. Comparing this year with the average of the typical prewar years, 1936 to 1939, expenditures in eating and drinking places have increased 143 percent. Expenditures in clothing stores have increased 102 percent, and in jewelry stores 218 percent.

Is there any answer but inflation? That is America's $150,000,000,000 question.

SAVINGS

Even these staggering figures do not give the whole picture. From the beginning of 1940 to June 30, 1943—in 3½ years—the American people saved $55,000,000,000. Of this total $24,000,000,000 are in the form of currency and checking accounts; $21,000,000,000 are in the form of redeemable or marketable bonds. It is a masterpiece of understatement to call these savings volatile; from the standpoint of post-war inflation they are liquid dynamite. Assume a slackening of governmental spending at the end of the war in Europe, followed by a short lull in civilian spending, and try then to imagine what will happen when millions of people, impatient with wartime direct controls, try to spend these savings to replace worn-out clothes, household equipment, automobiles,—all the things they have been longing to buy for several years. If we have the courage to impose additional taxes in time, we may be able to keep the post-war money floodgates closed. If we delay, if we disregard the inflationary thunderheads gathering in the form of liquid savings, there can be nothing but bitter economic weather ahead.

COMMERCIAL BANK BORROWING

Cold figures make it clear that hot dollars are also being created by commercial bank borrowing. War financing through banks is generally conceded to be dangerous. Bank purchases of government securities lead directly to an increase in cash assets held by the public. To the extent that bank depositors lend their deposits to the Government by buying bonds, no new funds are created; funds are merely transferred from private to Treasury accounts. But when banks buy Government securities for themselves, they have no right to make charges against their depositors' accounts; the result is that new funds are created. In payment for Government bonds the banks customarily set up "War loan accounts" payable to the United States Treasury. As the Treasury draws on these accounts to finance war expenditures, the new funds flow into the pocketbooks and bank accounts of individual citizens and business firms.

During the fiscal year 1943 banks thus increased their holdings of Federal securities by about $30,000,000,000. This was the main factor in expanding by about 36 percent the total of coin, paper money, and checking deposits held by the public. These holdings are liquid fuel which is ready and waiting to feed the fires of inflation.

THE EVILS OF INFLATION

The psychology of inflation is hopeful; its symptoms are exhilarating; but its hideous effects beggar description. Inflation is the mortal foe of every bank deposit, every insurance policy, and every War bond. It would increase the cost of the war and the service charge on our post-war debt. Even more important from the immediate standpoint would be the resulting inequitable distribution of our scarce goods. The orders of the day would go to black and grey markets. Those with the most money and the least scruples would get the lion's share of the goods. People with low incomes would come out on the short end. People who work overtime would have the least opportunity to buy. The real cost of the war—not the money cost, but the cost in terms of the things we must do without—would be badly distributed over our population. I need not describe the effect such a maldistribution would have upon home-front morale. It is obvious that the war effort would be the first to suffer from inflation.

THE FUNCTION OF TAXES

I have said that I would discuss the specific crisis confronting the country at this particular stage of the war. "Crisis" is a poor word for what we face. Our problem is second in importance only to results on the military front. And the answers we make to today's economic questions cannot fail to influence the shape of events on the military front.

What is the mission of taxes in this crisis? How can they help win the fight against inflation? The answer is simple. Taxes impound spending power. By taking away spendable income they reduce the strain on the defense line of rationing and price control, just as wage stabilization eases that strain. No one knows the ultimate breaking point of these direct control devices.

But we do know that they are now weakening, and we also know that well-chosen additional taxes may very well be the saving factor.

THE TAX LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

If this be true, one might well say: "Let's have some taxes in a hurry." Inflation waits for no body of men—not even the Congress of the United States. But tax bills take time. They aren't built in a day. The Constitution places the power to levy taxes in the Congress. All the Treasury can do in a time of crisis—or, for that matter, at any other time—is to place its recommendations before the Congress. Its first point of contact is with the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, which is the legislative body in which revenue bills must originate. I do not know how many of you—outside of Mr. Forand and Mr. Picchione—have ever seen with your own eyes the grinding of the legislative tax mill. I have had the privilege—and the pain—of close contact with it, and I should like to give you, by way of background, a picture of a revenue act as it goes through the mill.

A revenue bill usually starts with the submission of recommendations to the Ways and Means Committee by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary appears before the committee, and he and his staff are questioned by most of the 25 members. This process may occupy 1 or 2 days. Public hearings follow. At these hearings we have what Justice Holmes once called free trade in ideas. Witness after witness, some appearing individually and others speaking on behalf of chambers of commerce, business organizations, labor unions, and other groups, espouse and press their interests; sometimes, I am bound to say, their very selfish interests.

After 2 or 3 weeks of testimony the Ways and Means Committee shuts the door and goes into executive, or secret, session. In this session the recommendations of the Secretary, and all other recommendations are discussed at length. Facts and arguments are presented by members of the Treasury staff and the experts of the joint staff of the committee. Votes are taken on specific motions and at long last a bill emerges from a thicket of obscurity. This bill is drafted, not by the Treasury, but by the legislative staff of Congress. The bill is then sent to the House floor, usually with a rule limiting amendments from the floor. A vote is finally taken, and a bill is passed by the House. This bill is sent to the Senate.

History repeats itself before the Senate Finance Committee. Again the Secretary and his staff appear personally. Again public witnesses testify in open session. Again there is a secret executive session. At length, a bill is sent by the Finance Committee to the Senate floor. In the Senate there can be no closed rule, and amendments may be made on the floor in the course of debate. Finally, a bill is passed by the Senate. It may be a totally different bill from the House bill. The two bills are sent to the conference committee for reconciliation.

The conference committee consists of the ranking members of the Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee. Its job is to compromise the differing House and Senate bills into one bill. New matter is not in conference. The sessions of the conference committee are all secret. Every difference between the two bills must be discussed in detail. Either the House or the Senate, acting through its group, must recede from the position of its principal. When all conflicts are resolved, a new bill is written, which must again be passed by both the House and the Senate. Customarily each of these bodies approves the action of its conferees.

THE TREASURY PROGRAM

On October 4, 1943, the Secretary of the Treasury presented to the Ways and Means Committee the recommendations of the Treasury and of the President for new 1943 revenue legislation. The total additional taxes recommended came to $10,500,000,000 for a full year of operation. Of this total, $6,500,000,000 consisted of additional individual income taxes, some part of which might be made refundable after the war; $2,500,000,000 of excise taxes; $1,100,000,000 of corporate taxes; and $400,000,000 of estate and gift taxes. In addition, the Secretary recommended against a general retail sales tax, and against a tax on increased earnings of individuals.

In parentheses I might say that the Treasury's affirmative recommendations are displaying definite intimations of mortality. Putting things a little less poetically, the dog's tail is being cut off just behind the ears. The latest returns from the Ways and Means Committee showed a total of a little more than $2,000,000,000.

As I have said, part of the Secretary's program was negative. Before I pass on to a discussion of the proposed increases in taxes, I would like to give you the reasons for the Treasury's opposition to a Federal retail sales tax and a tax on increases in individual income.

THE SALES TAX

Since I am discussing wartime taxes this evening, I shall not stress the inequity of a Federal sales tax. The standard peacetime objection to such a tax is that it imposes a disproportionate tax load upon the low income groups. This objection is even more cogent in wartime, since a tax which infringes on an adequate standard of living cannot fail to impair workers' morale and hurt production.

In this particular war there are additional practical objections. A Federal retail sales tax would be a new tax. It would impose upon the Bureau of Internal Revenue an added administrative burden out of all proportion to the burden of collecting an equal amount of additional revenue from existing taxes. A 10-percent tax with no exemptions whatever would produce about $6,000,000,000 of revenue annually. It would have to be collected by more than two and one-half million business establishments scattered throughout the United States. The 10 percent rate would stimulate evasion. All business establishments would have to be policed. Trained personnel, automobiles, tires, gasoline, and accounting machines would be required. It is at least doubtful whether an adequate force and sufficient facilities could be obtained. But assuming that they could, adequate enforcement of the tax would divert valuable manpower and equipment, which might better be employed in more fruitful endeavors.

Collecting the tax is not only a problem for the Bureau. Merchants would be required to keep adequate records which would generally involve entries not needed for ordinary accounting or income-tax purpose. This burden, superimposed upon rationing and price-control duties, would be almost intolerable. Here again, valuable manpower would not be employed in its most productive capacity. It might be worth while to undertake this new administrative task if the sales tax were well adapted to our present economic situation. But it is not. While it is true that sales-tax dollars would absorb some disposable income, it is also true that the imposition of a sales tax upon all articles would immediately cause an increase in the cost-of-living index. The control of wages is geared to this index, and it would be almost impossible to resist demands for increased wages based upon an increased cost of living.

Directly or indirectly, the ceiling and support prices of most farm products are linked to farm parity prices. This link means that these prices are relative rather than fixed, and that they respond to the party index. A 10-percent sales tax on a reasonably broad basis would increase that index by 6 or 7 percent. The operation of the parity formula would immediately raise parity prices for agricultural commodities by 6 or 7 percent. Ceiling and support prices of various products would probably have to be adjusted to take the change in parity into account.

Thus, if a 10-percent sales tax had become effective on July 1, 1943, estimates indicate that there would have been an average increase of 6 percent in retail food prices during 1944, exclusive of the tax. When the 10-percent tax is included, this increase would raise food costs by approximately 16 percent. Moving over from food prices to the over-all cost of-living index, which includes many items not subject to tax, and taking into account both direct price increases and indirect tax-induced increases in food prices, it is estimated that the cost-of-living index would rise about 10 percent.[1]

TAX ON INCREASES IN INCOME

A tax on increases in income is no happier solution of our difficulty. The philosophy of such a tax would, of course, be extremely difficult to defend. We would be saying that two individuals with the same income should be paying a different tax. Moreover, we would be saying that the higher tax was payable by the person who had received less income in previous years. He might very properly reply that his ability to pay was less than that of the person who had received the greater income in previous years.

A tax on increases of income is objectionable on even more practical grounds. One has to find some normal standard against which increases may be measured, say, income for the year 1939. Most of our millions of taxpayers do not know their income for previous years. The Bureau has received no returns for earlier years from most of these taxpayers. Even if the amount of income for the base year were determinable, it would still be necessary to differentiate between normal and war increases. The modest increase in the salary of a postman, fireman, or a college professor, in accordance with an established promotion schedule, is an example of a normal increase. Equitable differentiation between normal increases in income and increases directly connected with war profits would entail more relief provisions than are contained in the corporate excess-profits tax.

Finally, there is a compelling wartime objection to a tax on increases of income. Increases of income have been received in large part by persons who are working overtime and women who have gone into industry to help the war effort and the family income. Where a son or husband has entered the armed services the family income is likely to be reduced, even though the wife or another member of the family receives a larger income now than in the base period. Many recipients of increases in income have moved to high-cost defense areas. If we imposed a substantial tax on these increases we would be impairing the incentive of many workers to continue in vital war production.[2]

---

[1] Further information on the sales tax may be obtained by writing to the House Ways and Means Committee for Part 11 of the Un-Revised Hearings on Revenue Revision of 1943.

[2] Further information on taxation of increases in individual income may be obtained by writing to the House Ways and Means Committee for Part I of the Unrevised Hearings and Revenue Revision of 1943.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE TREASURY PROGRAM

Three principal arguments have been made against the Treasury's affirmative program. I should like now to repeat these arguments for you and let you decide how well they meet the issue.

THE PROGRAM REACHES INFLATIONARY DOLLARS

The first argument is that the Treasury program in its attempt to help control inflation does not dip into the income brackets where inflationary dollars are most menacing. In his statement before the Ways and Means Committee the Secretary said: "Four-fifths of all the income of the Nation is going to people earning less than $5,000 a year." Consistent with this principle the Treasury program does call for substantially increased taxation of a large number of taxpayers with less than $5,000 a year. It does not, of course, demand higher taxes from everyone receiving less than $5,000. Some of these people have incomes barely above subsistence levels. Just because the Treasury program did not call for heavily increased taxes on everyone below $5,000, some critics have charged that it was inconsistent with the Secretary's statement. The sophistry of this charge must be self-evident. One might as well say that because people over 18 are eligible to apply for drivers' licenses, everyone over 18 should be permitted to drive a car.

We should be careful to understand precisely which individuals are treated lightly by the Treasury program. It is true that the elimination of the Victory tax relieves 11,000,000 taxpayers from the burden of that tax. But the lowering of the personal exemption brought back into the fold about 2,000,000 taxpayers, leaving a net loss of about 9,000,000 taxpayers. They would have paid a Victory tax of only about $300,000,000. This is a very small part of the total of $24,000,000,000 of individual income taxes that would have been payable under the Treasury program. The elimination of the Victory tax was recommended as a simplification measure as well as on grounds of equity. It is literally impossible to make the income tax sufficiently simple for the average taxpayer without eliminating the Victory tax with its disparate income tax base and exemptions. This makes it unnecessary to discuss the inequities of an increase in tax upon a married man with an income of less than $1,200 a year.

Of the increased income taxes proposed by the Treasury—$6,630,000,000 in total including refundable taxes—$1,600,000,000 would have been paid by the income groups under $3,000 of net income; $3,500,000,000, or more than half of the total, would have been paid by income groups under $5,000 of net income. Taking additional corporate taxes, excise taxes, and estate and gift taxes into the equation, $5,400,000,000, or about one-half of the total additional taxes proposed by the Treasury, would have been paid by the income groups under $5,000.

It is, of course, true that much of our increased national income has gone to persons with low or modest incomes. But it is also true that the incomes of millions of families still fall far short of adequate living standards. The fact that a large proportion of the $157,000,000,000 of income payments estimated for the calendar year 1944 will go to persons with incomes of $3,000 and less does not mean that the taxpaying ability of these millions of persons is substantial. We must look behind aggregates to individual cases. When we do so we find that the margin of disposable income over and above wartime needs is a narrow one for many families. Out of sixty-seven and three-tenths million income recipients, fifty-eight and two-tenths million receive incomes of less than $3,000. In the aggregate these persons receive $96,200,000,000 before personal taxes. This appears to be a fruitful source of additional taxes until we compute the number of dollars per income recipient. That figure is about $1,650 per recipient before taxes, or about $1,500 after taxes. It does not leave much opportunity for inflationary spending.

To impose additional taxes so heavy that they would cut into this margin would be false economy. It would deprive workers of basic necessities and thus undermine their productive efficiency and morale. Moreover, we should not forget that individuals in these low-income brackets bear a disproportionate share of the existing tax load, both Federal and State.

ECONOMY AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR TAXES

Others who oppose the Treasury's tax program assert that additional taxes are not necessary if we would curtail Government expenditures. They offer economy as a substitute for increased taxes. They urge that a reduction in Government expenditures would completely obviate the need for additional taxes.

It should not be necessary for me to say that the Treasury is in sympathy with the objective of curtailing all expenditures which may safely be deferred until after the war. The Secretary has been in the forefront working for economy. From time to time he has made recommendations for cutting governmental expenditures, many of which have been put into effect. But being against waste is like being against sin. Nonwar expenditures, exclusive of interest, are at the low level of $4,000,000,000. Curtailments of magnitude are possible only in connection with war expenditures. Here possible reductions—by "possible" I mean curtailments which will not impair the war effort—do not loom very large.

From the standpoint of inflation spendable income would still remain far in excess of available goods. Even a reduction in expenditures of $10,000,000,000 would do no more than give a $10,500,000,000 program a better chance to hold inflationary spending power and Government debt within manageable limits. It would give us a greater margin of safety in war finance, but it would not detract from the pressing need for additional taxes sufficiently to justify a lower program.

CAPACITY TO PAY

Finally, it is contended that the American people do not have additional capacity to pay more taxes. But here are facts: Comparing the fiscal year 1944 with 1940, income payments to individuals show an increase of about $75,000,000,000; in the same period individual income taxes have increased only about $18,000,000,000 a year. In other words, the present tax system is absorbing only about one-fourth of the increase in annual income payments generated by defense and war activities. The question is not whether the American people can afford to pay higher taxes, but whether they can afford not to pay them.

In an attempt to prove that American taxes are too high it is argued that taxes in the United States are higher in terms of dollars per capita than in the United Kingdom and Canada. This argument is, of course, wholly fallacious. Per capita taxes are not an indication of real burden. The proper test is the relation of taxes to the incomes of taxpayers. The burden of American taxes is lighter than the British and Canadian loads in terms of what counts—income remaining after taxes.[3]

The argument against additional income taxes is dramatized in statements to the effect that our existing tax rates are confiscatory when we combine their load with a required payment next March of uncanceled 1942 liabilities and State income taxes. It is said that some of our most fortunate citizens would have to pay a tax amounting to more than their year's income and that at the end of the year they would owe money for the privilege of living.

The most charitable word for such statements is that they are misleading. The ignored fact is that the Federal income tax allows for the deduction of State income taxes in computing net income. No matter how high the Federal and State rate schedules may be, the combination of the two can never result in a tax on one year's income in excess of 100 percent of net income.

Those who received a cancelation of three-quarters of 1942 tax liability are in no position to argue that taxes take more than 100 percent of income. The payment due March 15, 1944, of part of 1942 uncanceled tax liability cannot fairly be used to prove confiscation of 1944 incomes. This is a tax on 1942 income. If the taxes on the income of 2 or more years are added together and compared with 1 year's income, it is of course possible to reach a tax of more than 100 percent of 1 year's net income. But if we take 2 years of taxes into the comparison we should also take 2 years of net income. As a matter of fact, the cancelation of three-fourths of the tax on 1942 incomes was a windfall, making it easier, not harder, to pay tax on 1944 income.

INCREASED CORPORATE TAXES

The Secretary's recommendations to the Ways and Means Committee included additional corporate taxes of one and one-tenth billion dollars. The proposal was that the surtax rate of small corporations be increased 4 percent and those of large corporations 10 percent, making for the large corporations a combined normal and surtax rate of 50 percent. No additional excess-profits taxes were suggested. To promote post-war liquidity the Treasury also suggested a procedure for accelerating the payment of refunds attributable to the loss carry-back provision. This last item would have been particularly helpful to small business, which is more apt to have post-war cash problems.

CORPORATE WAR EARNINGS

The argument has been made that these increases drain life blood of corporations. This emotional argument ignores some startling figures which have been submitted to the Ways and Means Committee. Corporate profits (excluding dividends received) will reach the estimated level of twenty-two and six-tenth billion dollars for the calendar year 1943. The estimate for 1944 is twenty-four and five-tenth billion dollars. These profits are more than four times corporate profits for the year 1937, which was one of the most prosperous years of the thirties.

Taxes have also risen, it is true; they have been multiplied many times. Total corporate liabilities for income and excess-profits taxes amounted to slightly over one and one-fourth billion dollars for 1937. They have climbed to thirteen and one-half billion dollars for the year 1943. But taxes, even of this magnitude, have failed to keep up with the mad pace of increased earnings. For the year 1942 corporations will have left after taxes nearly eight and five-tenth billion dollars; and in 1943, nearly nine and two-tenth billion dollars. In 1937 they had left less than $4,000,000,000.

Nor have our high war taxes substantially affected dividends paid. The average of dividends paid for the years 1936 to 1940 was $4,100,000,000; the highest figure was $4,800,000,000 in the year 1937. For the years 1941, 1942, and 1943, dividends are estimated at $4,500,000,000, $4,100,000,000, and $4,000,000,000, respectively. Even after taxes and dividends are paid, the corporations of the country, including loss corporations, will have

[3] A mimeographed study, Comparison of Taxes in the United States, United Kingdom, and Canada, may be obtained from the Division of Public Relations, Treasury Department, Washington, D. C.

accumulated for the years 1942, 1943, and 1944 over $15,000,000,000 of undistributed corporate profits!

CORPORATE CASH POSITION

I have heard the argument that these high undistributed profits are invested in brick and mortar, and that they are not available as liquid funds to be used in postwar activity. However, recent studies show that liquid assets of corporations have risen even faster than retained earnings.

Nonfinancial corporations increased their holdings of currency, bank deposits, and United States Government securities by $12,000,000,000 during the 2 years 1941 and 1942 according to an estimate prepared by the Securities and Exchange Commission. If the accumulation of liquid assets in the first half of 1943 should continue at the present rate through the year, the total increase would be $25,000,000,000 for the 3 years, 1941, 1942, and 1943. A study just released by the Federal Reserve Board indicates that business deposits, both corporate and noncorporate, totalled $30,000,000,000 on July 31, 1943.[4] While all of these deposits would not be fully available for conversion to peacetime operations, and to provide working capital needed to maintain a high level of peacetime employment and production, it is hardly stretching a point to say that they reflect a generally liquid condition.

CONCLUSION

I hope the facts I have placed before you this evening make clear an issue which has become blurred in much discussion. Seldom are the outlines of an economic problem so black and white. The question is not whether we shall have no taxes, or some taxes, or more taxes than that. The question is whether we shall do everything possible to avoid inflation. I recognize that taxes cannot do the whole job. We need wage stabilization, rationing, price control, and other things. The fight on inflation is indivisible. I do not say that we can prevent runaway inflation. But at this eleventh hour we still have a chance. I hope we will take that chance—that we will grasp the nettle before it is too late.

Mr. PATMAN. I ask the Members, if they will be kind enough to do so, to read this statement by Secretary Morgenthau, who certainly should know this problem, as well as the statement by Mr. Paul, the general counsel.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has expired.

Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] is recognized for 3 minutes.

CHRISTMAS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, we sometimes lose sight of the historic character of Christmas as a great religious festival, but if we grasp its true spirit this year we will strengthen our defenses where they have at times been weak. I refer to our need for faith and for the spirit of sacrifice which are necessary elements in civilian as well as military endeavors. The faith of our fighting men is superb. Some of the great literature of this war is in the personal messages from them and has inspired the Nation.

We have equipped our Army and Navy with the best trained Chaplains' Corps in history. We have been assured that the religious life of our armed forces will be provided for, but on the home front we have too often assumed that selfish impulses are stronger than our capacity for unselfish action. Clever advertising is all right, glamour is not objectionable in the various governmental appeals, but there is something deeper and finer in America that these devices do not reach. We should therefore meet head-on the forces of materialism and selfishness.

The real America is one we have seen accept in its devotion to religion the sublime statement which is at the core of the Christian's faith, "Neither count I my life dear unto myself."

This capacity for self effacement and sacrifice constitutes a great resource which has been only partially utilized. It is this quality in American life rather than the desire for material gain that will respond.

In that spirit our people can be counted upon to accept cheerfully their share of the inconveniences, to accept the inevitable tax burdens, to waive some rights if by asserting them they cause unnecessary irritations. This is the quality in our national life that will maintain unity and good will at home, and finally prove us worthy of those who fight our battles.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1203. An act to limit private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States;

H. R. 1616. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended;

H. R. 2562. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey to the State Hospital at Goldsboro, Goldsboro, N. C., a certain tract of land, situated in Wayne County, N. C.;

H. R. 3598. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 171. Joint resolution to permit the importation from foreign countries free of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed, and suspending for 2 months the increase in the tax rates under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act;

H. J. Res. 209. Joint resolution extending until January 31, 1944, the provisions of the act of April 29, 1943, making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943; and

H. J. Res. 210. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. J. Res. 103. A joint resolution continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States; and

S. J. Res. 105. A joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1203. An act to limit private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States;

H. R. 1616. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended;

H. R. 2562. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey to the State Hospital at Goldsboro, Goldsboro, N. C., a certain tract of land, situated in Wayne County, N. C.;

H. R. 3598. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 171. Joint resolution to permit the importation from foreign countries free of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed, and suspending for 2 months the increase in the tax rates under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act.

H. J. Res. 209. Joint resolution extending until January 31, 1944, the provisions of the Act of April 29, 1943, making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943; and

H. J. Res. 210. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 29, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 29, the Chair declares the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress adjourned sine die.

Thereupon at 4 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m., the House adjourned sine die.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, notified the Clerk of the House of Representatives that he had approved acts and joint resolutions as follows:

On December 20, 1943:

H. J. Res. 199. Joint resolution to extend the time limit for immunity.

On December 21, 1943:

H. R. 2641. An act to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain lands for addition to the Sequoia National Park.

On December 22, 1943:

H. J. Res. 171. Joint Resolution to permit the importation from foreign countries free

[4] "Statistics of Deposit Ownership." Federal Reserve Bulletin, October 1943.

of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed, and suspending for 2 months the increase in the tax rates under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act.

On December 23, 1943:

H. J. Res. 209. Joint Resolution extending until January 31, 1944, the provisions of the Act of April 29, 1943, making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943;

H. J. Res. 210. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author;

H. R. 1203. An act to limit private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States;

H. R. 1616. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended;

H. R. 2545. An act for the relief of Samuel J. D. Marshall;

H. R. 2562. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey to The State Hospital at Goldsboro, Goldsboro, N. C., a certain tract of land, situated in Wayne County, N. C.; and

H. R. 3598. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COSTELLO: Committee on Military Affairs. Interim report on H. R. 3742 and H. R. 3799, bills to provide for payment of mustering-out pay to members of the armed forces; without amendment (Rept. No. 982). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3891 (by request). A bill to provide night differential for certain employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. R. 3892. A bill to require that psychiatric examinations be given to members of the land and naval forces prior to their trial before certain courts martial; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 3893. A bill to require granting of furloughs to overseas servicemen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAAS:

H. R. 3894. A bill to effectuate security of radio communications on merchant vessels during the war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SCANLON:

H. R. 3895. A bill to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 3896. A bill to establish Pacific standard time for that part of the State of Idaho now on mountain standard time, for the period during which daylight saving time is in effect; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OUTLAND:

H. Con. Res. 64. Concurrent resolution pertaining to the extension of the 3-mile limit; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr BONNER:

H. R. 3897. A bill for the relief of Lee Graham; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 3898. A bill for the relief of Frank Gay; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 3899. A bill for the relief of William B. Scott; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 3900. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nancy Ellen Satterlee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 3901. A bill granting an increase of pension to Annie M. Dill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3902. A bill granting a pension to Flora Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3903. A bill granting a pension to Hiram Russell Griffith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4154. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of Capt. Edward L. Grant Post No. 1225, American Legion, Department of New York, urging hospitalization for honorably discharged veterans of World War No. 2, also civilian clothing and mustering-out pay sufficient to maintain them until such time as they can find employment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4155. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Daisy Hyde and 52 other citizens of Philomath, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4156. By Mr. MURDOCK: Petition of Teresa M. Sloper and 21 other citizens of Clarkdale, Ariz., and vicinity, petitioning Congress to pass House bill 2082, introduced by the Honorable JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; a bill to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4157. Also, petition of Florence B. Armstrong and 37 other citizens of Tucson, Ariz., petitioning Congress to pass House bill 2082, introduced by the Honorable JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, a bill to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4158. Also, petition of Olive Goodykoontz and 47 other citizens of Chandler, Ariz., petitioning Congress to pass House bill 2082, introduced by the Honorable JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, a bill to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4159. Also, petition of Mrs. J. T. Hartman and 373 other citizens of Phoenix, Ariz., and vicinity, petitioning Congress to pass House bill 2082, introduced by the Honorable JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, a bill to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4160. Also, petition of Carrie L. Hollenbeck and 166 other citizens of Glendale, Ariz., petitioning Congress to pass House bill 2082, introduced by the Honorable JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, a bill to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4161. Also, petition of Lorenzo D. Rhoton and 369 other citizens of Mesa, Ariz., petitioning Congress to pass House bill 2082, introduced by the Honorable JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, a bill to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4162. Also, petition of Paul V. McCaw and 32 other citizens of Tempe, Ariz., petitioning Congress to pass House bill 2082, introduced by the Honorable JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, a bill to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4163. By Mr. SCRIVNER: Petition of sundry citizens of Bourbon County, Kans., urging Congress to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary to the winning of the war by enacting House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4164. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of Max Wiesen and 59 other residents of the Twenty-second Congressional District, Bronx, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4165. By Mr. HAGEN: Petition of Emelia Erickson, Alma Erickson, and 27 other petitioners from Thief River Falls, Minn., advocating passage of House bill 2082, a bill prohibiting the manufacture, sale, and/or transportation of alcoholic liquors for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4166. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the San Francisco Labor Council, requesting the National Housing Agency to program allocations to civilians' new homes and that the immigrant war workers' directive be set aside for these homes and that the War Production Board release materials and grant priorities for their construction in accordance with the civilian needs of metropolitan centers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.